

CHAPTER 2 CULTURAL HERITAGE AND THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF SCALE

2.1 Introduction

The rising importance of cultural landscapes, and increasing interest in creating heritage places rather than just the management of lone heritage objects and monuments, are indicators of a larger move within heritage management to view heritage as inextricably linked to its wider spatial and temporal context. Whether the terminology is setting, aspect, landscape or context, the increasing use of such language illustrates a shift in heritage management beyond the heritage site. Increasingly elements of the surrounding area are being incorporated into heritage places and landscapes as their contributions towards heritage value are being recognised by heritage professionals. However, the increased management focus on setting has not been reflected in the literature, with little discussion on the nature of the relationship between heritage sites and their settings. Particularly absent in the literature is debate surrounding the impact which heritage management has upon areas surrounding heritage sites. Until now, research into heritage places and spaces has been conducted within a theoretical framework that has explored the social construction of space and place. This literature has examined how the authenticity of heritage, the growth in heritage tourism, and the acceptance of certain heritage values over others, have all been motivated by a desire to create particular experiences and aesthetics that can enhance one set of values, or exclude another. This chapter expands beyond this to consider how the evaluation and revaluation of heritage continually shifts the boundaries, or limits, of heritage spaces.

With the increasing spatial contextualisation that is taking place in the management of heritage sites, it is argued in this thesis that it is now necessary to explore the scaled relationships between heritage sites and their surrounding spaces. Theories on the politics of scale argue that scale, as a way of framing reality, is socially constructed and is continually produced and reproduced (McMaster and Sheppard 2004). Scale as a term implies levels - of size or degree - and some scale theorists argue that these levels do not belong in a set hierarchy, but instead see them as sets of relations (Howitt 1993). This

approach will be applied in this chapter to explore the changing relationships between heritage sites, their management and the surrounding areas.

Notions of scale are widely used in heritage when consideration is given to the values attached to heritage objects and places. There has long been recognition of the differing values between those in close proximity to a site, and national or global populations more removed from the site (Grimwade and Carter 2000; Bianchi 2002; Byrne, Brayshaw et al. 2003). Using a theoretical approach that questions a pre-determined hierarchy of scale may help in the current debates surrounding 'local versus global' heritage values. This can be taken further by arguing that if consideration is to be given to the different values attached to heritage by different levels (groupings) of the population, then we must also explore how these different scaled populations interpret the relationships between heritage sites and their surroundings.

This chapter will further develop the argument that scale theory is applicable, and enlightening, for current heritage management practices. It first considers current theoretical approaches within heritage literature, such as discussions on perception and creation of heritage space, the rising influence of cultural landscapes and the ongoing discussion on balancing local and global heritage values. Focus will then be drawn to outlining the work of scale theorists and their discussion on the social construction of scale, highlighting the applicability of this theoretical material to situations other than those of an economical or political nature. Finally, this chapter develops the theoretical argument that underpins this research, outlining the scales of heritage and highlighting the continual rescaling of heritage sites.

2.2 Discourses of Heritage

As an area of academic interest, cultural heritage has been approached, in the literature, from a number of different angles. It is first and foremost grounded in the exploration of its practical application, both through heritage management and through discussions surrounding the role of cultural heritage in society. This has been driven by heritage

professionals and management researchers. There has also been a significant philosophical body of work, led by those such as Lowenthal (1994) and Harvey (2001), which examines the concept of heritage and associated ideas, including value, authenticity and identity. Whilst criticism has been levelled at heritage managers for not developing a strong theoretical basis to their work (Loulanski 2006), it often appears that the ideas and issues of these two approaches (the theoretical and applied) are absorbed into each other (Smith 2004). The discourse of cultural heritage management may appear to reflect theoretical debates taking place, but praxis reveals this to be rhetorical (Waterton, Smith et al. 2006). I would argue that this is because of fundamental philosophical differences. Many of those (for example: Lowenthal 1985; Harvey 2001; Smith 2004) who have approached heritage from a theoretical sociological perspective have taken a postmodernist, or at least a post-positivist, position. Assuming a post-positivist stance involves rejecting the meta-narrative, recognising the flexible and subjective nature of heritage, and emphasising the individualised and contextualised processes involved in valuing, interpreting and managing cultural heritage (Jacobs 1993; Poon 2005; Winter 2008). In contrast the field of heritage management is driven by archaeologists who embrace a processual, or positivist, approach to ensuring scientific, relevant and objective conservation and interpretation of heritage sites (Smith 2000; Smith 2001; Smith 2004).

This section will examine the current state of thinking surrounding heritage and heritage management. It will illustrate how the ideas of critical heritage studies – the concepts of heritage, value and identity - are reflected in the issues of cultural heritage management - the interpretation of heritage, tourism and the involvement of local communities. At the same time it will highlight some key areas where theory and practice diverge. This has implications for the construction and entrenchment of certain notions of scales surrounding heritage values and interpretation of heritage objects and locations.

2.2.1 Defining Heritage

As a concept, heritage is often nebulous (Loulanski 2006), with many different associations and meanings (Hewison 1989; Evans 2002). The term can be used narrowly (Hitchcock and King 2003) to refer to objects or locations tied to historic events, or it can more broadly encompass “*virtually everything*” that creates a link between the present and the past

(Harvey 2001). Common to many definitions is the idea of inheritance (Nuryanti 1996; Turnpenny 2004). Heritage is something from the past for the present, which will, in turn, be given to the future. Heritage is often considered as a juxtaposition of the natural world and cultural anthropogenic articles (Serageldin and Martin-Brown 1999; Pannell 2006). This thesis focuses on cultural heritage.

The elusiveness of a universal definition can be captured through inspection of the documentation and websites of various agencies responsible for facilitating the protection and management of heritage, such as UNESCO's World Heritage Committee (WHC), the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), and the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS). Whilst these organisations comprehensively describe and characterise various types of heritage, none of these organisations provide a clear definition of 'heritage'. Instead an understanding of the concept must be derived through analysis of the various categories of heritage. The WHC characterises heritage as objects and areas which have value from the point of view of history, art, anthropology, ethnology, aesthetics or science (WHC 2003). The word 'heritage' is repeatedly used by ICOMOS, however a definition was only found buried within the Ethical Commitment Statement (ICOMOS 2002). Here it is defined as including *"monuments, sites and places that range from the monumental to the vernacular; from cultural landscapes with intangible values which reflect layers of social traditions, to individual sites of community importance"* (ICOMOS 2002). Indeed even the Burra Charter (ICOMOS Australia 1999), recognised as being one of the key documents on standards of practice for cultural heritage management (Smith 2001; Taylor 2004; Waterton, Smith et al. 2006), does not use the word 'heritage', preferring instead the phrase *"culturally significant places"* .

Cultural heritage is not only the tangible material remains and locations of past events. Increasingly, intangible ways of life are also being formally acknowledged as part of personal or societal heritage (Robin and Rothschild 2002; Hitchcock and King 2003). Nor is cultural heritage only concerned with the grand monuments of the past; it also often encapsulates the ordinary and everyday through conservation of vernacular landscapes (Jacobs 1992; Moran 2004; Taylor 2004). Increasingly attention is being given to highlight the diverse relationships between humans and their environments (Russell and Jambrecina

2002; Corsane 2006; Loulanski 2006). These changes reflect a shifting emphasis from the conservation of isolated monuments to the integrated management of towns, cities, and their landscapes (The London Group 2000; Handler 2003; Loulanski 2006). This thesis is predominantly concerned with tangible cultural heritage, particularly those sites, objects and landscapes inscribed on the World Heritage List. As a starting point, heritage will be conceived as the inherited remains of the past, utilised in the present for cultural reasons.

Many writers (including Harvey 2001; Chang and Huang 2005; Loulanski 2006) have argued that the conceptual dynamism of heritage is natural, as it is produced by people according to their contemporary concerns and experiences (Harvey 2001; Hampton 2005). Early 20th century approaches to cultural heritage revolved around presenting and discussing authenticated artefacts in a factual manner that captured a particular spatial and temporal moment (Freestone 1993; Harvey 2001). This was associated with an antiquarian approach adopted by heritage-related disciplines of archaeology and architecture (Freestone 1993; Hodder 2001; Smith 2004). With ideological shifts in many of the social sciences in the 1950s and 1960s, a positivist methodology developed, centring on achieving objective, scientific understanding and presentation of heritage sites and objects (Smith 1994; Whitley 1998; Smith 2004). The counter-reaction to this was to spatially and temporally contextualise the remnants of the past (Carman 2000; Hamer 2000), and to argue for recognition of the inherent diversity in contents and significance (Loulanski 2006; Taylor and Altenburg 2006). This can be seen as reflecting wider popular movements that sought to recognise indigenous rights, and to redefine heritage as something owned by the public, not experts and officials.

Heritage is now concerned with the uniqueness of personal experiences and meanings (Fisher 2004; Taylor 2004; Loulanski 2006). When heritage is viewed subjectively (Taylor 2004), its contents and meanings can, and do, change within and between cultures across time and space (Galla 1994; Logan 1995; Carman 2000; Taylor 2004; Hampton 2005; Taylor and Altenburg 2005; Loulanski 2006). This flexibility is not viewed negatively, but is seen as an advantage as it allows ordinary people to engage and relate with heritage places and objects (Harvey 2001; Smith 2001; Taylor 2004). It has been argued that if heritage is only considered as the physical material fabric of places and objects, and avoids understanding

the attached 'messages', then it will play a lifeless role in popular consciousness (Petzet 1994; Robin and Rothschild 2002; Taylor 2004). Instead as a dynamic evolving entity, it should be accepted that heritage can be created, used, and interpreted in different ways by different actors (Hitchcock and King 2003; Hampton 2005). Flexibility also extends to recognition of a plurality of cultural approaches to heritage (Inaba 2001; Hajdu 2002; Taylor 2004; Karlström 2005). In this way acknowledgment is given to the role of heritage in the struggle to maintain local identities in the face of homogenising globalisation of culture (Chang 1999; Hamer 2000).

Recent recognition of the breadth of heritage arises from the impact of post-positivist thinking that values individualism and uniqueness, particularly in terms of human perceptions and experiences of the physical and social environment (Nuryanti 1996; Whitley 1998; Blake 2002). This 'human-centred' approach to heritage emphasises the functional aspects of cultural heritage (Loulanski 2006). In a functional world, material objects and locations are valueless without meaningful human uses and activity attached to them (Handler 2003). Heritage has value both as a cultural and economic resource. This has led to detailed discussions concerning the construction of heritage as a commodity, particularly for tourism (Jacobs 1992; Chang, Milne et al. 1996; Richards 1996; McIntosh and Prentice 1999; Mitchell and Coghill 2000; Winter 2002; Hampton 2005). By placing people and their perceptions at the centre of heritage discussions, it is not the past or its remains that matter, but the way that contemporary people recognise and relate to it (Lowenthal 1985; Laenen 1989; Harvey 2001).

2.2.2 Cultural Heritage Management

As perceptions of heritage have changed, so have the philosophies behind its management. Cultural heritage management is no longer just about the preservation and presentation of cultural items and locations valued as reminders of the past (Galla 1994; Green 2001; Loulanski 2006). Managing heritage as a cultural and economic resource currently takes place within an ideological framework that promotes conservation of heritage to ensure its place in sustainable economic and cultural development now and in the future (Carter and Bramley 2002; Bruce and Creighton 2006; Loulanski 2006). Heritage is understood as something that was here before us and remains when we are gone (Nuryanti 1996). In this

age of globalisation where many perceive (and fear) rapid westernisation and homogenisation of culture (Massey 1991; Clammer 2003), cultural heritage is seen as an empowering mechanism for sustaining local identities and communities (Chang 1999; Loulanski 2006).

Since the 1970s, social justice agendas have motivated a “*democratisation of heritage*” (Freestone 1993:19) away from the grand monuments and elaborate remains of the elite towards conservation of heritage that reflects the everyday and the ordinary (Freestone 1993; Galla 1994; Galla 1999; Byrne, Brayshaw et al. 2003). With the focus now on the social and economic resource value of heritage, there has been a corresponding shift in cultural heritage management towards ensuring functionality (Teller and Bond 2002; Bruce and Creighton 2006; Loulanski 2006). There has also been a greater awareness of the need to resolve tensions between different stakeholders. Effective community consultation is now seen as a necessity for successful management (Green 2001; Silori 2001; Bianchi and Boniface 2002), reflecting the ideological transformation towards post-positivist discourse that argues for a “*human-centred*” approach to heritage (Loulanski 2006). In terms of language, cultural heritage managers now prefer to use ‘conservation’ rather than ‘preservation’. The latter implies capturing objects and locations in time and restricting contemporary use, whereas conservation allows for integration of protection programs with human use and enjoyment (Dix 1994; Grimwade and Carter 2000; Carter and Bramley 2002). Thus the inheritance does not sit passively on the landscape, but is seen as an active part of the landscape that people should interact with in a sustainable manner.

Though the language of cultural heritage management reflects the post-positivist theoretical discourse, it is strongly argued here and elsewhere (Smith 1994; Smith 2000; Smith 2004), that the implementation remains solidly grounded in a positivist (or processual) methodology. The use of qualifying words such as ‘appropriate’ and ‘traditional’ indicate power relationships that are not necessarily equitable or inclusive. The institutionalisation of cultural heritage management, through the embedding of planning legislation and practices, has encouraged objective, rationalised management (Freestone 1993; Smith 2000; Jamal and Hill 2004). Such an approach is in conflict with ideological changes that encourage a subjective, pluralistic approach to heritage and its interpretation

(Smith 1994; Smith 2000; Byrne, Brayshaw et al. 2003). The contradictions between rhetoric and practice are evident at all stages of the management process: value identification; planning; and ongoing protection. It is these inconsistencies that lay the groundwork for potential tensions between stakeholder perceptions of relationships between different aspects of heritage landscapes.

The initial steps in cultural heritage management have always involved the identification of the significance, or value, of a heritage site or object (Hall and McArthur 1993; Aplin 2002). Post-positivist approaches to heritage have emphasised the plurality of values that can be possessed by different people in different locations and times (Lowenthal 1985; Harvey 2001). Dissonance between stakeholders, particularly where livelihoods are involved, can lead to the failure of heritage management projects (Silori 2001; Teller and Bond 2002). From a management perspective, there is thus a need to involve stakeholders at all stages of the management process (Green 2001; Johnston and Buckley 2001; Hou 2004). Despite a social justice agenda that promotes participatory planning and community management, resolving the tensions between the interests of cultural heritage planners and local communities remains one of the most controversial issues in culture heritage management (Green 2001; Silori 2001; Bruce and Creighton 2006). While there is recognition of differences between those who live near a site and those who visit from afar (Long 2000), in practice there is a tendency for the 'scientific' values and decisions of experts to rule over other less vocal groups (Smith 2001; Carter and Bramley 2002; Mason 2002; Dredge 2004). The integration of heritage with contemporary uses and spaces is seen by some as a way of providing sustainable development and community involvement and satisfaction (Logan 1995; Vines 2001; Teller and Bond 2002; Taylor 2004). It has even been questioned as to why contemporary use should be viewed as a threat, given that heritage values are entirely driven from a contemporary perspective (Graham, Ashworth et al. 2000). However, for many heritage professionals, any use of heritage is a potential threat (Loulanski 2006), and the barriers such ideas can generate, create significant communication gaps between local people and management (Teller and Bond 2002).

These ongoing tensions in cultural heritage management, and the evident contradictions between practice and philosophical discourse, highlight the need to recognise the cultural

politics active in the conservation and interpretation of cultural heritage (Smith 1994; Mason 2002; Sofield and Fung 2005). The alternation between post-positivist rhetoric and positivist practices creates power relationships that influence what is protected and how. This power can be exerted through controlling access to material culture (Smith 2000), or it can manifest in an imperialistic assessment of values that ignores local values, ideas and knowledge (Carter and Bramley 2002; Dredge 2004; Taylor 2004). At the extreme, the power exerted by foreign experts can create a neo-colonial environment, where western conservation ideologies can be imposed on non-western cultures (Boniface 2000; Henderson 2001; Fisher 2004). Later sections of this chapter will discuss cultural heritage value, interpretation, tourism and local involvement, highlighting the impacts of contradictions between discourse and practice on the relationships between heritage, humans and the encompassing landscape.

2.3 The Social Construction of Scale

It is difficult to discuss heritage and its related concepts without using terminology that implies levels, degrees or extents. The concept of scale is inherent to our current conceptualisation of cultural heritage and its management. The idea of value has been fundamentally linked to local, national and global scales (Graham, Ashworth et al. 2000). The input of stakeholders and their impacts are measured in areas with hierarchical extents. Similarly, the way that human, environment and heritage relationships are interpreted to create heritage places can be considered part of a dialogue of scale - referring to areas perceived to have differing levels of importance. This thesis explores how scales, as sets of relationships, influence the management of heritage. In particular, the research focuses on the social construction of scales of interpretation – the representation and management of relations between humans, the environment and heritage. The aim of this chapter is to explore the philosophical basis for examining the scaling of heritage, through an understanding of the theoretical discussions behind the concepts of heritage and scale.

Scale is central to any geographical concept (McMaster and Sheppard 2004). Tasks that define the extent of a study and seek to understand the relationships between processes at

different levels are regularly undertaken when exploring and managing human-environment relationships (Howitt 1993). Despite this frequent use, scale theorists have argued that 'scale' as a concept is not as neutral or innocuous as it is often assumed to be (Jones 1998; McMaster and Sheppard 2004). While there is widespread awareness of the potentially problematic nature of scale, there is less consciousness of the political and social consequences of scaling processes (Marston 2000). It is widely acknowledged that geographical processes, and the studies that observe them, can have drastically different results when defined with different spatial limits or viewed with varying degrees of resolution (i.e. The Modifiable Areal Unit Problem (Lam 2004)). However, scale theorists argue that, after a cursory nod to these variations, the concept of scale remains poorly defined and its current incarnation is "*taken for granted*" (Delaney and Leitner 1997; Brenner 2001). The spatial qualifiers - local, regional, national, and global - are widely accepted, and their nature (ordering, relationships, etc.) is usually seen as fixed (Howitt 1998; Bunnell and Coe 2001). These terms are used in a wide variety of situations from planning to politics, economics to social identity. They are all used, and carry implied geographical meanings, but at the same time to each of us, in different situations, they can mean something very different (Agnew 1997; Nielsen and Simonsen 2003). The use of these terms carries connotations of inflexibility that scale theorists challenge (Jonas 1994). Scale theorists argue that the naturalisation of scale is problematic as these geographically differentiated spaces are not ontologically given; rather they are constructed and manipulated through various social and political processes (Smith 1988; Jonas 1994; Marston 2000). Thus scale moves from being an unproblematic descriptor, to a socially constructed tool that influences the way we perceive and understand human-environment relationships.

In seeking to understand why and how scale is constructed in particular contexts, a clearer definition of the concept has been cultivated. Most scale theorists attempt to define the concept, but it is the work of Howitt (1993; 1998; 2002) that clearly highlights and draws together the three key 'metaphors' for scale: scale as size, scale as level, and scale as relation. Traditional understandings of scale revolve around the first two metaphors, with frequent references to the size of study areas, the cartographical representations of areas, and hierarchical groupings of objects, people, locations and space (Howitt 1998; McMaster and Sheppard 2004). However Howitt's third metaphor – scale as a set of relations – has

been underemphasised and it is the work of scale theorists that has pushed beyond thinking of scale as area, towards understanding scale as relationships and networks of association (Cox 1998; Howitt 1998; Bunnell and Coe 2001; Leitner 2004).

Geographical scales, whether size, level or relationships, can be considered a form of geographically differentiated space (Brenner 2001). If Howitt's last metaphor for scale (relations) is used then it is possible to move beyond seeing scale as simply a description of area, to being a form of inclusion or exclusion. More often than not, belonging to a particular geographical scale is defined by being contained within certain spatial bounds (or range) (Leitner 1997; Jones 1998). These spatial limits are created to spatially capture perceived similarities and differences, and reflect our comprehensions and formation of individual and collective identity (Howitt 2002; Mamadouh, Kramsch et al. 2004). The resulting scales are the consequence of conflicts, negotiations and manipulations between different actors, or political entities (Leitner 1997). It is these characteristics that draw interest towards examining the conceptualisation and production of scale. By understanding scale as a set of relationships based around inclusion and exclusion of people and objects, knowledge of their construction and ordering assists with deciphering the power structures of equalisation and differentiation which particular scales facilitate (Jones 1998; Brenner 2001). In the context of the current research, it is appropriate to use a definition of scales based around networks and relationships. Such a definition allows recognition that it is the similarities rather than spatial extents that see heritage objects, areas and the people who view them grouped together, and it is the perceived differences which create the structuring of different relationships (Jonas 1994; Leitner 2004). The term 'local' as it is used in heritage, such as 'local values' and 'local community', is limited not by a definitive spatial distance. It is defined through recognition of particular commonalities not apparent at the national or global scales. In the same way, global heritage value is not necessarily tied to a particular spatial area, but rather it can be seen as the recognition of a network of locations and objects that have similarities that link them and uniqueness that excludes others. This carries through to the hierarchy we impose on heritage, whereby power or political weight is put behind objects perceived as belonging, or of value. It is important to note here that though scales revolve around similarities and differences, this does not make them homogenous entities (Smith 1998; Staehali, Ledwith et al. 2002). Thus this work will see scale as a hierarchy of geographical objects of differing territorial limits

based around the relationships and connections existing between and within different spatial frames.

A key part of the notion of scale as relations is that one scale cannot exist on its own, there must always be another (Agnew 1997; Brenner 2001). There can be no big without small, no significant without insignificant, nor protected areas without unprotected areas. Scale is not about polar opposites, but rather the abstraction of relationships between objects, people and processes. Geographical scales are not separated by impenetrable boundaries, but are more fluid constructs with porous limits that are continually evolving and changing (Cox 1998). They are contingent on the object or processes being described. The boundaries of geographically differentiated spaces form the interfaces for unique multidirectional relationships between different scales (Agnew 1997; Howitt 2002). There are no restrictions on the relationships between different scales, nor is there any definitive hierarchical order (Kelly 1999; Marston and Smith 2001). Instead, hierarchies can be created and recreated by human agents using power derived from the politics of inclusion and exclusion (Brenner 2001; Mamadouh, Kramsch et al. 2004). Scales may be spatially nested, but spatial extents can vary (Agnew 1997) - the local can be both a neighbourhood and the town in which that neighbourhood sits. The ontology of scales can be manipulated to include and exclude objects and networks, and struggles for power and control flow out across multiple scales (Brenner 2001). For example, civil action groups organised at a local community level may bypass the national scale to interface with global groups through networks of like-minded organisations and people (Cox 1998; Jones 1998). By recognising closer ties with a global network than a national organisation, a 'smaller' organisation can derive power that sees the national disempowered in the relationship (Kelly 1997; Elwood 2002). Thus it is the relationships between scales that in effect define the scales themselves (Kelly 1999; Brenner 2001; Purcell 2003).

It is within this new awareness of scale as a political tool of inclusion and exclusion that attention has been focused upon the political and social construction of scale (Brenner 2001; Elwood 2002). This literature is widely seen as originating from the work of Henri Lefebvre (Brenner 2000; Marston 2000; Nielsen and Simonsen 2003). The key idea adopted from his work by scale theorists is that of the social construction of space (Miller 1997;

Marston 2000). Lefebvre (Lefebvre 1974) argued that space was not a blank arena within which things happen, but should be seen as a physical, social and conceptual product of social and natural events and processes (Brenner 2000; McMaster and Sheppard 2004). With scale as a way of (spatially) differentiating space, this argument has been transposed on to scale literature which seeks to reveal and understand the processes that shape and constitute social practices at different levels of analysis (Marston 2000).

Literature supporting the social constructionist perspective revolves around three core beliefs (Marston 2000). Firstly it is argued that scale is not just a label, but a way of representing, or 'framing' reality (Delaney and Leitner 1997; Mamadouh, Kramsch et al. 2004). These frames need to be closely examined to understand the processes, reasoning and power relations behind them. Secondly, scales are not simply figures of speech used as adjectives to describe an abstraction of reality, there are 'material consequences' that result from the ways in which scales are used (Cox 1998; Kelly 1999; Marston 2000). International and regional organisations are formed to cement 'ideas' of what constitutes a regional or global scale. Certain behaviours and traditions are conserved, or discouraged, based on what constitutes local or national identities. Wars are fought in support of maintaining a national scale, which was itself a result of classifications based around culture, identity and territory. Thus scale can have real tangible consequences (Marston 2000). Thirdly, the social constructionist approach to scale is that scale productions are "often contradictory and contested" and can be reproduced when new contextual factors come into play (Taylor 1987; Marston 2000; Whitehead 2003). We see this when regional conglomerations of countries ebb in and out of existence as allegiances and ideas concerning similarities of identity and purpose within such a grouping evolve over time. Similarly, the local scale is often a contestable scale, its spatial extent and relationship with other scales altering to suit the geographical context of concern (Smith 1998; Elwood and Leitner 2003).

Whilst most research into the social construction of scale has critiqued the creation and use of scales in political and economic arenas, there is scope to focus attention on the way scales are constructed and manipulated in our social and cultural lives (Jones, Woodward et al. 2006). Valuable ideas can be transferred to inform the analysis and discussion of

heritage scales. Scales are frames for representing reality (Taylor 1987), aiding our comprehension of the world and human actions (Jones 1998). The social and political actions of individuals and groups play a key role in the creation of these representations (Smith 1988). The objects, activities and processes that are included or excluded change as scales “*stretch and contract across space*” (Jonas 1994). Scale research thus focuses on the ways in which scale is constructed and the consequences of particular constructions (McMaster and Sheppard 2004). Beyond the economic and the political, culture can be seen as an arena where we actively partake in the construction of scale. By framing, grouping, excluding, including, judging, abstracting and valuing processes, people and places, we construct cultural scales of influence, value and representation. These theoretical interests can be directed towards cultural heritage to examine how levels of ‘value’ and ‘significance’ are constructed, and more importantly, how the ‘scaling’ of interpretation has been socially constructed and the consequences of the current constructions.

2.4 The Scales of Heritage

This chapter has discussed the discourses of heritage from philosophical and practical perspectives. It has highlighted the influences of shifts from positivist to post-positivist methodologies. These changes have resulted in the recognition, by academics and cultural heritage managers, that there are highly individualised responses to heritage objects and locations (Eisenhauer, Krannich et al. 2000; Dredge 2004). There has also been increased acknowledgement that heritage sites are not simply placed upon an empty canvas, but are objects and spaces plucked from the contemporary landscape and given an ongoing significance that is attached to the identity of the population interpreting the object (Anschuetz, Wilhusen et al. 2001; Taylor 2004; Taylor and Altenburg 2006). Thus it is that there has been strong interest in understanding the values and interpretation of heritage, and the stakeholders involved (Parkin, Middleton et al. 1989; Nuryanti 1996; Grimwade and Carter 2000). Within heritage literature, there has been comprehensive discussion that defines cultural heritage values, explores the potentially conflicting perspectives of different stakeholders, and investigates the utilisation of those values in building individual and community identities. Similarly, the methodologies of heritage interpretation and management have been critiqued to reveal concerns about restrictive representation

(Fisher 2004), the 'faking' of heritage (Crang 1996), and incorporation of contemporary uses (Grimwade and Carter 2000). In all of these analyses, it has become evident that it is difficult to discuss heritage and its related concepts without using terminology that implies levels, degrees or extents.

The concept of scale is embedded within heritage discourse. The way we think about heritage value has been fundamentally linked to the levels of local, national and global significance and agents. In constructing a heritage site or area, some form of boundary between the significant and the insignificant is created: a level or scale of importance is applied to the landscape. Similarly, the way that human, environment and heritage relationships are interpreted to create heritage places can be considered as a dialogue of scale. It is clear that it would be useful to re-examine the key ideas of value and interpretation using a social constructionist approach to heritage. The remainder of this chapter will explore the two key processes of scaling heritage: scaling of value and scaling of interpretation. The first of these influences what is identified as heritage, revealing the naturalisation of levels of significance. Awareness of the manner in which scales of value are socially constructed also acknowledges the way that heritage management has accepted certain configurations of stakeholders, or agents, considered as having an interest in a heritage site. These scales of value feed into the scales of interpretation, which are reflected in the management of heritage objects and locations. The constructions of these scales have material consequences which this research seeks to explore at the Angkor World Heritage area. For now however, this chapter will examine the construction of scales of value (significance and stakeholders) within heritage discourse. It will then demonstrate how the processes of management and conservation can be understood as constructed scales of interpretation that have material consequences. It will also reveal how scales of value and interpretation interact and influence each other.

2.4.1 Scales of Value

As has been previously stated, heritage theory has undergone a philosophical transformation towards recognition of the subjective nature of the concept and what it entails. An integral part of this revised vision is the notion of value. In the context of heritage, value is the important and desirable social, scientific, economic and political

qualities of an object, place or activity from the perspective of an individual or group (ICOMOS Australia 1999; Carter and Bramley 2002; Pocock 2002). The values, meanings or significance, attached to (heritage) objects and locations help us, the audience, to develop a sense of place and identity – or an idea of why we feel an attachment to an object or site (Hewison 1989; Sofield and Fung 2005; Taylor and Altenburg 2006). Value is so integral to heritage, that some authors have seen heritage itself as a value; in that it only exists through interactions (that generate meaning) between humans and their environment (Hewison 1989; Handler 2003; Loulanski 2006). A more generalist viewpoint of the importance for considering value and its utilisation in heritage conservation is that it provides an understanding of the socio-cultural contexts of heritage management (Jacobs 1992; Mason 2002).

In this examination of the scales of value, two key themes emerge within the literature. Firstly the question of ‘whose heritage?’ lends itself to untangling the widely discussed discourse surrounding the scaled agents who are both the perceivers of heritage and providers of value (Ashworth and van der Aa 2002). This ontology of scales is usually categorised according to physical relationships to a heritage site, with the social construction of local, national, and global ‘communities’ most evident in discussions that link heritage and identity (Ashworth 1994; Harvey 2003; Al-Kharrat 2005). The second key theme to be found within the literature on heritage value is that of ‘authenticity’. A strong focus on assessing and validating values and significance has led to reliance on a test of authenticity (McIntosh and Prentice 1999; Blandford 2006). This assessment revolves around the idea that not everything is equally valuable. Scales of significance are constructed which categorise locations and items based on how much value they possess. This value is not only direct, but can also be by association (Davis 2006). For example, at Stonehenge, the stone circle can be recognised as being the core heritage area and the surrounding cultural landscape as having value by association (Anderson 2004). For many years, heritage professionals and members of the community fought to protect the ‘viewscape’ of rolling green hills, as this surrounding landscape was seen as contributing to the aesthetics and atmosphere of the stone circle, and thus had value by association with the core site (Grimwade and Carter 2000; Pannell 2006). From a social constructionist perspective, exploration of the scales of significance through a lens of authenticity reveals how this concept is used by certain groups to legitimate some processes and reject others.

In addition, scales of value could also be understood as having a temporal element, as they result in objects, locations, and social practices being hierarchically and spatially differentiated based on connections between past and present.

2.4.1.1 Pluralistic Heritage

The social construction of heritage value makes it a political tool that can be used to empower different interests and ideologies (Jacobs 1992; Smith 1994; Green 2001). The present nature of cultural heritage management entails the ranking of values, as well as decisions of what is and isn't to be protected, and these processes are often contentious and political (Smith 1994; Green 2001; Waterton, Smith et al. 2006). A pluralistic viewpoint driven by principles of equity and empowerment recognises that heritage can have multiple meanings (Galla 1994; Sofield and Fung 2005), and that these meanings are not pre-given but are the result of interactions between an artefact and its spatial, temporal and social contexts (Eisenhauer, Krannich et al. 2000; Mason 2002). Thus it is quite possible for meanings to not only evolve over time, but also to often conflict (Ritchie 1998; Galla 1999; Ashworth and van der Aa 2002).

Managing conflict is a key part of managing cultural resources (de la Torre and Mason 2002; Byrne, Brayshaw et al. 2003). In recent years, there has been strong critique of the role heritage managers play in arbitrating the meanings attached to remnants of the past (Galla 1994; Smith 1994). Governments and key organisations look to 'experts', like archaeologists and architects, to rationally and objectively resolve conflicts between competing values (Smith 2001; Mason 2002). Heritage managers must make decisions that can both elevate and suppress different interests and ideologies (Jacobs 1992; Smith 2001). This means that there must be continual questioning of whose heritage and cultural values are being conserved (Ashworth and van der Aa 2002; Russell and Jambrecina 2002; Bruce and Creighton 2006). Whilst a pluralistic post-positivist framework is promoted in the various operational handbooks and guidelines (Hall and McArthur 1993; ICOMOS Australia 1999), growing criticism suggests the continued existence of an imperialistic science-based framework that is not so open to alternative evaluations and interpretations of heritage sites and objects (Smith 1994; Smith 2004). Often one set of values will hold greater

influence over others due to their alignment with certain (political) agendas (Sidorov 2000; Russell and Jambrecina 2002). Community experiences and meanings can be discounted, particularly where they are too closely linked to the economic functions of cultural resources (Russell and Jambrecina 2002; Loulanski 2006). The discourse employed by managers, calling for 'education' of host communities to ensure preservation of values (Fowler 1992; Crang 1996), carries the implication that the values possessed by the host community do not align with those which determine its importance.

This leads to a discussion of the socio-spatial object around which scales of agents are based. 'Community' as a concept is frequently used in heritage discourse to group people according to their residence within a distinct geographical location, or it can be used to define a social system or cultural grouping (Evans 2002; Hampton 2005). The concept is also utilised within management to portray a sense of collectivity, or togetherness (Hodges and Watson 2000). This latter idea is, on occasion, being used as a homogenising ideology that disguises the inherent diversity and power relations that exist within any socio-spatial grouping (Evans 2002). Communities are commonly defined at many spatial levels - local, national and global - as an inclusionary (and at times, exclusionary) tactic (Logan 1995; Hitchcock and King 2003). Heritage is seen as playing a key part in shaping personal and community identities (Laenen 1989; Ashworth 1994; Bruce and Creighton 2006). Within notions of community is the assumption of a common social or cultural background (Binks 1989; Scott 2002), where communities are often portrayed as stewards of a shared (material or immaterial) inheritance creating a sense of belonging and distinctiveness (Toupal, Zedeño et al. 2000; McLean 2006). Cultural identity is continually reconstructed and reinforced through interactions with people and objects, that produce memories and knowledge (Jamal and Hill 2004; Taylor 2004). The sharing of unique memories and experiences fashions the collective meanings attached to places, objects and behaviours that generate a sense of belonging (identification) within communities and to places (Osborne 2001; Jamal and Hill 2004). Thus it is that we can define identity as the recognition of unique combinations of behaviours, beliefs and knowledge that are used to distinguish social or spatial communities. From this we can understand the role of heritage in creating, legitimating and maintaining these identities, through the symbolic meanings and values attached to objects, events and places inherited from the past (Graham, Ashworth et al. 2000).

In an era when people fear rapid cultural homogenisation, alternate interpretations of heritage facilitate the formation and maintenance of distinctive cultural identities and communities. Heritage has been used to assert national identities (Long 2000), fight the forces of globalisation (Chang 1999), strengthen the belief in a global community (Scott 2002), and empower or suppress sub-cultural communities (Jacobs 1992). All of these can be considered *scaling* practices. Nations can be understood as reasonably large communities that have a common culture such as language, religion, political institutions, values, or historical experiences. Cultural heritage has been widely used to promote national identities and to provide 'authenticity' to the construction of such cultural groupings (Aldridge 1989; Al-Kharrat 2005). The symbolic nature of heritage provides a uniting force to drive cultural groups towards autonomy and independence (Bunnell, Kong et al. 2005), and in post-colonial situations, new interpretations and values for past monuments and events are promoted to indicate a break with the past (Logan 1995; Galla 1999; Fisher 2004).

At times, the meanings that rally people together through cultural understanding and identity can also be sources of control and conflict (Anderson and Gale 1992). The socially constructed nature of identity and its utilisation of heritage mean that consideration must be given to its powerful political potential to assist with the exclusion, or inclusion, of individuals or groups from society (Yeoh 2001; Noussia 2003; Waterton, Smith et al. 2006). Defining personal and community identity is as much about who doesn't belong as who does, with the idea of 'the other' essential to the concept of identity (Graham, Ashworth et al. 2000). The inescapable linkage between heritage and identity, means that decisions (economic and other) concerning the management of a site are all cultural choices (Hewison 1989). The assertion of particular identities can lead to suppression of others, including internal cultural diversity and alienation of sections of the population (Galla 1994). Similarly, the unequal economic relationship between tourist and visitor in many post-colonial countries can lead to tensions surrounding what heritage is preserved and how (Brohman 1996; Yeoh 2001). Cultural artefacts and locations will possess potentially dissonant interpretations for residents and visitors (Boniface 2000; Hajdu 2002). With increasing complexity in answering the question 'whose heritage?', international heritage

tourism has been accused of being a vehicle for neo-colonisation (Isar 1986; Henderson 2001; Fisher 2004). Thus the management of cultural heritage requires an awareness of the cultural identities to which interpretations and meanings are inherently linked.

2.4.1.2 Naturalisation of Value

As if to emphasise the contradiction between heritage rhetoric and management practices, two categories of value are often applied freely without consideration for their inherent instability – intrinsic and extrinsic values (Byrne, Brayshaw et al. 2003). These categories can be seen as the basis of the scaling of heritage significance. Intrinsic values are seen as those heritage qualities that do not require any particular experiences or modification to understand them, as they inherently exist in a cultural resource (Carter and Bramley 2002; Brown and Raymond 2007). In contrast, meanings that require human perception, utilisation or alteration of a cultural resource are seen as extrinsic (Carter and Bramley 2002; de la Torre and Mason 2002). Thus it is assumed that there are naturally occurring values, and it is these that must be protected above all others (UNESCO 1970; Bianchi 2002). Such an idea is used by heritage managers to legitimate certain decisions made concerning the ranking and conservation of heritage sites and values (Byrne, Brayshaw et al. 2003).

Scaling of heritage significance has become increasingly important with growth in public interest in heritage areas. The World Heritage Committee's Operational Guidelines (WHC 1999) now request that countries rank the sites they wish to nominate by order of significance. Similarly in the public domain there have been numerous 'competitions' in recent years to establish a list of the Seven Wonders of the World. These lists form part of the naturalisation of the scales of significance, whereby there is a perception that even amongst objects and locations deemed important, there are areas which are even more important. The acceptance of this idea even goes to the contents of these hierarchical lists, with our 'most treasured' global heritage firmly driven by a classical European view of the unique and important (Taylor and Altenburg 2006). The fact that heritage is something that can be differently perceived becomes lost. The values attached to items included on these lists come to be seen as the most natural in the world (perceivable by any and everyone).

Subjective reasoning that recognises the social construction of all value is lost, as naturalisation creates an illusion of *intrinsicity*.

The idea of values which are natural and not inherently linked to human perception can be considered as a contradiction with the dominant post-positivist philosophical discourse that argues that all heritage is subjective and the result of human experiences and interpretation (Lowenthal 1985; Harvey 2001). Instead, the notion of intrinsic value needs to be recognised as a political tool that assists with the naturalisation of certain values and meanings and not something free of human subjectivities (Byrne, Brayshaw et al. 2003). Indeed, the rankings mentioned in the preceding paragraph are all the result of perceptions of value, and not a significance that simply exists. The publicity that surrounds the World Heritage List, or other global campaigns which rank heritage, naturalises the notion that there is inherent value in these sites. Similarly, criticism can also be raised about the level of objectivity and transparency on the part of cultural heritage professionals (Batisse 1992; Smith 1994; Smith 2001). Whilst the varying meanings of different stakeholders will be highlighted, there is often no mention of the values possessed by the experts themselves. At times experts seem to be raised to lofty levels, whereby they can remove all other influences, and similarly perceive the 'true' value of a site (Batisse 1992; Cleere 1994; de la Torre and Mason 2002). Thus there is a need to enquire about how much influence the values and meanings of experts are having on what is being protected and represented (Batisse 1992; Smith 1994; Smith 2000; Turnpenny 2004). In addition, there is a need to reveal the way that experts influence and construct the scales of value, particularly through their application of and adherence to the test of authenticity. These scales potentially have important material consequences for heritage sites and surrounding landscapes, in that they dictate spatially differentiated management and protection policies placed on these objects and areas.

2.4.1.3 Authenticity

The critique of the objectivity of cultural heritage managers, and the correspondence between a pluralist philosophy and practice, highlights potential tensions when it comes to assessing heritage value through the test of authenticity. Once again a complex term with

multiple uses (Jamal and Hill 2004), authenticity is the test of legitimacy that all potential heritage sites and objects are subjected to (ICOMOS 1964; ICOMOS 1994; WHC 2003). Authenticity, as a concept, developed in the twentieth century when processes of preservation moved towards legitimating sites through age (Petzet 1994; Ashworth and van der Aa 2002). This assessment has been centred on the integrity of the material fabric and function of a site and its surrounds (Petzet 1994; Smith 2001; Robin and Rothschild 2002; Blandford 2006). Authenticity has been conceived as relating to traditional culture and the original, and therefore pure, source of material culture, and as such authenticity is the 'sense of being genuine' (Angelstam, Boresjö-Bronge et al. 2003; Chhabra, Healy et al. 2003). The result of these tests is that heritage objects and locations are given a degree of authenticity. A more genuine heritage site will be deemed to be more significant, whereas sites which integrate modern activities often have their level of significance lowered. However, this narrow focus has been criticised by those who show an awareness of the varying cultural conceptions of heritage (Inaba 2001; Taylor 2004; Al-Kharrat 2005). One attempt to rectify this was The Nara Document on Authenticity (ICOMOS 1994) which highlights the cultural differences in Asian conceptualisations of authenticity, where legitimacy is tied to technique and use, rather than form and material fabric (Petzet 1994; Hajdu 2002; MacLaren and Villalon 2002; Taylor and Altenburg 2006). This suggests that scales of value can, and are, culturally constructed through the varied techniques used to differentiate between them.

Over the last twenty years, European (and 'global') notions of authenticity have progressed as part of the post-positivist paradigm shift (Heron and Reason 1997; Del Casino and Hanna 2000). Contemporary notions of authenticity not only recognise cultural differences (Petzet 1994), but have also come to recognise how European notions cannot be completely stagnant either (Lowenthal 1994). The concept of authenticity is as much tied to its historical context, as it is to its socio-spatial context (Stovel 1994; Inaba 2001). Authenticity has been based around two relative temporal concepts that are usually seen as diametric opposites – 'traditional' and 'contemporary' (Galla 1994). These terms have often been used to form sharp formal boundaries between objects belonging to the past, and those which are seen as part of the present (McIntosh and Prentice 1999). The closer the modern is to the traditional, the more authentic the contemporary culture (Evans 2002; Chhabra, Healy et al. 2003).

Management of heritage landscapes has become spatially differentiated, with areas of high significance through to less significant surrounding spaces. The recognition of these degrees, or scales, of significance will have material consequences as different management practices will be applied to different spaces. However, shifting ideas about heritage and authenticity have led to the realisation that authenticity is always relative to the observer's circumstance, place and culture (Harvey 2001; Chhabra, Healy et al. 2003). Such an understanding has led to philosophical investigations into the manner in which formalised ideas of 'authenticity' have enabled the construction, invention and imagination of culture and tradition (Hitchcock 2002; Hitchcock and King 2003). This lends weight to the idea that the scales of value and heritage are not inherent, but are socially constructed, and that all heritage value could therefore be considered extrinsic (Byrne, Brayshaw et al. 2003).

Whilst there is greater flexibility and awareness of the complexity and political nature of heritage and related concepts, like authenticity, this has not led to greater elasticity in the assessment and management of the 'authenticity' of a heritage site (McIntosh and Prentice 1999). Instead there seems to have been a tightening of the reins, with heritage practitioners having a general perception that the authenticity of a heritage site, despite its inherent subjectivity, is something that can be determined empirically (Cleere 1994). The main motivation behind this contradiction is growing concern with the manufacturing of authenticity in order to 'fake' heritage (Fowler 1989; Sofield and Fung 2005). One of the main destabilising arguments for the validity of heritage, as opposed to 'factual' history (McLean 2006), is that the linkage between cultural heritage and economic development has led to the creation of a commodity (Harvey 2001; Jamal and Hill 2004). The formalisation of heritage values (McIntosh and Prentice 1999), the construction and imagination of culture, identity and traditions to accompany inanimate objects (Hitchcock and King 2003), and the stereotyping of what makes a heritage site or object (McIntosh and Prentice 1999; Sofield and Fung 2005), have all led to a concern with the development of 'fake history' (Fowler 1989; Hewison 1989). Whilst none of these are new phenomenon, the linkages between tourism and heritage have raised questions about the ways in which heritage is staged for commercial purposes: manufacturing, distorting or replicating

heritage so that it can be fit for mass consumption (Galla 1994; McIntosh and Prentice 1999; Winter 2003; Jamal and Hill 2004). The fight for legitimacy by heritage managers has led to authenticity 'testing' that strictly demarcates between the 'traditional' and the 'contemporary' (Cleere 1994), perhaps denying the natural evolution of an area or an object beyond its founding moment.

By denying a cultural continuum when assessing authenticity, limiting the links between past and present, the relationship between heritage, experts and communities becomes more problematic (Corsane 2006). The formalisation of boundaries by heritage planners to demarcate protected heritage from contemporary space (Bianchi 2002), means that inevitably there must be some similar separation by local communities (Russell and Jambrecina 2002; Bruce and Creighton 2006). Achieving a balance between protection and sustainable use of cultural heritage resources remains one of the most controversial issues (Green 2001). Whilst many argue for strict physical separation of past and present in order to maintain the authenticity of a site, there are those (Mabulla 2000; Teller and Bond 2002; Taylor and Altenburg 2005) who see heritage as part of a modern dynamic cultural system. It is recognised that through the process of living, heritage is fundamentally connected to a sense of place and identification with the surrounding contemporary space (Harvey 2001). As people will constantly create, transform and experience space and place (Robin and Rothschild 2002), the boundaries between old and new places are often much more complex for local communities, and thus ideas about authentic heritage spaces are similarly multifaceted.

2.4.2 Scales of Interpretation

After determining and assessing the values of a cultural heritage site, the attention of heritage management turns to sharing them through the interpretation, or representation, of the site. Interpretation is broadly defined as the way that an individual or group views and then contextualises a heritage site or object (Aldridge 1989). The context of a site can be spatial, social or temporal. The methodologies of heritage interpretation have seen increasing attention since the 1970s and 1980s with a growing awareness of the consumer (Richards 1996; Frochot and Beeho 1997). As attitudes surrounding cultural heritage have shifted towards highlighting its role as an economic and cultural resource, questions about

its functionality (through the experiences offered to people) have been raised (Samant 2004; Hampton 2005). The interests of heritage management have moved beyond preservation of an object or location, towards managing the interactions between people and historic spaces (Cartier 2005; Loulanski 2006). Interpretation can now also be understood as the representation, utilisation and experiences of heritage places by a varied audience, including visitors, locals and governments (Graham, Ashworth et al. 2000; Loulanski 2006). Through interpretation we develop an awareness of heritage places and our attachment to them, thereby informing our own sense of identity and sense of place (Aldridge 1989; Freestone 1993; Boniface 2000).

The emphasis on spatial practices in the management of cultural heritage experiences means that there is a strong case for examining the construction and use of scale during heritage interpretation. Scaled practices can be observed in the shifts towards recognising the importance of context. The contextualisation of heritage uses the previously mentioned scales of significance to spatially differentiate between heritage and contemporary materials. More importantly the idea of context as important for heritage values has seen a spatial expansion in the influences of heritage management. New levels of protection and conservation further divide the space, impacting on the form, function and perceptions of the landscape. We can see the construction of scales of interpretation as being ontologically represented by a hierarchy of objects, sites, heritage places and heritage landscapes. The scales of interpretation can be seen as the scales of heritage conservation. Post-modern and commercial influences upon heritage have shifted the focus away from isolated monuments to area-based conservation policies (Teller and Bond 2002). These moves reflect an acknowledgement of the way that individual and collective experiences influence our perceptions of heritage.

As previously mentioned, many cultural heritage professionals have felt that beneath the layers of personal meanings, every heritage object and location has an intrinsic value (du Cros and McKercher 1999). Emphasising context is about protecting and enhancing those intrinsic values (Carter and Bramley 2002). The contextualisation of cultural heritage is reflected in the heritage discourse, where an emphasis on the value of being *in-situ* legitimates the process of interpretation (Carman 2000; Jamal and Hill 2004; Corsane 2006).

In the last 20 years we have seen discourse move from discussing heritage objects, to heritage sites, to heritage places, and increasingly heritage, or cultural, landscapes. The rise and naturalisation of these latter geographical entities also reflects an expansion of the influences that heritage management can have on the surrounding landscape. Adding to the complexity of the scales of interpretation are the influences of differently scaled agents and values. The post-processed ideological changes within heritage have created an awareness of the individualistic nature of the heritage experience (Fowler 1989). As a global community, we have an image of 'a heritage place'; however this image can be quite different if viewed through a closer physical relationship (Bradley 2003). A pluralistic philosophical approach has highlighted the subjective nature of the heritage experience (Sofield and Fung 2005). The variety of meanings and values attached to heritage objects and locations creating multiple images and experiences that must coexist in the same space (Smith 2001; Chang and Huang 2005).

Philosophically choice is embraced within heritage discourse. Post-positivist discourse encourages those managing heritage to guide visitors and users to reflect and develop their own interpretations, rather than to control heritage experiences (Aldridge 1989; Evans 2002). By enabling as great a range of interpretations as possible, this diversity allows not only for equity and social inclusion (Peleggi 1996; Taylor 2004), but also enables the full complexity and range of cultural heritage to be realised (Boniface 2000). An awareness of social justice issues has seen growing appreciation that the success of heritage management relies upon the support of host communities (Binks 1989; Buergin 2003; Fisher 2004). This requires recognition of the ways that host communities integrate heritage objects and spaces into contemporary places, and the highly variable, often evolving, historic and modern meanings that can be attached to these places (Frochot and Beeho 1997; Hou 2004).

The encouragement of public participation in heritage management and interpretation, particularly by indigenous groups, has been actively undertaken in both Western and non-Western contexts (O'Riordan, Shadrake et al. 1989; Blair 1993; Ashworth and van der Aa 2002). The symbolic role that heritage plays in cultural, social and national identities means that participation can be an empowering experience (Peleggi 1996; Galla 1999). However,

critics of heritage practices have argued that the choice of interpretations is illusory as the connection with subjective value judgements means that interpretation is inherently about power and politics (Chang and Huang 2005; Sofield and Fung 2005). The link between past and present in the formation of heritage values and interpretation (Lowenthal 1985; Harvey 2001), means that it is impossible to escape from current prejudices and beliefs (Laenen 1989). Heritage managers, bestowed with the job of preparing and presenting heritage to the public (Smith 2004), are in a powerful position to push forward their perception of a site and its values (Boniface 2000; Bianchi and Boniface 2002). In doing so, they control the resource base of consumers, making decisions about what will, or will not, be conserved and accessible (Capelle, Veverka et al. 1989; Chang and Huang 2005). There is therefore an awareness of the role heritage interpretation in constructing social and cultural meanings, particularly as a way of legitimating political agendas and propaganda (Aldridge 1989; Hewison 1989; Chang and Huang 2005; Sofield and Fung 2005).

The debate surrounding heritage values and interpretation has been largely driven by philosophical discourse that seeks to ensure the protection and representation of heritage within a social justice and equity framework. However, there is also a strong interest in the role of heritage in everyday life (Loulanski 2006). While creation and maintenance of personal and community identities is the key cultural and social role of heritage, tourism is the main economic utilisation of these resources. Tourism appropriates the symbols of cultural heritage – key features, locations, and the meanings and events attached to them – to create attractive products and places for consumers (Winter 2002; Hitchcock and King 2003; Chang and Huang 2005). Over the last 20 years, there has been a surge in public interest in heritage tourism (Chang, Milne et al. 1996; Richter 1999; Chhabra, Healy et al. 2003). This has occurred parallel to the philosophical shift from considering heritage solely as scholarship, stewardship and identity to also recognising it is about experiences and entertainment (Hewison 1989; Loulanski 2006). Heritage is now seen as a commercial commodity (Freestone 1993), offering escapism from the contemporary everyday and rediscovery of cultural identity (Anagnostopoulos 1994; McIntosh and Prentice 1999; Del Casino and Hanna 2000). For this postmodern consumerist society, it is not the raw resource that is 'sold', but the meanings and interpretations packaged into suitable products (Ashworth 1994; Chang and Huang 2005). To be economically successful, tourism requires an attractive product that can be marketed to either a broad, or particular,

audience (Richards 1996). In many cases this is achieved through the appropriation and development of objects, buildings and landscapes with specific meanings, interpretations and images in mind (Henderson 2001; Hitchcock and King 2003; Chang and Huang 2005).

As with most contemporary uses of heritage, tourism is perceived both positively and negatively by the heritage management community. Some see the tourism and commercialisation now associated with heritage landscapes as developing and promoting popular consciousness about the past in a form that is more easily accessible (Laenen 1989; Stewart, Glen et al. 2001; Blandford 2006). Others view the process of representation in heritage tourism as affecting the authenticity of the heritage experience (Shackley 1996; McIntosh and Prentice 1999; Chhabra, Healy et al. 2003; Hitchcock and King 2003; Jamal and Hill 2004). As in the previous discourse concerning authenticity and interpretations, the power wielded by those in control of cultural heritage management raises questions about the flexibility of interpretations. The links between the present and past in the realisation of heritage values means that no heritage product is freely developed without being attached to a political agenda of contemporary society (Lowenthal 1985; Harvey 2001; Ashworth and van der Aa 2002).

Whilst successful heritage tourism should provide a broad range of methods of interpretation and representation to achieve maximum visitor numbers (Taylor 2004), in reality critics of the process see the production of heritage products as restrictive, promoting populist interpretations and smothering others (McIntosh and Prentice 1999; Del Casino and Hanna 2000; Garrod and Fyall 2001). In part, this can be attributed to the rapid fluidity of the tourist experience, which requires a visitor to be able to quickly interpret an object or site (Nuryanti 1996). With spatial and temporal contexts a key part in the development of a sense of place, cultural heritage managers must coordinate tourist space so as to maximise potential interpretations of the site (Jamal and Hill 2004). Thus it is that heritage tourism discourse returns to the familiar themes of conflict and contestation of values, meanings and interpretations. These are perhaps exacerbated by the fact that heritage tourism often captures heritage and its associations, denying the natural evolution of values and interpretations (McIntosh and Prentice 1999; Garrod and Fyall 2001).

Compounding these issues is the growing negativity surrounding many of the participatory approaches within management (Smith 2000; Few 2001; Buergin 2003). Participation often involves communication and education about preconceived objectives to contain possible conflict or dissent (Hall 1999; Buergin 2003). Within discussions on heritage interpretation, this manifests as a concern with 'inaccurate' interpretations (Hewison 1989; Laenen 1989; Sofield and Fung 2005), resulting in a discourse that utilises 'education' rather than 'communication' of values (Crang 1996; Grimwade and Carter 2000). Thus it appears that public participation in heritage planning and evaluation of multiple values affirms the agenda of the powerful, who maintain control of knowledge and procedure (Few 2001; Pain and Francis 2004; Chang and Huang 2005). This is another indication of the contradictions between a positivist management methodology that seeks to preserve the 'truth' and a pluralistic discourse that sees many truths (Sofield and Fung 2005). In heritage tourism these conflicts can manifest as tensions between stakeholders about the contemporary uses of heritage areas.

For many less developed countries, the economic benefits of tourism mean that it is a valuable industry for the pursuit of socio-economic development (Anagnostopoulos 1994; Hampton 2005). Some are wary of the increased attention, seeing the potential for exploitation leading to destruction and decay of cultural resources (Anagnostopoulos 1994; Olwig 2001). Many heritage practitioners view the ubiquitous tourism development around heritage sites as culturally destructive (Taylor 2004). Designed to aesthetically complement and extend the heritage experience, such development is seen as capturing a particular interpretation of the past and entrenching it in the landscape. However, the economic drive is seen as inescapable, a 'necessary evil' that must be worked with to benefit, rather than destroy, cultural resources (Taylor 2004). With this understanding, recognition is given towards the benefits that economic growth can contribute to cultural heritage (Richards 1996; Seale 1996). Heritage tourism can provide the economic support to maintain not only cultural artefacts and landscapes, but also potentially the traditional lifestyles that accompany them (Drost 1996; Taylor 2004). A key part in successfully conserving cultural heritage resources is to realise that local community support and participation often rests in ensuring their long-term socio-economic development and survival (Mabulla 2000; Teller

and Bond 2002). Stakeholder conflict can arise when host communities are isolated from economic benefits either through their exclusion in participating or because of prohibition of modernisation of livelihood practices (Hampton 2005; Bruce and Creighton 2006). Thus cultural heritage managers need to ensure that by adopting and supporting a particular interpretation of a heritage object or site, they do not stunt other interpretations, or the socio-economic development of the local community who must live with the site.

2.5 Constructing Heritage Scales

The conceptualisation of heritage revolves around a number of comparative, relative terms - old versus new, protected versus destructive, traditional versus contemporary, significant versus insignificant, authentic versus inauthentic, heritage versus non-heritage - used by heritage professionals, governments, and local communities, to define formal (and informal) spatial management practices. Whether it is the formal zoning of land uses (for example, the Angkor ZEMP), educational activities to encourage or discourage particular aesthetics and behaviours (for example, government run village workshops on producing handicrafts in the Angkor Park), or village cultural practices acknowledging particular locations as important, people possess mental images of their world that involve spatially differentiated levels of importance (Lawrence and Low 1990). It can therefore be argued that the application of management strategies across space and place can be manipulated as a process of inclusion and exclusion, to suit individual or collective, political, social and economic agendas (Mitchell 2001).

As part of a post-positivist heritage discourse, heritage professionals have endeavoured, at some level, to make their practices more open and participatory (Maikhuri, Nautiyal et al. 2001). They have recognised that the relationship between heritage and non-heritage, and between contemporary and traditional, is not perceived similarly by all peoples. Criticisms of the under-representativeness of the World Heritage List have led to formal international recognition of cultural landscapes (Rössler 2000). Traditional spatial notions of heritage places are based around locations and objects, such as buildings, towns, and archaeological sites, where there are usually clear physical boundaries, such as a wall or change in landuse. The contemporary concept of cultural landscapes revolves around understanding human-

environment interactions (Head 2004), and therefore recognised the associative values of landscapes and landscape features (Rössler 2000; Blandford 2006). Within a cultural landscape the use of dichotomous heritage discourse starts to break down (Kammeier 2003). The intention being that cultural landscapes will encourage heritage professionals and other stakeholders to consider the linkages (and disconnections) between past and present (Grimwade and Carter 2000).

In considering the social construction of the scales of heritage, the concept of a cultural landscape is important as it challenges existing western understandings of heritage (Seale 1996). European spatial conceptualisation of heritage has been strongly tied to a past that is separated from, and therefore can be disrupted by, the present (Harvey 2001). In contrast, non-European cultures have traditionally supported much closer linkages between the 'traditional' and the 'contemporary', with an emphasis on meanings and functions rather than on material form and fabric (Carman 2000; Fisher 2004; Taylor and Altenburg 2006). It is argued here that the use of cultural landscape terminology by heritage professionals could be seen as a re-construction of heritage scales, especially with the emphasis that a landscape places on the associative and functional values of interpretative space. Within a cultural landscape, heritage sites and objects are inextricably linked to their geographical context (Garden 2006), thus spaces of interpretation are absorbed into spaces of value. Cultural heritage landscapes are understood as possessing three key components: boundaries, cohesion and visibility (Garden 2006). These are all elements which have been utilised by heritage professionals and others to construct the traditional relationship between values and interpretation; with a cultural landscape there is a transformation in the relationship between these key components. Visibility is the physical appearance of the scale. Cohesion involves the attitudes, behaviours, and value judgements which hold an image or understanding of a site together. Lastly, boundaries are the demarcation of space that defines, tangibly and intangibly, what belongs and doesn't belong (Garden 2006). In this sense, boundaries ensure that the formation of landscapes is a political action (Jackson 1984). In a push towards cultural landscapes and with the expansion of heritage places to affirm the role of interpretative and associative space, the boundaries of heritage scales are being re-drawn and potentially altering the relationships between them.

This chapter has illustrated that a theoretical approach that investigates the social construction of scale is valid when examining the relationships between heritage, humans, and the environments in which they are located. It has demonstrated that there is not only scope to examine the scaled values of various stakeholders, but also a strong need to investigate the consequences of the social construction of scale in the processes of interpretation. Within a post-positivist dialogue, it is important to explore the interactions and relationships between the various scales of heritage. As scales of heritage are constructed to satisfy political, economic and cultural agendas, it is also necessary to identify potential conflicts resulting from the construction of scales of significance and interpretation, by different levels of agents. The scales of heritage have material consequences not only for items and areas recognised as heritage, but also for the populations and areas surrounding them. This thesis will apply this theoretical understanding to investigate the relationship between the Angkor World Heritage Site and the surrounding population and landscape.