

BRISTOL CLASSICAL PRESS DEBATES IN ARCHAEOLOGY

Series editor: Richard Hodges

- Against Cultural Property John Carman
Archaeology: The Conceptual Challenge Timothy Insoll
Archaeology and Text John Moreland
Archaeology and the Pan-European Romanesque
Tadhg O'Keefe
Beyond Celts, Germans and Scythians Peter S. Wells
Combat Archaeology John Schofield
Debating the Archaeological Heritage Robin Skeates
Early Islamic Syria Alan Walmsley
Gerasa and the Decapolis David Kennedy
Image and Response in Early Europe Peter S. Wells
Indo-Roman Trade Roberta Tomber
Loot, Legitimacy and Ownership Colin Renfrew
Lost Civilization James L. Boone
The Origins of the English Catherine Hills
Rethinking Wetland Archaeology Robert Van de Noort &
Aidan O'Sullivan
The Roman Countryside Stephen Dyson
Shipwreck Archaeology of the Holy Land Sean Kingsley
Social Evolution Mark Pluciennik
State Formation in Early China Li Liu & Xingcan Chen
Towns and Trade in the Age of Charlemagne
Richard Hodges
Villa to Village Riccardo Francovich & Richard Hodges

Heritage, Communities and Archaeology

Laurajane Smith &
Emma Waterton



Bristol Classical Press

in a failure to learn from the *collective* experiences of communities and heritage professionals who work together. It also helps facilitate the extent to which systemic issues are ignored or go unidentified. This ignorance means that heritage professionals engaging with communities make the mistake of assuming that their individual participation and support equates to the recognition of community interests. While we have been arguing that heritage professionals often hold a powerful place in Western societies, due partly to the authority given to them as intellectuals and partly to the fact that heritage policy and legislation explicitly recognise their expertise, individual action is not always enough. This is not to say that as individuals we should desist from engaging with communities. What we *are* saying is that we need to understand that as heritage professionals we hold dual positions in the process – both as individuals, with individual interests and agendas, but also as representatives and participants in wider social policy processes. Individual heritage professionals can be sidelined as much as communities if they deviate from the authorised processes in which they are enmeshed. Such occurrences do not help the communities we are engaging with, nor do they necessarily help the careers of professionals. It is important to appreciate and recognise the political networks that community archaeology and heritage sits within. In engaging with communities, heritage professionals cannot escape becoming implicated in the politics of recognition, but this is not something we should shy away from. Rather, the politics of recognition, the nature of dissonance and the relationship between heritage, identity and memory identified in this and previous chapters offer a way of understanding the wider significance of professional engagement with community interests. More importantly, these issues help us to acknowledge what is at stake for both communities and heritage professionals.

5

Museums and communities

Introduction

Community engagement by archaeologists and other heritage professionals is an ongoing process. However, engagement often stops when the 'dig' or other project ends. This sudden cessation may be entirely acceptable to all parties, but sometimes, and for some communities, it is not. This may be the case when communities have invested not only time and emotional energy into a project, but may also see the project as part of wider processes of ongoing identity expression and recognition. In these contexts the ending of a project, and thus engagement with communities of expertise, can be quite bewildering and frustrating. However, engaging with communities is an ongoing process that can be as important as the outcomes of the project itself. This process should be about equitable and respectful exchanges of dialogue undertaken with critical awareness of the wider contexts within which both communities and experts are operating.

A consideration of museums and communities is a useful point from which to consider the idea of community engagement as an ongoing relationship. This is because it is museums, at the end of excavations or other projects, who must take responsibility for curating and interpreting the collected data. When this data is also a community's heritage, communities must often then redevelop contacts and relationships with museum staff or new communities of expertise. This can be frustrating as communities re-engage with a process that inevitably impedes and frustrates community aspirations. A review of the literature on museum and community engage-

Heritage, Communities and Archaeology

ment reveals that this community of heritage experts shares many of the issues and concerns identifiable within the literature on 'community archaeology'. This reinforces our point that there are systemic issues associated with engagement, and heritage professionals need to open dialogue with each other and exchange views, practices and insights about the processes of community engagement and its consequences.

The community 'debate' in museums

Museums and their staff, like other heritage professionals, engage and interact with a range of different communities in a variety of ways and for different purposes. Museums may consult various communities about the content of new exhibitions, and these communities may range from those represented by 'Friends of ...' groups, volunteers, patrons, and other communities of museum visitors. They may also include 'special interest' communities, such as local communities or those sharing ethnic, cultural, religious, gender, age affiliations and so forth, communities based on explicit social or political agendas, or those sharing particular social or political experiences (see Mason 2005; Watson 2007 for further discussion). Communities may also be the subject of outreach and other educational programmes (Hooper-Greenhill 2007), be invited to use space within museums to mount their own temporary exhibitions (Szekers 2002), or develop and run their own museums. Significant examples of community or community-based museums include ecomuseums (Davis 1999) and Indigenous keeping-places and cultural centres (Kelly & Gordon 2002; Simpson 2007). Communities can also engage in protracted disputes with museums over the curation and retention of certain cultural artefacts, such as the Parthenon marbles, Benin Bronzes or human remains (Hamillakis 1999; Fforde et al. 2002; ARM n.d.).

Of particular significance to museums and their engagement with communities are social inclusion policies and practices, with the lead strategic agency in the UK, the Museums, Librar-

5. Museums and communities

ies and Archives Council (MLA), recently identifying such issues as key drivers of relevance to society (Crooke 2008: 418). Like other areas of the heritage and cultural sector, museums in the UK have been required to broaden their audiences. These policies have seen an escalating engagement with an increasing range of communities by museums. Traditionally, visitors to museums, like visitors to most traditional heritage sites (such as castles, country houses, archaeological monuments and so forth), are predominantly white, well-educated and middle-class and tend towards either the retired or those with children (Merriman 1991; Swain 2007). One of the aims of social inclusion initiatives has been to increase the range of communities who visit museums, galleries, heritage sites and cultural events. Such a construction of social inclusion would see Kawashima's (2006: 56) example of a classical orchestra playing in a shopping mall or the increase of visitor numbers from traditionally excluded communities (such as African-Caribbean British communities, Pakistani British, working-class communities etc.) as evidence of social inclusion at play. However, engagement that flow from this, are better understood as acts of cultural or social assimilation.

Museums and exclusion

Traditionally, museums have been viewed as institutions of public enculturation (Macdonald 2003: 5). The development of text that also saw the creation of the nation-state, and museums became immersed in the project of cementing and expressing national identity and nationalism (Bennett 1995), with a liberal sense of pastoral care, underpinned the authority of museums to represent, regulate and pronounce upon national identity and to act as agents in the moral and social improvement of a nation's citizenry (Bennett 1995; Whitehead 2005). Museums also have a central and defining role as educa-

tors, and concerns with how museums educate, and how visitors learn, during the museum visit dominate much of this literature (Falk & Dierking 2000; Kelly 2004; Hooper-Greenhill 2007). More recent policy references to notions of 'community' as an ideal for invoking positive social change have meant that museums now also need to demonstrate their role in creating cohesion and inclusion (Crooke 2008: 417). In this context, the authority afforded to museums as arbitrators of appropriate taste, cultural value and national identity, together with a deeply ingrained sense of their educational role, has meant that social inclusion within museum practice has tended towards strategies that aim at bringing the excluded 'into the fold'. Indeed, as Tili (2008) reports, social inclusion has become blurred with marketing issues, so that hitting numerical targets, which are measurable and related to funding, has tended to dominate approaches to social inclusion. Sara Selwood's (2006) analysis of increasing visitor numbers following the implementation of social inclusion strategies suggests that such policies have simply succeeded in attracting repeat visitors from the same socio-economic groups. Moreover, social inclusion policy implementation is frequently relegated to particular officers or units within museums, and thus can be sidelined rather than integrated holistically into the institution – it becomes a gesture or an exercise in box-ticking (Tili 2008). This approach to inclusion never really challenges the values and social and cultural functions of museums, because it does not question why certain communities are, or feel, excluded.

As Sandell (2003) observes, social inclusion requires a considerable shift in thinking about the relationship of museums to society, as well as a challenge to the idea of the expert (see Dodd and Sandell 2001 for further debate). The degree to which museums can and do present excluding narratives is well documented. Cash Cash (2001) argues that Indigenous identity and cultural knowledge can become refashioned through museum displays so that they become appropriated by national narratives, or neutralised and replaced by institutionally sanctioned

5. Museums and communities

narratives and knowledge. Similarly, Porter (1996) has noted that women's experiences are often obscured through the normative assumptions made about the importance of women's history that underwrite the collecting and interpreting strategies of museums. Labour history is another area that can be poorly translated into curatorial practices (Oliver & Reeves 2003), while the representation of experiences and identities of Multiculturalism has also been critically examined (Dodd et al. 2004). Multiculturalism is another area currently presenting challenges to inclusive museums (Sandell 2007). These are just a few examples of the range of communities of interest who are questioning the representational role of museums and demanding that they take an active position on challenging discrimination based on, for example, ethnicity, class, gender, sexual preference, disability, religious affiliation, or age.

Uncritical approaches to social inclusion will simply see the recreation of universalist stories of nation being asserted to those who feel excluded from those narratives in the first place. What is achieved by this construction of 'social inclusion' – that is, encouraging more people from working-classes or ethnic minorities into visiting museums or traditional heritage sites – is the assimilation of a more diverse audience into the white middle-class and elite values that tend to underpin traditional museum and heritage displays. The term 'integration' is often used in social inclusion debates and policy initiatives, but 'integration' is simply another word for assimilation. In much the same way as policy language such as 'tolerance' conjures up an image of a patronising *allowance* by dominant groups for those who find themselves in a subordinate position, so the phrase 'integration' implies a one-way process, wherein the excluded are 'educated' into normative and politically dominant historical and heritage values and narratives. What is missing in this process, and in the language used to describe it, is respect for social and cultural diversity. Debates about 'integration' are always 'top-down' and never 'bottom-up', so that what may be important about history and heritage, and what they might mean to excluded communities, is not on the agenda. What is

interesting in the social inclusion debate is the lack of concern to get people from white middle-class or elite socio-economic categories visiting working-class, ethnic minority or other excluded or contentious forms of heritage. This means that currently social inclusion is *not* about respecting or understanding diversity. Rather, it is about disseminating and assimilating authorised historical and heritage narratives to a wider audience. What is also interesting is the apparent assumption that this broader audience would actually be interested in such narratives in any case.

Museums and inclusion

Social inclusion has the potential to occur only when the historical and contemporary experiences of exclusion are acknowledged, and the diversity of community identities within the nation is recognised and incorporated into museum narratives. This sort of inclusion will occur only through critically and politically aware community engagement. As Newman and McLean (2006) argue, the impact that museums have on identity means that they can be a positive vehicle for social inclusion. In fact, Sandell (2002: 3) asserts that museums have the responsibility to combat social inequality. The turn to New Museology in the UK, and the social history movement in the US, has seen increasing concern within museums to develop relationships with communities that attempt to challenge power relations (see Vergo 1989; Karp 1992; Handler & Gable 1997; Ross 2004). This responsibility means not only engaging with and 'owning' political agendas within curatorial practice, but also allowing room for communities to assert and drive their own agendas. As Fyfe (1996) notes, although museums are implicated in the reproduction of the social order, this does not mean that it is not actively contested. Communities are not waiting passively, 'out there' within the public body, to be identified and 'included'.

Museum research has revealed that museum visitors are active agents in the way that they engage with museum exhibi-

5. Museums and communities

tions (Bagnall 2003; Longhurst et al. 2004). Further, 'education' is not always given as the main motivation for visiting. As Orr (2004) notes, the reasons for visiting are not easily revealed, and a range of diffuse motivations have been recorded. While learning *does* occur at museums it can be incidental (Katriel 1997), and research by Doering suggests that exhibitions that *confirm* visitors' worldviews are more often identified as satisfactory in visitor surveys (cited in Orr 2004). Interviews conducted with visitors as part of wider research projects at social history museums, house museums and at exhibitions marking the 1807 bicentenary also support the idea that people tend to confirm their views and ideas at museums (Smith 2006, 2008b). What this shows is that there is a range of identity and memory 'work' that people undertake while visiting museums. Moreover, the relationship between museums and communities is highly complex, multi-layered and continually changing. Museums are places that communities use to represent and communicate their sense of belonging to other members of their community or to external audiences, and have come to be defined as places people use to 'think with' (Fyfe & Ross 1996: 148; Crooke 2007). They are also used as places to remember and reminiscence, and to pass these reminiscences on to family members, and are places where people may find expression for their identity and sense of place (Urry 1996; Smith 2006). Thus, visiting can be understood as a performance in which certain identities are being expressed. This performance can occur both in terms of the actual act of visiting and/or the way visitors engage with, and construct meaning for, certain exhibitions (Smith 2006; Dicks 2008). The point is that the relationship between museums, their audiences and communities is not passive. Museums, like other places of heritage, become sites of mediation and authorisation.

This relationship is encapsulated in Crooke's (2007: 131) statement that it 'is people who bring the value and consequence to objects and collections; as a result, if a museum cannot forge associations with people it will have no meaning'. This resonates with the statement by a Castleford community

member cited in Chapter 4 that objects have no value unless they are being used. The objects museums conserve and exhibit have, of course, no intrinsic value; it is people who invest them with meaning and symbolic power. The relationship between museum staff, archaeologists and non-museum heritage professionals is made complex by the way we use heritage to undertake a range of social and cultural 'work', as discussed in Chapters 1-4. In some ways, we may say that museums 'create' communities in the sense that the representational authority of museums helps to validate and legitimise community identity claims and all that flows from this. However, this complex cultural and social relationship is made more difficult by a range of issues discussed below.

'Acquisitive relationships'

The ability of expert communities to talk past, and misunderstand, the communities of interest with which they work is significant. One of the fundamental reasons for this rests with the fetishisation of material objects (Macdonald 2002). The history of museums is centred on an obsession with 'the thing', and the curation and celebration of aesthetics is still argued by some to be the primary aim of museums (Appleton 2007). Despite support in the museums literature and curatorial practice for a community agenda, the authority and nature of the institutions within which curators work mean that they will inevitably have the final say on, or responsibility for, how artefacts and other exhibits are used and the meanings constructed around them in displays (Witcomb 2003). The issue, however, is how that authority is *used*. Indeed, the shift that Sandall (2003) calls for, and which was the aim of the New Museology, is yet to be realised in museum practice. This is demonstrated in the degree of hostility and bemusement that is often expressed over repatriation debates between museums, particularly in England, and Indigenous peoples (Chalmers 2003; Jenkins 2003; Brothwell 2004). Following reviews of policy and legislation in 2003-4, British museums have been the

5. Museums and communities

focus of renewed requests by Indigenous Australian communities for the return of human remains (DCMS 2003; Smith 2004b). The bemused response such requests receive rests on the inability of museum curators and archaeologists to understand that objects can and do exist within competing spheres of meaning. However, this bemusement is not confined to debates between Indigenous peoples and museums. Other oft-cited disputes include continuing repatriation debates over the Parthenon marbles, the Benin bronzes, and the successful repatriation of the Lakota Ghost Shirt from Scotland. However, such disputes do not occur only between nations, but can also crop up at sub-national community levels. In return of some Roman artefacts from regional museums. During the 1970s, and as a result of local government reorganisation, museum collections of Roman cultural material that archaeologists had excavated and collected at sites around the town were removed to regional museums. The CHT had asked that some of these items be included in a community exhibition to be held at Castleford. This met with some resistance, and the CHT was told that these artefacts could not be returned as they were 'too valuable' (Drake 2008: 69). The value perceived here by the museums in question rested on an assumption about the innate or essentialised archaeological or informational value that they are assumed to possess – their fetishisation. Alison Drake, chair of the CHT, observes:

The CHT members emphasised that the collections were, to them, worthless if the community to which they belong never saw them. Council officers stated that the museum service had a duty to preserve the collection for future generations, so the group asked which generations in particular were seen as the focus of the work of the museum service, as there were now three generations in Castleford who had never seen the items in question (2008: 69).

We see here a misunderstanding of the point Crooke (2007) made about the relationships between objects, communities and representation. At the time of the request the items were not on display but held in museum vaults and, thus, to the Castleford community were worthless – their value resting on the inability of the community to use them to create and represent their own community messages and meanings. In this instance, this issue was resolved to the satisfaction of both the CHT and museum professionals. However, it is useful to note that the artefacts here *were* being used by the museum, even though they were not currently part of a public display. The possession and control of artefacts by museums is as much about proclaiming identity for professionals or institutions as it is for other communities. As artefacts become 'inalienable possessions', surrendering the possession of those things that historically constitute the museum and the museum's reason for existence, challenges institutional and professional identity. It requires museum staff to question and evaluate their own identities and roles as museum experts. Further, as museum staff are also members of wider social or cultural communities, any involvement with communities of interest may also require staff to examine their own community identities, and the values and cultural assumptions that underpin them. Community engagement requires a fundamental philosophical shift in the museum community's values and sense of belonging, and this is something that needs more than a change in policy. This shift is not easy because, as with the communities with which museums work, the museum community is itself disparate. Other community members will of course challenge moves by individual curators that threaten the museum community's identity. More importantly, however, challenges will also come from other communities as well, particularly those that are comfortable with the ways in which museums represent them.

As Davis (2007: 57) points out, advocacy by museum curators on behalf of excluded communities can leave curators very exposed. For instance, exhibitions about, and institutional policies on, engagement with Indigenous Australia at the National

5. Museums and communities

Museum in Canberra saw that museum embroiled in very public and politically charged 'history wars' over the significance and nature of colonial history (Casey 2007). The *Enola Gay* exhibition discussed in Chapter 3 is another example of the way staff can be exposed to pressure. Museums and their staff will be criticised for being 'political' or even 'politically correct' (Macdonald 1998; Szekeres 2002). This charge of political correctness has become a mark of derision for those professionals who act to advocate and support community-based work. A meaningless phrase, it simply denotes discomfort with the political agendas being pursued. Another often-cited criticism is that museums and their curators have belittled their authority by pandering to public entertainment. 'Infotainment', or 'education' expressing discomfort with changes within the museum community. In both cases the use of these terms or phrases is a response to threats to the core values of museum practice, philosophy and identity. These core values are that museums can be 'objective' and should primarily be about top-down 'education' and enculturation. However, while community engagement does expose museum staff to such critique, failure to engage while assuming the identity of authoritative expert is no less political and open to exposure. Museum staff, like other heritage professionals, are engaged in a cultural process of meaning-making that has consequences. Thus, criticism and entanglement in dissonant disputes are, as argued in Chapter 3, part of the territory heritage professionals occupy.

One of the significant issues facing the development of museum-community relationships is the bewildering, shifting and complex nature of communities, and this statement holds true for both communities of interest and museum communities. The museums literature often points to the difficulty of identifying who museums should contact in particular communities. How museums *know* who really represents a community and, as communities are disparate entities, how museums *evaluate* which individuals or organisations really represent broad community issues, are worrying concerns. So daunting

and difficult are these issues that many museums tend to focus on the clearly defined, well-organised and vocal communities (Watson 2007: 2). Communities, however, also face similar issues when engaging with the institutional nature of the museum. This is because institutions such as museums can not only appear very impersonal, but can also be difficult for an uninitiated community to engage with. Community outreach officers or units and individual curators may provide the desired links between communities and the museum. However, such links are inevitably fragile and mutable as individuals move jobs or as museums undergo restructuring, and thus the faces of community contact officers change. These may seem obvious observations, but the point is that although community engagement is often scary and risky for heritage professionals and museums, and while it leaves staff exposed to professional criticism, it can also be *equally* scary and risky for communities and their representatives, who can be as exposed as the museum/heritage professional.

Museums, in their desire to consult with communities about the development of exhibitions, or as they open up exhibition space to community-led exhibitions and so forth, can place considerable pressure on individuals. Interviews with community groups involved in the development of exhibitions marking the 2007 bicentenary of Britain's abolition of its slave trade report on the considerable pressure that individuals were put under by museums to represent quite disparate and diffuse communities (Fouseki 2008). Within museums, as in many state bureaucracies, committees form a particular way of consulting upon, negotiating and debating issues. Committees are often highly structured, operate to formal (if often unwritten) rules and protocols and, above all, based on the idea of *representation* whereby individuals are charged to represent the views of interested parties in the issues or problems under discussion. Community consultation that follows the committee model will often see the appointment of individual representatives from identified communities. Some communities and their representatives will find committee work

5. Museums and communities

familiar and comfortable, but this is not the case for all. Community representatives interviewed as part of research on the 2007 bicentenary reported not only that too much pressure and responsibility was placed on them to represent the needs of diverse and mutable communities, but also that they often felt isolated and exposed in such committees. Moreover, these individuals also become exposed to community criticism if (or when) exhibitions or other projects do not live up to wider expectations.

Part of the problem lies with the idea of 'consultation'. Relationships between museums and communities are often based on the idea that communities are there simply to consult with about the content or aims of an exhibition, outreach programme or other project. Sheila Watson characterises this as their 'acquisitive relationship' (2007: 2). Indeed communities and their representatives can be 'collected' by museums to help legitimise exhibition content and policy development. It is all too easy for consultation to become part of the social inclusion 'tick-box' phenomenon. Witcomb (2003: 89) also sees the idea of consultation as limited, and offers James Clifford's idea of museums as 'contact zones' to mitigate this problem, in which contemporary and historical, moral and political meanings are negotiated and mediated. Dialogue is key here, and as the balance of power in such dialogues will be in favour of the museum, a commitment to *negotiation* rather than consultation in these exchanges is vital. Indeed, the idea of a 'community of practice' is one that has been advocated within the museums literature (Kelly & Gordon 2002; Kelly 2004; Crooke 2005, 2007). This refers to the idea of collective learning through working towards a common goal, resulting in practices that are reflective of both the goal and development of a social relationship built over time (Kelly & Gordon 2002: 153). While Kelly and Gordon argue that museums professionals should act as facilitators for community expression through museums, Whitcomb (2003: 101) sees the role of curator as more complicated, arguing that it involves a responsibility for defining the community to be represented. This should not be seen, Whit-

comb argues, as a repressive exercise of power, but rather one of positive civic reform that legitimises the idea of cultural diversity.

One of the criticisms often voiced by community groups is that once the exhibition is in place the relationship with the museum ends or gradually dissolves, while others note that they feel like a resource that the museum will use each time it needs to undertake community consultation. These situations contradict any sense of 'relationship'. While it may be hard for museum staff to maintain relationships or communities of practice with the sometimes very wide ranging and disparate communities with which they work, these 'relationships' occur anyway. If we accept that museums are not simply treasure-houses full of 'stuff', or *only* about 'top-down' educating and learning, but rather sites of meaning-making, then relationships with communities become central to museum practice. Even if we accept the traditional model of a museum, the consequence of which is the enculturation and the making of 'good' cultured citizens, the museum still establishes relationships with communities – albeit inclusive ones with traditional museum visitors and relationships of exclusion and de-legitimation with many others. Community links do not end with the opening of the exhibition; once opened and visited, exhibitions do cultural and social 'work' – they tell stories, convey messages and values, and people interact and engage with exhibitions in a variety of ways. The messages audiences take away will have consequences for communities, and thus dialogue about those consequences needs to be maintained between communities and museums.

The process of engagement can be as important, and sometimes more important, than the practical outcome of a heritage project. It is the *process* as much as the end product that is about the creation, maintenance and safeguarding of heritage and the identities and social values that flow from this. As Crooke (2005) discusses in relation to the development of community exhibitions in Northern Ireland, the exhibitions were *part of* a process of celebration and remembrance, or a means to

5. Museums and communities

an end. In the process of developing exhibitions, group meetings were held and discussions and dialogue occurred within the community that saw the development of community pride, self-esteem, and the cementing of community social networks. If we accept the argument advanced in Chapter 2 that heritage is a process of meaning-making, then as museums and other heritage professionals become entwined in this process they cannot help but become *active* players. The decision then rests with heritage professionals as to whether they become voices of 'authentication' and authorisation in this process or something more creative and engaging.

Conclusion

Although this chapter addresses the relationship between museums and communities, the point we have stressed is that all heritage professionals are engaged in ongoing relationships with communities that do not end with the 'dig' or the preserved or conserved 'monument'. As communities of experts engage with communities of interest, they become active advocates and players within the cultural and social processes of 'heritage-making', and the (re)creation and maintenance of cultural values and narratives. This engagement is unavoidable and it becomes important for experts to 'own' the political and social agendas, assumptions and values that they bring to these engagements as much as it is for communities to 'own' theirs. Community relationships are difficult and fraught, and they do not exist to tick a box in social policy implementations or to legitimise the agendas and practices of heritage professionals. If that is all they do, then the potential of community engagement can only be defined as social and cultural assimilation or integration. It is important to remember that communities and heritage professionals operate within an unequal framework, and thus communities may sometimes seek to use experts to legitimise community identity and aspirations, and they will do so because of the authority of expertise and the legitimising power of the institutions within which experts

work. The response of the expert to this use will inevitably depend on the political agendas and sympathies of that expert. Indeed, how and why heritage professionals engage with communities will always depend on the institutional and individual political and social agendas that experts work with – whether following social inclusion or other public policy defined by government or more personal agendas. Community relationships will be framed by a whole range of social, cultural and political agendas. This framework, however, need not be set in stone, nor necessarily set and led by communities of experts. Rather, if we envisage engagement with communities as an ongoing relationship, then it becomes mutually beneficial that part of that engagement should include the active and self-conscious negotiation of the social and political agendas being pursued.

6

Digital communities

Introduction

Recent decades have seen a proliferation of debate surrounding the significance of the internet and computer-mediated communication (CMC). Simultaneously, awareness that common interests, rather than geographic proximity, would underlie the meaning of 'community' has developed (Licklider & Taylor, cited in Jones 1997: 10). It should come as no surprise that there has been an emerging breadth of literature that seeks to bring together these cultural formations and examine the possibility of 'online community'. From the early 1990s onwards, a growing number of books, articles and conferences have begun to realign a concept traditionally associated with senses of belonging and affective experiences derived from place-based and face-to-face encounters with the realm of CMC. This interest is not confined to the academy alone. Indeed, in 2006, *TIME* magazine signalled that the melding of more traditional notions of community with life online had, indeed, taken place with their pronouncement of 'You' as Person of the Year. In explanation, Grossman (2006) introduced the special section of that *TIME* edition with the following reflection:

It's a story about community and collaboration on a scale never seen before. It's about the cosmic compendium of knowledge Wikipedia and the million-channel people's network YouTube and the online metropolis MySpace. It's about the many wrestling power from the few and helping one another for nothing and how that will not only change the world, but also change the way the world changes.