Chapter One

Heritage, Nationalism and Landscape.

Introduction.

This chapter quite literally sets the scene for the study by considering the symbolic roles of sites and monuments in two particular contexts with which they are associated, landscape and nationalism. The first part of the chapter discusses the various meanings of the term landscape, showing that, like 'heritage', it is a socially constructed idea rooted firmly in the renaissance and modernity. Importantly the discussion of landscape considers ways that sites and monuments form a part of many understandings of landscape. The use of the terms 'real' and 'partial' landscapes is also proposed to differentiate landscape that is viewed as part of a person's physical space and that which is fragmented and presented in selected pieces to the public as 'heritage' or as a museum display or exhibition. The second part of the chapter introduces the idea of nationalism to the landscape through the work of Kenneth Robert Olwig (1993) and considers in particular the ways that nationalism might be physically expressed or flagged. Michael Billig proposed the concept of flagging nationalism in 1995. He considered nationalism to be kept alive in a 'banal' form by physical and literary flagging. Such flagging allows expressions of nationalist fervour to be expressed at unexpectedly short notice. In some situations 'heritage' can be understood as a flag for the 'banal nationalist' message.

The role of sites and monuments as nationalist flags in the landscape will be illustrated with reference to Kenny's geographical study of hill stations in India (1995) and Peter Odermatt's ethnographic study of prehistoric towers in Sardinia (1996). In both examples the authors interpreted structures in the landscape as symbols of nationalism. These symbols are available, in a visual sense, to the people who live in or visit that landscape. In the case of the Indian hill station, Kenny interpreted the landscape as a symbolic expression of separation between imperial rulers and the ruled. In the second case Odermatt observed changes in the symbolism of monuments in the landscape over time, from being imbued with local meanings of place-identity, monuments were vested with nationalist symbolism as regional authorities took control of their management as 'heritage' sites.

The chapter concludes by drawing together ideas of landscape (particularly as a scenic concept, as an artefact and as a place or location) with ideas pertaining to nationalism and 'heritage'. Landscape is established as an important place, both physically and as an idea, in which people interact with the symbolism of sites and monuments and ideas of nationalism. The concept of the visual is also established as the crucial medium by which these interactions take place.

1. Meanings of Landscape.

The term 'landscape' is as complex in its usage as 'heritage'. In a similar fashion to 'heritage', many meanings of landscape are value laden but tend to be used as if their meaning were unambiguous and natural (Olwig 1993). Olwig demonstrated this complexity with two conflicting definitions taken from scientific usage; 'the landforms of a region in the aggregate' or 'a portion of area that the eye can comprehend in a single view, vista, and or prospect' (Olwig 1993, 307).

It is possible to expand upon Olwig's two definitions to identify three general types of meaning for landscape:

a) Picturesque Landscape: Landscape as scenery.
b) Scientific Landscape: Landscape as topography or the 'lie of the land', landscape as nature and landscape as environment or habitat.
c) Symbolic Landscape- Landscape as artefact and landscape as place or location.

These types of meaning and the areas within them constantly overlap but all may be treated as unambiguous in certain contexts. Olwig (1993, 307) commented:

> "The word landscape... contains meanings which, because they are left unsaid, mystify
> and increase their power. 'Landscape', is integral to an ongoing hidden discourse,
> underwriting the legitimacy of those who exercise power in society."

a) Picturesque Landscape: Landscape as Scenery.
The notion of landscape as scenery is an important aspect of the present study because as Olwig (1993) and Brett (1995) argued, this is a meaning laden with underlying assumptions about an apparently visual, tangible aspect of the world. Scenic or picturesque landscape has aesthetic connotations referring to a pleasing outlook. The scenic landscape is found represented in landscape painting. It has a set of accepted 'rules' of geometry and perspective, which are assumptions and languages that are derived from renaissance humanism. In his influential paper on the subject -"*Prospect, perspective and the evolution of the landscape idea*"- Denis Cosgrove (1984) noted the advance of geometry and perspective as the 'critical advance' in the development of renaissance humanism. More particularly this advance came through 'the re-evaluation of Euclid and the elevation of geometry to the keystone of human knowledge, specifically its application to three-dimensional space representation through single-point perspective theory and technique' (Cosgrove 1984, 47). These 'rules' make scenic landscape pleasing because we see what we expect to see. It can be argued that these same aesthetic expectations for landscape are transferred to the way that people expect representations of the past to be constructed. 'Indeed, it is these assumptions and languages that may constitute the real substance of 'heritage'' (Brett 1996, 38). The 'rules' that inform the appreciation of scenic landscapes may be termed 'visual

ideologies'. They are found in painting but also other forms of picture making, like photography, as well as in literature and architecture.

Scenic landscapes are expected to be 'picturesque'. They are underpinned by human constructions of what is natural in 'unspoilt' visions. David Brett cited seventeenth and eighteenth century artistic and literary visions of the 'Celtic fringes' of the British Isles as an example of landscape constructed to reflect the picturesque and sublime in nature (Brett 1996). Brett noted that these landscapes of sublime nature are opposed to developing industrial landscapes in the same period (Brett 1996) and also noted (quoting Kant) that by creating visions of the power of nature, we also make ourselves aware of our ability to be independent of those powers (Brett 1996).

The rules of landscape do not demand the representation of nature alone, more often there is a heroic figure inserted in the form of a traveller or peasant. On occasions a peasant building, a ruin or classical temple is included in the image. In the case of some portrait art, similar natural landscapes are used as backdrops for portraits of landowners and their families. The inclusion of human figures, peasant buildings, ruins from once great civilisations or the portrait of a powerful landowner all suggest the control and subjugation of the dramatic powers of nature as noted by Brett (1996).

In famous English landscape paintings like the *Hay-Wain* by Constable, nature itself is not sufficient to make a landscape. A building, the mill hidden amongst the trees, and the *Hay-Wain* with its peasant driver is included to make the landscape complete. The mill building despite being surrounded by trees is quietly controlling the force of nature represented by the river.

The presence of human activity and building are accepted and regularly used in representations in scenic landscapes. The presence of buildings or structures as acceptable parts of scenic landscapes is important because they influence common-sense ideas about sites and monuments. Sites and monuments are components of many picturesque landscapes and people often expect to find them there.

b) Scientific Landscape.

There are three meanings of landscape that are derived from their use in scientific analysis; topography, nature and environment or habitat. Just like the picturesque landscape these meanings are rooted in the renaissance and the development of scientific study as a means of ordering and understanding the world.

Landscape as topography.

The first of these scientific meanings is a landscape of topography, the 'lie of the land' that can be captured on a map through cartography. This meaning includes the definition of topographical features as landforms or geomorphology. This meaning of landscape ignores human influence entirely and does not consider sites and monuments as part of the landscape at all.

The landscape of natural processes.

The second meaning of landscape is a scientific construction of nature. This is a landscape of natural processes like erosion and deposition which form and reform topography. Human activity can impinge upon natural processes e.g. as acid rain, building coastal defences or through river course, management. This meaning of landscape as nature is different from the romantic picturesque landscape but still carries underlying meanings. The idea that human kind seeks to control nature and stand apart from it is implicit in this construction of natural landscapes. Human influence on natural processes is perceived as problematic rather than celebrated. Sites and monuments may stand in the landscape as symbols of human control of natural processes, Roman aqueducts, dams or irrigation systems for example. These may come to symbolise the effect of human activity on natural processes, watercourses in the case of the examples cited above, but they may through time be accepted as part of a renegotiated symbol of a natural landscape.

Landscape as environment or habitat.

The third scientific meaning of landscape is as environment or habitat. In these landscapes human activity continues to be problematic. Humans are perceived as separate from nature and are seen as a threat to the balance of these landscapes. Sites and monuments may stand as symbols of defeats or victories for nature over human incursion in the landscape. This sense of the victory of the environment over human activity may be one of the themes symbolised in artistic and landscape gardening traditions by the image of the overgrown ruin or garden folly. The symbolism of such images is more complex than that however, as the ruin is rediscovered, by the artist and the viewer. Thus the final victory may lie with humanity and scientific progress. Like the landscape of nature as process, environment and habitat is impinged upon by human activity.

The difference between landscape as natural process and landscape as environment or habitat is in the sense of nature itself. On the one hand natural processes are understood as acts of nature; e.g. rivers, floods, summer breezes or hurricanes, but are not alive. On the other hand the sense of nature as environment or habitat is understood as, (in scientific terms), the biosphere i.e. an interacting living layer of plants and animals that occupies the surface of the landscape.

The scientific meanings of landscape have a lot in common with the picturesque, because they construct landscapes as manifestations of nature. In a landscape of environments and habitats, the incursion of human activity (perceived as outside nature) is not welcomed as it is in the picturesque. These landscapes are described and objectified by scientific study, a different set of rules to the picturesque, and are conserved against the influence of human activity. Although it is possible to find a place for sites and monuments in these meanings of landscape, they are not as prominent for the purposes of the present study as those located in picturesque or scenic landscapes.

c) Symbolic Landscape.

The remaining two meanings for landscape impact more directly on the present study than the purely scientific do, because they contain a vision of human activity.

Landscape as artefact.

The first of these is landscape as artefact. This meaning suggests that the landscape is continually changed and moulded by human actions and not produced solely by nature. Landscape gardening, a feature of the enlightenment in seventeenth and eighteenth century Britain, is a good example of landscape as artefact. In this case the landscape's meaning as an artefact connects to the picturesque or scenic as gardens were constructed to mimic renaissance art. An example of many British landscape gardens is found at Studley Royal in North Yorkshire, a garden carved out of former farming land surrounding a great manor house. The work was commissioned by the landowner John Aislabie and began as a formal garden but when his son William took over the project he extended the landscape area in the picturesque romantic style of the time. Landscape gardens generally included a ruin or folly as a representative of 'heritage'. This was certainly the case at Studley Royal where Fountains Abbey, an 'authentic' ruin, was incorporated. More often buildings that mimicked the past were built in the garden. The same process of landscape construction continues in contemporary society through the process of architecture and town and country planning. The role of local and regional planning and conservation officers in Britain and Europe has an important influence on the appearance of the landscape. This apparently local influence is given a global sense by the professional discipline through which planners and conservators are trained and professionalised (Ashworth 1998, Montès 2000).

Understanding landscape as an artefact, a human construction both physically and ideologically, emphasises the importance of human activity. In particular it highlights the symbolism of sites and monuments and the landscape as a whole, as opposed to singling out particular examples to be viewed in isolation. The symbolism is deeply visual in its nature both for those commissioning work on landscape features and for those who see them in the landscape. The artefact approach to landscape is particularly interesting because it allows for the top down exertion of social power, authority, influence, wealth or status through symbols in the landscape. As the examples used later in this chapter show, artefactual landscapes and the sites and monuments that they contain, can be used as symbols of national identities in very powerful ways. The landscape as artefact emphasises the influence of social power. It takes a combination of authority, influence, wealth or status -held by individuals, institutions or groups- to alter and mould the landscape and this is often manifested in building structures that become sites and monuments. This meaning of landscape is important for the purposes of the present study because it emphasises sites and monuments and the symbolic nature of such landscapes in terms of the expression of power and cultural unity, vital issues in understanding nationalism.

Landscape as place.

The sixth and last meaning for landscape concerns place or location. This refers to the ways in which individuals interact with the landscape around them, their sense of place-identity or how they locate themselves in their surroundings. Landscape as a sense of place allows for the individual's understanding of a variety of elements in their own particular surroundings. In this meaning landscape becomes more than an artefact that is manipulated to symbolise particular power relations. It is an existential concept emphasising the relationship between people and their landscape in a more dynamic way.

As suggested by the previous meanings, individuals are influenced by culturally held rules of what to expect from a landscape whether it be a picturesque, scientific or symbolic meaning. An individual's interaction with a landscape is more complex than this however, because they are aware of landscape as a place, in which they develop their own relationships and understandings.

People may consciously resist 'rules' that bind the meanings of landscape as picturesque, scientific or as a symbol of power. Many artists resist the 'rules' of the picturesque, others emphasise the geometry that underlies renaissance art. People rise up to protect the environmental landscape whilst others seek to claim natural landscape by 'conquest' through any number of outdoor pursuits. In this last and most dynamic meaning of the landscape, as a place where people dwell, all of the other meanings are drawn together allowing them to interact in a variety of social contexts.

The general concern of the present study is to explore people's understandings of nation and the idea of Europe in relation to sites and monuments. In this context, the most relevant meanings of landscape are those of the picturesque, artefact and of place.

'Real' and 'Partial' landscape.
Although the meaning of landscape is socially constructed there is of course a sense in which landscape is 'real'. This is the landscape that is available to individuals or communities on a day-to-day basis and can be viewed physically. What can be viewed is sometimes structured by the architecture of the landscape (e.g. high walls and hedges are used to block off certain parts of the landscape) but the experience is none the less 'real'. A person may still view the majority of the landscape around them and interact with meanings vested in that landscape.

In many circumstances another individual or group presents the landscape to a person. This may take the form of images created as artistic representations, photographs (that are produced and viewed according to socially constructed 'rules') or may be found in a more complex representation of landscape, the 'heritage' presentation or museum. These public presentations take fragments of the contemporary landscape and use them to represent particular meanings of the past. The landscape that people view at a museum or 'heritage' presentation can thus be described as a 'partial' landscape. Some 'heritage' presentations of course bridge the gap from 'real' landscape to 'partial' landscape because they take place in the open air. Yet even in these situations some 'heritage' experiences might

be considered partial, stately home for example are located in carefully constructed landscapes that restrict certain views and permit others.

The use of the terms 'real' and 'partial' landscapes are helpful for the present study as they consider 'heritage' presentations and museums as constructions of landscape in their own right. The next part of this chapter discusses ways in which ideas of nationalism are expressed or symbolised in the landscape. The discussion explores the picturesque and artefactual meanings of landscape where nationalist symbolism and associations are generated. It is in the landscape of place however, that we may find these discourses subverted.

2. Flagging Nationalism in the Landscape.

Kenneth Robert Olwig examined the ideas of Landscape with those of Nature and Nation. Olwig commented on the lexical parallels between the development if the Germanic word *landscape* and the Romance word *nature*. He also commented on a 'synergistic power' that links the word *nature* to *nation*, bound by their common root in *nat*. Olwig saw a connection between natural inheritance and nation as an important legitimisation of power (Olwig 1993, 309), a connection that has a resonance with the definitions of 'heritage' discussed in chapter one. Olwig considered that *nation* and *nature* have been bound together as concepts since before the idea of territory:

> "The nation is essentially a people to which you belong by virtue of being born into that people. The way in which people interact culturally affects, however, the character of the place where they dwell. This, in turn, can lead to the development of a permanent bond between the nature, or character, of the culture of a particular people and the nature, or character, of the particular areas where they dwell".

(Olwig 1993, 310)

The word *landscape* shares many features with those of *nation* and *nature*. The Germanic word *scape* has a number of alternative spellings in English that Olwig highlighted; *ship* as in township and *shape* as in forming or carving something out (Olwig 1993, 310). These derivations of the word *scape*, Olwig argued are related to the word nature whilst *land* is related to nation. Olwig concluded that the word *landscape* suggests 'an area carved out by axe and plough, which belongs to the people who carved it out' (Olwig 1993, 311). This relationship between nature and nation in the landscape removes the idea of nation from formal government control by making nationhood a deeply rooted social given, a part of the very land 'we' live in rather than the province of democratically elected governments. This idea of nation allows for the perpetuation of national bonds that are not currently, or have only recently been constituted as formal states, Scotland or Croatia for example. Of course this does not prevent the governments of nation states or institutions, groups or even individuals from using the landscape to express nationalist influence by 'wrapping themselves in the flag'.

Olwig saw geographic science as instrumental in this kind of nationalism by establishing national territory. This is territory that can be mapped and studied as topography, a topography that preceded man, a natural landscape. This scientific capture of territory as natural landscape, 'Olwig' proposed, is opposed to the sense of nation as a cultural landscape which is superimposed on to a natural area. Olwig identified this process in the expansion of Germany in the nineteenth century as an emerging state that sought to incorporate Germanic peoples from within the boundaries of other states (Olwig 1993).

The combination of nature and nation in the landscape is also found in the establishment of other states, although as Olwig conceded only subtly in Britain. Britain certainly underwent the same process of mapping and topographical planning as Germany that was carried out by the military in the nineteenth century and is still referred to as the Ordnance Survey today. Britain was not however, a newly forming state. The process of mapping might be understood as a symbolic 'stock taking' of the British Empire at its height, beginning at home and spreading to all the colonies. This perhaps reached its apogee with the mapping of the Himalayas in Tibet and Nepal. The same process of mapping included the definition of sites and monuments in the landscape, reflecting the symbolic power of the past to legitimise the power of Empire.

Manifestations of British nationalism in the landscape differ from those in emerging states in significant ways. Traditionally, British picturesque landscapes incorporate people and sites and monuments into images to legitimate not the new nation state but the old. This is the very idea of nationhood that places like Canada and the USA sought to rid them selves of.

In the case of Canada early picturesque painting by European artists followed post-renaissance European artistic tradition of the time and included Native Americans, often with their dwellings, as peasants and 'heroic' extras. The post-renaissance way of painting landscape in Europe showed the interaction between people and landscape. But a demand arose in the 1920s to establish an appropriate 'Canadian' school of art. A school of seven artists was formed that would be 'imbued with the idea that an Art must grow and flower in the land before the country will be a real home for its people' (Bret, 1996, 59). The seven Canadian artists concentrated on the physical nature of the landscape and omitted people and buildings from their 'national' landscapes. Just as the development of scientific methods of recording natural landscapes legitimised the expansion of Germany so emphasis on the unspoiled unpopulated natural landscape of Canada legitimised the development of a new nation state, at the expense of the native nations. The same process of creating images of a virgin national landscape to underpin a new state also took place in the United States. In the case of Canada the resonance of this national landscape can be found in photographic tourist imagery today, whilst the American National Park system, as well as artistic and literary traditions, epitomises the national ideal of unspoilt landscape (Brett 1996).

It might be concluded from Olwig's work that by applying the science of Geography and artistic representation to a wild and unpopulated landscape a new nation can legitimise itself. In the landscapes of Europe however, cultural referents are included in images and landscapes because the past legitimises a nation in the present. Because they are visible, buildings and ruins that evoke the past are vital inclusions in landscapes whether they are scenic, artefacts or places where people dwell.

In the United Kingdom research carried out by Crawshaw and Urry (1997) has noted that people still prefer the idea of a landscape as populated. In their project people were asked to select which images in the Lake District tourist brochure they found best evoked the area. People overwhelmingly selected images where there were people acting as extras, like the heroic extras of landscape painting. Crawshaw and Urry suggested that people did not select representations of an 'auratic romantic landscape' but one that was populated by people, the landscape was 'tamed by humans and especially by visitors much like themselves' (Crawshaw and Urry 1997, 192). This scenic landscape containing people -visitors rather than noble peasants- echoes the eighteenth century construction of the Lake District making it a resource for recreation, taming the natural landscape (Crawshaw and Urry 1997).

Crawshaw and Urry did not particularly find referents to nation or nationalism in their study of the landscape. This was a result of the nature of their work, which was essentially aimed at understanding the relationship between landscape, tourism and photography at a local level. The data for the study was collected from two sources:

- Interviews with ten local photographers.
- A survey (using two open ended questions) which asked people who had obtained a Lake District tourist brochure to select 'which photograph in the guide (there were 120) most closely represented the types of experience which they would hope to enjoy during a visit to Cumbria and why this was so' (Crawshaw and Urry 1996, 189)

Crawshaw and Urry's drew important conclusions regarding the appearance of people in images of landscapes; they did not draw any reference to nationalism from their data. Why might this be? After-all nationalism is an influential part of contemporary society. Indeed, the Lake District has been labelled a National Park and consequently a national resource. The questions in the brochure asked about experiences and enjoyment within the landscape, not feelings of national pride *per se*, perhaps there were images of the Lake District that would have evoked a nationalist response if the viewer felt their sense of nationality challenged. This suggests that the role of nations in the landscape is subtle, perhaps because an unquestioning eye sees it. The next part of this chapter looks at ways that nationalist referents may remain active yet unnoticed in our landscapes until they are called upon to stimulate nationalist sentiments. This set of unnoticed nationalist referents Michael Billig has called 'banal nationalism' and these should be considered further.

Michael Billig proposed the idea of 'banal nationalism' when analysing the response of Americans to the Gulf War. He wanted to understand how a nation like the United States had become so overtly

nationalist so rapidly when members of that state did not necessarily consider themselves nationalists. Billig noted that in popular and academic writing nationalism is associated with fringe groups in society, those struggling to establish new states or those who espouse far right politics. Billig points out that this is a misleading approach to take in a world dominated by nation states. These nation states do not lie dormant and only become nations at time of crisis. They continue through a collection of ideological habits and beliefs that keep the nation state self aware and ready to show more fervent nationalism when threatened. Billig terms these everyday ideological habits 'banal nationalism', because to the members of the state concerned at least, they seem unremarkable, everyday and banal (Billig 1995).

Billig joined writers on nationalism like Gellner (1964), Anderson (1991) and Giddens (1987, 1990) in proposing that nationalism is a part of modernity arising after the renaissance. Gellner argued that it is the need of modern societies for cultural homogeneity that creates nationalism. Nationalism is thus sociologically rooted in modernity (Gellner 1964, 158-69). Anderson argued that the modern nation was an artefact or an 'imagined community', he also argued that nationalism was only possible in a modern society which has the right style of imagination and institutions to make it happen. Pre-eminent among these institutions were newspapers and publishing houses, which he termed 'print-capitalism', who portrayed through their publications a nation as a sociological community (Anderson 1991). The role of nations as 'imagined communities' concurs with Olwig's approach. Olwig showed how the notion of objectivity is used to make territorial claims appear unquestionable by creating 'natural' landscapes when nations are in reality constructed by ideological and discursive consciousness.

Billig described the process underpinning 'banal nationalism' as one of 'flagging'. The flag itself is the most obvious example of flagging 'banal nationalism', it 'symbolises the sacred character of the nation; it is revered by loyal citizens and ritually defiled by those who wish to make a protest' (Billig 1995, 39). Although it does not carry information directly, the way that the flag is flown conveys messages, most notably a flag at half-mast denoting the death of an important person. Apart from these special occasions however, the citizen generally sees flags that do not convey particular information.

 Flags are treated differently in different contexts. They can be overtly saluted and acknowledged or can remain unacknowledged. Billig called this the waved or unwaved flag or saluted and unsaluted (Billig 1995). Billig used a copy of *Paris-Match,* described by Roland Barthes, to illustrate the waved and unwaved flag. On the front cover of the magazine stands a soldier saluting the French tricolour. To that soldier at the moment the image was taken the flag was waved, it had to be responded to in an appropriate way. To those who see the magazine, sitting in a rack or in a doctor's surgery however, the

flag is there but it is not waved. There is no need to salute it in these contexts. Most of the time flags around the western world do not demand saluting because they are not being waved. Billig comments however, that they would be noticed if they all vanished or changed colour. These flags are providing banal reminders of nationhood; this was not according to Billig a conscious activity but is mindless and routine (Billig 1995).

Billig also pointed out that symbols such as coins and bank notes are similar visual referents that flag 'banal nationalism'. In the various landscapes of 'new world states' like the USA and Canada, nature itself is a flag of 'banal nationalism', acting as a reminder of nationhood over other claims to own this unspoilt land. For 'old world' states it is possible to use many referents to natural landscapes to flag nationhood but here we also find buildings and ruins that can in the right circumstances flag national referents. Buildings that imitate classical architecture draw comparison with classical empires to flag the stature of the contemporary nation, especially if the building is topped with a flag. Of course only some buildings or sites will flag 'banal nationalism', but some are powerful images. It seems that a recent advertising campaign by computer Internet provider Freeserve sought to use 'banal nationalist' referents to highlight that the company is British in contrast to its American rival AOL. They used two images and the slogan 'The finest sites in Britain'. The images were of the crowd at the last night of the proms (a mass of swirling Union Flags) and an image of Stonehenge at sunset (see Fig 1.1). The Union Flags are obviously acting as 'banal nationalist' unwaved flags, but of interest to the present study Stonehenge was selected to act as a subtle reminder of British nationalism. A difficult project for the marketing company who had to look for images that were 'banal' in the whole of the United Kingdom. 'Banal nationalism' is only banal in the nations to whom it is aimed. When a paper given by the author of the present study at The Cambridge Heritage Seminars (Kenny 1997) raised the issue of 'banal nationalism' a member of the audience commented that as Scot in England he found nationalism anything but banal. The banality of 'banal nationalism' is stripped away for the outsider. It may be that people from Britain/England often see American flag waving as excessive yet do not notice the way in which 'heritage' sites like Stonehenge are constantly flagged as national icons.

The way in which sites and monuments can act as national referents in various meanings of landscape can be demonstrated by two particular examples, Indian hill stations studied by Kenny and Iron Age towers in Sardinia studied by Peter Odermatt.

a) Hill Stations in 'British India'.

At the time of the British Raj in India a remarkable set of landscapes were created which had significant symbolic meanings for both the imperialist understanding of the landscape around them and for their place within that landscape. (Kenny 1995). Hill stations were established as summer retreats for the British imperial administration and the social groups that had grown up around them. They were built in highland areas where some respite could be found from the worst of the tropical heat and disease associated with the monsoon season. There were about 80 such hill stations constructed the most important being Ooty, Simla, Poona and Darjeeling which served the cities of Madras, Agra, Bombay and Calcutta respectively. Today places like Ooty still have particular British Raj influences in the town institutions and architecture containing exclusive clubs and public schools. The present day clientele has changed but the relations of power remain the same as the clubs and schools are still highly exclusive.

Kenny argued that the hill station landscape was created for a number of functions other than a cool climate (Kenny 1995). The common-sense activity of building these retreats as summer havens masked more complex uses of the landscape. Hill stations were built in areas sparsely populated by the indigenous peoples, allowing extensive landscaping work to take place without initiating riots against the rulers. This extensive work created small-scale British landscapes separating the rulers from the ruled. Kenny argued that this separation was generated by the nineteenth century views of race that considered that Europeans worked best in cooler conditions and a desire amongst the British to define themselves in circumstances of their own choosing.

Ooty was the official seasonal residence of the government of the Presidency of Madras after 1870. John Sullivan began the hill station project at Ooty in the early nineteenth century. He set about building a pastoral utopia drawing upon the 'rules' of scenic landscape painting and English landscape gardens. Sullivan imported European species of trees, flowers fruits and vegetables to create his idealised English landscape in the hills of India; he even had a serpentine lake dug in the country garden style. Whilst creating this scenic pastoral idyll, Sullivan also had English churches schools and clubs built. These buildings recreated a 'heritage' set in picturesque scenery giving the British a sense of belonging in a landscape that was not originally their own The architecture of the clubs and schools reflected that of Europe. It was 'Palladian' in style (like so many public buildings built in Victorian Britain at the time), adding authority to the landscape through the use of classical pillars and architectural lines. Kenny commented that this landscape must have had the appearance of a Victorian Spa town (Kenny 1995, 703).

The hill station town of Ooty reached its peak of influence in 1901 when the permanent population reached 19,000, a figure that doubled during the summer. After the First World War Indian nationalists began a campaign against hill stations like Ooty. To the British Ooty, must have seemed homely, full of British and imperialist 'banal nationalist' flags. Perhaps the most powerful of these flags was the sum of the landscape itself, but within that landscape of 'banal nationalist' flags the buildings were a key

element, housing as they did key social institutions. To the Indian nationalist of course, the flags were anything but banal. Flags emphasised the exclusion of native peoples, even the Maharajas, from territory they considered the natural home of their nation. The encoding of power held in the hill station landscape was clear to those that it dominated and through the indigenous nationalist movement, was revealed to those who lived in the shadow of the hill stations. The Governor's house for example was the grandest of the buildings, set higher up the slopes than any other whilst the native population lived in cramped conditions, out of sight (and out of the visible landscape) on low poorly drained ground. At its peak, the landscape of the hill station was a constant reminder of separation between the ruler and the ruled, having very different meanings for those who looked upon it. As the British Raj came under increasing pressure for independence so the hill station system was abandoned and in 1930 the system of summer migration for imperial administrators was abandoned (Kenny 1995).

The landscape of the Indian hill station illustrates the symbolic power of the landscape as an artefact for those who gaze upon it. In this British construction of landscape buildings were a vital component, unlike the Canadian and US examples of nationalist landscape. The local people were part of the imperial project in a colonial British construction of landscape. Indigenous people were subjugated by landscape that contained the civilising architecture of a 'superior' nation. In the case of 'new world' nationalism indigenous people were squeezed out of the landscape to give the impression of a virgin land, ripe for the creation of a new nation.

The study of the Indian hill station emphasises the symbolism of social power in the landscape that is essentially visual in its expression and that often uses the architecture of buildings as symbols. The second example of the interaction of nation, landscape and sites and monuments concentrates on a particular type of ancient monument in a landscape. It also concentrates on the clash of two meanings of the word landscape, the artefact that is available for change and use as a cultural symbol on the one hand and the place or location for individuals on the other.

b) The Nuraghe of Abbasanta.
The village of Abbasanta is located on the Sardinian coast. It is a small fishing village typical of the island. The coast that rises steeply from the sea dominates the physical landscape surrounding the village. Because hills rise up quickly behind the village the natural landscape is one of cliffs and sea views. The work that Peter Odermatt carried out at Abbasanta considered both issues of nationalism and local place-identity in the landscape so is of particular interest to the study (see Chapter three for a discussion of the implications of his work on local place-identity).

Sardinia has a particular feature to its historical remains; large cylindrical stone towers known as nuraghe. Archaeologists dispute the past use of the nuraghe but they are dated to the Iron Age in Sardinia, making them pre Roman. Many nuraghe still stand to considerable height, (up to 20 metres) and form impressive landscape features especially when they are seen in silhouette. The silhouette of a nuraghe has enough local significance for it to appear on the flags of some local contrade within larger

Sardinian towns. These flags do not represent nationalism but local pride in a particular district of a town traditionally dominated by a few families and specific trades. The flagging of contrade stands as an example of the same processes as those identified by Billig in relation to nationalism at work at local levels. Sardinia is part of a nation that only thinly papers over its long history of affiliation to town and city-states and the families who rule them rather than modern nations.

Standing as part of its coastal landscape Abbasanta also has a nuraghe. It stands near to the cliffs and is seen in silhouette from many angles. The scene was considered so picturesque that Benito Mussolini visited it in the 1930s. On the cliffs near to the nuraghe stands a small tabular monument that commemorates the visit of King Vittorio Emanuele III and Mussolini in 1926.

Ethnographer Peter Odermatt has studied the interrelationship of the monuments at Abbasanta and the local people in some depth. Odermatt arrived to carry out his study at a time when local government set out on a programme of encouraging tourism on Sardinia. This was to have a dramatic impact on the relationship between the people of Abbasanta and the monuments in their local landscape.

Until the 1970s local people used the nuraghe and its adjacent commemorative table regularly. In his interviews with older members of the community and through historical documents Odermatt identified a close sense of ownership of the monument and the landscape amongst local people (Odermatt 1996). Families and groups from the town would often walk out from the village to the cliffs. They would spread a tablecloth on the memorial tablet and use this as a picnic table whilst the children climbed on the nuraghe. The monuments in the landscape were clearly part of their special sense of place. The original intention of the tablet (commemoration of the King and Mussolini) had no power in this landscape, whilst there was a sense of communal ownership to the nuraghe.

The Sardinian local authorities began to record the archaeological remains on the island as part of a drive to make Sardinia a tourist venue, and to bring Italian regions into line with European Union conservation policies towards 'heritage' sites and monuments. Sites and monuments are constantly used as important attractions for tourists. In order to protect the Sardinian resource of sites and monuments, (now given enhanced 'value' by the drive to increase tourism), local archaeological management plans were introduced. This meant that sites under threat from erosion or development were subject to local conservation and management plans.

When the plans for selling Sardinia as a tourist destination were drawn up, nuraghe (inspired by the contrade flags) were identified as an important symbol of the island. The Sardinian archaeological authority introduced a local conservation programme for the nuraghe at Abbasanta. There was no consultation with the local people who were prevented from climbing on the monument.

Odermatt observed the resistance to the imposition of authority and the change that took place in people's sense of place associated with the sites and monuments around them. 'The locals rejected the

appropriation of the local built 'heritage' even at the cost of jeopardising the badly needed impulses for local development' (Odermatt 1996, 115). Money was to be injected into local communities as part of the development plans which included the conservation of other archaeological sites that were on peoples land. Landowners refused to give access to the archaeologists even if it meant the withdrawal of development funds. Local businesses geared up for increased tourism, but the post card of the village showed the singularly unimpressive village street rather than the nuraghe. It was as if the people no longer related to parts of the landscape that they previously used on a daily basis.

In the case of Abbasanta the local authorities sought to appropriate local monuments and change their role in local sense of place to become Sardinian symbols to promote tourism. In this case landscape features are removed from one landscape into another. The visual nature of landscapes and sites and monuments is still central, but in this case we can also identify selective blindness amongst the people of Abbasanta.

Conclusion.

This chapter has discussed some of the ways in which 'landscape' may be constructed. The place of sites and monuments has been firmly grounded in many understandings of landscape, but not in all. The remains of human activity are particularly important to the idea of the picturesque held in most of Europe. These landscapes emphasise both the power of nature and human kind's ability to appreciate and suppress it. Remains of human activity are also important features of the landscape as an artefact, mouldable and symbolic, in the hands of those with the power to sculpt it. Lastly the sites and monuments which interest the present study are important features to the landscape of place, available for people to use as a part of the stage on which to act out their everyday lives.

Landscapes full of symbolic referents, some of which are archaeological sites monuments or standing buildings, are available to people trying to understand the environment around them. The landscape then appears a key issue when investigating people's visual experience of 'heritage' structures, the first objective of this study. One of the common symbolic uses of landscape is to flag the imagination of national forms. Symbols of nation are found in the landscape and sometimes, more specifically, in its sites and monuments. On some occasions symbols of nation in the landscape rely upon visions of nature itself, on other occasions sites and monuments are used as banal nationalist referents, thus in considering the second objective of this study, roles of 'heritage' structures in identity negotiation, the landscape is likely to be a fertile hunting ground.

Up to this point the present study has focused on nations as imagined communities. It is also possible that 'heritage' and landscape represent other (e.g. supranational) imagined constructs and identities. Of particular interest to this study of contemporary identity negotiation are Europe and the concept of European collective memory. The next chapter considers different social constructions of Europe and suggests what type of 'heritage' and landscape might evoke these constructions today.