Chapter Three

Place-identity and the Local Landscape

Introduction.

Chapters one and two discussed the role that landscape plays in forming and perpetuating national identities and suggested social constructions of Europe that might be evoked by certain aspects of the landscape. In this chapter the idea of the landscape as a place vested with cultural meaning is combined with the idea of place-identity to discuss local identity. The discussion of place-identity at the local level has a particular bearing on the second objective set out in the introduction on page five; to gain insight into the negotiation of identity through the landscape in which people live.

This chapter begins by defining the term place-identity. The concept has been understood both as an individual and communal sense of belonging. More recently definitions of place-identity have emphasised communal aspects of the idea as a symbolic resource through which particular social practices and relations, such as a sense of local community, are legitimated (Dixon and Durrheim 2000). The discussion about the idea of place-identity in relation to senses of local belonging is illustrated by the work of four particular studies. The concept of place-identity as an individual sense of belonging is demonstrated by the work of Bonauito *et al* (1996) who studied children's relationship with their local coastal landscapes. The interrelationship between landscape and the place-identity of local communities or groups is then discussed using examples from Skye (Macdonald 1997), Sardinia (Odermatt 1996) and London (Merriman 1999).

1. Definition of Place-Identity.

The idea that identity might be related to place was developed amongst Environmental Psychologists and Geographers in the 1980s. Proshansky, Fabian and Kiminoff first published the notion in a paper in 1983. Proshansky *et al* defined place-identity as a 'potpourri of memories, conceptions, interpretations, ideas and related feelings about specific physical settings as well as types of settings' (1983, 60). The idea of relating place to identity allowed for spaces or landscapes in which people's activities became understandable and in which they could express tastes, preferences and mediate human efforts to change environments.

Korpela (1989) built on the definition used by Proshansky *et al* (1983) to develope a more narrow definition which related place-identity closely to a person's attempts to regulate the environment. According to Korpela this interaction with the environment resulted in a sense of belonging that was the 'necessary basis' for place-identity (Korpela 1989, 246). By utilising the environment, Korpela argued, 'we can express

ourselves both for our own means and to reveal ourselves to others' (Korpela 1989, 246). When the environment is changed by human activity we, at least in part, create a sense of belonging, this is the heart of Korpela's definition of place-identity:

> "Place-belongingness is not only one aspect of place-identity, but a necessary *basis* for it. Around the core the social, cultural and biological definitions and cognition of place, which become part of the person's place-identity, are built"
>
> (Korpela 1989, 246)

Korpela's definition of place-identity described people as actors in the landscape around them. They appropriate landscapes and create a space to which they feel attached and rooted. This activity creates a home landscape that is organised and represented in ways that help individuals feel a sense of belonging, even self-esteem. This place-identity suggests that a landscape becomes something that a person knows and expects, perhaps even a stereotyped view.

The individual was uppermost in Korpela's definition of place-identity. Graham Rowles (1983) noted similar relationships between individuals and their environment, or landscape in a study of elderly residents in an Appalachian community in the United States. Rowles interviewed people about their sense of affinity with their surroundings. From these interviews he identified three particular kinds of special local knowledge. He called this knowledge 'insideness', a sense that came in three aspects; 'physical insideness', 'social insideness' and 'autobiographic insideness'.

'Physical insideness' was a spatial knowledge within the landscape, which Rowles called 'body language'. By this he meant that people had a tacit knowledge of where they were in the landscape, they were able to find their way around in physical terms. 'Social insideness' described a person's connection to community or 'integration with the social fabric' (Rowles 1983, 302). This referred to ways that people knew others in their community and were in turn known. The third type of Rowle's 'insideness' was 'autobiographical' which he described as 'idiosyncratic' and giving a sense of rootedness. The 'autobiographical' sense of place arose through people's interaction with the landscape and their memory of those interactions. Rowles suggested that this was a particularly important kind of 'insideness' for elderly people who had seen their landscape change through time but yet were able to retain a sense of belonging by remembering their interactions within the landscape.

Sarbin (1983) noted the 'autobiographical' attributes of place-identity; he explored how people might develop a sense of belonging with a particular landscape. The relationship between a person and their landscape was formed through 'self narrative'. Sarbin suggested that this process of autobiographical association with the landscape is not as idiosyncratic as Rowles believed. In deed the telling of

autobiographical narrative is a tradition that is not restricted to a literary elite but is part of everyday use of language in conversation.

In their paper on 'displacing place-identity' Dixon and Durrheim (2000) highlighted the shortcomings of early definitions of place-identity that concentrate on the individual. They take up Sarbin's suggestion that language is important and use this to move the definition of 'place-identity' into a position of political and collective meaning. A discursive approach is proposed to place-identity that becomes something that we create together through talk: a social construction that allows us to make sense of our connectivity to place and to guide our actions and projects accordingly. Through language, collective practices are possible and place-identity becomes a resource for discursive action, something that can be talked and written about and used to express an opinion, elaborate on an experience or evoke a communal activity. Dixon and Durrheim (2000, 32) defined place-identity as a 'symbolic resource' in which 'constructions of place are orientated to the performance of a range of social actions' such as 'blaming, justifying, derogating, excusing, excluding and all the other things people do with words (Edwards and Potter 1992, Edwards 1997)'. As a 'symbolic resource' place-identity remains a sense of belonging but also takes on properties of social practice and relations that become legitimated through place-identity and the landscape. The social legitimisation attached to place-identity is illustrated by the symbolic metaphors and meanings that evoke nationalism discussed in chapter one.

Dixon and Durrheim (2000) do not exclude the earlier definitions of place-identity as individualistic but rather they displace the argument onto discourse and communal meanings of the idea because they believe that the latter facilitates the study of complex issues in cultural, historical and political contexts. They emphasised the importance of discourse in forming place-identity, and suggested that the role of talk and action are keys to negotiating communal place-identity. The communal role of place-identity is important for this present study because it seeks to understand how people may relate landscape features to national, European or local identities.

How does the definition of place-identity as a communal notion affect senses of local belonging? Local belonging must relate to individual as well as communal place-identity because a sense of local belonging is negotiated in an intimate and knowable 'real' landscape. This relationship with the 'real' landscape emphasises both individual place-identity and collective place-identity creating and recreating community through shared experiences. The 'real' landscape itself is also formed and constructed by local communal activity in the work of local planning authorities. This issue was raised in chapter two with regard to Ashworth's (1998) observations regarding the construction at the local level of urban landscapes influenced by a planning profession that reflects pan-European ideologies and practices.

The interactions between local people and the landscape around them have been studied on a number of occasions; in this chapter particular examples are used to reflect the individual and communal role of place-

identity and the landscape. The first example is the work of Bonauito, Breakwell and Cano (1996) who studied senses of place-identity felt by children who lived near to beach landscapes designated as unpolluted or dirty by the EU. The remaining three studies described here all concentrate on landscapes that have specific 'heritage' features, a local 'heritage' centre (Macdonald's (1997) work on the 'Aros' 'heritage' centre on Skye), a landscape containing a number of historic monuments (Odermatt's (1996) anthropological study of changing attitudes of prehistoric stone towers on Sardinia) and a major urban museum attempting to reflect a varied cultural landscape (Merriman's (1999) paper on the 'crisis of representation in archaeological museums' which highlights issues regarding the exclusion of certain communities from museum representations of the urban landscape. The latter paper suggests that a landscape need not be 'natural' but can be any aspect of the environment open countryside or built. After all of the landscape that we experience in the UK has been created by human action.

2. Local and National Place-Identity with Polluted Beach Landscapes.

Bonauito *et al* (1996) carried out a study on the relationship between local and national identification and individual's perceptions of the beach in their local landscape. The study took place in six resorts on the southeastern English coast and the sample comprised 347 school children living in those areas. Three of the beaches concerned had 'blue flag' designation by the EU, labelling them as unpolluted whilst three had been classified as dirty under the same designation. The research was carried out through a complex questionnaire survey designed to ascertain nationalism, local identification and perceptions of beach pollution.

Those children who showed a strong local or national attachment tended to see their local beach as less polluted than those who had a weaker sense of local or national attachment. Bonauito *et al* proposed two reasons for these findings that were compatible with models of collective identity, based on ideas of insider or outsider distinctions; *Social Identity Theory* (Tajfel and Turner 1979) and *Self Categorisation Theory* (Turner 1987). The researchers drew two observations from the study. The first was described as, 'defensive differentiation' by which beach pollution was denied. This strategy retained a positive 'in-group identity' through holding a positive 'in-place distinctiveness' resisting outsiders definitions of the state of their local beaches (Bonauito *et al* 1996, 172). The second observation was that place-identity was located at different levels, national as well as local. This may have important implications for the present study as place-identity can be located at the level of nation as well as local and may also be found located at the European level too.

Bonauito *et al* (1996) illustrated place-identity at different levels by showing 'in-group' identification with the idea of local landscape and the landscape as a representation of nation. This illustration relies on an individual sense of identity with the landscape and the importance of context as the landscape is specifically

being understood in terms of pollution. In this particular context some of the beaches concerned were being criticised whilst others complemented.

In the case of Bonauito *et al*'s study the landscape was 'real' in the sense described in chapter one. This was not a specially constructed representation of the landscape, a consciously designed 'heritage' experience, but a landscape open to be imbued with a much wider range of meanings. The respondents were presumably completing their questionnaires out of direct sight of the beach itself, so they relied on some kind of memory. The issue of how people understand 'real' landscapes that they cannot actually see is addressed by the present study as the data collection also took place out of direct sight of the landscape in question. As suggested in chapter one however, it is possible to represent a landscape and display it to people by showing particular details in a specially designed space, a museum or 'heritage' experience. This type of representation of a 'partial' landscape is discussed by the next part of this chapter that considers the work of Sharon Macdonald on Skye (1997).

3. Local Place-Identity Through Representations of 'Partial' Landscape.

Macdonald's study about 'Aros', a 'heritage' centre on the Isle of Skye, considers it in terms of its creation as a tourist attraction but also as an expression of local identity. She noted a sense of local 'authenticity' as opposed to consumption of 'inauthentic' or 'staged authenticity' as suggested by Hewison (1987) or MacCannell (1989) in their commentary about 'heritage' centres.

Macdonald observed the creation of ''Aros*': "The Skye Story"* heritage centre'. In these observations she studied the motivation of the people who created 'Aros' and particularly notions of 'history' and 'story', which underpinned their work. This kind of represented landscape highlights specific details, individual artefacts and combinations of artefacts, put together to create tableaux to constitute 'partial' landscapes depicting the past and present. This use of special detail suggests an alternative construction of landscape differing from those evoked by renaissance painting styles (discussed in chapter one) but following their own 'rules' created by professional museum and 'heritage' managers.

Representations of 'partial' landscape have been criticised as an 'inauthentication' of culture by Greenwood (1989) and MacCannell (1989). 'Heritage' experiences make explicit what people are going to experience in their promotional material and follow a set standardised model for proclaiming what Shields (1991) calls 'place myths'. 'Aros' is certainly built in the same way as the *Jorvik Viking Centre* in York and is similar to *The Oxford Story, The Queenstown Story* (in Cobh, Ireland), *The Story of Hull* or *The People's Story* in Edinburgh. This standardisation is the kind of inauthentic commodification that MacCannell (1989) used to critique such 'heritage' centres. Macdonald accepted that 'Aros' had a commercial commitment to be financially viable and that local place-identity had to be placed into categories that would be understood on

a global scale, but she argued persuasively that those who criticise centres like ‘Aros’ have only looked at the finished article and not studied the creative process (Macdonald 1997). The people who designed ‘Aros’ were part of the local community; having been born, bred and lived there.

The two people who created ‘Aros’ were local Gaelic speakers, both in their thirties. Donald, one of the creators and manager, explained that the centre was part of a local movement to preserve Gaelic culture on Skye. The local agenda, he explained, had to take a commercial turn. Despite the commercial realities he argued that ‘Aros’ was not primarily for the tourist but was ‘for the people’. Macdonald drew on her interviews with the creators of ‘Aros’ to suggest that they had a vested interest in the local ‘heritage’ and Gaelic culture as both a source of local employment and as a source of local place-identity. The museum creators were a young and did not share the vision of some older Gaelic speakers, their vision was an ‘attempt to forge a new Gaelic identity, which informs and indeed is part of the motive force for the story that the exhibition tells’ (Macdonald 1997, 160). Macdonald identified ‘understandings of authenticity and their notions of local identity and culture’ which ‘in relation to the wider system which impinges upon it, are a good deal more sophisticated than many of the models for interpreting ‘heritage’ and touristic performance would allow’ (Macdonald 1997, 157).

Macdonald’s analysis highlighted the role of story telling in local place-identity. The ‘Aros’ presentation avoids telling the same stories as the other ‘heritage’ centres on the island, the clan centres (the Donald, MacDonald and Macleod). The clan centres tell stories surrounding the clan system and thus the lairds. ‘Aros’ on the other hand tells the stories of the crofters, what Donald calls ‘the people’. On occasions where the stories overlap, like the tale of ‘Bonnie Price Charlie’ ‘Aros’ gives an alternative history, whilst making it clear that this is a version of the story, although this version is the version from the Skye point of view. The process of story telling, commented on by Rowles and Sarbin earlier appears as an important factor again in expressing a sense of local place-identity. It is clear from Macdonald’s study that the story told about ‘Aros’ is not the only story that might arise from the local community but it emphasises certain aspects of the landscape and culture that are important to a particular group within that community. So what exactly does ‘Aros’ emphasise about the landscape and culture of Skye?

Firstly ‘Aros’ is more consciously politicised that the other ‘heritage’ experiences on Skye. The presentation confronts the role of the lairds and the great landowners in the depopulation of the highlands, and the decline of the Gaelic culture and language. This is in part a representation of a ‘real’ and politicised landscape that was depopulated and scattered, its appearance dotted with ruined crofts, the people who worked and lived in the landscape replaced by sheep. ‘Aros’ emphasises the struggle for existence by the crofters through the story of Mary MacPherson or Big Mary of the Songs. She was a poetess of the nineteenth century who became a heroine of the Crofter’s Wars when the local people demonstrated against their removal from the land.

A second feature of the presentation at ‘Aros’ is specific reference to the Gaelic language especially to the contemporary revival of the language on Skye. This aspect of the culture of Skye is not a direct reference to landscape and reflects the context, under which the centre was created, by a particularly pro Gaelic part of the community. It does however; reflect a seamless continuity from the past to the present.

Thirdly ‘Aros’ takes up the story of ‘Bonnie Prince Charlie’, but not in the same light as the favoured and romanticised version. When the Jacobite rebellion of 1745 failed it was a disaster for Highland people. The story of Charles’s flight from the defeat at Culloden has been the subject of many stories in which Skye plays a central role. Most of these stories are romantically constructed, through song, literature or through visual media like painting and film. The presentation of the story at ‘Aros’ compares the romantic story, illustrated by the Skye Boat Song juxtaposed with a lament of the time that told of the deaths of local men in the battle at Culloden. A ‘walk in’ reconstruction shows Charles’ stay at the MacNab’s Inn in Portree, showing a scene in which the Young Pretender is an outsider and an aristocrat who did not understand the Highland culture of his hosts, refusing to share a drinking cup and making a lavish tip to the Inn keeper. The story addresses the lack of support that Charles actually received on Skye from the clan chiefs who were more interested in a clandestine ‘slave trade’ sending Skye people to the Americas. The most dramatic scene at ‘Aros’ shows part of a slave ship referred to as the ‘Ship of the People’. Macdonald points out that the story telling about the role of the clans in the history of Skye has a resonance with today as the people are still in dispute with the major landowners of the island. Once again this description of ‘Aros’ emphasises the political context to show that reproducing particular ‘partial’ landscapes, or questioning other romanticised landscapes that link the past to the landscape of the present can express particular aspects of local place-identity.

Macdonald’s conclusions make important points about the reproduction of place-identity by displaying representations of specific features, creating ‘partial’ landscapes. Most reproductions have been criticised by commentators such as Hewison or MacCannell as inauthentic constructions made for a global audience, but here the ‘Aros’ centre shows that local place-identity can be expressed. The stories being told are different from the globally accepted versions, allowing both locals and visitors to think again about the sense of place-identity evoked by the landscape of Skye. This suggests that ‘partial’ landscapes like ‘Aros’ have a role to play in negotiating place-identity.

The reproduction of landscapes through particular features held in a special building will be discussed further in relation to museum’s roles in place-identity later. First the discussion moves back to a ‘real’ landscape in Sardinia, where a number of sites and monuments play their part in local place-identity as it clashed with national and global identities.

4. Local Place-Identity and the Nuraghe of Abbasanta.

Peter Odermatt's study, discussed in chapter one, is an excellent example of an anthropological study of a community living with a 'heritage' site in their landscape (1996). Odermatt carried out an ethnographic and historical study with the people of Abbasanta a small village in Sardinia.

Odermatt studied changes in the local attitude towards a specific 'heritage' monument during the 1980s. His study described changes over a period of time by drawing on written sources and his own observations of local events and changes in communal relationships with their landscape. Odermatt's work suggested that built elements of the landscape are represented by a variety of powerful interest groups, these representations are often at variance to the local understandings of the same structures. Odermatt termed the process of representing structures in the landscape as 'staging' that implies selection, classification, description and enshrinement. 'Staging' is a process of objectification that puts structures under a gaze that can 'in the eyes of local residents, become invested with new, controversial, and often problematic meanings' (Odermatt 1996, 96).

Odermatt's study described the development of a variety of representations of the past in Sardinia since the nineteenth century and then concentrated on the response of the community to these changes in a specific landscape in which a particular type of prehistoric structure was located.

In the first half of the twentieth century diaries written by nineteenth century travellers led to interest in Sardinia at the newly formed Italian national board of antiquities. This in turn led to an academic interest in prehistoric Sardinia, although interest was confined to a small academic community until the aftermath of the Second World War.

As described in chapter one the post-war central government in Italy identified tourism as a way of generating income to restructure Sardinian society, a community that had remained essentially a peasant economy. Central government initiatives led attempts to reconstruct the economy of Sardinia until the 1970s and 80s when Sardinian local government took on the protection and representation of monuments in the Sardinian landscape, not only as tourist attractions but as political symbols.

The particular structures in the landscape in Sardinia that Odermatt referred to are called nuraghe. Nuraghe are large stone built towers that are seen in the landscape all over Sardinia, one of the best-preserved examples being in Abbasanta in central Sardinia. Nuraghe remained interesting oddities to antiquarian travellers throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Odermatt suggested that Sardinian sites and monuments were overlooked during this period when many other nations like Britain were cataloguing structures in their landscapes and using them as monuments to national pasts. It was only in 1890 and again

in 1915 that archaeological excavation took place at the nuraghe at Abbasanta the sites at this stage however, were not presented as national monuments. The excavations at Abbasanta resulted in the building of a wall around the monument to prevent local shepherds from using the site as an animal shelter. Following this brief archaeological interest the nuraghe at Abbasanta began to decay until 1930 when a local priest and amateur archaeologist repaired the structure. Odermatt suggested that the repairs were completed as a manifestation of pride in the site following a visit from King Vittorio Emanuele III and Mussolini in 1926, local interest rose rapidly after the visit (Odermatt 1996, 104). A marble table was built to commemorate the visit, this became known as the 'King's Table' and was used as a place for picnics, festivals and family celebrations. A study of local photographs shows that the nuraghe became a popular backdrop for family portraits. In this instance the landscape was represented not by painting but as a photographic image. The photograph is still composed according to the same 'rules' as a landscape painting, framing an image and taking in particular features like the nuraghe and the 'King's table'.

Villagers viewed visits to the nuraghe at Abbasanta in the 1930s as an important symbol of the modernisation of their village, which became one of the first to have electricity. The association was made between the nuraghe and a sense of nation for the first time which Odermatt associates with modernisation taking place at the time (Odermatt 1996, 105). This contrasts with the use of images of nuraghe on the flags of the local contrade and might represent a sense of local place-identity that, perhaps for the first time in a previously peasant community, was grounded in belonging to a new nation and a sense of being part of a national 'in-group'.

This sense of national belonging was lost after the Second World War as new efforts were made by central authorities to build up the local economy through tourism. Part of the new tourist regeneration plan was to promote nuraghe as special local monuments, to be visited. The fact that visitors from all over Europe, knew about Abbasanta raised local pride in the nuraghe in their landscape, but not necessarily national pride. New local initiatives sprung up amongst the local people to restore the monument and a new set of post cards were produced depicting the nuraghe and the village war memorial.

During the 1970s however, changes took place that led to radical change in local attitudes towards the nuraghe that stood in the landscape. The local government archaeological service in Cagliari took the view that monuments throughout the island required better presentation for growing tourist numbers. Central planning authorities in Sardinia imposed changes on the Abbasanta landscape without consulting the local people. The access path to the nuraghe was changed and a new street was built to make access by car easier, large amounts of 'rubble' were also removed from the site to tidy it up and make it more presentable for tourists. All this change made the nuraghe a contested feature in the local landscape, the local mayor learned that the 'rubble' being removed was in fact a whole Roman layer of the site, so he ordered the local Carbinieri to halt the work by force. The Roman layers of the nuraghe site had not been viewed as a particularly important part of the local landscape until this crisis arose, suddenly the Roman 'rubble' was a

point of conflict which closed the nuraghe to the public for two years. The conflict between central Sardinian government and the Abbasanta community had a profound effect on the place of the nuraghe in local place-identity. A local resident told Odermatt in 1990 that: 'Twenty or thirty years ago Losa (the local name for the nuraghe) was our symbol (simbolo proprio), we were proud of it, we showed it to friends and tourists and often visited ourselves, but then it became a commercial symbol' (Odermatt 1996, 108).

Odermatt reflected upon the change in attitude to the nuraghe in the village landscape when he observed that landowners denied 'local residents and independent tourists access to the monument' because 'the indigenous "heritage" industry denied the Abbasantees an active part in the representation of Losa' (Odermatt 1996, 108). This change in local identification with the nuraghe can be located in the sudden disappearance of images of the nuraghe in local post card views.

Odermatt was able to identify other examples of the appropriation of the nuraghe by cataloguing incidents of conflict over the site and interviewing the protagonists at the time. Odermatt observed the increased use of Losa as a national symbol for Sardinia, used widely in tourist publications and even on political campaign material. The latter backfired on the political party who used an image of the nuraghe when they misjudged the new and negative sense of place-identity evoked by the nuraghe.

The changing role of the nuraghe at Abbasanta in the place-identity and landscape of the local community illustrates a number of issues regarding local identity. The meaning of a particular landscape feature is not fixed, its meaning changes at least through time, depending on the context in which it is viewed. In fact the nuraghe probably held a sense of place-identity that was at the same time national, when visited by the King and Mussolini, and yet local as it represented a source of local pride. The sense of local place-identity was however, challenged over time as regional powers sought to appropriate the landscape and the nuraghe. Appropriation was manifest in the physical alteration of the landscape and was countered by individual responses and communal action. Individuals found their sense of place-identity challenged in that those who had the power to do so, restricted access to other sites of archaeological interest in the landscape, whilst the community, at least in the figure of the Mayor resisted by defending the Roman archaeology adjacent to the nuraghe. The multiple meanings of the nuraghe suggest that local place-identity cannot be studied in isolation from national or indeed global identity. This is even more pertinent when considering the complex landscape of place-identity in urban situations, which museums such as the Museum of London attempt to represent.

5. Place-Identity and Representations of Urban Landscapes.

The Museum of London serves a number of functions in preserving and presenting the past in London. Whilst working for the Museum Merriman published a paper entitled *The Crisis of Representation in*

Archaeological Museums (1999). Merriman's paper suggested that museums had become ensnared by the notion that 'there is an objective and monolithic past that awaits revelation by the informed expert' (Merriman 1999, 5). The view that there are many versions of the past constructed in relation to the present and thus changeable, challenges the concept of an objective and monolithic past. As suggested above (in the discussion of Macdonald's work on Skye) the representation of the past creates 'partial' landscapes that carry meanings for contemporary museum visitors. For the large urban museum, which has stood as an institution for many years, there is little sense of place-identity generated by members of the local community as 'Aros' was on Skye. Just as 'Aros' engaged in telling stories to create a sense of place-identity so do larger museums, the Museum of London has a role to play in the place-identity of that city whilst the British Museum plays a role in telling the story of Britain (possibly overemphasising the imperialist past).

Merriman referred to the telling of stories as 'myth telling', he identified two types of myth: The first types of myth were 'the myths exhibited in archaeological museums tend to be those that receive establishment and academic approval. These coexist with a second type of myth, a series of non-establishment myths which exist outside official institutions and which develop to provide a past for disenfranchised groups with no access to official media of representation (Merriman 1999, 2). Merriman noted that many working within the Western paradigm of rationalist thought would object to having their representations of the past described as 'myths' but, he says there are many examples in the past of archaeological writing providing 'identity-affirming origin myths' (Merriman 1999).

When large, urban, institutionalised museums evoke place-identity by representing 'partial' landscapes as predominantly 'White, Western, imperialist, monolithic and modernist' they are found to have a problematic existence in a culturally diverse community. It seems that museums such as the British Museum are not engaged in reproducing place-identity for the individual, they are creating partial landscapes that are representative of communal place-identity that is both nationalist and imperialist. This problem has been amplified in nations that were former colonies. There state museums were created in the image of institutions like the British Museum. In states like Canada, the USA, Australia and New Zealand where a majority white population lives alongside a strong indigenous tradition critiques like those above led to a re-evaluation of museum approaches to representation (Merriman 1999). This re-evaluation has been termed the 'crisis of representation' in museum anthropology (McManus 1991).

Merriman considered three ways that the Museum of London might represent the past that would allow for a variety of place-identity in a multicultural urban environment like London. The first approach was through combining 'narrative and evidence' (Merriman 1999). This acknowledges the important role that story telling or narrative plays in the establishment of local place-identity. This, Merriman suggests, must be combined with a readiness to tell stories from different perspectives and show that these stories are historically contingent, very much as the 'Aros' centre had recreated an alternative narrative about 'Bonnie

Prince Charlie'. The telling of alternative narratives is not all that Merriman suggests. He also proposes that the evidence behind representations of the past should be made more explicit. Leading on from the importance of narrative is a readiness to be more amenable to 'multiple interpretation'. This process Merriman describes as 'mutlivocalism' that changes the narratives told by museums from a monologue with a passive public to a dialogue by which the public can make a critically informed judgement about the past.

A 'museum of dialogue' as Merriman called it would allow the public to create their own narratives in a public place and influence their expression of place-identity by creating landscapes themselves within the confines of a museum. This process Merriman suggested would require a complete overhaul of the way that museums interact with the public, asking for perpetual feedback on displays and exhibitions. Merriman concluded that museums should be places where evidence is assessed and where narratives are told. This he says allows a 'new and more dynamic future for archaeological museums in which they work actively with their publics in a process that involves dialogue and a variety of perspectives' (Merriman 1999, 12).

Conclusions.

This chapter has discussed a number of issues regarding local place-identity and the landscape. From work on place-identity it is clear that this sense of belonging works on an individual and a communal level. It is also evident that place-identity may evoke local, national or global place-identities. Dixon and Durrheim (2000) have emphasised that place-identity is a resource for discursive action, they highlighted the role that this relationship has in negotiating nationalism by reference to the work of Billig (1991) and Rose (1996). The role of landscape discussed in chapter one as a carrier of cultural meaning and metaphor overlaps with the concept of place-identity providing symbolic points through which place-identity of all kinds can be evoked.

In addition to the dual nature of place-identity, both individual and communal, this chapter also considered two types of landscape. The 'real' landscape, that is a physical environment that is overlain and created by multiple cultural meanings and a created or 'partial' landscape that is formed and presented to the world in a specially built space, namely a 'heritage' centre or museum. The 'partial' landscape differs from the 'real' in that it takes some special elements of the whole and uses them to present a narrative to the public. This narrative can be used to represent local place-identity, as we saw at 'Aros' on Skye, or to represent the dominant or establishment narrative, nationalism for example, in a traditional museum or indeed the many 'heritage' centres.

The introduction of the importance of dialogue and narrative is important when deciding how to research the relationship between 'heritage' sites and monuments that feature in the landscape and the sense of place-identity that they may evoke. As Dixon and Durrheim (2000) have suggested, it is in people's talk

about the landscape that the relationship between ‘heritage’ sites and monuments that feature in the landscape and the sense of place-identity that they may evoke is illuminated.

The three opening chapters of this thesis have established the role of landscape and the features in the landscape as important components in the negotiation of identity, particularly through the sense of sight. This role for landscape and the features in it has a direct bearing on a debate current amongst historians, archaeologists and ‘heritage’ managers about the social value of ‘heritage’. The next chapter looks in detail at this debate. It suggests that studying the negotiation of identity through viewing the landscape, and features within it, can contribute to the debate about social value of ‘heritage’.