CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Robin Coningham and Nick Lewer

Abstract Coningham and Lewer chart the interest of archaeologists and heritage management specialists in engaging with communities associated with sites of historical tangible and intangible cultural importance. Drawing from archaeological, social science, development and tourism literature, international charters and codes of practice, and discussions at the AHRC-GCRF sponsored Kathmandu Conference *Heritage at Risk 2017: Pathways to the Protection and Rehabilitation of Cultural Heritage in South Asia* in September 2017, the chapter notes participatory methodologies used in community consultation and then provides conceptual and operational issues, questions and themes which inform the backdrop to this book. The chapter next identifies context-specific and generic challenges for community engagement which are highlighted through the case studies in the book, which is the first of its kind to focus specifically on South Asia.

R. Coningham (✉)
Durham University, Durham, UK
e-mail: r.a.e.coningham@durham.ac.uk

N. Lewer
Coral Associates Ltd, North Yorkshire, UK
e-mail: nick.lewer@coralassociates.org

© The Author(s) 2019

R. Coningham and N. Lewer (eds.), *Archaeology, Cultural Heritage Protection and Community Engagement in South Asia*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6237-8_1

Keywords South Asia • Community engagement • Archaeology

1.1 INTRODUCTION: CONTEXT

Home to one-third of the world's human population, South Asia has a corresponding richness of cultural heritage with 44 properties inscribed on UNESCO's World Heritage List and thousands of protected national properties. Although strikingly rich, South Asia's cultural heritage is a non-renewable resource and there have been a series of tragic, high profile events, which have irreversibly damaged that heritage.

Less visible within media reports is the equally concerning widespread grassroots destruction of South Asia's heritage monuments, cityscapes and landscapes caused by increasing pressure from agriculture intensification and resource extraction as well as the spread of modern urbanization, industrialization and investment in mega-infrastructure. The balance between heritage and development has been successfully reached at a number of sites but this is not always the case and there are many examples of irreversible damage. These range from the impact of the Orange Metro Line along Lahore's Grand Trunk Road in Pakistan and aspects of the reconstruction of Kathmandu's skyline after the 2015 Gorkha Earthquake (Coningham et al. 2018) to the recognition that over 50% of Buddhist sites in Pakistan's Charsadda District have been damaged by illegal digging as have two thirds of Buddhist archaeological sites in Anuradhapura District in Sri Lanka (Coningham and Young 2015: 96).

Motivated by this context, over 180 experts and professionals from a wide range of disciplines, including archaeology, conservation, architecture, heritage management, development, planning and economics from across South Asia and beyond along with local stakeholders, including community members, site managers, army, police and policymakers met in Kathmandu at the *Heritage at Risk 2017: Pathways to the Protection and Rehabilitation of Cultural Heritage in South Asia* between 4th and 7th September 2017 to discuss contemporary issues of the protection of heritage during natural disaster and conflicts, but also accelerated development. The event was sponsored by the UK's Arts and Humanities Research Council's Global Challenges Research Fund (AHRC-GCRF-AH/P005993/1), with support from UNESCO Kathmandu, ICOMOS (Nepal) and the Department of Archaeology (Government of Nepal).

Allowing interaction with, and feedback from, local stakeholders, community leaders, administrators and key disaster responders and first responders, the participants co-produced resolutions for the enhanced protection and rehabilitation of heritage following natural disasters, conflict and in the face of accelerated development in Kathmandu and the Greater Lumbini Area.

These resolutions stressed the collective agreement that community engagement should be an integral element of heritage interventions but that it should also be linked with realistic social and economic benefits to adjoining communities and to a clear strategy related to pilgrim and tourist activities. It also advocated the undertaking of regular monitoring and evaluation of protection and maintenance processes and the economic and social benefits that local residents receive from on-site activities. The delegates also recognized the need for additional targeted exchanges and training, with the adoption of training materials, to strengthen the capacity of national agencies and NGOs tasked with the protection of sites and monuments in the face of accelerated development. Finally, they recognized the urgent need for the development of a network of South Asian experts to formulate, share and implement responses to protect sites and monuments in the face of accelerated development and climate change.

In this context, community consultations offer the opportunity of exploring ways in which individuals and groups can be involved in the protection of sites of archaeological and historical importance, to discuss the future development of tourism and pilgrimage to the site that benefit the local community, and to establish mechanisms for continuing community engagement in archaeological excavations, preservation and protection. This volume of case studies from across South Asia (Fig. 1.1) represents our first collective steps towards these collective goals.

1.2 APPROACHES

There is a causal relationship between heritage, local people and their well-being. As a result of this bond, local communities and indigenous peoples are often committed custodians of World Heritage sites, where they play an important, and sometimes overlooked, role in the stewardship of the biocultural diversity of their environments. (Brown and Hay-Edie 2014: 5)

Fig. 1.1 Map showing the location of South Asian case studies

Community engagement in archaeological fieldwork and heritage protection has been of increasing interest to archaeologists and heritage managers. This is reflected in a literature that includes reports from conferences, a special issue of the *International Journal of Heritage Studies* (2010), Little and Shackel (2007), Smith and Waterton (2009), Sapu (2009), Waterton and Smith (2010), Silva and Chapagain (2013), Gould (2016, 2018), Brown and Hay-Edie (2014), Carman (2000), Moshenska and Dhanjal (2011), Perkin (2010), Schmidt (2017), Schmidt and Pikirayi (2016), Tully (2007), Watson and Waterton (2010), a number of International Charters and Codes of Practice including the *World Heritage Convention* (1972), the *Burra Charter* (1999), the *ICOMOS Nara Document on Authenticity* (1994) and *The*

Valletta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historic Cities, Towns and Urban Areas (2011), and publications from the Getty Conservation Institute (2009), the Global Heritage Fund (2010) and UNESCO's World Heritage Centre (Albert et al. 2012).

Linked to this 'archaeological' interest is an established economic (tourism), conservation, development and social science literature containing broad-ranging debates about what the concepts of 'community' and 'participation' mean in theory and practice, including Oakley (1991), Burkey (1993), Chambers (1997) and Kothari et al. (2013) and this has been referred to by academics and practitioners in archaeology, heritage protection and tourism sectors (Winter 2009; Crooke 2010). Within this literature, it has been noted that communities are not usually homogeneous or united but often characterized by tensions including issues associated with local power and business interests, group identity, access to resources, political influence, marginalization, religious differences and the impact of conflict or natural disaster. In the most positive sense, participation is envisaged as an approach that draws from, and values, local knowledge that can challenge top-down interests and development paths.

Methods used to engage communities include social surveys, opinion and perception polls, participatory and rapid rural appraisal (PRA/RRA), participatory action research (PAR) and participatory learning analysis (PAL). In these methods, researchers and practitioners from outside the communities use a facilitative, empowering and listening discursive approach that enables them to learn from an engaged community. However, critics have pointed out that in some cases participation has been manipulative and may have reinforced Western concepts and approaches to inclusion. For example, research and analysis that is designed around a short term project can be defined more by agency needs and agendas rather than those of the people and community, that local culture and social relationships are not fully understood, and that if care is not taken dysfunctional local power disparities are maintained or even strengthened (Cooke and Kothari 2001).

There remains a challenge for archaeologists and heritage protection practitioners who want to engage (complex) communities in the excavation, understanding, interpretation, conservation and preservation of their cultural history. Methods and approaches that tackle such tensions in a meaningful and sustainable manner are still an issue and require a multidimensional and multidisciplinary team approach in which discipline interests and priorities need to be negotiated within the overarching context of 'what does a community think is best for them?' and 'how

might we help them achieve this?'. The balance between site protection and community needs and interests can give rise to tensions. For example, when sites may be linked to community agricultural livelihood or religious practice, or when funding objectives and priorities do not mesh with community needs and perceptions of site importance, or when the local community has no connection with the culture of the site to be protected and sees it only as a resource.

1.3 ISSUES AND THEMES

We have identified the following conceptual and operational issues, questions and themes which inform the backdrop to this book.

1.3.1 *Terminology*

The terminology associated with this subject is wide, and definitions of community engagement vary depending on context. These include:

- Community engagement, community participation, community consultation, community custodianship;
- Cultural resource management, cultural heritage management, community-driven heritage engagement;
- Archaeological resource management;
- Archaeological heritage management, community heritage, heritage conservation, heritage protection;
- Public archaeology, community archaeology.

1.3.2 *The Need to Engage Local Communities*

In discussions relating to why is it necessary to engage local communities, a number of reasons have been identified and tried. These include:

- Educating and promoting understanding of what heritage protection is and why it is important, and the values and meanings of elements associated with it including historical, archaeological, scientific, economic, social, cultural, religious and political factors
- Explaining the importance of ownership and responsibility, to strengthen social capital and social fabric and increase capacity of stewardship of sites;

- Sharing archaeological skills and knowledge by outside experts with local people;
- Raising public awareness through outreach activities as to how local communities can participate in the preservation of sites by identifying risks and dangers and what they can do to protect or mitigate against these so that communities can become effective custodians or stewards of sites;
- Disseminating knowledge and information about the site, ongoing excavation programmes and research findings;
- Discussing methods and processes that will benefit the social and economic well-being of communities; this may be through local business enterprise schemes and links with the tourism industry.

1.3.3 Analysis and Understanding of Community Fabric

Underpinning community engagement and the design of partnerships with local communities is the need to understand social, economic, historical, political and cultural elements that inform both past and present contexts. To help with this process, systematic and sustained analytic methods should be used such as:

- Surveys and mapping to understand the social fabric and social capital in a local community associated with an archaeological site. This includes categorizing community identity groups and key stakeholders and analysing the relationships between them for connectors and dividers;
- Identifying outside stakeholders (regional, national and international) and mapping their relationships and interests in the archaeological site as well as assessing resources and capacities they might have;
- Constructing a framework of community engagement to ascertain who might be involved, and how, in the maintenance and protection of a site.

1.3.4 Community Engagement Activities

Archaeologists have acknowledged the importance of community engagement and have implemented activities and approaches that include:

- Raising awareness and interest in heritage protection through community meetings, talks by members of archaeology teams, and the production of information booklets;
- Involving people in excavations and field projects;
- Supporting festivals and cultural events;
- Promoting handicraft and local culture, including provision of small grants to assist local business opportunities;
- Suggesting and participating in education and vocational skill capacity building, forming archaeology clubs;
- Knowledge exchange between outside experts and local people;
- Tourism development and impact research.

1.4 CHALLENGES FOR COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

It is evident from the literature and prevailing practice that many challenges, context-specific and generic, still remain when designing community engagement strategies. These will be picked up by the case study authors throughout the book but include:

- **Community Cohesion:** for community-led initiatives to coalesce in terms of ownership, inclusiveness, trust building and power-sharing, flexibility and patience is needed to ensure the participation of local development and peacebuilding NGOs and CBOs.
- **Inclusion:** broad participation needs to be ensured so that civil society is strengthened as a counterbalance to local power structures which may be perceived as good or bad. In terms of setting up community engagement processes, important questions that need to be asked are: who is involved and how are they selected? what do they do and at what level are they involved—consultation, management, decision-making, protection, social mobilization?
- **Level of Engagement:** the difference between volunteers and paid workers in community engagement needs to be rational and explicit.
- **Transparent Processes:** inclusive public participation is a key to ensuring community engagement and the strengthening of civil society.
- **Sustainability:** community-led processes take time and require a long-term commitment of support; this might mean longer term financial assistance, longer term support from archaeology teams,

continuing education and skills development, and repeated community surveys. There is also a challenge in keeping a community interested in between excavations at sites where there is little to be seen and of no apparent benefit for local people.

- **Monitoring, Evaluation and Impact Measuring Mechanisms:** a challenge for community engagement initiatives is the funding of benchmarking, monitoring and evaluation processes, and for longer term impact assessment. The combination and linkage between social and economic data (qualitative and quantitative) requires interdisciplinary collaboration from the outset of a project.
- **Political Interest and Corruption:** there may be interference from political interests on site development and protection and this can affect the manner in which a community is prepared to become engaged. It is helpful to ascertain whether political interest is positive or negative and how close the relationship of local people to political parties might be and why this is.
- **Role of Outside Activist Groups:** may mobilize communities to oppose excavations and agitate for greater community involvement. This takes time and energy from archaeologists and technical experts.
- **Conflict:** contested ownership and claim to a heritage location between identity groups (such as religious) can lead to violence, political interference and problems for maintenance and protection. This impacts on how and why local communities become engaged.
- **Destruction, Vandalism and Looting:** ‘theological’ and cultural identity attacks on religious sites with or without support of a local community requires specific types of community engagement in protection measures. Local communities may be involved in looting.
- **Conflict Prevention and Resolution:** setting up new mechanisms or building on existing processes to resolve conflicts associated with the site development may challenge existing structures and cause problems. Approaches might combine traditional methods with ‘newer’ ideas.
- **Impact of Tourism:** communities may be worried with regard to increased visitor numbers and their social and cultural impact on traditions and beliefs and influence on younger people.
- **Coherence and Integration:** the integration of the different levels of governance (local, regional, national, international) is needed

to ensure that there is complementarity of action between archaeological site excavation and protection measures with the wider economic and development infrastructure plans. This means regular consultation between the local community, business and tourism sectors perhaps designing an integrated framework for these factors. Deciding on a lead agency, organization or individual for this is helpful.

- ‘Experts’ Taking Communities Seriously: the engagement of local community in conferences and feedback loops does not happen much at the formal level of symposia and ‘higher’ level consultations. A challenge is to find ways of bringing local people into these forums so that their voice is listened to so that they have input at more conceptual and academic level where programmes and projects are conceived, reported, and assessed.
- Authenticity and Value of Objects: what is a truthful and credible expression of value (Nara Document on Authenticity)? Developing a common understanding about objects and land that is of value or of no-value to people is important. For example, to an expert something may be interesting, to a villager it might be rubbish. How is this commodified? Who decides what to keep and what to discard and on whose value and ethical base is this decided?

1.5 BOOK CONTENT

Chapter 2 is written by Shahnaj Husne Jahan, who explores Bangladesh’s national cultural heritage and then takes Bhitargarh as a case study to present how micro-heritage tourism can become an effective tool to improve social benefits and participation for the protection and safeguarding of the cultural heritage of Bangladesh. Her chapter will illustrate strategies for community-based outreach programmes to promote sustainable tourism as well as to stimulate public interest in micro-heritage preservation and management for socio-economic development of the community. To achieve a balance between income-generation, sound management of heritage and community involvement in heritage tourism, the collaboration of all stakeholders is paramount.

In Chapter 3, K. Krishnan and Vrushab Mahesh focus on the design and development of the Bindu Sarovar Museum at Sidhpur in the Indian State of Gujarat. A *sristhal* or pious place, Sidhpur is considered one of the holiest Hindu sites to perform *shradha* or post-funerary rites for

one's mother. In this context, a group of academics, religious practitioners, policy makers and community stakeholders came together to fashion a modern museum, which presents myth, legend and religious and ritual practices. Drawing from the site's deep intangible heritage traditions, this chapter will evaluate whether this development met its stated goals of satisfying the intellectual curiosity of visitors, develop their sense of the past and awareness of heritage of the region and, finally, providing opportunities to generate income for resident populations.

The Venerable Mahinda Degalle addresses religious and ethnic tensions in Chapter 4, relating to the preservation of archaeological heritage of Sri Lanka with a focus on Kuragala, which has become a contested sacred site between Buddhists and Muslims. It contains a Buddhist stupa and a rock shelter, with third Century BCE Buddhist inscriptions, and also a shrine with a mosque dedicated to a Persian Sufi mystic. The chapter will consider debates surrounding politicization of 'sacredness' of Kuragala site. For Buddhists, the visible Islamization of Kuragala has been become a political and co-existence related community issue.

Chapter 5, by Nick Lewer, Anouk Lafortune-Bernard, Robin Coningham, Kosh Prasad Acharya, and Ram Bahadur Kunwar, highlights the historical and modern importance of the Greater Lumbini Area in Nepal within the context of archaeological sites and excavations and the importance of living cultural heritage preservation and protection. Using Dohani as a micro-heritage case study, the approaches and methodologies used for community consultation and community engagement initiatives will be described and their effectiveness considered.

In Chapter 6, Marielle Richon reviews projects working with communities initiated by the Oriental Cultural Heritage Sites Protection Alliance. She provides an overview of projects at Lumbini, Kathmandu's Itum Baha Monastery and the Medieval walled city of Lo Manthang in Upper Mustang. The objectives of the Upper Mustang project are the preservation of its tangible and intangible cultural heritage. The Gorkha earthquakes in 2015 generated an awareness among the Lopa community and stakeholders about the need to undertake preservation rapidly in order to protect the local culture for future generations. This chapter will explore the manner in which the Alliance contributed in building harmony between all stakeholders.

In Chapter 7, Lisa Choegyal reflects that World Heritage Site management is a complex task and that heritage resource managers need to understand the principles of tourism. Firstly, it is necessary to understand

your visitors, as well as your product and attraction. Secondly, it is important to see the resource through the eyes of the community. Community consultations have the objective of empowering people to participate in resource management, heritage protection and tourism. Choegyál asserts that it is important that communities receive benefits heritage conservation, and a sustainable partnership exists between resource managers, stakeholder communities and the tourism industry.

Zahra Hussain discusses the mapping of the cultural landscapes in northern Pakistan in Chapter 8. Focusing on intangible heritage, she argues that conflicts and disasters pose considerable risk to intangible cultural heritage which is not always visible and cannot be easily protected as it requires deep engagement and analysis. This chapter will discuss how the process of documenting cultural practices and pattern language was carried out in the northern Valleys of Pakistan. It will highlight participatory mapping methodologies used in the field and how communities were involved in the process of generating, producing, reflecting and exchanging knowledge.

Chapter 9, by Rajendra Narsingh Suwal, describes Nepal's success in natural heritage conservation stewardship moving from a protection regime to a community participatory and revenue-sharing mechanism. He shows how innovative community projects helped assist animal protection, anti-poaching activities, habitat management, forest restoration and livelihood activities. Involvement by members of a community in the planning and decision-making process was essential for the success of these initiatives. Suwal suggests that this approach to community engagement, to which WWF Nepal has contributed, may prove useful for conservation stewardship of archaeological and other heritage sites.

In Chapter 10, Kai Weise examines community engagement, archaeology and heritage protection in Bagan, Myanmar. The chapter charts the difficult process of nominating Bagan for World Heritage status and raises concerns about threats to the cultural heritage site. The link between the monuments, subsurface archaeology and the landscape and the human activity of farming is noted. Recently, the local community has been strengthened because of governance opportunities through the newly elected government. Communities are now taking a lead in discussing the future of Bagan and this chapter presents a case study of a community that has only recently been politically empowered and is still finding confidence in its engagement role.

Chapter 11, by Robin Coningham and Nick Lewer, examines two case studies, the Orange Metro Line in Lahore, Pakistan and Jaffna Fort in Sri Lanka. These examples describe some of the broader (political, economic, post-war) problematic and sensitive issues associated with heritage protection and archaeological excavations in economic development and post-war contexts.

Our final Chapter, Chapter 12, reviews and comments on the key issues and lessons learned, both generic- and context-specific, from the case studies and discusses challenges for community engagement when built in as an integral part of the archaeological project process.

We acknowledge the generosity of Durham University and Durham's UNESCO Chair in allowing Chapters 1, 5 and 12 to be made Open Access to reach and influence as wide an audience as possible. Finally, it should be noted that diacritical marks have been dispensed with following the convention of the Cambridge Encyclopedia of India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Bhutan and the Maldives.

REFERENCES

- Albert, M. T., Richon, N., Viñals, M. J., & Whitcomb, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Community Development Through World Heritage*. World Heritage Papers No. 31. Paris: UNESCO. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/series/31>.
- Brown, J., & Hay-Edie, T. (2014). *Engaging Local Communities in Stewardship of World Heritage: A Methodology Based on the COMPACT Experience*. World Heritage Papers No. 40. Paris: UNESCO.
- Burkey, B. (1993). *People First: A Guide to Self-Reliant Participatory Rural Development*. London: Zed Books.
- Carman, J. (2000). Theorising a Realm of Practice? Introducing Archaeological Heritage Management as a Research Field. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 6(4), 303–308.
- Chambers, R. (1997). *Whose Reality Counts? Putting the First Last*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Coningham, R. A. E., Acharya, K. P., Davis, C. E., Weise, K., Kunwar, R. B., & Simpson, I. A. (2018). Look Down, Not Up: Protecting the Post-disaster Subsurface Heritage of the Kathmandu Valley's UNESCO World Heritage Site. In L. A. Bracken, H. Rusczyk, & T. Robinson (Eds.), *Evolving Narratives of Hazard and Risk: The Gorkha Earthquake, Nepal, 2015* (pp. 159–181). London: Palgrave.
- Coningham, R. A. E., & Young, R. L. (2015). *The Archaeology of South Asia: From the Indus to Asoka*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Cooke, B., & Kothari, U. (Eds.). (2001). *Participation: The New Tyranny?* London: Zed Books.
- Crooke, E. (2010). The Politics of Community Heritage: Motivations, Authority and Control. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 16(1–2), 6–29.
- Getty Conservation Institute. (2009). *Conserving Heritage In East Asian Cities: Planning For Continuity and Change*. Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute. http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications_resources/teaching/management.html.
- Global Heritage Fund. (2010). *Saving Our Vanishing Heritage: Safeguarding Endangered Cultural Heritage Sites in the Developing World*. Palo Alto: Global Heritage Fund.
- Gould, P. (2016). On the Case: Method in Public and Community Archaeology. *Public Archaeology*, 15(1), 5–22.
- Gould, P. (2018, forthcoming). *Empowering Communities Through Archaeology and Heritage: The Role of Local Governance in Economic Development*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Kothari, A., Camill, P., & Brown, J. (2013). Conservation as If People Also Mattered: Policy and Practice of Community-Based Conservation. *Journal of Conservation and Society*, 11(1), 1–15. <http://www.conservationandsociety.org/article.asp?issn=0972-4923;year=2013;volume=11;issue=1;page=1;epage=15;aulast=Kothari>.
- Little, B., & Shackel, P. (Eds.). (2007). *Archaeology as a Tool of Civic Engagement*. Lanham: AltaMira Press.
- Moshenska, G., & Dhanjal, S. (Eds.). (2011). *Community Archaeology: Themes, Methods and Practices*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Oakley, P. (Ed.). (1991). *Projects with People: The Practice of Participation in Rural Development*. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Perkin, C. (2010). Beyond the Rhetoric: Negotiating the Politics and Realising the Potential of Community-Driven Heritage Engagement. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 16(1–2), 107–122.
- Sapu, S. (2009). Community Participation in Heritage Conservation. In *Conserving Heritage in East Asian Cities: Planning For Continuity and Change*. Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute. http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications_resources/teaching/management.html.
- Schmidt, P. (2017). *Community-Based Heritage in Africa: Unveiling Local Research and Development Initiatives*. London: Routledge.
- Schmidt, P., & Pikirayi, I. (Eds.). (2016). *Community Archaeology and Heritage in Africa: Decolonizing Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Silva, K., & Chapagain, N. (Eds.). (2013). *Asian Heritage Management: Concepts, Concerns and Prospects*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Smith, L., & Waterton, E. (2009). *Heritage, Communities, and Archaeology*. London: Duckworth.

- Tully, G. (2007). Community Archaeology: General Methods and Standards of Practice. *Public Archaeology*, 6(3), 155–187.
- Waterton, E., & Smith, L. (2010). The Recognition and Misrecognition of Community Heritage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 16(1–2), 4–15.
- Watson, S., & Waterton, E. (2010). Heritage and Community Engagement. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 16(1–2), 1–3.
- Winter, T. (2009). Tourism and Development. In *Conserving Heritage in East Asian Cities: Planning For Continuity and Change*. Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute. http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications_resources/teaching/management.html.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.