

Heritage, Communities and Archaeology

Laurajane Smith &
Emma Waterton

B L O O M S B U R Y

LONDON • NEW DELHI • NEW YORK • SYDNEY

Bloomsbury Academic
An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

50 Bedford Square
London
WC1B 3DP
UK

1385 Broadway
New York
NY 10018
USA

www.bloomsbury.com

First published in 2009 by Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd.
Reprinted by Bristol Classical Press 2012

Laurajane Smith and Emma Waterton have asserted their right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as Authors of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

No responsibility for loss caused to any individual or organization acting on or refraining from action as a result of the material in this publication can be accepted by Bloomsbury or the author.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN: PB: 978-0-7156-3681-7
ePUB: 978-1-4725-1979-5
ePDF: 978-1-4725-2133-0

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

Contents

Abbreviations	7
Acknowledgements	9
Introduction	11
1. Heritage, communities and archaeology: a history	21
2. Material culture, memory and identity	41
3. Community dissonance	55
4. Having a stake	77
5. Museums and communities	103
6. Digital communities	119
7. Conclusion: working together	138
Notes	145
Bibliography	147
Index	169

Abbreviations

AHD	Authorised Heritage Discourse
AHM	Archaeological Heritage Management
BAJR	British Archaeological Jobs Resource
BBC	British Broadcasting Corporation
BBS	Bulletin Board System
CARP	Community Archaeology Research Project, Lincoln
CAPQ	Community Archaeology Project at Quseir, Egypt
CBA	Council for British Archaeology
CCGG	Cawood Castle Garth Group
CHM	Cultural Heritage Management
CHT	Castleford Heritage Trust
CMC	Computer-Mediated Communication
COBG	Consortium of Black Groups
CRM	Cultural Resource Management
DCMS	Department for Culture, Media and Sport
HER	Historic Environment Record
HPR	Heritage Protection Review
ICOMOS	International Council on Monuments and Sites
IM	Instant Messaging
LDF	Local Development Framework
MLA	Museums, Libraries and Archives Council
MUD	Multiple User Domain
NAPIncl	National Action Plans for Social Inclusion

Abbreviations

NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NDPB	Non-Departmental Public Body
PPG	Planning Policy Guidance
SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
SMR	Sites and Monuments Record
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
WHC	World Heritage Convention

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Deborah Blake, Editorial Director at Duckworth, for her patience, and acknowledge and thank those individuals and organisations that accommodated our requests for their time and input: Dr Daniel Hull, Council for British Archaeology, Dr Jon Kenny, York Archaeological Trust, and Dr Keith Emerick, English Heritage (York) – although we acknowledge that the opinions we have expressed within are our own.

We are especially grateful to the many people from the Castleford Heritage Trust and the Cawood Castle Garth Group who generously offered us their time, patience and knowledge. In particular, we are indebted to Carole Birtwhistle, Margaret Brearley, Alison Drake, Ian Dersley, Jane Dersley, Lorna Malkin and Margaret Squires, all of whom extended extraordinary levels of kindness, enthusiasm and support.

As always, we would like to thank Gary Campbell for his intellectual stimulation, impeccable editorial skills and encouragement. Thanks also to Dr Steve Watson for his support and humour, and Alison Drake for her inspiration.

Finally, we acknowledge financial assistance from the British Academy Small Grants scheme for funding work undertaken by Laurajane in Castleford, and the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC, on behalf of RCUK, fellowship reference number EP/E500579/1) for Emma.

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

This book is aimed at making people think about ‘community’, heritage and archaeology. It is in part polemical, and as such we are not interested in making people feel comfortable about ‘community’, which, to be blunt, has been drawn on for comfort for too long, ‘like a roof under which we shelter in heavy rain, like a fireplace at which we warm our hands on a frosty day’ (Bauman 2001: 1). At the same time as we work to take people out of their comfort zones, we also want to stress the massive potential that working with ‘communities’ has for the heritage sector. However, before we discuss that, we need to clarify the concepts of ‘community’ and ‘heritage’, and address some core issues relevant to the three main interest groups for whom this book is written.

For professional workers in the heritage sector – archaeologists, museum workers, architects, art historians, public historians, etc. – we have a very direct message. You are a community, but just one community of interest among many others. Once we cut through the rhetoric of custodianship and stewardship, and the authority accorded to expert knowledge by society in general and government and state bodies in particular, experts in the heritage sector are just another community with an interest in the past. The difference is that they get paid for it, and define themselves and their careers by their engagement with the past, but their interest in the past is no more or less legitimate, or worthy of respect, than anyone else’s.

For decision-makers in government, and those who frame and deliver policy, the yoking together of ‘community’ and ‘heritage’ has been far less effective than they might have hoped. This is largely because of the ill-defined assumptions

policymakers have made about communities, heritage and social inclusion. While staying out of the rain and warming their hands at the fire of 'community', policymakers have lost sight of the fact that ticking a few boxes about including working-class and ethnic minorities in visitor targets has confused more effective marketing with democratically extending the idea of what heritage is, and how it should be promoted. Rather than asking why the 'socially excluded' should visit stately homes and art galleries, perhaps the question should be asked why the middle-classes aren't visiting, for example, the many local museums that commemorate working-class life in industrial regions, or museums and heritage centres that address less comforting aspects of history, such as slavery, the experiences of migrant communities and colonialism. Assuming that 'social inclusion' means one community visiting the heritage of another, but not the other way around, is simply cultural assimilation, and makes many unwarranted assumptions about who should visit what, and why.

For those active in communities there are also some challenges in this book. For many people, 'community' and 'heritage' are comfortably self-evident, defined by place and shared histories, and often ethnicity and nationality, and redolent of shared values and their celebration. However, communities take many forms, are often riven by dissent, and bear the burden of uncomfortable histories. They are often defined by the articulate and the privileged, who are readily recognised by policymakers and professionals, leaving others to some peripheral status. Diversity and social difference, both between and within communities, must be recognised not just by policymakers and professionals, but also by communities themselves. This book therefore starts from these critical observations about 'community' and 'heritage', and we suggest that heritage experts, policymakers and community activists need to engage in debate lest the use of the terms 'community' and 'heritage' remain warm, cuddly and lacking in substance.

The power the term 'community' has should not be understated: about a decade ago, Barrie Sharpe (1998: 39) published

an article in the field of natural resource management in Cameroon in which he quoted the Director of the South Bakundu Forest Regeneration Project's remark that 'if they don't have a community we'll make them form one, and then we'll order them to participate'. Admittedly, this was uttered in a context rife with corruption, where limits were imposed on freedom of expression, and thus may seem a somewhat disingenuous statement with which to open a volume dealing with heritage and archaeology in the predominantly Western world. However, it does reveal the powerful and evidently far-reaching influence of the notion of 'community'. What we draw from it is the degree to which 'community' has become near-mandatory, an almost daily construction, or something that borders on a pathological compulsion, extending beyond the limits of our own disciplines and cultural specificities. This escalation of interest can be seen from the spate of voluntary organisations, local governance initiatives and grassroots projects using the prefix 'community', to the large funding bodies, national policy initiatives and international economic aid directives, all using the term with impunity (Kumar 2005). Certainly, it has attractiveness in a policy sense, but what exactly drives this obsession with the idea of 'community'?

The rhetoric of 'community' is used to make ourselves *feel good* about the work we do as heritage professionals, particularly as we become increasingly aware of the politically difficult nature of our work – it becomes *the right thing to do*. It is a term that is 'never used in a negative sense', nor, for that matter, do people ever 'say that they are against "community"' (Kumar 2005: 277). It is for this reason that the concept turns up with such frequency within the heritage sector (Arantes 2007). This development of a community rhetoric, as Cooper (2008: 26) notes, has become one of the most enduring characteristics of present-day heritage management and archaeological practice, *despite* the fact that we do not yet have a clear understanding of its varied uses and implications.

If the idea of 'community' most frequently embraced is something that is 'good', 'safe' and 'comfortable', it is with an acute

sense of paradox that we note its emergence out of a distinctly *uncomfortable* and challenging context. Indeed, perhaps the most powerful impetus behind our talk of 'community' is agitation by Indigenous people in colonial settler societies to have their voices, and views of the past, heard. In this context, much of what has been described as 'community archaeology' emerged as a consequence of sustained challenges to the imposition of authorised accounts and understandings of heritage and archaeology onto Indigenous peoples. Similarly, tensions emerging out of the perceived fragility of the experiences and knowledges of the so-called Third World also triggered an interest in community mobilisation as a means of using local resources to address 'local' problems (Hudson 2004: 252). Hot on the heels of this recognition of a community impetus in post-colonial and Third World contexts was the realisation that some of the lessons we have learnt might have broader relevance in discrete cases within the West. This, for us, seems a confusing situation. If politically fraught, complex and haunting issues succeeded in raising our awareness of community interests in the first place, why, then, do we deal with these issues within archaeology and heritage management on an episodic (Zielinski 2007) or case-by-case basis, leaving our overarching understanding of 'community' as something that is unusually and unambiguously 'good'?

To answer this question, it is necessary to revisit the relationships between heritage, archaeology and community, not only in terms of their historical association, but by unpacking the prevalent images of 'community' in heritage studies and critically examining implementations of community work around the world. At the same time, we argue for a reconsideration of the implications of this dominant approach to community archaeology and heritage, particularly in terms of how archaeological knowledge and heritage expertise are *used* in these situations, and the wider consequences our practices have for a range of social problems. Of course, this inevitably draws the heritage profession beyond the parameters of archaeological sites or episodes of engaging with a museum, local

Introduction

landscape or collective memories. Indeed, it requires the profession to think more clearly and responsibly about what else is happening – or what else is at stake – within the management process, forcing us to grapple with the unwieldy areas of social justice (see Chapter 4). This will at times be painful, especially when we are asked to acknowledge the less positive aspects of our work and the uses it is put to, not least when it is harnessed to wider public policies that skate closer to messages of racism and cultural assimilation than they do to social inclusion (see Chapters 3 and 5). Yet the relationship between heritage professionals and communities need not be negative; indeed there are many positive case studies documenting useful community engagement in the literature. However, one of the central arguments of this volume is that it is the *process* by which community groups are engaged with that is important, and this should be a process that is open to – and accepting of – difference in the richest sense of the term. This orientation to difference allows for an awareness of competing definitions and understandings of the same thing, prompting useful and rewarding two-way exchanges of ideas, experiences and interpretations of heritage. It is only in this way that we can begin to acknowledge the systemic and theoretical blinkers that prevent us from engaging with community groups holistically and honestly. Indeed, it is only from such a position that we can convincingly argue that the idea of ‘community’ should be a central concern for *all* archaeological and heritage practice.

What do we mean by ‘community’?

Before developing our argument, there are three definitions that we need to pin down. Foremost, what do we mean by ‘community’ in relation to archaeology and heritage? Our reading of the related literature has revealed a bewildering array of terms used in the description and implementation of community projects. These include: community archaeology, community-engaged, community-based, community-led, outreach, public archaeology, Indigenous archaeology, community col-

laboration, community facilitation, postcolonial archaeology, public education, democratic archaeology, community heritage, participatory archaeology and alternative archaeology. Of these, it is perhaps 'public archaeology' that has become the most visible, originally coined by Charles McGimsey in 1972 and now the title of an international journal. Community engagement can also be undertaken for a wide-range of reasons. Consultation with community groups may occur as part of archaeological/heritage management work, as part of educational outreach programmes, or from a desire to make research work 'relevant' to communities. Community volunteers may participate in excavation and other projects, and communities themselves may approach experts for support, help or guidance in archaeological or heritage projects that they have initiated.

Although a variety of phrases and aims exist, it is the phrases 'community collaboration' and 'community-based' that are the more promising, both in terms of describing the range of aims for community engagement and in allowing the most room for the development of effective engagements. Two of the most widely – and positively – cited approaches to 'community' are Moser et al.'s discussion of the Community Archaeology Project at Quseir (CAPQ), Egypt, and Greer et al.'s exploration of experiences of community-based archaeology in Australia. Tully (2007: 157) notes that the CAPQ project was the 'first academic grant awarded to a community archaeology project' and has become something of a quintessential example. Perhaps best received is the set of methodological components considered essential for conducting community projects:

1. communication and collaboration;
2. employment and training;
3. public presentation;
4. interviews and oral history;
5. educational resources;
6. photographic and video archive;
7. community-controlled merchandising (Moser et al. 2002: 229).

Introduction

Collectively, these steps aim to cover archaeological projects from beginning to end, and are based on the proposition that ‘at every step in the project at least partial control remains with the community’ (Marshall 2002: 211). They are underpinned by a belief in the need for a collaborative and transformative practice that extends beyond the standard question of ethics, and are based upon the inevitability of conflicts, tensions and dissent (Moser et al. 2002: 243). Of the seven components listed above, only two – communication/collaboration and interviews/oral history – have reached a high level of representation across more recent projects (Tully 2007). The seven components provide a baseline of practical points for undertaking collaborative work, although there are two key limitations. First, they infer a case-by-case methodology that need be applied only in certain circumstances, or in those projects that self-consciously set out to be about the community. Second, while the sharing of information within the components is laudable, it continues to reinforce a somewhat unidirectional flow of knowledge, as witnessed by the tendency to *invite* community members into the process. However, the CAPQ was set up some ten years ago. Our aim is not to test or adhere to the continued validity of this methodological baseline, but to provoke debate *beyond* these seven principles.

The haunting colonial context of Australian archaeology has facilitated an articulated debate about community interest and as such, the second approach we draw attention to emerges out of work by Shelley Greer and her notion of ‘community-based’ research. This is defined as ‘empowering communities by contributing to the construction of local identity’ using an *interactive* orientation to communication (Greer et al. 2002: 268; Clarke 2002). This approach explicitly emerges out of a dialogue between archaeologists and Indigenous people and is an attempt to incorporate the challenges and dissatisfaction of Indigenous people into the discipline of archaeology, and destabilise the assumed prominence of archaeological knowledge above all other ways of seeing/knowing the past. It is thus built upon an awareness of the political nature of heritage, and the

capacity for heritage to be used as 'lodestones for group memory and identity' in the present (Greer et al. 2002: 282). It is, to borrow from Clarke (2002), a re/negotiated experience. In relation to the very notion of 'community', Greer et al. (2002) make mention of several key points. They, like Swadhin Sen (2002), caution against assumptions that a community is a homogeneous unit; instead it is a heterogeneous and changing aggregate of people. As well, membership of a community should not necessarily be defined by – or tied to – a person's geographical residency. A significant assumption often made is that community *is* 'local' – that it is geographically-based. While there are communities that define themselves geographically, communities may be defined and linked by a range of social and cultural experiences, and/or political experiences and aspirations that transcend geography and are, in fact, geographically widespread. For instance, shared experiences influenced by ethnicity, class, gender, age, religion, sexual orientation, political beliefs, and so forth, are factors around which communities may define themselves. It is also important to acknowledge that individuals may belong to more than one community at any one time. Moreover, engagements with heritage and the past will not be limited to one key community group, but will inevitably revolve around a convergence of often conflicting interests and aspirations (Marshall 2002: 216).

Another important aspect of communities is the recognition that they may self-define, and engagements with such communities may be difficult. This is complicated as the automatic response of experts is often to try to manage the situation and define how engagement with communities will progress. But we cannot 'make' people conform to our expectations nor 'order them to participate' in ways we control. Engagement is often fraught, and tensions, misunderstandings and confusion between expertise and communities are not confined to interactions within cross-cultural contexts. Moreover, in avoiding these discomforts and difficulties, there is often a tendency to confine our interactions to the well-organised, vocal and geographically 'local' community. However, if we want to engage

Introduction

properly with the idea of 'community', we must address our discomforts.

The second term to clarify is that of power. While the above authors encourage a context within which competing groups cooperate and collaborate, creating such a context is not always that simple. Indeed, it requires an explicit assessment of the sustained failure to acknowledge not only the existence of unequal power relations both within and surrounding heritage and archaeological practice, but also the outcomes of those relations. What does it *do* for, and to, those attempting to engage in collaborative projects, in terms of individuals, groups and societies, and *how* have those power relations come about? This questioning of power will move beyond a simplistic assessment of who prevails in terms of decision-making (Richardson 2007: 30) to examine those practices and assumptions that *limit* public, community and non-expert involvement to a discrete variety of projects or instances within the wider management process. The distribution of resources, both symbolic and material, and the conditions available for parity of participation and issues of control are vital considerations. As are the 'rules of the game' (Richardson 2007: 31), or those facets of power that allow expertise to suppress, thwart or obscure some heritage issues, while drawing others to the foreground.

The third and final definition draws explicitly from the above understanding of 'community' and 'power': archaeologists, heritage managers and museum professionals can be defined as a community group themselves, on a par with other groups encountered in this volume – this 'community of expertise' will be referred to as 'heritage professionals' hereafter. The work of Julie Lahn (1996) and her critique of the disciplinary identity of archaeology draws attention to the degree to which self-image, group-image, status, ownership and control are bound up with the ability of archaeologists to make pronouncements about the past and maintain political and professional control over its material remains. We can see that in some ways things have moved on since Lahn first presented these criticisms, but her prediction that the archaeological commu-

nity would seek, unconsciously or not, new ways of asserting their authority – and, in effect, prevent the conditions for a genuine politics of recognition – continues to ring true. One source that heritage professionals have turned to in reinventing that identity is the realm of community work. For us this is critical, as it forces us to see ourselves in terms of our own interests, needs, desires and aspirations, and acknowledge that the ways in which we utilise heritage are no different from those of the groups we attempt to represent.

Heritage, communities and archaeology: a history

Introduction

Talk of ‘community’ is endemic in much of the heritage sector in England, resulting in what McClanahan (2007) has labelled ‘the cult of community’. For many, this is a consequence of New Labour’s and Tony Blair’s fixation with John Macmurray’s Christian communitarianism (Fairclough 2000; Levitas 2005: 105). With the introduction of policies such as the *New Deal for Communities*, the recent emergence of the governmental department *Communities and Local Government* (formerly the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister), and the setting up of the *Community Cohesion Unit*, it does indeed seem as though ‘community’ is at the heart of New Labour politics (Blair 2005; see also Blair 2000, 2001). Likewise, the recent introduction of a requirement that all local authorities produce Local Development Frameworks (LDF), including a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), is also indicative of its significance. Consequently, as a recent volume of *Heritage Counts* identifies, the idea of ‘community’ has reached ‘the forefront of the work in the sector’ (English Heritage 2006a: 2).

This increased focus on ‘community’ is also mirrored popularly, as evidenced by a long-term and wide-scale interest in public history/archaeology in Britain, captured by the 162 heritage-related programmes broadcast on television during 2005-06 (English Heritage 2006a), such as *Time Team* (Channel 4), *Meet the Ancestors* (BBC and UKTV), *Who Do You Think You Are* (BBC) and *Restoration* (BBC). By 2006, English Heri-

tage and the National Trust collectively enjoyed a four-million-strong membership, with 90% of participants in the 2007 DCMS-led *Taking Part Survey* citing the importance of 'heritage' for improving local places (DCMS 2007: 29). Simultaneously, visible institutional kudos have been attached to the term 'community', resulting in the establishment of full-time community heritage/archaeology posts across the UK, the development of the Outreach Department within English Heritage in 2003, and long-running heritage projects such as the Community Landscape Project in Devon (2001-present) and the Community Archaeology Research Project (CARP) in Lincoln (1999-present). Similar projects have also been ongoing in an international context, including Archaeology in Annapolis, USA, since 1981 (Leone et al. 1987), the Levi Jordan Plantation Historical Society, USA, since 1993 (McDavid 2004), and the Community Archaeology Project at Quseir, Egypt (CAPQ), since 1998 (Moser et al. 2002).

Despite the contemporary ubiquity of the term, the aim of this chapter is to suggest that increasing community focus is not of recent provenance: indeed, it has been with us for some time. The chapter argues that a limited position has been crafted for community groups within the management process, one that decisively differs from that afforded to heritage professionals, particularly in terms of their respective abilities to identify and influence heritage values, meanings and experiences. Many of the tensions and conflicts that arise between community groups and heritage professionals revolve around these positions, which are based upon a misunderstanding of the significant stake each group has in the management process.

A fireside at which we warm our hands¹

The history of community research is characterised by periods of intense study separated by phases of conceptual anxiety and misuse. Across this history, the term 'community' has seen-sawed from an association with empirically rich investigations

1. Heritage, communities and archaeology: a history

of social relationships to theoretically weak and nostalgic representations (Hoggett 1997: 5; see also Stacey 1969). It is therefore unsurprising that the term has appeared, disappeared and reappeared within the sociological and anthropological lexicon a number of times, making a recent a come-back (Hoggett 1997: 6). The burgeoning literature and simultaneous policy emphasis on the notion of 'community' in the last few years can therefore best be described as something of a revival of a focus that initially developed in the 1950s and 1960s, and reappeared in the 1980s and early 1990s (Crow & Allan 1994). Indeed, within heritage studies community research is now enjoying its third peak. Thus, while the subject has experienced periods of avoidance and obfuscation within the academy, it remains, as Day and Murdoch (1993: 85) point out, 'a term that just will not lie down'.

While there is no clear and specific history for the development of community research in heritage studies, we will focus upon three distinct phases: the 1960s and early 1970s; the 1990s; and the 2000s. These phases coincide with the arrival of an internationally recognisable conservation ethic in the 1960s and 1970s, an interest in – and *from* – 'ordinary', marginalised and disenfranchised groups in the 1990s, and policies of social inclusion and community cohesion in the 2000s. Our point is that while the heritage sector has ostensibly mapped the ebb and flow of wider sociological explorations of community, it has simultaneously absented itself from more critical explorations of the subject. Consequently, an unchanging and uncritical notion of 'community' continues to be embedded and disseminated within heritage policy.

For many commentators, community has become something of a misnomer: 'a fantasy' (Clarke 2005, cited in Neal & Walters 2008: 280), a 'weasel word' (MacGregor 2001: 188), or something that is tied up with so many ways of thinking about human relationships that it has come to mean virtually nothing. Like 'identity', the term has become ambiguous and ambivalent, and can therefore be difficult to use in any mean-

ingful way. An important reason for this is that so much is simply assumed from the word itself that little time has been spent scrutinising and articulating what exactly is meant by 'community', and how it might be recognised within a range of encounters. Indeed, it is a concept that 'needs to be explained rather than *be* the explanation' (Neal and Walters 2008: 281, emphasis added). Important work by authors such as Anderson (1983) Cohen (1985), Bauman (2001) and Amid and Rapport (2002) has provided theoretically engaged work on the issue of community. However, despite this extensive critique – or perhaps because of it – a generic understanding of 'community' continues to dominate public policy.

For Alleyne (2002), this generic understanding has become something of a doxa, or convenience, that tends to refer to rural towns and villages, or, if incorporating the urban context, the working-classes and minority groups. Implicitly, then, the generic conceptualisation of 'community' refers either to social relationships existing 'back in time' or within the strict parameters of social hierarchy. Moreover, as Alleyne (2002: 611) points out, this assumption is based on the premise that the dominant 'we' (read here white, middle- and upper-classes) are 'individuals in society, while they (the Rest) have community (of course, "we" once had community as the dominant form of social organisation, but "we" dropped it on the way to modernity)'. This hierarchical approach has been reiterated by research done by Williams (2003) on UK government policy approaches to community involvement, which tend to denigrate the participatory culture of less affluent wards as 'simple' or 'immature'. As such, this understanding of 'community' is able to weave together an enduring image of tradition, creating a 'golden age of community' (Clarke et al. 2007: 98) that is inevitably tinged with nostalgia, and *applied* by scholars, policymakers and experts to a range of marginalised groups. This idea of 'community' is one commonly associated with the early community studies of the 1950s and 1960s, in which a homogeneous and non-conflictual image of community groups emerged. As such, the accepted notion of 'community' tends to

1. *Heritage, communities and archaeology: a history*

be essentialised and, importantly, comfortable, with positions of power assumed to lie with experts and expertise (Labadi 2007). More often than not, it is also tied up with distinct geographical areas that are rural in character and inevitably romanticised, through which the public are assumed readily to attach ideas of cohesion and inclusion. As Dicks (2000a: 51) points out, it has become coupled with an idealisation of place. Although sociological explorations of the term have moved on significantly from this 'feel-good' factor, a conceptualisation of 'community' as small-scale, face-to-face and attached to place retains a strong political hold, and the heritage sector offers no exception.

The beginnings of a community focus in heritage studies

A focus on 'community' in archaeological and heritage projects was relatively rare before the 1970s (Malloy 2003). Although volunteerism and amateur archaeology have a long history in the UK, as does support for the preservation and conservation of archaeology evidenced by a suite of 'Friends of ...' groups, a formal acknowledgement of the lobbying work of a range of interest groups can be pinpointed to the 1970s with the work of *RESCUE: The British Archaeological Trust* (1971), *SAVE Britain's Heritage* (1975), and *The Interpretation of Britain's Heritage* (1975). Similar lobbying also occurred in the US and Australia at this time (see Barthel 1996; Smith 2004a). It is this timeframe that heritage professionals regularly associate with the emergence of a serious public engagement with heritage and archaeology. With the publication of *Public Archaeology* by McGimsey in 1972 and the concerted efforts of Pamela Cressey to introduce the notion of 'community archaeology', the visibility of 'community' was also signalled to be of academic interest, a point that can be illustrated by the emergence of scholarly work such as *Guardians of Community Heritage* (Walker 1984) and *Community Archaeology: A Fieldworker's Handbook of Organization and Techniques* (Liddle 1985).

The emergence of public, academic and political interest in heritage and archaeology is often explained in terms of a wider sense of environmental crisis, at a time when the Western world witnessed massive economic expansion, warnings of global shortages, spectacular nuclear accidents, and a huge growth in urban and rural development. In the UK, this sense of crisis played out in public reactions to the building of large swathes of new motorway, the wiping away of terraced housing and a general sense of being over-awed at large-scale development. This momentum was not confined to the UK, as similar issues were also agitating groups and individuals in many other Western countries. Two responses to this crisis of heritage are relevant here. First, the material culture associated with heritage and archaeology was popularly and politically re-imagined as 'fragile, finite and non-renewable resources'. Debate and discussion of heritage thus focussed not on *what* it might be, but on *how* it ought to be managed. Inevitably, this meant drawing upon the work and advice of particular experts; in this case, the epistemological and ontological frameworks favoured by archaeologists, art historians and architects. Second, the formulation of policies and procedures for the technical management of heritage led to the formalisation of an archaeological profession in the UK (Merriman 2002: 550). One aspect of this was the development of archaeological heritage management (AHM), cultural heritage management (CHM), or cultural resource management (CRM), which was established as a counterpoint to academic archaeology.² Imagined as a technical concern bound up with preservation and conservation, CHM ostensibly operated as a mechanism through which archaeology was planned, protected and managed *in the public interest* (Merriman 2004: 3). It was thus with some irony that the vociferous lobbying of volunteer and hobby groups in effect led to decreased amateur and public involvement in archaeological practice (Merriman 2002: 550).

It was also at this time that a particular idea of heritage was naturalised, which works towards sustaining and shaping the parameters of debate around issues of community and public

1. *Heritage, communities and archaeology: a history*

engagement. Legislative documents that embed this idea of heritage in England include the *Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979*, the *National Heritage Act 1983* and *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990*. Smith (2006) has labelled this framing of heritage the Authorised Heritage Discourse (AHD), and has written extensively on both its institutionalisation and its implications (see also Waterton et al. 2006). Within this discourse, emphasis is placed upon the material and tangible which are earmarked as crucial markers of heritage and identity. The importance of this material focus is twofold: first, the above are assumed to provide *real* and tangible reminders of the imaginative bonds used to define and legitimise narratives of the nation; and second, these physical markers justify the prominence of expertise within the particular course of action undertaken to deal with the problem or crisis of heritage that permeated the 1960s and 1970s. The naturalised conservation ethic is thus both technocratic and top-down, designed to deal primarily with a nationally-based understanding of heritage and the past, and draws explicitly on the rights of future generations as a commonsense principle.

The Authorised Heritage Discourse

The roots of the AHD can be traced back to nineteenth-century debates concerned with the authenticity of fabric, and it thus owes its legacy to both Enlightenment rationality and Romanticism. As Ruskin (1849), Morris (1877) and Viollet-le-Duc ([1868] 1990), among others, debated the nature of conservation work and argued for the ‘moral’ worth of conservation over restoration, ideas about the innate value of fabric became embedded in what was to become standard definitions of ‘heritage’. Artistic and aesthetic values were granted primacy, as were authenticity and age, all of which rehearse those ideas associated with Ruskin (1849: 186) and his suggestion that ‘the greatest glory of a building is not in its stones, nor in its gold. Its glory is in its Age ...’. Encapsulated within this

assumption of inherent value is the idea of paternalism, permanence and patrimony, out of which a moral sense of obligation emerges that insists that 'we have a duty to champion our heritage for the enjoyment of future generations' (Green 1996: 1). This ethic was influenced by Ruskin's idea of 'conserve as found', while Viollet-le-Duc stressed the 'duty' that conservators had to respect, if not revere, the original meaning and values of a building. Being 'honest' to the original cultural meaning of fabric not only reinforces the idea that authenticity and meaning can only be 'found' in the fabric of places and objects, it also works to privilege the position of architects, archaeologists and museum professionals as stewards of that material culture. This idea of stewardship encompasses the moral worth of nineteenth-century European debates, and has come to underpin not only a range of legal heritage instruments (see Smith 2000, 2004a), but also the ethical guidelines of archaeologists and heritage professionals (see Lynott & Wylie 2000; World Archaeological Congress 1989, Australian Archaeological Association 1991, Museums Australia 1999, Canadian Archaeological Association 1997). Although the idea that material culture has innate meaning and value is questioned today, and has been identified as a problematic legacy of antiquarianism, it is still a significant assumption, framing the AHD. However, as Larry Zimmerman (1998, 2000: 72) points out, the idea of stewardship assumes that only archaeologists have valid knowledge about the past, and in many respects is a trope for justifying the existence of heritage professionals, as it is assumed that they have the skills to 'unlock' the meaning of the past through its material culture.

The nineteenth century in Europe also saw significant social changes following the industrial revolution and the rise of nationalism. A concern to preserve the material culture from the past was linked not only to an attempt to hold on to familiar anchors in a changing world, but to modernity's sense that the present had 'lost' its links to the past (Byrne 2008). A need to re-forge that link, and to hold onto desired values, helped to reinforce the AHD's obsession with materiality and monumen-

1. *Heritage, communities and archaeology: a history*

tality. Material culture makes the intangible and ephemeral *material* – social and cultural values, identity and memories are all intangible and mutable, but are rendered ‘real’, touchable and in some ways ‘knowable’ through material symbolism. Monuments, as Choay (2001) points out, act to commemorate or recall those values and meanings important to the present that they hope to see perpetuated in the future.

Thus, in a careful mix of aesthetics, assumptions of innate value, age and authenticity, a particular fascination with the historicity of heritage was formalised. What we are arguing here draws from a critical understanding of discourse and the suggestion that the language we use to talk and think about heritage issues should not be seen as incidental. This is because discourse affects, contributes to, and is constituted by the production and reproduction of social life, including arrangements of power (Richardson 2007: 26). This allows us to think about the AHD as a naturalised discourse working to sustain the privileged positions of a range of experts – along with their interests – while simultaneously thwarting or marginalising the interests of others. This has occurred as a consequence of the systematic uptake of the AHD within national and international policy and practice. As such, the AHD is able to operate from a position of power *because* it legitimises and authorises a particular pattern of management. Our argument borrows from Gramsci’s notions of hegemony, and his position that dominant groups will *teach* their values, beliefs and interests to ‘the general public’ (ibid.: 36). Indeed, if ‘education lies at the heart of hegemony’, as Richardson (2007: 36) suggests, then the role of expertise within the realm of heritage works to mediate the diffusion and influence of the AHD *through* their pedagogic roles within the management process. Essentially, the AHD is characterised by the privileging of expertise and efficiency. Heritage is imagined as something old, beautiful, tangible and of relevance to the nation, *selected* by experts and *made to matter* (Waterton 2007a: 318). Individuals and interest groups *outside* professionals are rarely acknowledged as playing any sort of active role in the defining, conserving and

maintenance of heritage, and are instead characterised as audience, visitor or consumer.

In addition to categories of ownership operating at the level of 'the nation' and 'expertise' are those associated with the middle- and upper-classes; a category that has also played a prominent role in defining the meaning of the terms 'heritage' and 'public' involvement. This involvement can be charted through the role played by the social elite in the activities of the National Trust, and its preservation of particular cultural values represented by the country house, stately home and designed landscape (Smith 2006). This is not an idea of heritage that is capable of sustaining genuine calls for social inclusion and multiculturalism, as it regularly rejects heritage experiences that do not share the same social and cultural markers. Moreover, it asserts that heritage professionals have a duty to educate and inform, thereby ensuring that the cultural symbols of the elite are imparted to, and upheld by, everybody else. A theme linked with this consensual sense of heritage is the idea that it is inherently good, safe and conflict-free, an assumption that provides a powerful underpinning for recent policy emphasis on social inclusion. To make this 'goodliness' work, the AHD not only closes down notions of personal, local and community heritage in an attempt to mitigate conflict and dissent, but also attempts to focus on heritage at a distance, out there or 'back there' in the past (Urry 1996: 148). Paradoxically, then, the AHD attempts to capture all society within a singular understanding of heritage, which is itself a contravention of the term 'inclusion' in that it denies the legitimacy of difference and dissonance. How non-experts are made passive within this scenario is crucial for our discussions of community and/or public engagements with heritage and archaeology. Not only is this promoted by the belief that the proper care of heritage lies with expertise, but also by the associated assumption that identity is inevitably embedded within sites. This lack of a serious examination of precisely *how* identity is tied up with heritage likewise works to flatten out any

1. *Heritage, communities and archaeology: a history*

involvement by non-expert individuals or groups in contemporary society (Waterton 2008a).

'Community' in policy

The conservative nostalgia of 'community' outlined at the beginning of this chapter found congruence with the AHD. Thus, while notions of community have ostensibly found their way into national and international policies, this rhetoric is rarely as engaging in practice. Indeed, accommodation of individuals, communities and public interest groups is more often characterised, as Riley and Harvey (2005: 280) point out, as 'trowel fodder' under 'close guidance' and 'supervision' of a range of experts. This passive role has been embedded within a range of policy frameworks for managing heritage, and its sustained appearance across a range of publications offers the AHD political legitimacy. In England, the 'polluter pays' ethos found in documents such as *Planning Policy Guidance Note 15: Planning and the Historic Environment*, and *Planning Policy Guidance Note 16: Planning and Archaeology*, illustrates the degree to which archaeology was turned into a fully-fledged commercial enterprise. While the developer-led archaeology of the 1990s triggered a recognition of public interest and accountability, this interest was again constructed in terms of outcomes, so that public involvement was imagined either as something *inspired* by archaeological projects or through the provision of information as part of the planning process. With this increasing emphasis on contract archaeology, professionalisation and development controls, community involvement was further marginalised (Carman 2001: 174).

Policy initiatives continue to rehearse the AHD, including *Power of Place: The Future of the Historic Environment* (English Heritage 2000a), *The Historic Environment: A Force for our Future* (DCMS 2001), *The Heritage Protection Review (HPR)*, *Discovering the Past, Shaping the Future* (English Heritage 2005a), *People and Places: Social Inclusion Policy for the Built and Historic Environment* (DCMS 2002), *Conservation*

Principles for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment (English Heritage 2006b), and *English Heritage Strategy 2005-2010: Making the Past Part of our Future* (English Heritage 2005b) (Waterton 2007a for a fuller discussion). This range of policy material is particularly significant for discussions of community engagement, as it is through these that notions of 'social inclusion' became embedded within the English heritage sector and the parameters of community participation were formalised. The particular narrative animating this line of policy in the heritage sector revolves around attempts by 'mainstream' heritage organisations to persuade excluded groups to *buy into* and accept dominant understandings of heritage. It is in this context that the notions of 'community' and 'heritage' have found their strongest political backing, as it is *through* heritage that wider goals of creating community cohesion and fostering sustainability are being channelled.

Although our familiarity with this issue lies explicitly with the English experience, it is also one that can be mapped across a range of national experiences, particularly in Europe. The concept itself emerged out of French policy in the 1970s, and since then has spread across the European Union, where it has been taken up by member states in the form of biennial National Action Plans for Social Inclusion (NAPIncl) (Koller & Davidson 2008: 307).

Internationally the AHD has also been enshrined in policy and underpins a range of recommendations, charters and conventions. These include documents such as the *Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments* (the Athens Charter) 1931 (ICOMOS); the *Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict* (the Hague Convention) 1954 (UNESCO); the *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites* (the Venice Charter) 1964 (ICOMOS); the *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Natural and Cultural Heritage* 1972 (UNESCO); the *Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance* (the Burra Charter) 1999 (Australian ICOMOS), and the *Convention for the*

1. Heritage, communities and archaeology: a history

Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage 2003 (UNESCO), while social inclusion debates have also influenced the last two documents. These texts provide an additional authorising layer to the management of heritage and represent a specific variation of the AHD that also impacts upon the relationships established between community groups.

Collectively, these international documents lay down a straightforward framework for the protection, conservation and restoration of architecture and archaeological sites, within which the scientific nature of preservation is taken as axiomatic. Moreover, they all tend to draw upon, and highlight, the technical expertise of archaeology, art history, architecture and history, and therefore privilege communities of expertise over any other community group. The latter half of the twentieth century thus saw the development of a conservation ethic on an international scale, primarily disseminated through archaeology, art history and architecture. This timeframe highlighted particular elements as important, such as an interest in 'emblems', materiality and fabric. Indeed, as Byrne (1994: 14) argues, the "authentic" material fabric is valorised by archaeologists and art historians because it constitutes the evidence on which they base their studies; it is valorised by the state because the fabric constitutes the emblem'. Byrne (1991), among other scholars, argues that these notions are inherently Western European, and that UNESCO and ICOMOS, as international representatives of this Western ethos, have established a specific way of seeing heritage as universal.

The nationalistic tendency of Western heritage hit its zenith with the World Heritage Convention, with the idea that there not only is, but only can be, universal value, and that this universal value is best exemplified by European monuments. That the World Heritage List is dominated by the monumental heritage of European states is now acknowledged (Cleere 2001), and indeed the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention is, in part, an attempt to address that dominance (Aikawa-Faure 2008). However, European dominance of the World Heritage List is no accident, but a direct consequence of West-

ern definitions of heritage and assumptions about innate values. The explicit message passed on by the Convention is clear: *the preservation of this common heritage concerns us all*. In signing or ratifying the Convention, each country gives this sentiment credence. This 'universalising' tendency is an important aspect of the AHD. The universal nature of traditional definitions of heritage lies in the assumption that heritage tells us about the 'human past'. Certainly, heritage *is* something constructed by people, but the values and meanings we give to it are by no means universal in the sense that 'human values' implies. This idea of the universality of both the past and heritage allows experts to speak for the past – because it is a universal past. But *no* heritage site can be regarded as universally valuable or as possessing or symbolising universal meanings. All heritage sites are dissonant and contested (see Chapter 3), and any heritage site, place or object will be valued and understood differently by different individuals, communities or nations. This is a simple observation, underscored by the routine tensions between economic developments, developers, local resident groups and even heritage professionals. It is also evidenced more dramatically in the examples of Seahenge in England, the Ayodhya temple in India, the Bamyān Buddhas in Iran, and many other possible examples. Nonetheless, the simple observation that others value the past differently from ourselves is often forgotten in the universalising rhetoric of the AHD and heritage management practice. The point is that in addition to the formalisation of the AHD at the national level, that discourse was also authorised, safeguarded and naturalised at the international level, as were the cultural values and experiences that underpin it.

As with the emergence of social inclusion policy directives in England, two international documents can be earmarked as reference points within the management process for engaging with communities: the Burra Charter and the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention. It is in these documents that the term 'community' came to international prominence, with the latter embracing a notion of heritage as 'something shared within and symbolically identified with a cultural community'

1. Heritage, communities and archaeology: a history

(Kurin 2004: 69). Both recognise the need to work with and involve people – individuals, community groups and stakeholders – within the processes of managing heritage (Marquis-Kyle & Walker 1992; Blake 2008). Quite what ‘community’ means in these documents, and what room will be allowed for community decisions or interventions that stand in opposition to those provided by expertise, however, is not so forthcoming. What is clear is that these constructions of ‘community’ run *parallel* to communities of expertise, which are considered to sit outside – and above – other communities. In short, heritage became something that was done *for* communities and the public, rather than something that was done *with* them.

A more critical ‘community’ agenda

Loosely since the 1980s, and more vehemently since the 2000s, heritage studies and archaeology have begun to respond to the ‘community’ agenda emanating from Indigenous and non-Western cultural contexts, and to address issues of ethics, politics, power and the marginalisation of non-Western terms of knowledge. This engagement with shifting boundaries between archaeologists and descendant/Indigenous communities has had a profound impact on the practices of both heritage and archaeology in post-colonial nations (Colwell-Chanthaphonh & Ferguson 2004: 5; Geurds 2007). These groups also began to challenge and contest the very idea of heritage embedded in legislation. In these contexts, relationships between community groups and archaeological practitioners are still haunted by a history of tension and distrust. The 1980s and early 1990s saw particularly vociferous and powerful statements emerging from Indigenous people dissatisfied with the uneven power relationships sustained by policy and legislation (e.g. Langford 1983; Deloria 1992). In particular, these groups sought to challenge the definition of their heritage as an archaeological resource or possession of the national or international community. Although these debates continue, they have succeeded in drawing attention to the deeply entrenched power

relations attached to notions of 'science' and 'expertise', which have for so long mediated heritage issues. While these challenges have primarily been characterised as specific to issues of repatriation, illicit trade and reburial debates, there are wider issues to be drawn out that touch upon the affective and emotive dimensions of community heritage (see Chapters 2, 4).

Our argument is that these shifts need not be restricted to what has been termed 'Indigenous archaeology', but may offer lessons for a wider range of community groups seeking greater control and acknowledgment of their definitions, understandings and uses of heritage. The recent history of agitation from a range of non-Western interest groups has undoubtedly spurred a recognition of the need to go beyond uncritical notions of the term 'community' and acknowledge that it is a contested concept, often drawn upon in forms of political resistance (see Chapter 4). While this increased visibility is most often associated with disempowered and displaced groups, it applies also to those who have been marginalised, historically, from the process of 'heritagisation' (Dicks 2003: 140). No longer are individuals, community groups and stakeholders simply supportive of preservation and conservation; they instead seek to have their own sense of heritage acknowledged and legitimised. The secondary committees operating at the international level, along with the wider role of expertise that developed in the 1960s, have since come under sustained criticism by those striving to achieve greater democratisation (Cressey et al. 2003: 3). Despite increased pressure for community involvement, there is, nonetheless, a distinct one-sidedness to how this is carried out in practice, relegated as it is to the 'secondary' issues of methodology and ethics (Moser et al. 2002: 223). 'Public archaeology' and 'public history', as Smith (2007) has pointed out, are still considered to lie outside the more rigorous academic pursuits of 'straight' archaeology and history.

Recently, academic inquiry has sought to rethink 'community' in response to a general dissatisfaction with the term and its unreflective use – although it is important to note that this

1. *Heritage, communities and archaeology: a history*

shift has not been so forthcoming in a policy sense (Day & Murdoch 1993; Cooper 2008). It is thus once more a subject recognised as worthy of academic investigation, particularly as a response to the reified notion of 'community' most often found embedded in archaeological practices and public policy. As such, a large amount of research has recently been conducted – both within and outside heritage studies – that has worked to redefine community as something that is (re)constructed within ongoing experiences, engagements and relations between a range of people, sometimes consensually and sometimes contentiously (Alleyne 2002: 608). It is thus a term or entity that is created and constituted in *action* and in the present (ibid.). Indeed, as Dicks (2000a: 97) points out, a community is often constructed, produced and maintained *through* its heritage work, and incorporates the very active concerns, tensions and anxieties that drive community projects in the first place. Together, these influences have triggered a broadening of 'the imagined community' (Anderson 1983) from 'the nation' to a range of geographical, social, ethnic and cultural sub-groups, including those held together by virtual social networking (see Chapter 6). This decoupling of 'community' from geography has also been accompanied by the recognition that it is saturated with power, and is thus an inevitably dissonant and contested term (Hoggett 1997: 14). Not only, then, do we need to move away from the assumption that all community groups are similar and defined by ethnic or socio-economic classifications, we also need actively to acknowledge that power and empowerment are not neutral or uniformly distributed within any given community. The issue, as Green et al. (2003: 382) point out, is that an 'entire community cannot be empowered simultaneously; certain individuals will be more empowered than others, with the implication that empowerment activities alter the social landscape'. Our re-theorisation of community needs to acknowledge, to quote Thrift (2005: 139-40), that:

achieving sociality does not mean that everything has to be rosy ... sociality does not have to be the same thing as

liking others. It includes all kinds of acts of kindness and compassion, certainly, but equally there are all signs of active dislike being actively pursued ... as malign gossip, endless complaint, the full spectrum of jealousy, petty snobbery, personal deprecation, pointless authoritarianism, various forms of *schadenfreude*, and all the other ritual pleasures of everyday life ... It is to say, however, that we need to think more carefully about whether we really have it in us to just be unalloyedly nice to others at all times in every single place: most situations can and do bring forth both nice and nasty.

This means that we have to move away from uncritical and dialogically closed relationships with community groups and reconsider the nature of involvement, responsibility and control. This takes us beyond the hierarchical levels of involvement proposed by Moser et al. (2002), towards a framework of engagement that is no longer guided by the dominant understanding of heritage and its management. This means we have to deal with power and the consequences of alienation. Acknowledging these deeply entrenched relations of power requires a total reconsideration of the conventional relationships assumed between community groups and archaeologists, of whom the latter are presumed to exist *outside* the boundaries of 'community'. However, for the purposes of this volume, archaeology is re-imagined as precisely that – another community group bound by common interests. As Nicholas and Hollowell (2007) point out, this requires a leap forward in terms of power, particularly in relation to scholarly privilege and control. The intent is to make processes of managing heritage less patronising and paternalistic, and more open to self-examination, critical reflection and negotiation. Importantly, it means abandoning the notion that we are 'discovering the truth' on behalf of 'everyone'.

Conclusion

The idea of 'community' embedded in public policy remains uncritically 'positive', 'comfortable' and traditional, but a pivotal point within current negotiations around social exclusion, multiculturalism and cultural diversity. As a central plank of government, it has spread across associated departments, where it has become a tool with the implicit aim of engendering consensus. Here, 'community' is used in association with popular discourses drawn upon to divide the nation between the majority, the white middle-classes, and various minority/ethnic/excluded communities as a mechanism of government (Alleyne 2002: 609). Such is the degree of naturalisation of the white middle-classes that as a socio-economic group they are rendered invisible and thus are not considered to 'have community or ethnic identity in the same way as everybody else, whiteness being the norm' (ibid.: 609). This same argument can be applied to communities of expertise, which are likewise imagined to operate outside the parameters set in place for 'community' involvement and participation in decision-making. Following this, as Alexander (2007) argues, white groups and professionals are rarely targeted as the problem as it is the cultural values of excluded groups that become the focus of social reform. This harnessing of 'community' to wider constructions of artificial harmony is assimilatory, in that it works to regulate and integrate various excluded communities through an enforced adherence to a particular set of national values or 'norms of acceptability' (Alexander 2007: 116; Wetherell 2007: 8). The notion of community, in this instance, is forced to play a dual role that is both positive – in terms of the 'ideal' that policy aspires to – and negative – in terms of the *wrong* kind of community encountered within minority and excluded groups (Alexander 2007: 121). Despite a significant increase in popular, political and academic interest in community participation, involvement and identity, the idea of community continues to revolve around a self-evident and homogeneous understanding that is itself an obstacle. It is also

something that is attended to on a case-by-case basis, rather than holistically embedded across the management process. As such, it is important to remind ourselves, as Brent (1997: 82) points out, that 'community is not a term suitable for use as a unequivocal slogan of redemption'.

Material culture, memory and identity

Introduction

What lies at the heart of the uneasy relationship between communities in general and the community of heritage professionals is the idea of heritage. How it is defined, what is done with it, and the uses it is put to are the pivotal points from which tensions, misunderstandings and conflicts arise. This chapter argues that there is a significant disjunction between authorised, professional and institutional understandings or definitions of heritage and the realities or material consequences that heritage has. That is, heritage does social, political and cultural 'work' in society, but definitions of heritage at large in public policy, legal instruments and management practices fail to acknowledge this. While they gesture at acknowledging that heritage has an integral link with identity, authorised or traditional definitions do not actually *understand* this link in any meaningful way. This chapter critically develops a definition of heritage that actively incorporates the linkages between material culture, memory and identity. The ways in which communities utilise heritage are identified and the disjunction between this use and professional definitions is highlighted. From this, the consequences of heritage knowledge and practice are identified and explored.

Heritage as a known thing?

In archaeological terms, heritage is often understood to be the material culture of the past, or all those artefacts and structures produced by humans that make up the archaeological record and are used to explain, or help explain, the past – heritage is a known thing. For some archaeologists, heritage and archaeological material culture are one and the same thing; and that is the data that helps to define both the past and who ‘we’ *are* in the present. Although there is explicit recognition in the literature that such interpretations of the past are neither definitive nor objective, there is often a tacit assumption that the knowledge produced by the discipline informs ‘identity’ and is thus ‘heritage’. This assumption survives even though archaeologists recognise the multi-vocality of interpretations of the past, and is particularly strong in Europe, and in archaeological dealings with non-Indigenous pasts and communities in the ex-colonial countries of North America and Australasia. Indeed, so strong is this assumption that archaeologists – and archaeological knowledge – often form the primary body of expertise (followed, perhaps, by architecture) drawn upon in the development of heritage management practices. Archaeologists readily find employment as heritage practitioners in key government heritage agencies, inter-government heritage organisations, heritage amenity societies and other NGOs, or they work as freelance consultants within units, or other private/semi-private organisations involved in the environmental assessment process. This assumed synergy between ‘heritage’ and ‘archaeological data’ can be summed up in Britain with reference to the popularity of the term ‘Archaeological Heritage Management’.

This materiality of archaeological data makes the concept of heritage (and, by inference, ideas of ‘identity’ deemed to be linked to heritage) inherently *knowable*. The way in which archaeological heritage can be discovered, defined (spatially and conceptually), recorded, mapped, put on a site register or any other list, and finally, managed and conserved, makes

2. *Material culture, memory and identity*

heritage both knowable and controllable. The sense that heritage is a known thing is also reinforced by the naturalisation of archaeological assumptions about heritage in legal and policy instruments. As much as heritage is knowable by archaeologists, it is also a known thing for heritage practitioners more generally, simply because it is defined in national and international legal and policy documents. However, this close linkage of archaeological material culture and heritage is problematic and has led to the conflation of heritage with archaeological data and knowledge. This conflation of archaeological data, and material culture more generally, with heritage underwrites the misunderstandings and tensions between archaeologists and many other communities. This is because heritage is *not* a known thing – nor is it a thing at all. Rather, it is mutable and intangible and means many different things to many different people and communities.

Smith's notion of the AHD, as developed in Chapter 1, goes some way towards explaining this propensity to equate 'heritage' with 'archaeological data', as it is a discourse that works to define both the concept of heritage and the boundaries of debates about its nature, values and meanings. These boundaries are very much guided by the discourse's historical associations with archaeology. What is significant about this discourse is its near complete naturalisation, as it is from this position that the AHD is able to promote and maintain social inequalities. While the extent to which the AHD underpins heritage policy and practice has already been discussed, it remains crucial for understanding the misunderstandings and tensions between various communities and groups, including communities of archaeological and other heritage professionals. The AHD works to appropriate, obscure or misrecognise the heritage values and knowledge that communities have of the past. Moreover, heritage professionals assume a role as spokespeople and *educators* for the past and thus community heritage, not only because they are stewards for the past, but because it is 'the past' – singular – and the past belongs to all of humanity. Thus, community heritage will never, in terms

of the hierarchy of values constructed by the AHD, be as important or as representative as 'national' heritage, and consequently is devalued or ignored.

Rethinking heritage

The re-theorisation of heritage adopted here emerges out of Smith's (2006) idea that heritage is a cultural process or performance of meaning-making. Heritage, therefore, becomes not a thing or a place, but an intangible process in which social and cultural values are identified, negotiated, rejected or affirmed. It is thus what is done at, or with, heritage sites that is significant, rather than the places themselves. As Smith states:

There is no one defining action or moment of heritage, but rather a range of activities that include remembering, commemoration, communicating and passing on knowledge and memories, asserting and expressing identity and social and cultural values and meanings. As an experience, and as a social and cultural performance, it is something with which people actively, often self-consciously, and critically engage in ... The product or the consequences of heritage activities are the emotions and experiences and the memories of them that they create (ibid.: 83).

The memories and experiences created and reinforced by heritage performances help bind communities and other social and cultural groups through the creation of shared experiences, values and memories, all of which work to help cement or recreate social networks and ties. This definition of heritage draws on Samuel's (1994) notion of 'theatres of memory', through which 'place' becomes a locus for performing, mediating and negotiating the meaning of the past for the present. It also draws on similar work by Dicks (2000b) and her suggestion that heritage is an act of communication, and that of Harvey (2001), who argues that heritage is a 'verb' rather than

2. Material culture, memory and identity

a noun. This idea also underpins the work of Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1998), Byrne (2008) and Bendix (2008), and informs their explorations of how concepts of heritage or material culture are used to legitimise, or make material, the intangibilities of culture and human experience. The idea of heritage as a cultural process is important as it allows for a broader capacity within which to consider how and why a variety of things can become heritage or, conversely, cease to be heritage. This definition of heritage does not negate traditional arguments about the importance of identity-making. Rather, it sees this process as ultimately more fluid and changeable than identifying heritage as a 'thing' or place allows.

Memory and identity: the emotive nature of heritage

Memory and identity are fluid, intangible and inherently social concepts. Recollection, reminiscing and remembering – either in formal ceremonies of commemoration or in day-to-day activities – are social activities (Connerton 1991). The way societies or other collectives choose to remember and reminisce, and what they choose to remember and forget, are thus cultural and social processes of meaning-making. Further, any single event can be remembered differently and made meaningful or non-meaningful by different individuals and communities.

A case in point is the cultural phenomenon of Holocaust remembering, which has been memorialised in dispersed and diverse ways, internationally, nationally and sub-nationally. This has occurred through a range of Holocaust Memorial Days undertaken by at least fourteen countries, all of which are negotiating as much a process of national forgetting as of national remembering (Yuval-Davis & Silverman 2002). For Britain, this form of national remembering involves a process of obfuscation that subtly forgets anti-Semitism and complacency during the Second World War (ibid.: 116). In their examination of cosmopolitan memory formations in Israel, Germany and the USA, Levy and Sznajder (2002) note that different collective memories are drawn upon to represent and

mediate the same difficult past for different communities. For Israel, this oscillates between silenced, painful memories and sacred remembrance (ibid.: 94). In Germany, the immediate silences of the post-war years have been replaced by a more self-critical national narrative of the nation's past (Huyssen 1995: 257), while the USA has performed its own unique memorialisation, referred to as the 'Americanisation of the Holocaust', which remembers the American nation as 'the primary keepers of the flame of remembrance' (Shandler 1999; Levy & Sznajder 2002: 98). At the same time, sub-national processes *within* each country present alternative memories or ways of remembering. Further, these debates reflect upon the iconic status granted to the historical reality of Auschwitz as an emblem of the Holocaust, rendering it a monument whose memories are under dispute (Yuval-Davis & Silverman 2002: 111) (Figure 2.1).

In the case of the Warsaw Ghetto Monument, the monument evokes different memories for different viewers, as a site of resistance, a memory to suffering and mythic memory of heroism (Young 1989). Moreover, as different political groups and communities undertake different performances of commemoration at and around the monument they rehearse and make new meanings for themselves. The point is that memory cannot be understood as something that is simply passed on, unchanged, from generation to generation, nor is it a 'thing' to have and catalogue. Indeed, no form of memory, collective or otherwise, will cease to be contingent and unstable despite international appeals to its intractability and permanence (Huyssen 1995: 249). Rather, memories are recast and recreated in the minds of each generation to help them make sense of the present and, in the process, come to understand themselves (ibid.: 90). Even the immediate recollections of individuals, whether they are of private and family events or as eye-witnesses to historic moments, will be reinterpreted and thus remade and re-understood in the context of present day experiences and the aspirations and desires of those doing the remembering (Wertsch 2002).

This fluidity of memory is something that challenges us. It is

2. Material culture, memory and identity

much easier to accept the authority of the written text and the intellectual authority of historians and archaeologists when dealing with collective memories or recounting pasts to which we were not witness. Moreover, there is no spontaneous memory. Memories need to be actively remembered, and thus memory needs to take root in the concrete object or site, and needs to be maintained through anniversaries or celebrations, otherwise it becomes overtaken by, or lost in, the authority held by universal claims of history (Nora 1989: 9-12). Monuments, and material culture more generally, act as cultural tools in the processes of remembering and forgetting (Wersch 2002). Indeed, heritage works to help 'organise' public and historical memory (Young 1989: 101). Further, memories are also recalled in the

'doing' (Crouch & Parker 2003: 396), and both the commemorations society organises around monuments and the practices of heritage management are actions involved in the creation and maintenance of collective memories.

Memory underpins identity, and different communities or collectives will have different mnemonic strategies they draw upon to help them reinforce their sense of self and collective identity (Misztal 2003: 15). Identity, like memory, is also intangible and fluid, such that none of us will possess a single 'identity'. Rather, our sense of self is composed of many different, although often overlapping and interlinked, social identities, which are forged not only in terms of 'who we are', but also of 'who we are not'. As with memory, linking identity to physical places and objects renders the intangible *material* and gives it physical 'reality' (Graham et al. 2000). Further, anchoring identity to material culture and places makes the mapping of our own individual or collective identities more manageable and comprehensible. This is a point illustrated by mural paintings of the Somme in Northern Ireland, which act as visual *aides-memoire* for a range of commemorative processes and objectified reminders of disparate Northern Irish identities (Jarman 1999: 184). Images of the Battle of the Somme and the 36th Division are tangible manifestations of a complex and contested process of identity construction within Ulster, which attempts to negotiate, as Graham and Shirlow (2002) argue, a range of identities including those associated with paramilitary legitimisation, protestant working-class identities and prospects for reconciliation. While the images contained within murals more generally are varied, as are the messages they contain, they nonetheless perform a role in constructions – and maintenance – of community identity (Graham 1998).

These links between identity and heritage are well documented in the literature, and its symbolic value is not in dispute here; the point is the emotive nature of heritage. Identity and memory are not simply something you 'have', but are something you experience and perform. Heritage, then, does

2. Material culture, memory and identity

not just simply sit there and proclaim the viewer's identity. Rather, viewers must emotionally engage with heritage, and meaningfully interact with it, for that site or place to 'speak to' the individual. Indeed, it is in a mix of doing, reacting, feeling and understanding that heritage is created, as part of a wider cultural process within which people ascertain feelings of connection, belonging and a sense of themselves. Poria et al. (2003), in their study of the behaviour of domestic and international visitors to the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem, make a similar observation in their conclusion that people come to heritage sites not just to 'gaze' but also to 'feel'. The emotional quality of heritage is thus not abstract, but is *felt* and continually reinforced and remade in the performances of heritage; that is, it is continually *experienced* and *re-experienced* at and through the performances of heritage.

Memories and people's sense of self and belonging – their sense of identity – are highly emotive constructs. This is, of course, obvious and may appear to be hardly worth stating. However, the emotional quality of heritage is often like 'an elephant in the room'; we all know it is there but it can be seen as quite embarrassing, especially if it is linked to expressions of nationalism or patriotism, and so it often goes unaddressed. Further, the emotional quality of heritage is often tacitly assumed to be positive, as heritage is meant to provide a comfortable and comforting affirmation of 'who we are' – after all, as constructed within the AHD, heritage is 'good', 'great' and 'consensual'. However, with the creation of any sense of inclusion comes, inevitably, exclusion, and the emotions that heritage generates can be as negative as they can be positive. With places or heritage that acknowledge the traumatic aspects of a community's or culture's past – sites of dissonance, shame or pain – the emotions and memories evoked can be painful or mixed (Tunbridge & Ashworth 1996; Logan & Reeves 2008). Linkon and Russo's (2002) study of the way industrial workers in the deindustrialised town of Youngstown in the USA sought to renegotiate their sense of identity is a case in point. The past of Youngstown is both painful in terms

of the brutalities of working-class history, but also a source of pride in terms of community solidarity and achievements. The challenge is negotiating new identity(ies) that incorporate both the bad and the good as the Youngstown communities attempt to recreate themselves in the context of deindustrialisation (ibid: 245).

The complexity of the emotional quality of heritage can also be witnessed in the religious and spiritual values it is given. Heritage does not just represent or symbolise established religious identities and beliefs, but can also take on spiritual values for other communities. This can be observed in the conflicts in England over pagan access to sites such as Stonehenge and Seahenge (Skeates 2000). As Byrne et al. (2006) point out, this aspect of community connection is often underplayed in the West because of what they label a 'secularity premise' in dominant approaches to heritage management. They argue that an array of deeply emotive and abiding spiritual affinities and responses emerge from our associations with heritage places, sites and landscapes. Their analysis of enchanted parklands documents the range of spiritual meanings given to landscapes around Sydney, Australia, by a range of community groups, as well as by established religious communities. Their contention is that while this aspect of emotional connection often falls below the threshold of conventional heritage evaluations, and thus remains invisible in a management sense, it is nonetheless a valid projection of meaning onto a landscape.

Our acknowledgment of the emotional qualities of heritage is important for the observations it enables us to make about the cultural process of heritage itself. This is because our emotional connections to heritage experiences are inevitably managed and open to interventions through the way heritage places organise and facilitate remembering and expressions of identity. Heritage sites are points at which our sense of place becomes anchored and emotionally manageable. Those experiences of memory-making, remembering and other forms of emotional identity expression are made manageable by taking them out of the 'everyday' and concentrating them in specific

2. Material culture, memory and identity

performances in which 'heritage' places are identified, looked after and visited. This process is done at both national and community levels. Although the national process is called heritage management, and is governed by national legislation and public policies, it is nonetheless part of the process in which the emotional registers of national and collective identities, and processes of remembering and commemoration, are regulated and controlled.

The difficulties between communities occur as a consequence of the extent to which the emotional quality of heritage goes unacknowledged. More specifically, they are a symptom of the ways in which our emotional connections are managed and regulated through the privileged position of the heritage management process as opposed to other forms of heritage engagement. Nostalgia is an important issue here. Wright (1985) and Hewison (1987), in particular, have criticised the so-called 'heritage industry' (that is, heritage tourism) for creating sanitised and historically inauthentic versions of the past. In so doing, both have dismissed the emotional quality of heritage as nostalgia. While they make a valid point – that certain heritage interpretations and performances can create or legitimise reactionary nostalgic heritage performances – their concern over nostalgia has become a dominant theme in contemporary heritage debates in the West. In England, at least, there is a tendency to dismiss or equate the full emotional register of heritage with 'nostalgia', along with all the negative connotations of sanitisation and reactionary visions of the past that this entails. However, as Strangleman (1999) argues, nostalgia is often confused with memory. Indeed, discourses of nostalgia are often used to dismiss or debase the rememberings of communities and individuals whose heritage and sense of identity exist outside the dominant narratives of national heritage: nations remember, communities reminisce; national heritage constructs national identity, community heritage is nostalgic. This tendency is reinforced by the generic conceptualisation of 'community' that operates within the policy sphere discussed in Chapter 1, which is itself tied up with

images of either 'tradition' and a rural 'golden age', or strict parameters of social hierarchy in which only the non-white and non-upper to middle-classes have community. In this structuring, the nostalgia of communities and their remembering is taken as self-evident. A hierarchy of heritage, then, is not only constructed by the AHD, where national heritage is valued more than sub-national or community heritage, but is reinforced by wider political assumptions of who can – and cannot – form part of a 'community'.

One of the issues that heritage professionals have commonly commented on to us, and often with some bemusement, is the emotional response of communities not only to their heritage, but to external attempts to manage that heritage. This bemusement derives from the extent to which we work within the AHD, which obscures and ignores the emotional quality of heritage and all that means for an individual's and community's sense of place. This compartmentalisation of 'experts' from 'communities' also spills out semantically where it forms part of the way in which institutions and professionals talk and write about engagements with heritage. Here, communities are characterised as those that 'feel', whereas experts are those who 'think' and 'know' in a process that skilfully 'avoids' subjectivities (for an example of this in action see Clark 2006: 97). The emotional response of communities is thus often fuelled by frustration; a frustration that also often works to mask more complex and nuanced emotional responses from the heritage expert. This frustration can arise for a range of reasons, such as: the lack of recognition given to their heritage; 'talking past' experts about the nature and meaning of heritage; finding their heritage intensely personal and emotional, and seeing those emotions either disregarded or misinterpreted. These frustrations also mount when the emotional elements of heritage become the subject of 'management', and thus of interventions by expertise and heritage agencies – individuals and organisations that could not possibly have the same emotional linkage or understanding of the heritage in question as community members.

2. Material culture, memory and identity

These interventions inevitably work to disregard those emotions without necessarily meaning to do so.

Conclusion: the arenas of conflict

Mapping the potential arenas of conflict around issues of heritage for community groups is a complex task. This is heightened by the fluidity of communities and the fact that no community is itself homogeneous and self-referential. Tensions more often than not exist between a range of heritage professionals and community groups, no matter what their nature. Even when there are apparently harmonious working relationships, the room for misunderstanding is always there and tensions arise not only from the differing aspirations and agendas of community groups but from the definitions of heritage each group employs. For archaeologists, heritage is data. As such, it offers them a convincing way of knowing and understanding the past. It is the material reason for the existence of the discipline. As Julie Lahn (1996) notes, the possession of certain prestigious objects or data sets by individuals, and indeed collectively by the discipline, is symbolic of the community identity claims made by archaeologists. This understanding of heritage is entirely cognisant with the way we have been arguing heritage is used by communities. For communities too, heritage is about knowing the past through remembering and commemoration, and through the performances of identity creation and recreation. However, for both archaeologists and communities these performances are often masked by the AHD. Archaeologists often remain unaware of the heritage value the data they collect carries for themselves and the consequences of their knowledge for community self-awareness and pride. Moreover, they remain unaware of the power this gives them in terms of their ability to make claims about community 'involvement' and 'participation' without putting in jeopardy their rights of access and control as cultural experts and custodians. Communities construct a sense of heritage that they know may never be regarded as important or rele-

vant; they may not even recognise that a community heritage exists simply because that heritage is not recognised within the authorising agencies of the dominant heritage discourse. The AHD can work equally to mask the role and nature of heritage within and from communities as it does from archaeologists. The possibilities for conflict are endless as the AHD masks the consequences of heritage. The ability of the AHD to render heritage as a thing to be 'managed' means that the emotional and political work that heritage does in our society goes unrecognised and can lead to frustrating bewilderment as communities and the community of expertise talk past one another and misunderstand the impact each has on the other.