SCIENCE VERSUS 'SENSE'
The Evolution of Heritage Discourse

Plate 2: UNESCO World Heritage Plinth, Ayutthaya

2 | SCIENCE VERSUS 'SENSE'
The Evolution of Heritage Discourse

As place is sensed, senses are placed; as places make sense, senses make place
Feld (1996: 1)

This chapter reviews the identification and assessment of heritage in terms of its reliance on a Eurocentric, scientific paradigm that privileges tangible heritage and professional discourse, and reinforces the separation between natural and cultural heritage. I introduce ideas and policies that developed within a particular historical and ideological context and that have significantly influenced and formalised a global practice of heritage management. This has largely been through their influence on national policies that determine the active management of heritage 'resources', primarily through some form of legislated heritage management, often characterised by the separation of natural and cultural heritage management legislation, processes and agencies (Carman 2000; McManamon & Hatton 2000: 8).[12]

Although a number of groups are influential in cultural heritage on a global scale, UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), and ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) retain the broadest interests and most influence in terms of identifying, protecting and managing cultural heritage. ICOMOS, for example, suggests that responsible heritage management

> … is possible only through a coherent training process, where 'conservationists' 'know, understand and apply UNESCO conventions and recommendations, and ICOMOS and other recognised charters, regulations and guidelines' and where they are capable of making 'balanced judgements

---

[12] For a range of general discussions on systems of heritage legislation and regulation see Bourke et al. (1983); Byrne et al. (2001); Cleere (1984, 1989); Costin (1993); Hutt et al. (1992); McManamon & Hatton (2000); Prott & O'Keefe (1984); Ritchie (1994).

based on shared ethical principles'. (Jokilehto 1996: 73, quoting the ICOMOS
1993 Education & Training Guidelines)

ICOMOS, IUCN (World Conservation Union), with its role in natural heritage
protection, and ICROM (International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and
Restoration of Cultural Property) are all identified as advisory bodies in the World
Heritage Convention (Section III). Through their combined role in the World Heritage
management process, UNESCO and these organisations form a globally influential
network with multi-linked interests. While the actions and policies of these
international organisations reinforce a prevailing interest in the identification and
protection of 'World Heritage', this is not to diminish their role in influencing heritage
identification and management more generally.

Whose Values? The Hegemony of Expert 'Scientific' Approaches

Foucault (1984: 39) argues that modernity is a particular way of dealing with the
world. The pattern of thought seen to follow the Enlightenment arose from a series of
developing discourses that acted to create a 'number of givens of this contemporary
world'. Among them was the emergence of a definable set of elements, seen to
represent real units of analysis grounded in science, rather than 'objects which have
been produced by discourse' (Thomas 1999: 12). Ellen (1996: 30) in suggesting that
'science as a global cross-cultural practice consolidated at a particular point in
history', posits that the reason the Western scientific paradigm predominates is not
necessarily attributable to it being a 'demonstratively more truthful way of perceiving
the world', but rather is an effect of historical infrastructural priority. That is, once in
place and working well, not only was there little point in changing the established
rules, but it would have been difficult to do so. In addition, the maintenance of the
'rules' reinforced the hegemony of Western political and economic ideologies. 'By
invoking its claim to universal truth, such a system of knowledge hides cultural
diversity and conceals the power structures that preserve the hierarchical arrangements
of difference' (Rutherford 1990: 21). Eriksen (2001: 132), in a discussion of
UNESCO's ideology of culture, identifies that attempts to create a multifaceted
picture of the social world have required a manoeuvring between nihilistic cultural

relativism and supremacist universalism. One of his conclusions is that while there is explicit acknowledgment of the dynamism of cultures, 'UNESCO cultures remain islands, or at least peninsulas'. He acknowledges, however, that there is no simplistic theoretical or practical resolution to many of the dilemmas encountered, faced with the complementary dimensions of traditionalism and modernism, and ethnic fragmentation and global unification in contemporary political processes.

Possibly the most significant outcome of the universalising project was the establishment of the 1972 UNESCO *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* (the World Heritage Convention), and the implementation of a process that attributes international ('world') significance to natural and cultural heritage. UNESCO has consequently been referred to as 'an archetypal universalist body' (Evans 2002: 118). The history of the World Heritage Convention has been extensively discussed elsewhere (see Titchen 1995). As at December 2003 it has been ratified by 177 countries.[13] It is the most widespread convention of UNESCO and is very probably the most powerful international tool for the conservation of cultural and natural heritage.

The desire to preserve the past is not a modern phenomenon. However, by the 20th century, the time had come for the internationalisation of heritage concerns and practices. This was facilitated by the impacts of globalisation and the communication revolution. The impetus for a global program of heritage protection arose in response to the recognition of the potential for destruction that followed World War II, and within the framework of emerging national identities and policies during the 1960s and 1970s.[14] This period saw a growth in interest in natural and cultural heritage, and in the past, in both a group and individual sense. This interest was often vocalised through community concerns, albeit more commonly in Western nations. However,

---

[13] The three countries relevant to the case studies in this thesis became signatories as follows: Australia, 1974; United Kingdom 1984; Thailand 1987. As at December 2003, 754 properties had been added to the World Heritage List, made up of 582 cultural, 149 natural and 23 mixed. These are spread across 129 of the 177 member countries.

[14] I do not propose to review the international development of heritage consciousness, other than to acknowledge its close connection with the political and economic developments of 19th-century Europe. This material is well documented elsewhere (see Byrne et al. 2001; Marks 1996; Pearson & Sullivan 1995; Titchen 1995).

the drafting of national legislation and conservation policies was dominated by the views of professionals involved with the identification and protection of heritage. At this stage, these were predominantly Western-educated natural scientists, archaeologists, architects and historians. It was the input of practitioners from such disciplines that generally informed the policies of heritage management systems and continues to do so. These specific disciplines lie outside areas that are making the greatest contributions to understandings of community identity and attachments: for example, human geography and anthropology. The ongoing involvement of what is effectively a restrictive arena of interest has supported a positivist approach to heritage management that reinforces a particular view of cultural and natural heritage that is tied to objectivism (but see Egloff 1993). Munjeri (2000: 41) provides additional insight into the disciplinary conundrum:[15]

> Maintaining the correct balance between the requirements of sites and of the people who have placed their stamp on nature … is a delicate 'balancing act', calling for skills and expertise and experience that, with due respect, is seldom found in our genre. Many of us in heritage management positions were never recruited on the basis of those qualities … certainly it was never our vocation to put people as part of the landscape because what we always put to the fore is the 'object', 'artefact', 'archaeology', 'specimen'.

To a great extent, the globalising approach was enshrined following the Venice UNESCO resolution adopted in May 1964, which established an international non-government organisation for monuments and sites: ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites). Following the ratification of the resolution by 25 countries in 1965, ICOMOS was officially founded in Warsaw. In 1966 ICOMOS adopted the Venice Charter, the *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Site,* as its fundamental ethical guideline, reinforcing the construction of cultural heritage as monuments and sites, in line with contemporaneous discussions by UNESCO in the context of 'monuments of world interest'. ICOMOS was a major contributor to the development of the World Heritage Convention, and under Article 8(3) of that convention is established as an advisory body to the World Heritage Committee, together with the IUCN and ICROM (Titchen 1995: 51–52). ICOMOS

---

[15] At this time, Dawson Munjeri held a role as a senior Zimbabwe government heritage official and was a member of the ICOMOS executive.

committees have subsequently contributed to the preparation of a number of international heritage charters and guidelines that have become international doctrinal texts: these relate to areas of interest such as cultural tourism, historic gardens, archaeological heritage management, underwater heritage and training.

Heritage as Science: Archaeology as Heritage

Although I argue that the Eurocentric nature of established heritage assessment processes acts to broadly disenfranchise the concerns of both Western and non-Western communities, this criticism has been more commonly applied in the latter context. It is usually exemplified in the discord created in the application of heritage practices in non-Western cultures, for example in African and Asian countries, and in those countries that have a history of European colonisation, whether or not they have regained self-rule. India, for example, having become independent of British rule, has inherited and maintained a legislative and ideological heritage regime that has been criticised for approaches that privilege Western-based systems of disciplinary knowledge and remain insensitive to the worldviews of contemporary communities, particularly its own indigenous tribal populations.[16] As Chadha (1999: 147) comments: 'The Government's attitude is reinforced by the intelligentsia, among them anthropologists and archaeologists who have yet to divorce themselves from the colonial heritage in their scholarly research.' Bond and Gilliam (1994: 20) offer the following comment:

> The acceptance of the dichotomy and the West as the centre has often led to the belief that the self-proclaimed 'Third World intellectual' has some special hold on knowledge or an intuitive insight into the non-western world. Both the dichotomy and the belief are no more than romantic radicalisms. [There is an] absence of the critical voice of the indigenous common folk in academic discourse … the western and non-western dichotomies often obscure the common ground shared by a body of scholars who explore social inequality, domination and subjugation from a partisan perspective.[17]

---

[16] See Chadha (1999), Imam (2001 & 2003), P. Larsen (2000: 12); but see Gosden (1999: 87) for discussion of the growth of local anthropological traditions that are critical of ideas arising from the colonial milieu.

[17] See also Rowlands (1994: 138) and Shack (1994).

Much has been written about the ways in which indigenous minorities have historically been excluded from the development and formalisation of heritage management, particularly in the sense that significance assessment has been based on values established by Western intellectual traditions, notably those arising out of archaeology (see Greer 1996a, 1996b; Langford 1983; Tasmanian Aboriginal Land Council 1996; Tainter & Lucas 1983; Williams & Ulm 1994). This process has dispossessed and marginalised many contemporary indigenous people, particularly through a process that has primarily assessed heritage significance as being the 'scientific value' of the physical remains of the indigenous past.[18] Less attention has been paid to the way in which communities within the Western world have also been marginalised by heritage discourse and praxis.

Where heritage legislation has been particularly concerned with 'relics', it has engaged with preoccupations and questions framed by an archaeological (scientific) paradigm, significantly influencing the future direction and practices of cultural heritage management. A compounding issue has been that questions about the nature of cultural heritage or about who owned that heritage were outside the consideration of the paradigm, which was interested in establishing models for understanding the past. While this may have been a 'proper' consideration for the discipline of archaeology, it was (and is) far less so for an inclusive approach to the issues more necessarily involved in heritage management (Ellis 1994: 9, 11; see also Broadbent 1995, Ucko 1994: xi). Smith (2000: 313) asserts that the situation has not significantly changed: 'It is archaeological involvement, and the position of authority held by archaeologists and archaeological knowledge in CHM that helps hinder effective theoretical debate and development'.

---

[18] This is not to suggest that more ethnographic approaches have not been applied in various circumstances; the USA in particular has for some time included ethnography as an integral part of heritage management, notably in parks management (see, for example, Crespi 2001). In Australia, since at least the mid-1970s, there has been acceptance of the need for archaeologists (whether engaging in academic research or in broader cultural heritage matters) to consult with the relevant Aboriginal community/ies. This has most commonly been critiqued as a process of one-way communication in which the archaeologist 'tells' the community what he or she is planning to do, and/or led to Aboriginal people being brought into the work of archaeology as field assistants. One impact has been that Aboriginal people have been included in the process primarily through active participation in archaeological projects (see Byrne et al. 2001; Greer 1996a; Greer et al. 2000; Langford 1983; Tasmanian Aboriginal Land Council 1996; Ucko 1983).

Academics and professionals from non-Western communities *have* contributed to the development of universalising heritage philosophies, but for the most part they are university-educated and have associations with the academic and professional heritage world.[19] As such, they represent a small segment of the population and have variously been exposed to Western heritage identification and management practices. In this sense they, too, 'talk the dominant talk' (see, for example, Folorunso 2000). Certainly, as Moore (1997: 6) points out in a discussion of anthropologists, the distinction between the 'Western' knower and the non-Western known is highly problematic. But the question must be asked as to whether professionals from either non-Western or Western countries are representative of their wider community and can speak for localised heritage concerns and interests – particularly those that relate to contemporary attachments to place and to traditional practice.

The universalising ideology that has been pervasive in the Academy and international approaches, particularly as disseminated by ICOMOS, has strongly influenced legislation, policy and practice in heritage agencies. The result is that 'a remarkably coherent style of archaeological heritage management has come to be practiced around the world with almost no discussion as to how this came about' (Byrne 1990: 270).[20] This applies to heritage management more generally. Byrne further suggests that heritage management has spread over most of the non-Western world through a process of ideology transfer, not through imposition, and that this applies beyond post-colonial nations to countries such as Thailand.

The universality and global acceptance of 'heritage' and the problematic issue of ownership of the past in varying contexts is clearly contentious. Langford critiques the contemporary construction of heritage, and the privileging of determinations by sanctioned professional disciplines. It is shown to be a system that reinforces

---

[19] Warren (1996: 39) discusses this in terms of the precepts (influenced by background, training and personality) of heritage practitioners being secondary to the principles of 'accepted practice' as defined by internationally accepted charters and recommendations.

[20] One exception to entrenched Euro-centric approaches is found in Japanese cultural legislation, which enshrines the protection of intangible cultural properties and folk-cultural properties. The former includes artistry and skills, and 'properties' are identified as both individuals and groups holding those skills.

hegemonic principles that are at odds with many sections of the broader community (see also Broadbent 1996; Gelder & Jacobs 1998; Tasmanian Aboriginal Land Council 1996):

> Underlying that view is the notion that heritage, no matter what the view, the culture, the religion or conceptual significance that heritage has to the particular group, is the property of mankind. Mankind, needless to say, is mainly represented by that culture which has, and continues to exploit and invade the lands and cultures of 'other' societies … The underlying theme of that view is nothing new. In fact colonialism was justified on that basis. The view itself sounds quite reasonable, but has enabled and justified the domination of other groups by the powerful, and stands condemned on that basis. (Langford 1983: 4)

In this statement, Langford is making an Australian Aboriginal challenge to the hegemonic approaches of 'white' dominated heritage practices. I would, however, assert that the power (in the heritage sense) is in the hands of a more defined group represented by heritage management agencies and practitioners, as well as the Academy to some extent, and that this is wielded in contexts that affect both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities, whether or not they are in a post-colonial milieux.[21]

Desired changes are unlikely to be achieved unless paradigmatic shifts that incorporate more comprehensive understandings of heritage are endorsed at an international level. One applauded initiative is the support for an anthropological approach to advance the 1994 World Heritage Global Strategy (a conceptual framework and operational methodology to implement the World Heritage Convention) (UNESCO WHC 1998: 14, 15). However, a particular challenge to the efficacious achievement of such a goal may well lie in the nature of the membership of ICOMOS.[22] Being predominantly composed of academics and professionals who

---

[21] I am not suggesting that the broader socio-political contexts and consequences are the same for both groups – that would be to trivialise an obviously more complicated situation of difference.
[22] There are over 7000 ICOMOS members across some 110 countries. Membership is open to those 'engaged in the conservation of monuments, groups of buildings and sites as a member of the scientific, technical or administrative staff of national, regional or local monuments, fine arts or antiquities services, a decision-maker or a specialist engaged in the conservation restoration, rehabilitation and enhancement of monuments, groups of buildings and sites, including, as appropriate, architects, town planners, historians, archaeologists, ethnologists, and archivists'(http://www.international.icomos.org).

are drawn from the 'traditional' or core cultural heritage disciplines, and with interests that primarily lie with tangible heritage, most are not equipped with theoretical or methodological backgrounds that allow a more inclusive approach to heritage issues. The majority of this group are therefore not well placed to engage with broader interests, such as those that relate to community heritage values.

Entrenched heritage approaches continue to be reinforced in international protocols, in the academy, and by conservation agencies. Enshrined in the bureaucratic order of modern states, heritage practices (together with other arenas of government control) can act to powerfully influence the construction of identity (see B. Kapferer 1995a & 1995b). As Lowenthal (1994: 313) asserts: 'The Eurocentric legacy dominates modes of valuing the past throughout the world, even among peoples long deprived of, or at odds with, Europeanisation. The Western emphasis on material tokens of antiquity as symbols of heritage has been all but universally adopted.' Gosden (1999: 201) suggests that it is only recently that there has been a realisation of how deeply colonial relations have influenced trends of thought in political, economic and social philosophies.[23]

'Special Places': The Creation of Hierarchies of 'Value'

Approaches to both natural and cultural heritage have their roots in a conservation ethic that is based on the premise that heritage must be managed if it is to be retained for future generations, and that this hinges on an assessment of significance, or 'value', determined by the rigorous application of a set of predetermined criteria. This process is intended to ensure consistency, objectivity, and a reliance on assessment that is more quantitative than qualitative. Within such systems, it is evident that it is methodologically easier to quantify measurable biological data than to similarly quantify a broad range of culturally determined attributes.

---

[23] Gosden (1999: 202) highlights the irony of post-modern critique is that it also sets up Western values as the norm, with assertions that the West has single-handedly created modernity and the conditions of post-modernity. See also Byrne (1990).

Apart from the immediate dilemma that values, unless quantified (and possibly even then), are neither objective nor neutral, challenges arise when we acknowledge that different places and 'things' can have different values and significance for different people, and that these can change over time (see Costin 1993: 28; Titchen 1995: 97). Appadurai (1986: 56–58) reinforces that underlying any classification system is a 'theory' of value.[24] That is, through the imposition of a particular system of classification, hierarchies of value will be established and the politics of classification and evaluation will be revealed. Commodities are desirable in economic terms, while other 'things' (for example, heirlooms, children, sacred places) have a different type of value under normal circumstances. Of consequence is the understanding that things can move between different classificatory systems and hence acquire different categories of value in their lifetime – that is, their value becomes contextual – in terms of both time and perception. When value systems overlap, an arena for confrontation can be created. This arena is what Appadurai refers to as 'tournaments of value', where

> Participation in them is likely to be both a privilege of those in power and an instrument of status contests between them … though such tournaments of value occur in special times and places, their forms and outcomes are always consequential for the more mundane realities of power and value in ordinary life. (Appadurai 1986: 21)

One of the problems of the current approach to heritage 'values' is that assigning significance, based on a determination of value, ultimately leads to a system of hierarchy of value. Many systems incorporate a process of comparison to identify those places or sites that are more 'special' than others. This is exemplified by World Heritage listing, which through the attribution of a ranking of 'outstanding universal value', is a process of spectacularisation (for a further discussion on outstanding universal value see Jokilehto 1998 and Titchen 1995). In addition, it is closely associated with the creation and reinforcement of a national 'iconic' past and history. In the applied sense, it is a process that privileges 'big' issues over local and hence 'less important' matters. In doing so, it reinforces the creation of grand narratives and

---

[24] See Foucault (1974) for an account of the development of taxonomic ordering and its transmission into modern scientific processes. B. Kapferer (1995a: 84) suggests that Foucault's discussion of the development of scientific knowledge is also applicable to modern bureaucratic practice.

the subjugation of regional differences and identity. The process of listing potentially refutes espousals of value-free cultural relativism, where cultures are 'neither better nor worse, only different' (Moore 1997: 9). Judgements to the contrary are potentially discriminatory or disrespectful. Moore further notes Bhaba's suggestion that notions of cultural diversity, based as they are on a relative/universal opposition, do not sit well with fields of enquiry in various social sciences, because they are hinged on the idea of cultures untainted by the intertextuality of their historical locations (ibid). The existing process that only accepts World Heritage nominations at the national government level of a State Party is clearly not divorced from political, economic, and 'badging' considerations. However, to allow that these may be primary motives for World Heritage listing is cause for concern.[25]

Systems that rely on a hierarchy of value are problematic on several fronts: heritage protection is predicated on a basis of selecting the special few from the greater set; many communities do not assign such hierarchical systems to their heritage; significance can change over time; and the likelihood that something 'more' rare, typical, representative, important or threatened may be discovered. This aside, many heritage assessment systems, including those reinforced in legislation, rely on the application of a defined set of criteria and the creation of 'levels' of value based on today's standard of 'importance': for example, local, regional, state, national, international (world).[26] One interpretation is that these represent magnitudes of 'community interest'. Another and more relevant interpretation for this discussion is that these actually represent and incorporate a range of different communities, whose attributions of value to a given place can be conflicting. In either instance, however, it is not 'the community' itself setting the standards, determining a level of interest or identifying what should attract a public commitment of stewardship. Rather, what is 'important' is determined *for* the community by heritage professionals, in a process

---

[25] See comments in Munjeri (2000: 39) and also Cleere (2000a: 6) that suggest that for some countries listing has become a form of competition. See also Lane & Corbett (1996) for comment on Australian World Heritage properties.

[26] As well as significance ranking/value there is commonly an attribution of 'type' of value, encompassing such headings as aesthetic, architectural, historical, informational, scientific, social, symbolic, and economic. For example, the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter, which sets guiding principles for heritage management in Australia, relies on aesthetic, historical, social, spiritual and scientific values.

that often seeks to enhance protection of 'important' places through 'educating' the community as to why such places are special. It is not to be supposed that seeking to engage communities in the protection and management of mainstream heritage values is inappropriate. Rather, it seems incongruous to assume that communities will value one set of judgements – based on a particular knowledge system and engaging in a specific set of rules and language – over their own. It is inappropriate, therefore, to engage in a process that may disenfranchise or reject community opinions because they are outside of and dissonant to the dominant heritage discourse.

There are obvious dilemmas when a place is subject to multiple appropriations, some, or one, of which may be deemed by those in power to be 'more legitimate' than others. This is very often the case in cultural heritage methodologies that seek to attribute significance (or 'value') on a scaled system that more commonly slides from local through to global. As Ucko (1994: xvii) states: 'Local versus national or even world conflicts over heritage will not simply go away'. The simplicity of this observation belies the complexity of the argument that proposes that 'heritage' – whether cultural or natural – is the rightful inheritance of all people, with equal rights to share. We stand cautioned by Lowenthal (1994: 302) that: 'The politics of the past is no trivial academic game; it is an integral part of every people's earnest search for a heritage essential to autonomy and identity'.

Splitting the Ways: the Divide between Nature and Culture

Prior to the emergence of Enlightenment thinking, 'culture' was perceived as the nurturing of living things. Following the emergence of distinctive modes of modern thought, culture took on a more abstract connotation implicated with the progress of human society. 'Nature' and culture came to be increasingly opposed, culminating in the intellectual division of human and natural sciences (J. Thomas 1999: 13–14). We are faced today with multiple challenges to the validity of maintaining the nature/culture separation that has been handed down. These come from a range of sources: contributions from non-Western, holistic philosophies; advances in environmental biology; a growing awareness of the detrimental impacts of

environmentally damaging practices, and a growth in anthropological studies of ecology (Casey 1996: 33–36). The result has been an increased emphasis on the integration of people as parts of larger, more complex systems, on culture *in* nature and the cultural construction of nature. There has been an increased concern within anthropology for these and other relevant matters, such as species co-existence and sustainable development (Ellen 1996: 1). There has been a similar increase in interest from natural conservationists, although this is more consistently applied to issues relating to indigenous involvement in protected area management and protection, and the recognition that indigenous communities have a significant role in maintaining biodiversity and ecosystem stability through traditional stewardship practices (for example, see P. Larsen 2000).[27] There is a global recognition that both biological and cultural diversity are being depleted, which poses a very real threat to humanity: our long term existence is dependent on a sustainable and interwoven relationship between nature and culture.

The challenge to the construction of 'wilderness' areas as places untouched by human contact has been a positive outcome, particularly for indigenous people. However, little attention has been paid to the relationship between non-indigenous (or non-'traditional') communities and the natural environment. In this regard, Knowles' (1997) study within the Tasmanian World Heritage Area is particularly relevant for its demonstration that the concept of 'traditional' use extends to non-indigenous stakeholders. Knowles establishes that many of the hunting, fishing, camping, hut-building and other land and resource-use activities are part of a wider and long-term community understanding and association with the area. Such associations are extremely important to the community's sense of identity and continuing social and economic function. When management agencies began to institute controls perceived necessary to achieve natural conservation goals, they inadvertently compromised a wide range of significant cultural practices. In many respects, the definition of the Tasmanian World Heritage Area as 'wilderness' has denied not only the long-term association of Aboriginal people with the land, but also the lengthy relationship with

---

[27] P. Larsen (2000: 9) reinforces that while the acknowledgment of the relevancy of traditional ecological knowledge is increasing, practical management applications that work with this tend to have been less progressive.

the community who have been actively using and managing aspects of the environment for over 150 years.

The relationship between non-traditional communities and the natural environment has been most formalised in the recruitment and participation of the community in attempts to preserve 'threatened' natural values. Where this has been activated by environmental organisations the primary goal is to protect biological values, and there is little attention from such groups to deeper understandings that could identify and protect the attachments and meanings communities have for their natural surroundings.[28] What we are seeing today is the entrenchment of the concept of 'the environment' as a particular Western construct that serves as a focus of natural conservation rhetoric and 'provides a source of authority to a whole language of domination' (Fitzsimmons 1989: 109).[29]

One of the more significant developments in 'the heritage debate' in the last decade has been a rethinking of this nature/culture dichotomy. Arguably, however, the theoretical debates that have shaken the validity of maintaining this polarity have not been reflected in significant changes in domestic heritage management policies and practices. This is surprising given the growing understanding of nature as culturally constructed and defined. By 'culturally defined', following Ellen (1996: 3), I suggest that nature gains meaning through practical engagement and cognition. This equally applies to scientific apprehensions of nature. Ironically the definitions of nature and the 'natural' criteria applied in UNESCO World Heritage assessments are themselves culturally derived, placing great emphasis on nature as determined from the scientific,

---

[28] The recent Great Barrier Reef campaign by the World Wide Fund for Nature in Australia is a case in point. Their contribution to the final outcome of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Parks Authority's Representative Areas Program (RAP) proposals is commendable, with approximately one third of the reef proposed for protection from both recreational and commercial fishing. However, the campaign was predicated on protecting the biological values of the reef, and had little concern with protecting areas of the reef that were 'special' to the community (see Greer et al. 2000 and Harrington 2000).

[29] Jacobs (1996: 135), for example, suggests that the ecotourism industry represents a 'deceptive elaboration of these processes of construction and domination'.

conservation or aesthetic point of view (see the World Heritage Convention, Article 2. See discussion of changes to criteria in Titchen 1995 and von Droste et al. 1998).[30]

Some of these issues have been addressed in anthropological literature, which includes broader epistemological debates that grapple with cultural relativity and the nature of knowledge systems. This literature also discusses specific lifeways that interweave nature and culture in a rich web of relationships. Such dialectics are particularly relevant in a context where the protection of nature and of 'natural heritage' has for the most part accepted the disconnection and contradiction between nature and humans. Nature protection in its traditional approach emphasises species protection and nature reserves, with the supposition that the value of natural regions is intrinsically compromised by human influence.[31]

Nature, Culture and the World Heritage Convention

The World Heritage Convention is the result of an international effort to protect both natural and cultural heritage of outstanding universal value. Titchen (1995: 70) suggests that the definitions provided in the Convention acknowledge that cultural and natural heritage are intrinsically linked. However, although the achievement of this under a single instrument was quite progressive, the convention did not result in establishing a substantive connection between nature and culture. In implementing the convention the World Heritage Committee made an attempt to avoid the separation of nature and culture, but could not entirely bridge the gap. The distinction between different ways of thought and scientific backgrounds, particularly between art history and nature, remained evident. As a result, attempts to protect the heritage places of the

---

[30] Perhaps a 'natural' criterion of landscape assessment that derives the 'enhancement of scenic beauty' from 'the *intrinsic quality* of the natural features themselves' (Hogan 2000: Annex 1, italics added) is oxymoronic: nature cannot of itself hold to any qualities of beauty. These characteristics are not intrinsic, but externally conceived and perceived by people. Hence they are of a social and cultural origin.

[31] In the course of my research, this disconnection between nature and people, and the latter as in some way polluting the integrity of the former, was most consistently echoed by people who identified themselves as 'green'. An exemplary comment in my mind is the assertion: 'I am only interested in trees, not people'. McKenzie (1999: 114) notes that much of the opposition to national parks based on the prevailing IUCN definitions has come from developing countries that criticise the priority given to preventing or eliminating the human exploitation or occupation of entire park areas. The result has been the enforced displacement of large numbers of people and, for many, the prevention of access to areas of traditional significance for their cultural and material survival.

world were predicated on an acceptance of the disconnection and contradiction between nature and humans (see von Droste et al. 1995; ICOMOS 1998; A. Phillips 1998).

This disconnection was enshrined in the World Heritage Convention's Operational Guidelines by a separation of criteria: originally six cultural and four natural. As part of a review process, which has sought among other things to resolve this disconnection, the recommendation has been made to revise the Guidelines to make a single list of criteria numbered from 1–10 (see UNESCO WHC 1998: 3–4).[32] However, little change to the wording of the criteria has been proposed, so it is difficult to comprehend how this will result in the abolition of the formal distinction between cultural and natural heritage. The paradox is that 'the distinction between "cultural" and "natural" heritage is fundamental to the Convention, as defined in Articles 1 and 2 respectively' (von Droste 1998: 12–13). Von Droste (1998: 13) explains:

> The Convention's definitions for natural and cultural heritage are not an attempt to distinguish between what is 'natural' and 'cultural'; it is aimed at recognising the importance of the diversity of 'heritage'; i.e. natural and cultural, whose identification, conservation and preservation are built on different combinations of disciplines and knowledge-based traditions.

In the same report, however, an IUCN position paper asserts:

> … use of terminologies such as natural, cultural, mixed and cultural landscapes to distinguish World Heritage sites was undermining the Convention's uniqueness in its recognition of the nature-culture continuum … IUCN believes, too, that these distinctions are confusing to World Heritage practitioners, let alone to the general public. (IUCN 1998: 58)

Unfortunately, the maintenance of the nature/culture dichotomy at the World Heritage level can only reinforce the same dichotomies entrenched in wider heritage understandings and praxis. It is certainly contradictory to understandings of nature as

---

[32] See in particular von Droste et al. (1998) and UNESCO WHC (1998), which report on a UNESCO Expert meeting held to define a global and unifying view of the continuum between nature and culture. See also Hay-Edie (1998).

being culturally defined and as deeply implicated in the material and affective practices of society.

Cultural Landscapes

In terms of conservation strategies, the management of natural areas commonly relies on their separation from the surrounding environment, which includes people and their activities. At the same time, single cultural objects have been perceived independently of the cultural context and the landscape environment in which they developed. This has been a particular criticism of archaeological approaches, which seek to impose a domination of culture over nature, and to look at what is 'done' to the land. Bender (1992), for example, asserts that 'landscapes' are created through the collection of sites, ignoring the interconnectedness with the topography within which the sites are located.

In 1992 the World Heritage Committee adopted the World Heritage category of cultural landscapes, to embrace the diversity of interactions between people and the natural environment.[33] In so doing, the Committee acknowledged developments in the intellectual and philosophical bases of heritage identification and management, particularly the growing attention to landscape archaeology and the adoption of landscapes as an IUCN protected area category (Category 5: see http://www.icun.org/themes/wcpa/pubs/pdfs/iucncategories).

Understandings of cultural landscapes for World Heritage purposes were predicated on approaches primarily defined through archaeological and biological paradigms. In the former, landscapes are described by a combination of material features, interpreted through archaeological methodology and theory – by archaeologists. The latter are characterised by approaches that seek a relationship between the protection of biological diversity and human interaction, more particularly with indigenous knowledge systems.

---

[33] This added 'cultural landscapes' to the existing three 'World heritage' categories of natural, cultural

The notion of cultural landscapes has been described as Eurocentric and definitions diverge tremendously worldwide. However, consensus has been reached on a definition of cultural landscapes of 'universal value' to be protected on a global level (see WHC Operational Guidelines Article 39). The conundrum is that analytical landscape categories can introduce the danger of reductionism. That is, an objectivist perspective can become separated from the individual experience of the landscape. This potentially leads to conflict between locally experienced realities and formal conservation interpretations (Hay-Edie 1998: 5). Paradoxically, while it is recognised that the importance of many landscapes is expressed through oral history, stories, songs, arts and crafts (Rössler 2000a: 14), it is the landscape itself that is the object of protection through the World Heritage Convention, not the practices and traditions that give it value. However, as is discussed in the following chapters, 'cultural landscapes' are more broadly defined and interpreted in theories and approaches that are gaining acceptance in cultural heritage management applications (and see von Droste et al. 1995).

The grey zones in cultural heritage management, and in the World Heritage context, arise when natural areas are deemed to have no intrinsic biological value or contain no tangible cultural material. Although there is acceptance that such places may accrue 'spiritual' attachment in an indigenous context, there is little understanding of the nature, or relevance, of such attachments when the community is non-indigenous. In both indigenous and non-indigenous contexts, there is a need to acknowledge that what people *do* and *feel* may be more significant than a place itself. In addition, we must recognise that particular 'objects', features or monuments within a landscape can be mnemonic devices that allow *access* to particular practices or feelings (see Greer 1996a). A common recourse has been to seek an understanding of 'aesthetics', and/or to attempt to somehow quantify the visual amenity of the landscape.

The problematics of the matter are exemplified in the approach taken by the World Heritage Committee to the application of cultural heritage criterion (vi): 'be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance'. The debates

surrounding the renomination of Tongariro National Park (New Zealand) as an associative cultural landscape, and the listing of both the Memorial of Peace in Hiroshima (Japan) and the Historic Centre of Warsaw (Poland) have clearly indicated the discomfort of the World Heritage Committee with recognising places solely for their associative values.[34] An amendment to the wording of the World Heritage criteria was recommended by the June 1994 Expert meeting, and adopted at the following meeting of the World Heritage Committee (see Titchen 1995: 139–143, 231). The wording of criterion (vi) now concludes as follows: 'The Committee considers that this criterion should justify inclusion in the List only in exceptional circumstances and in conjunction with other criteria cultural or natural'.[35]

While this remains the case, the intent to favour World Heritage recognition of the 'universal value' of *tangible* heritage is reinforced, as is an approach to understanding heritage that demotes practices, attachments and other intangible aspects to secondary, add-on values. The incongruity, as noted by a former member of the ICOMOS Executive Committee, is that the decision was 'highly controversial in that it represents a severe limitation on recognition of those forms of cultural heritage in which the intangible element predominates' (Luxen 2001: 3). However, the decision is clearly consistent with ICOMOS policies that themselves reinforce that the value of intangible heritage lies in its contribution to the values grounded in the physical elements of a place. This has specific consequences for places, such as natural areas, that have no natural or cultural heritage value other than that which is accrued through cognitive and experiential processes. It is through these sorts of engagements that local communities commonly form attachments to their lived environment.

---

[34] The centre of Warsaw was reconstructed in the 1950s, following its destruction during World War II. At the time of its 1980 inscription on the World Heritage List, the World Heritage Committee added the statement that 'there can be no question of inscribing in the future other cultural properties that have been reconstructed' (quoted in Cameron 1999: 11; see also Pressouyre 1996: 12).

[35] There appears to be a contradiction in the case of 'associative cultural landscapes', which justify for inclusion on the list by virtue of 'powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element, rather then material cultural evidence, which may be insignificant or even absent' (Operational Guidelines Para 39(iii)). Yet, under the rewording of criterion (vi), these associations are not enough by themselves to list a cultural landscape.

The recognition that nature is culturally, ideologically and morally constructed is commonplace in anthropology and the history of ideas. The challenge, therefore, is one of addressing the implications of the 'epistemological relativity' for scientific practice and 'for those who attempt to implement change in the lives of people outside the Academy' (Ellen 1996: 1–3). The case studies that inform this thesis reinforce that there is lag between this epistemological revolution and its realisation in on-the-ground practice. The implementation of meaningful change takes longer because heritage practice is entrenched in disciplinary, legislative and bureaucratic mechanisms. Nonetheless, the combination of UNESCO cultural landscape approaches and the concerted work by organisations such as the IUCN and WWF to integrate community issues with the management of protected areas are initiatives that will lead to systemic changes.[36] However, although many protected-area projects are valuable in terms of working with relevant communities, their primary goal is protecting the environment and biodiversity. They are not necessarily concerned with protecting community heritage interests that lie outside of this agenda. Where broader concerns involve the social and economic well-being of local communities through sustainable development, the opportunity exists for a more holistic approach to community values (see, for example, Borrini-Feyerabend 1996; Glowka et al. 1994; Reti 1999).

The UNESCO *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Heritage*

Recent developments have seen the promulgation of a new UNESCO convention that relates to intangible heritage. This has been established in a forum that is external to both the World Heritage Convention and the involvement of ICOMOS. In parallel with debates surrounding the inclusivity of the World Heritage list and constraints in dealing with intangible heritage, UNESCO interests (external to the World Heritage Centre) implemented a global project with the potential to resolve these areas of concern. In May 2001 UNESCO launched a new initiative: *the Proclamation of*

---

[36] For example, the UNESCO project 'Sacred Sites – Cultural Integrity and Biological Diversity' uses a multi-disciplinary approach and involves both natural scientists and anthropologists, in a 'culture based approach to enhance environmental conservation' Rössler (2000a: 14). See also P. Larsen (2000); Thorsell & Sigaty (1997); Thulstrup (1999).

Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity. Its antecedents lay in the 1989 UNESCO *Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore* (see Seitel 2001 for a broad discussion). The first proclamation listed 19 Masterpieces. Intended to be released every two years, it was followed by an additional list of 28 in November 2003 (see http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev). Although the culmination of over 20 years of work, with roots in approaches to 'folklore', the protection of intangible heritage has been made a priority by the current Director-General of UNESCO, Mr Koïchiro Matsuura. The Proclamation was intended to be a short-term course of action, to be followed in the longer term by a standard-setting instrument to preserve intangible heritage (see UNESCO 1998a, 1998b, 1999 & 2000). This instrument, the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Heritage*, was adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO at its 32nd-session meeting in Paris, 29 September to 17 October 2003. The new convention complements the protective mechanism for tangible heritage: the World Heritage Convention. Matsuura strongly supported an additional instrument to separately protect intangible heritage, seeing it as one way of remedying the geographical imbalance existing in the World Heritage Convention (see, for example, UNESCO 2001a). However, it was not implemented without opposition within UNESCO, particularly from those who believed that amending the World Heritage Convention to incorporate intangible heritage would be preferable to having two separate conventions. Opinions in its favour have lauded it as '… more than just an extension of the World Heritage List. It is a minor revolution in the way we look at heritage, hitherto dominated by the views of archaeologists and museum curators … there is now interest in the intangible aspects of a physical monument – for example, the skills needed to build a cathedral' (Bardon 2001: 5).

The Proclamation (UNESCO 2001b, 2001c) and new Convention contain similar definitions of intangible heritage. Article 2 of the Convention provides the following definition:

> … the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognise as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation

to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity.

Article 2 further identifies this heritage as being manifest as:

(a)   oral traditions and expressions, including language as a vehicle of the intangible cultural heritage;
(b)   performing arts;
(c)   social practices, rituals and festive events;
(d)   knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe;
(e)   traditional craftsmanship.

The convention goes beyond previous attempts to preserve disappearing traditions that primarily applied documentary approaches. Rather, it supports the practitioners, or 'masters', themselves. Hence the distinction is made between archival approaches to heritage, and the recognition that heritage is also embodied knowledge and practice. Through protecting the conditions that are necessary to allow cultural continuity and reproduction, protection is extended to the associated lived space and social spheres, that is, to the environment and the habitus. Nas, however, makes an interesting point about the protection of such cultural configurations: 'Although protection may lead to their alienation from the folk source and dependence on national and international governmental organisations, they are nevertheless supposed to be able to play a creative function in the development of humankind. In fact, the paradox is clear; the globalisation of these phenomena is being employed to counteract that same globalisation' (Nas et al. 2002: 142). One of the more obvious problems is that new meanings are often attached to such cultural expressions and it is only through this ongoing process of change that they receive a reason to continue. Kurin makes the further salient point that: 'Culture defined and selected by national governments may not be the best basis for deliberative and dispassionate consideration' (in Nas et al. 2002: 145). Karen Olwig, contributing to the same debate, encapsulates the dilemma:

> This leads to the important question … how a global organisation, operating according to general guidelines, can recognise and appreciate the complexity and diversity of the cultural expressions that it seeks to protect. By what criteria can one compare widely different cultural expressions, and how does one single out the "masterpieces" worthy of preservation? (in Nas et al. 2002: 145–146)

Olwig postulates that any attempt to concentrate on the 'outstanding' example in preference to the less conspicuous one appears to be more particularly inspired by the methods of global organisations that seek to protect biodiversity. The two being such highly different matters, she asserts that 'there are no general scientific principles whereby anthropologists or other scholars in the humanities and social sciences can evaluate the quality of and need for preservation of cultural diversity on a global basis' (ibid). Her comments echo the dilemmas identified above, associated with the operation of the World Heritage Convention, and with the imposition of a system of hierarchical heritage values. Arguably, UNESCO has compounded one set of problems by adding another form of spectacularisation to that which already exists, with a continuing reliance on positivist determinations.

Instead of resolving the inclusivity quandaries inherent in the World Heritage Convention, it is likely that the creation of a separate list has compounded the existing problems that mitigate against a holistic approach to heritage. The effect has been to reinforce the existing separation of theoretical and methodological approaches: archaeological, historical, architectural on one hand – and anthropological, folk-historical on the other. The former remain representative of the interests of ICOMOS, as the peak international cultural heritage body. The latter are rarely included in mainstream cultural heritage approaches. Until these thematic and disciplinary separations are broken down and applied in a unified process to heritage concerns, it is unlikely that understandings of the integral nature of the relationships between place, community, practice, nature and culture will be appreciated, much less translated into improved heritage praxis.

Heritage as Experience: 'A Sense of Place'?

Current heritage management praxis can be understood as 'an exercise in technical judgements and strategies of preservation' (Smith 1994: 2). Contemporary community values, attachments and meanings are more often secondary considerations. Community concerns are even less well considered where such values and meanings are not attached to an aspect of the built heritage, or are more closely involved with

what one does, feels or remembers. Munjeri, talking about African communities, emphasises the importance of lived experience and tradition in heritage understandings (Munjeri 2001: 2; see also H. Kuper 2003: 253):

> Cultural heritage is singularly more about *values* than edifices. These values need not be judged on the basis of physical properties and not even on the basis of an interactive mix of cultural and physical properties … let it never be forgotten that what distinguishes 'living traditions' from all others, is the fact that existence overrides visibility … living tradition provides the framework of design and construction and not the other way around.

What is advocated is a shift away from privileging the 'hard facts scientific approach' that marginalises many places (Munjeri 1998: 61; also see Avrami et al. 2000). This will allow places to be seen as the socially constructed results and mnemonics of the interests and meanings of others – where the products may be either material or ideational (Rodman 2003: 208). The attribution of 'other' in this case is predicated on a separation of those who are heritage professionals and those who are not. It hence includes both traditional and non-traditional communities in opposition to the hegemony of 'the established approach [to cultural heritage] that focuses on the physical fabric of sites and built structures rather than on their historical and social dimension' (Byrne et al. 2001: 3).

The conundrum lies in acknowledging that while places are 'given' greater meaning by the narratives and stories that surround them, the value of a place is more than 'knowing' its stories: it is the practice involved with telling the stories, the recreation of narratives and the active experience of place that are equally or even more meaningful. The ability to 'do', to experience, to feel and to observe are as important as material manifestations. It is through such practices and experiences that people, memory, identity and place interact. An understanding of practices also reveals the ways that life is learned and passed on through processes of socialisation, where different parts of social action act on and are creative of locales of action and efficacy (Gosden 1999: 123). The processes involved are also integral to the creation and maintenance of identity and belonging, of 'being in place'.

One of the problems for communities has been, and continues to be, that the heritage discourse (whether natural or cultural) is based on privileging the opinions and language of those who work within it (see Fairclough 1999b). Such specific language can have the consequence of neglecting personal experiences that can grant life and relevance to an otherwise depleted discourse. While the language remains privileged and exclusionary it can externalise and level personal experiences. One result is that they can be replaced by an objective rendering of some sort of universal standard – such as World Heritage listing – that is not necessarily shared or comprehended by the community at large (Hastrup 2002: 33; and see Sullivan 2003). A consequence has been the tendency for community protest to adopt scientific and conservation rhetoric, seeking to validate a multiple range of concerns and issues through the language that appears to have the most resonance (see Greer & Henry 1996). Resorting to such dominant discourses can lead to the masking of more elemental concerns that relate to relationship to place, the valuing of nature, and threats to a sense of community identity and cohesion.

Communication prompted by an 'education' agenda is, unfortunately, often the process that is identified as 'community involvement' (see McManamon & Hatton 2000). The assertion that 'communities residing near or among the locations of cultural resources … [will] protect and maintain these resources when they regard them as their own' (McManamon & Hatton 2000: 10; see also Dhanakoses 1992) is indicative of this educational quest. It throws out the challenge to heritage managers to convince the community of their (community) ownership and concomitant responsibilities, that is, to make the community partners in implementation. Byrne et al. (2001: 133), following a review of consultancy approaches, suggest that community consultation is at times interpreted as a process of informing the community that a heritage project was taking place. At other times, it was seen as an exercise in soliciting a community response to already prepared draft management strategies. The authors note that 'the impression gained … is that social significance assessment is often 'fudged' or guessed at'. Or, as elsewhere mooted: 'If a community is completely unaware of its heritage, or worse, does not see at least the emotional value of its conservation, then a different, more complicated set of strategies must first

be employed to raise the awareness level of the communities before the conservation and development activities can be attempted' (ACCU 2000a: 40; see comment in Herzfeld 1991: 197, and Sullivan 2003). If communities are indeed 'stakeholders in a cultural inventory' it is not difficult to concur that 'their stakes differ, as do their perceptions of the inventory itself' (Amit quoted in A. Cohen 2002: 169). It may well be that a community is very aware of 'its heritage', but that such heritage is conceptualised differently to that identified by professionals.

While members of the public can be recruited to 'serve as the eyes and ears' for heritage 'public officials' (McManamon & Hatton 2000: 14), or be seen as target groups or beneficiaries (see, for example, Faulkner 2000: 29; Lloyd 1999; National Trust UK 1995), they must also be allowed to have a voice that extends beyond that of official discourse (Greer et al. 2000). The encouragement for community assertions of heritage value must be more than token, vague, illusory or problem-oriented. As the following chapters show, local communities do have a strong awareness of cultural values and heritage of their locales, but their expression is often not in accord with the 'value' given to a place through professional heritage practice. This highlights that 'people's perceptions are seldom governed by a monolithic, one dimensional normative framework' (Mumma 2000: 30).

The judicious 'gatekeeping' that can ensue when opinions expressed by the community encroach on privileged disciplinary knowledge denies the capacity for valuable contributions by 'lay' members of the public to discussions of relevance to archaeology, architecture, history, zoology, botany and so on. Byrne et al. (2001: 9) charge that 'professionals in these fields should not be seen as having a monopoly on this expertise. People in communities, for instance, are conventionally thought of as 'possessing' oral histories relating to heritage places, but we should also recognise that the maintenance and transmission of these oral histories is a skill in its own right' (see also Gosden 1999: 11). Equally missing is an understanding of the *special* nature of memory as a source of history. Often, oral historians fail to recognise that oral history relies on memory, not on texts, and prefer 'to treat memory as a set of

documents that happen to be in people's heads rather than in the Public Records Office' (Fentress & Wickham 1992: 2).

The ways in which communities view their physical environment, and the remains of earlier use of the landscape found in that environment, are as important to an understanding of the human-use history and the landscape archaeology of that area as are the usual archaeological approaches (see Lihiri & Singh 1999 for a discussion of the disjunction between academic archaeological observation and ground-level perception; see also Avrami et al. 2000; de la Torre 2002). We should not forget that archaeology as a discipline was founded by 'gentlemen antiquarians' and amateur archaeologists whose contributions were sanctioned until the 1960s and the rigorous quest for scientific validity that fuelled the rise of Processual Archaeology. While many of their approaches and endeavours have been criticised in the light of modern techniques – with some justification – others have been lauded for their contribution to the rigour of today's archaeology. Alexander Keiller, for example, an amateur who undertook archaeological work at Avebury, is one such individual (see Chapter 4). It would be incorrect to advocate a total rejection of academic authority. However, it seems equally disadvantageous to stifle individual inquiry and contribution unless it emanates from a 'professional' source.[37] In the heritage context, it can only lead to the disenfranchising of ordinary people from their own – and others' – pasts. It inhibits a valuable contribution to multifarious understandings of the world. We should keep in mind Friedman's comment that: 'Culture is supremely negotiable for professional culture experts, but for those whose identity depends upon a particular configuration of the past this is not the case … I am not arguing against science here, but against an inconsequential posture, itself an outcome of the confusion of academic and real politics' (1992: 852–853).

---

[37] During the course of my fieldwork I attended several meetings of the consultative committees established in Queensland by the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA). A community criticism that emerged is the failure by GBRMPA officers, and various visiting scientists, to take heed of information passed on by members of the local community. This ranged from dugong counts to the preferred use of certain types of wood in marine structures. It has been made clear to the 'lay' informants, often over many years, that their 'data' lacks validity as it had not been collected by properly qualified people (scientists) using appropriate scientific methodologies. See also Faulkner (2000) for a discussion of the disenfranchising of 'ordinary people' from 'official' archaeology.

In allowing people to speak for themselves, we are acknowledging Lyotard's assertion that 'knowledge' is more than a set of denotative statements, and includes notions of know-how, of knowing how to live and how to listen and is 'a question of competence that goes beyond the simple determination and application of the criterion of truth' (1989: 18; see also Appadurai 1997: 181). However, Lyotard also points out that lacking a shared set of 'criteria' it is impossible to 'judge the existence or validity of narrative knowledge on the basis of scientific knowledge and vice versa' (1989: 26). The answer lies in acknowledging that different knowledge systems may be incommensurate, but that each can be equally valid. Hence it seems clear that only a small part of the solution lies in empowering the community to participate in the prevailing discourse by learning it. It requires more than recognising that it may not be enough for a community to 'simply value an old building or landscape feature; they will, for instance, need to be able to describe the history of the place and perhaps record oral histories relating to it' (Byrne et al. 2001: 65). I suggest it is not the community that will need to 'develop certain skills', but heritage practitioners who must attempt to do so.

Conclusion

It remains incongruous that while there is an increasing awareness of the arbitrariness and interrelatedness of various categories (tangible/intangible, nature/culture), the heritage meta-process continues to impose such categorical distinctions. The new Convention on Intangible Heritage reinforces intangible heritage as separate from, and peripheral to, the scientifically determined, place-oriented approaches to heritage reinforced through the World Heritage Committee and ICOMOS. The ideological intent to take a more inclusive approach to heritage is constrained by entrenched operational and intra-systemic practices that perpetuate a process of list creation through globalising cultural processes. These processes promote cultural phenomena and reify them in the international heritage sphere, creating a system that spectularises on the one hand, but marginalises and trivialises the less powerful on the other.

The question remains as to how to protect intangible aspects that are properly 'heritage' such as ethical values, social customs, traditions and practices, stories, beliefs and myths – which are not anchored to or signified by physical features, or have become disassociated from such features. It is difficult to look inside established heritage practice for ways of understanding and engaging with the complexities of an expanded concept of heritage, when it is apparent that existing approaches are ill-equipped to do so. The wide-spread incorporation of anthropological approaches to heritage is perhaps little more than an idea that is yet to have its day (but see Low 2002). Egloff, discussing university education and cultural heritage, suggests that: 'for the most part neither [the discipline of archaeology or of history] provide the opportunity for students in the early stages of their education to work on projects associated with local community needs. It is the development of skills necessary to work effectively within diverse communities which is an essential component of a good heritage education' (1993: 7).

I propose that while the need to develop new approaches is generally accepted (although sometimes conditionally), the on-the-ground practice of this acceptance remains less explicit, a situation that Byrne et al. (2001: 6) describe aptly as the 'gap between a reality and an idea'. One can be reassured by the statement that it is never easy to adjust perspectives and that paradigm shifts do not simply 'happen' (McManamon & Hatton 2000: 2). As Sullivan (2003) argues: 'There is no easy solution to these issues, but my point is that the beginning of solving them is acknowledging all the heritage values and then working towards a resolution'. On a positive note, if one of the first steps is the acknowledgment that a change in position is required, then there is an established impetus for the adoption of new ideas and approaches.

The lived experiences of communities and their attachments to places are important in considering and understanding cultural heritage. A holistic approach to heritage conservation is reliant on accepting that there is more than one 'truth and reality'. While precedence is given to approaches to heritage based on a Western scientific paradigm, and as long as such representations are seen 'as not only significant reality,

but the *only* reality' (Winter 2000: 65), there will continue to be a struggle for power sharing in the context of divergent understandings and interpretations of place, practice, memory and 'value'.