On the Merits of Heritage Informed Coastal Wellbeing (HICW): Assessing our Common Maritime Heritage as a Governance Model

Benjamin McTaggart[*], University of Ottawa

Abstract

Heritage Informed Coastal Wellbeing (HICW) is a novel model proposed here as utilizing maritime cultural heritage, both tangible and intangible, to illustrate the temporal, geographical and cultural links humans have with coastal environments. To that end, it can not only inform how societies govern and utilize their ocean spaces, but through heritage regulatory frameworks, guide responses to climate change. Through an analysis of broad maritime law, maritime cultural heritage itself, environmental assessments and finally on how people generate wellbeing from proximity to the sea, this article explores the

[*] Biography: Ben McTaggart is a UOttawa graduate student in the International Development and Globalization program, focusing on Environmental Sustainability. Having previously studied archaeology and worked at sea, he is interested to focus his research and studies on the intersection of cultural heritage management and ocean health. Additionally, having worked for Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada, he is curious about how to his work can work in support of First Nations, Metis and Inuit traditional knowledge. How Canadian and international policy factors in Arctic and northern voices and place-based knowledge is central to that learning.

Biographie : Ben McTaggart est un étudiant diplômé du programme de développement international et de mondialisation de l'Université d'Ottawa, qui se concentre sur la durabilité de l'environnement. Ayant déjà étudié l'archéologie et travaillé en mer, il souhaite axer ses recherches et ses études sur l'intersection de la gestion du patrimoine culturel et de la santé des océans. En outre, ayant travaillé pour le ministère des Relations avec les Autochtones et des Affaires du Nord, il est curieux de savoir comment son travail peut contribuer à soutenir les connaissances traditionnelles des Premières nations, des Métis et des Inuits. La façon dont les politiques canadiennes et internationales prennent en compte les voix de l'Arctique et du Nord ainsi que les savoirs locaux est au cœur de cet apprentissage.

legitimacy of HICW as a governance model. Through case studies, the model's legitimacy and limitations in the Canadian Arctic and the South China Sea (SCS) are addressed. I concentrate on two specific research questions: 1) how maritime heritage can inform coastal wellbeing and 2) if such heritage regulation can be used to generate cooperative ocean governance in areas of authoritative, legal, or governance dispute, will guide discussion on how a HICW model can function as a marine, environmental, and regional governance framework.

Keywords: Heritage, Governance, Wellbeing, Arctic, South China Sea

Résumé

Le bien-être côtier éclairé par le patrimoine (Heritage Informed Coastal Wellbeing, HICW) est un nouveau modèle proposé ici, qui utilise le patrimoine culturel maritime, à la fois matériel et immatériel, pour illustrer les liens temporels, géographiques et culturels que les êtres humains entretiennent avec les environnements côtiers. À cette fin, il peut non seulement informer sur la manière dont les sociétés gouvernent et utilisent leurs espaces océaniques, mais aussi, par le biais de cadres réglementaires patrimoniaux, guider les réponses au changement climatique. En analysant le droit maritime au sens large, le patrimoine culturel maritime lui-même, les évaluations environnementales et, enfin, la manière dont les gens tirent leur bien-être de la proximité de la mer, cet article explore la légitimité de l'approche intégrée de l'écosystème côtier en tant que modèle de gouvernance. À travers des études de cas, la légitimité et les limites du modèle dans l'Arctique canadien et la mer de Chine méridionale (SCS) sont abordées. Je me concentre sur deux questions de recherche spécifiques : 1) comment le patrimoine maritime peut informer le bien-être côtier et 2) si une telle réglementation du patrimoine peut être utilisée pour générer une gouvernance coopérative des océans dans les zones de litige autoritaire, juridique ou de gouvernance, guidera la discussion sur la façon dont un modèle HICW peut fonctionner comme un cadre de gouvernance marine, environnementale et régionale.

Mots-clés: Patrimoine, gouvernance, bien-être, Arctique, mer de Chine méridionale

Heritage, as a lens through which to guide how we humans govern our interactions with both land and sea, is an often-unexplored phenomenon. Jurisdictions around the world already have laws and regulations that encode heritage site preservation both tangible and intangible, integrating environmental considerations for areas frequented by community members like parks, beaches, and national monument sites. However, it is often underexplored how this heritage governance generates greater ecosystem services for human wellbeing (Blythe et al 2020). As such, the concept of Heritage Informed Coastal Wellbeing (HICW) is proposed here as a model that looks to manage coastal and marine tangible and intangible heritage to better steward such environments. Implicit in this is HICW's capacity to increase place-based wellbeing for surrounding communities.

Central to HICW is the knowledge that, as discussed further in Henderson (2019), the concept of a marine coastal landscape encapsulates the multitude of ways humans interact with the ocean: geographical, temporally, and culturally to name the most pertinent dimensions. By incorporating a "common heritage of mankind" (associated with seabed law in Schofield et al (2013)) into how humans interact with the ocean, more sustainable and border-crossing solutions to cooperative (co-) governance exist. As such, I explore the legitimacy of HICW's ability to mobilize that common heritage to inform regional co-governance. Today, critical marine coastal zones and their associated biodiversity are under threat from a warming world, made worse by many nations, including Canada's, collective inability to respond accordingly (CBC News, 2023). I propose that HICW can utilize our common heritage to help us respond and operate within that warming world. To do so, I use two regional contexts to provide evidence for HICW's legitimacy: the circumpolar Arctic from an Inuit and Canadian standpoint, and the South China Sea (SCS) in a Vietnamese context, specifically on the island of Quan Lạn in Hạ Long Bay. Both regions are informed by coastal benefits and access to resources defined by a status quo where built and intangible heritage is impacted by a changing geopolitical and environmental climate. I have worked within and in support of both of these regions and bring contexts to light throughout this article to highlight the utility of HICW as a dynamic model able to address different global contexts.

Ultimately, the utility of taking a HICW approach to governance is illuminating multidimensional (temporal, spatial, multispecies, multicultural) aspects to human interaction with the oceans. Too often, ecosystem preservation is pursued in isolation from heritage preservation, and vice versa (Henderson, 2019). A HICW approach means using cultural heritage as the starting point for the creation of laws and regulations governing coastal areas increasingly impacted by a changing climate. The approach posits that ecosystem and natural resource governance is stronger when connected to the protection of cultural heritage (Blythe et al, 2020; Jing and Li, 2019). In short, ecosystem services, defined as how people benefit from the environment, and social wellbeing, indicators determining how we thrive in life, are at the center of HICW (Blythe et al, 2020).

To generate an effective discussion around the concept of HICW, I draw on concepts and themes found in four areas of research: cultural resource and heritage management, environmental and ecosystem management, maritime law, and general discussions around coastal wellbeing. Through their relevance to marine and environmental management, political governance, and human wellbeing/flourishing discussions, these areas serve as the epistemological backbone of HICW. I explore these by presenting the four areas of research and discussing their interconnections, taking a siloed approach. I discuss an overview of these areas of research in relation to heritage management before outlining how I intend to utilize them for a discussion on the HICW concept.

Research Framework and Literature Review

Maritime Law and Jurisdiction

To start as broad as possible, the maritime law and jurisdiction literature provides the backdrop for the relevance of HICW. When looking at both Arctic and SCS cultural and natural resource management topics, most research focuses on some form of fishing and sub-sea resource use like gas and oil (Vu, 2013; Zhang, 2018; Ca, 2019; Tanaka 2020; Guilan and Weiwei, 2021; Daly, Knott, Keogh, and Singh, 2021). Additional discussion also focused on the role of mitigating and adapting to climate change in the region (Arruda and Krutkowski, 2017; Scott, 2020; Zou and Zhang, 2020) and the role of co-governance (Dela Cruz, 2019; Ca, 2019; Crawford

2021). The role of heritage informing law itself is either within the domain of marine and maritime cultural heritage discussions or how it may be relevant to existing law under specific articles in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage (UCHC) (Vu, 2013; Jing and Li 2019). Establishing a broad discussion on law and looking at its current and previous precedents indicates that heritage, while at the basis of conventions and agreements like UNCLOS and UCHC, are disaggregated and subject to the whims of signatory states (Zou and Zhang, 2020, p. 218). In both the SCS and Arctic, understanding how heritage informs both regions is central to understanding the various states inherent conflict of interests.

A cursory investigation into the basis of the SCS dispute reveals an understanding of Chinese intentions in the region. One source of this dispute is rooted in historic claims to use and livelihood within a region known as the nine-dash line that currently overlaps the existing exclusive economic zones (EEZ's) of Vietnam, Taiwan, the Philippines, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Brunei. Yet, central to this review, is the role of heritage in coastal wellbeing at a local level, so how do regional governance disputes factor in? Guilan and Weiwei (2021), in their discussion on synergistic management on maritime cultural heritage from a Chinese standpoint outline its major role in ancient Maritime Silk Road and place within SCS maritime history. The central question is one of if this history is to be used benevolently or just as a means of hegemony and jurisdiction acquisition. With Guilan and Weiwei noting expansive sunken cultural heritage all over the SCS region, they note how:

> A shipwreck's hull, fragments, and other objects inside are representative of a nation's maritime heritage, the shipyards and waterfronts that promote the development of shipbuilding and fishing and facilitated trade are also a significant part of the maritime cultural landscape, exemplifying the interaction between sea and land (2020, p. 1)

But this is not specific to China, as Vietnam, among other SCS nations have significant claim to cultural material both inside and outside of their EEZ. Observing difficulties, Guilan and Weiwei note

how a lack "bridges across domains" "highly limit" the ability to interpret and work with marine cultural heritage as "issues of public social utilization" due to the outsized economic importance of development and fishing considerations (p. 2). Bridging across domains can be read as the siloed nature of sector management in sea governance, a factor that both Grip and Blomqvist (2021, p. 3) and Scott (2020) highlights in a discussion around integrated ocean management (IOM). Defining IOM as "an approach to oceans governance that aims to integrate the management of marine-based activities across sectors, space and time under a unified, overarching vision," this potentially useful tool can harmonize economic and heritage informed use of coastal zones, among other considerations (Scott, 2020, p. 297). Yet, as discussed in Blythe et al. (2020) and Avieli (2015), applying management to regions with diverse culture and heritage meets up against a SCS region with multiple national claims of place and space.

From an Arctic perspective, the calculus of co-management is less so a question of one state dominance over a shared sea, but traditional voices long marginalized having a stake in international consideration. The Canadian Arctic, like other Arctic nations, represents a region requiring consistent planning and change management as the world warms and the climate changes. Many Inuit and Indigenous governments have proposed their own plans and governance regimes for their coastal and marine zones that highlight the connections in human-environment relations (ITK, 2018; Qikiqtani Inuit Association, 2019; Inuvialuit Regional Corporation 2020). Moreover, on a macro, international, and geopolitical level, Crawford (2021) describes the region as an "exception" in that conflict and violence are absent. Crawford argues that the region is "ruled by networks of overlapping local regimes and states engaged in environmental co-management, economic development, scientific and security cooperation, and more," while agreeing that "these networks alone cannot stop ice from melting" (para 3). This also ignores the very real injustices facing Indigenous populations, past and present. As a result, discussing the Arctic as a region to be managed simply within a context of climate change represents a "narrow framework" as highlighted by Arruda and Krutkowski (2017). Instead, by focusing on place-based avenues to expand awareness of life in the arctic, aspects like media and technology can help

"Indigenous people to alter this dominant approach and expand the concept of "change" with a discussion of cultural, social, political, economic, and technological issues affecting the everyday life of Arctic communities" (Arruda and Krutkowski, 2017, p.519). Further, they note how, by advancing what is already present in Arctic communities, cultural and natural awareness, knowledge of the environment, and how to rely on sustainable livelihoods, amplification of Arctic Indigenous voices creates an environment through which "Indigenous people can pursue community-focused goals" (p. 519). Here, HICW has a role to play in listening to and promoting the traditional heritage of Inuit populations, be they through tourism, ecosystem services, or other place-based or digital dimensions. However, moving forward, Canada also has a role to play in walking the line between co-managing, governing and, ultimately, devolving authority over Arctic ocean governance to a Inuit community level. This is made harder as the Arctic warms, natural resources become easily accessible, and competition and conflict with other states increases (Paikin, Kemp, Fitz-Gerald & Blais 2023). Doing so in a way that keeps Canada's northern residents safe increases the imperative for effective co-governance.

In addressing these vastly different contexts, I propose that HICW management regimes, which take a common heritage approach, can address diverse governance questions. In this way, the concepts of co-governance based on heritage between states in both the Arctic and SCS require unique, agreed upon frameworks if heritage informed coastal wellbeing is to be a legitimate model. Schofield et al (2013) highlights the precedent for seeing the seas and, by extension, the seabed as a "common heritage of mankind," viewed as such by 1970 UN General Assembly resolution 2749, called "A Declaration of Principles Governing the Sea-bed and Ocean Floor Beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction" (p. 36). As such, HICW, by its very nature and landscape in question, is not without precedent. The question of governance is based inextricably on a shared heritage, to the extent that states are signatories to the resolution. As such, while it may be engrained at a global governance level, in practice in places like the SCS with overlapping claims, the extent to which a "common heritage" can inform human use and governance is subject to which actor has the power to enforce "whose heritage" and "whose governance" takes

precedence. This provides rationale for research around the claims of use in the region, along with a systematic historical review of heritage.

Maritime Cultural Heritage

HICW intentions derive their major inspiration from the literature on maritime cultural heritage and resource management. I explored research relevance to heritage, in general, and maritime heritage, specifically (Avieli, 2015; Khakzad, Pieters, and Van Balen, 2015; Sarid, 2018;Jin and Li, 2019; Henderson, 2019; You and Hardwick, 2020; Weber, Dawson, and Carter, 2021). All authors cover the broad themes of historical/cultural interpretation and stewardship. I link wellbeing and ecosystem service discussions expressed in Blythe et al (2020)[8] throughout this literature review. Focusing on the value of maritime cultural heritage to the previous overview of law, Jing and Li (2019) look at maritime cultural heritage as a lens through which stewardship and governance can be effectively implemented within the SCS. As highlighted in the above discussion on law, they too see heritage as a less researched and little recognized avenue towards claim of ownership and governance compared to resources like oil, gas, and fisheries. Jing and LI (along with Sarid 2020) see the significance of UNCLOS and UCHC as pivotal to governing maritime cultural heritage. They note that Vietnam's political views on the subject see that "cultural heritage is divided into intangible and tangible elements, comprising intellectual and material products with historical, cultural and scientific value that are passed on from generation to generation" (p. 110). With maritime cultural heritage being inherently political in Vietnam due to the dispute in the region with China, Jing and Li, linking with Dela Cruz (2019), promote the

---

[8] Blythe et al defines ecosystem services as "the flows of benefits that people derive from nature through provisioning, regulating, supporting and cultural functions". Additionally, they define social well being as "an approach to understand three related dimensions of a life well-lived: 1) a material dimension; 2) a relational dimension; and 3) a subjective dimension." From "Frontiers in coastal well-being and ecosystem services research: A systematic review," by J. Blythe et al, 2020, *Ocean & Coastal Management,* 185, p. 2.

idea of a regional seas convention for the SCS based on a shared heritage.

The relevance of HICW through a legal lens informed by Jing and Li's focus on heritage stewardship gives weight to the model's ability to promote regional co-governance. However, a deeper discussion of the criticality of maritime heritage is required. Henderson (2019) is a seminal text, looking at how including maritime cultural heritage in governance frameworks is considered essential for humans interacting with the oceans, regional seas, and bodies of water in all economic, leisure and cultural capacities. Specifically, Henderson discusses how maritime cultural heritage can integrate with UN Decade of Ocean Science for Sustainable Development Initiative (2021-2030). Henderson also highlights that current climate-based ocean science is suffering from a dearth of knowledge surrounding human cultural dimensions in the social sciences (p. 2). In discussing how practices of cultural heritage preservation are considered by many governments to be a "further financial burden they can ill afford" (p. 2), Henderson identifies the "potentially calamitous" gap of the minimally "effective sustainable development without a consideration of maritime cultural heritage, potentially [undermining] the identities and wellbeing of coastal communities" (p. 2). In further laying out the issues associated with the disaggregating of law surrounding land and sea management, Henderson illuminates how a marine cultural landscape, designed to integrate all manner of human-sea interactions, can situate wellbeing models (p. 3). Henderson's work serves as a nexus around which the literature examined here and the research question of the validity of HICW will be set.

Henderson's points link with the prior work of Khakzad, Pieters and Van Balen (2015), highlighting the missing opportunities of integrating 'coastal cultural heritage' into ways of knowing, stewarding, and operating in and around coastal regions. In defining cultural heritage as "that part of the past which we select in the present for contemporary purposes, be they economic, cultural, political, or social", Khakzad, Pieters and Van Balen situate maritime cultural heritage as the basis through which humans, governance structures and management decisions should steward the relationship between humanity, land, and sea (p. 110). Here we see

the merit of Guilan and Weiwei's (2021) "bridg[ing] across domains" in making maritime cultural heritage a policy consideration in the face of diverse and siloed governance regimes (p. 2).

By this point in the literature review, macro-concepts have been discussed with little consideration to everyday human use and interaction considerations of HICW. Here, Khakzad, Pieters and Van Balen (2015) provide further insight. Their methodology utilizes "integrated complexity theory" (ICT) or the ways people interact with, reconcile, and understand multiple dimensions informing a given space or concept (p. 112). The authours highlight the complexity of "the integrated planning and management of coastal resources and environments […,] defined as an approach based on the physical, socioeconomic and political issues inherent in a dynamic coastal system" (p. 112). While outside the scope of this article, ICT links with Metabolic Rift theory, highlighted by Ul-Durar et al (2023) as the capitalist informed rift between humanity and nature that effective ecological management can address. Looking at water conflict between India and Pakistan, Ul-Durar (2023) sees complexity as yielding to a needs-based approach (p. 2) ICT, informed by an ecological needs-based approach, can look at the differentiation of these dynamic coastal systems, how they are siloed, and then considers how they are integrated once more, or how people consider them related. In analyzing ICT's relevance to the HICW model, how people engage with a coastal landscape is made more informed and culturally significant through an awareness of the marine cultural landscape (as understood by Henderson 2019). Furthermore, this installation and multilateral awareness of a marine cultural landscape can serve to generate cooperation, representing an innovative way to bring both government, community, and marginalized groups to the governance table (Henderson, 2019; Rudolph, 2020; Dela Cruz, 2019; Vu, 2013). Taking the point further, HICW is not only for observable heritage, like a wreck or sunken use site. Rather, the intangible aspects of maritime cultural heritage discussed by Jing and Li (2019) represent what You and Hardwick see as "complex networks of concepts with political and historical stakes" (p. 4). Here again, it is seen how maritime heritage is inherently political: it involves a deeply human connection with the sea, culture, and the environment in which people live. How heritage is informed by memory, who is remembering and how groups

collectively remember within the bounds of 'Memory Politics'[9] as outlined by Lewis et al (2022) is critical for governing maritime heritage. Henderson's discussion of landscapes highlights how people can render dynamic complexity within an understandable policy or implemented use, as will be discussed in the section that follows.

Maritime cultural heritage also has value to coastal wellbeing through an analysis of economic development. While beyond the scope of this literature review, taking the concept of HICW to its ultimate conclusions, land, and sea use planning, along with stewardship and interpretation of maritime heritage sites would potential generate and promote tourism. Weber, Dawson, and Carter (2021) discuss this concept through recommendations made from interviewing residents of Gjoa Haven in Nunavut, focusing on the economic and tourism benefits that can come through interpretation of the Franklin wreck sites of the *Erebus* and *Terror.*[10] In finding a desire for increased economic opportunities in a remote and hard to reach environment, an awareness of Henderson's marine cultural landscape promotion

---

[9] "Even when under-stood spatially, "regions of memory" are of course not intended as large areas in which everyone shares the same memories—analogously to national memory-scapes, which are likewise never monolithic. There are diverse historical events remembered with varied significance across the geographical space; and the same events are often given different or conflicting meanings. However, their memories are in one or other way dis-cursively connected to the place in which they happened. They might form supra- or transnational constellations of representations of the past within or referring to the particular regional space. They may share specific regional carriers, forms, agents, sites, or nodes of memory" (p.5). From " Regions of memory : transnational formations," by Lewis, S, Olick, J. K, Wawrzyniak, J, & Pakier, M, 2022, Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-93705-8

[10] The *HMS Erebus* and *Terror* left from Britain in 1845 to find the Northwest Passage in what is today northern Canada. Finding their wreck sites in 2014 and 2016 respectively, their relocation has generated significant attention from the Canadian government, historians, archaeologists and tourists. Parks Canada. (2021). Wrecks of HMS Erebus and HMS Terror National Historic Site. In *Parks Canada National Historic Sites*. Retrieved from https://www.pc.gc.ca/en/lhn-nhs/nu/epaveswrecks

can assist interpretation. Value is still found in heritage interpretation, even as the wrecks themselves are not dive-able due to Canadian government restriction (p. 10). Yet interest in the Arctic and Canadian heritage remains strong (p. 4). Arctic heritage and its regional governance are obviously distinct from the SCS region, yet still represents an interesting parallel worth exploring in future research.

Environment and Ecosystem Considerations

As a natural extension of how HICW can be utilized to better realize climate change governance, we must examine the implementation of Marine Protected Areas (MPA) in, around, or encompassing the Arctic and SCS. Specifically, MPA can represent Henderson's intended use of marine cultural landscapes by instilling ecological and biological protections, stimulating co-governance of areas in dispute. Many sources that looked at law and governance in the SCS region focused on combating human induced climate change to develop regional cooperation (Vu, 2013; Bai and Hu, 2016; Zhang, 2018; Dela Cruz, 2019; Ca, 2019; Zou and Zhang, 2020; Scott, 2020; Tanaka, 2020). Corresponding to the previous discussions of the Arctic example, Bai and Hu (2016) see the actions taken by the Arctic Council[11] as example for what the SCS region could develop

---

[11] The Arctic Council is an intergovernmental panel, founded in 1996, consisting of Arctic states (states who border the region) that deal with regional environmental, economic and sovereignty concerns. Arctic Council. (2021). The History of the Arctic Council. In *Arctic Council.* Retrieved from https://arctic-council.org/about/timeline/

[11] These skills are investigative in nature, designed for field digging, analysis and artifact identification. There is also a lab component and outreach and education opportunities designed to advertise and promote Vietnamese maritime cultural heritage. From "Choice, Values and Building Capability: A Case Study from Vietnam," by P. O'Toole, & M. Staniforth, 2019, *Journal of Maritime Archaeology*, 14(3), 355–68.

[11] Yuan Dynasty invasions of the lands of the Dai Viet in the 13th century form the basis of this national history. Wooden invasion ships were snared and scuttled off the coast of Quan Lan. Without knowing the exact location, taking on the guise of intangible cultural heritage, the ships represent a source of regional and national pride against historical Chinese aggression. From "Naval Battlefield Archaeology of the Lost Kublai Khan Fleets," by J. Kimura

through environmental based co-governance. Bai and Hu also highlight the complicated nature of co-governance, with Zhang (2018) focusing on the little action undertaken to mitigate the complexity of the issue in the SCS region. Subsequently, both Ca (2019) and Dela Cruz (2019) highlight the need in the SCS sea region for a "regional ocean governance framework" (p. 198), and a "regional seas convention" (p. 7), respectively. The literature surrounding environmental governance thus indicates a need but fails to streamline or advocate for a singular solution, highlighting the complexity.

Perhaps the most illustrative way environmental and ecosystem service considerations can result from HICW is through the Sustainable Development Goal initiatives. While SDG 14 (Life Below Water) focuses on interactions and stewardship of the ocean specifically, SDG 11 as noted by Carpenter, Skinner, and Johansson (2021), intersects more specifically with Henderson's marine cultural landscape. While its doesn't mention landscape ideas specifically, it notes how SDG 11, making cities more sustainable, safe, resilient, and inclusive, looks at the importance of cultural and natural heritage in places where people live, work and recreate. The "maritime domain", as they call it, is key when looking at how large or intensified populations of people use the coastal and ocean areas for their wellbeing (p. 490). Governance and management consideration are key however, and as Holon et al. (2015) highlight, global or regional analyses of marine biodiversity protections do not always mesh at a local governance level (p. 1). As such, it can be seen how a bottom-up approach that prizes and centres human use could lead a path forward. A HICW model could be based on recreation and use sites that stewards environmental protection and input from the local community. This point links with Carpenter, Skinner, and Johansson (2021)'s belief that SDG 11 can generate sustainable development through incorporating environmental (and possibly maritime) considerations.

---

et al ,2014, *The International Journal of Nautical Archaeology, 43(1*), 76–86. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1111/1095-9270.12033

From a Canadian Arctic perspective, these outcomes articulate more clearly. Canada is currently committed to protecting 25% of its ocean and coastal waters by 2025, and 30% by 2030. To do so, it is looking to co-create and manage Marine Protected Area's (MPA), support the creation of Indigenous Protected Area's (IPA) (combined I/MPA) and Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measure's (OECM's). Central in their implementation is the prohibition of misuse and economic activity like unregulated fishing and fossil fuel extraction. Here, the main conflict between government intention and Indigenous/Inuit demands for livable northern livelihoods appears, as access to economic development through fossil fuels is removed. While this research stands in support of MPA/OECMs, as noted by Daly, Knott, Keogh, and Singh (2021) "although MPAs can improve both human well-being and conservation, negative impacts can co-occur with benefits" (p. 8). These negative impacts can be seen not only as limits on traditional activities due to conservation measures, but the removal of access to resources that has improved the economies of the western and southern developed world, potentially curtailing wellbeing for northern residents. Further, the question of preservation over use represents issues prevalent in the Arctic and SCS, as noted by Barkley et al 1997: "while there may be strong urban pressure to "preserve", there is a strong pressure from economically-depressed rural communities to utilize" (p. 726). While "economically-depressed" may be invariably inaccurate across both the Canadian north and SCS region, the divide between preservation and utilization needs to be bridged. Specifically, if moratoriums and resource extraction bans in the Arctic ocean which limit coastal Inuit communities are to remain law, it is critical to find ways to generate meaningful livelihoods and well-being through I/MPAs, both traditional and wage-based.

It remains to be seen if a HICW model could represent a basis for environmental co-governance through the establishment of livelihood focused MPAs in the Arctic and SCS based around shared heritage or what Schofield et al (2013) highlights as "common heritage". Guilan and Weiwei, previously alluding to the breadth of China's heritage claim, dubious though they may be, illuminate how heritage is used to stake territorial claim. This is something that can potential help bolster the position of SCS border nations like Vietnam under threat from Chinese territorial expansion AND guide Canada's desire

to strengthen Indigenous voices in the Arctic while righting its previous policy wrongs. But heritage, as will be analyzed in Blythe (2020) and Avieli (2015), is highly specific and regional. Local context is key to informing HICW.

Wellbeing

HICW is proposed here to be based on how communities and groups interact with and facilitate an awareness of maritime heritage into the use of their coastal regions. Blythe et al (2020) is central to HICW, as the proposed model's legitimacy is based around the definitions of ecosystem service and social wellbeing. According to Blythe et al (2020), ecosystem services relate to how humans benefit through their interactions with nature. Critically, social wellbeing serves as an indicator of material, relational and subjective dimensions in life that move beyond basic needs and reflects "the importance of social, psychological and cultural needs required to thrive" (p. 2) Local context then, informs how and when heritage could ever be used to govern a landscape, discuss interactions, or generate wellbeing. Noting Henderson (2019)'s promotion of a lack of heritage contexts in sustainable development, Rudolph (2020) provides a window into how HICW could serve to fill this void as "innovative leadership and niche-level experimentation" (p. 3). Demanding such leadership and experimentation in ocean stewardship, Rudolph provides the ownness to explore a niche concept within a context specific geographic location where society lives close to and in relative dependence on the sea. Of note, Wegscheidl (2016)'s work serves as an interesting environmental parallel for a marine cultural landscape as described by Henderson. Wegscheidl describes coastal seascapes as existing within a "range of services that contribute to human well-being" noting provisional, regulation-based, cultural and biodiversity services within said range (p. 4). This shows how Henderson's ideas around all human interactions with the sea from a cultural standpoint can also have an environmental one. HICW can inherently operate as environmental management, powered as it is by perceived human well-being and valuation of the marine landscape.

This opens the door for future research on why such close relationships exist between people and the sea, be it cultural or

purely for economic gain, and if focusing on a temporal dimension that explores past use, understandings of and cultural significance with these coastal regions is of use. Quimby and Levine (2021) bring further credence to the relevance of this framework on climate change governance, citing the need for local ecological and social memory being key to adaptive co-management (p. 2). Adding to Blythe et al (2020)'s highlighting that ecosystem services are "context-dependent" (p. 2), Quimby and Levine note that "community self-organization, participation in management actions, and decision-making are all cited as important principles for successful co-management" (p. 10). Relevantly, O'Toole and Staniforth (2019) explore the adaptive capacity building of the Vietnamese Maritime Archaeology Project for its ability to generate maritime cultural heritage skills of both the Vietnamese government and the local community where maritime heritage is situated. In this way, building the capacity of government and local knowledge around interacting with maritime cultural heritage represent a case study rooted in both the Arctic and/or SCS to test Rudolph's (2020), Quimby and Levine's (2021) and Blythe et al.'s (2020) notion of contextual and culturally specific relevance of ecological wellbeing. By exploring the ways in which HICW can benefit the local populace through co-management on a local level to build capacity, the relevance and legitimacy of HICW can be further assessed for its regional ocean governance potential.

Discussion

HICW is an experimental concept based on gaps identified predominantly in Henderson (2019) and Khakzad, Pieters, and Van Balen (2015). These gaps have been contextualized by the dependent implementation in the analysis of Blythe et al (2020), Rudolph (2020), and Quimby and Levine (2021). Specifically, for future assessment, I call on ethnographic research in both regions explored in this paper. Additionally, I recommend the secondary questions used to guide this review of HICW (the utility of heritage as management and such management used for regional governance) be used to inform and develop such research. With the legitimacy of HICW in Vietnam based on the idea of heritage informing regional co-governance of the South China Sea (SCS) region for example,

regional contexts need to be considered and approved ahead of any research.

In determining the legitimacy of HICW, I have assessed the four themes in a siloed manner through Arctic and SCS lens for contextual clarity. Moving forward, analysis through ethnographic accounts of how people interact with maritime culture can better inform the utility of HICW. One example of how this may look is from a Canadian Arctic perspective is the work of Weber, Dawson. and Carter (2021), highlighting how Indigenous input (through local interviews in Gjoa Haven) are critical for heritage tourism leading to economic gain in the region. Such work can inform HICW's utility on Quan Lạn Island in Hạ Long Bay, Vietnam. The island is thought to be home to the historic port of Van Don, where the Mongolian controlled fleet of China's Yuan Dynasty attempted to invade Vietnam in 1288. The site of a decisive victory for the Vietnamese forces and current nationalist pride serves a source of intangible cultural heritage. Ethnographic accounts of how people interact with this heritage, intangible as it is, can yield information on how people organize themselves around heritage as a form of governance. Structured interviews can look at how this heritage informs land and coastal use, the benefits it yields through tourism, and how heritage labels under the likes of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) can generate awareness of place-based use. Of note, in Avieli (2015)'s ethnographic account of Hội An's heritage implementation, the lack of local community input prior to and during UNESCO's world heritage implementation procedures obscures what world heritage designations intend to do through preserving culture in the first place (p. 39). An ethnographic account which generates an awareness of what maritime heritage means to the residents of Quan Lạn and how it can inform coastal use more broadly, not simply advocating protection for protections sake as evidenced in Avieli's accounts, would provide a crucial contribution to literature. In this way, ethnographic accounts from residents can, reflexively, help illuminate the validity of HICW as a process able to assist and generate co-governance in disputed regions. Validity will also be of central concern to HICW, given the experimental nature of the concept.

There are drawbacks to taking an ethnographic approach. Observing and discussing everyday interactions may miss the minute details associated with teasing out an illusive understanding of HICW. Indeed, interacting with people whose main concerns are their livelihoods may not yield answers that directly relate to heritage as a means through which people engage with their coasts. Additionally, and from experience, the Vietnamese government is highly structured and may not tolerate planned research on heritage deemed vital or sensitive to the national interest of Vietnam. Recent arrests of local climate NGO researchers by the Vietnamese government highlight the political and national security sensitivities inherent to such research (New York Times, 2023). Ethnography, while seemingly simply a process of observing and interpreting, may be both too broad and too intrusive a tool. Yet, it represents a relevant method for understanding what maritime heritage and landscape use means to people within a given context.

Secondly, looking at the relevance of HICW for informing governance from an Arctic context, existing Inuit management plans for coastal use need to be taken into consideration for future assessment of HICW's legitimacy. Blythe et al. (2020) look at the combined role of ecosystem services, or the benefits people gain from nature "through provisioning, regulating, supporting and cultural functions", and wellbeing as defining a life well-lived as incorporating material, relational and subjective dimensions (p. 2). How ecosystem services and human well-being combine is of relevance to creating strong livelihoods from protected and conserved areas:

> well-being and ecosystem service concepts can offer linked social-ecological insights on how best to craft and implement management interventions and processes (e.g., resource rights allocations, zoning for protection and use, flexible institutions) appropriate in rapidly changing coastal systems (Blythe et al, 2020, p. 2).

These social-ecological management interventions can perhaps best be represented as Integrated Ocean Management (IOM) and Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) schemes. IOM is defined by Scott 2020 as "an approach to oceans governance that aims to integrate the management of marine-based activities across sectors, space and time under a unified, overarching vision" (p. 297). In relation, Grip and Blomqvist (2021) discuss that MSP is a process of "analyzing

and allocating the spatial and temporal distribution of human activities in marine areas and space to achieve ecological, economic and social objectives" (p. 1). The social objectives, further discussed in Potts (2015) to integrate all manner of human uses of marine and coastal zones in stewarding the environment highlight how existing laws, statutes and tools like IOM and MSP employ can be repurposed to use Schofield's (2013) "common heritage of mankind" ideal (p.36).

Individual plans and agreements from Indigenous regional governments, representing an opportunity for heritage and environmental to guide conservation-based highlight overarching visions of livelihoods. Such examples within the Inuvialuit's *Proactive Vessel Management initiative* (2020) the Qikiqtani Inuit Association's *Evaluating the role of Marine-Based Harvesting in Food Security in The Eastern Arctic (2019)*, as well as the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami's *National Inuit Climate Change Strategy (2018)*. Combined, these documents highlight how heritage, environment, and human management planning, in many ways, act as one and the same. These varied management and policy plans share a common theme: cultural heritage and the natural environment are intimately linked, and these links need to be preserved in decision making. It is proposed here that the combination of these two can not only make the push to conserve marine spaces more economically viable for northern populations but can do so in a way that centers preservation of the natural environment through a common heritage governance model based on wellbeing.

Conclusion

The aim of this article has been to justify the rationale for exploring the validity of HICW and explore its legitimacy as a governance model. This was done through a method that tests its ability to measure human-environment interactions in coastal environments with heritage significance, in this case, the South China Sea and Canadian Arctic. Future studies and tests on the model, based on measurable wellbeing and ecological benefit for the communities in question, will ideally be able to highlight attitudes based on regional co-governance around a shared understanding of common heritage. The gap that exists in protecting tangible and intangible heritage risks

erasing our common heritage. Through HICW, such common heritage is not just a tool for governance, but central to its inception and implementation. To pursue that intention, I presented the concept of HICW through a limited analysis of the existing literatures in maritime law, cultural resource management, environmental stewardship, and human wellbeing. I propose that HICW should be thought of as these four separate fields interacting on a spectrum between less governance and more governance. Finally, I identified the validity of HICW as a framework designed to manage our shared and conflicted marine spaces in order to promote united significance in service of a human and natural heritage, focused climate change governance regime.

References

Avieli, N. (2015). The Rise and Fall (?) Of Hội An, a UNESCO World Heritage Site in Vietnam. Sojourn, 30(1), 35–71. https://doi.org/10.1355/sj30-1b

Arruda, G.M., and Krutkowski, S. (2017). Arctic governance, indigenous knowledge, science and technology in times of climate change: Self-realization, recognition, representativeness. Journal of Enterprising Communities. 11(4): 514-528. https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JEC-08-2015-0041/full/html

Bai., & Hu, H. (2016). Transcending Divisions and Harmonizing Interests: How the Arctic Council Experience Can Inform Regional Cooperation on Environmental Protection in the South China Sea. Chinese Journal of International Law, 15(4), 935–945. https://doi.org/10.1093/chinesejil/jmw039

Barkley, B., Patry, M., Story, P., & Virc, S. (1997) The Eastern Ontario Model Forest: Acting Locally, Connecting Globally. Forestry Chronicle. 723-726. https://pubs.cif-ifc.org/doi/abs/10.5558/tfc73723-6

Betcherman, G, & Marschke, M. (2016). Coastal Livelihoods in Transition: How Are Vietnamese Households Responding to Changes in the Fisheries and in the Economy? Journal of Rural Studies. 24–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2016.02.012

Blythe, J., Armitage, D., Alonso, G., Campbell, D., Esteves Dias, A. C., Epstein, G., Marschke, M., & Nayak, P. (2020). Frontiers in coastal well-being and ecosystem services research: A systematic review. Ocean & Coastal Management. 185, 105028–. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2019.105028

Ca, V. T. (2019). A regional ocean governance framework for the integrated management of the environment and biological resources in the South China Sea. In T. T. Tran, J. Welfield, & T. T. Le. (Eds.) Building a Normative Order in the South China Sea (pp. 196–210).

Edward Elgar Publishing.
https://doi.org/10.4337/9781786437532.00019

Carpenter A., Skinner J.A., & Johansson T.M. (2021) Conclusions:
Connecting Sustainable Development Goals to the Maritime Domain.
In Carpenter. A., Johansson T.M., Skinner J.A. (Eds.) Sustainability
in the Maritime Domain: towards ocean governance and beyond (pp.
489-507). Springer Cham. https://doi-
org.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/10.1007/978-3-030-69325-1_22

Crawford, B.K. (2021). Explaining Arctic peace: a human heritage
perspective. International Relations. 35(3).
https://www.sciencegate.app/document/10.1177/0047117821103678
2#:~:text=Looking%20below%20the%20radar%20of%20IR%20theor
y%20and,steered%20by%20indigenous%20knowledge%20holders%
20in%20Arctic%20governance.

Daly, J., Knott, C., Keogh, P., Singh, GG. (2021). Changing climates
in a blue economy: Assessing the climate-responsiveness of
Canadian fisheries and oceans policy. Marine Policy, Elsevier.
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0308597X210
02347

Dela Cruz, A. I. P. (2019). A South China Sea Regional Seas
Convention: Transcending Soft Law and State Goodwill in Marine
Environmental Governance? Journal of Territorial and Maritime
Studies 6(1), 5–29. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26664177

Grip, K., & Blomqvist, S. (2021). Marine spatial planning:
Coordinating divergent marine interests. Ambio, 50(6), 1172–1183.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-020-01471-0

Guilan, L, and Weiwei, D. (2021). Synergetic Management Strategy
for Maritime Cultural Heritage Protection and Marine Development in
China. Marine Policy, 125, 1-8.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.104383

Henderson, J. (2019). Oceans without History? Marine Cultural Heritage and the Sustainable Development Agenda. Sustainability, 11(18), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11185080

Holon, M. N., Boissery, P., Bouchoucha, M., Delaruelle, G., Tribot, A.-S., & Deter, J. (2015). Fine-Scale Cartography of Human Impacts along French Mediterranean Coasts: A Relevant Map for the Management of Marine Ecosystems. PloS One, 10(8), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0135473

Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami. (2019). National Inuit Climate Change Strategy. ITK Publications. https://www.itk.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/ITK_Climate-Change-Strategy_English.pdf Inuvialuit Regional Corporation. (2020). Proactive Vessel Management in the Inuvialuit Settlement Region. IRC Research. https://irc.inuvialuit.com/sites/default/files/2021-02/PVM%20Booklet_final2021.pdf

Jing, Y., & Li, J. (2019). Who Owns Underwater Cultural Heritage in the South China Sea. Coastal Management, 47(1), 107–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/08920753.2019.1540908

Khakzad, S., Pieters, M., and Balen, K. V. (2015). Coastal Cultural Heritage: A Resource to Be Included in Integrated Coastal Zone Management. Ocean & Coastal Management, 118, 110–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2015.07.032

Lewis, S., Olick, J. K., Wawrzyniak, J., & Pakier, M. (2022). Regions of memory : transnational formations. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-93705-8 Nunatsiavut Government. (2020). Immappivut (Nunatsiavut Marine Plan). About page. https://imappivut.com/about/.

O'Toole, P., & Staniforth, M. (2019). Choice, Values and Building Capability: A Case Study from Vietnam. Journal of Maritime Archaeology, 14(3), 355–68. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11457-019-09249-6

Paikin, Z., Kemp, W., Fitz-Gerald, A., & Blais, L. (2023) True North: A Canadian Foreign Policy That Puts the National Interest First. The

Institute for Peace & Diplomacy. https://peacediplomacy.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/True-North-%E2%80%94-A-Canadian-Foreign-Policy-That-Puts-the-National-Interest-First.pdf

Potts, T. (2015) Marine spatial planning and various uses and interests relating to the marine environment. In Hassan, D., Kuokkanen, T., Soininen, N, (Eds.) Transboundary Marine Spatial Planning and International Law (pp. 42-59). Routledge. https://doi-org.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/10.4324/9781315816425

Qikitani Inuit Association. (2018). Evaluating the role of Marine Harvesting in Food Security in the Eastern Arctic. Publications. https://www.nirb.ca/publications/strategic%20environmental%20assessment/190125-17SN034-QIA%20Report%20Re%20Marine%20Based%20Harvesting-IEDE.pdf

Quimby, B., & Levine, A. (2021). Adaptive Capacity of Marine Comanagement: A Comparative Analysis of the Influence of Colonial Legacies and Integrated Traditional Governance on Outcomes in the Pacific. Regional Environmental Change, 21(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-020-01730-6

Rudolph, T., Ruckelshaus, M., Swilling, M., Allison, E.H., Österblom, H., Gelcich, S., Mbatha, P. (2020). A Transition to Sustainable Ocean Governance. Nature Communications 11(1): 3600. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-020-17410-2

Schofield, C. H., Yi, S., & Kwon, M.S. (2013). A jurisprudence of pragmatic altruism. In Schofield, C. H., Lee, S., & Kwon, M. (Eds.) The Limits of Maritime Jurisdiction (pp. 21-48). Brill. http://brill.com/view/title/22799

Scott, K. N. (2020). Integrated oceans management and climate change. In Scotee, K. N. (Eds.) Research Handbook on Climate Change, Oceans and Coasts (pp. 295–312). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788112239.00023

Sarid, E. (2018). International Underwater Cultural Heritage Governance: Past Doubts and Current Challenges. Berkeley Journal

of International Law, 35(2), 219–261.
https://www.academia.edu/38735525/International_Underwater_Cult
ural_Heritage_Governance_Past_Doubts_and_Current_Challenges#
:~:text=International%20Underwater%20Cultural%20Heritage%20Go
vernance%3A%20Past%20Doubts%20and,Unauthorized%20salvag
e%20and%20looting%20are%20a%20continuing%20threat.

Tanaka, Y. (2020). Reflections on the Implications of Environmental
Norms for Fishing: The Link between the Regulation of Fishing and
the Protection of Marine Biological Diversity. International Community
Law Review 22, 22(3–4), 389–409.
https://doi.org/10.1163/18719732-12341437

Ul-Durar, S., Shah, M., De Sisto, M., & Arshed, N. (2023). Metabolic
rift theory and the complexities of water conflict between India and
Pakistan: A pathway to effective environmental management. Journal
of Environmental Management, 347, 119164–119164.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2023.119164

Vu, H. D. (2013). A Bilateral Network of Marine Protected Areas
Between Vietnam and China: An Alternative to the Chinese Unilateral
Fishing Ban in the South China Sea? Ocean Development &
International Law, 44(2), 145-169,
https://doi.org/10.1080/00908320.2013.750984

Weber, M., Dawson, J., and Carter, N. A. (2021). Tourism
Development in Gjoa Haven, Nunavut and Around the Wrecks of the
HMS Erebus and HMS Terror National Historic Site. (Available
through uOttawa Research Portal) http://dx.doi.org/10.20381/15nv-
4658

Wee, S. (2023, November 28). Vietnam Relied on Environmentalists
to Secure Billions. Then It Jailed Them. The New York Times.
https://www.nytimes.com/2023/11/28/world/asia/vietnam-cop28-
environment.html (Accessed on December 1, 2023).

Wegscheidl, C J., Sheaves, M., McLeod, I. M., Hedge, P. T., Gillies,
C. L., & Creighton, C. (2016). Sustainable management of Australia's
coastal seascapes: a case for collecting and communicating
quantitative evidence to inform decision-making. Wetlands Ecology

and Management, 25(1), 3–22. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11273-016-9515-x

You, Z., & Hardwick, P. A. (2020). Guest Editors' Introduction: Intangible Cultural Heritage in Asia Traditions in Transition. Asian Ethnology, 79(1), 3–19. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26929482

Zhang, H. (2018). Fisheries cooperation in the South China Sea: Evaluating the options. Marine Policy, 89, 67–76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.12.014

Zimonjic, P. (2023, November 7). Liberal government set to miss 2030 emissions targets, says environment commissioner audit. CBC News. https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/environment-comissioner-audit-emissions-charging-stations-1.7020689#:~:text=The%20federal%20government%20is%20set%20to%20miss%20its,audit%20from%20the%20commissioner%20of%20the%20environment%27s%20office. (Accessed on November 22, 2023).

Zou, K, and Zhang L. (2020). Handling climate change for the East and South China Seas. In McDonald, J., McGee, J., Barnes, B, (Eds.) Research Handbook on Climate Change, Oceans and Coasts (pp. 210–223). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788112239.00018