

This is an Accepted Manuscript of the following article:

Herdis Hølleland, Joar Skrede.

What's wrong with heritage experts? An interdisciplinary discussion of experts and expertise
in heritage studies

The article has been published in final form by Taylor & Francis in
International Journal of Heritage Studies on 04/12/2018,
available online:

<https://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/13527258.2018.1552613>

© 2018

It is recommended to use the published version for citation.

What's wrong with heritage experts? An interdisciplinary discussion of experts and expertise in heritage studies

The role of heritage experts has become a prominent topic in the heritage studies literature. Proclaiming that 'we are all heritage experts', one of the striking features of the interest in experts within heritage literature is the tendency to confine the discussion to the issue area of heritage, rather than situating it within the wider multidisciplinary discussion on the role of experts in modern democratic societies. Taking inspiration for the burgeoning multidisciplinary literature on experts, this paper is an attempt to theorise more fully the role of heritage experts in liberal democracies. This discussion leads to an acknowledgement that we are not all heritage experts in a narrow sense of the term. We need heritage experts, in the same way as we need other forms of expertise in modern societies characterised by division of labour. This implies expanding the emerging interest for 'studying up' and carrying out more research on the political dimension of heritage.

Keywords: heritage experts; expertise; non-experts; democratic involvement; liberal democracies; studying up

Introduction

The Oxford English Dictionary defines expert as 'a person who is very knowledgeable about or skilful in a particular area' (OED 2017). As most 21st century societies are characterised by division of labour, we are surrounded by and hugely reliant on experts: We depend on the various types of specialised knowledge experts hold, whether it is for personal medical purposes, for communal infrastructure creation or for policy development. Precisely because experts are in the possession of specialised or 'esoteric' knowledge, the power of experts has also been scrutinised: More precisely, scholars have questioned whether experts pose a threat or problem to liberal democracies (e.g. Turner 2001). Yet, despite their contentious position in modern democracies, scholars across the disciplines nonetheless argue that modern democracies need experts (e.g. Durkheim 1987[1893], Larson 1977, Abbott 1988, Giddens 1990, Shore and Wright 1997b, Turner 2001, Jasanoff 2003, Schudson 2006, Boswell 2009, Shore, Wright, and Però 2011, Kalleberg 2012, Holst and Molander 2017, Winch 2017). Arguing that 'we are all heritage experts', as Schofield (2014b) does, the emerging heritage

literature on experts therefore seems to lead us in rather different direction. Taken to its extreme, when arguing we are all heritage experts, we move down a slippery slope whose consequence is seemingly that we do not need experts or expertise (cf. Larson 1977, 31). We set out to examine this paradox by addressing what it is, if anything, that makes heritage experts so different that we do not need them, when modern societies elsewhere are crucially dependent on experts. Furthermore, by bringing the heritage literature into dialogue with the flourishing multidisciplinary interest for experts, the many different roles heritage experts and expertise plays can be further nuanced.

In terms of structure, we first address how the discussion of heritage experts has developed in tandem with, and been coloured by, how heritage itself is conceptualised. Structured around heritage as a singular issue area, the role and function of heritage experts in liberal democracies have not achieved a prominent position in the academic debate. Consequently, the aim of the second and third parts of this article is to bring forward a more overarching perspective on the expert by drawing on multidisciplinary discussions on the expert role and expertise. In the final part, we address how we might move forward by expanding the focus from democratising heritage, to exploring the role of heritage experts in 21st century liberal democracies. The latter implies expanding the emerging interest for ‘studying up’, that is to lift our gaze and further scrutinise the political and governance dimensions of heritage. As Laura Nader (1972, 292) succinctly pointed out, this is not a neither/nor situation; ‘studying up’ will eventually lead us to study down. In other words, ‘studying up’ is likely to provide us with new knowledge to identify and address barriers to laypersons’ democratic involvement with heritage.

The expert in heritage studies literature

The abundant references to experts and expertise, often used synonymously with professions and professionalism in heritage literature, highlight their importance in the field. However, while celebrated by some as, for example, the unsung heroes saving Britain’s heritage (Thurley 2013), experts more often hold a convoluted position within heritage studies as the binary other to various non-expert communities (e.g. Smith 2004, 2006, Schofield 2014b, 2015). This binary of experts/non-experts has developed alongside the debate on how to conceptualise what heritage is or should be. Over the last century, international charters and conventions have served as central catalysts for establishing and altering the notions of heritage and thereby have structured the field’s notions of expertise and what constitutes a heritage expert. For the most

part of the 20th century – from the 1931 Athens Charter, through ICOMOS’s 1964 Venice Charter, to UNESCO’s 1972 World Heritage Convention – heritage was firmly linked to the material remains of the past, be it monuments, buildings or archaeological sites (e.g. Choay 2001, Christensen 2011, Meskell 2018). Unsurprisingly, the expertise needed to pursue and implement these charters and conventions centred on the technical skills and scientific knowledge needed for material preservation and the conservation of archaeological sites and the built environment. As a result, heritage experts have to a large extent been drawn from disciplines such as archaeology, architecture and conservation, whose focus rests solidly on the material side of heritage.

However, during the last decades of the 20th century, professionals and scholars alike criticised the conceptual and managerial biases of heritage conservation (e.g. Ucko 1987, Byrne 1991, Cleere 2001, 2011, Smith 2004, 2006, Waterton, Smith, and Campbell 2006, Rao 2010, Harrison 2013). Instead of strictly focusing on tangible heritage, an interest in heritage as a social and political construct evolved. This shift has influenced the conceptualisation of experts. Starting with the former, Smith’s notion of the ‘Authorised Heritage Discourse’ (AHD) cannot be underestimated. Smith argues that the AHD 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, 4). Thus, the AHD is closely linked to heritage experts (Lixinski 2013). Helping unmask how international and national legislation and policy documents are far from neutral, but rather able to inculcate certain world-views at the expense of others (e.g. Smith 2004, Waterton, Smith, and Campbell 2006), the ‘objectivity’ of heritage has been challenged (Smith 2006). The latter can be seen as part of a move from a realist view of knowledge whereby it is increasingly recognised that scientific facts are partly constructed and negotiated by scientists, not simply found or discovered (e.g. Haraway 1988, Haas 1992, Latour and Woolgar 2013, Asdal 2015, Lewandowska 2017).¹ Thus, what we expect from a heritage expert of the 21st century *ought* to be different than that of the 20th (Lewandowska 2017, 2).

¹ This is basically a version of the classic realism/idealism debate. In an extreme version, realism would imply to assume that the world dictates the content of our knowledge, or, to reduce epistemology to ontology (Fairclough, Jessop, and Sayer 2010, 209). This has been referred to as committing an ‘ontic fallacy’. An extreme version of idealism, however, would imply to assume that the world is dependent on our knowledge of it, or, to reduce ontology to epistemology. This has been referred to as committing an ‘epistemic fallacy’ (Bhaskar 2012). Although we are arguing that we have ‘moved on’, that does not imply that one paradigm has fully replaced the other, and there may be elements of both realism and idealism in the social sciences and humanities. However, it may be reasonable to argue that many contributions in heritage studies come closer to idealism than realism, in as much as peoples’ right to define what counts as heritage is emphasised. This is particularly relevant in regard to the recent incorporation of non-representational theories in heritage studies.

The more realist view of the knowledge underscoring the international charters and conventions of the early to mid-20th century has increasingly been replaced by calls for more ‘people-centred approaches’ to heritage management and valuation. Jones (2017), for example, points at the Burra Charter (1979) and its many subsequent revisions as a key document in placing *social value* on an equal footing to historic, aesthetic and scientific value (Jones 2017, 23). More recently, this development has also triggered the launch of UNESCO’s (2003) ‘Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage’ and the Council of Europe’s (2005) ‘Framework convention on the value of cultural heritage for society’. These conventions shift focus from the materiality of the past, towards placing humans and their practices on the centre stage. Situating people at the centre of heritage has then formed an integral part of a ‘democratic turn’ in heritage studies. Using the phrase ‘dialogical democracy’, scholars take note of the encounters between experts and non-experts, and emphasis is placed on giving ‘non-experts’ the opportunity to partake in decision-making processes (Harrison 2013, 223-224, Lixinski 2013). Others have asserted that democratic involvement is a human right (e.g. Logan and Smith 2009, xii, Schofield 2015, 418, Logan 2012).

Nevertheless, one may draw parallels with Arnstein’s (1969, 216) observation in her discussion of citizen participation: The idea of people-centred approaches to heritage ‘is a little like eating spinach: no one is against it in principle because it is good for you’. While good in principle, moving from the idea to implementation is challenging: Good intentions may be compromised by realist or logical-positivist underpinnings of disciplines such as archaeology which serves as premise providers for the legislation and policies governing management (e.g. Smith 2004, 30). Moreover, they may be seen as empty gestures wherein participants become passive beneficiaries, and experts achieve, or re-establish, the position as the active subjects ‘making things happen’ and determine what is valuable heritage (Waterton, Smith, and Campbell 2006, 350, see also Arnstein 1969, Cooke and Kothari 2001, Smith 2004, 2006, 95-114, Kilty 2017 for discussions on similar challenges and pitfalls). Indeed, to borrow an argument from Bennett, experts raising the cultural and intellectual level of the population would not provide ‘any positive political value if the forms of participation remain passive’ (Bennett 1995, 105). The tensions exposed above, help contextualise Schofield’s arguments.

In the introduction to the anthology *Who needs experts?*, he argues in favour of a more inclusive heritage practice not restricted to an expert view as represented by an AHD. He puts forward three core principles: ‘1. Heritage is everywhere; 2. Heritage is for everyone; and that 3. We are all heritage experts’ (Schofield 2014a, 2). Schofield’s first point is that a narrow definition of heritage does not include the fact that people also ‘value the place they were born,

or a garden, or a street corner for some memory associated with it' (Schofield 2014a, 3). Schofield's second claim – that heritage is for everyone – is a normative statement that demonstrates the democratic conviction that is so common in heritage studies. In a similar fashion to the Faro Convention, he argues that every person has a right to engage with cultural heritage (Schofield 2014b, 6). By the third claim, that we are all experts, he reasons, for example, that people with strong ties to a place are experts (Schofield 2014b, 8). He refers to scholars arguing that the role of heritage experts – confined to the AHD – in the future should be to disseminate knowledge and skills to encourage and enable others to learn about, value and care for the historic environment (Schofield 2014b, 7-8). This statement implies that there are different forms of expertise that may cross-fertilise each other.

The aspiration to make heritage democratic and inclusive also resonates with the recent incorporation of the so-called non-representational theories (e.g. Thrift 2008) in heritage studies. Non-representational theories direct attention away from analyses of discourses like the AHD, and towards psychology and more emotional and embodied meaning-making (Tolia-Kelly, Waterton, and Watson 2017). This psychological move is argued to be 'released from conventional understandings of both heritage-as-objects and objects-as-representations' (Tolia-Kelly, Wateron, and Watson 2017, preface). Emphasis is put on peoples' right to feel and articulate heritage through feelings, without any expert telling them what to value. Thus, non-representational theories neatly fit the democratic ideals, since individual feelings are 'genuine'. No expert can say that our feelings are 'wrong' or 'false'. The psychological perspectives may also have inspired Schofield's (2015) separation between experts and non-experts: Drawing on Jungian ideal types like feeling-thinking and judging-perceiving, he argues that we may distinguish between 'thinking words' and 'feeling words' (Schofield 2015, 422-423). Schofield provides some examples of thinking-words he claims are less common in everyday usage: 'analyse', 'study', 'conclude', 'evaluate' and 'question'. These words he attributes heritage experts and practitioners as they are 'less well understood by the wider public' (Schofield 2015, 423). Thus, Schofield contends that heritage management should find better ways of listening to what the 'everyday experts' have to say, and accommodate these views in heritage practice and policy formation (Schofield 2014b, 1, 2015, 423) – which implies listening to laypersons' emotional responses to heritage.

Even if exceptions exist, such as Smith (2004), Waterton and Smith (2010) and (Barthel-Bouchier 2014), the heritage literature on experts is rather 'internal'. Thus, heritage studies' premise for discussing the role of experts departs from the more sociological literature dealing with professions and professionalism, which endeavours to explore and understand the role of

the expert in modern democratic societies (e.g. Larson 1977, Abbott 1988, Holst and Molander 2017). Considering the interest for ‘democratising heritage’, it is somewhat puzzling that not more attention has been given to the extensive multidisciplinary literature on experts and the relations and interactions between expert and non-expert communities. Whereas Schofield seems to suggest that the solution to democratising heritage is to rid it of its experts, researchers starting from the other point of departure acknowledge that democratic societies depend on division of labour, and that they are deeply reliant on experts and expert knowledge (Holst and Molander 2017, 237). This discrepancy makes it worthwhile to use the abundant multidisciplinary literature to further explore heritage experts and revisit the relationship between experts and non-experts.

Discussion

Thus far, we have argued that the portrait of experts in heritage studies is relatively internal in nature. Drawing further on the multidisciplinary literature on experts, this section will therefore critically assess the statement ‘we are all heritage experts’ and highlight some paradoxes and dilemmas that can be derived from this claim.

Are we all heritage experts?

Starting this discussion, we would like to address what the consequences of us all becoming heritage experts would be. One of the consequences of the argument ‘we are all heritage experts’ is that we are dissolving the very notion of experts. Taking Schofield’s claim seriously, there would be no demarcation criteria between experts and non-experts and it would therefore be difficult to distinguish between types of expertise (Holst and Molander 2017, 237). Furthermore, it would be difficult to engage in intellectual considerations of different forms of expertise and their potential roles in heritage management. Additionally, we run the risk of losing the basis for what may be considered validated knowledge: When our emotional engagement with heritage is considered more genuine, real and relevant, expert representations of heritage become derelict. This may challenge the field in several interrelated ways; there is a conjoined risk of devaluing professionals and exploiting volunteers (Fredheim 2018, 620). In times of austerity, volunteers willing to undertake projects for free may also undermine the will to pay professionals in the first place, and the reliance on volunteers can also prevent professionally qualified people from entering positions they are professionally trained for (Richardson 2017, 313). Taken further, this may rock with the very core of heritage as a field

of professionals and professions; as ‘only a knowledge system governed by abstractions can redefine its problems and tasks, defend them from interlopers, and seize new problems’ Abbott (1988, 9). Eventually, we would have nothing to teach students in, for example, archaeology at universities, nor would we push knowledge of the field forward (Kalleberg 2012, 48, see also González-Ruibal, González, and Criado-Boado 2018, 511). Taken to its extreme, this would set us on the path to professional suicide. It is important to note that this is not an argument that ‘certified’ heritage experts should not listen to non-experts or devalue and side-line local voices. However, insisting that we are all experts will not conduce the ‘co-creation’ called for in order to democratise heritage. Sociologist Kalleberg argues that the relation between experts and laypersons is relative; a person without expert knowledge of heritage may be an expert in other academic fields (Kalleberg 2012, 46). No one can be an expert in more than a rather narrow area (Giddens 1994, 95). We may, nevertheless, benefit from distinguishing between *contributory expertise* and *interactional expertise*. The former refers to the ability to contribute in a domain of expertise, whereas the latter refers to having enough competence within the given domain to be able to make sense of what experts are saying (Holst and Molander 2017, 238). If the expert is not using specialised technical terms or too much academic jargon, most laypersons would fit into the latter category.

Schofield is concerned with heritage experts’ way of communicating, calling for a great attention towards the words and language used. However, when exploring the language associated with the proclamation ‘we are all heritage experts’, the uneasiness of the statement come to the fore also among its proponents: There is still a tendency to distinguish between non-experts from heritage experts by using pronouns like ‘them’ when referring to the former group (Schofield 2015, 423). Somewhat paradoxically, this language consolidates the very same divide that many heritage scholars want to overcome. In Schofield’s case, the use of pronouns contributes to dividing society into seemingly homogenous groups, where ‘we’ – the experts – are separate from the ‘others’ (see Waterton and Smith 2010, 5, for an analogous argument). When Schofield argues that we are all experts, it may be read as a politically correct statement, as appeals to ‘grass roots’ are often reputed (Schudson 2006, 491). It has been argued that heritage experts’ ‘rhetoric of inclusion’ has been embraced since it makes the experts feel good about their work (Waterton and Smith 2010, 7-8). Nevertheless, attempts to dissolve distinctions between forms of expertise paradoxically demonstrate that we are *not* all heritage experts in a narrow sense of the term.

Within heritage studies, however, scholars tend to lean towards idealism and assert the right to participate in questions concerning heritage, without experts interfering in non-experts’

valuation processes. To paraphrase Kalleberg (2017, 97), there is a captious irony here that can be explicated as follows: What heritage experts implicitly are doing is to ask ‘what can and should heritage scholars do to develop more inclusive heritage practices’?. This is a normative question that permeates the democratic turn in heritage studies. All accounts that consider normative questions – independently of whether it is recognised or not – only serve to confirm the existence of moral expertise and the fact that values are involved in decision-making (Holst and Molander 2017, 239-240). Thus, many heritage scholars need to overcome their aversion towards normativity. Indeed, in everyday life, we do not normally doubt that some experts are better informed and better at pursuing normative arguments than others (Holst and Molander 2017, 241). Nor is the self-effacing statement ‘we are all heritage experts’ commonly seen in other disciplines. Undoubtedly, Schofield argues in favour of the knowledge and expertise of local users, but the logic of his proposal does not convincingly bring experts and non-experts any closer. It may be more useful to scrutinise the relation between experts and non-experts, rather than denying such a distinction. In prolongation of this argument, we should also raise our expectations towards heritage experts.

What should we expect from experts?

As there are good reasons to argue that we are not all heritage experts, we may instead ask: What should we expect from those who are or aspire to become heritage experts? While much of the discussion in heritage studies seemingly centres around removing heritage experts, upon a closer look it is also clear that it concerns renegotiating the role of heritage experts. Indeed, the critique of heritage experts and how they enact their expertise reflects Stover’s critique of a modern notion of expertise, where ‘the professional acts as a monopolistic gatekeeper to both resources and knowledge to create an impenetrable façade that few if any clients can overcome’ (Stover 2004, 227, for a similar argument, see also Larson 1977, 225). This is precisely what scholars have challenged and what has been addressed in new conventions and attempts at co-management alike (e.g. Green 2009, Logan 2013). The research does show, however, that while rhetoric may have changed, practice has perhaps to a lesser degree been altered. Thus, Stover’s call for a ‘postmodern’ notion of expertise may be useful to frame discussion and push heritage practice and research forward. According to Stover, this postmodern notion of expertise is developed ‘out of “social relations within which power is mediated and reproduced.”’ (Stover 2004, 277). As a result, the expert becomes a ‘reflective practitioner’ whose authority is

based on her[his] ability to demonstrate special knowledge through client interaction. The postmodern concept of expert should be thought of as a type of interaction rather than embedded in a person. Experts, in the postmodern framework, exist only because there is someone who has a particular kind of knowledge for which someone else has a need. (Stover 2004, 278)

This finds resonance in, for example, Jones' argument, wherein she acknowledges the need for expertise, but in a de-centred fashion where professionals and community participants interact (Jones 2017, 3). This would imply a shift from the tendency to do things *for* non-expert communities, to rather doing things *with* them (Waterton and Smith 2010, 7). In this sense, expertise becomes a form of co-creation that may turn out to be a better way of democratising heritage than pursuing Schofield's argument that we are all experts, which would imply doing away with experts altogether. After all, as Larson (1977, 31) argues '...where everyone can claim to be an expert, there is no expertise'.

However, if we accept the premise that we are not all heritage experts, and that heritage experts (in the narrow sense) have acquired some form of privileged position in heritage debates, we may ask: How can expert knowledge that contributes to making collective decisions be made as 'valid' as possible, without undermining democratic principles? (Holst and Molander 2017, 244). Several social scientists have addressed the intimate relationship between expertise and knowledge, noting that what counts as valid knowledge is legitimised in accordance with scientific norms.² A central issue to address is therefore how experts can become more accountable (e.g. Turner 2001, Jasanoff 2003, Schudson 2006, Boswell 2009, Holst and Molander 2017). This is to some extent ensured in the expert communities' own institutional arrangements for identifying, exposing and addressing tendencies of 'confirmation bias', that is, the phenomenon where you look for arguments that confirm own ideas. These include criticism from peers that (hopefully) detect fallacies and biases in experts' arguments. Indeed, collegial self-governance – experts holding experts accountable for their judgment – is the cardinal principle of professional autonomy (Holst and Molander 2017, 242-243, Schudson 2006, 499). Such arrangements are not institutionalised when it comes to considering individual

² However, as Barthel-Bouchier (2014, 102) points out 'this positive role has its negative counterpart, for the public frequently appears unimpressed with scientific expertise and is suspicious about those who use it to assert the superiority of their position'.

conceptions of heritage – and nor should they be, for that matter – but transferring heritage values to solely an individual emotional assessment may come at the expense of heritage as a communal value – which is central for human belonging and well-being.

Furthermore, although the Weber doctrine claimed that social science must be value-free, it nevertheless has to be value-relevant (Bhaskar 1998, 55). Because of the infinite variety of the empirical reality, we have to make a choice of what to study, and such a choice would be guided by what we find culturally significant (Bhaskar 1998, 55). Even though Schofield's (2014b, 3) argument that everything has the potential to be heritage is reasonable in an ordinary sense, cultural heritage management still has to be about something, not everything. Taylor's notion of the 'dark side of individualism' may be useful to situate this discussion in a wider societal context. The notion refers to a situation where people's broader vision is lost as they become 'focused on their own lives'. Centring on the self, Taylor argues, 'both flattens and narrow our lives', making us 'less concerned with others or society' (Taylor 1991, 4). However, Taylor also makes the point that our choices must be made against a horizon of important questions in order to be meaningful (Taylor 1991, 39). He claims that our individual selves are conditioned by something larger than ourselves – our collective heritage as social beings – in which our identities are given meaning. This implies that every individual's emotional experience cannot be a concern for cultural heritage management, which must instead focus on the collective heritage. Thus, we need some form of a shared heritage that people find relevant – in addition to the variety of individual evaluations and encounters with heritage. In order to identify meaningful collective horizons, we should expect heritage experts to take part in the process, sharing their knowledge and expertise with non-experts. Therefore, rather than doing away with experts, we should ask: What kinds of expertise are produced, for what purposes, and by what kinds of professionals? Answering these questions, one needs to more firmly build a tradition for fully 'studying up' and engaging with the political and bureaucratic sides of heritage. The two are part and parcel of liberal democracies, yet, somewhat counterintuitively, they have to a lesser extent been part of the 'democratic turn' in heritage studies. We believe moving the expert discussion in such a direction would be valuable.

From 'democratising heritage' to understanding the role of heritage experts in the 21st century's democracies

The previous discussion calls for further scrutinization of the role of experts within the field of heritage. A central feature of how experts have been framed in heritage studies is their uneasy position in 'democratising heritage'. The rationale for democratising heritage is based on

experiences drawn from ‘studying down’, that is, moving outside the realm of traditional professional experts to those with, for example, a particular connection to a given place. This has been hugely important: Studying down has provided much food for thought in terms of what counts as heritage, and who has the right to define, select and ‘own’ heritage. Yet, we may wonder whether this emphasis has contributed to a situation where heritage is treated as an area radically different from other policy areas. Thus, lifting the gaze and expanding the empirical focus somewhat, would therefore be desirable. Indeed, engaging more fully with how heritage experts and expertise functions in liberal democracies would potentially help expose why efforts to ‘democratise heritage’ are slow to materialise. Taking inspiration from Nader’s (1972) call to reinvent anthropology, the time has come for heritage studies to also ‘study up’. Nearly five decades on, anthropology has very much taken Nader’s call to heart, leading to flourishing subfields, such as the anthropology of policy and global organisations (e.g. Shore and Wright 1997b, a, Shore 2000, Boyer 2008, Schwegler 2008, Shore, Wright, and Però 2011, Niezen and Sapignoli 2017). We believe that fully exploring the realms of heritage politics, governance and bureaucracies will help us gain a better understanding of how different types of knowledge and expertise are integrated and utilised when heritage policies are created, as well as dissecting why intentions on paper are not realised.

Research on the World Heritage Committee has, for example, demonstrated the usefulness of ‘studying up’, exposing how heritage has become one of many bargaining items used when international relations are negotiated (e.g. Brumann 2014, Meskell 2015, Meskell et al. 2015, Bertacchini, Liuzza, and Meskell 2017, James and Winter 2017, Hølleland and Phelps 2018). Indeed, recent research shows that even when World Heritage sites clearly are threatened, be it because of civil unrest, war, infrastructural development or climate change, the actual conservation is increasingly secondary to handling international relations and national political economy (e.g. Maswood 2000, Aplin 2004, Meskell 2014, 2018, Hamman 2017, Hølleland, Hamman, and Phelps 2018). Unsurprisingly, this literature has therefore highlighted how shifts in the weighting of technical versus diplomatic expertise has been paramount for understanding the so-called ‘politicisation’ of the World Heritage Committee, whereby scientific evidence and standards are increasingly challenged and set aside (e.g. Maswood 2000, James and Winter 2017, Brumann 2017). What the literature clearly illustrates is the fact that heritage is not set apart from other issue areas. Rather, on the international scene heritage is part and parcel of foreign affairs. While there may not always be as clear-cut lines between different types of experts as on the international World Heritage arena, it is hardly surprising that one can identify different types of cognition, knowledge and interests among experts whose

work tangents heritage (Lewandowska 2017, 7). As of yet, however, we have a limited understanding of how different types of experts and expertise impact heritage as a policy area. Focusing attention towards Turner's (2001) two 'novel types of experts' provides further food for thought.

Turner's first type is the 'subsidised expert'. That is those 'subsidised to speak as experts and claim expertise in the hope that the views they advance will convince a wider public and thus impel them into some sort of political action or choice' (Turner 2001:133). Be it charitable organisations, interest groups or think tanks, these organisations are home to experts 'exerting influence (...) through the creation of public demands (...) persuading the public of the validity of the demands' (Turner 2001:134). Using the United States' oldest non-profit, grassroots environmental organization, the Sierra Club, as an example, Turner argues that the expertise these organisations claim is policy-oriented and pushed to the public with the help of subsidisers whose motivation for funding is typically concealed. Turner contrasts this type of expertise, which operates at the fringe of governments, to a second type of expertise, 'the public administration', operating within government. The latter represents 'individuals with discretionary power, usually in bureaucracies', whose actions can affect the public, yet whose actions are most commonly not a public concern (Turner 2001:136). These two groups of experts interact with each other, both make use of scientific knowledge, and draw on independent scientific experts or researchers to a varying degree (Tellmann 2017).

Emerging and fully materialising in the late 19th and 20th century, these types of experts are hardly novel; however, they enable us to start thinking about the role of heritage experts in policy development and political action in liberal democracies: Within the issue area of heritage, both types of experts can easily be identified (see e.g. Smith 2004, for examples from the US and Australia), and we ought to give them more attention in heritage research. Likewise, we should take into account that experts operating within and lobbying governments come in many forms and are bound by formal legislation and staff regulations, as well as operating within more informal networks, hierarchies and communities of practice (e.g. Shore 2000, Adler and Pouliot 2011, Shore, Wright, and Però 2011, Niklasson 2016, Brumann 2017, Hølleland and Johansson 2017, Meskell 2018). A key task is therefore to expose the relations between them and, moreover, address how heritage experts negotiate their role and balance professional, scientific and political concerns. This is particularly valuable to explore at a time when the political climate in, for example, Europe is in flux and heritage is activated politically (e.g. Gardner 2017, Bonacchi, Altaweel, and Krzyzanska 2018, González-Ruibal, González, and Criado-Boado 2018, Niklasson and Hølleland 2018, Pendlebury and Veldpaus 2018). This

provides an interesting environment to approach the relations between experts – whether they are civil servants, researchers or interest groups – and elected members of parliaments and governments: To what extent are the plethora of heritage experts and their knowledge used in policies with bearings on how heritage is conserved and managed? How do different heritage experts respond to politicians’ use of heritage? Not before we gain a clearer picture of how different forms of experts, expertise and elected officials work within the issue area of heritage, can we start to compare, contrast and understand the extent to which heritage really is as a particularly unique issue area compared to other policy fields and whether heritage experts are so different from other experts. While heritage practitioners probably need to identify new ways of retaining and sharing, for example, archaeological knowledge to gain public support in the future (Richardson 2017, 307), it is not a viable solution to get rid of experts. Rather than a ‘punk rejection’ of experts and (their) prevailing standards (Richardson 2017, 310), we need to start ‘studying up’ and scrutinise the politics of heritage, in addition to emphasising democratic heritage involvement.

Conclusion

Emerging from an interest in ‘thickening’ the description of heritage experts (cf. Jasanoff 2003), we have explored some of the paradoxes of Schofield’s forceful statement ‘we are all heritage experts’. Contrary to the tendency to resolve the expert problem by removing them altogether, we have argued that the solution is not to get rid of experts. In line with the growing multidisciplinary literature on experts, we note that experts are intrinsic parts of modern democratic societies. We really cannot manage without them and it is therefore perplexing that this is essentially what we do when arguing ‘we are all heritage experts’.

Pushing the discussion onwards, we believe that heritage scholars should become more self-critical about their own role as experts. It is important to note that this is not the same as experts having to excuse themselves towards non-experts. Experts should rather expose and explore their normative commitment to making heritage practices socially inclusive. We believe that more fully embracing the opportunities for ‘studying up’, conducting more empirical research on the making of national as well as international heritage politics, policies and legislation, will put us in a much better position to address the complexities involved in ‘democratising heritage’ than if we dismissed heritage experts.

Literature

- Abbott, Andrew. 1988. *The System of Professions. An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Adler, Emanuel, and Vincent Pouliot. 2011. *International practices*. Vol. 119, *Cambridge studies in international relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aplin, Graeme. 2004. "Kakadu National Park World Heritage Site: Deconstructing the Debate, 1997–2003." *Australian Geographical Studies* 42 (2):152-174. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8470.2004.00258.x.
- Arnstein, Sherry R. . 1969. "A ladder of citizen participation." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35 (4):216-224.
- Asdal, Kristin. 2015. "What is the issue? The transformative capacity of documents." *Distinktion: Journal of Social Theory* 16 (1):74-90. doi: 10.1080/1600910X.2015.1022194.
- Barthel-Bouchier, Diane. 2014. "Professionalism and its discontents." *The George Wright Forum* 31 (2):101-106.
- Bennett, Tony. 1995. *The birth of the museum : history, theory, politics, Culture : policies and politics*. London: Routledge.
- Bertacchini, Enrico, Claudia Liuzza, and Lynn Meskell. 2017. "Shifting the balance of power in the UNESCO World Heritage Committee: an empirical assessment." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 23 (3):331-351. doi: 10.1080/10286632.2015.1048243.
- Bhaskar, Roy. 1998. *The Possibility of Naturalism. A Philosophical Critique of the Contemporary Human Sciences*. Third ed. London: Routledge.
- Bhaskar, Roy. 2012. *From Science to Emancipation. Alienation and the actuality of enlightenment* London: Routledge.
- Bonacchi, Chiara, Mark Altaweel, and Marta Krzyzanska. 2018. "The heritage of Brexit: Roles of the past in the construction of political identities through social media." *Journal of Social Archaeology* 18 (2):174-192. doi: 10.1177/1469605318759713.
- Boswell, Christina. 2009. *The political uses of expert knowledge : immigration policy and social research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boyer, Dominic. 2008. "Thinking through the Anthropology of Experts " *Anthropology in Action* 15 (2):38-46.
- Brumann, Christoph. 2014. "Shifting tides of world-making in the UNESCO World Heritage Convention: cosmopolitanisms colliding." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37 (12):2176-2192. doi: 10.1080/01419870.2014.934261.
- Brumann, Christoph. 2017. "The best of the best: Positioning, measuring and sensing value in the UNESCO World Heritage Area." In *Palaces of hope. The anthropology of global organizations*, edited by Ronald Niezen and Maria Sapignoli, 245-265. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Byrne, Denis. 1991. "Western hegemony in archaeological heritage management." *History and Anthropology* 5 (2):269-276. doi: 10.1080/02757206.1991.9960815.
- Choay, Françoise. 2001. *The invention of the historic monument, Allégorie du patrimoine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Christensen, Arne Lie. 2011. *Kunsten å bevare : om kulturminnevern og fortidsinteresse i Norge*. Oslo: Pax.
- Cleere, Henry. 2001. "The uneasy bedfellows. Universality and cultural heritage." In *Destruction and Conservation of Cultural Property*, edited by R. Layton, P. G. Stone and J. Thomas. London: Routledge.
- Cleere, Henry. 2011. "The 1972 UNESCO World Heritage Convention." *Heritage & Society* 4 (2):173-186. doi: 10.1179/hso.2011.4.2.173.

- CoE. 2005. Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society. edited by Council of Europe: Council of Europe.
- Cooke, Bill, and Uma Kothari. 2001. *Participation. The new tyranny?* New York: Zed Books.
- Durkheim, Émile. 1987[1893]. *The Division of Labour in Society*. New York: Free Press.
- Fairclough, Norman, Bob Jessop, and Andrew Sayer. 2010. "Critical realism and semiosis." In *Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language*, edited by Norman Fairclough, 202-222. Harlow: Longman.
- Fredheim, L. Harald. 2018. "Endangerment-driven heritage volunteering: democratisation or 'Changeless Change'." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 24 (6):619-633. doi: 10.1080/13527258.2017.1399285.
- Gardner, Andrew. 2017. "Brexit, boundaries and imperial identities: A comparative view." *Journal of Social Archaeology* 17 (1):3-26. doi: 10.1177/1469605316686875.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- González-Ruibal, Alfredo, Pablo Alonso González, and Felipe Criado-Boado. 2018. "Against reactionary populism: towards a new public archaeology." *Antiquity* 92 (362):507-515. doi: 10.15184/aqy.2017.227.
- Green, Carina. 2009. "Managing Laponia: A World Heritage Site as Arena for Sami Ethno-Politics in Sweden." PhD, Uppsala University.
- Haas, Peter M. 1992. "Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination." *International Organization* 46 (1):1-35.
- Hamman, Evan. 2017. "The role of non-state actors in promoting compliance with the World Heritage Convention: An empirical study of Australia's Great Barrier Reef." PhD, Queensland University of Technology.
- Haraway, Donna. 1988. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." *Feminist Studies* 14 (3):575-599. doi: 10.2307/3178066.
- Harrison, Rodney. 2013. *Heritage. Critical Approaches*. London: Routledge.
- Holst, Cathrine, and Anders Molander. 2017. "Public deliberation and the fact of expertise: making experts accountable." *Social Epistemology* 31 (3):235-250. doi: 10.1080/02691728.2017.1317865.
- Hølleland, Herdis, Evan Hamman, and Jessica Phelps. 2018. "Naming, Shaming and Fire Alarms: The Compilation, Development and Use of the List of World Heritage in Danger." *Transnational Environmental Law* First view:1-23. doi: doi:10.1017/S2047102518000225.
- Hølleland, Herdis, and Marit Johansson. 2017. "'...to exercise in all loyalty, discretion and conscience': on insider research and the World Heritage Convention." *International Journal of Cultural Policy*:1-13. doi: 10.1080/10286632.2017.1301933.
- Hølleland, Herdis, and Jessica Phelps. 2018. "Becoming a conservation 'good power': Norway's early World Heritage history." *International Journal of Cultural Policy*:1-18. doi: 10.1080/10286632.2018.1431223.
- James, Luke, and Tim Winter. 2017. "Expertise and the making of World Heritage policy." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 23 (1):36-51. doi: 10.1080/10286632.2015.1035267.
- Jasanoff, Sheila. 2003. "(No?) Accounting for expertise." *Science and Public Policy* 30 (3):157-162. doi: 10.3152/147154303781780542.
- Jones, Siân. 2017. "Wrestling with the Social Value of Heritage: Problems, Dilemmas and Opportunities." *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage* 4 (1):21-37. doi: 10.1080/20518196.2016.1193996.

- Kalleberg, Ragnvald. 2017. "Question-Driven Sociology and Methodological Contextualism." In *Theory in Action. Theoretical Constructionism*, edited by Peter Sohlberg and Håkon Leiulfstrud, 89-107. Leiden: Haymarket Books.
- Kalleberg, Ragnvald. 2012. "Sociologists as Public Intellectuals and Experts." *Journal of Applied Social Science* 6 (1):43-52. doi: 10.1177/1936724411435747.
- Kelty, Christopher M. 2017. "Too Much Democracy in All the Wrong Places. Toward a Grammar of Participation." *Current Anthropology* 58 (Supplement 15):S77-S90.
- Larson, Magali Sarfatti. 1977. *The rise of professionalism : a sociological analysis*. Berkeley, Calif: University of California Press.
- Latour, Bruno, and Steve Woolgar. 2013. *Laboratory Life. The Construction of Scientific Facts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lewandowska, Kamila. 2017. "License to judge: fleshing out expertise in cultural policy." *International Journal of Cultural Policy*:1-13. doi: 10.1080/10286632.2017.1285288.
- Lixinski, Lucas. 2013. "International cultural heritage regimes, international law, and the politics of expertise." *Journal of Cultural Property* 20 (4):407-429.
- Logan, William. 2012. "Cultural diversity, cultural heritage and human rights: towards heritage management as human rights-based cultural practice." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 18 (3):231-244. doi: 10.1080/13527258.2011.637573.
- Logan, William. 2013. "Australia, Indigenous peoples and World Heritage from Kakadu to Cape York: State Party behaviour under the World Heritage Convention." *Journal of Social Archaeology* 13 (2):153-176. doi: 10.1177/1469605313476783.
- Logan, William S., and Laurajane Smith. 2009. "Series General Co-Editor' Foreword." In *Intangible Heritage*, edited by Laurajane Smith and Natsuko Akagawa, xii-xiii. London: Routledge.
- Maswood, S. Javed. 2000. "Kakadu and the Politics of World Heritage Listing." *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 54 (3):357-372. doi: 10.1080/713613526.
- Meskill, Lynn. 2014. "States of conservation: protection, politics, and pacting within UNESCO's world heritage committee." *Anthropological Quarterly* 87 (1):217-243.
- Meskill, Lynn. 2015. "Transacting UNESCO World Heritage: Gifts and Exchanges on a Global Stage." *Social Anthropology* 23 (1):3-21. doi: 10.1111/1469-8676.12100.
- Meskill, Lynn. 2018. *A Future in Ruins. UNESCO, World Heritage, and the Dream of Peace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meskill, Lynn, Claudia Liuzza, Enrico Bertacchini, and Donnatella Saccone. 2015. "Multilateralism and UNESCO World Heritage: Decision-making States Parties and Political Processes." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21 (5):423-440. doi: 10.1080/13527258.2014.945614.
- Nader, Laura. 1972. "Up the Anthropologist - Perspectives Gained from Studying Up." In *Reinventing Anthropology*, edited by Dell Hymes, 284-311. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Niezen, Ronald, and Maria Sapignoli. 2017. "Palaces of hope : the anthropology of global organizations." In *Cambridge Studies in Law and Society*: Cambridge University Press.
- Niklasson, Elisabeth. 2016. "Funding matters : archaeology and the political economy of the past in the EU." 66, Department of archaeology and classical studies, Stockholm University.
- Niklasson, Elisabeth, and Herdis Hølleland. 2018. "The Scandinavian far-right and the new politicisation of heritage." *Journal of Social Archaeology*:1469605318757340. doi: 10.1177/1469605318757340.
- OED. 2017. "Expert." accessed 20 April. <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/expert>.

- Pendlebury, John, and Loes Veldpaus. 2018. "Heritage and Brexit." *Planning Theory & Practice* 19 (3):448-453. doi: 10.1080/14649357.2018.1428337.
- Rao, Kishore. 2010. "A new paradigm for the identification, nomination and inscription of properties on the World Heritage List." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16 (3):161-172. doi: 10.1080/13527251003620594.
- Richardson, Lorna-Jane. 2017. "I'll give you 'punk archaeology', sunshine." *World Archaeology* 49 (3):306-317. doi: 10.1080/00438243.2017.1333036.
- Schofield, John. 2014a. "Heritage Expertise and the Everyday: Citizens and Authority in the Twenty-first Century." In *Who Needs Experts? Counter-mapping Cultural Heritage*, edited by John Schofield, 1-11. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate.
- Schofield, John. 2014b. *Who needs experts? : counter-mapping cultural heritage, Heritage, culture and identity*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Schofield, John. 2015. "'Thinkers and Feelers': A Psychological Perspective on Heritage and Society." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*, edited by Emma Waterton and Steve Watson, 417-425. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schudson, Michael. 2006. "The trouble with experts – and why democracies need them." *Renewal and Critique in Social Theory* 35 (5):491-506. doi: 10.1007/s11186-006-9012-y.
- Schwegler, Tara A. 2008. "Trading up: Reflections on power, collaboration, and ethnography in the anthropology of policy." *Anthropology in Action* 15 (2):10-25.
- Shore, Cris. 2000. *Building Europe : the cultural politics of European integration*. London: Routledge.
- Shore, Cris, and Susan Wright. 1997a. *Anthropology of policy : critical perspectives on governance and power, European Association of Social Anthropologists*. London: Routledge.
- Shore, Cris, and Susan Wright. 1997b. "Policy. A new field of anthropology." In *Anthropology of policy. Critical perspectives on governance*, edited by Cris Shore and Susan Wright, 3-38. New York: Routledge.
- Shore, Cris, Susan Wright, and Davide Però. 2011. *Policy worlds : anthropology and the analysis of contemporary power*. Vol. 14, *EASA series*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Smith, Laurajane. 2004. *Archaeological theory and the politics of cultural heritage*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, Laurajane. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge.
- Stover, Mark. 2004. "The Reference Librarian as Non-Expert: A Postmodern Approach to Expertise." *The Reference Librarian* 42 (87-88):273-300. doi: 10.1300/J120v42n87_10.
- Taylor, Charles. 1991. *The Ethics of Authenticity*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Tellmann, Silje Maria. 2017. "Bounded deliberation in public committees: the case of experts." *Critical Policy Studies* 11 (3):311-329. doi: 10.1080/19460171.2015.1111155.
- Thrift, Nigel. 2008. *Non-Representational Theory. Space, Politics, Affect*. London: Routledge.
- Thurley, Simon. 2013. *Men from the ministry : how Britain saved its heritage*. New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press.
- Tolia-Kelly, Divya P., Emma Waterton, and Steve Watson. 2017. "Preface. Heritage, Affect and Emotion." In *Heritage, Affect and Emotion. Politics, practices and infrastructures* edited by Divya P. Tolia-Kelly, Emma Waterton and Steve Watson. London: Routledge.
- Tolia-Kelly, Divya P., Emma Waterton, and Steve Watson. 2017. "Introduction. Heritage, Affect and Emotion." In *Heritage, Affect and Emotion. Politics, practices and*

- infrastructures*, edited by Divya P. Tolia-Kelly , Emma Waterton and Steve Watson, 1-11. London: Routledge.
- Turner, Stephen. 2001. "What is the Problem with Experts?" *Social Studies of Science* 31 (1):123-149. doi: 10.1177/030631201031001007.
- Ucko, Peter. 1987. *Academic Freedom and Apartheid: The Story of the World Archaeological Congress*. London: Duckworth.
- UNESCO. 2003. "Basic Texts of the 2003 Convention for the Sageguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage." UNESCO, accessed February 12, 2018.
https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/2003_Convention_Basic_Texts-2016_version-EN.pdf.
- Waterton, Emma, and Laurajane Smith. 2010. "The recognition and misrecognition of community heritage." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16 (1-2):4-15. doi: 10.1080/13527250903441671.
- Waterton, Emma, Laurajane Smith, and Gary Campbell. 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>.
- Winch, Christopher. 2017. "Professional Knowledge, Expertise and Perceptual Ability." *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 51 (3):673-688. doi: 10.1111/1467-9752.12257.