USES OF HERITAGE

Laurajane Smith

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2006
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
270 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016

Reprinted 2008

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2006 Laurajane Smith

Typeset in Garamond 3 by
RefineCatch Limited, Bungay, Suffolk
Printed and bound in Great Britain by
Antony Rowe Ltd, Chippenham, Wiltshire

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

ISBN10: 0–415–31830–0 (hbk)
ISBN10: 0–415–31831–9 (pbk)
ISBN10: 0–203–60226–9 (ebk)

ISBN13: 978–0–415–31830–3 (hbk)
ISBN13: 978–0–415–31831–9 (pbk)
ISBN13: 978–0–203–60226–3 (ebk)

BTU Cottbus
Uni.-bibl.

FOR GARY, HAMISH AND MAHALIA

CONTENTS

List of figures x
List of tables xi
Acknowledgements xiii

Introduction 1

PART I
The idea of heritage 9

1 The discourse of heritage 11

There is no such thing as 'heritage' 13
When was heritage? 16
The authorized heritage discourse and its use 29
Subaltern and dissenting heritage discourses 35
Conclusion 42

2 Heritage as a cultural process 44

Heritage as experience 45
Heritage as identity 48
The intangibility of heritage 53
Memory and remembering 57
Heritage as performance 66
Place 74
Dissonance 80
Conclusion 82

PART II
Authorized heritage 85

3 Authorizing institutions of heritage 87

Venice Charter 88
World Heritage Convention 95
Burra Charter 102
Intangible heritage 106
Conclusion 113

4 The 'manored' past: The banality of grandiloquence 115

The country house as authorized heritage 117
Knowing your place: Performing identities at the country house 129
Conclusion 158

5 Fellas, fossils and country: The Riversleigh landscape 162

Riversleigh World Heritage Site 163
The Australian landscape as authorized cultural heritage 168
The Riversleigh sense of place 173
Conclusion 191

PART III
Responses to authorized heritage 193

6 Labour heritage: Performing and remembering 195

Museums and heritage 197
'Better rememberings from here': Remembering and the negotiation of social meaning and identity 207
Conclusion 234

7 The slate wiped clean? Heritage, memory and landscape in Castleford, West Yorkshire, England 237

History and place 240
'But Miss, what's the black lump?' Memory and heritage in Castleford 247
Performance, remembering and commemoration: Heritage as community networking 265
Conclusion 272

8 'The issue is control': Indigenous politics and the discourse of heritage 276

The history of Indigenous critique – or why the control of heritage matters 277
Cultural differences and discursive barriers 283

Controlling heritage 287
Conclusion 297

Conclusion 299

Notes 309
References 312
Index 342

FIGURES

2.1 Waanyi Women's History Project 46
4.1 An example of the English country house: Audley End, Essex 115
5.1 Riversleigh World Heritage Area – locality map 163
5.2 The Riversleigh landscape 164
5.3 The Gregory River 165
5.4 Fossilized leg bone and gizzard stones of a dromornithid, Riversleigh 167
5.5 'Mansworld', a Mount Isa rural outfitters 184
7.1 Castleford, West Yorkshire, England – locality map 238
7.2 The Castleford Forum 250
7.3 Inside the old market hall, Castleford, 2003 258
7.4 Inside the old market hall, Castleford Festival, 2003 259
7.5 The head of the closing parade of the 2004 Castleford Festival 261
7.6 Rag-rug making, Castleford Festival, 2004 262

TABLES

4.1 Country houses: Profile of survey population 131
4.2 Country houses: What does the word heritage mean to you? 132
4.3 Country houses: Whose history are you visiting here? 138
4.4 Country houses: Reasons for visiting 139
4.5 Country houses: How does it make you feel to visit this place? 140
4.6 Country houses: What experiences do you value on visiting this place? 144
4.7 Country houses: What messages do you take away from this place? 147
4.8 Country houses: What meaning does a place like this have in modern England? 149
4.9 Country houses: Does this place speak to any aspect of your personal identity? 152
4.10 Country houses: Commentary on the interpretation and information provided to visitors 156
6.1 Industrial museums: Profile of survey population 208
6.2 Industrial museums: What does the word heritage mean to you? 209
6.3 Industrial museums: Reasons for visiting 216
6.4 Industrial museums: Whose history are you visiting here? 217
6.5 Industrial museums: How does it make you feel to visit this place? 219
6.6 Industrial museums: What does being here mean to you? 220
6.7 Industrial museums: What experiences do you value on visiting this place? 222
6.8 Industrial museums: What messages do you take away from this place? 224
6.9 Industrial museums: What meaning does a place like this have in modern England? 228
6.10 Industrial museums: Does this place speak to any aspect of your personal identity? 229

7.1 Castleford: What does the word heritage mean to you? 253
7.2 Vivid or important memories of Castleford 260
7.3 Do you think the Castleford Heritage Trust and the Forum Project important? 266
7.4 Importance of the Castleford Festival 267

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The British Academy funded the research discussed in Chapters 4, 6 and 7. An Australian Research Council Small Grant gained through the University of New South Wales funded the research discussed in Chapter 5.

I would like to thank the following people and institutions for graciously giving me and my survey team permission to conduct survey work on their grounds: May Redfern, Harewood House; Emma Carver, English Heritage; Bobbie Robinson, National Trust, Nostell Priory; Pippa Shirley, National Trust, Waddesdon Manor; Richard Saward, National Coal Mining Museum for England (NCMM); Trish Hall, North of England Open Air Museum, Beamish; Janet Pickering, Tolpuddle Martyrs Museum. I also want to thank Rhiannon Hiles (Beamish) and Rosemary Preece, (NCMM) for allowing me to interview them. Any misinterpretation of interview materials I acknowledge to be my own.

The following people helped administer the questionnaire surveys on which Chapters 4 and 6 are based: Gary Campbell, Dr Peter Gouldsborough, Sally Huxtable, Cath Neal, Lila Rakoczy, Emma Waterton, Rob Webley and Kate Wescombe. Anita van der Meer helped administer the questionnaires discussed in Chapter 5.

I am very grateful to the Castleford Heritage Trust (CHT), especially its executive committee, for allowing me to interview them, attend meetings and generally pester them with questions. Not only did they put up with me, but they also made me feel very welcome indeed. In particular, I want to very warmly thank: Alison Drake, Derek Catherall, Erick Crossland, Reg Lavine, Winifred McLoughlin, Harry Malkin, Hazel Parks, Shirley Schofield, Roy Sivorn, Greta Sharkey, David Wilders. Lorna Hay, Heritage Development Office, CHT, very kindly gave me her time and patience, helped organize interviews, and greatly facilitated my research. I want to thank all those people in Castleford, both members of the CHT and other residents who allowed me to interview them – I am unable to list everyone here, but thank you for giving me your time and patience, and allowing me into your homes and sharing your memories and recollections with me. Any errors in fact or in the interpretation of interview data are entirely my own. Thank you also

to Keith Emerick and Neil Redfern, English Heritage, for introducing me to Castleford.

For the work undertaken in the Riversleigh region of Queensland, Australia, I particularly want to thank Anita van der Meer for all her help, friendship and effort. I also want to thank Anna Morgan, Del Burgan and Eunice O'Keefe for their help, all the people from Mount Isa, Riversleigh and surrounds who gave me their time and allowed me to interview them. I note, however, that any errors in fact and interpretation of interview data are all my own. Thanks also to Professor Michael Archer for introducing me to the region. Thank you to the Queensland National Parks and Wildlife Service for supporting the research undertaken in the Riversleigh region.

A number of people kindly read and commented on various drafts of chapters and I want to thank Emma Carver, Alison Drake, Keith Emerick, Jon Finch, Lorna Hay, Patricia Reynolds, Lynette Russell, Paul Shackel, Anita van der Meer, Kevin Walsh, Emma Waterton, David Wilders and Linda Young for giving their time and making constructive and useful comments. In particular, I want to thank Emma Waterton for all her time.

Most of all I want to thank my partner, Gary Campbell – without his active help, encouragement and support this book would most certainly not have been written. Gary, as always, edited and proofed this work, offered professional advice and help on the design and analysis of the questionnaires used in the research and discussed, debated and commented on all aspects of the work. I am more grateful than I can express. Yet again, I need to thank him, Hamish and Mahalia for putting up with the long hours that went into the writing of this book.

INTRODUCTION

What has sitting on the banks of the Gregory River in far northern Queensland fishing to do with heritage? I was watching a group of senior Aboriginal women from the Waanyi community fish as I tried to get my twelve-week-old daughter to sleep. We were about five hours' drive from the nearest major town, on a field trip with two of my colleagues, to record sites of heritage importance to Waanyi women in the Boodjamulla National Park and Riversleigh World Heritage area. Most of the women we were working with had travelled great distances to get here, some having flown in by light aircraft, and all had been eager to come and do some 'heritage work'.

Although we had done some recordings of archaeological sites and oral histories, fishing quickly became the order of our days in the region. Fishing was a leisure activity that filled the time between periods in which my colleagues and I pestered people with maps, site recording forms and tape recorders. But as my colleagues and I began to realize, fishing was a multi-layered activity. It was a leisure activity and a chance to catch dinner, it was also an activity to get away from us annoying archaeologists and heritage managers, and it was an opportunity that the women were using to savour simply being in a place that was important to them. It was in fact 'heritage work', being in place, renewing memories and associations, sharing experiences with kinswomen to cement present and future social and familial relationships. Heritage wasn't only about the past – though it was that too – it also wasn't just about material things – though it was that as well – heritage was a process of engagement, an act of communication and an act of making meaning in and for the present.

Listening to the senior women telling stories to younger women about the place we were in, or events that were associated with that place, I thought of the stories that members of my own family had told me, and that I would now pass on to my own children. I realized, too, that the meanings I drew out of those stories, and the uses I had made of them, would of course be different to the meanings, and uses, the generations both before and after me had and would construct. These family stories, shared memories, could sometimes be attached to material objects or family heirlooms, and while these

'things' were useful for making those stories tangible – they were not in and of themselves 'heritage'. For instance, I would still tell the stories associated with my grandmother's necklace, should I be unfortunate enough to lose it before I passed it on to my daughter. The real sense of heritage, the real moment of heritage when our emotions and sense of self are truly engaged, is not so much in the possession of the necklace, but in the act of passing on and receiving memories and knowledge. It also occurs in the way that we then use, reshape and recreate those memories and knowledge to help us make sense of and understand not only who we 'are', but also who we want to be. This is not to say that I would not be distressed if the necklace was lost or destroyed. However, I would grieve not for the loss of any monetary or inherent value it may have, but for the loss of the opportunity to pass it on, and the role it plays as both prop and prompt in the stories about my mother's family.

Can these observations about fishing and intimate moments of family memories tell us anything about why people visit World Heritage sites, national monuments, local and regional heritage sites and museums, or other places of heritage? Can they offer any insight into the sort of cultural and identity work that people do at these sites? Is heritage visiting simply a middle class leisure or touristic pursuit, as some sections of the heritage literature assert, or are there more varied and nuanced social and cultural processes at work? The idea of heritage as an act of communication and meaning making – indeed as an experience – is not something, however, that finds much synergy with the professional or expert view of heritage. My colleagues and I were required to map sites and places, to put dots on maps, identify conservation and management needs and so forth. How do you map, conserve and manage an experience? But then, of course, that is what we do as heritage managers, in managing and conserving places identified as 'heritage', we are also engaged in the management and conservation, or as I have argued elsewhere (Smith 2004) the 'governing', of the cultural and social values, meanings and associations they have. In effect, we are managing and defining people's 'heritage experiences' through the management and conservation process. By going fishing, the Waanyi women were taking themselves out of the technical processes of site recording and management, and both recreating and redefining their own sense of being in place and experiencing the moment of 'heritage'.

This book explores the idea of heritage not so much as a 'thing', but as a cultural and social process, which engages with acts of remembering that work to create ways to understand and engage with the present. In doing so, I draw on a range of ideas about the nature of heritage that have begun to emerge in the diverse interdisciplinary field of 'Heritage Studies'. Within this relatively new area of academic study a range of disciplines have come together to use the idea of 'heritage' to ask some interesting questions about modern practices of conservation, tourism and museums and site visitation.

This book, while making no claims to offer a fully rounded or synthetic statement, is an attempt to bring together disparate strands of thought and stimulate debate about the nature and use of heritage. For the purposes of structuring this book, I have developed themes of intangibility, identity, memory and remembering, performance, place, and dissonance, and used these ideas in various combinations to explore different aspects of the uses of heritage.

Indeed, the work starts from the premise that all heritage is intangible. In stressing the intangibility of heritage, however, I am not dismissing the tangible or pre-discursive, but simply deprivileging and denaturalizing it as the self-evident form and essence of heritage. While places, sites, objects and localities may exist as identifiable sites of heritage – we may, for instance, be able to point to such things as Stonehenge, the Sydney Opera House, Colonial Williamsburg, the Roman Coliseum, Angkor Watt, Robben Island, and so forth – these places are not *inherently* valuable, nor do they carry a freight of innate meaning. Stonehenge, for instance, is basically a collection of rocks in a field. What makes these things valuable and meaningful – what makes them 'heritage', or what makes the collection of rocks in a field 'Stonehenge' – are the present-day cultural processes and activities that are undertaken at and around them, and of which they become a part. It is these processes that identify them as physically symbolic of particular cultural and social events, and thus give them value and meaning. The traditional Western account of 'heritage' tends to emphasize the material basis of heritage, and attributes an inherent cultural value or significance to these things. Furthermore, the sense of gravitas given to these values is also often directly linked to the age, monumentality and/or aesthetics of a place. The physicality of the Western idea of heritage means that 'heritage' can be mapped, studied, managed, preserved and/or conserved, and its protection may be the subject of national legislation and international agreements, conventions and charters. However, heritage is heritage *because* it is subjected to the management and preservation/conservation process, not because it simply '*is*'. This process does not just 'find' sites and places to manage and protect. It is itself a constitutive cultural process that identifies those things and places that can be given meaning and value as 'heritage', reflecting contemporary cultural and social values, debates and aspirations.

In short, this book is about how the idea of heritage is used to construct, reconstruct and negotiate a range of identities and social and cultural values and meanings in the present. Heritage is a multilayered performance – be this a performance of visiting, managing, interpretation or conservation – that embodies acts of remembrance and commemoration while negotiating and constructing a sense of place, belonging and understanding in the present. Simultaneously the heritage performance will also constitute and validate the very idea of 'heritage' that frames and defines these performances in the first place. Although often self-regulating and self-referential, heritage is also

inherently dissonant and contested. However, the traditional and authorized conceptions of heritage ensure that all conflict is reduced to case-specific issues, and the cultural process of identity formation that is basic to heritage is obscured. At one level heritage is about the promotion of a consensus version of history by state-sanctioned cultural institutions and elites to regulate cultural and social tensions in the present. On the other hand, heritage may also be a resource that is used to challenge and redefine received values and identities by a range of subaltern groups. Heritage is not necessarily about the stasis of cultural values and meanings, but may equally be about cultural change. It may, for instance, be about reworking the meanings of the past as the cultural, social and political needs of the present change and develop, or it may be about challenging the ways in which groups and communities are perceived and classified by others. Heritage is about negotiation – about using the past, and collective or individual memories, to negotiate new ways of being and expressing identity. In this process heritage objects, sites, places or institutions like museums become cultural tools or props to facilitate this process – but do not themselves stand in for this process or act.

Heritage is also a discourse. The idea of discourse does not simply refer to the use of words or language, but rather the idea of discourse used in this work refers to a form of social practice. Social meanings, forms of knowledge and expertise, power relations and ideologies are embedded and reproduced via language. The discourses through which we frame certain concepts, issues or debates have an affect in so far as they constitute, construct, mediate and regulate understanding and debate. Discourse not only organizes the way concepts like heritage are understood, but the way we act, the social and technical practices we act out, and the way knowledge is constructed and reproduced. One of the arguments developed in this book is that there is a dominant Western discourse about heritage, which I term the 'authorized heritage discourse', that works to naturalize a range of assumptions about the nature and meaning of heritage. Although this discourse is inevitably changing and developing, and varies in different cultural contexts and over time, there is nonetheless a particular focus and emphasis – primarily the attention it gives to 'things'. This often self-referential discourse simultaneously draws on and naturalizes certain narratives and cultural and social experiences – often linked to ideas of nation and nationhood. Embedded in this discourse are a range of assumptions about the innate and immutable cultural values of heritage that are linked to and defined by the concepts of monumentality and aesthetics.

The authorized discourse is also a professional discourse that privileges expert values and knowledge about the past and its material manifestations, and dominates and regulates professional heritage practices. However, alongside this professional and authorized discourse is also a range of popular discourses and practices. Some of these may take their cue from or be influenced by the professional discourse, but they will not necessarily be reducible

to it (Purvis and Hunt 1993). Some discourses may also challenge, either actively or simply through their existence, the dominant discourse. This book also charts the work that the various discourses about heritage 'do', and the way they structure and frame different heritage experiences and acts of remembering and commemoration. From this, the book develops the argument that heritage may also be understood as a discourse concerned with the negotiation and regulation of social meanings and practices associated with the creation and recreation of 'identity'. Heritage is shown to have become a highly active discourse in the latter part of the twentieth century, having been raised as a particular environmental and social concern during the 1960s and 1970s, a period that also witnessed the consolidation of national and international technical processes of management and conservation. The reworking of the discourse of heritage at this time marks the development of an explicit and active way of negotiating cultural and social change. This is not to say that heritage as a process did not exist prior to this – certainly as Harvey (2001) notes, the processes that we today define as heritage are an integral part of human culture (see also Diaz-Andreu under review). However, the development of quite explicit professional discourses, and the burgeoning array of popular and community discourses on heritage that have developed over the last few decades, marks an explicit and sometimes self-conscious way of negotiating social and cultural identity, value and meaning.

The debates and arguments explored in this book draw on, and attempt to contribute to, the rise in ethnographic approaches that aim to understand the nature of heritage and how the past is constituted and utilized in the present. Since the 1990s there has been increasing multidisciplinary interest in the way diverse communities forge, maintain and negotiate their identities. Alongside this, a range of communities, defined either geographically or by cultural, social, ethnic, economic and/or other experiences, have increasingly asserted the legitimacy of their collective identities and social, political and cultural experiences. Consensual heritage narratives about the nation and national identity were challenged by the diversity of community experience and identity claims. Consequently, heritage debate and practice began to recognize and critically engage with issues of dissonance and the use of memory in the formation of heritage and identity. Increasing sophistication in writing about tourism has also lead to the realization that heritage tourists and other heritage visitors are far more active and critical – or 'mindful' – than they have previously been portrayed. Tourism may have more deeply layered or nuanced cultural and social meaning and consequence than its characterization as a leisure activity and economic industry often allows. These events have also coincided with increasing Indigenous and non-Western questioning of dominant Western perceptions of heritage, and the consequences that the dominance of these perceptions have had on the expression of their own identities. This critique has drawn attention to the issue of intangibility, and challenged the emphasis placed on the idea of material

authenticity, and the preservationist desire to freeze the moment of heritage and to conserve heritage as an unchanging monument to the past. Arising out of the confluence of all these issues and moments is a new interdisciplinary subfield that offers the opportunity to redefine the idea of 'heritage' through an analysis of the consequence this idea has in people's lives.

The first section of this book outlines its theoretical basis. Informed by concepts of discourse analysis, the first chapter identifies and examines the orders of discourse that surround heritage, and considers how and when they developed, and who engages in this dialogue. An 'authorized heritage discourse' is identified, which works, it is argued, to construct a sense of what heritage is – and is not. How the discourse works to naturalize certain ideas about the immutable and inherent nature of the value and meaning of heritage within the practices of heritage conservation, preservation and management is also explored. Drawing on a range of interdisciplinary theoretical innovations, in particular ideas of place, remembering, and performance, Chapter 2 offers an alternative way of conceiving heritage that will be explored throughout the rest of the book. More specifically, it is argued that what heritage does is intersect with a range of social and cultural debates about the legitimacy of a range of values and identities, and subsequently plays a part in their validation, negotiation and regulation. By recognizing that the management of heritage has consequences beyond the preservation of historic fabric, it will be possible to explore the uses that heritage is put to outside of the management and conservation field.

The following two sections of the book examine a range of themes, all of which draw on original research work in England, Australia and the United States. Part II of the book (Chapters 3–5) examines the consequences of 'authorized' heritage, and explores how authorized discourses of heritage influence expert and professional heritage practices and are themselves perpetuated (Chapter 3), how such discourses influence the construction and expression of certain social and cultural identities (Chapters 4 and 5), and how it is used to regulate and arbitrate dissonance (Chapter 5). Chapter 3 offers a critical examination of the discourse of ICOMOS and UNESCO Charters and Conventions and the practices these documents influence. Chapters 4 and 5, respectively, are based on the results of survey and interview work with visitors to English country houses and with a range of stakeholders concerned with the use and management of Australia's Riversleigh World Heritage palaeontological site. In this section of the book it is argued that practices of management and conservation are themselves constitutive performances of heritage, and that the authenticity of heritage lies ultimately in the meanings people construct for it in their daily lives. Chapters 4 and 5 illustrate the ways in which the performative experience of heritage engages with the creation, recreation and legitimization of social and cultural bonds and identity in the present. In particular, they illustrate the way heritage may be used to regulate, legitimize and justify the maintenance of national

narratives and social hierarchies. While heritage is shown to be an affirmation of identity and a sense of belonging, that identity may also nonetheless be one that is governed or regulated by wider social forces and narratives.

Part III (Chapters 6–8) examines subaltern uses of heritage, and explores the various ways authorized and received notions of heritage and the values they represent are contested. Chapter 6 explores the role of remembering and commemoration in the construction of social and family identities, and is based on survey and interview work undertaken with visitors to industrial museums in England. Chapter 7 is based on ethnographic, interview and survey work with residents of the town of Castleford, located in the coalfield of West Yorkshire, England. In this chapter, heritage is shown as a process that is actively and critically used to negotiate and facilitate social and cultural change within the community. Commemoration and remembrance are used as platforms from which the community is continually redefining and remaking both itself and the social networks that bind the people of the community together. Chapter 8 explores the ways in which Indigenous peoples, drawing on work in the United States and Australia, use heritage as a political and cultural resource. All three chapters demonstrate why control is an important issue in heritage.

Ultimately, the process or moment of heritage is shown to be potentially critically active and self-conscious, through which people can negotiate identity and the values and meanings that underlie that, but through which they also challenge and attempt to redefine their position or 'place' in the world around them. Heritage is not only a social and cultural resource or process, but also a political one through which a range of struggles are negotiated. The implications and consequences of the theorization of heritage as a cultural practice concerned with negotiating the tensions between received and contested identity has consequences for both academic analysis and heritage practice and policy.

Part I

THE IDEA OF HERITAGE

1

THE DISCOURSE OF HERITAGE

There is, really, no such thing as heritage. I say this advisedly, and it is a statement that I will qualify, but it needs to be said to highlight the common sense assumption that 'heritage' can unproblematically be identified as 'old', grand, monumental and aesthetically pleasing sites, buildings, places and artefacts. What I argue in this book is that there is rather a hegemonic discourse about heritage, which acts to constitute the way we think, talk and write about heritage. The 'heritage' discourse therefore naturalizes the practice of rounding up the usual suspects to conserve and 'pass on' to future generations, and in so doing promotes a certain set of Western elite cultural values as being universally applicable. Consequently, this discourse validates a set of practices and performances, which populates both popular and expert constructions of 'heritage' and undermines alternative and subaltern ideas about 'heritage'. At the same time, the 'work' that 'heritage' 'does' as a social and cultural practice is obscured, as a result of the naturalizing effects of what I call the 'authorized heritage discourse'.

The aim of this chapter is to demonstrate the discursive nature of heritage and to unpack this discourse to illustrate that the subject of our heritage 'gaze', to borrow from Urry (1990), is not so much a 'thing' as a set of values and meanings. 'Heritage' is therefore ultimately a cultural practice, involved in the construction and regulation of a range of values and understandings. How these observations are then dealt with is then the subject of Chapter 2. The argument advanced in this chapter is that there is a hegemonic 'authorized heritage discourse', which is reliant on the power/knowledge claims of technical and aesthetic experts, and institutionalized in state cultural agencies and amenity societies. This discourse takes its cue from the grand narratives of nation and class on the one hand, and technical expertise and aesthetic judgement on the other. The 'authorized heritage discourse' privileges monumentality and grand scale, innate artefact/site significance tied to time depth, scientific/aesthetic expert judgement, social consensus and nation building. It is a self-referential discourse, which has a particular set of consequences.

The first consequence is the need to construct a material reality for itself – to

establish claims about itself that make it real. In this process a number of boundaries are drawn. One boundary disconnects the idea of heritage from the present and present-day values and aspirations so that it becomes something confined to 'the past' (Urry 1996). Another ensures that heritage becomes the proper subject of analyses and responsibilities for a range of forms of expertise and associated 'experts'. The power relations underlying the discourse identify those people who have the ability or authority to 'speak' about or 'for' heritage . . . and those who do not. The establishment of this boundary is facilitated by assumptions about the innate value of heritage, which works to obscure the multi-vocality of many heritage values and meanings. Discourse works to identify particular forms of expertise that may be called upon to make pronouncements about the meaning and nature of heritage, and to mediate and adjudicate over any competing heritage discourses. This is not to say that expert pronouncements and judgements are not contested – they are – but in this process the boundaries of any negotiations over heritage values and meanings become very tightly drawn indeed, as they become specific contests over the management or interpretation of specific heritage sites. This process works to limit broader debate about, and any subsequent challenges to, established social and cultural values and meanings.

The discourse also constructs two important sets of heritage practices, those focused on management and conservation of heritage sites, places and objects, and those tied to the visitation of sites and institutions within tourism and leisure activities. However, the broader cultural work that these practices do is often obscured by the way the discourse of heritage constructs not only the idea of heritage, but also its practices. However, what these practices are involved in are the negotiation and regulation of a range of cultural and social values and meanings. Cultural heritage management and the acts of visiting heritage sites as a tourist or other visitor become acts directly implicated in the occasional construction or reconstruction, but most certainly the maintenance, or more precisely *conservation* and *preservation*, of social and cultural meanings.

To explore these ideas a bit further, this chapter does a number of things. Firstly, it briefly reviews theories of discourses and defines the concept as used in this work. The first section of this chapter thus presents a theoretical and methodological underpinning for the rest of this chapter and the book. The second section asks 'when was heritage' and examines when, why and where the dominant discourse of heritage emerged and how and why it became dominant. The chapter then briefly examines the consequences of the existence of this discourse and finally reviews the range of competing heritage discourses. These themes are examined in more detail throughout Parts II and III of the book.

There is no such thing as 'heritage'

The discursive construction of heritage is itself part of the cultural and social processes that are heritage. The practice of heritage may be defined as the management and conservation protocols, techniques and procedures that heritage managers, archaeologists, architects, museum curators and other experts undertake. It may also be an economic and/or leisure practice, and/or a social and cultural practice, as I am arguing, of meaning and identity making. These practices, as well as the meaning of the material 'things' of heritage, are constituted by the discourses that simultaneously reflect these practices while also constructing them.

I also want to use this section to carefully set out some parameters to my use of the term 'discourse'. In discussing how people talk and write about 'heritage', I don't want to get tangled up in debates on the relevance of post-modern arguments that discourse is all that matters. The position that I adopt epistemologically draws on critical realism and, though I acknowledge the usefulness of Foucauldian approaches to discourse, I anchor my analysis firmly in an understanding that social relations are material and have material consequences, in a way informed by *critical discourse analysis*. This is an important distinction, as I do not want to lose sight of the materiality of heritage at the same time as I am problematizing it.

The analysis I am constructing explicitly deals with the 'work' that the practices and performances of heritage 'do' culturally and socially. As such, I am also concerned with what Lorimer (2005: 84), drawing on the work of Thrift, calls the non, pre or more than representational aspects of social life, which are prior to or not dependent on discourse: 'focus falls on how life takes shape and gains expression in shared experiences, everyday routines, fleeting encounters, embodied movements, precognitive triggers, practical skills, affective intensities, enduring urges, unexceptional interactions and sensuous dispositions.'

This analysis offers insights into the political consequences of space, performance and affect. As Thrift argues (2003: 2022–3):

> Spaces can be stabilised in such a way that they act like political utterances, guiding subjects to particular conclusions. But, as a counterpoint, the fabric of space is so multifarious that there are always holes and tears in which new forms of expression can come into being. Space is therefore constitutive in the strongest possible sense and it is not a misuse of the term to call it performative, as its many components continually act back, drawing on a range of different aesthetics as they do so.

Thinking about discourse

At its most simplistic, as Wetherell (2001: 3) observes, discourse is the 'study of language use', it is an analysis of how language is used 'to do things', but is not reducible to language (see also Taylor 2001: 5). It is about the inter-relationship between language and practice (Hall 2001: 72). Discourse is a social action, and this idea of discourse acknowledges that the way people talk about, discuss and understand things, such as 'heritage', have a material consequence that matters. In addition, not only is discourse 'used' to do things by actors, but discourses also do things to actors and are productive independently of actors (Bourdieu and Wacquant 2000; Fischer 2003). A useful starting point is the idea of discourse 'as a specific ensemble of ideas, concepts, and categorisations that are produced, reproduced, and transformed in a particular set of practices and through which meaning is given to physical and social realities' (Hajer 1996: 44). As such, discourses are 'inherently positioned', and so the collection of ideas, concepts, and categorizations regarding heritage give rise to different ways of 'seeing' the social practice of managing 'heritage' according to the positions of social actors (Fairclough 2001: 235).

Foucault (1991), one of the more influential writers on discourse, argues that discourses are forms of expertise, collected into different disciplines, which deal with the construction and representation of knowledge. Discourse not only reflects social meanings, relations and entities, it also constitutes and governs them. The focus of much of Foucault's work was concerned with the epistemological issues of knowledge construction and practice, in particular the power–knowledge relations underlying forms of expertise and the relations of power underpinning dominant discourses. Although his work was concerned with the contestation of and challenges to the dominant discourse, focus tended to be on the dominant discourse itself and competing and/or everyday or 'popular' discourses tend to be overlooked, as are the ways in which they contest and challenge bodies of expertise or dominant discourses (Purvis and Hunt 1993; van Dijk 1998). This is because Foucault was concerned not so much with general political struggles but with identifying techniques of power (Rouse 1987, 1994). For Foucault, the relationship between power and knowledge – power/knowledge – was vital, and he identified knowledge as a particular technique of power (1991). As Hall notes (2001: 78), a major critique of Foucault's work on discourse is that he attempts to 'absorb too much' into the idea of discourse, and in particular to neglect the material, economic and structural factors in the way power and knowledge are deployed. Other critiques of Foucault have been concerned that his focus is 'not about whether things exist but about where meaning comes from' and that this focus leaves studies of discourse open to the charge of relativism (Hall 2001: 73), while others express concern that all social action may be perceived as reducible only to discourse (Fairclough

2000: 145). In addition, Foucault's ideas about discourse have been criticized for not offering a clear methodological approach, particularly in relation to the links between knowledge and practice and social change (Sayer 1992; Fairclough 1993).

As a remedy to these issues, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) offers a theoretical platform and methodological approach that aims to illuminate the links between discourse and practice, and the light this can shed on human relationships and social actions and issues. CDA is a well-established interdisciplinary methodology for analysing discourse and discursive practice and is located within critical social scientific theory and analysis (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999). In particular, the philosophy of critical realism underlies CDA, which acknowledges that things exist independently of our knowledge of them, or indeed discourses about them, but that 'we can only know them under particular descriptions' (Bhaskar 1978: 250). Critical realism recognizes the power of discourses, but stresses the concrete social relations that underlie and generate discourses (Bhaskar 1989; Sayer 1992; Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999; Fairclough et al. 2003).

A central concern of CDA is identifying and understanding how people organize themselves and act through particular discourses (Fairclough et al. 2004: 2). It is also important to understand the relationships between different discourses, as discourses are elements that constrain and constitute the various relationships between people. As such, discourses may be deployed to help regulate, maintain or challenge social relations. This is not to say that discourse represents the totality of social practice, but is one of the interlinked elements of that practice. However, if we accept that discourse is an irreducible part of social life, then one route to analysing what is going on socially can be achieved through the analysis of what is going on interdiscursively (Fairclough 2001: 240). Particular practices, sections of society, such as bodies of expertise, areas of policy development, public employees, community groups and so forth have particular discourses internalized within them that help them to shape social life and particular behaviour and practices (Fairclough 2000: 144–5). Discourse may also work to bind collectives to particular internalized ideologies, assumptions and practices. The important point here, however, is the recognition of the existence of competing and inter-relating discourses that are understood to have an impact on the way people think about and interact with the social and physical world.

Integral to CDA is not simply an analysis of discourse but also an analysis of the social and political context of that discourse and an analysis of the social effects that a discourse has – that one of its elements is 'looking closely at what happens when people talk or write' (Fairclough 2003: 3). Of particular concern is an examination of the way discourses become intertwined with the legitimation and maintenance of power (Marston 2004). In legitimizing and naturalizing the ideologies and range of cultural and social assumptions

about the way the social world works, discourses can have a persuasive power in maintaining and legitimating hierarchies of social relations (Fairclough 2003).

For Fairclough (2003: 124), the point of analysis is not only how those using a particular discourse see the world, but also a consideration of how discourses are also projective given that they may 'represent possible worlds which are different from the actual world [but are] tied in to projects to change the world in particular directions'. An important issue here is the idea that discourses are not just about sustaining and legitimizing certain practices and social relations, but may also simultaneously be engaged with social change (Fairclough et al. 2004: 2). While CDA may privilege the study of language and how it is used, it also sees language as a tool to reveal and reflect social projects and relations, and changes within these. The micro-analysis of discourse provides a macro-analysis of social contexts (Marston 2004: 38). CDA is, in sum, concerned with developing accounts of the inter-relation of discourse with power and domination, social hierarchies, gender relations, the work of ideologies, negotiations between different social identities and the acts of production and resistance within political spheres (Fairclough 2003; Waterton et al. 2006).

The idea of discourse used in the rest of this volume incorporates the notion of discourse as advanced by CDA; in short, that discourse is both reflective of and constitutive of social practices. The following section of this chapter identifies a particular discourse and area of discursive practice centred on ideas of 'heritage' and its management and conservation. This is a historically situated discourse; it is also a discourse, as I will argue, situated within certain Western social experiences and social hierarchies. Due to the limits of space, and for the sake of the arguments I develop in this volume, it is a generalized characterization of a discourse. Subsequently I recognize that some nuances of this discourse will be glossed over, and that this discourse is far more mutable across both time and space than I am characterizing it. Indeed, there are elements within it that recognize and pursue agendas for social change, although these are often obscured by the self-referential tendencies of the discourse. However, my task is to identify the general characteristics of the dominant discourse in heritage, and the way it both reflects and constitutes a range of social practices – not least the way it organizes social relations and identities around nation, class, culture and ethnicity.

When was heritage?

David Harvey (2001: 320) notes that a concern with 'heritage', or at least a concern with 'the past' and material items from that past, has a much deeper history than most contemporary debates around the idea of heritage usually allow. He notes that the use of the past to construct ideas of individual and group identities is part of the human condition, and that throughout human

history people have actively managed and treasured material aspects of the past for this purpose (2001: 333; see also Diaz-Andreu et al. 2005). Certainly, the use of material culture in bolstering national ideology is well documented in the literature (see, for instance, Trigger 1989; Diaz-Andreu and Champion 1996; Boswell and Evans 1999; Carrier 2005; Diaz-Andreu under review). Harvey cautions that the tendency to see heritage as largely a modern phenomena works to reduce debates about heritage to specific technical issues over contemporary management and conservation practices, and subsequently any real engagement with debates about how heritage is involved in the production of identity, power and authority are obscured (2001: 320). However, my task here is to examine what Harvey (2001: 323) himself identifies as a particular 'strand', but which is more usefully discussed as a particular discourse, of heritage that emerged in late nineteenth-century Europe and has achieved dominance as a 'universalizing' discourse in the twenty-first century. One of the consequences of this discourse is to actively obscure the power relations that give rise to it and to make opaque the cultural and social work that 'heritage' does. While there is a general interest in the past, there is a discourse of heritage that creates a particular set of cultural and social practices that have certain consequences in the context of late modernity. Although some commentators today see heritage as having a particular post-modern expression tied to economic commodification and hyper-relativism, this is simply not the case. The origins of the dominant heritage discourse are linked to the development of nineteenth-century nationalism and liberal modernity, and while competing discourses do occur, the dominant discourse is intrinsically embedded with a sense of the pastoral care of the material past.

As has been well rehearsed in the heritage literature, the current concept of heritage emerged in Europe, particularly Britain, France and Germany, within the context of nineteenth-century modernity (for overviews see, for instance, King et al. 1977; Walsh 1992; Bennett 1995; Barthel 1996; Pearce 1998; Jokilehto 1999). Enlightenment rationality and claims about the possibility of objective truth had overturned medieval religious ideas about the nature of knowledge. The idea of progress took on particular force at this time and both legitimized and reinforced European colonial and imperial expansions and acquisitions in the modern era. Through colonial expansion new dialogues about race developed, and ethnic and cultural identity became firmly linked with concepts of biology or 'blood', and Europeans believed themselves to be representative of the highest achievements of human technical, cultural and intellectual progress. Debates over Darwinian evolution had also cemented the social utility and rationality of science, and social Darwinism had further helped to naturalize the conceptual link between identity and race, and the inevitability of European cultural and technical advancement and achievement (Trigger 1989).

The industrial revolution and associated urbanization of the nineteenth

century dislocated many people from a sense of social and geographical security. The French Revolution had also altered the European sense of historical consciousness (Anderson 1991; Jokilehto 1999), and undermined previous ideas of territorial sovereignty, already challenged by the treaty of Westphalia. Nation states had emerged and nationalism developed as a new meta-narrative to bind populations to a shifting sense of territorial identity and to legitimize state formation (Graham et al. 2000: 12). The emergence of a mercantile middle class as feudalism gave way to capitalism had also destabilized the political and economic role of the aristocracy. All in all, the nineteenth century may be characterized as a period that called for 'new devices to ensure or express social cohesion and identity and to structure social relations' (Hobsbawm 1983b: 263). National and racial discourses coalesced and naturalized a link between concepts of identity, history, and territory to establish a doctrine of 'blood and land' (Olsen 2001: 53). It is within this context of the developing narrative of nationalism and of a universalizing modernity that a new, more pointed, concern for what we now identify as 'heritage' emerged. The sense of the new Modern Europe was to be expressed in the monuments that were to be protected and managed for the edification of the public, and as physical representations of national identity and European taste and achievement. As Graham et al. (2000: 17) note, 'to be modern was to be European, and that to be European or to espouse European values (even in the United States) was to be the pinnacle of cultural achievement and social evolution.'

The desire to propagate these values found synergy with the liberal education movement, whose sense of pastoral care identified a moral responsibility to educate the public about their civic and national duties, and to promote social stability by fostering a sense of national community and social responsibility. As Walsh (1992: 30) argues, museums developed as a consequence of the modern condition and narratives of progress, rationality and national and cultural identity became embedded in exhibition and collection practices. Museums took on a regulatory role in helping to establish and govern both social and national identity, and the existence of national collections demonstrated the achievements and superiority of the nation that possessed them (Bennet 1995; Macdonald 2003; Diaz-Andreu under review).

Along side of the institutionalization of museums as repositories and manifestations of national identity and cultural achievement, many European nations also turned their attention to the conservation and management of non-portable antiquities and historic buildings. Legislation to protect what was often defined as 'monuments' ushered in a particular practice of 'conservation'. Although the first legal decree to protect national antiquities dates to the seventeenth century in Sweden, the second half of the nineteenth century saw a surge in the development of legislation to protect ancient monuments or religious or other architecturally and historically significant

buildings (Jokilehto 1999; Choay 2001). These acts, and other legal instruments and public agencies, included the English *Ancient Monuments Protection Act* of 1882; the 1807 chancellery recommendations in Denmark; the establishment in the 1830s of the Comité historique in France, amongst others (Kristiansen 1984; Schnapp 1984; Murray 1989; Choay 2001; Poirrier 2003). Explicitly following the European example, the United States also attempted to get similar legislation enacted during the late nineteenth century, although this was not successful until 1906 with the passing of the *Antiquities Act* (McManamon 1996; Murtagh 1997). Professional architects and the newly emergent discipline of archaeology were significant in the history of the development of these acts. Archaeology, particularly in England and the United States, pressed its case for status as an intellectual endeavour through its claims of stewardship over prehistoric sites and monuments in public debates around the development of these acts (Carman 1996; Smith 2004). Both architecture and archaeology, due to their ability to claim professional expertise over material culture, took on a pastoral role in identifying the appropriate monuments to be protected under these acts, and in caring for and protecting these places. Educating the public about the value and meaning of historic buildings and monuments also became embedded in a sense of a 'conservation ethic' that to disseminate these values was to ensure greater conservation awareness and appreciation of a nation's cultural heritage. This sense of a conservation ethic became institutionalized in organizations like the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) established in 1877, one function of which was to lobby and educate government and society at large about 'proper' conservation principles and about the value and aesthetic significance of ancient buildings.

The use of the term monument is particularly important in the European context. As Choay (2001) documents, the word took on particular registers of power, greatness, and beauty during the seventeenth century and came to affirm a sense of grand public schemes and aesthetic sensibilities. The monument became 'a witness to history and a work of art' that took on a commemorative role in triggering certain public memories and values, and is a concept that has come to embody a particular European vision of the world (Choay 2001: 15; Carrier 2005). The French idea of *patrimoine* – specifically the concept of inheritance – also underwrites the sense of aesthetic grandness (Choay 2001). This sense of inheritance promotes the idea that the present has a particular 'duty' to the past and its monuments. The duty of the present is to receive and revere what has been passed on and in turn pass this inheritance, untouched, to future generations. The French sense of patrimony found synergy in the English conservation ethos of 'conserve as found', heavily influenced by John Ruskin and his treatise *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* ([1849] 1899). In this work, Ruskin argued against the dominant nineteenth-century practice of restoration, where historic buildings would be 'restored' to 'original' conditions by removing later additions or adaptations.

For Ruskin, the fabric of a building was inherently valuable and needed to be protected for the artisanal and aesthetic values it contained:

> It is again no question of expediency or feeling whether we shall preserve the buildings of past time or not. We have no right whatever to touch them. They are not ours. They belong partly to those who built them, and partly to all generations of mankind who are to follow us.
>
> (Ruskin [1849] 1899: 358)

As Burman (1995) notes, this sense of 'trusteeship' over the past was taken up by the SPAB and, as Emerick (2003) shows, became embedded and propagated in English legislation, policy and conservation principles and practices throughout the twentieth century. For the SPAB 'conservation repair' was advocated, so that there would be little intervention in the fabric of a building, and repair work would principally be done to prevent decay. William Morris, one of the principal founders of the SPAB and heavily influenced by Ruskin, wrote in his 1877 manifesto for the Society that:

> To put Protection in the place of Restoration, to stave off decay by daily care, to prop a perilous wall or mend a leaky roof by such means as are obviously meant for support or covering, and show no pretence of other art, and otherwise to resist all tampering with either the fabric or ornament of the building as it stands . . . in fine to treat our ancient buildings as monuments of a bygone art, created by bygone manners, that modern art cannot meddle with without destroying.
>
> (Morris 1877)

This sense of protection or conservation is explicitly incorporated into English planning policy, notably within the document 'Public Planning Guidance 15' (PPG15), which oversees the conservation and use of historic buildings. Further, members of the public today seeking information about conservation principles in their local borough may download from the Internet documents from local government websites that recommend conservation procedures and practices that heavily quote William Morris and the SPAB (see, for instance, East Hertfordshire 2005).

The particular aesthetic championed by Morris and Ruskin owed much to nineteenth-century Romanticism, and many of the buildings they sought to save were essentially those built before the seventeenth century. Buildings to be protected were 'anything which can be looked on as artistic, picturesque, historical, antique, or substantial: any work, in short, over which educated, artistic people would think it worth while to argue' (Morris 1877). Romanticism, as a reaction to urbanization and industrialization, harkened back to a time of the 'rural idyll' and it was thus no accident that many of the

buildings that most concerned the SPAB were churches and homes of the rural elite. The idea that architectural monuments were also something that could principally be appreciated by the educated is also embedded in this conservation philosophy – as it was the professional whose responsibility it was to care for and pass on the aesthetic values that lie at the heart of what it meant to be a 'Modern European'. More specifically, it was only the well-educated who had the necessary cultural literacy to understand grand social and national narratives that were inherent in the fabric of such monuments.

The European conservation principles spread to other parts of the world; actively so in places like the United States, where European conservation found synergy with the 'secular pietism' that characterized the nineteenth-century American preservation movement (Murtagh 1997: 11). In other countries like India, these principles were imposed as part of colonial rule, with the British colonial government legislating in 1863 for the conservation of buildings for their historical and architectural value (Thapar 1984; Menon 2002). These principles have also became embedded in the *Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments* of 1931, and the *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites* (Venice Charter) of 1964, the first of a range of ICOMOS charters that continue to frame and define the debates about conservation and heritage management practices. European ideas about conservation, and the nature and meaning of monuments, have become internationally naturalized, so that these principles have become global 'common sense'. Denis Byrne (1991) has argued, more critically, that they have become hegemonic and that the 'conservation ethic' has been imposed on non-Western nations.

The Romantic Movement also found expression in the conservation of 'natural' heritage. The idea of a 'pristine wilderness', and the nature/culture divide facilitated by Enlightenment philosophy, led to the concept of a natural landscape that needed to be protected from the depredations of human activities (Head 2000b; Waterton 2005a). This idea of landscape was institutionalized in the late nineteenth century with the creation of Yellowstone National Park in 1872, the world's first national park. In England, the National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or Natural Beauty was founded in 1895 to address threats to the landscape of the Lake District (Jenkins 1994). The socialist founders of the Trust were concerned to preserve common land for recreational use as a reaction to the *General Enclosures Act* of 1845 (Weideger 1994). In particular, the initial founders of the Trust were concerned to ensure urban populations had access to rural lands and landscapes for their cultural and physical health and well-being (Crouch 1963: 18). In 1907, an Act of Parliament established the National Trust, and gave the organization the right to declare any properties it possessed as inalienable, so that they could be held in 'trust' for the nation (Crouch 1963: 7). Although initially concerned with areas of natural beauty, the Trust began to acquire buildings in the early twentieth century. In 1934, Philip Kerr, the

eleventh Marquess of Lothian, lobbied a new generation of National Trust officials to consider the 'plight' of the country house (Mandler 1997: 295–6). By this time, death duties, other taxes and the impact of the First World War had had a debilitating impact on the ability of the landed gentry and aristocracy to maintain these buildings. Kerr (aka Lord Lothian) argued in 1934 that the Trust should be enabled to acquire houses, repair and modernize them and then let them to tenants, some of whom may be their old owners, 'who would respect and preserve, so far as they could, the tradition of beauty they enshrined' (quoted in Mandler 1997: 296). In 1937 and 1939, new legislation allowed owners of houses to gift or bequeath their properties, along with an endowment for their upkeep, to the Trust; in return, the Trust would maintain the property and generous tax concessions would be granted on the transfer of the property to the Trust (Cannadine 1995: 20). Subsequently, the Trust has become primarily associated in England with the country house and other properties of the English elite. Rather than the original sense of holding public lands in trust for the public, the National Trust adopted, at this time, a 'Ruskinian' sense of trusteeship over the types of buildings that inherently appealed to Romantics and organizations like the SPAB. In addition, the conservation ideas and the ideologies embedded in the European conservation movement helped to legitimate the Trust's almost seamless adoption of Kerr's 'Country House Scheme', and to become subsequently a major and natural advocate for the preservation of elite heritage as 'national' heritage.

Indeed this was no accident, as the discourse of monumentality and heritage as developed from the nineteenth century is not only driven by certain narratives about nationalism and Romantic ideals, but also a specific theme about the legitimacy and dominant place in national cultures of the European social and political elite. In Britain, for instance, the upper classes have dominated the conservation movement, by not only founding organizations like the SPAB and in hijacking the National Trust, but also in championing legislation. For instance, Lord Lubbock, early archaeologist and liberal politician, was the primary champion of the Ancient Monuments Act, which he saw as part of a wider social improvement scheme, in which the public would be made aware of the antiquity of their national and cultural character through the preservation of ancient antiquities and other monuments (Carman 1993, 1996). In the United States, the early leaders of what in that country is called the 'preservation movement' were drawn from the upper middle and upper classes (Barthel 1996: 6). Early campaigns in America concentrated on the preservation of the stately homes of historically significant men, such as George Washington's 'Mt Vernon' and Andrew Jackson's 'The Hermitage' (Murtah 1997). The motive behind this movement was, as Barthel (1996: 19) observes, to specifically engender and bolster American patriotism in the general public. Individuals like Lubbock and organizations like the SPAB in England, and early US preservationist organizations like the

Mt Vernon Ladies Association and Daughters of the American Revolution, were driven by a sense of liberal duty for social improvement, wherein their messages about patriotism, nationalism and the desirability of inheriting and passing on certain aesthetic tastes was seen as occurring for the general good and edification of the public.

The idea of 'preservation' is interesting here, as the nineteenth century was a significant period of social change. The European conservation movement and the American preservation movement developed in the context of this change, and what is revealing is what it was that early conservationists and preservations sought to 'save' in this context. Almost inevitably it is the grand and great and 'good' that were chosen, to 'remind' the public about the values and sensibilities that should be saved or preserved as representative of patriotic American and European national identities. Even when it is the 'bad' that is being preserved, it is very often the exceptionally 'tragic' event that is commemorated, rather than unpleasantness that is more mundane or reflective of the general inequalities of human experiences. The very idea of monumentality – drawing on a sense of the inevitability and desirability of inheritance, of grand scale and of aesthetic taste – derives ultimately from ruling and upper middle class experience. That these ideals came to dominate was not simply a function of the degree to which the upper classes were involved in early preservation and conservation movements. It was also the degree to which their own experiences and understanding of the importance of material culture in demonstrating lineage, cultural and social achievement and power became embedded in these movements and the conceptual frameworks in use today. This was also facilitated by a certain desire to maintain the legitimacy of those experiences on the social and cultural register.

In Australia, where the conservation movement developed relatively late, we can see the degree to which these concepts have become naturalized as common sense in the wider international discourse on heritage. Australia faithfully imported the basic philosophy of Ruskinian conservation as witnessed in the development of the first version of The Australian ICOMOS *Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (Burra Charter)* in 1979. This charter was an attempt to rework the Venice Charter for an Australian context, which by the late 1970s included self-conscious public debate about multiculturalism and Indigenous heritage. However, the 1979 Burra Charter focused attention entirely on the fabric of a place or building, a focus derived from the basic premises underlying the Charter that significance is deemed to be inherent in the fabric of a building. The Charter incorporates the basic conservation ethic that requires that as little as possible be done to damage or alter a building's fabric and thus its historic or other values. Although the Burra Charter was rewritten in 1999, the basic focus on fabric, and the underlying ethic and assumptions of innate value has not changed (Waterton et al. 2006). Indeed, as argued in detail in Chapter 3, the new version of the Charter, which attempts to incorporate greater

community participation in conservation and heritage management matters, effectively works to compromise that participation (see also Waterton et al. 2006). It does so as it has not altered the dominant sense of the trusteeship of expert authority over the material fabric. Nor has it challenged the degree to which experts are perceived as having not only the ability, but also the *responsibility* for identifying the value and meanings that are still perceived to be locked within the fabric of a place. The degree to which the Burra Charter incorporates the common sense views about conservation and heritage are revealed in the extent to which this document, written *specifically* for the Australian context, is lauded and adopted internationally as a standard of good principles and practice. A number of countries in Europe, and in particular the United Kingdom, have now adopted and actively use the Burra Charter in conservation and heritage management.

In the 1940s, both America and Australia imported the English model of the National Trust. As various commentators have noted, the majority of houses and other properties preserved in Australia during the post-war period tended to be drawn from the Australian Squattocracy (rural upper class) and other elements of the ruling classes (Bickford 1981, 1985; Lake 1991; Pennay 1996). However, a significant moment in the history of the conservation movement in Australia was the activities of the Builders Labourers Federation (BLF), a now disbanded trade union, which in the 1970s, under the leadership of Jack Mundy, imposed 'green bans' (work bans) on areas in Sydney deemed by the union leadership and community groups as constituting both natural and cultural heritage. The first area thus successfully protected was a piece of bushland, 'Kelly's Bush', in the affluent Sydney suburb of Hunters Hill (Burgman and Burgman 1998). Another area that became the focus of Mundy's green bans was Victoria Street in the red-light and one time bohemian inner city suburb of Kings Cross. A large section of Victoria Street was due for redevelopment by a private landowner, and a significant number of Victorian terraced houses were due for demolition. Although these terraced houses had once been built for middle class occupation, they had by the 1970s largely been subdivided into boarding houses and were occupied by protected tenants, workers from the nearby dockyards and other low-income tenants. For many of the residents of Kings Cross, my own family included, the agenda for protecting these houses was not simply the aesthetic amenity of the streetscape, although that was important, but appreciably the agenda was also driven by the need to save not only low-income accommodation, but low-incoming housing that had an aesthetic amenity.

Victoria Street became a significant and very public community and trade union protest, which at times became very violent and was nationally broadcast on news programmes. This protest occurred at a time when there was wider agitation from organizations like the National Trust to develop legislation in the State of New South Wales, where these events were occurring, to

protect heritage sites. The *NSW Heritage Act 1977* was duly enacted. The Victoria Street development did proceed, but in a modified form, and public pressure saw the preservation of some of the Victoria Street housing stock. However, the agenda for *why* these houses were saved was lost. Tenants were removed and the houses modified and 'restored' to their pre-boarding house days, and re-tenanted with, or sold to, the mobile middle classes that were, at this time, gentrifying the inner city. The actions of the BLF in Sydney were significant in that they helped raise public consciousness about environmental and cultural heritage issues, and the public protests they sparked helped to put pressure on the government to develop heritage policies and legislation. However, the dominant sense of heritage prevailed in this case, as the houses were saved for their aesthetic values, not their community values or as affordable homes. Perhaps these latter issues would never have gained political credence given the degree of economic pressure to redevelop the inner city; however, it is revealing nonetheless that it was the aesthetic argument that was seen as plausible and of enough political influence to protect these buildings. In short, it was the *houses* that were saved, and saved ultimately for middle class use, and not the sense of community that drove the protest for many local residents. The other point this example reveals about the nature of authorized heritage and monumentality is that it is inherently *material*, and that Victoria Street could be seen as a conservation victory rather than the local community defeat that it was, because the building stock, and not the community, had been saved.

The public concern with environmental and heritage issues that Mundy and the BLF, and indeed the National Trust of Australia, drew on in lobbying for heritage legislation during the 1970s was part of a growing wider Western concern with what were becoming identifiable as 'heritage issues' during the 1960s. Some commentators have seen this increased public debate as a consequence of the political and social changes of the 1960s (Chase and Shaw 1989; Lowenthal 1985; McCrone et al. 1995), while others suggest that it was a result of increased leisure time, and thus a greater public interaction with their built and cultural environments (Hunter 1981; Mandler 1997; Tinniswood 1998). Certainly, by the late 1960s and 1970s, there was an increasing momentum in two areas of heritage practice. One was the marked increase in heritage tourism. Prentice argues that mass consumption of heritage tourism became a significant economic and cultural phenomenon by the mid-1970s as public interest in heritage and history increased (1993, 2005; see also Urry 1990; Hollinshead 1997). Another was the degree to which national public heritage policy and legislation was being introduced and/or amended in the Western world. For instance, the Ancient Monuments Act in Great Britain was replaced with the *Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979*, and other acts were put in place to protect portable antiquities, underwater sites and historic buildings (Hunter and Ralston 1993; Cookson 2000), and similar legislative activity was going on in other

European countries (see Cleere 1984). Australia also developed its first acts at this time to protect both Indigenous, archaeological and built heritage (Smith 2004). The United States, fearing in this period that it was lagging behind Europe in the area of buildings preservation, established a committee under Albert Rains, with the patronage of the American First Lady, Lady Bird Johnson, to review the European laws and procedures and introduce them into legislation in the United States (see Rains [1966] 1983). The US federal government in the 1970s also introduced a number of other acts designed to protect a range of archaeological resources (King 1998). International Charters and Conventions identifying and nominating procedures for protecting buildings and archaeological sites in a variety of different contexts or situations were also adopted.

By the 1970s, at least, it became possible to talk about and recognize a set of procedures and techniques, guided by national legislation and national and international charters, conventions and agreements, concerned with the preservation and management of a range of heritage sites and places. In the United States, this process is called Cultural Resource Management (King 2002), in Europe it tends to be referred to as Archaeological Heritage Management (Willems 2001; Carman 2002) and in Australia, where Indigenous criticism has challenged the idea of heritage both as a 'resource' and as the privileged purview of archaeologists, Cultural Heritage Management is increasingly used. Archaeologists and conservation architects inevitably dominate these processes. This is because, on a practical level, it is members of these disciplines that have lobbied for the legislation, worked within government heritage bureaucracies and amenity societies, and had a significant presence in UNESCO and ICOMOS. On a philosophical level, it is the ability of both disciplines to claim expert authority over material culture (whether as artefacts, sites or structures). Further, and as various historians of archaeology and architecture have identified, the conservation ethic developed in the nineteenth century was both constituted by and continually reinforced within the epistemological frameworks of both disciplines (see, for instance, Murray 1989; Trigger 1989; Byrne 1991; Smith 2004 for archaeology; and Lowenthal 1985; Jokilehto 1999; Earl 2003 for conservation architecture).

The Venice Charter of 1964 is, as Starn (2002: 2) correctly identifies: 'the canonical text of modern' heritage practices. This document reinforces the conservation ethic and stresses one of the key principles of heritage management: that the cultural significance of a site, building, artefact or place must determine its use and management (see Chapter 3). Inevitably, it is those holding expert knowledge that must identify the innate value and significance, which are often defined in terms of historical, scientific, educational or more generally 'cultural' significance. There have been extensive debates about the nature and need for self-conscious significance assessments in Western heritage management, particularly in North America (see, for instance, McGimsey 1972; Lipe 1977, King 2000, Mathers et al. 2005),

Australasia (Sullivan and Bowdler 1984; Fung and Allen 1984; Johnston 1992; Pearson and Sullivan 1995; Byrne et al. 2001) and Europe (Darvill et al. 1987; Darvill 1995, 2005; Carman 1996, 1998; Clark 1999, 2005; Deeben and Groenewoudt 2005). Although extensive, these debates have historically focused on the technical issues of assessment and 'best practice'. Ironically, however, it is in England, the source of many of the justificatory texts of conservation, where the debate about the nature of heritage significance and assessment processes have been less developed relative to other countries such as the United States or Australia. In England (this is less the case in the rest of the UK), value appears to be largely, and often unproblematically, assumed. This may be an expression of the degree to which the cultural values of heritage are part of the cultural common sense of the nation. In the post-colonial contexts of the United States and Australia significance values, as discussed below, have been one of the first areas contested by competing heritage discourses.

The year 1972 is another noteworthy milestone in the development and institutionalization of the heritage discourse. In that year, UNESCO adopted the *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*, which established an international agenda for the protection and conservation of sites of universal significance, and importantly confirmed the presence of 'heritage' as an international issue. In addition, the World Heritage Convention further institutionalized the nineteenth-century conservation ethic and the 'conserve as found' ethos. As Choay (2001: 140) has argued, the European sense of the historical monument as universally significant underwrites this Convention, which inevitably universalizes Western values and systems of thought (see also Byrne 1991). A glance at the World Heritage List today demonstrates the degree to which the sense of the monumental underwrites the convention, with cathedrals and grand buildings of state dominating the listing process (Cleere 2001). Under this convention, heritage *is* not only monumental, it *is* universally significant with universal meaning, and it *is*, ultimately, physically tangible and imposing. The idea of 'authenticity' is also significant in this convention, and in many ICOMOS charters. Starn (2002) argues that the degree of attention given to the idea of authenticity in heritage management and conservation is a relatively new issue and was not one that exercised nineteenth-century European conservationists, and suggests that it was not until the writing of the Venice Charter that authenticity becomes a notable problem. He sees the concern with 'authenticity' in this document as deriving largely from a reaction to the devastation caused to cityscapes during the Second World War and the runaway urban development of the 1960s. He suggests the use of the word was a call for continuity in the rapid post-war changes to urban centres (2002: 8). Certainly the concept has taken on added force and authority in the post-war period, and has found a certain synergy with the conservation ethic. As Colin Graham (2001: 63) notes: 'authenticity tends to a monologic

unquestioning discourse concurrent with the idea of the "nation", it arises also out of contexts in which the nation becomes an active arbiter between the past and a "people" . . . [it] combines the prioritisation of "origins" with the "pathos of incessant change".'

This section has demonstrated that there is a self-referential 'authorized heritage discourse', whose authority rests in part on its ability to 'speak to' and make sense of the aesthetic experiences of its practitioners and policy makers, and by the fact of its institutionalization within a range of national and international organizations and codes of practice. The *when* of heritage stretches back to nineteenth-century values and cultural concerns, the *where* of this discourse may be found not only in Western Europe, but also more specifically in the authorial voices of the upper middle and ruling classes of European educated professionals and elites. It is as much a discourse of nationalism and patriotism as it is of certain class experiences and social and aesthetic value. However, this discourse has not been unchallenged. Internationally, the World Heritage Convention has been criticized, in particular by non-Western nations and commentators, for universalizing Western concepts of heritage and the values inherent within that (see, for instance, Blake 2001; Cleere 2001). In response to this, UNESCO adopted the 2003 *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. This convention attempts to recognize new and non-Western ways of understanding heritage – how successful this is in challenging the dominant discourse is discussed in Chapter 3.

In addition, community groups from within many Western countries have also challenged the dominant discourse and advocated greater community participation; demanding that practitioners recognize not only locally geographically defined communities, but also communities bound together by common social, cultural, economic and/or political experiences. Also Indigenous criticism in post-colonial countries about the inequities inherent in the ways in which museums, archaeologists and other heritage practitioners have dealt with human remains and other items of cultural value and significance have been increasingly influential. A second prong of attack has centred on the economic commodification and 'Disneyfication' of mass heritage tourism (Handler and Saxton 1988; McCrone et al. 1995; Brett 1996; Waitt and McGuirk 1996; Handler and Gable 1997; Waitt 2000; Choay 2001; Greenspan 2002). In the United Kingdom, this criticism has been particularly vociferous, marshalled as a critique of the so-called 'heritage industry' led by historians Robert Hewison (1981, 1987) and Patrick Wright (1985, 1991), which has also criticized the self-referential and elitist nature of the discourse. The next section of this chapter will examine in more detail the consequences of the authorized heritage discourse and then return to consider these competing discourses in more detail.

The authorized heritage discourse and its use

The authorized heritage discourse (AHD) focuses attention on aesthetically pleasing material objects, sites, places and/or landscapes that current generations 'must' care for, protect and revere so that they may be passed to nebulous future generations for their 'education', and to forge a sense of common identity based on the past. This section briefly outlines some of the key consequences of this discourse in constituting and legitimizing what heritage *is*, and in defining who has the ability to speak for and about the nature and meaning of heritage.

One of the consequences of the AHD is that it defines who the legitimate spokespersons for the past are. One of the ways the AHD does this is through he rhetorical device of 'the past', which is used as a shorthand or an alternative to 'heritage'. 'The past' is vague, though the use of the definite article also identifies something both singular and concrete. The vagueness of 'the past', its mystery and 'hard to pin downness', immediately works to render it subject to the judgements of experts such as archaeologists and historians. It is part of the discourse that maps out what it is archaeologists and other areas of expertise may have domain over – the vagueness being particularly useful here. Yet, the definite article also identifies that there is *a* past that will be looked after by expert analysis and study. The important point here is that terms like 'the past', when used to discuss and define heritage, disengage us from the very real emotional and cultural work that the past does as heritage for individuals and communities. The past is not abstract; it has material reality as heritage, which in turn has material consequences for community identity and belonging. The past cannot simply be reduced to archaeological data or historical texts – it is someone's heritage.

One of the other ways the AHD maps out the authority of expertise is through the idea of 'inheritance' and patrimony. The current generation, best represented by 'experts', are seen as stewards or caretakers of the past, thus working to disengage the present (or at least certain social actors in the present) from an active use of heritage. Heritage, according to the AHD, is inevitably saved 'for future generations' a rhetoric that undermines the ability of the present, unless under the professional guidance of heritage professionals, to alter or change the meaning and value of heritage sites or places. In disempowering the present from actively rewriting the meaning of the past, the use of the past to challenge and rewrite cultural and social meaning in the present becomes more difficult.

Another crucial theme of this discourse is the idea that 'heritage' is innately valuable. This is because 'heritage' is seen to represent all that is good and important about the past, which has contributed to the development of the cultural character of the present. Moreover, embedded within this discourse is the idea that the proper care of heritage, and its associated values, lies with the experts, as it is only they who have the abilities, knowledge and

understanding to identify the innate value and knowledge contained at and within historically important sites and places. This is an embedded assumption within the discourse that has a legacy in antiquarian understandings of knowledge and material culture. Principally, it is architects, historians and archaeologists who act as stewards for the past, so that present and future publics may be properly educated and informed about its significance.

The heritage literature maintains that heritage is a symbolic representation of identity. Material or tangible heritage provides a physical representation of those things from 'the past' that speak to a sense of place, a sense of self, of belonging and community. The emergence of the heritage discourse within the context of nineteenth-century nationalism has meant that the primary form of identity often associated with heritage is that of the nation (see Macdonald 2003; Graham et al. 2005). This is reinforced by the nationalizing discourses that underlie the discipline of archaeology and history (Meskell 2001, 2002, 2003; Kane 2003; Diaz-Andreu under review) and the emphasis on the universality of heritage values and principles embedded in documents such as the World Heritage Convention (Byrne 1991). Such an emphasis means that other forms of identity are often obscured or devalued. The literature on globalization has made strong claims about the localizing affects of this process, whereby the local has become a greater focus in terms of identity work (Chang et al. 1996; Escobar 2001; Berking 2003; Castells 2004). However, this shift in focus is not accommodated easily by a discourse that is ultimately assimilationist in nature, drawing as it does on the narrative of nation and universality of world heritage. The heritage discourse, in providing a sense of national community, must, by definition, ignore a diversity of sub-national cultural and social experiences. Ultimately, the discourse draws on too narrow a sense of experience of what heritage is and what it may mean to readily incorporate sub-national identities.

Within the narrative of nation, the heritage discourse also explicitly promotes the experience and values of elite social classes. This works to alienate a range of other social and cultural experiences and it has been no accident that the heritage phenomena has been criticized for absenting women (Johnston 1993; Smith 1993; Dubrow 2003), a range of ethnic and other community groups (Leone et al. 1995; Hayden 1997; Ling Wong 1999, 2000; Shackel 2001), Indigenous communities (Langford 1983; Fourmile 1989b; Deloria 1992; Ah Kit 1995; Watkins 2003) and working class and labour history (Johnston 1993; Hayden 1997; Dicks 1997, 2000a). While the AHD may work to exclude the historical, cultural and social experiences of a range of groups, it also works to constrain and limit their critique. It does this on a broad level by privileging the expert and their values over those of the non-expert, and by the self-referential nature of the discourse, which continually legitimizes itself and the values and ideologies on which it is based. However, the emphasis on materialism in this discourse also helps constrain critique.

Linked to the idea of the materiality of heritage is the idea of its 'boundedness'. Heritage has traditionally been conceived within the AHD as a discrete 'site', 'object', building or other structure with identifiable boundaries that can be mapped, surveyed, recorded, and placed on national or international site registers. This ability to reduce the concept of heritage to 'manageable' and discrete locales helps to reduce the social, cultural or historical conflicts about the meaning, value or nature of heritage, or more broadly the past, into discrete and specific conflicts over individual sites and/or technical issues of site management. Over the last decade, however, and as disciplines such as geography start to consider heritage issues, greater attention has focused on the idea of cultural landscapes and their heritage values (see, for instance, Titchen 1996; Jones and Rotherham 1998; Fairclough 1999; Cotter et al. 2001; Fairclough and Rippon 2002). As Head (2000b) has demonstrated, the philosophical separation of concepts of 'nature' and 'culture' during the Enlightenment has lead to an assumption that landscape is inherently a natural rather than a cultural phenomena. Waterton (2005a) and Titchen (1996) have argued that this has affected the ability of heritage organizations to embrace the idea of cultural landscape as heritage. However, this ability is also hindered by the discursive construction of heritage that naturalizes it as a discrete 'spot' or locale within a landscape. This conceptualization helps to obfuscate wider cultural and historical debates about the meaning of the past, and works to draw tight conceptual and knowledge boundaries around the meanings and values given to these locales. The idea of a cultural landscape as heritage makes both conceptual and physical space for a wider range and layering of competing values and meanings than does the idea of 'site'. The consequence of this will be explored in Chapter 5.

However, another aspect of the AHD's obfuscation of, and attempts to exclude, competing discourses is the way it constructs heritage as something that is engaged with passively – while it may be the subject of popular 'gaze', that gaze is a passive one in which the audience will uncritically consume the message of heritage constructed by heritage experts. Heritage is not defined in the AHD as an active process or experience, but rather it is something visitors are led to, are instructed about, but are then not invited to engage with more actively. The 'glass case' display mentality Merriman (1991) identified for museum exhibitions is equally present in traditional interpretation and presentations of heritage sites and places (see also Hall and McArthur 1996).

This mentality helps to exclude non-traditional conceptions of heritage as it is assumed that heritage visitors will not value sites and places that do not fit into the dominant aesthetic. An example is Diane Barthel's (1996: 68–9) discussion of the possibility of interpreting an industrial site in such a way that it recalls the inequities, aggression and unpleasantness of industrial life. She states that: 'the raw masculinity . . . [of the industrial workplace] is not the usual subject for tours of schoolchildren and senior citizens or for family

outings. Layers of dirt and grime violate tourist expectations, and serious questioning of industrialism's costs runs counter to the ideology of many political and economic interests involved in preservation.' Despite the critical acuity of her latter point, she does assume that visitors to such sites have uncritically accepted the dominant discourse, and that they tend only to be interested in the traditional aesthetics of heritage and nothing else. Not only is she assuming that dominant perceptions of heritage *are* indeed universally shared, she also assumes that heritage visitors are inherently uncritical and passive.

'The public', and more specifically visitors to heritage sites and museums, are too often conceptualized as 'empty vessels' or passive consumers of the heritage message (Mason 2004, 2005). The idea of the passivity of the gaze of heritage visitors or consumers derives from three factors. Firstly, it has a legacy in the values and ideologies of the liberal educational movement that influenced early museum development and the conservation movement. Secondly, it lies in the 'conserve as found' ethos that identifies sites as something to be looked upon and passed unchanged on to the future. Work by Emma Waterton (2005b) on the visual imagery of England's heritage agency, English Heritage, demonstrates the degree to which this ethos permeates the perception of heritage and management practices in that country. In her critique, she identifies the systemic absence of people in the visual imagery used to attract visitors and represent its heritage properties more widely. She also notes that although many properties are ruins, they are neatly – almost ostentatiously – maintained. Keith Emerick (2003) also argues that the on-site manicured presentation of most heritage properties managed by English Heritage is a direct reflection of the Ruskinian conservation ethic, citing policy documents from throughout the twentieth century instilling the need for site managers to keep sites neat and tidy. This sense of tidy control is brutally represented by the immaculate lawns that characteristically surround most ruins, buildings and other English Heritage properties and which help facilitate the management aim of:

> conserving the beauty and the stability of the old buildings in its charge without involving the removal or alteration of a single old stone or the addition of a single new one, except upon obvious structural necessity. The monuments are allowed to tell their own story without the intrusion of modern architectural design, whether good or bad, affecting the question.
>
> (William Harvey, architect in the Office of Works – the then body responsible for heritage – 1922, cited in Emerick 2003: 112)

Thirdly, it owes something to the recent developments in mass tourism. During the 1980s a strong critique of heritage emerged that focused on the development of mass consumption and tourist marketing of heritage

attractions. A focus of this critique was the idea that tourism reduced heritage to simple entertainment, with the derogative motif of 'theme park' becoming central to this critique. Patrick Wright (1985), for instance, warned that Britain had itself become one gigantic heritage theme park, which Hewison (1987) thought was integral to the cultural decline of Britain. This critique has been echoed in other countries, where heritage has been accused of stifling creativity and sanitizing or simplifying the historical messages of the past (McCrone et al. 1995; Brett 1996; Choay 2001: 4–5; Burton 2003). For instance, Colonial Williamsburg, one of the American Flagship heritage sites often associated with American patriotism, cultural achievement and aesthetics, has been a particular focus of this critique. The need to attract more visitors has resulted in what Greenspan identifies as 'low brow' advertising, and he reports the unease felt by heritage professionals that the 'fun' side of the site has been promoted over its educational role (2002: 175). While the Disneyfication of tourism marketing and interpretation is a feature of real concern (Smith et al. 1992; Hollinshead 1997; Waitt 2000), this critique has been extended to heritage interpretation more generally. Hewison (1987) scornfully identifies a 'heritage industry', which commodifies, sanitizes and creates a false past and stifles cultural development and creativity.

While Rafael Samuel (1994) has demonstrated that it is inappropriate to lump all heritage under this label, and that heritage does much more than offer a sanitized version of the past, nonetheless it is a critique that has had some force both in Britain and internationally. Although it appears to stand in opposition to the AHD, the heritage industry critique, as discussed below in more detail, reproduces some of the work the AHD does in constructing heritage visitors or users as passive consumers. Within this critique visitors are redefined as 'tourists', which further distances heritage users from an active sense of engagement with heritage sites – as tourists they are by definition culturally foreign to the heritage site in question and may be conceived as 'simply passing through'. The idea that most visitors or users of heritage sites are 'tourists' has now become a pervasive motif in the AHD; the consequence of this will be discussed more fully in following chapters (particularly 2, 4 and 6).

The advent of mass heritage tourism, together with the economic rationalist discourse of the market that took hold in the 1980s and 1990s (Dicks 2003: 33), has also brought the lexicon of 'consumption' into heritage debates. Jane Malcom-Davies, in her critique of the history of heritage interpretation, identifies its conservation and preservation origins, which she then claims as overlain by a more recent 'heritage phase' and states that: 'The "heritage" phase is the one in which the resource is transformed into a product for consumption in the marketplace' (2004: 279). In this construction, 'heritage' is conflated with mass tourism and the processes of engagement with heritage are reduced to simple consumption. This is not to say that

heritage is not an economic resource, rather that the reduction of heritage as only or largely a product of the marketplace helps to reinforce the idea that heritage is a 'thing' that is passively and uncritically consumed. Embedded in 'common sense' views of consumption is the perception that it is a passive process in which mass consumers are manipulated by the narcotic effect of the media (Abercrombie and Longhurst 1998: 5) or, in this case, tourism marketing.

Subsequently, what is absent in the AHD is a sense of 'action' or critical engagement on the part of non-expert users of heritage, as heritage is about receiving the wisdom and knowledge of historians, archaeologists and other experts. This obscures the sense of memory work, performativity and acts of remembrance that commentators such as Nora (1989), Urry (1996) and Bagnall (2003) identify as occurring at heritage sites (these ideas are discussed in more detail in Chapter 2). However, the point to be made here is that the AHD establishes and sanctions a top-down relationship between expert, heritage site and 'visitor', in which the expert 'translates', using Bauman's (1987) sense of the word, the site and its meanings to the visitor. The very use of the term 'visitor' also facilitates the construction of passivity and disconnection. When 'visitors', or heritage users, step outside of this legitimized relationship the critique from heritage professionals can be swift and uncompromising. Witness the degree of condemnation of heritage re-enactments and re-enactors within the heritage and museum literature, which condemns such activities as being amateurish, unauthentic, sanitized, escapist and so forth (see, for instance, Hewison 1987: 83; Dening 1994: 4–5; Kammen 1991: 605–6; Beidler 1999; see exchanges in Sutton 2001; see also Handler and Saxton 1988; Uzzell 1989; Abroe 1998 for extended critical commentary). Mike Crang (1996) argues, on the other hand, that re-enactors are often concerned with actively engaging and negotiating the meaning of the events they re-enact and the sites at which these events occurred, and that it is part of a personal strategy of negotiating heritage meaning. As he notes, re-enactors are often patronized by academics, although, as he illustrates, many re-enactors carry out extensive research into the events they reconstruct and the roles they play as actors within the reconstructed events. The point is that regardless of whether we agree or disagree with the interpretations produced, what is produced is perceived as an authentic and legitimate way of understanding and using heritage sites for those involved. For some of us, the activities of re-enactors may be viewed as an eccentric or irrelevant hobby. However, it is a process that nonetheless challenges the roles established for non-expert users of heritage, and the strength of reactions it engenders in the traditional heritage literature, highlights the degree to which the AHD decrees that heritage is to be viewed from afar as an unchanging vista rather than actively *used*, remade and negotiated.

Subaltern and dissenting heritage discourses

As Graham et al. observe (2000: 258), 'heritage may represent the dominant ideological discourse, but that also ensures that it can become the focus of alternative meaning for those who dissent'. There are a number of dissenting discourses and critiques about the nature, meaning and use of heritage. Two broad strands of debate are identified here. The first concerns the expression of subaltern discourses of community participation in heritage management and conservation processes. These are 'subaltern' in that they stand outside of the dominant discourse, and this section outlines the development of this broad area of dissent and examines the responses of both heritage institutions and the heritage literature to it. It is argued that in large part the official responses, although often well meaning in their attempts to deal with this critique, are constrained in their attempts because of the conceptual problems of extending debate and practices outside of the frameworks established by the AHD. The second strand of dissent outlined is that developed around the critique of the British 'heritage industry' and heritage tourism more broadly. This strand of critique cannot be identified as part of a 'subaltern' discourse, nor, as it is argued, does it offer a concrete challenge to the AHD, as the heritage industry critique shares all too much discursive space with the AHD.

There is a growing literature in heritage studies that expresses a strong desire to identify and engage with community participation in heritage management, interpretation and conservation work, which is often expressed as community outreach or social and cultural inclusion (see, for instance, Hayden 1997; Newman and McLean 1998; Hodges and Watson 2000; Byrne et al. 2001; Smardz Frost 2004; Gard'ner 2004; amongst many others). Specific disciplines that engage directly with the heritage management process have also participated in extensive debates about community involvement in research and heritage practices, although these are often relegated to marginalized subfields, for instance in archaeological and historical debates about 'public archaeology'/'public history' (Carman 2002; Hodgkin and Radstone 2003b). The need, and in some cases even the desire, to identify and work with community groups has arisen as a consequence of the agitation by these groups for greater inclusion and consideration of their own needs, aspirations and values in the way the past is used in present society.

The greatest challenge has arisen from agitation by Indigenous or First Nations peoples from around the world. Although often focusing on issues surrounding the reclamation and reburial of Indigenous human remains, the claims by Indigenous communities to control their past is more profound than simple conflicts over the possession or 'ownership' of particular relics, remains or artefacts. The issues revolve around the cultural politics of identity – who has the legitimacy and power to define who a particular group or community *are* and who they are not (see Chapter 8 for more details). The

ability to control your own identity, to define who you are and to establish a sense of community belonging is emotionally and politically a powerful act. A sense of identity must inevitably draw on a sense of history and memory – who and what we are as individuals, communities or nations is indelibly formed by our sense of history and the way individual and collective memory is understood, commemorated and propagated.

The primary targets for Indigenous criticism were those with the intellectual authority and power to define how the past is used to legitimize (or not) certain forms of identity within Western societies – so criticism was particularly targeted at archaeologists, anthropologists, museum curators and historians. Although these criticisms were particularly pointed in post-colonial contexts, they nonetheless have pointed correspondences for post-imperial nations within Europe. The universalizing tendencies of the World Heritage Convention have also been singled out for criticism by Indigenous peoples and other non-Western cultures for failing to incorporate culturally relevant concepts of heritage (Cleere 2001; Munjeri 2004; see also Chapter 3).

The issue of community participation is often, at least in the archaeologically informed heritage literature, defined as 'indigenous issues'. However, these criticisms have been echoed by many other culturally- and socially-defined community groups in many Western and non-Western countries. In the United Kingdom, for instance, organizations such as the Black Environmental Network (BEN) have lobbied for greater involvement of ethnic communities in government heritage polices (Ling Wong 1999, 2000) and various local community groups and interests apply pressure on heritage practitioners and government agencies alike (Hall 1999; Littler and Naidoo 2004). Throughout the world a range of interests are also highly active in challenging traditional heritage practices or reworking new understandings of heritage (Hayden 1997; Shackel 2001). A number of issues are raised in these critiques; of particular note is the issue that traditional and authorized definitions of heritage tell nationalizing stories that simply do not reflect the cultural or social experiences of subaltern groups. This is problematic as it discounts the historical legitimacy of the experiences of these communities and thus the social, cultural and/or political roles they play in the present are ignored or trivialized. It also helps to obfuscate continuing social inequities and perpetuates social and political marginalization (see, for instance, Langford 1983; Fourmile 1989a, 1989b; Ling Wong 1999; Deloria 1992; Watkins 2001, 2003; Littler and Naidoo 2004). In addition, definitions of heritage that stress its materiality also fail to acknowledge non-material or intangible forms of heritage, and thus the resources or processes used in sub-national group identity work are denied or marginalized (Teather and Chow 2003: 115). Yet another issue is that the 'conserve as found' mentality means that more active interactions and engagements with heritage become problematic as community groups attempt to step out of the passive role of the

heritage 'visitor' defined within the AHD. This issue is often raised in tensions over the use of sites like Stonehenge by alternative religious groups (Chippindale 1985, 1986; Bender 1992, 1998; Skeates 2000) or in the use of historic battlefields by re-enactment groups (Hewison 1987: 83; Beidler 1999; Sutton 2001) or the repainting of Aboriginal rock art sites in Australia by their Indigenous cultural owners (see Mowljarlai and Peck 1987; Bowdler 1988), amongst other examples.

The so-called 'post-modern' concern with multi-vocality has also facilitated the acknowledgement of divergent and multiple conceptualizations of history and heritage within academic and public policy contexts. For instance, research by historians Rosenzweig and Thelen (1998) in the United States reveals a significant difference in the ways Euro-Americans and African-Americans and Indigenous-Americans understand and use history. Their research demonstrates that Euro-Americans tend to see the past within the context of a national and authorized narrative, while for many of the African- and Indigenous-Americans surveyed a more community and family orientated sense of history was expressed, which, unsurprisingly, often stood in opposition to the national narrative. A similar survey in Australia has also found that many people engage with history at a far more personal and engaged level than previously understood (Ashton 2005). In England, a MORI (2000) poll commissioned by English Heritage surveyed public attitudes to heritage, which also revealed that many Black and Asian British people saw traditional definitions of heritage and its association with national narratives as irrelevant to them. The response to both agitation by community organizations and other interest groups, and the increasing realization of competing conceptualizations of heritage, have seen many government heritage agencies and amenity societies initiate policies for greater community participation in the ways the past is understood and used. One such response is the 'social inclusion/exclusion' policies of the current British Labour government, responses that are expressed in similar terms or as 'outreach programmes' in other European countries and the United States (Newman and McLean 1998, 2004; Newman 2005) and as community participation in Australia.

However, what I want to suggest here is that these policies too often tend to be assimilationist and top-down in nature rather than bottom-up substantive challenges to the AHD. In the first instance, these policies and debates are often framed in terms of how excluded groups may be recruited into existing practices, and how may non-traditional visitors be attracted or encouraged to visit existing heritage sites. Laudable, as far as they go – but this creates a conceptual framework that heritage practitioners must simply add the excluded and assimilate them into the fold rather than challenge underlying preconceptions. As Pendlebury et al. (2004: 23) observe, 'merely enabling more people to enjoy heritage, or extending how it is defined to recognize the diversity of society, does not in itself challenge power relations

and control over the process by which heritage is defined and managed.' Community consultation undertaken without an active sense of negotiation between community understandings and values and those of practitioners can simply become gestural politics. As I have argued elsewhere (2004), a critical and engaged understanding of the power and authority of competing heritage discourses, and the relative power and authority that underpins them, is necessary before negotiation can commence. However, this is not easy as the AHD naturalizes a sense of the legitimacy of traditional definitions of heritage, which are institutionalized in heritage legislation, and national and international government and amenity policy documents. Heritage practitioners who may wish to challenge the AHD must walk a perilous tightrope between those community groups they may wish to support or concede knowledge and experience to, and those that, for a range of political and cultural reasons, they may wish to challenge and exclude.

Heritage practitioners are required to adopt an overt political agenda in defining which groups and interests they seek to support and those they challenge (Schadla-Hall 2004). For instance, some practitioners may wish to support the aspirations of locally geographically defined communities, or support issues that address such things as ethnic, gender and/or class inequality. However, they may also wish to actively challenge creationist view points, or those who may wish to exclude view points that ignore the role of class, gender and other contentious issues in the history and experiences of the past, or may wish to challenge the value of some heritage to local communities. The overt political nature of supporting (or otherwise) community and other interests is viewed as particularly problematic within the bureaucratic processes of heritage management and conservation, based as they are on the ideologies of the impartiality of expertise. Subsequently, the issue of community participation in framing and implementing heritage practices teeters between a desire to include and a hesitancy to surrender or reduce the authority of both the AHD and the heritage practitioners to wield it, and to recognize the inherently political and discordant nature of heritage.

The other strand of critique examined here is that centred on the advent of mass tourism, which in Britain has been led by historians Wright (1985, 1991) and Hewison (1981, 1987, 1991). Both saw increasing mass interest in heritage as a symptom of a backward-looking country, in which a nostalgic yearning for better times had stifled cultural innovation and development, and was itself an expression of a loss in cultural confidence and overall cultural decline. Hewison (1987) identified what he called a 'heritage industry', which he argued offered sanitized, false and inauthentic history to a gullible audience of heritage tourists.

For Wright (1985, 1991: 45f.), in particular, the elitist nature of heritage was particularly alarming. One symptom of the retarding gaze of heritage he identified was the post-war increase in the mobilization of public interest in country houses, alongside the growth of country house visiting. This

phenomenon was an expression of the degree to which certain versions of the past were being reinforced and propagated. He noted (1985: 22) that, 'in a world where the social hierarchy has lost its settled nature, it is not so surprising that old forms of security become alluring', while going on to note that in the traditional mode of 'upstairs/downstairs' life the distinct divisions between servants and 'family' offered a certain comforting authority for modern life. In this process, the social values of the elites were argued as actively being preserved as part of a politically conservative backlash to prevent cultural and social change in the present and future (see also Lowenthal 1985; Hewison 1987: 53; Walsh 1992). Heritage was thus identified as part of a conservative backlash against post-war social and economic change.

Visitor surveys, as Prentice (2005: 249) reports, have continually demonstrated a disproportionately middle class profile of participants in heritage tourism (see also Merriman 1991), further fuelling the sense that heritage is an elite concern presenting social messages only of relevance to the socially and economically comfortable. It was also these classes that were leading the gentrification of deindustrialized urban areas and the reinforcement of various aesthetic values through conspicuous heritage consumption added to the sense of self-referential and self-congratulatory social politics of the time (Urry 1995). In Britain, heritage became synonymous with right-wing politics and entrepreneurialism, with some commentators associating it with Thatcherite cultural and social control and free market enterprise (Shanks and Tilley 1987; Corner and Harvey 1991; Dicks 2000a: 33). Samuel noted that heritage had been characterized as 'Thatcherism in period dress' (1994: 290). Certainly, Urry (1996: 52) is correct in observing that the dominant trend in British heritage is to make history 'safe, sterile and shorn of danger, subversion and seduction'. As Wright (1985, 1991) observed, these tendencies were not confined to Britain, but became more pervasive during the cultural, economic, and political climates of Britain during the 1980s. Three social trends may be associated with this. Firstly, it may be a symptom of the insecurity of England's sense of national identity, tied as it is to the collective 'Britain' and the imperial history and loss of imperial identity that Union now represents (Daniels 1993: 3; Colley 1999; Lumley 2005: 15).

Secondly, this national angst is coupled with a greater hesitation in recognizing post-imperial multiculturalism, and there has been greater public tensions and debates about multicultural issues in post-colonial countries than has occurred in England (see also Barthel 1996). Thirdly, England takes a certain pride in the degree to which it perceives itself to have greater continuity in cultural traditions, institutions and expressions than other European nations, which have more frequently and directly been subject to wars and revolutions. This sense of cultural pride in social and cultural continuity is well demonstrated by the Duke of Norfolk in his foreword to *The Cambridge Illustrated Dictionary of British Heritage*:

> I have often pointed out that, although we are part of Christendom and have taken part in so many of the activities of our European neighbours, such as the Crusades and the Renaissance, our heritage of buildings (castles, palaces, country houses, cathedrals and, indeed, whole towns) has not suffered to the same extent from the destruction that took place across the English Channel owing to the wars and revolutions that have ravaged their lands. Many of our political, legal, educational, and economic institutions too, have survived many centuries with little change. We can indeed be proud of our continuity, which is well illustrated by the fact that our Queen can provide direct descent from the Saxon King, Cerdic, who died in 534 AD.
>
> (Norfolk 1987: vii; see Pearce 1989: 124, for similar sentiments)

Whatever the cause, Hewison, Wright and others hit a chord in English public and academic debate, and the idea of 'heritage' in England took on an uncomfortable and problematic edge in public policy debate thereafter, with English Heritage in recent years reinventing 'heritage' as the 'historic environment'. What Lowenthal (1998: 100) defines as the 'antiheritage animus' is not confined to debates amongst British historians, but is internationally pervasive in the heritage critical literature. The concern that 'heritage', and/or its commodification as an economic and cultural resource, inherently stifles cultural creativity, encourages reactionary nostalgia and a consensual view of history while focusing public cultural attention backward is conspicuous in the international literature (see, for instance, Bickford 1981, 1983; Beckman 1993, cited in Hjemdahl 2002: 106; McCrone et al. 1995; Schouten 1995; Brett 1996; Lowenthal 1998; Choay 2001; Knecht and Niedermüller 2002; Gable and Handler 2003; Debary 2004). Likewise, critiques about the sanitization of history for the sake of tourism revenue and the emphasis on historical titillation as a form of tourism experience are prevalent (Smith et al. 1992; Hollinshead 1997; Waitt 2000; Rowan and Baram 2004).

Authenticity has become a central issue, and the rising interest in reconstructions and on-site dramatizations further fuels concern over the degree to which heritage may move away from the authority of historical texts and archaeological fact, and spill into the so-called 'heritage theme park'. Although the search for cultural 'authenticity' is understood to paradoxically drive the tourist experience while also constructing cultural experiences that must undermine it (MacCannell 1973, 1999; Harkin 1995), the tourism literature has begun to question the nature of traditional accounts of 'authenticity' and authentic experiences. Commentators within tourism studies have suggested that tourists may understand authenticity entirely differently than it is traditionally defined and understood within the AHD, with its emphasis on inherent material qualities. Instead, they have begun to stress the idea of

emotional and experiential authenticity (Prentice 1998, 2001; McIntosh and Prentice 1999, 2004). This is discussed more fully in Chapter 2; however, a particular problem here is that the tourism literature invariably frames all discussions of this thorny issue in terms of marketing and consumption, which many researchers of the humanities and social science disciplines that intersect with heritage issues often see as intellectually simplistic, and thus of little intellectual utility. It is worth noting that, as Tribe (1997) observes, not all tourism studies are so simplistic, though they are nonetheless often seen as such.

While the heritage industry critique warns against some cultural and socially stultifying and reactionary uses of heritage, its critical utility in advancing debates about the nature and use of heritage is limited. This is because it tends to assume that all 'heritage' innately invokes a sense of nostalgia. 'Nostalgia' is commonly assumed to be intrinsically conservative, and is seen as synonymous with a plea for social continuity, often in the face of change or in response to a sense of social loss (Grainge 1999: 623). There is, however, nothing inherently reactionary nor right wing or indeed progressive and left wing in the idea of heritage. It may be inherently conservative, but not necessarily with a capital C. Its sense of conservation can resonate with ideologies of 'it was better back then', but equally may engage with more critical and challenging social values and experiences. Rafael Samuel (1994), in response to the heritage critique, demonstrates that heritage does far more, and is employed in far more progressive and socially diverse ways, than has been generally admitted to in the British heritage literature. Indeed he argued that 'so far from heritage being the medium through which a Conservative vision of the national past becomes hegemonic, one could see its advent as part of a sea-change in view of the national past – liberal, radical or Conservative in tatters' (1994: 281). Some of the diverse ways heritage is used and expressed are explored more fully in later chapters; however, it is important to note here that the totalizing critique offered by the 'heritage industry' literature is itself problematic. By identifying all heritage as either elitist and/or commercially inspired pastiche, little conceptual room is made for alternative uses of heritage, or for identifying the roles that disciplines like history and archaeology play in the constitution and legitimization of heritage. Lowenthal (1998: 104) has quite correctly argued that heritage and history (and for which we could also add archaeology) 'serve quite different purposes' and thus are not the same. However, this does not mean that disciplines such as history and archaeology can identify themselves as bystanders in the development of heritage narratives. As Hollinshead (1997: 179) points out: 'sanctioned history remains tilted to the story-lines of the privileged: in practice, that is perhaps history, by definition.'

The reaction to the development of mass visitation or heritage tourism in the 1970s also hints at disciplinary boundary marking. There is a sense that emerges in this literature that mass interest in the past is *inherently* negative.

As people engage with 'heritage' (however we define it), a conceptual 'intermediary' enters the equation and the public become 'once removed' from the pronouncements about history and the past made by the disciplines of history and archaeology. In this critique, heritage audiences are, as in the AHD, defined as passive, if not dupes, of the heritage industry (Samuel 1994: 267). The public are unknowingly manipulated by tourism marketing, as they are not under the direct supervision of historical or other intellectually-sanctioned expertise. This is not to say that the Wright and Hewison critique does not have some application to various heritage scenarios as demonstrated in Chapter 4; however, it is simply not the full story. Further, the concern with authenticity and commodification, and the identification of 'heritage' with social and political reaction, share all too much conceptual ground with the AHD, which leaves the significance of 'heritage' at an intellectual impasse between the AHD and the heritage industry critique.

Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to map out the discursive field of heritage, and has identified the authorized or dominant discourse against which a range of dissenting and subaltern discourses interact. The authorized discourse of heritage creates a particular set of cultural and social practices that have certain legacies in the context of late modernity. It is now the task of the rest of the book to examine the consequences of the existence of the authorized discourse and to illuminate the social relations it both reflects and constructs and the ways in which it is challenged and subverted. For the purpose of the arguments developed in this volume, the characterization of the authorized discourse as reflecting the grand narratives of nation and aesthetics, and as bolstering and privileging expert and professional judgements and stewardship over 'the past', has tended to stress overarching themes and skated over more nuanced aspects of the discourse. Certainly, the authorized discourse as I have characterized it will vary over time and will reflect and give particular emphasis to differing elements in different cultural contexts in the West (see, for instance, Chapter 5). However, the identification of a historically, institutionally and politically situated discourse is useful for identifying the ways in which certain understandings about the nature and meaning of heritage have been excluded in heritage practices, and the consequences this exclusion has had for the expression of cultural and social identity. Its identification also helps to understand the nature of 'heritage' itself as a social process concerned with the creation and maintenance of certain social and cultural values.

As this chapter illustrates, the discourse of heritage not only establishes who has the power or 'responsibilities' to define and 'speak for' the past, but is also a process that continually creates and recreates a range of social relations, values and meanings about both the past and present. The authorized

discourse is itself a form of 'heritage' in that it legitimizes and defines the identities of a range of social actors and mediates the social relations between them, while also defining and legitimizing values that underpin those relations. Understanding the discursive element of heritage – the way ideas about 'heritage' are constructed and legitimated – also facilitates the identification of the philosophical and conceptual barriers that may exist in either recognizing or in engaging with competing or excluded forms of 'heritage'. Chapter 2 takes up the challenge offered by the analysis of the authorized heritage discourse and attempts to develop an idea of 'heritage' that takes us beyond the conceptual field provided by both the authorized discourse and the heritage industry critique.