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Abstract

Heritage is considered to be anything that someone wishes to conserve or to collect, and to pass on to future generations. Heritage tourism can contribute to reducing stereotypical attitudes in society and it may lead to a behavioural change and then reduce social contradictions. At present, the use of heritage in tourism is a sensitive and dynamic area of development, particularly where communities which were involved in violent conflicts have moved from war to non-war. Sri Lanka in its post-war peace building process is yet to harness heritage tourism as an avenue for peace and to discover its developmental potential and novel perspectives for peace building process. Godawaya in Hambanthota district in the Southern province of Sri Lanka retain archaeological evidence of a prehistoric civilization. The objectives of this research are to explore the archaeological significance of this site, its cultural value, the interconnections between community and to find possibilities of promoting peace through tourism in Sri Lanka. The methodological approach taken to answer the research question was based on grounded theory. This theory had been constructed based on the meaningfulness or understanding of conversations, observations and interpretations made at the research field. Systematic coding, data analysis and theoretical sampling procedures were carried out during the research process that enables the researcher to deduce from diverse patterns of data description into a higher level of abstraction. The main qualitative methods incorporated to the grounded theory were participant observation, unstructured interviewing, observation and documentary materials. The study finds the failure to construct a cohesive identity suffers a major drawback in Sri Lanka’s nation-state building process. This research has explored the potential of this site which can channel the conscientization process to rediscover a common inheritance and identity between the two ethnic groups of Sinhalese and Tamils which can foster peace. This article also discusses how different ideological representations would like to perceive the history, the land and the heritage of Sri Lanka as well as how primordial sentiments are developed leading to the ethnic segregation. This study has identified the potential that heritage tourism has to reduce structural violence by empowering local communities to reduce inter-ethnic, religious and other prejudices.
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INTRODUCTION

This article examines how the way of promoting heritage tourism in Sri Lanka has connected with the process of nation-building and how it has influenced the ethnic polarization and as "heritage" is constructed, constantly reconfigured and as a social concept it evolves and changes with time. In another way, this can be interpreted as a social construction. Another significant aspect is the potentials it has to redirect the country towards peaceful coexistence by alleviating stereotypic attitudes and promoting mutual respect and understanding war is an important conservation problem in some regions. Unfortunately, nations and ethnic groups, they are often targeted for destruction by enemies in times of conflict. Sri Lankan conflict is between the majority ethnic group Sinhalese and a minority Tamils. They both have cohabitated on Sri Lankan soil from time immemorial. The causes of more than thirty-five-year-old ethnic conflict are miscellaneous and complex. A major causative factor for the conflict in post-colonial era is the failure to integrate minority groups into the mainstream of nation state-building. And it is important to mention that heritage tourism is also commonly used to build patriotism at the domestic level, and further heritage places and event are also commonly employed as tools to build nationalism and patriotism. Rich examples can be cited as battlefields, cemeteries, monuments to national heroes and other places important in the national psyche which can be regarded as central to this particular use of heritage. This paper scrutinizes the problems encountered in the Sri Lankan nation building process with particular concern into its peculiarity and uniqueness. The author believes that the attempts to analyze the problems of the third world by applying universal theories have created confusion and misperceptions in the world. With that view, the discussion will be undertaken more on the grounds of real-life situations in Sri Lanka. The starting point of this paper is to view the Sri Lankan conflict as a reflection of failure in the process of state formation during the post-independent era. This is a situation that is also found in many other countries that have emerged from a colonial experience. Colonial expansion put an end to the autonomous existence of a variety of social formations and political frameworks. ‘Concepts’ and reality were homogenized. The export of the nation state model to the colonies posed a host of difficulties, because no appropriate foundations for this kind of construct existed in the extra European world (Scherrer, C., 2002:2). Decolonization created new states whose mandates exceeded previous
experiences; the prerequisite to fulfilling these expanded mandates was integration at three levels: integration of territories, integration of administrations, integration of the various people who lived in new territories and under new administrations (Rajagopalan, S., 2006:2). The latter level of integration is the most difficult because it challenges groups’ demands to remain separate and distinct, to retain the unique markers of their identities. Heritage tourism is an important medium which provides markers for communicating identity. One of the most useful recent developments in the study of museums, heritage centres, and tourism, in general, is the analysis of all these attractions as forms of media (Morgan and Pritchard et al, 1998). Marshall McLuhan foresaw future with his famous sentence ‘the medium is the message’ (Babic, D., 1996: 207). Tourism fits to be a ‘medium’ or a channel of communication or expression through which information or impressions are conveyed. Attractions that focus on a group’s history and culture, and the distinctive appearance and practices of the group, certainly convey information and impression, or ‘messages’ about the group. The phrase stands for the idea that the currently available media shapes human activities, more so than we are aware of. In other words, media themselves (i.e. the medium) affect our society not so much through the content delivered, but by the characteristics of the medium itself. By serving as a medium in which people’s ‘stories’ are told and their history and culture portrayed in appealing ways, tourist attractions could be part of a campaign to reshape group images and group identities. The representation of heritage will have substantial implications for both collective and individual identity and hence for the creation of social realities (Hall, M.C., 1998:180). However, heritage is not only considered a link between past and present, it is also a well of meaning for understanding the world. Identity attractions often ‘stress’ the importance of emerging self-consciousness and self-determination of the ethnic minority, the need to correct the historical record in so far as it undervalues the contribution of minority, and [remind] the visitors of past discriminations against the minority (MacCannell,1984:387). And this the critical point: When attraction to do these things, then the ‘messages’ sent through tourism come to resemble those contained in activists’ ideology and rhetoric. This is why ‘heritage has an identity-conferring status’ (MacCrone et al 1995:181).

The integration process cannot always be perceived as being honestly conducted from the view point of minority groups. In the eyes of the minority/from the perspective of the racial minority, they are under-represented in many realms of the nation state. The state’s actual policies
and functions sometimes contradict its pressing need for integration. Integration is the process of amalgamation with factions through the general concurrence in attitude, memory to share common interests. This process drives from and contributes to the development of constitutive individuals, groups and units. The state bears the primary responsibility for directing the integrative process, which may involve a variety of relationships among the constitutive groups and between those constituents and the collective. The author bears the stance that failure to construct a collective identity in which all constituents feel inclusive is a major drawback in nation-state building in Sri Lanka. Some studies highlight the importance of modern technology to empower rural communities to connect with economic development via informational communication technology to avoid cultural and knowledge barriers (Dissanayake, 2011). However, the history and culture of Sri Lanka were attributed by such knowledge as per the evidence proved in construction, irrigation and indigenous medicines being used. History is a powerful resource in the construction of collective identities, both in the core and the periphery, and tradition is a fertile source of mobilizing symbols (Hobsbawm and Rander, 1983). Heritage like history, popular memory, commemorations and national celebrations – links us as individuals and as groups into broader constituencies (the local community or the nation) recognizing and accepting the significance of heritage is part of identity making, of nostalgic remembering, of connecting with roots and origin whether these are familiar or national (Trotter, Robin, 2001:149). One of the most useful recent developments in the study of museums, heritage centers, and tourism in general is the analysis of all these attractions as forms of media (Morgan & Pritchard, 1998). Tourism probably does not spring to most people’s minds when they think of media, but it confirms to a common-sense definition of a ‘medium’ as a channel of communication or expression through which information or impressions are conveyed (Pitchford, S., 2008:83). Conclusively, Sri Lanka is a service driven economy (Dissanayake & Ismail, 2015). Thus, tourism and supportive sectors are mainly found in service sector scope. The first part of the article discusses how different ideological representations would like to perceive the history, the land and the heritage of Sri Lanka. The vast and the vivid sources of historical evidence and the hybrid stories descent from the past of culturally rich societies in Sri Lanka yield a background in which different interpretations could be easily formulated for nationalistic advantage. As reasons for the existence of different interpretations, the author identifies the necessity of ethnic groups to justify autonomy and to bolster nationalist sentiments over and
above any academically motivated reasons. The interpretation of history and culture is central to national identity building because revised narratives of the nation as well as recovered or invented culture and tradition are key resources for constructing national consciousness and infusing that consciousness with pride, affection and loyalty (Hobesbawn 1983:1-14).

**LITERATURE: HERITAGE TOURISM FOR PEACE**

Heritage tourism has been introduced as a force for peace by Poria, (2001:115) in the Middle-East. The author assumes that the use of heritage in tourism is a sensitive and dynamic area of development, and there is a critical need to know how to manage this phenomenon, especially in the context of communities which have moved from war to non-war and were involved in violent conflicts. The author suggests that in post war period if the groups are truly willing to create a culture of peace some changes need to be made quickly on both sides. There is a need for both sides to understand that neither of them is presenting the real thing. And the presentation of some parts of history, and non-presentation of other parts of history, may influence the long-term future of the peace culture. The author’s argument is condensed in the expression that ‘a more responsible and open presentation of the past can be used as a weapon for peace’. Such a presentation if promoted in a way that is perceived by tourists from both sides as fair and reliable may lead to mutual tolerance and warm rather than cold and fragile peace.

The role of heritage tourism in formation of identities is another central phenomenon that is discussed in the existing literature on heritage tourism’s relevance in conflict and peace. In many fields, identity differences are seen to be a root cause of conflict. For an inter-group (e.g., racial, ethnic, or religious) conflict to occur, the opponents must have a sense of collective identity about themselves and about their adversary, each side believing the fight is between "us" and "them" (Kriesberg, K., 2003:1). It is identified that areas of local importance play a predominant role in the construction of identity (Gonzale, M., V., 2008:807). In literature changing identities and transforming intractable conflicts are deeply discussed in categorical form. The ways to modify identities so as to reduce the intractability of conflict several policies are introduced in three settings: (1) within each group, (2) In the relations between the groups, and (3) In their social context (Kriesberg, K., 2003:5). Utility of heritage tourism in modifying identities can also be analyzed in this framework. There is mounting interest in the cross over between heritage and other sectors of the tourism industry. However, there is a need to refine these ideas further the and to understand the various
power relations at play when planning and developing the heritage tourism. And it is significant to understand heritage as a form of expression and social differentiation brings us to contemplate the idea of continuity between past and present. The ways of harnessing heritage tourism can also be identified in three different directions of policy orientations that: (1) help prevent conflicts becoming intractable (2) Help stop the prolongation and escalation of intractable conflicts and help transformed and resolved intractable conflicts (Kriesberg, K., 2003:5).

Gonzale (2008:809) explored the trade-off between existential intangible heritage tourism and modern destination image. He examines the relationship between existential intangible tourism and personal identity in his conclusion he suggests the role of existential heritage tourism when building cosmopolitan identity. In some of the relevant literature, heritage tourism’s role has been discussed under the all-inclusive theme of cultural tourism. Cultural tourism is said to overlap heritage tourism, rural tourism, educational tourism etc (Craik, J., 2001:114). Therefore, the assertions on cultural tourism have also been regarded for this literature review on heritage tourism. According to Burns (2006:13) ‘if it is argued that culture (and nostalgia) can be appropriated as a resource by the tourism sector, tourism needs to be understood in terms of contested cultures, created by (a) the collision of local realities and globally driven commercialism and (b) the collusion between state and the tourism sector to construct social identities and to fuse (and perhaps, muddle) histories. The interpretation of history and culture is central to national identity building because revised narratives of the nation, as well as recover or invented culture and traditions, are key resources for constructing national consciousness and infusing that consciousness with pride, affection, and loyalty (Hobsbawm and Ranger, 1983:1-14). These same resources come into play when a redefined identity is projected outward, to an audience beyond the group. It is precisely because of their power to interpret history and culture that “museums and historical sites have, indeed, become major participants in contemporary efforts to construct culturally shared, historically anchored representation of ‘self’ and ‘other’” (Katriel, 1993:70).

METHODOLOGY

The qualitative nature of this study presented many potential frameworks for investigations. But the research question is less explored so far and contentious in nature that grounded theory approach shows more suitable to this research. Before entering the study field, there was no “preconceived” theoretical framework. The theory was to be discovered in the data gathering process of answering the research question. At the outset, it
was only the general disciplinary knowledge on the subject matters of the research that set forth the initial planning and setting of the research question. But in the end, the process of approaching the answers to the research questions is to discover unknown theories. In grounded theory; having identified a problem or topic in very general term and selected a site where that problem could be studied the researcher was then to allow the evidence, they accumulated to dictate the emerging theoretical agenda (Day, I., 1999:3). Data for this research were collected primarily through a combination of fieldwork methods. Because each method reveals different aspects of empirical reality, multiple methods of inquiry help the reader to see and hear vividly the people and situations in the area under study. The main qualitative methods incorporated to the grounded theory were participant observation, unstructured interviewing, observation and documentary materials. Passive participation was the type of participant observation that has been used to observe the behaviour and culture of people in Godawaya. Participation in fisheries and welfare society meetings can be named as more important opportunities taken for passive participation in the research. Unstructured interviewing was conducted with the community leaders in the society such as chief incumbent of the temple, president of the fisheries society, one elderly retired principal and a person involved in the tourism field. Few interviews were held in archaeological department and Post Graduate Institute of Archaeology in Colombo with some academics namely Dr Nimal Fernando, Prof. Gamini Adhikari and Prof. Raj Somadeva. The documentary materials were mostly derived from research papers on Godawaya and related archaeological sites, and ancient Indo-Sri Lankan relations. The specific locus chosen for the study was special in its geography and demography. Hambanthota is a ‘peripheral’ area in Southern Sri Lanka which makes a home for an array of tourist destinations. Hambanthota is marginalized in political and economic terms, but at the same time is a region charged with enormous development potentials (Southern Development Master Plan, 2000: 124). They provided a rich research background to let the study grow from specific to general on grounded theory basis. According to grounded theory, data is central and superior. Therefore, care has been taken to select the most appropriate method for gathering data.

This study which is a qualitative employed a purposeful sampling technique. Patton (2002:46) argues that ‘the logic and power of purposeful sampling lies in selecting information-rich cases for in-depth study. There are quite a few strategies to do this out of those theoretical sampling was realised to be the most appropriate sampling method to this study.
Theoretical sampling is a method that has its roots in grounded theory. The representatives of a sample are guaranteed neither by random sampling nor by stratification. Rather individuals, groups etc. are selected according to their (expected) level of new insights for the developing theory, in relation to the state of theory elaboration so far. The criterion for judging when to stop sampling the different groups pertinent to a category is the category’s theoretical saturation. Saturation means that no additional data are being found whereby the sociologist can develop properties of the category. Figure 1.1 below illustrates a flow chart specifying the different stages leading to the emergence of a substantive theory.

Fig. 1.1: Grounded Theory approach

The comparative analysis helped to distinguish a pattern or frequency of some of the data. Table 1.1 below shows how these data were categorized according to their attributes:

Table 1:1: Categorization of data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional villages</td>
<td>pre-history / proto-history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological</td>
<td>Ruins and artefacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excavations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The traditional</td>
<td>livelihoods, sustainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way of life</td>
<td>agricultural practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>sand dunes, salterns, heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heritage</td>
<td>fauna and flora</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the research progressed and conceptual interconnections were being explored, it was found that five core categories had emerged through coding and categorizing these data. These core-categories have supported one major phenomenon. The process of development of the phenomena will be explained in the discussion. Figure 1.2 is a diagrammatic representation of the development of phenomena in the grounded theory approach.

**Fig. 1.2: Diagrammatic representation of the development of phenomena**

**DISCUSSION**

The interpretation of the history and culture is central to national identity building because revised narratives of the nation, as well as recovered or invented culture and traditions, are key resources for constructing national consciousness and infusing that consciousness with pride, affection, and loyalty (Hobsbawm and Ranger, 1983). In Sri Lankan conflict historical legacies, archaeological sites and state symbols can be seen to be interpreted
in different ways justifying each party’s involvement in the conflict. According to the ‘Mahawamsa’, a reordered history of Sri Lanka the Sinhalese majority claims an exclusive possession to the island. Based on the ‘Mahawamsa’ the Sinhala race originated in the island with the arrival of King Vijaya and his seven hundred companions sometime in the fifth century B.C. They were all from Northern India. Later migrations were from Bengal and Orissa as well. Buddhism came to the island later. According to the ‘Mahawamsa’, it was during the time of ‘Ashoka’ the great of India that the Sri Lankan king ‘Devanampiyatissa’ (250-210 B.C.) was converted to Buddhism. With royal patronage thus received Buddhism spread in the island (Silva, 1983:3-11). The origin of the Tamils, according to the same historical source, can be traced to the third century B.C. There existed commercial contacts between the Sri Lankans and South India’s ports and there is a strong likelihood that the Tamils came to the island as traders, invaders or peaceful immigrants. For Sinhala Buddhist nationalist ‘Mahawamsa’ is an irreplaceable source for the reconstruction of the early history of the Island.

The Tamil demand for autonomy and the North-Eastern province as an autonomous Tamil region has been built around the concept of a ‘Tamil homeland’. The ‘Tamil homeland’ concept argues that the Tamil community has a distinct cultural and linguistic identity and the Northern and the Eastern provinces have been the historic home of the Tamil speaking peoples who have allegedly, throughout in the past lived in this territory (Iyer, 1989:102). These opposing arguments catalyze the ethnic polarization of Sri Lanka. It has been agreed that to achieve peaceful settlement it is necessary to discourage the vicious process of ethnic polarization. Tourism has been recognized by many informants as a vital force to enhance intercultural understanding and to demolish prejudices. How are ethnic divisions, symbolized by ethnic markers selected for tourist promotion, reconciled with national integration and the assertion of national identity? This question emerged in the research process in several situations and the answer also could be sought by further investigations and clarifications.

‘Godawaya’ is an ancient harbour situated in Southern coastal area of Sri Lanka that provided many research materials to answer the above question. This destination encompasses a monastery, an ancient settlement and a harbour. The site was neither publicized adequately nor visited frequently by tourists. Major sites that have been promoted as tourist attractions in southern province share some commonalities that typify the core interest in the tourism agenda. Mulkirigala, Thissamaharamaya, Naigala, Kasagala, Rambawehera,
Siththangallena, Bandagiriya, Karadulena, Situlpauwa are some of the heritage tourism destinations in Hambanthota. These heritage sites are mainly Buddhist temples built in third century B.C till 1300 A.C, by Sinhala kings which bolster Sinhala Buddhist nationalism. Promoting only the heritage of Sinhala Buddhist prosperity in past indirectly means reinforcing Sinhala Buddhist exclusiveness. Those heritage sites are visited mainly by Sinhala Buddhist people and to a lesser extent by foreign tourist. Why is it hard to see any person from minority ethnic groups visiting these sites? Do they feel excluded inside these Buddhist temples? One informant in my research who is from minority ethnic group bears the idea that ‘the feeling they get inside these heritage sites is no different from that they get in a touristic site in another country’. They don’t get any belongingness there. In brief, they feel like being surrendered to the ‘Sinhala exclusive’ idea.

Heritage tourism sites recognized by the Sri Lankan government for promotion are selectively implying a conscious choice to value some manifestation from the past above others and to enhance tourism products rooted in the selected representation of the past.

In his study of Cuzco, Peru, Van den Berghe (1980:387) argues that ‘tourism superimpose itself on a pre-existing, native system of ethnic relations’, transferring a long-established unequal relationship between Mestizos and Indians on to the new social and economic terrain of tourism. The author presents a similar argument for the Sri Lankan context following the research covering the heritage sites in Hambanthota district of Sri Lanka. A significant observation made in this research is in the backdrop of selected sites which attest the Sinhala Buddhist prosperity in past, places like ‘Godawaya’ in Hambanthota district in southern Sri Lanka which gives an alternative explanation to the historiography of the chronicles have been given least concern and importance as a heritage tourism destination. During the interview, the leader of a fisheries association in ‘Godawaya’, conveyed his discontent with the authorities in the archaeological department of not being able to develop the site as a heritage tourism destination. The author’s further investigations on the particular issue of ‘Godawaya’ included interviews with authorities in the archaeological department and local people. The villagers are highly interested in developing ‘Godawaya’ as a tourist destination. Unlike the other heritage sites that I have visited this particular place is closely related to the villagers living around the site. The ‘Godawaya’ harbour is functioning even today making livelihood opportunities in the fisheries industry for many villagers.

The archaeological excavations first started in the ancient coastal
settlement of ‘Godawaya’ in 1994 by the archaeological department of Sri Lanka and Bonn University as a cooperative project (Wijeyapala and Kessler, 2001:291). According to the information gathered from the interviews with villagers the author’s main argument is that ‘for an archaeological excavation to become socially significant and tourism-wise effective that should be conducted in an open manner attaining credibility of the villagers and also most importantly the national policies shouldn’t be partial to interests of one party. According to the authorities in the archaeological department, in 1991 the Archaeological Department of Sri Lanka and the German Institute of Archaeology agreed on archaeological excavations in the Southern province within the ancient citadel of Thissamaharama. To complement this project, in order to give the research a broader basis, the University of Bonn commenced investigations at ‘Godawaya’, one of the major harbours of the Ruhuna, as well as at an ancient monastery in Ambalanthota. Since then a team comprised of both Sri Lankan as well as German archaeologists have conducted joint excavations every year. Students of the Sri Lankan Universities took part in this fieldwork together with their German counterparts, giving them an opportunity to gather experience in modern excavation practice. While a couple of archaeologists conveyed discontent over-involvement of the foreign archaeologist in excavation, the villagers conveyed a strong suspicion on any ulterior motives over foreign involvement. The villagers have no idea of why the exposed archaeological monuments were earthed again by the archaeologists at the site. One could see the abandoned excavation sites in the monastery at ‘Godawaya’ adding no significance to the site. The only significance at the monastery is a temple renovated by the villagers at a higher place of the site. Villagers are furious over the archaeological department for not being able to keep the site uncovered and develop as a touristic destination. From the archaeological perspective, the excavation site has been earthed to preserve it for future generations. In addition, according to the department, they are not financially able to preserve it in situ for any development as a touristic destination. The author sees it as a failure of the archaeological department for reality being not transmitted to the villagers correctly. The same site exhibits how misperception and improper communication between these two parties lead to adverse consequences. The discontent villagers show no interest or respect over any statement from the archaeological department. They have built a playground for preschool over a piece of land which has been identified as archaeologically important by the archaeological department.

The villagers claim that they don’t get any advantage from the archaeological
site in their village. In this situation, they have no motivation to safeguard or develop heritage in this area. This is an example where a heritage site has been demolished in favour of new structures that have a more practical contemporary function. For the villagers, the economic rationale for saving the abandoned land does not outweigh the benefits of destroying them. The archaeologically important artefacts found at ‘Godawaya’ are kept in the central museum in Colombo. The message that is conveyed by the whole story is that the authoritative nature in the management of archaeological sites undermines the interests of the public and pursues only the motives of authorities such as acquiring training in archaeological excavations. Another point that is highlighted here is that attractions associated with contested identities, particularly in this case competing for national identities, those that pose a challenge to the national identity as defined by the state and supported by the apparatus at its disposal are fallen at a disadvantage. There are places in ‘Godawaya’ which can be developed into several types of tourism attractions. A place for safari, wetland for nature trail, a river for boat riding, shallow sea for diving, ancient port, monastery and ancient settlement are situated at one place making it a special location to attract many different types of local as well as foreign tourists to this place. The conventional way of prioritizing the tourism destinations for development need to be reconsidered, to promote ‘Godawaya’ like destinations which consist of evidence that make people re-think on stereotypical attitudes over ‘others’.

The archaeological evidence uncovered at the ancient settlement sites in ‘Godawaya’ and also in ‘Ambalanthota’ which is only about three kilometres away from ‘Godawaya’, present a story of a pre-historic human who could give a stimulus to think beyond the written history of the origin of people living in Sri Lanka. The archaeological sites of pre-historical settlements can be developed as a tourist attraction to convey the message of these pre-historic settlements to people effectively at the settlement site itself. But unfortunately, what is practised now is that the artefacts found in the site are taken away from the site and kept in the central museum after which the original site is abandoned for nothing. Exhibiting the archaeological evidence at tourism destinations would serve as a medium in which people’s ‘stories’ are told and their history and culture portrayed in appealing ways. This type of tourist attractions could be part of a campaign to reshape group images and group identities. According to Hall (1998:180) the representation of heritage can have substantial implications for both collective and individual identity and hence for the creation of social realities. The formation of collective memory is important also for national
integration a process derives from and contributes to the development of constitutive individuals, groups, and units. The state bears the primary responsibility for directing the integrative process, which may involve a variety of relationships among the constituent groups and between those constituents at the collective (Rajagopalan, S., 2006:4). The central authority has a big role to play in promoting heritage sites that are significant in the process of national integration. Another pathway opened at the ‘Godawaya’ archaeological site to redefine identities is the strong economic and cultural interdependency between Sri Lanka and South India evident by the artefacts and the stylistic affinities of sculptures and script found at Godawaya monastery and harbour (Somadeva, 2005:12). The author share Gill’s (1993:115) world-system approach of interdependency in societies to explain the picture of the cultural interaction between South India and Sri Lanka since the late first millennium BCE. It is a truism that societies do not function independently. They should be understood in the context of a larger system. The questions of how societies are intermingled with each other and how they maintained equilibrium in their systems emerged with major theoretical complications in the recent discussions of economic anthropology (Wallerstein, 1993; Ekholm and Friedman, 1993). Gill (1993:115) argues on the significance of hegemonic changes in the formation of world systems. His main idea describes the hegemonic transitions as reflectors of the underline rhythm of competition in the world system and the cycles of resources and wealth accumulation.

But he refuses to admit the existence of a single world system but instead interlinks different hegemonic powers (Franke and Gills 1993: 115). Gill’s assumption, which gives a more balanced frame of reference to discuss the complexity of the interactions of different ancient social systems like those in Sri Lanka and South India. The archaeological evidence unearthed from coastal sites in South India and the sites in Sri Lanka suggests that there was a strong economic and cultural interdependency between these two areas during the early first millennium CE (Somadeva, 2005:12). Somadeva’s (2005:12) main argument is that there was a dependency network, which operated actively during the last century of the first millennium of the BCE and the early centuries of the first millennium CE. Two systemic waves of socio-political and cultural interactions, which equally affected South India and Sri Lanka, can be identified between 300 BCE and 300CE. The first wave was associated with the urban scrawl of the Gangetic Valley (Bandaranayake, 1987). In Sri Lanka, it was apparent in the period between c.250-100 BCE. The second wave is evident after c.100BCE and continued till the decline of the Satavahana rule in the Andhra region.
in South India and the lower early historic phases in Sri Lanka (500-250 BCE) characterized by high quality textured dorsally glazed roof tiles, pottery types (Deraniyagala, 1972; 1992: 711) overlap with other South Indian cultural traits. According to Somadeva (2005:18), the systemic equilibrium of the socio-cultural and politico-economic dependency was interrupted by the political changes of the later periods. He explains (2005:10) that many individual research projects on archaeology made a limited impact on the archaeology of the wider Indian Ocean region in general. They produce valuable data and finally incorporated their interpretations, which are mostly site-specific or if not, perhaps, limited to their national geographical and socio-cultural objectives. The ancient city of Thisamaharama in the Southern province of Sri Lanka is one of the instances he has given for this phenomenon. In the politics of tourism in Asia, Linda Richter (1989:2) observes that ‘tourism is a highly politicized phenomenon, the implications of which have been only rarely perceived and almost nowhere fully understood’. The categories of data that have been emerged from the research were deduced into five core categories. These core-categories have supported two major phenomena.

Phenomenon A

Heritage tourism destination has the potential to enhance national integration. The following core-categories helped to develop this phenomenon:

A-1 There were economic and cultural inter-dependency between Sri Lanka and South India as evident from Godawaya

A-2 Prehistoric sites in Ambalantota conveys no identity messages

A-3 Local communities are enthusiastic over heritage and avenues to develop heritage tourism

Phenomenon B

Structural violence lies in depriving local communities the opportunity to promote peace through heritage tourism and the undermining of certain aspects of history for political reasons. The following core-categories helped to develop this phenomenon:

B-1 Deprivation of opportunity to use archaeological heritage sites as a tourism destination,

B-2 Undermining of certain aspects of history by political interests.

This study has identified the potential that heritage tourism has to reduce structural violence by empowering local communities to reduce inter-ethnic, religious and other prejudices. The research also reveals that grassroots level initiatives in promoting heritage tourism forecast a new era combining both traditionalism and modernism. More importantly, heritage tourism has the potential to ensure structural peace in Sri Lanka.
CONCLUSION

The fate of archaeological excavation at ‘Godawaya’ exemplifies that in Sri Lanka the heritage sites with potentials in promoting national integration have been neglected deliberately or unintentionally by authorities. The active choices made at the top level have been a determinant in shaping ethnic identity at the tourism site. These choices, however, are always constrained, and they are made by a range of actors- a range that increases as tourism enters the picture. In the example discussed in this paper, local people have been victimized and relatively passive along with the tourism development projects. The top-down approach in the heritage site development in Sri Lanka has undermined public interests in heritage tourism which carries viable options for building a collective Sri Lankan identity via heritage tourism. In Sri Lanka, the author identifies the existence of different interpretations and stories about the history and promotion of heritage tourism in line with those differences representing only certain aspects of the history and culture has caused more ethnic polarization. At the same time, the author identifies opportunities in heritage tourism to promulgate collective identity in Sri Lanka.
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