

Whose Sense of Place? Reconciling Archaeological Perspectives with Community Values: Cultural Landscapes in England

Emma Waterton

Like other forms of heritage, landscape provides a vital repository of cultural meaning in relation to identity, belonging and sense of place. Despite this, the process of heritage management tends to obscure these links between landscapes and communities, and is thus neglectful of the experiences, perspectives and recollections that both individuals and groups bring to their engagement with heritage. This paper draws on the Hareshaw Linn community project to illustrate the diverse ways in which communities construct relationships with landscape. This case study serves as a reminder that the heritage management process cannot usefully be reduced to the technical and scientific practice it is often assumed to be, as it is often both emotional and conflict ridden. In light of this, it is essential to question why landscape is underplayed in legislation and public policy, and this necessarily entails the exploration of issues such as ownership, power, knowledge and 'public' heritage.

Keywords: Cultural Heritage Management; Cultural Landscape; Community Values; Ownership; Power/Knowledge; Identity; Sense of Place; Archaeology

Recent emphasis on the political and ethical responsibilities of Cultural Heritage Management (CHM) has prompted attempts to reconsider the management process itself. Perhaps most notably it has been those debates emerging from post-colonial nations that have triggered such a staunch questioning of the theoretical frameworks that support and inform the management process. While such contexts have allowed a mix of circumstances ripe for unpacking ideas of 'universal applicability' and the

Emma Waterton, University of York. Correspondence to: emmawaterton@yahoo.co.uk

certainty of Western modes of knowledge, this line of questioning has seldom been extended into Western settings. These debates, however, should not be confined to post-colonial nations alone, as they raise issues that carry a broader relevance. For example, notions of ownership, control, power, knowledge, stewardship and 'the public' have been subjected to renewed interest and reconsideration. Importantly, however, such debates have worked not only to recast particular concepts but have also prompted a critical reflection on what it actually means to manage heritage. This paper attempts to pick up the challenge of utilising both these reworked concepts and a re-imagined management process, and to examine them through the critical analysis of a concrete case study in the UK—the Hareshaw Linn community project in Bellingham, Northumberland. In particular, this research centres on the conflict that surrounds the concept of 'cultural landscapes', and attempts to reconcile dominant archaeological perspectives of 'landscape' with a broader, postmodern-inspired understanding of heritage as experienced through 'landscape'.¹ Here, the concept of 'landscape' oscillates between the dominance of aesthetic and scientific values within heritage protection, and an understanding that invariably draws in intangible associations such as identity, social history and a sense of place, thus providing an important focus for local communities.² The case study is thus able to illustrate the interaction of two discordant views regarding heritage, and presents an opportunity to explore the ways in which these are encountered within current management frameworks, particularly in terms of how one of these works to counter and foreclose the other. It also provides a useful slate upon which to assess current political engagements with a broader social agenda, such as the recent policy emphasis on social inclusion and efforts to capitalise on the apparent links between community cohesion and cultural heritage. While this union is sound in theory, questions need to be asked as to how this policy actually unfolds in concrete situations.

Drawing on the arguments outlined above, the intention of this article is theoretically to refashion the expert–community relationship and attempt to open an opportunity for constructing understandings of landscape previously marginalised by dominant expressions of science and materiality. Through the introduction of the Hareshaw Linn case study, a series of arguments will be developed that can usefully be applied to the broader management process. Essentially, this is due to the opportunity this case study offers for examining the discursive conflict that underpins current management directions. This struggle will be illustrated by first developing a broad understanding of the history of archaeological theory, and counter-posing this against the emergence of a distinct, local appreciation of how to manage and interact with landscape. Together, the two provide substance for a sustained analysis.

Why and for Whom? The Hareshaw Linn Community Project

The Hareshaw Linn community project provides the circumstances within which to discuss the parameters of heritage management in both theory and practice. It draws from a community project in Bellingham, which lies just within the Northumberland National Park, in northern England, and is thus subject to the principles set out in the

Environment Act of 1995.³ This act places a duty on National Park Authorities aimed at 'conserving and enhancing natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Park' and 'promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of [the] areas by the public'. Using a National Park as a basis for analysis presents a special set of circumstances, because their remit incorporates both natural and cultural elements under one common authority. The Hareshaw Linn has been managed under the authority of the National Park since 1974, with the principle objective of maintaining the natural and scientifically important elements of the landscape, particularly the ancient semi-natural deciduous woodlands making up the Linn. These were scheduled by the Nature Conservation Council in 1974 by virtue of 'special scientific interest' and awarded Grade 2 status in the 1977 Nature Conservation Review.⁴ At the base of the Linn lie the remnants of a dam, once utilised to power the Hareshaw Iron Works, both of which were in operation during the 1830s and 1840s, and are now Scheduled Ancient Monuments.⁵ However, the key feature to emerge from this project sidesteps these nationally recognised elements and settles instead on a special sense of place, raising issues that question perceptions about landscapes and their use.

The Northumberland National Park Management Plan (NNPMP) is guided by national policy that explicitly defines 'heritage' as ancient archaeological remains, sites and historic structures, and thus largely conceives of landscape in terms of the role it plays as a setting or backdrop for these remains, structures or sites.⁶ The time-depth this framing brings with it is clear: 'heritage' is to be defined more closely in line with the impressions it has of the past, as opposed to the impressions it may leave in the present. As such, the idea of heritage, and thus landscapes, as a process in itself is overlooked.⁷ The term 'landscape', in this paper, is not the formally recognised categorisations already found in both English national and international policy documents, such as 'historic landscapes', or 'areas of natural beauty' or 'national parks', as such. Rather, it is the fact that some landscapes are imbued with an association that takes them under the umbrella term of 'heritage'. This is much in the way that some, but not all, buildings become heritage places; and some, but not all, songs carry whispers of identity and cultural meaning; and some, but not all, objects portray a powerful message of cultural belonging. As such, 'landscape' is here categorised to some extent, but only in a very loose sense so as to trigger an awareness and recognition of the contrast between policy and practice. Indeed, the role and importance landscapes have for communities is often underplayed by a rather one-sided focus, made up of the sum of bounded spaces defined in archaeological terms.⁸ Importantly, however, the NNPMP places great emphasis on local communities, and while there is no real legal framework for funding or defining development, the Northumberland National Park Authority (NNPA) began to engage seriously with the local community following the Hareshaw Linn project. Using this as a case in point, discussions about the reality of the relationships between landscape and communities can take place, and an argument for their inclusion in definitions of what constitutes heritage can take form. One important point from this overview must be extracted: while the National Park has made attempts to engage with issues of community aspirations and wider heritage values, there is no legal framework to support this impetus. This suggests that a larger dialogue still needs

to be opened—one that adequately incorporates an analysis of how the discourse underpinning wider national policy is constructed and legitimised.

Ideally, then, this case study situates discussions at precisely that point at which a top-down approach to management is met with a bottom-up understanding of ‘heritage’. It thus provides an opportunity to examine the consequences of top-down management, and does so with a particular emphasis on questioning the utility of ‘expert cultures’ and non-participatory policy-making strategies. In terms of heritage management, such issues are rehearsed in debates surrounding ideas of ‘stewardship’, ‘ownership’, ‘responsibility’ and ‘ethics’, which are perhaps more forcibly translated into the language of ‘control’. However, to understand the emergence of such debates it is necessary first to develop a sense of the history of archaeological thought, particularly with reference to the ways in which a specific ‘way of seeing’ has come to underpin dominant approaches to management.

Enlightenment’s Wake: Developing a Conservation Ethic

In terms of management and definition, landscapes are perceived predominantly in aesthetic, objectified terms based on the assumption that nature is something separate from culture. This idea is reflected in both national and international policy-making institutions, such as the divisions between English Heritage and English Nature in England as a national example, and the Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage of 1972, as an international example. Although the latter has certainly made attempts to overcome this distinction with the addition of the category for cultural landscapes, particularly ‘associative landscapes’, both continue to illustrate the implicit or hidden transcripts that have become embedded within, and disseminated by, dominant, scientific, archaeological discourse.

As such, perhaps the most useful way to address the issue of landscape-as-culture is to do so while also considering the historical context that prompted the relationship between science and archaeology, and consider how this ‘scientific’ archaeology has, in turn, influenced the management process. This situates discussions temporally and spatially within the intellectual revolutions roughly covering the 18th century in Western Europe, when modern philosophy, social theory and positivist science emerged.⁹ During the Enlightenment, certain schools of thought promoted the belief that people could be masters of destiny, thus firmly overlaying medieval perceptions with meta-narratives espousing progress, reason and objectivity.¹⁰ From this, the world came to be envisaged as something that could be apprehended and manipulated by the pervasive autonomy of people.¹¹ This autonomy equipped the mind with a persistent but unhelpful cluster of dichotomies that pushed knowledge in new directions: nature/culture; man/woman; subject/object and fact/value distinctions, which developed alongside notions of cultural superiority and ideas of linear and non-repeatable time. These concepts have endured, allowing dominant, scientific approaches to hang time within a seemingly unproblematic and straightened linear sequence with clearly definable epochs, but failing to grasp the inner, subjective qualities of social, ritual and sacred meaning.¹²

These ideas formed anchoring principles for theories of racial superiority, and worked to legitimise colonial and imperialist enterprises, both of which characterised much of Western Europe at this time. Archaeology, drawing on the authority accredited to this new system of thought, established itself as a developing discipline with a fundamentally scientific research agenda concerned with the origins of people and society.¹³ The conjunction of science, theories of evolution and progress proved an instrumental mix, culminating in the belief that Europeans were the most biologically and culturally advanced culture, which in turn lent itself to the development of competition among European countries.¹⁴ The uptake of a conservation ethic at this time revolved around this competitive edge, and thus predictably sought to register the monumentality of a highly civilised nation. This historical thread of nationalist sentiment continued, and was supplemented by a recurring reference to conservation philosophy, particularly that of William Morris and John Ruskin. Here, concepts of authenticity and aesthetics gained precedence, affirming the idea of inherent value, 'conserve as found' and the focus of future generations as the inheritors of 'heritage'. New avenues of knowledge were opened in order to deal with this emerging sense of 'heritage'. These 'expert cultures' rehearsed developments occurring in wider societal areas, and are not a reflection of archaeology alone. Indeed, the increased scale of change that faced society at this time prompted the growth of a trust in systems that took the form of abstracted and faceless committees.¹⁵ This idea of the 'expert' has created a gap between 'heritage', 'management' and 'people', allowing the imprint left by the latter to be diluted in comparison to the other two, and thus the particularities of interaction with heritage objects, acts, places and landscapes remain surprisingly muted.

The historical context briefly outlined above weaves together a number of threads that are still discernible in current management frameworks. These threads are illustrative of wider impulses in favour of positivist science and the ideas of truth this discourse brought with it. The relevance of this discussion thus lies with the internal restructuring of archaeology in the 1960s, which saw the logical-positivist epistemology of the New Archaeology, or processual archaeology, gain prominence. Importantly, this period also saw the general acceptance of CHM, which inevitably absorbed this specific structuring of knowledge. While many of these issues have been expanded by Smith,¹⁶ a number of these points warrant revisiting here. It was with this uptake of the processual epistemology and ontology that archaeological investigations began to circulate around processes of observation, hypothesis testing and the search for generalities. Essentially, these investigations embraced an empiricist conviction that 'legitimate knowledge is properly grounded in experience', culminating in a different kind of understanding regarding the past, which should be approached as a 'problem-orientated testing program'.¹⁷ The seduction of this approach was twofold, beginning firstly with its ability confidently to provide objective statements about the past and, secondly, the identity this supplied the archaeological discipline.¹⁸ The advantages that came with this scientific image cannot be understated; indeed, it allowed the discipline to gain intellectual respectability, expertise and authority from the power structures already grounded in the scientific paradigm.¹⁹

This issue of power is illustrated by the Hareshaw Linn community project, which is used in this paper to describe a concrete example of how many communities and people do not necessarily share the attempts of positivist science to compartmentalise the world. This argument is developed with particular reference to the associations ascribed to a specific tract of land adjacent to the village of Bellingham, which has become an integral part of a cultural process that carries the powerful ability to interact simultaneously with past and present. The Hareshaw Linn offers insight into the ways by which the dominant archaeological discourse fails to accommodate a situation in which the past mingles with the present in a series of durations.²⁰ This idea has been developed by Ingold, who suggests that just as we can move from place to place in the landscape, 'likewise we can move from one present to another, without having to break through any chronological barriers' separating one time from the next.²¹ Therefore, landscapes cannot be objects simply understood, but instead exist as living, social processes with the ability to generate values through a community's knowledge of the past.²² It is never complete and is perpetually under construction, and thus can never be satisfactorily relegated to just one past or another, or one present.²³ Further, 'people inhabiting and experiencing the landscape no longer stand outside it ... on the contrary, they are just as much a part of the landscape they live in as are the so-called "natural" features.'²⁴

In this, the creation and maintenance of a sense of identity involves cultural work, and in accepting that identities change over time it is also necessary to acknowledge that the management process must change with them.

Cultural Landscapes: Community Values versus Dominant Management Strategies

Until this point, only more abstract notions of landscape have been discussed, which have remained separate from the practical dimensions of heritage management. Away from the lumps and bumps of real-life landscapes it is an easy task to theorise, deconstruct and redefine landscape into distinct parcels of 'culture', 'history', 'environment', 'prehistory', 'associations' and 'nature', but what is happening in routine practice? The Hareshaw Linn project began as an exercise to restore a Victorian cobbled walkway, and a series of six bridges that allow the path to wend its way alongside the Linn, crossing the burn at several stages and passing through diverse surroundings. Originally, the NNPM project focused on the conservation and enhancement of the 'semi-natural' woodland habitat, and allocated few resources for aspects that deviated from this remit, aside from maintenance of existing facilities.²⁵ However, following local consultation, this seemingly simple project spiralled exponentially. The project, named 'White Water, Green Shade', intended to renovate the dam, manage the woodland, undertake an oral history project and present a creative interpretation of the Linn, pulling in a number of local groups and individuals in intense public consultation.²⁶

'White Water, Green Shade' thus provided significant material for gathering together a sense of the role played by the Hareshaw Linn in terms of the local community. It also provided a deeper sense of the Bellingham community itself, allowing the somewhat homogeneous term 'community' to develop into a layering of groups and

individuals, thereby expressing a complex account of Bellingham social life.²⁷ The results of this initiative produced a number of reports, recommendations, newsletters, management strategies and, importantly, transcripts of 24 oral history recordings, which together provided both historical and contemporary sources from which to gain an insight into the context of the project. Of particular relevance within these sources is the consistent reference made to an undertone of collective resistance, illuminated by a sceptical unease with the power relations that have historically marginalised and disempowered local values and interests. This has sometimes been expressed as disassociation:

The Linn is nothing like it used to be when the local people had it. Since the National Park bought it it's gone down. The local people would hold dances to raise money for the up keep ... The National Park is a sore point around here.²⁸

Used to run up there ... Don't walk so much because it's advertised in the National Parks as a public walk ... get lots of people up there in summer so tend not to go up.²⁹

Reluctance to participate was thus driven by a distrust arising from general dissatisfaction that ownership was thought to belong with the National Park, and not the local community.³⁰ This can be glimpsed in discussions about 'developing a sense of place', an objective that rather patronisingly assumed that this had not already been established by the community, and significantly overlooked the role this piece of landscape has played in the lives of the community, past and present.³¹ Perhaps the most telling element of this project was the oral history project carried out by Susan Mitchell, which was able clearly to illustrate how deeply embedded the Linn is in the culture of the Bellingham community, who see it as being enhanced through their interactions, and vice versa.³² While it is essential to remain aware of the biases that can occur during oral history collection, reminiscing and memory work, Mitchell points out that it is also important to acknowledge that there is a reality if collective memory is unanimous. Certainly it was here, as the comments gathered from the local community will attest, providing a vivid and tangible reminder of the importance the Linn plays:

Our own children played up the Linn, much the same way as we did. Except they didn't pick things. That bit at the bottom of the Linn was the spot, spent a lot of time playing in there, paddling and having a picnic, even the grandchildren play.³³

Going up the Linn, would play up there, go for walks ... exciting, in the winter. Would go up to the top of the hill and sledge all the way down ... can't remember going up with the school ... they go up with the school now. The bridges have all been put right.³⁴

The oral history testaments are supplemented by local commentary surrounding the creative elements of the project, including a local play production and a sculpture coordinated by the youth group:

Hareshaw Linn has been central to the life of the Bellingham community as long as people can remember. People have played, worked and partied there. Children have run dares over the dams; men have dug iron ore out of the ground and families have picnicked there ... It is a very special place, with a valley so damp and lush it is almost tropical and a waterfall that plunges through a spectacular gorge.³⁵

The Linn and its resources served many uses, embracing pragmatic, recreational and spiritual elements, including food and fuel sources, freedom and a place of magic.³⁶ The deep sense of place that can clearly be seen to have permeated past community life continues to mould the way in which the Bellingham community engages with the world in which they live today:

On the days up the Linn we didn't bother about taking food ... popped back if you got hungry ... would eat wild strawberries or raspberries. Always a season for rose hips ... if you wanted to make a bit of money you would take them to a cottage and get 2d for a pound. Just lived off the land.³⁷

Father used to take them up to collect [nuts] ... Have taken grandchildren nutting ... Don't think the Linn has changed a lot ... The stepping stones were instead of a bridge ... perhaps it was the second big flood ... must have gone up in the winter because can remember the icicles hanging. A magic place.³⁸

Such commentary reveals how a tract of land can characterise a particular area, define a locality and emphasise the need to belong and identify with a place, demonstrating the articulation of social and natural.³⁹ Access to the Linn is an important issue, and is emphatic of how deeply embedded it is in local culture. This idea is exemplified throughout the totality of actions and cultural work put into the Hareshaw Linn community project, in which the idea of the Linn as a 'community' sanctuary is clearly discernible, with one person saying they would never see it the same again.⁴⁰

One respondent⁴¹ recalls '[knowing] every tree at the beginning of the Linn', and others⁴² tell stories about certain features, using their environment, and holding an unspoken knowledge that dictated what could and could not be done to the Linn.

There [are] lots of plants up the Linn ... can remember the wild garlic ... lots of it. Go up a couple of times a year. Very happy memories of Hareshaw Linn ... not everywhere has a place like that.⁴³

Did the schools go up the Linn? Yes they did ... for nature walks ... to teach us about nature, but we knew because we lived it ... we knew more than they did.⁴⁴

This commentary exposes the cultural manifestations that are engaged with the landscape, and, importantly, highlights the potential for the emergence of tensions and a faltering of identity if these manifestations are not accorded the same importance in policy. The Bellingham community project provides an opportunity to acknowledge the associations vested in landscape, and thus dismiss the persistent conviction that it exists as an 'innate and immutable essence'.⁴⁵ The depth of identity drawn from the Linn surely parallels that ascribed to any given monument, discrete archaeological site or building, and must therefore present a powerful argument for re-evaluating the basic categories that underpin 'heritage' in both national and international policy and legislation. This move, however, needs to be made in tandem with a greater movement within the wider management process itself. It is thus an opportunity to broaden the scope of heritage beyond that of material and tangible elements, and engage as well with the values, meanings and aspirations that are symbolised and represented by that heritage.⁴⁶ In this way, landscape will become more than a physical backdrop:

Hareshaw Linn is special not only because it is a beautiful part of the landscape with some rare wildlife, but because it has played an important role in so many people's lives.⁴⁷

This case study reaffirms the idea that 'there can only be one valid reason for conserving heritage: they are valued by elements of a community, by a whole community, or by our society as a whole'.⁴⁸ But to make this statement real we must seriously question the relationship that exists between people and place, and do so by applying our assumptions and theories to real and everyday situations that use people, their words and their circumstances. This is a lesson learnt by the NNPA, which has established a new 'way of seeing' heritage following the Hareshaw Linn community project, epitomised by the park's new vision:

Northumberland National Park Authority will be proactive, innovative and forward-looking, working towards a National Park with thriving communities and a sustainable local economy grounded in its special qualities, including a richness of cultural heritage and biodiversity, a true sense of tranquillity and a distinct character associated with a living, working landscape, in which everyone has an opportunity to understand, enjoy and contribute to those special qualities.⁴⁹

This vision aims to reconcile previously ineffective liaison arrangements between the authority and local communities, which is continually being improved to create greater dialogue, engagement and feedback.⁵⁰

Discussion: Clearing the Way for Embracing a Wider Landscape

Two distinct directions have been taken so far in this paper, both with the aim of isolating the 'essence' of heritage management, firstly as it is currently practised, and secondly as a view of what it can potentially be. Pausing at this juncture allows us to reflect critically on the current position of the management process, and engage with multiple forms of knowledge including archaeological values, but also incorporating community aspirations. As Casey points out, landscapes hold the power to 'gather' experiences, histories, memories and thoughts, and figures in the way of life of many communities, thus somehow making it a seemingly general and universal category, but emphatically remaining specific and singular to particular locations.⁵¹ Examining the landscape in this light, it is difficult to equate the hills, rivers and woodlands with the remit of nature conservation, as these features cease to be merely familiar and take on, instead, ideological connotations that spill convincingly into the boundaries of cultural heritage. Close inspection of the heritage, identity and landscape suggests that heritage cannot be separated from those communities who are defined by it. However, this relationship is not as transparent or unproblematic as I have thus far suggested, and it must be remembered that any 'heritage' relationship is part of a process, and is thus open to dissonance and conflict, a point indicative of the diversity of identities linked to heritage.⁵² Nor can identity be considered static. Or that with the 'recovery of past' our sense of self will be eternally fixed: instead, identities undergo constant transformations, becoming the 'names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past'.⁵³

Of course, the idea of identity has received considerable attention, especially since the advent of postmodern and post-processual attempts to isolate the individual, or self. Identity has remained a central concept in recent heritage discussions, and it is this occurrence that strikes the greatest paradox when considering the current management process. Where are these issues of identity, ownership and belonging when it comes to the guidelines, assessment processes and definitions used in both national and international designation strategies? How can heritage management move towards inclusion of things that are not things at all, but intangible values stemming from identity and a sense of place if the mechanisms for allowing such opportunities are not put in place? How can the management process move beyond a consideration of how people use the landscape towards understanding why and in what way they value it?⁵⁴

At a base level the failure of the current heritage management process stems from the narrowly conceived definitions used to gauge what heritage actually is, which are informed by dominant assumptions of archaeological science. Neither adequately recognises the role of stakeholders. To do so, the role of stakeholder must be expanded and allowed to encroach upon the terrain of the archaeological steward, thereby also rocking the idea of perceived universal rights and a common heritage: and ultimately, the tendency of filtering heritage and the management process through the privileged hands of a few. This is an argument reminiscent of that developed by Weiner, and later Lahn,⁵⁵ who argue that:

The most important aspect of prized archaeological artefacts is not that these constitute data but that these 'inalienable possessions are the hub around which social identities are displayed, fabricated, exaggerated, modified, or diminished'.⁵⁶

Such that:

The person or group that controls (and thus defines) the movement and meaning of such objects inherits an authority and a power over others.⁵⁷

Heritage, then, has the potential to take on the most 'ancient and powerful economic classification' of inalienable possessions, and archaeologists, as advocates of the past, are able to validate their esoteric position by asserting control over heritage that represents that past.⁵⁸ Those holding a dominant form of knowledge have a greater scope to influence others, to close down other meanings and to arbitrate as to which meanings and values are socially permissible.⁵⁹ Questioning this position takes heritage management into a distinctly uncomfortable area that threatens not only the power of the expert but also the loss of scientific knowledge as 'truth' and a discipline's identity.⁶⁰ Introducing community perspectives is not a solution in itself, as the wider politics of heritage require deeper negotiations between desires to dismantle authoritative roles, yet at the same time a reactionary defence of precisely that authority.⁶¹ Reconciling archaeological perspectives with community values reveals an impasse. A reshuffling of power depends upon our resolve to question, test and explore the underlying assumptions of heritage practice, and develop a process that adequately reflects the needs of those in the present.⁶²

This requires sensitive treatment, as both community and expert knowledge need to find a way to coexist in a negotiated partnership. Largely, this requires an awareness of those knowledge systems that have allowed archaeologists to distance themselves from the political and social acts of archaeology, and embed the multiplicity of voices into the single authoritative voice of archaeologists as stewards.⁶³ It is an argument reminiscent of that begun some 20 years ago by Isabel McBryde and her edited volume *Who Owns the Past?*, and rehearsed numerous times since. These arguments have drawn attention to the knowledge politics that work to alienate the public in terms of ownership and control, and underscore quite significantly the muted success of claims to make archaeology “more relevant” for contemporary needs.⁶⁴ The paradox, of course, is that we have the label ‘public heritage’, but there is no distinct role for ‘the public’ within the management process; rather, more often than not, this role is found at the end of the process, in the form of educational or informational criteria. Instead, the public is largely removed from the equation by a process that enables archaeological and other heritage experts consistently to apply hegemonic understandings of the past by allocating exclusive priority to monumental and scientific values.⁶⁵ The set up of the expert, by this token, makes the process of stepping outside the natural or ‘common-sense’ route to take, both creating and maintaining the idea of the heritage manager as the person best suited to represent different communities and situations.

The Hareshaw Linn case study is able to feed into this debate, but to make the point more emphatic a line must be drawn—one that shies away from making overly universal or general claims. While it seems an easy task to cobble together a number of such examples and from there overemphasise the degree to which people, as a somewhat homogeneous category, engage with heritage, the strength of this argument actually emerges from the diversity of approaches to heritage. This is not a call for the privilege of the expert to be replaced by the privilege of the public as another formless and faceless committee. Rather, it is a call for heritage managers and policy makers to develop a more humanistic approach that seeks to find accountability with the specific interest groups that emerge around an aspect of heritage.⁶⁶ This process of interchanging ideas, values and meanings will not debase either archaeology or heritage management; rather, it will work towards building richer interpretations and understandings that hold value not only for heritage practitioners but also for those people ‘whose identities are affected by what is said about their pasts’.⁶⁷ This echoes the questioning of ownership in the Hareshaw Linn case study, visible in the collective resistance arising from the disempowerment of local values. If we do not move towards the idea of a critical sense of plurality, the balance in favour of scientific, archaeological and other expert knowledges will continue to impose a process of management that will fail to fulfil one of its central tenets—that we conserve cultural heritage because it is valued. In short, heritage acquires value ‘because of, and through, our desires’.⁶⁸ Importantly, this brings with it the assertion that people are not passively needing things done for them but are active subjects with values and judgements relating to heritage that hold validity in their lives. Fundamentally, attention must stay focused on the current political tendency towards greater community involvement, which inevitably brings with it a need to broaden the definition of what constitutes heritage.

Conclusion

This paper has attempted to take advantage of the aligning of an opportunity within heritage studies as a result of increasing questioning and debate regarding the frameworks within which heritage managers operate. This alignment has arisen as a reaction both to broader, global issues that have emerged from post-colonial nations and also in response to recent attempts to make heritage more socially relevant, such as current policy calls for social inclusion and community regeneration. As such, emphasis here has been placed upon understanding the current position of CHM, with particular regard to heritage discourse, and the discursive conflict emerging from the discordance of modernist and postmodernist viewpoints. The difficulty here has been that this subject easily lends itself to the questioning of philosophical underpinnings of the CHM process, rather than just unpacking practical problems to which there are equally practical solutions. It is a problem that remains hinged upon distance. Traditionally, heritage has been confined to the distant past, but the gap between past and present grows ever closer as heritage managers are forced to come to grips with the implications it has in the present. By distancing the expert from real social life, heritage managers have been able to soothe, sanitise and administer heritage to a public largely removed and alienated from the process. However, the contraction of distance has forced issues such as ownership and control to be renegotiated alongside the dismissal of ideas of heritage being a relic confined to the past and accessible only by scientific strategies. Essentially, this arises from the argument that heritage is part of contemporary society, rather than something dead, thereby contradicting the dominant approach that overlooks the workings of heritage and its ability to change and reshape over time.⁶⁹ The management process needs to respond to communities attempting to decide for themselves what constitutes value, and thus what warrants protecting as part of heritage. This resolution will take time, as it involves redefining the limits of universal assumptions, so as to accept the contribution of local communities as valid players in a process that has profound effects on cultural heritage. We must first acknowledge that our judgements are coloured by different contexts and are thus subject to, and should welcome, questioning and investigation. Synthesis, a difficult thing, must take account of a multiplicity of meanings and uses across a number of social axes, and balance these with loaded questions as to 'who decides'. Conflict, then, must be used to blow apart the subtle politics of heritage and lead us towards a dynamic and integrated system of management entered into via negotiation and debate. For this purpose, the Hareshaw Linn community project has provided a clear message of the importance of such self-reflection.

Acknowledgements

The research that forms the basis of this paper was part funded by a University of York Masters Scholarship and my present doctoral research project is funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council. I am extremely grateful to both. Thanks are also due to all those who commented on this paper: Mick Atha, Gary Campbell, Michael Fradley, Sally Huxtable, Rebecca Griffin, Anna Marshall, and Jenny Walker. Special thanks are

extended to Drs Laurajane Smith and Kevin Walsh. Finally, greatest thanks are owed to the generosity of Susan Mitchell, Dr Robert Young and the Bellingham community.

Notes

- [1] Crouch, 'Culture in the Experience of Landscape'.
- [2] Stewart, 'An Occupied Place', 14.
- [3] Northumberland National Park, 'The Hareshaw Linn Project', 1.
- [4] *Ibid.*, 1.
- [5] Northumberland National Park, 'The Hareshaw Linn Project', 1.
- [6] Northumberland National Park Authority, *Management Plan*, 37.
- [7] Ross, 'Landscape as Heritage', 10.
- [8] *Ibid.*
- [9] Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought*, 56; Store, 'The Ownership of Culture', 162; Benton and Craib, *Philosophy of Social Science*, 180.
- [10] Glacken, *Traces on the Rhodian Shore*, 494; Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought*, 57; Johnson, *Archaeology Theory*, 162; Franklin, *Nature and Social Theory*, 19.
- [11] Heidegger, *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, 129; Christians, 'Ethics and Politics in Qualitative Research', 208.
- [12] Artelius, 'The Framework of Pagan Identity', 10; Karlsson, 'Introduction', x; Simmons, *Interpreting Nature*, 11.
- [13] Silberman, 'Promised Lands and Chosen Peoples', 254; Smith and Campbell, 'Governing Material Culture'; Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought*, 61.
- [14] Hides, 'The Genealogy of Material Culture and Cultural Diversity', 36.
- [15] Giddens, *Modernity and Self-identity*; Chourliaraki and Fairclough, *Discourses in Late Modernity*, 73; Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*, 88.
- [16] Smith, *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*, 59. See Smith for an extended discussion of these issues.
- [17] Dark, *Theoretical Archaeology*, 9; Nicholas, 'The Past and Future of Indigenous Archaeology', 34; Tilley, 'Archaeology as Socio-political Action in the Present', 302; Trigger, 'Post-processual Developments in Anglo-American Archaeology', 66; Wylie, *Thinking from Things*, 3.
- [18] Preucel, 'The Philosophy of Archaeology', 19; Smith, 'The Repatriation of Human Remains'; Smith, 'Towards a Theoretical Framework for Archaeological Heritage Management', 65.
- [19] Fritz and Plog, 'The Nature of Archaeological Explanation', 412; Kintz, 'Archaeologists as Intellectuals', 47; Wylie, *Thinking from Things*, 1.
- [20] Olivier, 'Duration, Memory and the Nature of the Archaeological Record', 66.
- [21] Ingold, 'The Temporality of Landscape', 159.
- [22] See Kristiansen, 'Perspectives on the Archaeological Heritage', 27; and Mayne-Wilson, 'Understanding and Managing Cultural Landscapes', 13, for extended discussions of these issues.
- [23] Ingold, 'The Temporality of Landscape', 162.
- [24] Van Dommelen, 'Exploring Everyday Places and Cosmologies', 279.
- [25] Transport for Leisure, *Interpreting the Northumberland National Parks Cultural Heritage*, 4.
- [26] Green, *Hareshaw Linn Interpretive Project Report*, 9.
- [27] S. Mitchell, *Hareshaw Oral History Community Project: Report and Recommendations* (unpublished), Northumberland National Park Authority, Hexham, 1999.
- [28] Respondents 7 and 8, transcript of oral history recording by S. Mitchell, archive tape number HOH/19, p. 2.
- [29] Respondent 2, transcript of oral history recording by S. Mitchell, archive tape number HOH/2, p. 2.
- [30] S. Mitchell, *Hareshaw Oral History Community Project: Report and Recommendations* (unpublished), Northumberland National Park Authority, Hexham, 1999: 6.

- [31] Green, *Hareshaw Linn Interpretive Project Report*, 13.
- [32] *Ibid.*, 21.
- [33] Respondent 4, transcript of oral history recording by S. Mitchell, archive tape number HOH/7, p. 3.
- [34] Respondent 9, transcript of oral history recording by S. Mitchell, archival tape number HOH/22, p. 1.
- [35] White, '£12,000 Windfall for Beauty Spot', *Hexham Courant*, 7 July 2000, 7.
- [36] Respondent 10, transcript of oral history recording by S. Mitchell, archive tape number HOH/24, p. 1.
- [37] Respondent 1, transcript of oral history recording by S. Mitchell, archival tape number HOH/1, p. 1.
- [38] Respondent 6, transcript of oral history recording by S. Mitchell, archival tape number HOH/18, p. 2.
- [39] Allen, 'The Management of the Rural Landscape', 163.
- [40] Green, *Hareshaw Linn Interpretive Project Report*, 21.
- [41] Respondent 6, transcript of oral history recording by S. Mitchell, archival tape number HOH/18, p. 1.
- [42] Respondent 1, transcript of oral history recording by S. Mitchell, archival tape number HOH/1, p. 2.
- [43] Respondent 6, transcript of oral history recording by S. Mitchell, archival tape number HOH/18, p. 1.
- [44] Respondent 3, transcript of oral history recording by S. Mitchell, archival tape number HOH/4, p. 3.
- [45] Gwyn, 'Associative Landscapes in a Welsh Context', 188.
- [46] Smith, *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*, 195.
- [47] White, '£12,000 Windfall for Beauty Spot', *Hexham Courant*, 7 July 2000, 7.
- [48] Pearson and Sullivan, *Looking after Heritage Places*, 17.
- [49] Northumberland National Park Authority, *Management Plan*, 5.
- [50] *Ibid.*, 55.
- [51] Casey, 'How to Get from Space to Place in a Fairly Short Stretch of Time', 32.
- [52] Hall, 'Cultural Identity and Diaspora', 392; see also Graham et al., *A Geography of Heritage*; and Tunbridge and Ashworth, *Dissonant Heritage*.
- [53] Hall, 'Cultural Identity and Diaspora', 304; see also Osbourne, 'Figuring Space, Marking Time', 25.
- [54] See Howard, 'Resonance and Dissonance', 239; and Crouch, 'Culture in the Experience of Landscape', 12, for further discussions.
- [55] Lahn, 'Dressing up the Dead'; Weiner, *Inalienable Possessions*, 17.
- [56] Weiner, *Inalienable Possessions*, 99–100, cited in Lahn, 'Dressing up the Dead', 42.
- [57] Weiner, *Inalienable Possessions*, 10, cited in Lahn, 'Dressing up the Dead', 7.
- [58] Weiner, *Inalienable Possessions*, 17.
- [59] Gosden, 'Endemic Doubt', 806.
- [60] Lahn, 'Dressing up the Dead', 10; see also Smith, *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*.
- [61] Strang, 'An Appropriate Question?', 182; for a fuller discussion of these issues see Zimmerman, 'When Data Becomes People', 69–88; 'Regaining Our Nerve', 71–74; and 'Usurping Native American Voice', 169–184.
- [62] Pearson and Sullivan, *Looking after Heritage Places*, 4; see also Emerick, 'Use, Value and Significance in Heritage Management'; Smith, *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*; Newman and McLean, 'Editorial'; Newman and McLean, 'Heritage Builds Communities'; Russell, 'Towards More Inclusive, Vital Models of Heritage'; Zimmerman, 'When Data Becomes People', for further discussion of this issue.
- [63] Feld and Basso, 'Introduction', 5.

- [64] Smith, *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*, 410.
- [65] McBryde, 'Dream the Impossible Dream', 8; see also Zimmerman, 'When Data Becomes People', 70.
- [66] Zimmerman, 'When Data Becomes People', 83.
- [67] Leone, 'A Historical Archaeology of Capitalism', 264.
- [68] Lahn, 'Dressing up the Dead', 4.
- [69] Tehan, 'To Be or Not to Be (Property)', 281.

References

- Allen, T. 'The Management of the Rural Landscape: A Sense of Place'. In *Managing the Historic Rural Landscape*, edited by J. Grenville. London: Routledge, 1999: 163–72.
- Artelius, S. 'The Framework of Pagan Identity: "Time" in the Southern Scandinavian Late Iron Age'. In *Its About Time: The Concept of Time in Archaeology*, edited by H. Karlsson. Göteborg: Bricoleur Press, 2001: 1–27.
- Benton, T., and I. Craib. *Philosophy of Social Science: The Philosophical Foundations of Social Thought*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001.
- Casey, E. S. 'How to Get from Space to Place in a Fairly Short Stretch of Time: Phenomenological Prolegomena'. In *Senses of Place*, edited by S. Feld and K. H. Basso. Sante Fe: School of American Research Press, 1996: 13–52.
- Chouliaraki, L., and N. Fairclough. *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999.
- Christians, C. G. 'Ethics and Politics in Qualitative Research'. In *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues*, edited by N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 2003: 208–43.
- Crouch, D. 'Culture in the Experience of Landscape'. *Landscape Research* 15, no. 1 (1990): 11–19.
- Dark, K. R. *Theoretical Archaeology*. London: Duckworth, 1995.
- Emerick, K. 'Use, Value and Significance in Heritage Management'. In *Destruction and Conservation of Cultural Property*, edited by R. Layton, P. G. Stone and J. Thomas. London: Routledge, 2001: 276–85.
- Feld, S., and K. H. Basso. 'Introduction'. In *Senses of Place*, edited by S. Feld and K. H. Basso. Sante Fe: School of American Research Press, 1996: 3–12.
- Franklin, A. *Nature and Social Theory*. London: Sage, 2002.
- Fritz, J., and F. Plog. 'The Nature of Archaeological Explanation'. *American Antiquity* 35 (1970): 405–12.
- Giddens, A. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990.
- . *Modernity and Self-identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.
- Glacken, C. *Traces on the Rhodian Shore: Nature and Culture in Western Thought from Ancient Times to the End of the 18th Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.
- Gosden, C. 'Endemic Doubt: Is What we Write Right?' *Antiquity* 66 (1992): 803–08.
- Graham, B., G. J. Ashworth, and J. E. Tunbridge. *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy*. London: Arnold, 2000.
- Green, M. *Hareshaw Linn Interpretive Project Report*. Hexham: NNPA, 2002.
- Gwyn, D. 'Associative Landscape in a Welsh Context'. In *Europe's Cultural Landscapes: Archaeologists and the Management of Change*, edited by G. Fairclough and S. Rippon, EAC Occasional Paper 2. Brussels: Europa Archaeologiae Concilium, 2002: 187–92.
- Hall, S. 'Cultural Identity and Diaspora'. In *Colonial Discourse and Post-colonial Theory: A Reader*, edited by P. Williams and L. Chrismas. Essex: Pearson Education, 1994: 392–403.
- Heidegger, M. *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. New York: Harper, 1977.
- Hides, S. 'The Genealogy of Material Culture and Cultural Diversity'. In *Cultural Identity and Archaeology: The Construction of European Communities*, edited by P. Graves-Brown, S. Jones and P. Gamble. London: Routledge, 1996: 25–47.

- Howard, P. 'Resonance and Dissonance: When the Local and the Global Meet'. In *Heritage and Identity: Shaping the Nations of the North*, edited by J. M. Fladmark. London: Donhead, 2001: 239–49.
- Ingold, T. 'The Temporality of the Landscape'. *World Archaeology* 25, no. 2 (1993): 152–74.
- Johnson, M. *Archaeological Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.
- Karlsson, H. 'Introduction'. In *Its About Time: The Concept of Time in Archaeology*, edited by H. Karlsson. Göteborg: Bricoleur Press, 2001: ix–x.
- Kintz, T. 'Archaeologists as Intellectuals: Agents of the Empire or Defenders of Dissent?' In *The Responsibilities of Archaeologists: Archaeology and Ethics*, edited by M. Pluctennik. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2001: 47–55.
- Kristiansen, K. 'Perspectives on the Archaeological Heritage: History and Future'. In *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*, edited by H. Cleere. London: Routledge, 1989: 23–29.
- Lahn, J. (1996) 'Dressing up the Dead: Archaeology, the Kow Swamp Remains and Some Related Problems with Heritage Management'. In *Issues in Management Archaeology*, edited by L. Smith and A. Clarke. St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1996: 25–31.
- Leone, M. P. 'A Historical Archaeology of Capitalism'. *American Anthropologist* 97, no. 2 (1995): 251–68.
- Mayne-Wilson, W. 'Understanding and Managing Cultural Landscapes'. *Landscape Australia* 23, no. 1 (2001): 10–17.
- McBryde, I. 'Dream the Impossible Dream? Shared Heritage, Shared Values, or Shared Understandings of Disparate Values?' *Historic Environment* 11, nos 2&3 (1995): 8–13.
- Newman, A., and F. McLean. 'Heritage Builds Communities: The Application of Heritage Resources to the Problems of Social Exclusion'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 4, nos 3&4 (1998): 143–53.
- . 'Editorial'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 10, no. 1 (2004): 5–10.
- Nicholas, G. P. 'The Past and Future of Indigenous Archaeology: Global Challenges, North American Perspectives, Australian Prospects'. *Australian Archaeology* 52 (2001): 29–40.
- Northumberland National Park. 'The Hareshaw Linn Project'. In *News*. Hexham: NNPA, 1999.
- Northumberland National Park Authority. *Management Plan, 3rd Review Framework Document: A Secure Future for the Land of the Far Horizons*. Hexham: NNPA, 2003.
- Olivier, L. C. 'Duration, Memory and the Nature of the Archaeological Record'. In *Its About Time: The Concept of Time in Archaeology*, edited by H. Karlsson. Göteborg: Bricoleur Press, 2001: 61–70.
- Osborne, B. S. 'Figuring Space, Marking Time: Contested Identity in Canada'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 2, nos 1&2 (1996): 23–40.
- Pearson, M., and S. Sullivan. *Looking after Heritage Places: The Basics of Heritage Planning for Managers, Landowners and Administrators*. Victoria: Melbourne University Press, 1995.
- Preucel, R. W. 'The Philosophy of Archaeology'. In *Processual and Postprocessual Archaeologies: Multiple Ways of Knowing the Past*, edited by R. W. Preucel. Carbondale: Center for Archaeological Research, 1990: 17–29.
- Ross, A. 'Landscape as Heritage'. In *Issues in Management Archaeology*, edited by L. Smith and A. Clarke. St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1995: 9–17.
- Russell, J. 'Towards More Inclusive, Vital Models of Heritage: An Australian Perspective'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 3, no. 2 (1997): 71–80.
- Silberman, N. A. 'Promised Lands and Chosen Peoples: The Politics and Poetics of Archaeological Narrative'. In *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology*, edited by P. L. Kohl and C. Fawcett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995: 249–62.
- Simmons, I. G. *Interpreting Nature: Cultural Constructions of the Environment*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Smith, L. 'Towards a Theoretical Framework for Archaeological Heritage Management'. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 12, no. 1 (1993): 55–73.

- . *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- . 'The Repatriation of Human Remains—Problem or Opportunity? *Antiquity* 78, no. 300 (2004): 404–13.
- Smith, L., and G. Campbell. 'Governing Material Culture'. In *Governing Australia: Studies in Contemporary Rationalities of Government*, edited by M. Dean and B. Hindess. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998: 173–93.
- Stewart, K. C. 'An Occupied Place'. In *Senses of Place*, edited by S. Feld and K. H. Basso. Sante Fe: School of American Research Press, 1996: 137–65.
- Store, J. 'The Ownership of Culture: Reconciling Our Common and Separate Heritage'. *Australia in Oceania* 27, no. 2 (1992): 161–67.
- Strang, V. 'An Appropriate Question? The Propriety of Anthropological Analysis in the Australian Political Arena'. In *The Ethics of Anthropology: Debates and Dilemmas*, edited by P. Caplan. London: Routledge, 2003: 172–94.
- Tehan, M. 'To Be or Not to Be (Property): Anglo-Australian Law and the Search for Protection of Indigenous Cultural Heritage'. *University of Tasmania Law Review* 15, no. 2 (1996): 267–305.
- Tilley, C. 'Archaeology as Socio-political Action in the Present'. In *Reader in Archaeological Theory: Post-processual and Cognitive Approaches*, edited by D. S. Whitley. London: Routledge, 1998: 305–30.
- Transport for Leisure (TFL). *Interpreting the Northumberland National Parks Cultural Heritage: An Interpretive Plan for Hareshaw Linn*. Gosforth: TFL, 1996.
- Trigger, B. *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- . 'Post-processual Developments in Anglo-American Archaeology'. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 24, no. 2 (1991): 65–77.
- Tunbridge, J., and G. Ashworth. *Dissonant Heritage*. Chichester: John Wiley, 1996.
- van Dommelen, P. 'Exploring Everyday Places and Cosmologies'. In *Archaeologies of Landscape*, edited by W. Ashmore and B. Knapp. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999: 277–85.
- Weiner, A. *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping—While Giving*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- Wylie, A. *Thinking from Things: Essays in the Philosophy of Archaeology*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Zimmerman, L. J. 'When Data Becomes People: Archaeological Ethics, Reburial and the Past as Public Heritage'. *International Journal of Cultural Property* 7, no. 1 (1998): 69–88.
- . 'Regaining Our Nerve: Ethics, Values and the Transformation of Archaeology'. In *Ethics in American Archaeology*, edited by M. J. Lynott and A. Wylie. Washington, DC: Society for American Archaeology, 2000: 71–74.
- . 'Usurping Native American Voice'. In *The Future of the Past: Archaeologists, Native Americans and Repatriation*, edited by T. Bray. New York: Garland, 2001: 169–84.

Copyright of International Journal of Heritage Studies is the property of Routledge, Ltd.. The copyright in an individual article may be maintained by the author in certain cases. Content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.