THE NATURE OF 'BEING HERE'
Methodology & Analytical Approach

Plate 3: Elephants and warriors, wall mural, Wat Doi Suthep, Chang Mai

3 THE NATURE OF 'BEING HERE'
Methodology & Analytical Approach

A. 'DOING' ETHNOGRAPHY … BY COMPARISON

The local has traditionally been the object of anthropological investigation. Hastrup (2002: 30) suggests that while dominant trends in anthropology today stress, among other things, globalisation, process and agency, there is no theoretical reason within this to not maintain 'a distinct, more or less bounded object of ethnographic analysis: the local worlds of people'. Anthropology is inherently local, focussing on thinking and local knowledge (Peacock 2002: 63). In this way it opposes the confinement of thought to a global realm and the concomitant privileging of intellectuals and power brokers and their detachment from local struggles: 'As anthropology proclaims: locals think too!' However, Peacock charges that a contradiction is often found in the variable honouring of local knowledge of certain groups, which is most often manifest in a respect for disempowered and geographically distant peoples and a denial of that of empowered groups, particularly those who are 'part of power structures local to our own residences'. The result is the potential for alienation from certain global perspectives and from thoughts and actions pertaining to home-ground lifeworlds. The assertion so made is that it is as valuable to pursue an understanding of our own communities as it is to investigate the lifeworlds of 'others', and it is this grounding in the familiar – the supposedly 'non-exotic' – that I have chosen to pursue as one focus of this project.

Geertz (1993: 5–6, 9) proposes that practitioners of anthropology (more definitively of social anthropology) 'do' ethnography, where ethnography is 'a kind of intellectual effort … an elaborate venture in … 'thick' description'. Anthropological analysis relies on sorting out structures of signification and then establishing their social ground and significance.

> Nothing is more necessary to comprehending what anthropological interpretation is, and the degree to which it is interpretation, than an exact understanding of what it means – and what it does not mean – to say that our formulations of other peoples' symbol systems must be actor oriented. (Geertz 1993: 14)

The necessity to consider interpretation on the basis of actor orientation forms a starting point for this thesis. This follows Geertz's (1993: 20) point that what anthropologists in the field inscribe is not 'raw social discourse' but that small section of it that can be understood through the actions of informants. In the current intent to investigate a specific set of phenomena and relationships, I am reassured by his conclusion that 'it is not necessary to know everything in order to understand something', and that the relevance of microscopic studies lies in their ability to reveal the local, and not their capturing of the greater world in their little (ibid: 22).

This refutation of the 'world in a tea-cup' axiom is echoed by Fox and Gingrich (2002: 1). They identify a fundamental flaw in certain approaches to comparative studies: that such approaches become employed in a seemingly narrow sense of 'hard science' methodology that seeks to support universal theories or meta-narratives. Rather, they propose, it is necessary to move away from this prevailing critique and to use an alternative ensemble of comparative methods. Although such approaches may variously support major theories, they do not seek the (alleged) elaboration of grand theory – in fact, they often serve to oppose it.

It has been charged that existing and contested theoretical debates in anthropology reflect a resurging interest in the development of 'an appropriate anthropology for the present' involving a reassessment of comparative methods (Fox & Gingrich 2002: 6; see also Gosden 1999: 185; Gupta & Ferguson 1997: 3; Hastrup 2002: 27; Peacock 2002: 44).[38] This reassessment is emerging from an increased engagement with

---

[38] As Hastrup (2002: 27) notes, the use of comparison, in different guises, has been the core of the anthropological discipline for generations of practitioners, even if Evans-Pritchard asserts that 'There is only one method in social anthropology, the comparative method – and that is impossible!' (see Evans-Pritchard 1965). While comparison as a part of anthropological practice has been 'out of fashion', at the same time it is in wide contemporary use (Fox & Gingrich 2002: 1; for a discussion of why comparative approaches have been considered questionable in anthropology see Geertz 1993; Fox & Gingrich 2002).

research problems, rather than an elaboration of methodology. It is legitimated in the context of increasing global connections and the interrogation of localised responses to them. The result is a refined focus on contemporary problems (and finding their solutions) than on more specifically documenting the customs and practices of societies, exotic or otherwise. With a methodological intent that is non-universalist and non-quantitative, comparative approaches seek to understand how underlying principles are realised in context and across time (Fox & Gingrich 2002: 14). In addition, comparison promotes a thorough synthesis of existing studies and an impetus for complementary research: 'studies do build on other studies, not in the sense that they take up where others leave off, but in the sense that, better informed and better conceptualised, they plunge more deeply into the same things' (Geertz 1993: 25).

In the comparative mode of analysis, both differences and similarities may be revealed, encouraging attempts to investigate the nature of these differences and similarities – and the mechanisms that promote them. In choosing between a single or comparative study, Peters (1998: 5) suggests: 'we must confront a fundamental trade-off between the respective virtues of complexity and generalisation' which 'is inherent to the comparative research approach in components of the social sciences'. That is, the more an approach engages with the complexities of any one system, the less will it be capable of proposing generalisations. The converse is that the more an approach attempts to propose generalisations and test broad theories, the less nuance will be allowed in its analysis.

One of several viable approaches to comparative analysis is to address similar processes, phenomena or themes in a small number of localities (or even countries, depending on the nature of the research question), selected for analytical reasons (see Peters 1998: 10). The investigated examples can be analysed to illuminate the matter under study and to develop more localised comparisons of its operation. In such instances, the purpose of the analysis is clearly not to describe and compare entire systems. Peters asserts that: 'to be effective in developing theory, and in being able to make statements about structures larger than an individual or the small group, the

social sciences must be comparative … although there must be a self-conscious effort to compare effectively and efficiently' (ibid: 25).

Melhuus (2002: 78–79) suggests that the problem of relevance in anthropology today is related to a restriction in professional gaze and to core notions of 'fieldwork', which exclude questions related to what are perceived to be non-traditional 'fields'. The latter has received greater attention in recent decades, with a shift away from 'traditional' local studies to work that is more thematically oriented, and a shaking of the privileged position of a single study place. The work undertaken in such approaches still seeks to carefully and contextually situate social phenomena, and to illuminate relationships that can ground meaning in sociocultural life-worlds. Such studies are reliant on a tradition of knowledge that can be applied to chosen phenomena, without concern for whether or not the work involves engagement in 'proper' fieldwork (see also Øyen 1990: 4). It is not proposed that fieldwork be completely done away with, but rather that the approach be re-thought when more traditional fieldwork approaches restrict access to aspects of the social world. One such rethinking lies in the comparative approach. Its application is relevant when the comparison relates to meanings and ways of constructing relationships between people, events, situations and objects, or as in the study at hand, between people and place (Melhuus 2002: 79, 82).

On the larger scale, comparative approaches can be applied to the illumination of global and local issues: the comparative method creates the nexus between field-based ethnography and society-based issues. As Henry (1999: 20) broadly argues:

> Doing fieldwork … does not mean going to a particular geographical site, it simply means placing oneself in a *field of sociality* generative of an anthropological understanding about how totalities come to be 'fixed' as objective systems in the first place.

One course of action is to make 'pointed' comparisons, that compare a locality (on which discussion or practice or a single relevant case is focussed), leading to useful shifts in both emotional and intellectual perspective. Following this intent, it is clear

that one point of comparison can usefully be a locale of one's own culture (Peacock 2002: 49, 67).

Choice of Study Sites

One of the problems in a comparative approach is identifying and selecting 'units' of comparison, and in defining the sense in which such choices are then comparable. In this thesis it was determined, first, that each place would be in a different country, in order to allow a broad spread of national and cultural influences. Following this, the determining factor was the influence of European colonial expansion, in the sense that this relates to a history of imposed Western ideological and political constructions. As the 'practice' of heritage management is grounded in legislative instruments, it seemed legitimate to choose countries whose political regimes reflected differential engagements with imperialism and colonialism. The choice also considered the potential to represent a range of lifeviews and cultural constructions, particularly in terms of the relationship between people, land and place.

It would be unrealistic to suppose that criteria relating to the practicalities of fieldwork were not also relevant. The final choices considered issues such as accessibility, financial resources, available timeframes and language constraints. An opportunity that allowed me to work and reside in Paris early in the life of the thesis presented a number of advantages, facilitating the inclusion of a study area in Europe that may have otherwise been difficult.

Based on the criterion of political history, the United Kingdom, Australia and Thailand were identified as countries of interest: between them they represent a European nation with a history of colonising practice, a colonised country in the Pacific that is today 'Western' but is home to a significant indigenous minority, and a Southeast Asian country that remained free of European occupation. It was anticipated that this selection would provide access to notions of belonging and identity as constructed through a variety of connections and diverse attachments. In addition, this choice could allow an exploration of 'cultural heritage' in the context of the enmeshment of 'the cultural politics of place and identity'(Jacobs 1996: 4) with the

legacies of Western ideologies and practices. All three countries employ similar (Western scientific) approaches to cultural heritage identification and management (see Byrne 1993 for a discussion of Australia and Thailand).

The final decision to undertake field-based research at these study locations relied on obtaining relevant government and heritage management agency approval, without which the fieldwork could not have proceeded. While it was logistically essential to seek authorisation as required under legislative, permit or policy guidelines, I also sought support for the research aims of the project: that is, that the project itself and the potential outcomes were seen to address issues of relevance 'on the ground'. That the research goals of the project are both relevant and timely was reinforced by the encouragement and support I received from the relevant government agencies, most particularly from the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, the Thai Fine Arts Department, and English Heritage and the National Trust (UK). This reinforced that community heritage issues are identified as concerns for the agencies charged with protecting heritage in each of the study sites. However, as the discussions in the following chapters show, these concerns are variously articulated and often less evident in practice.

Magnetic Island, The Great Barrier Reef, Australia

As the nature/culture relationship is one focus of the research, it was important to incorporate a place that had been added to the World Heritage list on the basis of its natural values, and this criterion was met by the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area (GBRWHA). The Great Barrier Reef presented itself as an easily accessible option, in terms of both locality and degree of cultural familiarity, what Øyen (1990: 14) has referred to as 'the principles of least difference or invitation by opportunity'. Although these aspects were important, it would be incorrect to surmise that the result was a compromise. The GBRWHA provides a valuable field of exploration in the context of the posed questions, not the least of which is its natural heritage listing.

The Great Barrier Reef was added to the World Heritage list in 1981, solely on the basis of natural criteria. The area included in the boundaries of the listing have

significant and complex cultural heritage values, and there is a strong relationship between the reef 'landscapes' and the various communities that live either within the World Heritage Area or on the adjacent coastline of mainland north-east Australia. For research purposes, the immediate challenge is the size of the area, which required the identification of a smaller locality within the reef region. Magnetic Island is a small, settled island, contained within the World Heritage Area, and is one of the few islands within the reef region that is populated by an urban residential community. Although tourism is important to the economy of the island, it has not reached the level of primacy that characterises the occupation and economy of many of the reef islands. The close proximity between the north Queensland town of Townsville and Magnetic Island, and the existence of a regular ferry service, has resulted in the growth of an island community that is an outlying suburb of Townsville with commuters regularly travelling between the island and the mainland and vice versa.

In addition, Magnetic Island is part of my own lived environment. I experience it in the same ways as many other residents of Townsville, as an attractive and easily accessible escape from the mainland, and a place where friends and colleagues reside. In terms of enhancing the comparative aspects of the research through an engagement with my home world, there were clear advantages in having some degree of equivalence with lifeviews, 'norms and standards' and a greater understanding of people's roles and practices. However, for as many similarities I may share with some members of the Magnetic Island community, there are differences that in certain circumstances define me as an outsider. The island community includes variously distinguishable but informally identified groupings, many with overlapping memberships. Among the more formally identified community groups are the Traditional Owners, the Wulgurakaba people, a number of whom live on the island. Although in more general discussion I have identified a range of issues that relate to indigenous Australians, I have not explored the Magnetic Island community through differentiating Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal value systems and worldviews, preferring to concentrate on more general constructions of place and community.

Ayutthaya, Thailand

Ayutthaya was suggested to me early in the decision-making stage by colleagues familiar with the ancient Thai capital. In terms of pragmatics, the close proximity of Ayutthaya to Bangkok was advantageous when faced with a limited fieldwork period in Thailand and the desirability of accessing resources in both centres. Ayutthaya also encourages a comparison with Magnetic Island: first, the central core of the old city of Ayutthaya is contained on a river island; second, the old city is today associated with a more extensive urban landscape. The latter is of interest in that the features that collectively form the World Heritage site – the Ancient City of Ayutthaya – are dispersed throughout a modern built environment, with a major cluster of monuments contained in the Ayutthaya Historical Park. The juxtaposition of created monumental park, dispersed ancient features and a modern lived environment suggested a favourable location for the investigation of contemporary community attachments and practices.

The present-day community of Ayutthaya is characterised by a diversity of religious groups, containing significant Christian and Muslim populations. Existing as minority groups in a majority Buddhist population, the presence of Christians and Muslims in Ayutthaya has its roots in the origins of the kingdom as a major international trading port in the 14th century. Hence, not only is there the interesting relationship between the contemporary Buddhist community and the relics of the ancient city of Ayutthaya, which are predominantly the remains of Buddhist temple structures, but there is the potential to investigate the complexity of relationships found in differing religious affiliations.

Avebury, England

As with Ayutthaya, the World Heritage listing of Avebury arises solely from its cultural values, manifest in a series of isolated monuments dispersed across a more extensive area. The World Heritage listed monuments are those that represent the Neolithic period of the region, forming a more comprehensive World Heritage listing that also incorporates Stonehenge. In contrast to Stonehenge, however, the main henge in the Avebury area is physically entwined with a small rural village. The residents of

Avebury village are engaged in a heritage 'tournament' in which Neolithic and monumental narratives are pitted against a more recent history and the memories and experiences of the contemporary village community.

Fieldwork Program

As I was residing in Townsville for the majority of my PhD candidature, the period during which I undertook interviews with members of the Magnetic Island community was not as constrained as elsewhere. However, most interviews were conducted from October 2000 to June 2001, prior to my overseas research and fieldwork. An additional period of fieldwork on Magnetic Island was completed following my return to Townsville in October 2002. The research relating to the GBRWHA was greatly assisted through participation as a research officer (1999–2000, 2003) within the School of Anthropology, Archaeology and Sociology (James Cook University), on a project investigating cultural heritage in the Marine Park and World Heritage Area (see Greer et al. 2000). I was employed for three months in 2000 as a project officer in the GBRMPA Research and Monitoring Area. Among other advantages, this provided me with the opportunity to gain an 'insider' understanding of the Authority and to discuss issues relevant to my research with a range of staff, advisory committees and members of the public.

I also took the opportunity to travel to Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, to meet with officers of the (then) World Heritage Division, Environment Australia, and to access the departmental library and relevant archives. This was an interesting and volatile period for World Heritage issues in Australia. Not only did it encompass the introduction of the *Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (which replaced several pieces of legislation, including the 1983 *World Heritage Properties Conservation Act*), but Australia was to take the Chair of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee following its committee meeting in Cairns, Australia, in November 2000.

In June 2001 I travelled to Paris and commenced a project with the ICOMOS Secretariat. I lived in Paris until early January 2002, and returned to Paris in June

2002 for an additional three months following my fieldwork in Thailand. This period was to provide invaluable access to archival material at both ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre (UNESCO) and to officers and committee holders of both agencies, as well as prominent international heritage professionals. World heritage matters were not only critical items on the Australian domestic agenda at this time: a major review of the Guidelines to the World Heritage Convention was also in progress. The other significant UNESCO initiative that took place during this period was the establishment of the Masterpieces of Oral and Intangible Heritage.

After an initial visit to Avebury in September 2000, I stayed in England for most of December 2000 and early January 2001, and spent a number of very wintry days interviewing various village residents and representatives of associated management and interest groups. My initial intent to live in the village proved impossible when faced with limited accommodation facilities and the excessive cost of those available. Instead, I resided in the nearby town of Warminster. It became clear that I would need to return to the village for a further period and I arranged to spend another month in England in September 2001, prior to returning to Australia.

I spent a month in Thailand in early 2000, and also moved to Thailand from Paris in January 2001. I lived in Ayutthaya until the middle of the year, residing on the island, directly on the riverfront. This allowed me to directly experience the busy life and traffic associated with the Pasak River. As the house was owned by a family with long connections to Ayutthaya, I was provided with some immediate introductions to long-term residents. During this time I was given invaluable support by the Director of the Ayutthaya Historical Project with the Fine Arts Department.

Methodology

A comparative fieldwork approach has allowed a more effective investigation of broad issues that relate to meanings and ways of constructing relationships between people, practices, landscapes and places. Recognising that the incorporation of multiple sites constrains the length of fieldwork time at any one location, the end result was clearly not intended to inform a comprehensive ethnography. Rather the

intent was to follow recent approaches to ethnographic research that encourage a more directed process that seeks to answer specific questions. That is to say, the aim was to shift from 'traditional' local studies to work that is more thematically oriented. Emphasis is thereby placed on building on a tradition of knowledge through the investigation of a particular phenomenon.

I relied on three fieldwork methods. The first involved direct contact with individuals through a series of semi-structured interviews. The people targeted were primarily local residents, with a number of supplementary interviews being held with relevant heritage managers and representatives of various NGOs and interest groups. The interviews were undertaken with individuals or small groups in informal settings (often their homes), and with a focus on a particular aspect of their lives and experiences. I generally chose not to arrange broad public discussions, such as the community workshop approach commonly used in Australia. In particular I wanted to avoid a process that relied on organisational spokes-people, albeit tempered with an acknowledgment of the valuable role and support that can be provided by such representatives.[39] On a number of occasions I attended meetings that had been convened for other purposes, either as an observer or as an invited guest, and I gave presentations about the research as requested.

In all places preliminary contact was made with community leaders and key groups or government agencies. This ensured appropriate courtesy of communication and acted as a reference source for potential informants. Seeking names from those who have been interviewed can achieve what is referred to as a 'snowball' effect, so that within a certain number of on-referrals the interviewees are unknown to earlier informants. While this was adopted in some instances, the desire to seek broad representation from various community groupings meant that a chain of referrals was less relevant or

---

[39] In a broader political sense, the lack of membership representivity that can accrue from a reliance on an organisational spokesperson has been discussed by J. Kapferer (1996: 20): 'The designated spokespeople … are regularly accused of failing to represent the unanimous views of their entire constituencies … such spokespeople are frequently required to articulate opposing views within their own organisations, almost invariably within strict time limits which do not permit a canvassing of all their members. In these situations, what is produced as "the" position of the organisation is frequently the position of a powerful minority…'. See Carr & Halvorsen (2001) and Low (2002) for a discussion of a range of community based approaches and participatory techniques.

feasible. However, it must be stated that there was no intent to engage with a cross-section of the community that could be seen to be statistically representative of the larger community. I did attempt, however, to target individuals who had been identified as having a strong attachment to the study area, with a mix of those who were more and less public in the expression of this attachment and feeling. My intent in interviewing heritage agency representatives was twofold. Although they are obviously key informants regarding the formal heritage status of the various places, they are in many instances also residents, with their own attachments to these places that goes beyond their professional involvement. As Herzfeld (1991: 193) has remarked, bureaucrats are people too, and have similar roles as theorising agents as do residents, both groups being enmeshed in the same rhetorical nexus.

The interviews usually lasted between one and two hours, and consisted for the most part in the interviewee providing details that related to his or her family history and background, and what was important about where they lived, and why. The interviewees were not presented with a set of specific questions, but I directed the discussion at times so as to incorporate common issues that I wished to explore, World Heritage for example. To some extent by doing so I provided a form of legitimation of such terms and concepts by introducing them into the discussion. In particular the interviewees were asked to identify what were the important 'things' (aspects) about their lives that they wished to keep for their children. I tried to avoid the use of the word 'heritage' as it has become a value laden and variously interpreted term, and I wished to avoid the situation where 'the data of the senses are pushed under in favour of what one is taught to see and admire' (Tuan 1979: 146). Even among those with a professional or academic familiarity with the term, 'heritage' can be multi-definitional and context dependent.

I elected not to tape the interviews. It had been suggested that to do so could be particularly problematic in Thailand, and I preferred to maintain a consistent recording system for the three study sites. As I am proficient in a form of short-hand I took notes during the interviews, and added relevant observations when writing up the notes. All interviewees were asked for permission to record the conversation in this way.

Although I have been studying the Thai language, my language skills are far from proficient to undertake this level of discussion with Thai people. For most of my fieldwork in Ayutthaya I worked with a Thai field assistant, who provided assistance in strategic matters and with setting up and undertaking interviews. I was guided by two assistants, both Thai women, who provided invaluable support with translations and general communications. I do, however, acknowledge the constraints in using a translator as an intermediary agent, particularly in terms of the potential for inaccuracy in translating from English to Thai or vice versa. I am also aware that at times the responses, and even the questions, may have been influenced by my assistant's interpretation of my research aims. In a number of instances the interviewees spoke English so it was possible to conduct the interview primarily in this language, with the advantage of having a translator present to allow a finer discussion as required. I stress, however, that any potential for misunderstanding and error in translation must ultimately reflect my own limited Thai language skills, and not the English language proficiency of either my informants or assistants.

In most interview instances, my presence was legitimated and defined by my role as a researcher – I was not a part of my informants' daily lives. My interest in their activities and lives was also constrained by my research interests. It is not surprising therefore that a characteristic of the discussions was one of repetition and a certain reservation. However, to some extent I also had some limited interaction with the daily lives of the broader community through my own experiences of being 'in place'. This was the second method of gathering information, commonly referred to as participant observation. It would be incorrect to suggest that the level of community engagement I was able to accomplish in any of the three study sites was sufficient in itself to significantly inform my results. However, by spending time in each place it was possible to complement the information obtained through more direct interviewing. The establishment of a rapport with members of the communities was most effective at Magnetic Island. This was due to length of contact period but primarily to my status as a nearby resident who had a relationship with the island beyond that of my fieldwork activities.

The third research method involved the collection and collation of additional sources of information that could assist in a contextualisation of the study. Among this array of material were sources that included expressions of community attachments. These primarily involved texts, in the form of relevant legislation and policy documents, management plans, discussion papers, government heritage publications, local histories and accounts and newspapers (both local and national). There were additional sources in the form of television interviews and documentaries, and internet discussions and references.[40] Personal, unpublished commentary appeared through reviewing visitor and feedback books, and provided additional 'images' relevant to attachment. The synthesis and analysis of this additional material can shed light on community perceptions and provides a supplementary insight into the lives, experiences and attachments of the people with whom I spoke.

B. THEORETICAL AND ANALYTIC APPROACHES

The analysis of material collected during the fieldwork, and the complementary literature review, relies on a qualitative approach. A more quantitative approach, which engages with statistical explanations, can potentially leave a number of factors unconsidered that may be important for the more descriptive explanations available using qualitative analysis. Mason (2002), for example, asserts that qualitative research methods, including 'narratives and analyses written by experts to interviews of ordinary citizens, elicit cultural values more effectively'. However, although a qualitative, case-study approach to comparative studies and a statistical approach to the same phenomena may appear extremely different, the fundamental underlying logic of research comparison is very similar, in that either style of social research 'depends on the same issues of research design, each is prey to the same potential errors, and each requires interpretation that goes beyond their available data' (Peters 1998: 8).

---

[40] See, for example, Hastrup & Olwig's (1997: 10) discussion of the use of such material, both visual and written, as a valuable supplement to field-generated material; also see Gosden (1999: 61) and Low (2002).

Apart from the complexity of synthesis and analysis that accompanies an engagement with multiple study sites, there are additional challenges and constraints associated with a project of this nature. The recording, interpretation and analysis of the fieldwork will necessarily reflect my own lifeviews and perspectives; that is, it cannot encapsulate the reality of the lifeworlds experienced and created by the communities I have worked with. An antidote can be partly found in using contrasts and comparisons in an attempt to create a sensitivity to the relativity of knowledge (Dogan and Pelassy 1990: 9, 12). Another is to accept the futility of an attempt to be free from preconceptions and retain a consciousness of the values one already holds. I am also aware of the dilemma that Moore (1994: 10) has emphasised, in that writing and talking about the lives of other people it is impossible to separate the question of whether or not one is actually speaking *for* them. Further, I remain aware of the caution that 'all attempts to define reality for others are attempts to legitimate the position of the classifiers and definers' (Friedman 1997: 268).

To some extent I have grounded the translation of concepts through a single external reference point – that of the prevailing Western construction of heritage. In the first instance, therefore, the comparison is not cross-national but predicated on a relationship between centre and periphery.[41] The centre is deemed to be the heritage paradigm enshrined in the policies and practices of UNESCO and ICOMOS (and to some extent the IUCN). The systems through which this heritage paradigm is disseminated and legitimised are ultimately national and legalistic, so – following Øyen (1990: 9) – one would expect the operation of power structures, cultural imperatives and interpretations arising from the application of different doctrinal styles. One result is the impact this can have on influencing – mostly constraining – the range of behaviours shown by either heritage professionals or local communities. As Jacobs (1996: 5) neatly states in a similar comparative study, the intent is *not* to propose a near linear flow from Europe to other localities but to highlight a project that is global in scale but 'messy in its local effects'.

---

[41] In using a relationship based on 'centre and periphery' I do so only in the sense of this one particular phenomenon. I am not proposing that the centre/periphery nexus is logically applicable to more extensive colonial, imperial or global influences.

I have approached the analysis of how communities form attachments to places and attribute value to aspects of their lives through the concepts of identity construction and links with place, landscape and the social practices that 'make' place. I look at the social relationships inscribed in the interactions between people, location and practice, exploring how places become imbued with personal and social meanings that act to articulate identity at the local level. Following Bender (1995b: 248) I have attempted to emphasise the 'physicality of living in the world', created through the interaction of action, belief, experience and engagement. In the process, I attempt to avoid the trap identified by B. Kapferer (1995a: 86) and to ensure that the complexity of lifeworlds and the emotional force of their parts are not drained of content nor depleted of meaning.

A 'Community' by Any Other Name

It is clear that the world is not totally comprised of 'stable cohesive communities of shared tradition and perspective' (Carter et al. 1993: vii). The historical reality is that many communities have been subject to disruption and dislocation, or have not been created through strict alliance with a particular 'place' – communities that practice transhumance for example. Added to this, the forced displacement of people as a result of military, economic or environmental disruption, and the voluntary movement of people through travel, are far from modern phenomena. The more recent impacts of rapid advances in communications and technology, and of globalisation and capitalism, have created their own disruptions across multifarious groups of people (see Appadurai 1996; Hall 2000; Hastrup & Olwig 1997; Malkki 1992). Consequently, most communities today are not bounded in either membership or ideas, and are not impermeable to the influx through immigration of new experiences and memories. It cannot, therefore, be anticipated that a 'community' is entirely composed of individuals who share the same set of ideologies, histories, memories, experiences and values. As a result, communities are often, perhaps always, multi-representational and multi-vocal. Individual alliances and assertions of power, defined in the Foucauldian sense as being complex strategic situations in a particular society (Gupta & Ferguson 1997: 18), are context dependent and will fluctuate in line with changing priorities. People's temporal movements and interactions with others

fluctuate and re-create ways of being through both place and space. What can be done is restrained by 'what is there', but 'what is there' also permits negotiation so that life is always a process of 'becoming', even if grounded in routinised social practice (Bender 1992; see also Kapferer 1995b).

The 'knowability' of a community is in itself problematic, from the inside as well as the outside. Anderson (1992: 6) reminds us that all communities, other than those who experience face-to-face contact – and possibly even these – are imagined. As Jacobs (1996: 101) points out, many communities celebrate their diversity yet at the same time circulate the idea of community as an imaginative category that seeks to gather difference together. The transparency that knowability implies is hence impossible. Knowledge of community, therefore, can often be little more than a 'recognition' of community. This recognition is itself ephemeral. Place making and the construction of identity are predicated on a mutable construction of difference and 'sameness', not merely the discovery of either. Identity is influenced by a mobile and often unstable set of relationships (Gupta and Ferguson 1997: 13). The implication is that identity – and alterity – are formed at the same time as both locality and community, and that place and identity are continually contested. Communities may form (and reform) when faced with a motive to do so, such as the desire to meet a collective need or aspiration. As Deleuze argues, the multiplicity within groups and individuals suggests that 'all of us are "groupuscules"' (Bouchard 1977: 206), with the capacity for simultaneous loyalties to multiple communities. Amit and Rapport (2002: 59) assert that there are forms of community 'that are conceptualised first and foremost by reference to what is held in common by members rather than in terms of oppositional categories of insiders and outsiders'. In such circumstances identities are built up through shared experiences of particular associations and events. Difference and particularity have emerged out of a notion of relational group identity, itself claimed through publicly asserted difference (Carter et al. 1993: x).

My approach, therefore, has been to follow Hastrup's assertion that 'acknowledging the autonomy and integrity of selves … implies a thorough concern with the ways in which individual lives are implicated in a whole series of other lives, of power

structures, of habit and discourses' (2002: 38). People 'are not simply incarnated vocabularies, eternally trapped in particular languages and self-contained conceptual universes' (ibid: 39). Individuals construct a consciousness of their social world, which includes cultural understandings and practices, out of their engagement with and conceptualisation of lived experience.

A discussion about 'community' requires further definition, given the potentially broad understanding of the word (see Amit 2002; A. Kuper 2002: 147; Turner 1987: 126–127). Turner, for example, salutes Buber's definition: 'Community is where community happens'. Following Wittgenstein (in Cohen 1985) I *use* the word 'community' – rather than attempting to provide a lexical meaning – to refer to a group of people who share a sense of togetherness and cohesiveness, with ties to a particular locale, and who are variously distinguished from other groups, often in a process of self-identification. Community, however, is not simply a homonym for 'locale', and place and community are not homologous. 'Neither past nor present communities should necessarily be regarded as concrete, physical entities situated in particular places, but rather as cultural constructions that provide important symbolic as well as practical frameworks to life' (Karen Olwig 2002: 125). As communities change over time, so too will the 'community' construction of place: both are mutable. At any time communities will be drawn together through something in common, or by being distinguished from another 'group'. Ultimately, communities have as a primacy a sense of belonging.

My use of the term 'local community' is intended to reflect a relationship between a group of people and a particular location or locale. A 'local' community in this sense can also coincide with an administrative entity. Either can be considered a useful platform on which to situate a discussion of dwelling and emplacement and explore how individuals and groups within that entity create their own sense of community and place. It became clear in the fieldwork that individuals in referring to 'my' community called upon varying instruments of communality that revealed the context-dependent and fluid nature of community constructions: 'us' and 'them' remain fluid categories that can be 're-sited' in relation to new questions or different places and

times (Hall 1990: 228). Communities are not fully constituted entities, that exist as a given 'out there'. Laclau and Mouffe (1985: 12) suggest that a community comes into being through 'an attempt to dominate the field of discursivity, to arrest the flow of differences, to construct a centre' (see Henry 1999: 190).

Appadurai (1997: 178) makes a further distinction relevant to local constructions of community – between neighbourhood and locality. He defines neighbourhood as 'life-worlds constituted by relatively stable associations, known and shared histories, and by collectively traversed and legible spaces and places' (ibid: 191).[42] He distinguishes this from a more formal definition of neighbourhoods as 'barely more than stages, holding companies, sites, and barracks for populations with a dangerously thin commitment to the production of locality' (ibid: 193). For the purposes of my approaches to community, I find equivalence between the latter definition of neighbourhood and formally delineated locations, defined and bounded through bureaucratic processes that name and map. It is, for example, the distinction between suburb and neighbourhood, where the latter exists experientially, through social engagement and community making. Through this engagement, the material and spatial markers of locality – such as houses, paths and gardens, the mapping and negotiation of transhuman spaces – take on meaning to become 'moments in a general technology (and teleology) of location' that contribute to the production of locality as a structure of feeling (ibid 1997: 180; and see Raffles 2000: 2).

Appadurai defines locality as primarily contextual, as being a complex phenomenological aspect of social life, categorical rather than scalar or spatial. Neighbourhood, in contrast, he defines as existing social forms in which locality is realised, as either a dimension or value: 'Neighbourhoods, in this usage, are situated communities characterised by their actuality, whether spatial or virtual, and their potential for social reproduction' (1996: 179). He posits a dialectical and historical relationship between neighbourhoods – which are simultaneously practical, valued and taken-for-granted – and the production of local subjects. Without local subjects

---

[42] Heidegger defines 'neighbourhood' as 'dwelling in nearness' (quoted in Casey 1997: 282). Neighbourhood in this sense effects a pinning down and particularising of place, making it intimate.

'the construction of a local terrain of habitation, production and moral security would have no interests attached to it' (1997: 181). Amit (2002: 2–3) suggests that in terms of actual social relations, the general distinction Appadurai is drawing between category and phenomenology is apposite. He argues that there has been a shift away from community as an actualised social form, to an emphasis on community as an idea or quality of sociality in the conceptualisation of community in anthropological and related literatures. The process of 'making locality' is one in which space and time become socialised and localised 'through complex and deliberate practices of performance, representation and action' (Appadurai 1997: 180). Such practices are part of a cultural process that attributes values and meanings, symptoms and legibility, and which are integral to constructions of place and community. 'Making locality' in this context is a particular form of 'place-making'.

Places and Place Making

The intellectual foundations of the relationship between identity, people and place have been reinvigorated by discourse relating to diaspora, migration and movement (see for example Carter et al. 1993); however, while 'a place' may no longer be considered a straightforward support for identity, places remain a major element in the bricolage from which identity is created. In relation to the immense review of spatial relations arising from modernity and the technological advances that bring people together, Giddens suggests that 'place becomes increasingly *phantasmagoric*: that is to say, locales are thoroughly penetrated by and shaped in terms of social influence quite distant from them' (1990: 19; emphasis in original).

Hastrup and Olwig (1997: 3) encourage the exploration and refocussing of the 'place' of culture 'in both the experiential and discursive spaces that people inhabit or invent … the siting of culture as a dynamic process of self-understanding among people'. Places are significant as focal points of identification for people, most of whose daily lives are inculcated with relationships that enmesh both local and global complexities. The relationship between people and places in many instances has become less singular in that people may experience, and interact with, multiple places of significance. Equally, place and its impacts do not hold hegemonic sway. They are of

equal import to the action of people on places, where that action is created out of experiences, memories and imaginings of other places. Identity, hence, is a form of 'production', and consists as a process that is never complete (Hall 1990: 222), that is, it is not only a matter of 'being' but also a process of 'becoming'. And as Geertz (1996: 262) so aptly notes: 'no one lives in the world in general. Everybody, even the exiled, the drifting, the diasporic, or the perpetually moving, lives in some confined and limited stretch of it – "the world around here"'.

The interaction with place(s) is commonly addressed in terms of 'social space' and the multiplicity of spaces – as actioned places – that exist. Moreover, this multiplicity of places and spaces finds resonance in the concept of landscapes.[43] The collection and analysis of ethnographic data using landscape concepts can evaluate ways in which identity is individually and communally constructed, in terms of a relationship to place and practice (see Hirsch & O'Hanlon 1995). Morphy (1995: 205) cautions, however, that although landscape has a long history of conceptual application it has for most of that time been under-theorised, with the result that it becomes part of ethnographic description but fails to inform the analysis of social reproduction processes. I suggest a similar critique can be made for expositions of 'place' in heritage discourse.

Turning to phenomenology seems an appropriate direction where interest lies in pursuing the close connection between the individualness and communality of human experience, and of the finer graininess of 'being-in-the-world':

> Phenomenology, taking solitude as a fundamental basis of human experience, directs much of its analytic attention to the processes whereby individuals overcome or transcend their aloneness in the world and come to share their lived experiences with others … the point remains that human beings as social actors in their cultural worlds take for granted that they are acting in relation to others who share a history and a set of common experiences and understandings of experience. (B. Kapferer 1986: 188–189)

---

[43] See H. Kuper (2003) for a historical overview of anthropological approaches to the construction of space. For discussion on the relationship between space and place, including the hegemony of discourse relating to time and space that has served to marginalise the role of place, see Agnew & Duncan (1989); Casey (1993, 1997); Tuan (1979). Ward (2003) reviews how place has been variously formulated in anthropological approaches.

Kapferer reinforces that culture, as implicated in the ordering of life in day-to-day situations, is both particularising and universalising. Understanding of individual actions and experiences and situatedness in the world, and that of others, is given meaning through a variety of 'cultural typification and idealisation of experience … what is shared, however, is not the experience of the other in its full existential immediacy. Rather, the sharing takes place at another level, at a degree removed from any immediate individual experience' (ibid: 190). That is, while one person cannot share another's particular experience, such experiences can be comprehended and mutually realised in daily life.

Casey asserts the value of a phenomenological approach to understanding 'place':

> Even if such an approach is not without its own prejudicial commitments and ethnocentric stances, it is an approach that, in its devotion to concrete description, has the advantage of honouring the actual experience of those who practice it. In this regard it rejoins not only the anthropologist in the field but the native on the land: both have no choice but to begin with experience. As Kant insisted, 'there can be no doubt that all our knowledge begins with experience'. (Casey 1996: 16; see also Merleau-Ponty 2002) [44]

Underlying this is the role of perception, where perception is both constituted and constitutive. Places and senses act to mutually make each other, in a dialectic of perception and place – and of both with meaning – which is intricate, profound and never-ending: 'the existence of this dialectic means that we are never without placed experiences. It signifies as well that we are not only *in* places but *of* them' (Casey 1996: 19). Place as constituted, experienced and relational can be supported through a phenomenological approach (Ward 2003: 83).

Gosden (1999: 121) draws on Heidegger's idea of dwelling as an approach that seeks to appreciate life as it is lived, completely and undifferentiated 'with people in touch with the world through all their senses and acting using socially inculcated sets of bodily skills and practices'. Dwelling is formed by processes that give personal

---

[44] Bender 2003 cautions that some approaches to phenomenology fall into the trap of either naturalising the embodied experience as though the body was unproblematic, or of somehow essentialising 'being-in-place' as being separate from historical and political dimensions. The solution is to see a phenomenological approach as forming part of a socio-political-historical-economic analysis, and not as replacing it. See also Henry (1999).

dimensions to the place in which people exist, immersed in the present world with the possibility of reaching beyond in both space and time (Seamon & Mugerauer 1985: 8). Casey (1993: xv), however, criticises Heidegger for failing to adequately assess the role of the human body in the experience of significant places. In comparison, Merleau-Ponty pursues a thesis that access to the 'primary world' is principally obtained through our lived bodies. 'Merleau-Ponty teaches us not just that the human body is never without a place or that place is never without (its own or virtual) body; he also shows that the lived body is itself a place. Its very movement, instead of effecting a mere change of position, *constitutes place*, brings it into being' (Casey 1997: 229; emphasis in original). Although Merleau-Ponty sees the bodily engagement with place as being an *important* aspect of place making, Casey is more categorical: 'we get into place, move and stay there, *with our bodies …* there is no getting around the fact that it is with our bodies that we belong to the place-world' (1997: 239; emphasis in original). This is limiting in that such a preoccupation with bodily engagement runs the risk of marginalising – even ignoring – the engagement with place that arises through conceptualisation and imagining. Place is not only physically *here*, it is also the imagined or remembered *there* (Ward 2003: 84). Ward (2003: 85) also critiques Casey for neglecting to acknowledge that a person can be 'somewhere' but this may as easily engender a sense of being 'out of place' as 'in place'. So while physical emplacement is one determinant of place-making, it is not a prerequisite for engendering the strong attachments people feel for particular places. Such attachments do not necessarily arise from bodily presence, or indeed require such presence for their maintenance.

The phenomenological approach complements the understanding of life as a series of transformations, shifting in line with the changing relationships between people and things. Relationships are situational and derive from the enmeshment of material and social relations. While dwelling reinforces the importance of interconnectedness, a relational view reveals how actions are contextualised, and emphasises change and its causes. The two views can be seen to form a dialectic, that moves the attention between that of 'being' to that of 'becoming' (Gosden 1999: 124). Integral to such an approach is the relationship highlighted by Bourdieu (1990b) between practical action

and the way this is influenced by our conscious appreciation of the world. The process of socialisation is one through which 'habitus' is learned. The absorption of social norms becomes part of who one is, rather than just acquired knowledge. Bourdieu defines habitus as a set of principles that allows people to cope with the vagaries of situational change (Bourdieu 1977: 72). In the absence of a collective consciousness, a community's habitus can arise out of a set of strategies that are shaped by past circumstances, passed down through sayings and popular wisdom and through the manifestation of meanings in a range of social processes including interpersonal relations and ritual.

Place cannot be simply reduced to being no more than a containing surface, such a container model being rejected by both Heidegger and Derrida, and replaced by the Open, 'a regionalised neighbourhood that is more an event than an entity [and is] a matter of *taking place'* (Casey 1997: 339 emphasis in original). 'Rather than being one definitive sort of thing – for example, physical, spiritual, cultural, social – a given place takes on the qualities of its occupants, reflecting those qualities in its own constitution and description and expressing them in its occurrence as an event: places not only *are*, they *happen'* (Casey 1996: 27; emphasis in original). One manifestation of the relationship between people, events and places is found in aspects of performance, both formal and informal. This refocusses attention on what people do, on action, and on how practices act to imbue place with meaning.

Carter et al. (1993: xii) assert that it is places that 'ground identification', and that a space becomes a place through a process of being named and given meaning. Or, as de Certeau (1984: 104) comments: 'proper names carve out pockets of hidden and familiar meaning. They 'make sense''. This process is embedded in the flow of power and negotiation of social relations rendered in the physicality of architecture and in the embodiment of the imagination and symbolic attribution of a community. Places are not, therefore, bounded areas, but connected movements in networks of social relations and understandings. Places, cultures, and people are 'all situated on shifting ground', and it is this idea that cultural identities are not given, are not-static and are determined by connections that provides a central premise to theoretical accounts that

consider places as process (Ward 2003: 97). 'What gives a place its specificity is not some long internalised history but the fact it is constructed out of a particular constellation of social relations, meeting and weaving together at a particular locus' (Massey quoted in Ward 2003: 88). Seeking the specific in a world of interconnection and fluidity may require recognising the particular juxtaposition and adaptation of the cultural elements that constitute places and render them unique.

The images people construct in their minds do not exist independently from their everyday physical emplacement and engagement with the world. Places are constituted through the practical activity of individuals or groups – time, space and place act as cultural markers. They combine the cognitive, the physical and the emotional into something that may be socially reproduced but is always open to transformation and change. A place is contextually constituted by differing human experiences, attachments and involvements. The creation of meanings cannot be understood as independent from the symbolically constructed lifeways of social actors. Hence meaning will also depend on variables such as age, gender, social position and relationship to others (Tilley 1994: 10–11; Bender 1995a: 2). The limits of place are grounded in the limits of human consciousness and places are 'contexts for human experience, constructed in movement, memory, encounter and association' (Tilley 1994: 15).

Places are not fixed entities but cultural constructions that are part of the process of human life (Hastrup & Olwig 1997: 12). Or as Munn (2003: 93) describes it, places can be 'a complex kind of relative spacetime, not simply a set of determinate locales or "places"' where spacetime is 'a symbolic nexus of relations produced out of interactions between bodily actors and terrestrial spaces'. Tuan (1979: 138) suggests that an elemental sense of place comes from considering place as a pause in movement where 'the pause makes it possible for the locality to become a centre of felt value'. The 'pause' is similarly implicated in the relationships between people, place and community and issues of dependence. While Tuan discusses this in the sense of dependence relating to physical needs, there is the implication of greater experiential and emotional nurturing that reinforces an intimate association with and

sentiment for place. In this way, over time, encounters and associations construct places, with the experience of places being memory qualified (see also Lovell 1998; J. Thomas 1999: 52–53).

Place and Landscape

Places are far more than points or locations, because they have distinctive meanings and values for individuals and groups and are bound up with personal and cultural identity.   Experience begins at a place, reaches out to others through spaces, and creates landscapes for human existence. Place – as a centre for action, intention and meaningful concern – can be considered in terms of the wider context of landscape. Indeed 'the spirit of a place may be held to reside in a landscape' (Tilley 1994: 18, 26). Ellis (1994: 23) suggests that a 'cultural heritage' paradigm that relates to landscape would be concerned with a 'sense of place' and the various intellectual manifestations of the way societies create, maintain and respond to that sense of place. Although writing in the Australian context, he suggests that this preoccupation with place is common to all societies and is part of any community's view of themselves. A 'sense of place' will be influenced by peoples' different experiences and expectations, which in turn will be a product of the operation of culture.

Massey (1993: 66) notes that places are neither scale-bound nor reified: 'they can be imagined as articulated moments in networks of social relations and understanding'. The cultural landscape can be envisioned as similar articulated moments of networks that stretch across space. 'A landscape seems to exceed the usual parameters of place by continuing without apparent end; nothing contains it, while it contains everything, including discrete places, in its environing embrace' (Casey 1993: 25).[45] Landscape comes into being through social practices and the web of meanings communities attribute to their physical and cultural surroundings (see Hirsch 1995; Humphrey 2001).

---

[45] Casey suggests that these broader constructs are 'placescapes'. Appadurai (1996: 33; 2000), in considering global cultural flows, considers a number of '–scapes' as landscape building-blocks. One of these is 'ethnoscape', defined as the 'landscape of persons who constitute the shifting world in which we live'.

The value of a landscape approach to heritage is that it has the capacity to address multi-vocal 'experiences and expectations', and to allow for multiple interpretations and engagements with what are ostensibly the same physical manifestations that inhabit a place or places. Hence, it goes further than the purely visual: landscapes are also experiential. A landscape is 'not just something looked at or thought about, an object merely for contemplation, depiction, representation and aestheticisation', but rather 'a landscape has ontological importance because it is lived in and through, mediated, worked on and altered, replete with cultural meaning and symbolism' (Tilley 1994: 26). This process of cognitive shaping and reshaping of landscapes has a temporal dimension. In the same way that contemporary engagements will result in differentially shaped landscapes, so too landscapes will be engaged with differentially over time. Because communities change over time, landscapes are dynamic socio-geographic entities 'that are constantly being reshaped by political, economic and social forces, as well as shifts in moral and value systems' (Aziz 2001: 121) in a process that is both created by and creative of people.

In concert with 'community' and 'heritage', 'landscape' as a contemporary term is highly ideological, and variously elucidated. However, Daniels (in Tilley 1994: 25) suggests that: 'we should beware of attempts to define landscape, to resolve its contradictions; rather we should abide in its duplicity', or its 'vagueness'. The ambiguity of the word has led to numerous attempts at definition, and expositions of its etymology (see for example Bender 1995a: 2; Gosden 1999; J. Thomas 1995; Küchler 1995: 85; Kenneth Olwig 1995: 309–312). These reaffirm the emergence of landscape as an ego-centric Western concept, arising from a specific historical context, in which the world is rendered intelligible – and passive – from the view of the outsider: landscape as a scenic depiction of nature. It is something that is acted *on*. It is a backdrop or stage, having no internal, reactive agency.

In contrast, more recent phenomenological approaches to landscape have rejected the idea that the world or entities within it are abstract ideas or the subject of observation. Or, as J. Thomas (1995: 27) espouses, phenomenology rejects that 'the places where we live are purely external objects' and further suggests the value of distinguishing

between 'landscape-as-entity' and 'landscape-as-relationship' (see Tilley 1994; Ingold 1993, 1996). The latter allows for an understanding of landscape as incomplete and in the process of 'becoming' rather than as a bounded and static entity. Landscape as relationship has the implication that differing sets of relationships with the same collection of physical features are more than juxtaposed representations. They are two (or more) worlds occupying or overlapping the same space and places. The consequence of acknowledging a multiplicity of world views is that conflict will not be easily allayed through mutual understanding, based as it is on potentially incommensurate ways of being in the world. These are far more fundamental differences than those of perception (J. Thomas 2001: 181–182). This is not to suppose that conflict is essential, as there will be situations in which different understandings will exist harmoniously.

A landscapes approach facilitates an engagement with differences in time and interpretation, and the fluidity of landscape discourse can serve to cohere divergent intra-disciplinary themes. For example, landscape and myth converge and take on common theoretical interest in more recent approaches by anthropologists and human geographers (Cosgrove 1995: 281; Schein 1997; Wagstaff 1987; Ucko & Layton 1999). Within archaeology, landscape can unite research approaches covering ecological, scientific, empirical, historical, social or cultural questions (J. Thomas 1995: 20). Bender (1995a: 2), for example, notes that differences in spatial understanding will result in horizontal determinations of space, where the landscape encompasses the surface of the world, and vertical approaches that incorporate both the heavens and the world below the visible surface. One lesson is to retain a critical appreciation of the lack of universality of landscape as a concept: people view the world differently. Another is the need for caution in terms of the application of the concept of 'landscape'. Cultural landscapes have become a much used, abused and debated framework, and are running the risk of becoming intellectually passé. Geertz (1993: 3–4), discussing the way in which some new ideas burst upon the intellectual landscape, proposes that the path of such ideas is to lose their grandiose and all-promising scope. They become 'part of our stock of theoretical concepts' and a permanent and enduring part of our intellectual armory'. However, in this journey,

although losing what was a near universality of application, they retain the key to the explanation of some things. The task is to more clearly define what those 'somethings' are. On the basis of this 'something', landscapes retain an analytical resourcefulness that is worth pursuing.

Although the interpretation of landscape often cannot be separated from the voices of the past, there is a need to consider contemporary communities who interpret the past according to their present and its historical and political context. Society is the arena of multiple voices, meanings and values, and the forum in which the past, present and future co-exist. Landscapes do not have 'voices' as such, nor are memories written across them. These belong to the people who interpret them, creating a complex relationship between the object and the narrator. Landscape and place are hence constructed through the action of human agency – they are socially constituted. The complexity is compounded by differences in time, place, and historical conditions. Most emphatically, however, landscapes are not static: they are constructed and reworked, appropriated, contested and in a constant state of becoming. Through this ongoing process of transformation they act on identity formation at all levels (Bender 1995a: 15).

The discussion of specific communities in the following chapters calls on these understandings of the fluid and contextual nature of place and landscape, and their relationship in various circumstances with identity and community creation and re-affirmation. Integral to the exploration of place and identity in each case is the multi-vocality of landscapes and of how heritage and other scientific discourses have hegemonically acted to privilege certain landscape conceptualisations over others.