

This is an Accepted Manuscript of the following article:

Joar Skrede, Herdis Hølleland.

Uses of Heritage and beyond: Heritage Studies viewed through the lens of Critical Discourse
Analysis and Critical Realism.

The article has been published in final form by SAGE Publications in

Journal of Social Archaeology on 07/02/2018,

available online:

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1469605317749290>

© The Author(s) 2017

It is recommended to use the published version for citation.

Uses of Heritage and Beyond: Heritage Studies Viewed through the Lens of Critical Discourse Analysis and Critical Realism

Joar Skrede and Herdis Hølleland

Abstract

Uses of heritage (2006) has been an important contribution to the development of Heritage Studies. Resting on a thorough 're-read' of this modern classic, the article analyses the text applying some central concepts from Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Critical Realism (CR) in order to review the arguments put forward. One of the linguistic features from CDA we draw on is 'nominalization', which refers to replacing verb processes with a noun construction. Re-reading *Uses of heritage* and other succeeding publications, it is apparent that the phrase 'Authorized Heritage Discourse' is nominalized and reified into an entity obscuring who does what to whom, thereby making the 'AHD' a self-evident unit of explanation. Furthermore, the insistence on viewing heritage as a cultural process rather than as 'things' is not readably compatible with CR's non-reductionist stance. Wrapping up, we nonetheless argue that really taking CDA and CR on board could provide a rule of conduct for the future developments of Heritage Studies, where multifarious conceptions of heritage can co-exist.

Key words: Uses of heritage; Authorized Heritage Discourse; Critical Discourse Analysis; Critical Realism; Heritage Studies.

Introduction

Over 10 years have passed since Laurajane Smith's (2006) *Uses of heritage* was published. Due to its profound influence on the development of Heritage Studies, some critical attention is called for. Based on a thorough 're-read' of this classic, the article starts off by outlining its content, reception and its influence in the field of Heritage Studies. This is followed by a more in-depth discussion of *Uses of heritage's* theoretical position of Critical Realism (CR), the analytic-methodological device of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and the concept of the Authorized Heritage Discourse (AHD). While the latter has gained strong momentum within the field, to the extent that the acronym AHD is used as a self-evident unit of explanation, CDA and CR have received much less rigorous discussion. As the three are connected, according to Smith, we believe there is a need to unpack their relations in order to inform and enhance further discussion of both the way in which discourse analysis and not least the Authorized Heritage Discourse is used within field of Heritage Studies. We do this by drawing on terminology from the CDA tradition, thereby conducting a CDA-inspired analysis of Smith's arguments, as it were. It is important to stress that our aim is not to subvert Smith's work; quite the contrary, by taking her ideas seriously, we intend to examine how a critical re-reading of *Uses of heritage* and its subsequent influence on Heritage Studies –

acknowledging how the AHD has long escaped the confines of the book – may add to the debate on where Heritage Studies, critical or otherwise, should move from here.

Uses of heritage – its content and immediate reception

Published in 2006, *Uses of heritage* stands as an important witness of a time: Capturing the essence of the debates on heritage in this period, it succinctly pushes the discussion from ‘what heritage *is*’ to ‘what heritage *does*’, and places it at the forefront of Heritage Studies. Declaring in the introduction that ‘There is, really, no such thing as heritage’ (Smith, 2006, p. 11), Smith goes on to argue that heritage should be approached as a cultural process. This shift from viewing heritage as a thing to regarding it as a process, is explored in part I, ‘The idea of heritage’, which consists of two chapters. In chapter one, ‘The discourse of heritage’, Smith briefly presents the theories and approaches informing her work: Norman Fairclough’s (2000, 2003) Critical Discourse Analysis, Roy Bhaskar’s (1989, 2008[1978]) Critical Realism and Nigel Thrift’s (2003) work on ‘non, pre or more than representational aspects of social life, which are prior to or not dependent on discourse’ (Smith, 2006, p. 13). The remainder of the chapter is dedicated to discussing the interconnection between a view of heritage as things and the ‘Authorized Heritage Discourse’ (see further discussion below). In chapter two, ‘Heritage as a cultural process’, Smith outlines her counter-position, arguing for the intangible nature of heritage and the need to approach heritage as a cultural process – focusing on how heritage is negotiated through memory, performance, identity, place and dissonance. In the two subsequent parts, Smith discusses the theoretical backdrop empirically, drawing on policy documents, visitor surveys and ethnographic fieldwork, showcasing methodologically diverse approaches to heritage sites and processes. Part II is dedicated to ‘Authorized heritage’ and part III to ‘Responses to authorized heritage’ – both of which consist of a series of case studies from international charters, conventions and institutions to museums and heritage sites in United Kingdom and Australia. The brief conclusion ending the book largely reiterates the position taken at the onset of the book, highlighting the power and dominance of the Authorized Heritage Discourse and the need to approach heritage as an intangible, cultural process and thereby challenge ‘the materialist idea of heritage and the ideological baggage that goes with that’ (Smith, 2006, p. 307).

The early reviews of the book reveal the interdisciplinary nature of heritage as a field of research, with reviews from scholars from Museum Studies (Dicks, 2007; Feintuch, 2007), archaeology (Lennon, 2007), and Public History (Warren-Findley, 2007). Most of the reviews were descriptive, outlining the content of the book rather than providing strong opinions. Yet, seen together, the reviews indicate that the first reception was somewhat mixed. While highlighting its usefulness as resource for posing provocative questions and thereby pushing the field of heritage research forwards, it was also criticized for having a too familiar analytic framework and having a too dense, ambiguous and ‘jargony’ language – noting how the acronym AHD comes across as an ‘illness’ and ‘disease’ (Dicks, 2007; Feintuch, 2007; Lennon, 2007; Warren-Findley, 2007). Indeed the language, combined with a lack of spelling out new directions, were seen as obstacles for successfully engaging with the heritage professionals whose practices are criticized (Feintuch, 2007; Lennon, 2007).

Despite some initial critique, ten years on, however, *Uses of heritage* has nonetheless become a central work of reference within the field of Heritage Studies. The book's main catchphrase of the Authorized Heritage Discourse, or simply the AHD, is often referred to at conferences, yet it is difficult to properly trace the book's impact through current citation tools. If only based on central scholarly publication databases such as Scencedirect.com and Web of Science, one gets the impression it has become bookshelf-fill, hardly read or referenced. Rather than painting an accurate picture of the book's impact, it highlights the biases of the databases towards natural sciences (e.g. Larivière, Gingras, & Archambault, 2009; Mongeon & Paul-Hus, 2016). While taking Google Scholar's weaknesses into account, the search engine paints a radically different picture: As of mid-November 2017, there were an impressive 2292 citations of the book. Put in perspective, according to bibliometric researchers, around 80% of humanities research is never cited (Larivière et al., 2009). Finally, *Uses of heritage* has, according to Google Scholar, been cited twice as many times as another early classic in the field, *A geography of heritage* (Graham, Ashworth, & Tunbridge, 2000). Thus, the publication has struck a chord with the broad field of heritage research and become a key text in syllabi around the world – thereby impacting future heritage scholars and practitioners. Despite its wide coverage, relatively few researchers have engaged critically with the text and in particular the theoretical foundations on which the Authorized Heritage Discourse is built (although see Harrison, 2013; Solli, 2011a; 2011b for notable exceptions). Our aim is therefore to more thoroughly examine how the analytic and theoretical framework – Critical Discourse Analysis and Critical Realism – is used when developing the catchphrase of Authorized Heritage Discourse.

Introducing the philosophical backdrop of *Uses of heritage*

Smith argues that it is necessary to destabilize the idea of the 'objectivity' of heritage. To do this, she redirects the heritage gaze from what she views as an obsession with physicality:

Accepting the philosophical position of critical realism (Bhaskar 1978, 1989), it may be understood that while there *may* be a physical reality or aspect to heritage, any knowledge of it can only ever be understood within the discourse we construct about it. (Smith, 2006, pp. 54, emphasis added)

Furthermore, she claims that she does not want to:

[G]et tangled up in debates on the relevance of post-modern arguments that discourse is all that matters. The position that I adopt epistemologically draws on critical realism and, though I acknowledge the usefulness of Foucauldian approaches to discourse, I anchor my analysis firmly in an understanding that social relations are material and have material consequences, in a way informed by critical discourse analysis. This is an important distinction, as I do not want to lose sight of the

materiality of heritage at the same time as I am problematizing it. (Smith, 2006, p. 13, emphasis in original)

In these two quotations, her view on the relation between the discursive and the extra-discursive is expressed, with the extra-discursive representing tangible heritage such as objects. Although she does not want to get ‘tangled up in the debates on the relevance of post-modern arguments that discourse is all that matters’, it may be said that she has already entered this debate (e.g. in the forerunner Smith, 2004). In the following, we will discuss why, applying some of the key concepts of CDA and CR. As Smith provides very little description of what the research traditions of CDA and CR represent, our aim is to outline some central features with CR as a philosophy of science, and CDA as a research method, parallel to comparing it with Smith’s arguments. This will hopefully help readers more fully appreciate the strengths and weaknesses of the theoretical arguments put forward in *Uses of heritage*.

CDA and CR – research with a political agenda

Put briefly, both CDA and CR can be read as critical political projects. This is perhaps most clearly articulated in Fairclough’s *manifesto* for critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 2003, pp. 202-204). Fairclough uses the term ‘manifesto’ because he ‘begins from the political case for [his] research’, aiming to address and respond to present-day issues and problems (Fairclough, 2003, p. 203). CDA scholars play an advocatory role for socially discriminated groups, and the line drawn between social scientific research and political argumentation sometimes gets blurred (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 19). Following Bhaskar (1986), Fairclough develops a critical research program: Focus upon a social wrong (in its semiotic aspect), identify obstacles to addressing the social wrong, and identify possible ways past the obstacles (Fairclough, 2010b, pp. 235-239). Hence, critical theories, CDA included, generally want to produce critical knowledge that enables human beings to emancipate themselves from forms of domination through self-reflection (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 7). It is not difficult to read Smith’s critique into such a research agenda, as she wants to reveal ideologies and power structures in heritage management – that in its semiotic element, she argues, take the form of an ‘Authorized Heritage Discourse’.

While heritage research is rarely explicitly backed theoretically by CR, similar political and activist undercurrents can also be identified within certain areas of archaeology, one of the ‘disciplinary homes’ of both Smith and Heritage Studies. Within this context, the first World Archaeology Congress (WAC), held in 1986, and the numerous publications it produced, stand out as imperative (e.g. Cleere, 1989; Gathercole & Lowenthal, 1994[1990]; Robert Layton, 1989; Robert Layton, 1989; Shennan, 1989). As a child of Peter Ucko, WAC was inevitably influenced by Ucko’s own experiences and views (for a detailed, if personal, account of the controversies that lead to WAC, see Ucko, 1987): Having become a ‘research activist’ through his involvement in the Aboriginal Land Rights movement in Australia in 1970s and later the British Council in Zimbabwe, Ucko was eager to end the European dominance of archaeology (Ucko, 1987,

pp. 2-3; 1994[1990]). Furthermore, Ucko (1987, pp. xi, 27-28) aimed to open WAC to people with an interest in the past rather than being a closed forum for educated experts on the past. As such, the ‘unauthorised “subjects” of archaeological and anthropological observation’ were ‘admitted as equal participants in the discussion of their own (cultural) past or present’ (Ucko, 1994[1990], p. ix). Thus, WAC paved the way for an archaeology with a social and political activist edge which is also visible in the *Uses of heritage*.

Ontology and epistemology in CDA and CR

Moving from the overall political project, another central theme to expose is Fairclough’s conception of discourse (which Smith adheres to) and its relation to ontology and epistemology. In Fairclough’s CDA, the relation between language and surroundings is accounted for. Ontologically, Fairclough claims that social relations have a materiality which is not conditioned upon the human knowledge of them, but that they are nevertheless socially constructed. Epistemologically, he rejects positivist accounts of social and economic facts that exclude their social and discursive construction. Methodologically, he therefore emphasizes the dialectical character of the relation between different elements of the social, including discourse (Fairclough, 2006, pp. 12-13). Fairclough’s position is a realist one, which is based on CR as a philosophy of science (Fairclough, 2003, p. 14). In CR, causal structures and generative mechanisms exist and act independently of the conditions that allow us to identify them; that is, they are relatively independent of the events that may occur (Bhaskar, 2008[1978], p. 56). Events are also distinct from the experiences in which they are apprehended. This implies that mechanisms, events and experiences constitute three overlapping domains of reality: the domains of the real, the actual and the empirical.

	Domain of the Real	Domain of the Actual	Domain of the Empirical
Mechanisms	v		
Events	v	v	
Experiences	v	v	v

Table 1. Adopted from Bhaskar (2008[1978], p. 56). The empirical consists of that which is experienced, that is events and things observable to humans and is a subset of the actual. The actual refers to what occurs and includes events and things (or entities) which may or may not be observable to humans and is a subset of the real. Finally, the real refers to mechanisms that ‘arise from the structure of entities and give them casual powers’ (Elder-Vass, 2008, p. 458). As such, the real pre-exists the researcher’s identification of it.

The empirical is a subset of the actual, and the actual is a subset of the real (Elder-Vass, 2008, p. 461). Fairclough adopts this philosophy of science; however, he renames

‘the real’ to ‘the potential’ since both the ‘real’ and the ‘actual’ are real in any reasonable sense of the term (Fairclough, 2010a, pp. 295-296). This approach is anti-reductionist: the real (or potential) cannot be reduced to our knowledge of reality, which is contingent, shifting and partial (Fairclough, 2003, p. 14). This also applies to texts: we should not assume that the reality of texts is exhausted by our knowledge of texts.

We may say that Smith’s (2006) approach sits well with such an understanding of discourse. There are however, some distinctive features of CR that are less compatible. The first of which was briefly introduced in the quote above, where Smith notes, adhering to CR, there *may* be a physical reality or aspect to heritage (Smith, 2006, pp. 54, emphasis added). This statement can be usefully analyzed drawing on the classic CDA concept of *modality*. In CDA, modality refers to the relationship a clause or a sentence sets up between the author and what is represented, that is, what authors commit themselves to in terms of truth or necessity (Fairclough, 2003, p. 219). Epistemic modality has to do with the writer or speaker’s commitment to the truth of any proposition (Machin & Mayr, 2012, p. 187). Epistemic modality therefore concerns exchange of knowledge through statements and/or questions (Fairclough, 2003, p. 165).¹ The clause ‘there *may* be a physical reality or aspect to heritage’, is a statement (epistemic modality) which is modalized by the modal verb ‘may’. This modality marker can be seen as intermediate between categorical assertion and denial (Fairclough, 2003, p. 219). Using ‘may’ indicates the possibility that there may or *may not* be a psychical world outside language. Bhaskar himself did not modalize this claim; he simply stated that ‘things exist independently of our knowledge of them’ (Bhaskar, 2008[1978], p. 250). One of the characteristics of CR is ‘strong ontological commitments’ that have theoretical implications for theory construction and theory application. This *deep* ontology posits that the world is stratified into layers that require different concepts according to the analytic object in question (Jessop, 2016, pp. 88-92). Elsewhere in the book, Smith paraphrases this quote from Bhaskar using categorical modality (Smith, 2006, p. 15), and indeed herself discusses the very difference between ‘is’ and ‘may’ when analyzing the Burra Charter (Smith, 2006, p. 105; Waterton, Smith, & Campbell, 2006, p. 345). However, this inconsistency nevertheless causes a degree of uncertainty about Smith’s philosophical position.

The epistemic and ontic fallacy

Arguably, Smith’s handling of tangible and intangible heritage is also characterized by a somewhat unclear philosophical position. Smith argues that her work ‘starts from the premise that all heritage is intangible’ (Smith, 2006, p. 3). Considering the existence of tangible heritage, this would in CR terminology be an epistemic fallacy. Committing the epistemic fallacy is to assume that the world is dependent on our knowledge of it, that is, reducing ontology to epistemology (Bhaskar, 2012, p. 57).² For

¹ CDA also uses the concept ‘deontic’ modality, which concerns exchange of activity (demand and/or offer) (Fairclough, 2003, p. 165).

² In contrast to the epistemic fallacy, the ontic fallacy is to assume that the differentiations and qualities of the world dictate the content of our knowledge, that is, reducing epistemology to ontology (Fairclough, Jessop, & Sayer, 2010, p. 209). Essentially, this is a version of the realism versus relativism debate.

example, the physical and material earth will not become flat despite someone believing it is flat. However, Smith states that although ‘stressing the intangibility of heritage’, she is ‘not dismissing the tangible or pre-discursive, but simply deprivileging and denaturalizing it as the self-evident form and essence of heritage’ (Smith, 2006, p. 3). In spite of this clarification, the lack of interest in material heritage understates the fact that much heritage is objects *too*. To CR, it is unacceptable if a sign (signifier) and the interpretation of the sign (signified) are wholly cognitive, that is, if it provides no form of external reference (Hartwig, 2007, p. 417). The *semiotic triangle* is constituted by signifier, signified *and* referent (Bhaskar & Danermark, 2006, p. 284). In some academic accounts, *referential detachment* is emphasized (Bhaskar, 2016, p. 17). This is also apparent in Smith’s emphasis on describing heritage as a discursive process. This may be fair in as much as she is interested in ‘how the idea of heritage is used to construct, reconstruct and negotiate a range of identities and social and cultural values and meanings in the present’ (Smith, 2006, p. 3). However, in CR, societies are viewed as *laminated systems*. This term is used to underwrite the irreducibility of, and necessity for, describing the various levels of reality (Bhaskar, 2016, p. 16). Thus, a laminated system would allow heritage to be both monumental, material and tangible, intangible, discursive etc. CR moves beyond all forms of reductionism and aspires at interdisciplinary investigations that describe as many layers of society as possible (Bhaskar, 2016, p. 16). In a laminated system a phenomenon may be partly cultural, social, semiotic, economic, material etc. and corresponds to different levels of reality (Bhaskar & Danermark, 2006, p. 295). With her distinct disinterest in the material, it is not self-evident that Smith’s approach is in accordance with the CR premises.

Lifting the gaze from *Uses of heritage*, it is worthwhile to point out that in order to avoid polarization, CR has asserted the compatibility of ontological realism and epistemological relativism. According to Bhaskar and Danermark (2006, p. 294), CR is the ontologically ‘least restrictive perspective’; it is maximally inclusive in that it can accommodate insights from other meta-theoretical perspectives. Empirical phenomena can seldom be explained only by factors belonging to one single discipline (Høyer & Næss, 2012, p. 3). CR is therefore important in order to escape discourse imperialism and open up for method-pluralism. As such, CR sits well with the recent developments in Heritage Studies, and in particular the call for cross- and multi-disciplinary modes of engagement in *Critical Heritage Studies* (e.g. Association of Critical Heritage Studies, 2017; Winter, 2013).

AHD revisited

As noted above, drawing on CR and CDA, Smith puts forward what she terms the Authorized Heritage Discourse (AHD). In line with the shift from what heritage is, Smith focuses on what the Authorized Heritage Discourse does by arguing that it ‘works to naturalize a range of assumptions about the nature and meaning of heritage’ and ‘promotes a certain set of Western elite cultural values as being universally applicable’ (Smith, 2006, pp. 4, 11). Thus, the very construct contributes to universalizing what it denominates, which, as discussed below, causes conundrums once transferred to other empirical contexts. While attention is drawn to what the discourse does, she also describes the character of the discourse, thereby addressing what it is: First and foremost

the discourse is centered around ‘things’ and often intimately connected to notions of nationhood (Smith, 2006, p. 4). The occupation with ‘things’ is further reflected in the embedded ‘assumptions about the innate and immutable cultural values of heritage that are linked to and defined by the concepts of monumentality and aesthetics’ (Smith, 2006, p. 4). Smith also clearly spells out that Authorized Heritage Discourse is ‘a professional discourse that privileges expert values and knowledge about the past and its material manifestations, and dominates and regulates professional heritage practices’ (Smith, 2006, p. 4). While it remains somewhat elusively stated, the discourse seems to draw its authority and become authorized by professional association, representing the views of professionals, and specifically ‘the authorial voices of the upper middle and ruling classes of European educated professionals and elites’ (Smith, 2006, p. 28). Its own force and authority is, however, understood to rest ‘on its ability to “speak to” and make sense of the aesthetic experiences of its practitioners and policy makers, and by the fact of its institutionalization within a range of national and international organizations and codes of practice’ (Smith, 2006, p. 28).

Analyzing Smith’s Authorized Heritage Discourse, one of the key concepts of CDA – nominalization – is useful. Put briefly, nominalization replaces verb processes with a noun construction, and thereby obscures agency and responsibility for actions (Machin & Mayr, 2012, p. 137). As such, nominalization is often used to hide who did what to whom. Billig (2008) demonstrates the principle:

While a sentence that describes an agent performing an act can be easily transformed by nominalization into a statement about the act, the reverse is not true. ‘Police attack protestors’ can be easily transformed by anyone with a knowledge of the syntactic rules of English into ‘An attack on protestors occurred’. However, knowledge of the linguistic rules of syntactic transformation does not enable the native speaker to construct the former sentence from the latter, because nominalization has ensured that the latter sentence contains less information than the former. (Billig, 2008, p. 785)

Nominalizations are hard to contest, simply because while you can argue with a clause you cannot argue with a nominal group. Nominalization has the effect of transforming processes into entities – and it is these nominalized entities that become the agents in the process (Billig, 2008, p. 786). Therefore, identifying nominalizations is a crucial task for CDA scholars, since they may uncover ideologies involved. While writing completely ‘nominalization free’ academic texts is neither possible nor desirable, taking note of how the practice impacts our texts is crucial. It is important to identify nominalized entities’ ascribed agency, as they obscure clarity. Thus, we will now provide a few examples of nominalized AHD:

Within the regeneration process traditional values about the nature, meaning and value of heritage as defined by the AHD are not only unproblematically assumed, but are actively reinforced. (Smith, 2006, p. 246)

In this quote, the AHD (singular noun) is the agent that defines what counts as heritage. By means of nominalization, AHD is construed as the actor 'bringing about the unfolding of the process' (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 282). Similar patterns are found elsewhere in the book:

However, another aspect of the AHD's obfuscation of, and attempts to exclude, competing discourses is the way it constructs heritage as something that is engaged with passively – while it may be the subject of popular 'gaze', that gaze is a passive one in which the audience will uncritically consume the message of heritage constructed by heritage experts. Heritage is not defined in the AHD as an active process or experience, but rather it is something visitors are led to, are instructed about, but are then not invited to engage with more actively. (Smith, 2006, p. 31)

Here, Smith is drawing attention to how the AHD reduces conflict by excluding competing voices. This quotation is not unique, and similar arguments are found throughout the book, for example: 'The first is that the AHD, in privileging the innate aesthetic and scientific value and physicality of heritage, masks the real cultural and political work that the heritage process does' (Smith, 2006, p. 87). Wanting to demonstrate how the AHD obscures and masks the cultural process behind heritage politics, the extensive use of nominalization masks the very processes Smith alludes to. Nominalizing and reifying the AHD makes it difficult to challenge, and it serves to reduce rather than to enhance clarity. This is probably why some reviewers read AHD as an illness/disease or why Marc Askew (2010, p. 22) has referred to the AHD as a 'conceptual red herring'.³ We are told that the AHD is suppressive, non-democratic, elite-cementing etc. Although this may be true in many cases, it would have been more convincing to demonstrate this empirically by means of linguistic tools from CDA, rather than just asserting it. Smith makes the reservation that a detailed discourse analysis has been undertaken in an article co-authored by Waterton, Smith and Campbell (2006), but notes that she will not restate this in *Uses of heritage* (Smith, 2006, p. 102). In the mentioned article, the authors are able to demonstrate how the Burra Charter – by combining particular semiotic resources – is able to reproduce certain ideologies at the expense of others. The lack of such in *Uses of heritage* weakens the reader's ability to unpack the nominalized reified agent of the AHD and scrutinize how it has achieved its alleged hegemonic status in heritage management and interpretation.

The nominalized nature of the AHD contributes to deleting the agency of individual practitioners and policymakers who actually create the discourse, making them into one grey mass, visible only through what Smith terms 'authorizing institutions of heritage' such as ICOMOS, UNESCO and the National Trust. The individuals who appear in the texts are predominantly those that the AHD suppresses: Indigenous

³ The latter point is made within the context of World Heritage, alluding to the fact that nation states' power far outplays that of Smith's 'authorizing institutions of heritage' (i.e. UNESCO, ICOMOS). The field of World Heritage research has since expanded tremendously providing further weight to Askew's tentative remark (Meskell, 2014).

Australians, tourists and workers. It is not easy to assess whether Smith consciously uses nominalization as a linguistic strategy. As noted, it is difficult to avoid nominalizations altogether and you will find several in this article too. One 'good' thing about nominalizations is that we are able to generalize about a large number of separate events, processes and entities, parallel to discounting differences irrelevant for our purpose. On the negative side, nominalizations may serve to over-generalize or obscure differences which might turn out to be important, such as who the agents are and what they do to whom (Fairclough, 2008, p. 813). Furthermore, reified agents are often reproduced as 'enemies' that provide little benefit from examining 'the nature of the beast' (Peck & Tickell, 2007, p. 26). Generally, we may say that if CDA is to be critical, it should have clear political targets, and these targets should not be abstract entities, but the actions of actual people (Billig, 2008, p. 796).

Responses and refinements to the AHD

Leaving the nominalized nature of the AHD aside, there are, however, other elements of the textual choices Smith is more upfront about; at the onset she briefly notes that the generalized character of the AHD essentially glosses over nuances (Smith, 2006, p. 16). Furthermore, while Smith acknowledges the non-static nature of the hegemonic AHD and that other heritage discourses exist, examining these is not her primary concern in *Uses of heritage*. Indeed the passing nature of these reservations has contributed to a situation where the reservations are largely left unproblematized in the book, to the extent they are often unacknowledged by other scholars' uses of *Uses of heritage* and in the authorized heritage discourse (Enqvist, 2014; Högberg, 2012; Johansson, 2015; Linkola, 2015; Ludwig, 2016; Mydland & Grahn, 2012; Parkinson, Scott, & Redmond, 2015a; 2015b to name some; Pendlebury, 2013; Waterton, 2010; Yan, 2015). The way in which authors describe and use the concept varies greatly. It is often referenced in passing acknowledging it as a central reference, whereas others adopt it more openly, directly transferring it to new national contexts arguing e.g. 'the official perception of heritage in Jordan...accords with AHD' (Abu-Khafajah, Al Rabady, Rababeh, & Al-Tammoni, 2015, p. 195) or 'The institutionalization of the heritage system in China follows Smith's theory' (Zhu, 2016, p. 79). In the following, we explore some of the contributions which enter into more engaged discussions of the concept of AHD, critiquing and refining it (Ludwig, 2016; Mydland & Grahn, 2012; Parkinson et al., 2015a, 2015b; Pendlebury, 2013; Yan, 2015).

One of the observations the authors make when examining the AHD in relation to a given empirical material, is that one can hardly speak of *the* AHD. Rather, there are not only several competing heritage discourses, there are 'sub-AHDs' at work within the same organization (Pendlebury, 2013) and more generally several AHDs among the various actors operating within the conservation sector (Parkinson et al., 2015a, 2015b). Furthermore, authors observe a shift within AHDs away from a focus on monumentality towards an acceptance of a wider variety of tangible and intangible heritage (Ludwig, 2016; Mydland & Grahn, 2012; Parkinson et al., 2015a, 2015b). Whereas these observations are made in European contexts, Yan (2015, p. 78) pushes the discussion in a somewhat different direction pointing out the need to re-visit the 'West's hegemonic imposition of heritage discourses on non-Western cultures'. Examining the World

Heritage-listed Fujian Tulou sites in China, Yan (2015, p. 78) notes ‘that hegemonic inequality does not only arise from relations between the West and non-West’, but also from within non-Western states or regional philosophical traditions more generally. Thus, when applied to an empirical context, the limits of a strongly generalized AHD come to the fore. However, when critiquing Smith’s AHD, authors also adopt the nominalized ways of describing the AHD(s). For example, the AHD ‘maintains that current generations are responsible for the protection of heritage for future generations’ (Yan, 2015, p. 66), ‘aims to materialise heritage in order to classify and value it’ (Linkola, 2015, p. 945) or ‘(...) can seek to control fundamental questions about why material objects from the past should be considered valuable (...)’ (Pendlebury, 2013, p. 716).

This transfer of nominalizations, may in part be explained by the fact that most of the authors either do not, or only to a very limited extent, discuss or utilize concepts from the primary literature on CDA (Enqvist, 2014; Parkinson et al., 2015a; 2015b are notable exceptions). Hence, it might be useful to briefly draw attention to Billig’s (2008) point about nominalization: If using nominalizations as part of an analysis on nominalizations self-reflectively, it would not matter greatly; however, if analysts are unconsciously using – which might seem to be the case in some of the heritage research – the very linguistic forms that they are critically analyzing, it will definitely make a difference to become aware of this (Billig, 2008, p. 784). Summing up, it seems fair to argue heritage research may benefit from engaging more actively and critically with the rather large toolkit of CDA in the future.

The future of Heritage Studies

Over the last decade, we have witnessed the rise of Critical Heritage Studies and with it several debates on the future of Heritage Studies (for some examples, see Harvey, 2001; Smith, 2012; Smith & Campbell, 2016; Waterton & Watson, 2013; Winter, 2013; Winter & Waterton, 2013; Witcomb & Buckley, 2013). Our aim is not to reiterate these, but rather to further discuss some of the more recent critique of CDA as standing in opposition to other recent theoretical influences within archaeology and Heritage Studies, such as non-representational theories and new materialism(s).

Critiquing the ‘critical turn’ in Heritage Studies, Rodney Harrison (2013), if we understand him correctly, makes the point that Smith has not engaged with what is ‘beyond’ the discourse of heritage. He claims that Smith is cautious about a development that brings in the affective qualities of heritages (Harrison, 2013, p. 112). This is puzzling, as Smith’s own counter position to the AHD moves in an affective direction through the focus on the intangible nature of heritage (Smith, 2006, p. 2). As part of her argument, she directs the gaze to the *affects* of heritage, rather than to the cultural object itself, and she draws on the work of Nigel Thrift (Smith, 2006, pp. 13-14, 56-57, 76) – one of the key proponents of the so-called non- or more-than representational theories. Smith also takes explicit note of the dialectical relationship between reason, cognition and emotion, and the social and cultural spheres of life – including discourse – an insight that she has further developed after *Uses of heritage* (see e.g. Smith & Campbell, 2016). Thus, if somewhat camouflaged by the forceful AHD, *Uses of heritage* can also be read

as an early work on the affective qualities of heritage experiences, and their interconnectedness with heritage as a discursive practice.

Besides the debate on semiotics/discourse versus affect/emotions, Harrison (2013) also raises another concern about Heritage Studies:

While acknowledging its key role in producing a field of critical heritage studies, one criticism that could be levelled at this focus on the discourse of heritage is that it does not always produce an account that adequately theorizes the role of material things. (...) So, while I see the discursive turn in heritage studies as very important (...) I want to explore not only the ways in which heritage operates as a discursive practice, but also its corporeal influences on the bodies of human and non-human actors, and the ways in which heritage is caught up in the quotidian bodily practices of dwelling, travelling, working and 'being' in the world. (Harrison, 2013, pp. 112-113)

We believe this criticism is more warranted than the former. As already mentioned, there are some inconsistencies and ambivalences in Smith's treatment of tangible heritage, and if Heritage Studies is to become more cross-disciplinary and engage (more) with heritage practitioners, insisting too hard on the intangibility of heritage would probably separate rather than unify different 'camps' in the heritage field (Witcomb & Buckley, 2013, p. 572). Furthermore, it is not useful to view objects as empty and meaningless outside signifying practices, as 'things' have their 'affecting presence' (Pétursdóttir, 2013, p. 46). Although we ascribe objects meaning, their size and shape influence how we approach and react to them (Olsen, 2010; Witmore, 2014). Such a perspective has several tangents with the developments in Actor Network Theory (ANT), where focus on the 'non-human' has proved useful for challenging the 'modernist impulse to separate "objects" and "humans", "nature" and "culture", "subject" and "object"' (Harrison, 2013, p. 37). Thus, ANT may serve as a means to reinvigorate the interest for tangible aspects of heritage. However, as eloquently argued by Elder-Vass, there are both commonalities and distinct differences between ANT and CR. Starting with the latter, he argues ANT tends to deny CR's separation of the real from the actual, and the separation of the actual from the empirical (see Table 1). Rather, the what is 'out-there' tends to be viewed as non-existing until it has been identified and described (Elder-Vass, 2008, p. 461). However, a critical realist would argue that, for example, 'the phases of Venus existed in actuality before they were empirically recognized, and a patient's arteries are furred up (or not) before, or whether, they are diagnosed as such' (Elder-Vass, 2008, p. 460). Consequently, we may say ANT lacks the ontological depth of CR – and Elder-Vass therefore terms ANT's ontology a *flat ontology* in two respects: In its neglect of realities beyond the empirical domain, and in its ignorance towards social

structures (Elder-Vass, 2008, p. 465, emphasis in original).⁴ By the latter he alludes to a missing interest in theorizing structural stability compared to CR (Elder-Vass, 2008, p. 466). CR on the other hand, has been criticized for not sufficiently tracing the connections between individuals and social structure in practice (Elder-Vass, 2008, p. 466). As such, CDA may serve as a bridge helping us to understand the relationship between language and the extra-discursive part of social reality (Bhaskar, 2016, p. 106). Thus, it seems reasonable to sum up by reminding ourselves that we have yet a distance to go before the tangible, intangible, discursive and affective aspects of heritage are succinctly treated as a complementary rather than oppositional. Scholars may of course pay attention to only one of those, as long as other equally valid descriptions of heritage are not rejected as inferior.

Heritage Studies, CDA and the Holy Trinity of CR

The debates outlined above indicate how Heritage Studies has moved in the last five years or so. However, as very few have entered into a rigorous discussion of CR and Heritage Studies, we will explore how taking CR on board could contribute to further developments. We are not claiming that this is the only way forward, but it could provide a useful means to escape various forms of reductionism. The proponents of non-representational theories that are accusing discourse analysis (in general terms) for being too preoccupied with texts are (partly) wrong, at least when it comes to CDA. Indeed at times affect theories come across as exciting primarily because they are *not* discourse. However, affect and emotion are inextricably linked to the semiotic/discursive and it is futile to try to pull them apart (Wetherell, 2012, p. 20). Fairclough, the main proponent of CDA, clearly argues that language, and more broadly, semiosis, is an *element* of social life (Fairclough, 2003, p. 223). That means that we cannot reduce reality to language (or discourse), since it is only part of the picture. Undoubtedly, discourse is a powerful element of the social. If it was not, there would be no reason to do critical discourse analysis; however, the point is that CDA shall be understood as a contributing element to social research in *combination* with other methods (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. 16; Fairclough, 2003, p. 24). This corresponds to CR's insistence on laminated systems, where discourse may constitute one layer, affect another etc. In one of her empirical examples in *Uses of heritage*, Smith writes about the 'banality of grandiloquence' (Smith, 2006, pp. 115-161). Here she argues that the English manor house serves a ruling elite by having turned it into a 'lucrative profit-making enterprise' (Smith, 2006, p. 115). This conceals the 'English class system and the brutalities of acquisition and commercial exploitation of British colonies' (Smith, 2006, p. 118). The audience is found to be passive and does not challenge the AHD, which has defined the manor house as a beautiful aesthetic object. The stories about the servants' poor working conditions, for example, are left out of the narrative. However, in a laminated system, a manor house should be allowed to be *both* grandiloquent – serving as an example of important architectural history – and carry a (dark) social history. CR aspires to describe as many layers as possible, which implies inter-disciplinary approaches – also one of the aims of

⁴ Elder-Vass (2008, p. 465) launches the concept 'flat ontology' partly as a response to CR's concept 'deep ontology', and partly as a reference to Latour's chapter 'How to Keep the Social Flat' in *Reassembling the Social* (Latour, 2005, pp. 165-172).

the Association for Critical Heritage Studies (2017). Viewing reality as a laminated system, also implies including both tangible and intangible heritage when applicable, as both CDA and CR provide non-reductionist approaches. This inclusive and non-reductionist stance is also evident in the recent expansion of CDA into so-called multimodal CDA – often described by the acronym MCDA (Machin, 2013; Machin & Mayr, 2012) – where the empirical object is not only texts, but two-dimensional images and three-dimensional objects (see e.g. Abousmouga & Machin, 2011; 2013 for an example of analyses of war memorial). Here, texts, images and objects are all treated as semiotic resources that carry meaning potentials.

If Heritage Studies is viewed through the lens of CDA and CR, what can it contribute to future developments? Bhaskar has coined the compatibility of epistemological relativism, ontological realism and judgmental rationality the ‘holy trinity’ of CR (Bhaskar, 2010, p. 1). The combination of epistemological relativism and judgmental rationality allows us to assert that although our knowledge is fallible and without sure foundations, it can nevertheless be a rational ground for preferring one knowledge-claim to another (Bhaskar, 2016). Although CR accepts epistemic relativism, this does not entail accepting *judgmental* relativism – that all discourses are equally good (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. 8). To CR, all ‘knowledge is fallible, but not *equally* fallible’ (Yeung, 1997, pp. 43, emphasis in original). Many heritage scholars are criticizing what they see as a suppressing and non-democratic AHD, and they advocate laypersons’ right to define their own heritage. This is compatible with CR and CDA, as neutral or impartial approaches to social injustice (and/or) judgmental irrationality will not solve problems; it may even contribute to their perpetuation (Richardson, 2007, p. 2). CR therefore combines epistemological relativism and judgmental rationality. However, CR emphasizes that knowledge is *about* something that is not construed by the scientist (Næss, 2012, pp. 5-6). This is different from ANT’s argument that science produces the realities it describes (Elder-Vass, 2008, pp. 456-457). Using the holy trinity as a rule of conduct, we could reduce the risk on forwarding and reproducing reductionist arguments in Heritage Studies. Moreover, if applying concepts and tools from CDA, heritage scholars can manage to unpack local and diverse occurrences of AHDs (plural). This would be highly appreciated. Instead of just taking the existence of a universal AHD for granted, it is more constructive to demonstrate how multifarious AHDs play out linguistically – at least if one aspires for social change. CDA can also serve as an important tool for self-reflection in order not to reproduce the very same linguistic forms that we are critically analyzing in other texts.

Conclusion

There are few publications that have contributed so profoundly to the developments of Heritage Studies as an interdisciplinary field of research as Smith’s (2006) *Uses of heritage*. In this article, we have operationalized parts of the CDA and CR frameworks in order to re-read this modern classic. Put briefly, our re-read indicates that some parts of the book are in compliance with these methodological and meta-theoretical traditions, while others are less so. The critical and political project sits well within both CDA and CR; however, there is some hedging about the epistemological position on which the study is based, which leads to an element of confusion. This is also valid in the

descriptions of heritage as intangible, in as much as heritage is also tangible. Irrespective of the intangible-tangible debate, *Uses of heritage* may be read as an early and important contribution to the relevance of affect and emotion in Heritage Studies, although this has not received the attention it deserves. With reference to where heritage research should move in the future, we have suggested that the already established interest in CDA among several heritage scholars should be continued. This may be useful for at least two reasons. First, it may help to unpack what is hiding under the concept of AHD. Second, it may help heritage scholars to become more self-aware and self-critical about their own language use. We have also suggested that CR – the philosophical under-laborer to CDA – can reduce the risk of several forms of reductionism, be it affective, discursive, material, etc., since CR views societies as laminated systems. Consequently, there may be a lot to gain for Heritage Studies – in particular critical – to really take CDA and CR on board in the years to come.

Author bio

Joar Skrede (PhD) is a sociologist and researcher at the Norwegian Institute for Culture Heritage Research (NIKU). His research interests include Heritage Studies, Urban Studies, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Critical Realism (CR) as philosophy of science.

Herdis Hølleland (PhD) has an interdisciplinary background in archaeology, heritage studies and cultural history. She currently works as a researcher at the Norwegian Institute for Culture Heritage Research (NIKU). Her research interests include Heritage Studies, multilateral heritage governance, politics and bureaucracies.

References

- Abousnoug, Gill, & Machin, David. (2011). The changing spaces of war commemoration: a multimodal analysis of the discourses of British monuments. *Social Semiotics*, 21(2), 175-196.
- Abousnoug, Gill, & Machin, David. (2013). *The Language of War Monuments*. Huntingdon: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Abu-Khafajah, Shatha, Al Rabady, Rama, Rababeh, Shaher, & Al-Tammoni, Fadael Al-Rahman. (2015). Hands-On Heritage! Establishing Soft Authority over Heritage through Architectural Experiment: A Case Study from Jordan. *Public Archaeology*, 14(3), 191-213. doi:10.1080/14655187.2016.1191924
- Askew, Marc. (2010). The magic list of global status. UNESCO, World Heritage and the agendas of state state. In Sophia Labadi & Colin Logan (Eds.), *Heritage and Globalisation* (pp. 19-44). London: Routledge.

- Association of Critical Heritage Studies. (2017). Manifesto. Retrieved from <http://archanth.anu.edu.au/centre/centre-heritage-museum-studies/association-critical-heritage-studies>
- Bhaskar, Roy. (1986). *Scientific realism and human emancipation*. London: Verso.
- Bhaskar, Roy. (1989). *Reclaiming Reality. A Critical Introduction to Contemporary Philosophy*. London: Verso.
- Bhaskar, Roy. (2008[1978]). *A Realist Theory of Science*. London: Routledge.
- Bhaskar, Roy. (2010). Contexts of interdisciplinarity. Interdisciplinarity and climate change. In Roy Bhaskar, Cheryl Frank, Karl Georg Høyer, & Petter Næss (Eds.), *Interdisciplinarity and Climate Change: Transforming knowledge and practice for our global future* (pp. 1-24). London: Routledge.
- Bhaskar, Roy. (2012). *From Science to Emancipation. Alienation and the actuality of enlightenment* London: Routledge.
- Bhaskar, Roy. (2016). *Enlightened Common Sense. The Philosophy of Critical Realism*. London: Bhaskar.
- Bhaskar, Roy, & Danermark, Berth. (2006). Metatheory, Interdisciplinarity and Disability Research: A Critical Realist Perspective. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, 8(4), 278-297.
- Billig, Michael. (2008). The language of critical discourse analysis: the case of nominalization. *Discourse & Society*, 19(6), 783-800. doi:10.1177/0957926508095894
- Chouliaraki, Lilie, & Fairclough, Norman. (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Cleere, Henry (Ed.) (1989). *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Dicks, Bella. (2007). Book review. Laurajane Smith, *The Uses of Heritage*, London and New York: Routledge, 2006. *Museum and society*, 5(1), 58-59.
- Elder-Vass, Dave. (2008). Searching for realism, structure and agency in Actor Network Theory. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 59(3), 455-473.
- Enqvist, Johanna. (2014). The new heritage: A missing link between Finnish archaeology and contemporary society? *Fennoscandia archaeologica*, XXXI, 101-123.
- Fairclough, Norman. (2000). *New Labour, New Language?* London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, Norman. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, Norman. (2006). *Language and Globalization*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, Norman. (2008). The language of critical discourse analysis: reply to Michael Billig. *Discourse & Society*, 19(6), 811-819. doi:10.1177/0957926508095896
- Fairclough, Norman. (2010a). Critical discourse analysis in researching language in the new capitalism: overdetermination, transdisciplinarity and textual analysis. In Norman Fairclough (Ed.), *Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language* (Second ed., pp. 281-300). Harlow: Longman.
- Fairclough, Norman. (2010b). A dialectical-relational approach to critical discourse analysis in social research. In Norman Fairclough (Ed.), *Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language* (Second ed., pp. 230-254). Harlow: Longman.

- Fairclough, Norman, Jessop, Bob, & Sayer, Andrew. (2010). Critical realism and semiosis. In Norman Fairclough (Ed.), *Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language* (Second ed., pp. 202-222). Harlow: Longman.
- Feintuch, Burt. (2007). Book review. Uses of Heritage. Laurajane Smith. London: Routledge, 2006. *Museum Anthropology Review*, 1(2), 181-183.
- Gathercole, Peter , & Lowenthal, David (Eds.). (1994[1990]). *The Politics of the Past*. London: Routledge.
- Graham, Brian, Ashworth, G. J., & Tunbridge, J. E. (2000). *A geography of heritage : power, culture and economy*. London: Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, Christian M. I. M. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (Third ed.). London: Hodder Education.
- Harrison, Rodney. (2013). *Heritage. Critical Approaches*. London: Routledge.
- Hartwig, Mervyn. (2007). *Dictionary of Critical Realism*. London: Routledge.
- Harvey, David C. (2001). Heritage Pasts and Heritage Presents: temporality, meaning and the scope of heritage studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 7(4), 319-338. doi:10.1080/13581650120105534
- Högberg, Anders. (2012). The voice of the authorised heritage discourse. A critical analysis of signs at ancient monuments in Skåne, southern Sweden. *Current Swedish Archaeology*, 20, 131-167.
- Høyer, Karl Georg, & Næss, Petter. (2012). Introductory perspectives. In Roy Bhaskar, Karl Georg Høyer, & Petter Næss (Eds.), *Ecophilosophy in a World of Crisis. Critical realism and the Nordic contributions* (pp. 1-8). London: Routledge.
- Jessop, Bob. (2016). The symptomatology of crises. Some critical realist reflexions. In Petter Næss & Leigh Price (Eds.), *Crisis System. A critical realist and environmental critique of economics and the economy* (pp. 88-108). London: Routledge.
- Johansson, Marit. (2015). *Life in a World Heritage City. A case study of discussions and contested values in Angra do Heroismo, the Azores*. (PhD), Lindköping University, Lindköping.
- Larivière, Vincent, Gingras, Yves, & Archambault, Éric. (2009). The decline in the concentration of citations, 1900–2007. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 60(4), 858-862. doi:10.1002/asi.21011
- Latour, Bruno. (2005). *Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Layton, Robert (Ed.) (1989). *Who needs the Past? Indigenous Values and the Past*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Layton, Robert (Ed.) (1989). *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Lennon, Jane. (2007). Book review. Uses of heritage. Routledge, Oxford, 2006. . *Australian Archaeology*, 65, 58-60.
- Linkola, Hannu. (2015). Administration, Landscape and Authorized Heritage Discourse – Contextualising the Nationally Valuable Landscape Areas of Finland. *Landscape Research*, 40(8), 939-954. doi:10.1080/01426397.2015.1074988
- Ludwig, Carol. (2016). From bricks and mortar to social heritage: planning space for diversities in the AHD. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 22(10), 811-827. doi:10.1080/13527258.2016.1218909

- Machin, David. (2013). Introduction. What is multimodal critical discourse studies? *Critical Discourse Studies*, 10(4), 347-355.
- Machin, David, & Mayr, Andrea. (2012). *How To Do Critical Discourse Analysis. A Multimodal Introduction*. London: Sage Publications.
- Meskeel, Lynn. (2014). States of Conservation: Protection, Politics, and Pacting within UNESCO's World Heritage Committee. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 87(1), 217-243.
- Mongeon, Philippe, & Paul-Hus, Adèle. (2016). The journal coverage of Web of Science and Scopus: a comparative analysis. *Scientometrics*, 106(1), 213-228.
- Mydland, Leidulf, & Grahn, Wera. (2012). Identifying heritage values in local communities. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 18(6), 564-587. doi:10.1080/13527258.2011.619554
- Næss, Petter. (2012). Kritisk realisme og byplanforskning. *FORMakademisk*, 5(2), 1-17.
- Olsen, Bjørnar. (2010). In Defense of Things. Archaeology and the Ontology of Objects. Lanham, Md.: AltaMira Press.
- Parkinson, Arthur, Scott, Mark, & Redmond, Declan. (2015a). Competing discourses of built heritage: lay values in Irish conservation planning. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 1-13. doi:10.1080/13527258.2015.1121404
- Parkinson, Arthur, Scott, Mark, & Redmond, Declan. (2015b). Defining "Official" Built Heritage Discourses within the Irish Planning Framework: Insights from Conservation Planning as Social Practice. *European Planning Studies*, 1-20. doi:10.1080/09654313.2015.1077782
- Peck, Jamie, & Tickell, Adam. (2007). Conceptualizing Neoliberalism, Thinking Thatcherism. In Helga Leitner, Jamie Peck, & Eric S. Sheppard (Eds.), *Contesting Neoliberalism. Urban Frontiers*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Pendlebury, John. (2013). Conservation values, the authorised heritage discourse and the conservation-planning assemblage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 19(7), 709-727. doi:10.1080/13527258.2012.700282
- Pétursdóttir, Þóra. (2013). Concrete matters: Ruins of modernity and the things called heritage. *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 13(1), 31-53. doi:10.1177/1469605312456342
- Richardson, John E. (2007). *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach From Critical Discourse Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Shennan, Stephen J. (1989). *Archaeological approaches to cultural identity* (Vol. 10). London: Unwin Hyman.
- Smith, Laurajane. (2004). *Archaeological theory and the politics of cultural heritage*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, Laurajane. (2006). *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, Laurajane. (2012). Editorial. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 18(6), 533-540. doi:10.1080/13527258.2012.720794
- Smith, Laurajane, & Campbell, Gary. (2016). The Elephant in the Room: Heritage, Affect, and Emotion. In William S. Logan, Nic Craith Máiréad, & Ulrich Kockel (Eds.), *A Companion to Heritage Studies* (pp. 443-460). Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.
- Solli, Brit. (2011a). Reply to comments from Mats Burström, Ewa Domanska, Matt Edgeworth, Alfredo González-Ruibal, Cornelius Holtorf, Gavin Lucas, Terje

- Oestigaard, Laurajane Smith and Christopher Witmore. *Norwegian archaeological review*, 44, 78-88.
- Solli, Brit. (2011b). Some reflections on heritage and archaeology in the anthropocene. *Norwegian archaeological review*, 44, 40-54.
- Thrift, Nigel. (2003). Performance and..... *Environment and Planning A*, 35(11), 2019-2024. doi:10.1068/a3543a
- Ucko, Peter. (1987). *Academic Freedom and Apartheid: The Story of the World Archaeological Congress*. London: Duckworth.
- Ucko, Peter. (1994[1990]). Foreword. In Peter Gathercole & David Lowenthal (Eds.), *The Politics of the Past*. London: Routledge.
- Warren-Findley, Jannelle. (2007). Book review. Uses of heritage, Laurajane Smith. London and New York: Routledge, 2006. *Public History Review*, 14, 148-149.
- Waterton, Emma. (2010). *Politics, Policy and the Discourses of Heritage in Britain*: Palgrave Macmillan UK : Imprint: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Waterton, Emma, Smith, Laurajane, & Campbell, Gary. (2006). The Utility of Discourse Analysis to Heritage Studies: The Burra Charter and Social Inclusion. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 12(4), 339-355. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13527250600727000
- Waterton, Emma, & Watson, Steve. (2013). Framing theory: towards a critical imagination in heritage studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 19(6), 546-561. doi:10.1080/13527258.2013.779295
- Wetherell, Margaret. (2012). *Affect and Emotion. A New Social Science Understanding*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Winter, Tim. (2013). Clarifying the critical in critical heritage studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 19(6), 532-545. doi:10.1080/13527258.2012.720997
- Winter, Tim, & Waterton, Emma. (2013). Critical Heritage Studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 19(6), 529-531. doi:10.1080/13527258.2013.818572
- Witcomb, Andrea, & Buckley, Kristal. (2013). Engaging with the future of 'critical heritage studies': looking back in order to look forward. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 19(6), 562-578. doi:10.1080/13527258.2013.818570
- Witmore, Christopher. (2014). Archaeology and the New Materialisms. *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology*, 1(2), 203-246. doi:10.1558/jca.v1i2.16661
- Wodak, Ruth, & Meyer, Michael. (2009). Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory and Methodology. In Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 1-33). London: Sage Publications.
- Yan, Haiming. (2015). World Heritage as discourse: knowledge, discipline and dissonance in Fujian Tulou sites. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 21(1), 65-80. doi:10.1080/13527258.2014.894930
- Yeung, Henry Wai-chung. (1997). Critical realism and realist research in human geography: a method or a philosophy in search of a method? *Progress in Human Geography*, 21(1), 51-74.
- Zhu, Yujie. (2016). Heritage making in Lijiang. Governance, reconstruction and local Naxi life. In Christoph Brumann & David Berliner (Eds.), *World Heritage on the ground. Ethnographic perspectives* (pp. 78-96). London: Berghahn.

SAGE Journals template, article title [H1]

Author names [AU]

Abstract [ABKWH]

Abstract text [ABKW]: Apply the paragraph styles listed in the guidelines (Alt+Ctrl+Shift+5, to open the “Styles window”). The copy-editor and typesetter will particularly need to be clear about the following paragraph styles:

1. Heading levels [H1 to H4]
2. Quotes [OQ/opening quote and QS/quote source]
3. Extracts [EX]
4. Bulleted and numbered lists [BL and NL]