LOTTERY FUNDED

Intangible Heritage: Literature Review and Stakeholder Interviews
Report for HLF: March 2016

pomegranate

Sara Selwood 020 7735 8736 sara@pomegranateseeds. co.uk
Victoria Pirie 07545 984 375 victoria@pomegranateseeds. co. uk

"What should be done about our decaying heritage? What should we do with our overflowing archives and museum storerooms? How many more historic and commemorative sites can be supported? Can we accept the preoccupation for restoring places and spaces when the cultures that inhabit them are dying out; minority languages are being lost, stories and music are no longer being passed down from generation to generation?

In certain communities, heritage consciousness is still dominated by elites and expert concerns. Looked after by professionals and academics, what is the role of the public, except as passive spectators and witnesses to the decisions of others? Heritage is not simply about the past; it is vitally about the present and future. A heritage that is disjoined from ongoing life has limited value. Heritage involves continual creation and transformation. We can make heritage by adding new ideas to old ideas.

Heritage is never merely something to be conserved or protected, but rather to be modified and enhanced. Heritage atrophies in the absence of public involvement and public support. This is why heritage processes must move beyond the preoccupations of the experts in government ministries and the managers of public institutions, and include the different publics who inhabit our cities, towns and villages. Such a process is social and creative, and is underpinned by the values of individuals, institutions and societies.

We must continually recognise that objects and places are not, in themselves, what is important about cultural heritage. They are important because of the meanings and uses that people attach to them, and the values they represent. Such meanings, uses and values must be understood as part of the wider context of the cultural ecologies of our communities. "
(Robert Palmer (2009) Preface, in Council of Europe (2009) *Heritage and Beyond*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe)

Contents

Executive summary

It could be said that intangible heritage is the Cinderella of heritage. The stakeholders interviewed for this report suggested that there is considerable ambivalence towards, if not discomfort around, intangible heritage within the heritage sector. But, as the Heritage Lottery Fund's (HLF) recent research shows, it is *intangible* heritage that people most profoundly identify with and which carries the greatest meaning for them. This finding is not new, and was reflected over a decade ago in HLF's consultation with community leaders in preparation of its second strategic plan.

Many of the stakeholders interviewed for the present research welcomed HLF's serious consideration of intangible heritage as a way of opening up the discussion or "debate" about intangible heritage. HLF is perceived as well placed to raise the profile of intangible heritage and play a leading role in locating it centre stage within the discourses around developing policies related to culture, communities and place.

This was the context within which HLF commissioned Pomegranate to undertake a literature review and stakeholder consultation into the nature and impact of its support for intangible heritage across the UK, to inform HLF future strategic priorities. A parallel research project, undertaken by Museums Galleries Scotland, provides a review of the impact, lessons learned and challenges of intangible heritage projects that HLF has already supported.

The literature review considered the English-language academic and policy-related grey literature generated over the past decade. Its purpose was to identify what could be learned about the nature, extent, awareness and impact of intangible heritage work in the UK and elsewhere that might, potentially, inform the development of HLF's strategic priorities. The review also sought to draw out any specific observations about HLF's implicit attitudes to intangible heritage from a number of reports that it had recently commissioned.

Interviews were conducted with stakeholders drawn from government agencies, organisations and academics engaged in heritage, culture and communities in England, Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales. As such, they drew on views and perspectives of policy makers and practitioners across all HLF's heritage sectors. A significant aspect of HLF's engagement with intangible heritage is that it crosses both the historic and natural environment.

The literature review and stakeholder interviews highlighted seven issues:

1. questions of definition;

2. questions of time;

3. the language used to define and discuss intangible heritage;

4. the relationship between intangible and tangible heritage;

5. the politics of intangible heritage;

6. risks to intangible heritage; and

7. safeguarding.

Several stakeholders suggested that questions of definition have a tendency to dominate discussions about intangible heritage, and can lead to "analysis paralysis". However, they were in little doubt that that HLF should be asked if it was willing to challenge conventional ideas about heritage and address its current description on intangible heritage, by acknowledging "that intangible heritage is not necessarily the same as oral history" or memory. They clearly perceived the intangible as giving meaning to both the tangible, and to peoples' experiences of heritage more generally. Four potential definitions emerged from their reflections - namely that intangible heritage is

1. anything that is not physical or material heritage is intangible heritage - "you can't touch it".

2. about the ordinary, the everyday and family. It may not be grand or spectacular.

3. living heritage (or living culture). As such it is identified and defined by communities and embodied in individual and community skills, knowledge and understanding. It comprises forms of heritage that are practiced, transmitted, shared and passed on across generations. It is, therefore, contemporary and open to change.

4. as defined by UNESCO (2003). According to this, specific areas of cultural heritage are referenced within contexts of cultural diversity, sustainable development, human rights, cultural heritage generally and safeguarding. These include "oral traditions and language; performing arts; social practices, rituals and festive events, knowledge and practice concerning nature and the universe" and "traditional craftsmanship". UNESCO (2003: 1 and 2)

Discussions of these definitions raise questions of time, language and politics. The issue at the heart of all the potential definitions is whose 'voice' is heard and who is making decisions about heritage, and on what basis. It follows, that the role of heritage professionals, in particular, in determining what is heritage and heritage priorities was questioned.

Stakeholders identified a number of potential future priorities for HLF in relation to intangible heritage, including:

• producing a clearer working definition of intangible heritage and objectives for it;

• adopting a more challenging approach to heritage;

• focusing more specifically on "peoples' history" and "the everyday";

• advocating for intangible heritage;

• providing more funding for intangible heritage; and

- being more insistent about the legacy of its intangible heritage funding.

The six recommendations made below derive from our analysis of the stakeholders' positive views about the contribution HLF can make to the UK's intangible heritage, not least in relation to current opportunities for engaging with policy agendas around place. HLF should:

1 Consider its current approach to defining (or, preferring not to define) heritage and take a strategic view as to whether this advantages or disadvantages intangible heritage, not least in relation to tangible heritage.

2 Revise its current definition and description of intangible heritage as Cultures and Memories, in consideration of the possibilities identified above.

3 Strategise what role it assigns to (a potentially redefined) intangible heritage in relation to tangible heritage and, therefore, to the majority of its funding programmes, funded projects and operation and their likely impact.

- Assess what resources will be required to embed intangible heritage conspicuously across the full range of its operations, provide support for that in terms of staffing, training and development needs, not least in relation to a comprehensive

- understanding of intangible heritage;

- support for funding applicants

- its ability to assess and monitor projects; and

- advocacy.

4 Identify a critical role for itself as regards advocating for intangible heritage within the heritage sector, the wider cultural sector and beyond, and building on the roles and expectations of other organisations and bodies.

5 Develop a communication plan around intangible heritage, based on a set of clear messages to communities, the wider heritage and culture sectors, and the government's in each nation.

1 Introduction

Pomegranate was commissioned by the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) to undertake a literature review and stakeholder consultation into the nature and impact of its support for intangible heritage across the UK, and to inform HLF future strategic priorities. The research reviews the extent to which organisations and researchers are practicing and writing about intangible heritage in the UK, and their awareness and impact of HLF's funding of intangible heritage. A parallel project by Museums Galleries Scotland provides a review of the impact, lessons learned and challenges of HLF-supported intangible heritage projects.

1. 1 Context

In a world in which tangible heritage currently constitutes the main focus of the UK's heritage policy and funding, HLF is regarded as the UK's principle player in the protection and promotion of the intangible heritage (HoC, 2012: Column 381W). It funds Intangible heritage for a variety of reasons, not least

> "... because it fills gaps, secures history at risk, contributes to a sense of identity, maintains cultural diversity in relation to globalisation, helps intercultural dialogue, can have direct and indirect economic benefit, supports transmission of skills, challenges stereotypes and enlivens other activities including within the mainstream heritage institutions" (HLF, 2014: 7).

The RSA and HLF's *Heritage Index* (Schifferes 2015) recently revealed some of intangible heritage's contributions to local, regional and national identify in England, Scotland and Wales as listed in available databases. The Index refers to businesses that have been operating for at least 75 years; places with European protected food and drink designations, and blue plaques for famous sons & daughters, and the findings of an emerging cultural events index (Schifferes, 2015: 22-23). Across the UK, other current high-profile intangible heritage projects include the *ICH Scotland* wiki[1], managed by Museums Galleries Scotland, and the British Library's *Save our Sounds* [2], funded by HLF.

But, intangible heritage is the Cinderella of heritage. It has been suggested that there is considerable ambivalence, if not discomfort, towards intangible heritage (Deacon, cited in HLF, 2014; Smith & Waterston, 2009: 300) and, yet, it is increasingly regarded as a panacea for many social ills. As such, it carries the burden of issues such as diversity and is broadly credited with contributing positively to individuals and communities' well-being, to the quality of our economic, cultural and social lives, and as a driver of tourism and place development.

However, in this context there is, for example, scant reference to intangible heritage in the recently published DCMS Culture White Paper (2016: 13 and 30 refers to tradition) despite an emphasis on the importance of place and community. In Wales, the government has set up *Fusion: Tackling Poverty through Culture*[3] to increase the use and role of heritage and arts in community well-being.

[1] http://www. ichscotland. org
[2] http://www. bl. uk/projects/save-our-sounds
[3] http://gov. wales/topics/cultureandsport/tackling-poverty-through-culture/?lang=en

But, not all aspects of intangible heritage are viewed quite so positively and decisions about what intangible heritage comprises and how it might be interpreted are contested (Northern Ireland Assembly, 2011). Indeed, some stakeholder interviewees for this research even question whether intangible heritage requires support (see 3.1.8: 46).

1. 2 Purpose
The purpose of the research was to generate an understanding of:

- the extent to which organisations and researchers are practicing and writing about intangible heritage in the UK;

- the perceived impacts of HLF's funding of intangible heritage;

- research findings that can be used to raise awareness and stimulate new projects that incorporate, or focus on, intangible heritage, and

- information needed to make decisions about future HLF strategic priorities with regards to intangible heritage.

1. 3 Definitions
Given the UK's non-ratification of the UNESCO "Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage" [4], no single or official definition applies.

HLF's website refers to intangible heritage as Culture and Memories described as,

> "Our cultural traditions, local dialects and family histories all make us who we are. They are as much part of our heritage as archaeology, historic buildings or natural landscapes. Projects that delve into our diverse cultures and memories can bring people closer together, help them discover each other's heritage and create a sense of local pride. From the origins of the Kathakali Asian dance tradition to the experiences of Gypsy and Traveller communities; we want to help document everyone's history. "

The various uses to which funding awarded under that category are outlined, including enabling recipients to:

- explore the use, meaning and historical context of language, and the history of family and place names

- trace origins of proverbs and sayings

- record accounts of traditional farming methods, and ordinary peoples' memories (thereby giving them a voice)

- reveal the history of care for people with disabilities

- help people understand the social and historical context of art forms

such as dance, music and film; and learn about local traditions and crafts and the skills needed to preserve them

- enable them to bring people from different backgrounds together to learn about their rich histories, faiths and customs, as well as share them with new audiences. " [5]

The range of views on definitions is explored in Part 2 Literature review, Part 3 Stakeholder interviews, and Part 4 Conclusions of this report. To enable these views to be clearly identified and differentiated from the general text of this report and to avoid pre-empting the discussion of definitions, the terms "intangible" in the general text refers to all non-physical or material aspects of heritage, and "tangible" refers to all physical and material aspects of culture.

[4] http://www. unesco. org/culture/ich/en/convention
[5] http://www. hlf. org. uk/looking-funding/what-we-fund/cultures-and-memories

1. 4 Methodology

1. 4. 1 Literature review

This was a desk-based, online review of the grey and academic literature relevant to intangible heritage in the UK over the past 10 years. The purpose was to identify what can be learned about the nature; extent, awareness and impact of intangible heritage work in the UK that might, potentially, inform the development of HLF's strategic priorities. In addition, the review sought to draw out any specific findings about intangible heritage from a number of recently commissioned HLF research reports.

A document review template (Appendix 1) was used to filter for the inclusion of intangible heritage in the sources referred to, and to identify

- types of heritage discussed;

- definitions of intangible heritage;

- themes associated with intangible heritage, including diversity, digital and community;

- management;

- practices, and

- outcomes.

This enabled arguments to be followed across the literature reviewed, which contributed to the shape of the narrative of the report.

1. 4. 2 Literature sources

A long list of potential sources were identified through HLF's work, existing bibliographies, including, for example, the *ICH-related research: a working bibliography* [6] and databases, including Google Scholar; EThOS (British Library e-Thesis Online Service). Other sources were sought from AHRC (Arts and Humanities Research Council), relevant government agencies and organisations' websites. More were added as a result of the Stakeholder Interviews.

Around 60 sources were agreed with the HLF as the basis of the Literature Review. These were primarily concerned with intangible heritage in relation to the themes included in HLF's brief, including:

- community participation;

- diverse communities;

- environmental impacts;

- greater public engagement;

---

[6] http://www. ichngoforum. org/wp-content/uploads/ICH-Bibliography-oct-2014. pdf

- hidden heritage;

- inter-generational heritage;

- participatory heritage;

- place-based heritage;

- public policy;

- resilient places;

- safeguarding intangible heritage; and

- social cohesion, and the relationship of intangible heritage to the HLF's various heritage types.

While much of the academic literature on intangible heritage is not geographically specific, particular efforts were made to ensure that the selection of sources included coverage of the UK nations.

1. 4. 3 Stakeholder interviews

A long list of potential interviewees was developed from a web search across government agencies and organisations engaged in heritage across the UK and from a list provided by HLF. Individuals and organisations were mapped against a matrix that included:

- gender;

- social and/or cultural representation;

- geography;

- strategy/policy maker;

- academic, and

- HLF's broadly drawn heritage categories:

- buildings & monuments;

- community heritage;

- cultures and memories;

- industrial and maritime;

- land & natural resources; and

- museums, libraries and archives.

A short list of 30 interviewees (plus reserves) was identified and agreed with HLF. The selection was based on a desire to represent a range of perspectives, views across the range of interests and across the UK nations (Appendix 3).

HLF introduced the researchers to prospective interviewees, detailing the purpose of the research, themes to be explored and request to interview. Participating interviewees were provided with a list of standard questions, in advance of the interview. All interviews were confidential, and they focused on interviewees':

- understanding of intangible heritage and views on its importance, or otherwise;

- knowledge of good practice or otherwise linked to intangible heritage within and beyond the UK;

- perceptions of HLF and others' support of intangible heritage to date;

- considerations of the needs of communities, decision makers, the heritage and cultural sectors in relation to intangible heritage; and

- thoughts about HLF's support for intangible heritage in the future.

The interview topic guide is available at Appendix 2.

2. Literature review

This literature review is presented in three sections:

2. 1   provides an overview of the academic literature published in English, over the past decade.

2. 2   outlines the issues around intangible heritage raised in the grey literature pertaining to the UK - England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, and

2. 3   considers the treatment of intangible heritage within various publications commissioned, or written, by, HLF.

While the literature was gathered under the headings set out section 1, the review has been organised according to a narrative suggested by the literature itself. It covers a wide range of issues and addresses intangible heritage from generic, as well, as specific perspectives. A number of academic disciplines and professional interests are involved:

"ICH [Intangible Cultural Heritage] is a complex concept that has given rise to almost a decade of strong debates and profound reflection. In the last few years, it has been gaining a wider acceptance not only in the academic field, but also at the community level, with the growing participation of local practitioners and stakeholders, as well as NGOs and community-based organizations (CBOs). Anthropologists and other social scientists from all around the world were a fundamental force in its definition, mainly because ICH includes phenomena that have been traditionally addressed by anthropological research but that are now acquiring new meanings, or are being examined from innovative perspectives" (Amescua, 2013).

Other protagonists mentioned in the literature include: "community tourism planners and policy makers, industry operators/suppliers dependent on local cultural tourism products, and consumers of local intangible culture who seek unique cultural experiences."(George, 2007). The inclusion of other groups is rather less certain. Harmon et al (2014) for example, have posed the question, whether disabled dance is a part of our 'cultural heritage'?

Even within the remit of the headings determined by HLF's brief, a considerable range of concerns presented themselves. Implicit to this study is a separation between the grey and academic literature. Some areas of intangible heritage, such as folklore, as Widdowson (2010) suggested, have struggled to establish themselves in the higher education sector in England.

2. 1 The academic literature
2. 1. 1 Definitional issues
It's been suggested that since the 2003 Convention, which officially acknowledged an interest in intangible heritage, new questions are coming to the fore regarding cultural assumptions of what constitutes heritage and how it should be preserved (Conan, 2009).

One of the ways in which intangible heritage is defined is in relation of tangible heritage. Andrews et al (2006) usefully brought together some of the issues raised at a conference on the tangible-intangible dichotomy:

Having argued that all "heritage is intangible", Smith outlined that, what she referred to as "the Authorised Heritage Discourse, obfuscates what heritage

actually does in our society. It sees heritage as the actual 'thing' (monument, artefact, building) - as opposed to the values and meanings we ascribe to objects, acts and events"(Smith cited by Andrews et al, 2006: 126). But,

> ".... If all heritage is really represented by the values and cultural meanings that we give not only to tangible sites and places, but also to intangible events, performances and so forth - then ultimately what we preserve in the conservation and management processes are cultural and social values and narratives. For us, heritage is something that is done at sites and places, or in intangible events and performances - the moment of heritage is a moment when cultural, social and political values and meanings are recognised, scrutinised, accepted, reworked or otherwise negotiated. (Smith & Waterton, 2009: 300)

Carman (also cited by Andrews et al, 2006: 126) completely reinforces this, by suggesting that "heritage" status is only ascribed to things as a result of the ideas and memories that we have about them and the symbolic values that we attach to them.

As these arguments imply, heritage professionals are much criticised in the literature. Koerner & Singleton (cited by Andrews et al, 2006: 125) for example, observe that the 'Authorised Heritage Discourse' has been dominated by Western theories related to "expert knowledge and accountability". Waterston (cited by Andrews et al, 2006: 126) regards this is largely responsible for the lack of Western nations ratifying the 2003 convention.

2. 1. 2 History
Much that might be described as history is included in the intangible heritage literature. *The Stories of English* (2004) by the linguist, David Crystal, for example, is concerned with dialects and "non-standard" varieties of English.

His later examination, "What is Standard English" (2008) focuses on the evolution of the language, the fact that it is splitting and converging, with the result that local variants are becoming less mutually comprehensible within the rise of what he refers to as World Standard Spoken or International English exemplified by tourist cultures. Both publications are concerned with language as an immanent process, studied for its own sake, and not concerned with its preservation as a form of intangible heritage. By the same token, HLF is working in partnership with AHRC, which is funding universities and research organisations to support community groups and small heritage organisations to develop and deliver First World War projects[7]. However, many of these are primarily history projects. They draw on oral histories, and employ an approach that *History Workshop Online* (HWO) describes as promoting

> "... 'history from below': history envisioned from the perspective of ordinary people rather than elites. To that end, it sought to move the study of the past beyond the academy into public gatherings – "workshops" – that were open to anyone. The aim was to turn historical research and writing into (as founder Raphael Samuel put it) 'a collaborative enterprise' that could be used to support activism and social justice, and inform politics. HWJ *[History Workshop Journal]*

[7] ahrc research on funded themes and programmes world war one and its legacy/

emerged from this movement to become one of the most prestigious academic history journals in the world, while still maintaining its commitment to social and cultural history 'from below'."

2. 1. 3 Management and disputed values

Smith & Waterton (2009) cited above, defined heritage as happening when "cultural, social and political values and meanings are recognised, scrutinised, accepted, reworked or otherwise negotiated. "Clearly, much depends on who is doing the recognising and negotiating. As already implied, much of what we understand as intangible heritage is determined by administrative, or management interventions, as distinct from indigenous cultural practices. Indeed, Nichols (cited by Andrews et al, 2006: 127) argues that the intervention of heritage managers and other enthusiasts, seeking to revive and sustain cultural practices, often reflects those interventionists' values, as distinct from those of their original creators.

Some authors suggest that heritage professionals could do better.

Ardouin, for example, proposed that curators would make it possible for both staff and stakeholders to enjoy "a richer, more nuanced relationship" with objects if they united intangible heritage and tangible heritage (cited by Andrews et al, 2006: 125). Alivizatou (2006) proposed that intangible heritage could contribute to the concept of the "post-museum" - a reinvented museum that includes "elements of living culture in the fields of collecting and making exhibitions". Gorman (2007) thought that if libraries worked with a variety of cultural institutions, they might better preserve and transmit "the human record. " For Harrison (2012) it was a matter of

> "fundamental questions about the nature, value, and efficacy of museum collections in a postcolonial world, and the entangled agencies of those who have made, traded, received, collected, curated, worked with, researched, viewed, and experienced them in the past and present. "

In general, there has been a tendency to acknowledge that communities should play a role in identifying the value of their own intangible heritage, as well as its management and protection (Deacon & Smeats, 2013). Communities' use of digital media was said to be challenging institutions authority. Digital media is also presenting organisations with new opportunities to build closer links with them. Solanilla (2008) for instance, refers to this enabling as a shift from "traditional museographical discourse, based on the exhibition of objects, accompanied by text and graphic explanations", to a "cybermuseographical discourse in which new narratives are created that combine a range of elements: hypertexts, images, audio, video, animations etc." She sees the internet as a "rich territory" for the conservation and dissemination of supporting information about heritage. In this context "life stories and similar personal accounts and reminiscences can be considered a significant category of the intangible cultural heritage"(Solanilla,2008:114).

Other writers have suggested that it's not so much the life stories that constitute the intangible heritage, but the "socio-visual practices themselves". Freeman's 2010 account of Australian heritage institutions using Flickr to engage communities creates a social and cultural network generated around personal photographic practices.

But, while the rhetoric, posits that "heritage value and authenticity" has been handed to communities, many contributions to the academic literature argue that this remains "in the hands of experts rather than communities." Diversity, for instance, is thought of as a particular tenet of intangible heritage. But, Albro (2005: 251) prompted by the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Diversity of Cultural Contents and Artistic Expressions, argues that it has simply served to empower "a new bureaucracy of cultural workers". In their hands, it, too, "…becomes transformed into a regulated sphere of activity".

Such themes are particularly prevalent in the literature on safeguarding.

2. 1. 4 Safeguarding

Much of the literature focused on safeguarding, and written during the past five years, has been in response to the UNESCO *Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage,* 2003. This for example, largely dominates the agenda of the ICH-Researchers Forum, whose first meeting in 2012 was sponsored by UNESCO[8]. Contributions identify a number of issues related to the safeguarding of intangible heritage, including the importance of documentation (Ohnuki, 2012) the need to emphasise communities' own participation, consent and stewardship (Deacon & Bortolotto, 2012, and their intellectual property rights (Arantes, 2012). As might be expected, the UK literature includes special pleading for the Government to ratify the Convention. In the case of Howell (2013) this is about protecting Welsh intangible heritage in particular.

The academic literature inevitably includes a number of criticisms of what are perceived as the Convention's shortcomings. Lenzerini, (2011) for example, argues for the concomitant application of international human rights law alongside the Convention. Given the current UK government's plan to overturn the UK Human Rights Act[9], it is unclear what the implications might be for intangible heritage whether or not the Convention is ratified.

Much of the literature is concerned with communities' role in the safeguarding and practice of intangible heritage. The ICH-Researchers Forum touches on a number of tensions around this posed by the "management" of intangible heritage. These include "the construction of notions of 'community', 'identity' and 'authenticity'" (Deacon & Bortolotto, 2012) and of cultural heritage as a function of politics and power (Kuutma, 2012).

While these sources represent generic concerns, the literature is replete with examples of pragmatic, if not parochial, references. Take, for example, the question of representation: given the heterogeneity of rural England, Smith (2009) for example, wondered how many community groups a single museum wishing to contribute to the preservation of intangible heritage might be able to work with, and what that implies. This implies a whole host of questions about what should be safeguarded and why? Should the intrinsic, historic value of a form of intangible heritage be prioritised over the instrumental value of contemporary practice?

[8] The Forum was brought together "to build a virtuous cycle mechanism in which researchers exchange views focusing on the UNESCO, 2003 Convention and reflect their findings obtained through cutting-edge research in the practice of the Convention, while obtaining research seeds from the practice of the Convention. In order to achieve this, the Forum of ICH Researchers was organized and held its first meeting on June 3, 2012 in Paris". See http://www.irci.jp/assets/files/2012_ICH_Forum.pdf
[9] http://www.theguardian.com/law/2015/dec/02/plan-to-scrap-human-rights-act-delayed-again

2. 1. 5 Values

Over 15 years ago, for example, Prott observed that it was the preservation of "social processes", rather than the items produced that was necessary "to ensure the continued creation of these valued products" (Prott, 1999: n. p.) He argued that it was these - vital to various forms of intangible heritage - that were being "interfered with by other social processes" such as globalization, tourism and commodification. This reflection suggests an obvious comparison with wildlife conservationists arguing that the environment requires protection in order to ensure the survival of indigenous species.

Various contributors to the literature regard tourism as one such threat.

UNESCO's *Lists of Intangible Cultural Heritage and Register of Best Safeguarding Practices* include, for example, the Patum of Berga[10]. This is a popular festival whose origin can be traced to medieval festivities and parades celebrating Corpus Christi. While its survival seems ensured, UNESCO considers that "strong" urban and tourist developments might [however] lead to a loss of its value. For Smith & Waterton, the UK's failure to acknowledge the legitimacy of intangible heritage means that its management "inevitably becomes a process that simply engages cultural stasis and status". (Smith & Waterton (2009: 302). This hinges around the notion of "authenticity". Lovell (2013) explored how tourists and tourism managers in a number of English historic cities perceived staged authenticity. She compared their responses to the more affective, softer, intuitive original heritage city, where they experienced personal authenticity; with the restored and recreated city, which could "create a placebo heritage effect". Gu & Wang (2008) were similarly interested in evaluating research into the "exploitation value of the intangible culture heritage resource."

Such experiences are implicated in the instrumentalism attached to the positive promotion of intangible heritage by British funding agencies, not least in the sense of Wen yam's (2010) description of "the protection and tourism development of intangible cultural heritage" as being conceived as "a kind of organic interconnection…an interaction of culture and economy. "

UNESCO's listings are, arguably, neutral. It lists Catalonian Castells[11], for example - human towers built by amateurs, usually as part of annual festivities. The "castellers" stand on each other's shoulders, reaching up to between six and ten levels. The three uppermost levels of the tower comprise young children, whose involvement appears not to be subject to health and safety concerns[12]. Another listing involves rituals focused on children's sexual identification: the Ugandan cleansing ceremony, for instance, is a healing ritual for the male-child "believed to have lost his manhood"[13]. As these suggest, the safeguarding of such intangible heritage practices may not be necessarily acceptable to Western (and other) liberal sensibilities. Maghadam & Bagheritari (2005) for example, explored the need for attention to the human rights of women in relation to implementing the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* and the *Universal Declaration of Cultural Diversity*. Their concern was around the inclusion of particular "social practices and rituals". Infractions of these within the Arab World were explicitly addressed by Tohmé-Tabet (2001).

---

[10] Inscribed in 2008 on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (originally proclaimed in 2005)
[11] Inscribed in 2010 on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity
[12] http://www. unesco. org/culture/ich/en/lists?RL=00364
[13] Inscribed in 2014 on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding

While much management of intangible heritage is motivated by the distribution of social justice, several writers have argued that communities who should theoretically benefit from heritage professionals' attempts to safeguard intangible heritage are, in fact, being effectively dispossessed and disempowered by its appropriation. Brown (2003) had already established native communities' resistance to what some denounce as "cultural theft".

Much of the literature we examined, considered the problematic role of heritage professionals in this:

> "…the condition of intangible heritage is generally treated with a combination of social institutions (intangible heritage councils, committees, commissions, networks, foundations, etc.) and expressive genres (intangible heritage lists, festivals, workshops, competitions, prizes, documentaries, promotional materials, etc.) with the former administering the latter in practices that are jointly termed safeguarding. When successful, safeguarding (1) reforms the relationship of subjects with their own practices (through sentiments such as "pride") (2) reforms the practices (orienting them toward display through various conventional heritage genres) and ultimately (3) reforms the relationship of the practicing subjects with themselves (through social institutions of heritage that formalize previously informal relations and centralize previously dispersed powers) (Hafstein, 2015: 286)

Several critics have focused on the attribution of ownership and intellectual property rights. Coome (2011) for instance, maps out the conditions and protagonists involved

> "Critical understanding of the political economies of community construction in order to understand ownership as a process through which property-holders are constituted as social actors and as political agents. The legal and political conditions under which culturally self-defined communities emerge to make possessive legal claims include neoliberal governmentalities, environmental regimes, intellectual property and cultural policy initiatives, as well as indigenous rights discourses which converge in many parts of the world to encourage collective needs and aspirations to be expressed in terms of community property rights."

Clearly "aspects of the WIPO [World Intellectual Property Organization] protection efforts focusing on trademark-like and trade secret-like protections should benefit the people and cultures intangible heritage policies are intended to serve". However, it's been suggested that some forms of protection are "likely do more harm than good. Instead, global public policy will be far better served through emphasis on localism's attributes of developing human capital to improve the quality of content being produced and encouraging local communities to focus on the content of their own choosing. " (Garon, 2010).

Others present a more myopic perspective on particular communities.

George (2007) for example, found that

> "An inequity gap exists in benefits distributed to many rural communities whose cultural heritages are being appropriated and

exploited by multiple commercial entities for tourism purposes and personal gain. Little, if any, of the profits realized benefit the local community – the actual creators and owners of the local culture. "

Others critics have focused on "appropriation" resulting in either the loss, or sacralisation of meaning, which may be construed as controversial. Graham and McDowell (2007) for example, considered how the preservation of parts of the Long Kesh/Maze might sacralise place through its physical reconstitution. The former prison is one of the key heritage sites of the Northern Ireland conflict. Writing at time when a principal proposal was to reconstruct part of the Maze site as an International Centre for Conflict Transformation, they reflected on how Republicanism had "a clearly defined sense of the heritage value of the Maze and an understanding as to how the site might be appropriated and exploited as an iconic place for remembering, contestation and resistance."

2. 2 Grey literature relating to UK, England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland

This section considers issues of definition, policy and management and practice as considered by the UK nations' governments, cultural, heritage and environment agencies and organisations, and references tourism and community planning.

As stated earlier the UK is not a signatory to the 2003 UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage[14]. Therefore how England, Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales engage with intangible heritage varies considerably. These differences in attitude are also reflected in some of the stakeholder interviewees' comments.

With regard to the 2003 UNESCO Convention NGOs may become accredited[15] in the provision of advice, support and safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage[16]. Museums Galleries Scotland (MGS) is accredited despite the UK not being a signatory to the Convention. While an accreditation application by Heritage Crafts Association is awaiting ratification by the UNESCO General Assembly in June 2016.[17]

Awareness and understanding of the UNESCO convention and safeguarding is promoted by the ICOMOS UK's Intangible Cultural Heritage Committee[18] and the recently formed ICOMOS UK Digital Technology National Committee[19] includes intangible cultural heritage in its interests. The European Landscape Convention, of which UK is a signatory, emphasises the role of people and culture in shaping and making decisions about the landscape[20] and that landscape has a cultural role.

> "… the landscape contributes to the formation of local cultures and that it is a basic component of the European natural and cultural

---

[14] http://portal. unesco. org/en/ev. php-URL_ID=17716&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201. html

[15] UNESCO (2014) Operational Directives for the Implementation of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage items 90-98

[16] ibid In the context of this report the use of the term intangible cultural heritage reflects the UNESCO definition. http://www. unesco. org/culture/ich/en/directives

[17] pers comm HCA

[18] http://www. icomos-uk. org/committees/

[19] http://www. icomos-uk. org/committees/
Also referred to in the Committee's mission statement per Eithne Nightingale

[20] http://www. coe. int/en/web/landscape/the-european-landscape-convention

heritage, contributing to human well-being and consolidation of the European identity. " (UK Government, 2012:3)

The European Landscape Convention defines heritage[21] as tangible and intangible with reference to the UNESCO 2003 convention. In the UK, the ICOMOS UK Cultural Landscapes and Historic Gardens Committee[22] promotes implementation of the Convention.

Culture, heritage and environment policy in the UK nations emphasises their instrumental agendas - as contributing to the economy, environment, health and well-being, place, quality of life, and sustainability. The following considers each nation's devolved policies.

2. 2. 1 England

In England, *The Culture White Paper* (DCMS, 2016) has four themes access and opportunity, benefit to communities, increasing UK international standing, resilience and reform (2016: 8-11). As part of the consultation for the white paper DCMS sought to engage public views in its development[23]. There is no explicit reference to intangible heritage despite an emphasis on community and place. "Tradition" is referred to in the context of community culture (2016: 13), building skills (2016: 25), and influences that shape communities (2016: 30). It is of note that references in the context of the proposed ratification of the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the event of Armed Conflict[24] along with the proposed 'Cultural Protection Fund' (2016: 46) focus on tangible heritage and cultural property. However the white paper does propose a review of the government's position on ratifying "other international conventions designed to protect cultural heritage and property, including the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Heritage." (2016: 46)

The white paper does present opportunities for intangible heritage to come more to the fore in a number of proposed new initiatives. These include; the "cultural citizens" programme (2016: 24), cultural leaders to support developing the role of culture in place-making strategies and partnerships, and the "Great Place" scheme (2016: 34 and 35), the establishment of "Heritage Action Zones" by Historic England (2016: 37). The role of digital technology is narrowly defined in the context of digitisation of content for sharing and the streaming of performances (2016: 38 and 39).

Arts Council England's strategy (2013) has no references to intangible heritage or traditional arts. It contains a single reference to an artist described as a "folk singer". The website also refers to "folk" in relation to arts. By the same token, neither the National Archives (2012) nor the British Library refer to intangible heritage in their respective strategies, even though the former holds oral history collections and the latter has a significant sound archive[25]

---

[21]https://rm. coe. int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016802fc144 p6

[22] http://www. icomos-uk. org/committees/

[23] Vaisey, E (Sept 2015) *Share your ideas for a new Cultural Programme DCMS Blog*

http://dcmsblog. uk/2015/09/share-your-ideas-for-a-new-cultural-programme/

[24] portal unesco URL_ID=13637&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

[25] http://www. bl. uk/subjects/sound

based around language, dialect, music and oral history. The sound archive is the focus of 'Save our Sounds'[26] supported by HLF, which could be interpreted as a large scale and significant intangible heritage project that will support preservation of intangible heritage such as dialect.

Heritage 2020. Strategic priorities for England's Historic Environment (Historic Environment, 2014) refers to the inclusion of intangible heritage as a "modern" approach to heritage:

> "The historic environment is part of our nation's heritage, which includes tangible aspects such as monuments, buildings, historic places and landscapes in which we live our daily lives, as well as collections/museums, libraries, galleries and archives etc. The modern concept of heritage also extends to cover less tangible elements such as oral tradition, folk memories, language and other cultural traditions. This document focuses on the tangible aspects of the historic environment, but its priorities and issues intersect with this wider definition of heritage. " (2014: 1)

Historic England's strategy makes no reference to intangible heritage, however consultation with "under-represented groups"[27] (BOP, 2012: 1) identifies intangible heritage as a concern as this is "how tangible heritage acquires meaning" (BOP 2012: 8). In the report, intangible is referred to as the "hidden story".

> "… there is a need to place greater emphasis on the 'intangible' heritage,
>
> i. e. the 'hidden stories' behind historic sites that might be relevant for the under-represented groups. Such narratives include:
>
> - The history of 'ordinary' and working-class people-as opposed to the stories of the elite.
>
> - The history of transient, migrant communities who would pass through/temporarily use historic sites.
>
> - Significant events that are not necessarily confined to one particular site.
>
> - The stories of interaction between communities e.g. at sites that have been used by, and are relevant to, a number of different communities.

With regards to the interpretation of historic sites, there was some debate among the consultation group as to how best present their experiences which, due to the nature of their historical situation (in which they were criminalised, enslaved, transient etc.) has often been traumatic. " (BOP, 2012: 2)

DEFRA's 2011 Natural Environment whitepaper *The Natural Choice: securing the Value of Nature* described culture as part of "ecosystem services",

---

[26] http://www. bl. uk/projects/save-our-sounds

[27] African-Caribbean communities; Asian communities; Disabled people; Faith groups (including Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim, Jain, Jewish, Sikh and Black Christian groups); Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) people; Women

https://content. historicengland. org. uk/images-books/publications/responses-from-the-consultation-on-under-represented-heritages/responses-from-the-consultation-on-under-represented-heritages/ p1

> "Cultural services: We gain non-material benefits from ecosystems, for example: through spiritual or religious enrichment, cultural heritage, recreation or aesthetic experience. Accessible green spaces provide recreation, and enhance health and social cohesion. "(DEFRA, 2011: 8).

There are no references to culture or heritage in Natural England's 2014-2019 corporate plan (Natural England 2014) and where this might be anticipated, for example with reference to the landscape, the focus is on "geo-diversity" (2014: 8).

Visit England's "Inspire me" micro-website[28] includes craft, literature and regional listings in their culture, heritage and food sections. The other home nations' tourism websites have a higher profile for intangible heritage as part of the tourism offer.

Last but not least, since 2012, at local authority level, communities have been empowered to produce Neighbourhood Plans[29] for guiding development, conservation and regeneration of an area as defined by themselves. The Plans, which can include heritage, are subject to a local referendum and, if agreed, will form part of the statutory development plan for the area, thereby carrying more weight than either Parish or Community Plans (Chetwyn, no date: 6). While information and advice is available to support neighbourhood planning, heritage and the environment, intangible heritage is not included (English Heritage, 2014 and Historic England, no date).

However, guidance and work in this area has been available for more than twenty years, for example, the work of The Parish Maps Projects[30] led by Common Ground, to explore and promote the relationship between nature, culture and local distinctiveness[31],"The Parish Maps Project is encouraging people to chart the wild life, landscape, buildings, history and cultural features which they value in their own surroundings "(King & Clifford, 1985 preface)

2. 2. 2 Scotland

Intangible heritage has a more visible presence in Scottish policy and delivery than in England. The Scottish Government is more explicit about the everyday nature of culture: it stipulates that

> "Scotland's historic environment is part of our everyday lives. It gives us a sense of place, well-being and cultural identity". (The Scottish Government, 01. 10. 2015)

> "The historic environment could be said to be 'the cultural heritage of places', and is a combination of physical things (tangible) and those aspects we cannot see – stories, traditions and concepts (intangible). " (Scottish Government, 2014: 2)

---

[28] https://www. visitengland. com/things-to-do/culture

https://www. visitengland. com/things-to-do/heritage

https://www. visitengland. com/things-to-do/food-and-drink

[29] http://www. planningportal. gov. uk/inyourarea/neighbourhood/
[30] http://commonground. org. uk/projects/
[31] http://commonground. org. uk/about/

With regard to language,

> "Scots is all around us in our everyday lives and [is] a vibrant part of current Scottish culture. We hear it in conversation, on radio and television, we read it in poetry and literature[32] and see it on posters and signs. " (The Scottish Government, 07. 03. 2016)

The need for safeguarding is recognised,

> "The position of Gaelic is, however, extremely fragile. If Gaelic is to have a sustainable future, there needs to be a concerted effort on the part of Government, the public sector, the private sector, community bodies and individual speakers [to]:
>
> - promote the acquisition of speaking, reading and writing skills in Gaelic
> - enable the use of Gaelic in a range of social, formal and work settings
> - expand the respect for, and visibility, audibility and recognition of Gaelic
> - develop the quality, consistency and richness of Gaelic" (The Scottish Government, 30. 04. 2015)

As noted, MGS is currently the only accredited Intangible Cultural Heritage NGO in the UK. As such, it undertakes a number of activities including working at UK national level to promote the signing of the UNESCO Convention, managing the ICH Scotland Wiki [33] and promoting the identification, discussion and work around intangible heritage. [34] In November 2015 MGS convened an international symposium that considered intangible heritage and human rights[35]. MGS has an inclusive approach to intangible heritage making clear that it is not just focused on 'Scottish culture', but all cultures in Scotland. [36]

> "Cultural heritage includes the traditions or living expressions of groups and communities, such as oral traditions, performing arts, social practices, rituals, festive events, knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe or the knowledge and skills to produce traditional crafts. While these may not be tangible – they cannot be touched – they are a very important part of our cultural heritage. This is Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) a living form of heritage which is continuously recreated and which evolves as communities adapt their practices and traditions in response to their environment.
>
> It provides a sense of identity and belonging in relation to our own cultures, which in turn promotes respect and understanding for the cultures of others. People play the key role in the creation and carrying forward of ICH. Communities, collectively, are the ones who create, carry and transmit ICH. A community might share an expression of intangible cultural heritage that is similar to one practiced by others.

---

[32] And well known cartoons- Asterix the Gaul is available in Scots as well as Gaelic http://www. scotsman. com/lifestyle/asterix-comic-published-in-gaelic-and-scots-1-3157523

[33] http://www. ichscotland. org

[34] http://www. ichscotland. org

[35] http://www. museumsgalleriesscotland. org. uk/about-us/news/news-article/636/key-unesco-and-cultural-figures-gather-for-mgs-symposium-on-ich

[36] http://www. museumsgalleriesscotland. org. uk/about-us/news/news-article/634/intangible-cultural-heritage-symposium-legacy-materials

> While ICH expressions can have either material or non-material outcomes, the key distinction between intangible and tangible cultural heritage is that the former are living examples of human creativity and ingenuity, embedded in the community.
>
> The approach to ICH in Scotland is an inclusive approach, which respects the diversity of Scotland's communities. It is underpinned by UNESCO's 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage."(ICH Scotland, 2016)

While Creative Scotland doesn't specifically mention intangible heritage, it nevertheless refers to "Scotland's national culture in its broad sense is better understood, [by] spanning contemporary practice, traditional arts in Gaelic and Scots and work inspired by Scotland's languages" (Creative Scotland, 2014: 19). The cultural component in the significance of Scotland's landscapes is also recognised:

> "Scotland's unsurpassed landscapes have long been celebrated in paintings, verse, prose and song. Our fine scenery is inspiring to live in and to visit, and the imagery of an unspoilt landscape is important in the marketing of our tourism, film industry and world renowned products such as whisky.
>
> The quality of the greenspaces in our towns and cities, and the ease, with which we can access our surrounding landscapes, are important for our health and wellbeing: high quality landscapes encourage us to venture into the outdoors.
>
> Each part of Scotland has a distinctive character, contributing to a sense of national and local identity, also known as a 'sense of place'. The diversity of our landscapes and townscapes provides a living canvas of Scotland's history, reflecting ways of life and traditions that are deeply engrained in Scotland's culture. " (Scottish Natural Heritage, 08. 06. 2015)

Culture and heritage are also key elements of the tourism offer, which includes themed years[37] - the Year of Homecoming in 2014 was the second such year.

2. 2. 3 Wales

While the Welsh Government's aim for culture and heritage is to enrich the lives of individuals and communities[38], intangible heritage is not referred to in, for example, *Culture and Poverty* (Andrews, 2014) *A Museums Strategy for Wales* (CyMAL, 2010) or the *Welsh Language Action Plan* (Welsh Government, 2014). Nevertheless, the importance of heritage, culture and community to Welsh identity is expressed as at the core of culture and heritage strategies and policy (CyMAL, 2010: 4; Arts Council Wales, 2014: 6; and CADW 2016). The Arts Council Wales' strategy suggests that it is only though living arts, that traditional culture finds meaning, "Because without the living arts, culture risks becoming a museum for recycled works, and a showcase for reproduced interpretations of the cultural traditions of the past. "(Arts Council Wales, 2014: 8).

Wales' rich tradition of legends and stories is reflected in CADW's interpretation strategies for example The Princes of Gwynedd where "An approach could be developed which reflects the importance of the Welsh oral tradition. "(PBL, 2010: 51)

[37] https://www. visitscotland. com/about/themed-years/

[38] http://gov. wales/about/programmeforgov/culture/programme?lang=en

The importance of the oral tradition came out of consultation "Consultees wanted a greater emphasis on people than places/ sites: including through use of the Welsh oral tradition." (PBL, 2010: 11) and "Emphasis on the Welsh oral tradition: links with the Eisteddfod, poetry, songs, music."(PBL, 2010: 9)

The role of culture and heritage in the landscape is not visible on the Natural Resources Wales[39] website. In contrast heritage tourism is important and 2017 will be the Year of Legends.[40]

2. 2. 4 Northern Ireland

In Northern Ireland, following a government department re-structure, culture and the historic environment are being moved from the Department of Culture, Arts and Libraries and the Department for the Environment to a new Department of Communities[41]. Intangible heritage is recognized in a number of strategies and that for Ulster-Scots (DCAL, 2015: 17) cites the 2003 UNESCO Convention as part of the strategic context and basis for the strategy. The *Strategy to Enhance and Develop the Ulster-Scots Language, Heritage and Culture* aims include promoting, safeguarding, sustainability and contributing to community development (DCAL, 2015:19).

Intangible heritage is also recognized in Northern Ireland's museums policy,

"Museums, particularly those with statutory duties, have obligations to collect, preserve, display and, interpret aspects of Northern Ireland's tangible and intangible heritage. Around the world there is a growing recognition of the importance of cultural rights. Such themes have been referenced in several international conventions. These often refer to the representation of cultures and cultural communities and also access to and participation in cultural activity. Work on defining and interpreting this area is ongoing but it is an important concept to explore, develop and reflect as Northern Ireland emerges from a period of conflict and social division. " (DCAL, 2011: 2)

Consultation on the policy raised issues of clarification around "cultural rights", in response the Northern Ireland Assembly (2011) published a report summarising international, European and domestic instruments that deal with cultural rights. The challenges in the relationship between cultural rights and human rights in the context of heritage are summarised as:

"Difficulties in deciding which heritage should be selected, preserved or presented.

- Difficulties in establishing who has legitimacy to speak on behalf of a particular cultural group, and the dangers of government presuming to act on behalf of a group.

- The challenge posed by 'cultural relativism', where any or all views of cultural heritage are seen as equally valid

- The legal relationship between cultural and human rights, especially where the rights of one group or individual could be interpreted as being contravened by the promotion of a particular aspect of cultural heritage by others

39 https://naturalresources. wales/about-us/?lang=en
40 http://gov. wales/topics/tourism/year-of-adventure-2016/?lang=en
41 http://www. nidirect. gov. uk/changes-to-government-departments

- The ways in which cultural heritage can be used as a controlling influence either (a) by governments in seeking to assimilate minorities or (b) by minority groups in seeking secession from the political mainstream. " (Northern Ireland Assembly, 2011: 3)

These are noted and that they may take time to "resolve". (2011: 3)

Museums are also attributed a major role in the safeguarding of intangible heritage, "It is essential that the artefacts and specimens within collections, as well as intangible heritage, such as oral and sound archives, are displayed and preserved to the appropriate standards. " (DCAL, 2011)

The role of supporting traditional arts falls to Arts Council Northern Ireland, which explicitly seeks "to help organisations, individual practitioners and small community groups to preserve, promote and celebrate the traditional arts of Northern Ireland" (Arts Council Northern Ireland, 2016) alongside language and intercultural arts.

The economic, regeneration, tourism and social value of the historic environment is emphasised[42] and intangible heritage is referred to in the context of Derry's potential to apply for World Heritage status,

> "International recognition is seen primarily as a way to build upon the heritage investment to maximize the economic and social potential of the city's history and built fabric. However it is also seen as a way of focusing disparate efforts and encouraging appreciation of the more intangible aspects of the city's history. " (Northern Ireland Environment Agency, 2010: 31)

Although there is no specific reference to intangible heritage the culture, heritage and landscape are linked,

> "… Northern Ireland has a great variety of scenic countryside, reflecting its contrasting geology and topography as well as a long history of settlement and land use. The mosaic of prehistoric monuments, traditional farms and buildings, forest plantations and wildlife habitats all contribute to the special landscapes that are part of our culture and heritage. " (Department for the Environment, no date)

As with the other home nations, culture and heritage is regarded as an important part of Northern Ireland's tourism offer. 2016 has been assigned Year of Food and Drink, and each month is themed - with March being heritage month. [43]

Each local council is required to draw up a community plan, based on an "assessment of the key characteristics of the area" including the historic and natural environment and tourism destinations (Department for the Environment, 2015: 20). In that context, heritage[44] is viewed as an economic asset, but it is recognised that,

> "The involvement of communities in strategic decisions about heritage, and in ensuring that these decisions take account of wider issues is increasingly seen as vital to good decision making in the sector.

> National and international bodies have advocated this. " (Department for the Environment, Heritage and Community, no date)

[42] https://www. doeni. gov. uk/articles/social-and-economic-value-historic-environment
[43] http://www. tourismni. com/BusinessSupport/MajorEvents/NIYearofFoodandDrink2016/March. aspx
[44] https://www. doeni. gov. uk/articles/heritage-and-community-planning

3. 1 Heritage Lottery Fund's literature

The reviewed HLF literature is based on a selection of published and unpublished reports compiled by HLF. These were examined in relation to references to intangible heritage, categories of intangible heritage, themes, practices and impact.

3. 1. 1 Strategy

Between1994 to May 2012, HLF invested £1,883 million in Historic Buildings and Monuments - seven times more than the £258 million allocated to Cultures and Memories (HLF, 2012: 5).

HLF's strategic framework, Making a lasting difference for heritage and people (2012) makes implicit, rather than explicit, references to intangible heritage, noting that, for example, "Heritage Lottery Fund investment has truly broadened the horizons of heritage, ensuring that people from all communities see their heritage reflected in our national story…" (HLF, 2012: 5)

In seeking to encourage wider engagement, since its earliest strategic plans, HLF has deliberately refused to define heritage (HLF, 2002: 19). This position, based on consultation (HLF, 2002: 16) was intended to encourage individuals and communities to identify and explain the value of what they recognised as heritage as the 2002 strategy aims state.

> "to encourage more people to be involved in and make decisions about heritage themselves; to encourage communities to identify, look after and celebrate their heritage; [and]to promote a greater appreciation of the value and importance of heritage for our future well-being and sense of identity." (HLF, 2002:18)

The current strategy Making a lasting difference for heritage and people (HLF, 2012) shifted the strategic emphasis from aims to outcomes. The outcomes for Heritage are identified as; "better managed, in better condition, better interpreted and explained, and identified/recorded" (2012: 10). Outcomes for communities are focused on activities and impact; increased engagement, resilience, and environmental and economic impact (2012:7). With regard to resilience there is an emphasis on tangible heritage, "Communities are beginning to take on new responsibilities for heritage, for example, social enterprises and voluntary organisations becoming custodians of heritage through transfer from public bodies…" (2013: 10).

It appears that HLF was rather more explicit about people making decisions about heritage in the aims of its earlier 2002 and 2008 strategies. Its desire to encourage more people to be involved in, and make decisions about their heritage, related to HLF's aim to build a large and active constituency for heritage in the UK.

> "It means bringing about a better understanding of andcommitment to heritage conservation by policy-makers and members of thepublic alike. We want to help communities to engage with those parts ofthe past, which have meaning and value for them, and to stimulate debate about the value of heritage and its contribution to society. The role of young people as custodians of tomorrow's heritage will also be important. " (HLF, 2002: 19)

By seeking to encourage communities to identify, look after and celebrate their heritage. HLF intended it's funding to enable communities to be more in touch with their heritage.

> "Over the years we have resisted offering a definition of heritage, and

will continue to challenge others to tell us what is important to them. We want heritage of all types to be better understood and enjoyed, as responsibility for its care is shared by a broader section of society than at present. " (HLF, 2002: 19)

What is clear, however, is that while the publics' view of 'heritage' is principally predicated on the tangible, in a personal capacity their strongest connections were with intangible heritage:

> "Residents 'top-of-mind' definitions of heritage related to physical heritage, and especially museums, monuments and old buildings. However, in conversation participants moved beyond this to include aspects of local culture that they perceived to be unique or special, including local dialects, folklore and food. *These were often the aspects of heritage that participants identified most strongly with.* Participants were much quicker to move on to this broader definition, and identified more strongly with it, in areas such as Armagh and Glasgow where residents had a particularly highly developed sense of local identity. In Bradford, British Asian participants added a strong familial dimension to this definition of heritage. " (BritainThinks, 2015: 25 our emphasis).

The same sentiments had already been expressed 10 years earlier in HLF's consultation with "community leaders", which informed its 2002 strategy (2002: 45 and 46). This may suggest that while the heritage sector is currently much occupied by the impact of public funding reductions and seeks to justifying funding by valuing heritage in instrumental terms the public identify and value heritage in intrinsic and intangible terms.

3. 1. 2 Evaluation
While it's beyond the remit of this research to address the nature and impact of HLF's funded projects, it nevertheless is able to comment on the visibility of intangible heritage in a number of evaluation reports.

HLF has commissioned various thematic reviews. These assess, for example, its social impact and volunteering (Applejuice, 2008; BOP, 2009, 2010, 2011) and economic impact (GHK, 2008, 2009, 2010). Other evaluations are specifically heritage-focused, and cover conservation (Bond, 2009) digital use (Flow & Collections Trust, 2010) and oral history (Mirchandani et al 2013).

With the exception of Mirchandani et al (2013) these contain few, if any, references to intangible heritage beyond the listing of projects according to HLF's ascribed categories. This is not surprising, given the strategic contexts and objectives addressed by the evaluations. The ICF GHK evaluation of *All Our Stories* (no date) for example, makes no mention of intangible heritage, despite its interests covering a number of themes associated with it.

Mirchandani et al noted that HLF was one of the few sources to provide funding for intangible heritage (2013: 13 &15). They also emphasised the role of oral history in enabling "mainstream" heritage organisations to bring "hidden" histories and the experiences of "marginalised" communities to wider attention (Mirchandani et al, 2013: 10).

Other reviews commissioned by HLF evaluate discrete programmes. These include those of its *Major Grants* (BOP, 2015); *Our Heritage* (ECORYS, 2015); *Sharing Heritage* (Jacquet & Waterman, 2015); *All Our Stories* (ICF GHK, no date a and b); *First World War Centenary* (Bashir et al, 2015a and b); *Young Roots*

(Centre for Public Innovation, no date); *Skills for the Future* (ICF GHK, 2013); *Collecting Cultures* (DC Research, 2013a and b); *Landscape Partnerships* (Clarke et al, 2011); *Parks for People* (Baggott et al, 2015) and *Townscape Heritage* (Reeve & Shipley, 2013). Of these, only Clarke et al (2011) specifically addressed intangible heritage. It also referred to the strategic contexts within which the Landscape Partnerships operated, as informed by UNESCO's definition of intangible heritage (Clarke et al, 2011: 39) and the European Landscape Convention[45].

> "The ELC places obligations on the UK to recognise landscape 'as an essential component of people's surroundings, an expression of the diversity of their shared cultural and natural heritage, as a foundation of their identity'. Signatories are required to identify the diversity and range of their landscapes, the important features of each, and to engage with local communities, private bodies and public authorities in their protection… There is a considerable overlap between the provisions of the ELC and the objectives of HLF's landscape partnership programme, which is the only national grant programme whose objectives largely coincide with the ELC philosophy. " (Clarke et al, 2011: 3)

It also notes a number of issues around assessing intangible heritage activity.
> "Sometimes these may be a specific focus of projects; more often they are a (sometimes incidental) by-product. For example research into place names, landscape interpretation and archive work as well as the experience of volunteers working on projects involving physical heritage, may all enrich local identity and the understanding, and 'sense of place' on the part of local residents and visitors alike. Either way outcomes in relation to 'intangible cultural heritage' may be problematic (as well as difficult to evaluate)…Questions of authenticity arise; our earlier consultation revealed a view that 'celebration' of heritage could on occasion encourage the inclusion of somewhat contrived 'events', which might amount to little more than a confected pastiche of heritage. " (Clarke et al, 2011:39)

Clarke et al (2011: 39) were also concerned with questions that had arisen of 'whose heritage?' and reported, "It has been suggested that projects focused on 'intangible' cultural heritage should seek to understand (and question, rather than reinforce) relations of power (such as class, gender, or ethnicity). They also discerned a shift in the aims of the Landscape Partnerships programme between 2004-2008 and 2008-2013 away from its earlier implied emphasis on intangible heritage. "To conserve and celebrate the cultural associations and activities of the landscape area." is replaced with "To increase community participation in local heritage. " And "To improve understanding of local craft and other skills by providing training opportunities" with "To increase training opportunities in local heritage skills." The changes reflect a change between HLF's second and third strategic plan in 2008 (Clarke et al, 2011:7)

In a stark contrast, Baggot's evaluation of Parks for People (2013) includes very few references to activities that might be associated with intangible heritage, apart from the increased use of parks by diverse communities. It is interesting to note that several stakeholder interviewees for this current research commented on the intangible value of parks open space and activities focused on growing and sharing food.

[45] http://www. coe. int/en/web/landscape/homeThe UK is a signatory https://www. gov. uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/236096/8413. pdf

HLF categorised the majority of its Young Roots projects (59%) as intangible heritage, in that they involved "People's memories and experiences (often described as 'oral history' or spoken history)", such as histories of people and communities (including those who immigrated to the UK); languages and dialects; cultural traditions - stories, festivals, crafts, music, dance and costumes; and histories of places and events" (Centre for Public Innovation, no date: 22). It noted that young people themselves associated heritage with culture and identity.

> "At the start of the projects many young participants found it difficult to define heritage although they were able to make links between culture and identity… Some of the projects such as *Taakin Heeds* used the HLF Models of Practice[46] guidance. Available through the HLF website to introduce the concept of heritage to young people… The young people eventually came up with the idea of producing something relevant to their interests that was also representative of their culture and identity in the North East and focused the project on Geordie dialect. " (Centre for Public Innovation, no date: 23)

The *Sharing Heritage* evaluation (Jacquet and Waterman, 2015) doesn't discuss intangible heritage beyond noting that 40% of the projects are categorised as intangible (2015: 50). Two of the case studies are focused on intangible heritage (2015: 47 and 87).

DC Research's report on Collecting Cultures (2013a; 2013b) implicitly demonstrates the potential for museum's tangible collections development of intangible heritage though this was not an aspect of the aims of the programme or evaluation. For example,

- *Enriching Our Musical Heritage* project at Edinburgh University Collection of Musical Instruments – an intangible heritage focus would be traditional music;

- *Tain Silver- the collection* at Tain and District Museum – an intangible heritage focus would be craft;

- *Connection and Division* at Fermanagh County Museum, Derry Heritage and Museum Service; Enniskillen's Museum's project- an intangible heritage focus would be culture and identity;

- *Staying Power - The story of Black British identity 1950-1990s*, the V&A and the Black Cultural Archives – an intangible heritage focus would be culture and identity; and

- *Trainers, Sneakers, Daps and Pumps* at Northampton Museums and Art Gallery and Kettering Manor House Museum – an intangible heritage focus would be culture and identity.

3. 1. 3 Place
Recent HLF research focuses on place. It includes explorations of attitudes towards investment in heritage in 12 towns and cities (BritainThinks, 2015) [47]; and what existing data sets suggest about the breadth of heritage so that "people understand local heritage better and access relevant data"

[46] http://closedprogrammes. hlf. org. uk/preApril2013/furtherresources/Documents/YR_ModelOfPractice. pdf
[47] Armagh, Bradford, Durham, Exeter, Glasgow, Manchester, Newark, Peterborough, Pontypool, Portsmouth, Shrewsbury and South East London

(Schiffers, 2015: 1). As Nightingale (2015) notes, the local heritage that people often most value is intangible.

Maeer et al also noted that people's "connections" to heritage often generate positive impacts with are both "transactional" and "emotional" (2015: 6). However, how people viewed their quality of life varied from place to place.

> "Whilst life in big cities is improving for many, and life remains good in rural areas and in smaller towns and cities, there is a type of place – caught between these – where optimism is thinner on the ground. And the research also highlights that the inequalities in access and involvement with heritage… documented in previous research have not gone away – with younger people, those from social grade DE, and black and minority ethnic residents all less involved than others.

> We think that, to a large extent, part of the answer to these issues has to be to continue investing – especially in those places that have had less funding from HLF. These are… where we can expect the returns, in terms of improvements to local quality of life, to be greatest.

> In some cases, though, we have to acknowledge that perceptions – of both heritage and place – have not improved, despite substantial per capita HLF funding. It is tempting to view this as a different causality – that the trajectory of place has overshadowed improvements in heritage. But this will not do. Instead, we believe that we have to take on the responsibility of re-doubling efforts to connect heritage with local community needs and aspirations, and investing in what local people want to see from Heritage Lottery funding. " (Maeer et al, 2015: 9)

The Heritage Index, Heritage, Identity and Place emphasises tangible heritage. It does, however, discuss the challenges involved in identifying intangible heritage (Schiffers, 2015: 22). The compilation of the index relied on datasets, which are either not available, or less readily available, for intangible heritage. The lack of any standard definition of intangible heritage is a major obstacle. The Index uses the term Cultures and Memories and describes these as "activities", whereas it describes tangible heritage as an "asset" (Schiffers, 2015: 2). The Index treats 'assets' as a value, whereas "activities" are regarded as interpretation:

> "…the places where history comes alive are places where people have activated local history. Heritage doesn't speak for itself – it involves people playing a role to interpret historic resources, so that they are meaningful in the present day. Therefore, we consider that heritage activities are just as important as heritage assets. " (Schiffers, 2015: 5)

It is hoped that the Index would be used to inform discussions about local authority devolution, economic development such as tourism and by those seeking funding (2015: 24). But the Index perception and description of intangible confines it to invisibility.

3. Stakeholder interviews

Stakeholder interviews were undertaken with 29 individuals, plus one additional written response. A short list of 30 interviewees, plus reserve interviewees, was identified from a long list drawn up by Pomegranate and augmented by HLF. To ensure representation across a range of interests a UK wide long list mapped individuals against a number of criteria including social and cultural representation, geography and HLF's broad heritage categories. The shortlisted interviewees comprised those whose professional lives involved them (to varying degrees) with intangible heritage. Some, including academics, worked in areas of social and cultural representation, anthropology, cultural geography and place making, strategy and policymaking, Others were drawn from those heritage areas with which HLF is associated: buildings and monuments; community heritage; cultures and memories; industrial and maritime heritage; land and natural heritage; museums, archives and libraries. Some stakeholders were interviewed as representatives of national heritage and culture agencies, others in an individual capacity. They had various degrees of engagement with intangible heritage: some specialised in it, whereas others were more closely involved in other heritage fields. Individuals in this category often described themselves as "laymen", "not really qualified" or not having an "expert view" with which to answer our questions.

This section of the report focuses on the findings from interviewees' reflections on the opportunities and challenges of intangible heritage support; its present and future needs. It is organised on the basis of the questions listed in Appendix 1. Wherever possible we have included quotes from the stakeholders, who remain anonymous.

3. 1 Issues, opportunities and challenges with regards to support for intangible heritage
3. 1. 1 Defining intangible heritage
Stakeholders' understanding of the term "intangible heritage" varied enormously. One stakeholder had spoken to a number of colleagues, also heritage specialists, prior to the interview, who were unaware of the term.

Natural environment specialists, for example, didn't necessarily use the term, preferring "cultural ecosystem services", which embraces many of the same qualities (as explored at the ICOMOS UK 2014 conference[48]). From a landscape perspective, intangible heritage was understood to account for "…the larger part of what constitutes a sense of place". Others associated intangible heritage with "everyday aesthetics that give credence - not to the grand - but the lived environment." Other stakeholders described it as "something you can't put your hands on… not a physical entity. It exists in voice, memory and association." It was considered that the public simply associate heritage with buildings and "English Heritage" in particular.

As this implies, several stakeholders found the concept of intangible heritage difficult. Several admitted to "struggling" with the term; they described it as "unfathomable, a bit meaningless"; as sounding "negative, rather than

---

[48] Intangible Cultural Heritage in the UK: promoting and safeguarding our diverse cultures ICOMOS UK conference September 2014. It is planned to publish conference proceedings. http://www. icomos-uk. org/uploads/sidebar/PDF/ICOMOS-UK%20intangible heritage%20Conference%202014_150914. pdf

positive". And they speculated on why this might be so. One insisted that the term was awkward because it was derived "from translations into English of words meaning intangible heritage"; another thought that the use of the word " intangible" was simply to distinguish it from tangible heritage, even though the two were intrinsically linked: "tangible [heritage] needs the intangible" - the one constitutes the physical expression of the other.

The absence of a clear definition of intangible heritage was "a big issue", which was taken to relate to a lack of government recognition and funding for it. Interviewees speculated why there was no standard definition of intangible heritage: "There doesn't appear to be anyone driving it. I wonder whether the fact that the UK hasn't signed up to the UNESCO Convention makes a difference to this, and whether that's why. " Whereas intangible heritage was "increasingly being talked about" in Northern Ireland, not least because of Community Planning[49], and in Scotland, there was a perception of it being "resisted" in England.

In discussing what intangible heritage comprises, several stakeholders worked with, or were content to use, UNESCO's definition; others broadly agreed with that of HLF in the interview topic guide (Appendix 1). Several suggested expanding that by adding poetry, oral testimonies, historical tradition, and "people's collective memory and cultural experiences in a changing world." But, others challenged the inclusion of memory and oral history.

No one argued with intangible heritage involving "skills, knowledge and practice" and their transmission from generation to generation. This implies that intangible heritage is, at least, partly synonymous with "traditional practices". However, the term, "traditional" might not necessarily apply. "From the outside, you might assume it has to do with tradition, but some practices have only developed in the last 10 to 15 years and are still conceived as 'traditional' "

By dint of being passed on down the generations, knowledge contributes to "living heritage", and communities continue to shape and develop their intangible heritage. "If intangible heritage isn't practiced, it's history."

But, the notion of continued practice raised definitional issues. "It would", it was suggested, "be a mistake to conflate intangible value (heritage significance) with intangible heritage (practices)."

Contemporary practice is associated with "living heritage". This is taken to refer to "people's heritage… ordinary heritage in contrast to heritage as defined by the upper classes: big houses or opera. Ordinary heritage is music, craft, stories…" It comprises "shared practices, eating, family, community and society memory, performance, dance and festivals…" It is also "everyday" and "ordinary" heritage. In this respect intangible heritage is regarded as "bottom up. Communities identify and define what is intangible heritage and what is significant". A heritage society member emphasised "the collective":

> "There's a distinction between what an individual values, and what's collectively valued. It's a standard issue in the anthropological

[49] http://www. sustainableni. org/our-activities/community-planning/index. php

literature and in folklore studies. It's about culture being common to the neighbourhood. Folklore exists within the collective. "

As such, it would be for the collective to decide whose or what intangible heritage merits support: one stakeholder called for "a community-led identification of significant intangible heritage across the UK."

The notion of living heritage implicitly raises critical issues related to the term "heritage". One interviewee thought that the concept of "living heritage" was "pretty oxymoronic really. It's very straightforward problem of distinguishing what's living, and what's history. "

This was seen to constitute a dilemma for HLF. Providing support for contemporary, manifestations of heritage forms was likely to constitute a challenge. This is, after all, what the Crafts Council and Arts Council essentially do. This implied that the job of HLF might be to subsidise the market failure of historic practices. A heritage society observed that:

> "What was once common practice [in the field of Heritage craft skills) has now changed because of the markets, because of changes in communities, and the loss of market demands. Consequently, practitioners now struggle to make a living out of those practices and they need subsidy to do so. "

In contrast, another interviewee saw the growth, for example, of traditional boatbuilding and shift in public perception towards the "individually hand made as opposed to mass produced" as an indication of future demand, in particular from younger people, that needs supporting.

Stakeholders generally accepted that intangible heritage could have two identities: one historic, the other, as living culture as observed by a development agency:

> "Of course, traditions evolve, stop, or morph into other things. I understand that we're looking at an ever-changing, dynamic instance of cultural traditions. Some are collected in order to preserve a tradition. For instance, the Cornish language revival[50] would never have been possible without the research and collection of the oral tradition in the first place. So I guess there's a need for both the collection of cultures, and what you might think of as a continuous living culture. "

Ultimately, as one interviewee put it, intangible heritage is "really only a strategic definition - you need to know what it refers to in particular contexts and why", in this sense, intangible heritage is simply "a hook to hang other things on. It's never just about heritage - it's always about something else. . .

Safeguarding intangible heritage is not like safeguarding tangible heritage: It's not about problems of, say, repairing the fabric of a church. Intangible heritage isn't just used in terms of national politics, but for international policies. "

At the end of the day, "In terms of support, the debate about definition can involve a lot of navel gazing that could go on forever." It was suggested, "A narrower definition of intangible heritage would enable us to treat storytelling, dialects, music and dance on a par with material history and recorded evidence."

---

[50] Recently recognised by the British Government as a living regional language after a long period of revival, file:///Users/selwood/Desktop/CORNISH%20LANGUAGE%20. pdf

3. 1. 2 The importance of intangible heritage
The interviewees were unanimous in regarding intangible heritage as important - although there were considerable differences of opinion as to why that might be so:

- "It's what humans do".

- "It contributes to identity. Celtic [language] is crucial for Scottish identity". "Even at a community, as opposed to national level, it's about what happens here, about our rootedness in our local cultures". It also provides groups with "social resilience" in the sense of individual and community confidence;

- It can, it was suggested, "build community cohesion through the recognition of people's heritage and sense of belonging."

- For "displaced people - memory, storytelling, songs dance and sharing practices are important and may be the only heritage they have."

- It gives meaning to places; "Landscape can't simply be defined by the physical content of heritage, buildings and land. What it means to the community is what really defines and makes the landscape for that community. "

- It gives meaning to tangible heritage; "Collections of objects are less important if they don't have access to the associated intangible heritage."

For the intangible heritage specialists amongst the stakeholders, intangible heritage was important in terms of the politics of the heritage discourse: "Of course, the word "heritage" is problematic - it's often perceived as exclusive and is associated only with certain kinds of people who have "heritage". So, by definition, it excludes those who are different and appears exclusive. " Several stakeholders, therefore, regarded intangible heritage as providing "an important base from which one can challenge more conventional ideas about heritage". The establishment might, now, "remedy its previous neglect" and, in doing that, "give some prominence to those forms of cultural heritage usually associated with marginalised communities - that are without tangible focus".

Areas of intangible heritage 'at risk' in the UK

As to whether aspects of the UK's intangible heritage were at risk; some "couldn't say" and at best cited examples of what they thought that HLF had already supported, "dialect projects in Norfolk" [51]. Others were clear about 'at risk'.

Specific examples included "traditional skills, language skills and the knowledge they embody" and crafts, which were endangered because there may only be one or two practitioners left. Swill basket[52] making was an example as, " very specific [to the Lake District] and passed down from generation to generation and could disappear as there is nothing … as in education or a qualification to preserve the knowledge. Also "town based industrial crafts" this included ceramics in Stoke, shoes in Northampton and cutlery in Sheffield. " Languages and dialects were referred to, including Yiddish, which once thrived in the East End; and Ulster Scots. The ceilidh (a tradition of people coming together performing and sharing music, song, story telling and poetry) was also said to be in danger of dying out. As were "Traditional outdoor games and the skill of making toys out of found or natural materials", at risk because children rarely play outside now. In terms of the environment, "…local knowledge about plants, landscape, wildlife is becoming fragmented as people do less on the land and do things in different ways. "

[51] For the Lost in Translation project, see *The Economist* (2006) "Dew you go down to Norfolk? School pupils learn to speak as their ancestors did", http://www. economist. com/node/7855235
[52] http://www. potterwrightandwebb. co. uk/wood-2/owen-jones-the-one-and-only-swill-maker see also MERL http://www. reading. ac. uk/merl/online_exhibitions/ruralcrafts/thefilms/swillbasketmaker. html
The Heritage Crafts Association has funding from The Radcliffe Trust to research and list endangered craft skills https://www. google. co. uk/?client=safari#q=Heritage+Crafts+endangered+craft&gfe_rd=cr

Post-industrial intangible heritage was considered at risk as practices formed around work; community life and the industry disappear with the decline, change and loss of industry. Examples given included the life of fishing villages in the North Scotland, mining communities in what are now seen as rural settings. Migrants' heritage was cited as at risk because it is "often practiced in domestic space and this can be lost or become a gap in intergenerational heritage."

Other communities' intangible heritage was thought to be at risk through lack of acknowledgement and acceptance. LGBT intangible heritage was given as an example, South Asian LGBT, in particular, was described as "very buried and very difficult to get." Disabled people's intangible heritage was seen as not recognised or visible. With a further caveat that when seeking to make heritage visible, the experience of one, say, visually impaired person does not 'represent' all visually impaired people.

Stakeholders considered why the UK's intangible heritage might be at risk. A number of reasons were suggested: "The UK has not signed the [UNESCO] Convention, which impacts on the visibility of intangible heritage…"

The lack of recognition of the UK's intangible heritage expertise was another factor: "… in Scotland, for instance, there is a long tradition of collecting folklore, but no means of showing or raising its profile. The profile of UK intangible heritage as a whole sector needs raising locally, nationally and globally". It was understood that "different parts of the UK have different attitudes to the subject", and it was suggested that England's intangible heritage was harder "to pin down… because of its diversity, compared to the prevailing concept of nationalism in Scotland, Wales and Ireland".

Were it to be the case that the UK's intangible heritage is, indeed, at risk, stakeholders blamed heritage agencies' shortcomings. These included decisions about the distribution of funding. One interviewee's experience of working with local history groups made them aware that the majority of intangible heritage funding available went to London. "So, I'd say that the risk is to victims of London-centricity". The lack of funding meant that controversial or dissident heritages were unlikely to receive support: "From an Irish perspective, we'd be anxious to collect aspects of our most recent history before it becomes a distant history - collecting memories and peoples' experiences. We wish we could address that. " Examples of the cuts affecting existing intangible heritage initiatives included The Irish Traditional Music Archive (which holds the most extensive collection of traditional music in Ireland, including Orange Music)[53], and the University of Ulster's Conflict and Politics in Northern Ireland programme and website[54].

Other stakeholders blamed institutional neglect as observed by a project officer:

> "Many people aren't aware of the importance of the items that they have - they just get lost. Even though they value them, they may not do things with them… So, more effort has to be made to capture community heritage. In so far as, it's very active. HLF helps. But, things are at risk because different organisations value different things. "

Heritage professionals' lack of skills was cited, in particular, the "…degradation of curatorial expertise, knowledge and practice in acquiring associated information" when collecting. A particular issue when collections move beyond living memory and ways of life have changed "scholarly history doesn't recover or provide this. Museums need to work with communities to collect associated information."

[53] http://www. itma. ie
[54] http://cain. ulst. ac. uk

Addressing these issues, was thought to require nothing less than whole scale cultural change as was observed by a culture professional

> "Landscape knowledge is strongly scientific. Only farmers and locals have the knowledge to map the landscape and topography from the point of view of a place's character and stories…We need a cultural change in the way this is dealt with, and rather than locals sharing stories in the spirit of consultation, [we should] give these stories the same authority as experts give, say, a paper by a geologist. "

3. 1. 3 Examples of good practice (not necessarily HLF's or UK based) in supporting, safeguarding and disseminating greater understanding of intangible heritage

Some stakeholders were unable to identify any examples of good practice. Others made general, but unqualified, assertions: "It seems to me that there's an awful lot of good intangible heritage practice around… Much of it's very localised: if you want to find out about it you have to look very hard".

The types of UK projects that were specifically cited tended to be based around the "folk-cannon" and "local industrial places". "Living" museums that seek to nourish and cultivate heritage practices (such as Ryedale Folk Museum and the Museum of East Anglian Life) were referred to. Community-based projects, such as Scotland's Rural Past[55], based on what consultees themselves valued, were mentioned. Other examples included HLF-supported projects: Picmatic[56]; Belfast Hills which sought to engage the community of Belfast in the hills around the city[57] and Myatt's Field Park[58],

[53] http://www. itma. ie
[54] http://cain. ulst. ac. uk
[55] Scotland's Rural Past was a five year initiative, run by the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS) with partnership funding (2006 - 2011) ly involved local communities in researching, recording and promoting Scotland's vanishing historic rural settlements and landscapes. Over 60 community-led projects were initiated across Scotland during the duration. "Together these projects have really improved our understanding of Scotland's rural heritage, from Shetland to the Scottish Borders. http://www. scotlandsruralpast. org. uk/
[56] This was the argot of North-East miners for over 150 years. The project drew on detailed research in archives and interviews with the last generation to use it http://www. theguardian. com/uk/2007/jul/30/books. britishidentity
[57] http://belfasthills. org
[58] http://www. myattsfieldspark. info

London, where the community shared food cultivation, cooking, cultural knowledge and skills. "Sharing food and skills in this way gets people thinking and if they see this as intangible heritage they may make links to other areas of life."

Beyond HLF, we were referred to apprenticeships based around heritage craft skills; instances of nation-building projects in Wales, Scotland and Ireland, and equalities work. One overseas example cited was the Smithsonian Folklife Festival [59].

Given that our stakeholders included several heritage specialists, it was probably not surprising that numerous examples of institutional good practice around safeguarding in particular were identified. These included UNESCO's Lists of Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices [60]. Listing was considered especially important in the context of intangible heritage's relationship to tourism. As a specialist consultant observed

> "The issue is around geographical indicators for intangible heritage and handicrafts - like the French *Appellation d'origine contrôlée*. It's intended to protect their name and differentiate a market for them, which could even be supported by government grants."

Other good examples of safeguarding intangible heritage included initiatives promoted by the South Korean Preservation Law initiative, whereby a group of specialist scholars identify a selected possessor of the craft skills, and give them a stipend to train others.

Historic England cited its own recent listings of Reliance Avenue, Brixton Market - because it had formed the commercial and social heart of the extensive African-Caribbean community that settled in Brixton post-

WW2 [61] - and the Royal Vauxhall Tavern - one of the best known and longstanding LGBT venues in the capital [62]. At the time of our interviews, Historic England was looking to list more mosques. "They're interesting because often they're very ordinary - even domestic buildings - but very important because of what happened in them and how they represent the communities involved".

---

[59] Founded in 1967, The Smithsonian Folklife Festival is an annual international exposition of living cultural heritage produced by the Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage. It is a major research-based presentation of contemporary living cultural traditions and is usually divided into programmes "featuring a nation; region, state, communities or theme includes programs of music, song, dance, celebratory performance, crafts and cooking demonstrations, storytelling, illustrations of workers' culture, and narrative sessions for discussing cultural issues. It's conceived as an exercise in cultural democracy, in which cultural practitioners speak for themselves, with each other, and to the public". In 2007, Wales was the guest nation. http://www. festival. si. edu/about-us/mission-and-history/smithsonian

[60] http://www. unesco. org/culture/ich/en/lists

[61] The market was listed because it is "the clearest architectural manifestation of the major wave of immigration that had such an important impact on the cultural and social landscape of post-war Britain, and is thus a site with considerable historical resonance" http://historicengland. org. uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1393881

[62] "The building has historic and cultural significance as one of the best known and longstanding LGB&T venues in the capital, a role it has played particularly in the second half of the C20. It has become an enduring symbol of the confidence of the gay community in London for which it possesses strong historic interest above many other similar venues nationally" http://historicengland. org. uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1426984

The Hans Rausing Endangered Languages project at SOAS[63] was cited as a worldwide initiative that supports research, training and archiving of endangered languages. The work of the British Library[64] was considered important because it records and archives "the everyday".

Other examples represented the work of partnerships. In principle, good practice was defined as essentially being led "by the community, not the state". But because "it doesn't always work like that on the ground, it needs to come from the people and bottom up." In this sense as an academic observed

> "Communities need to be empowered to look after their heritage. The role of agencies is to provide or support opportunities: maybe guide or support communities with democratic processes, since communities don't always agree [amongst themselves]; support their working together and a sense of ownership; help them think about sustainability and the long-term, for example, after funding."

If good practice, then, includes "any intervention that helps the community involved to do it, and pass on the ability of doing it" - we were inundated with examples of partnership working. Many appear to comply with the principle of creating as an academic observed

> "…self-sustaining critical mass [which] is very important for intangible heritage. It doesn't work top down. It needs individuals to take it forward. . . The sense of having a stake in something needs to be created and people need to feel that they are running the project."
> Some examples of good practice were attributed to NGOs.

SmallWoods (an NGO and social enterprise) was cited in the basis of the multiple contributions it makes to a more sustainable society. Another example was a Norwegian network (managed by an NGO) of about 24,000 crafters, belonging to local cells, which have jointly developed the skills needed to make, knit and embroider national *Bunads*[65]. Societies and membership associations, such as the English Folk Dance and Song Society (EFDSS) and Heritage Crafts Association, were also considered to represent good practice by providing people with opportunities to practice intangible heritage skills.

E-museums, including the Portuguese, Memoriamedia,[66] and the Brazilian, Museum of the Person[67], were held up as exemplars of interventions around oral traditions and promoting the community's life stories.

Closer to home, Scottish craft boat building projects were highlighted. GalGael[68] works with the community and vulnerable groups, while the Port

---

[63] http://www. hrelp. org
[64] http://www. bl. uk/subjects/sound
[65] These traditional rural clothes that mostly date back to the 19th and 18th centuries, as well as modern 20th-century folk costumes. They are usually are worn on 17 May (National Day) and other national occasions.
[66] http://www. memoriamedia. net/index. php/en.
This museum is "intended to identify, register, preserve and publicize tales, legends, proverbs, and any other form of oral culture: the skills of ancient artisans; the uses and rites prevailing in day-to-day professional, social and family circles". See Souse F (2015) The International Dimension: MemoriaMedia in Scottish Storytelling Centre (2015) "Making It Ours: Intangible Heritage in Scotland" pp21-2
[67] http://www. museumoftheperson. org/about/
[68] http://www. galgael. org

Soy Traditional Boat Festival[69] has created boat-building links around the North Sea. The Irish Traditional Music Archive[70], Dublin, was cited as an example of good practice because it "unpacks perceptions of traditional music belonging to one side of the community or another, which, for a long time, was a challenge. " The Welsh Dyfi Biosphere[71] (designated by UNESCO's Man and the Biosphere Programme) tests and demonstrates innovative approaches to maintaining living tangible heritage goods, culture and economies based on a healthy environment.

Work in schools and with young people were also cited: the Asian Supplementary Schools, which support language and customs; " building momentum around teaching Cornish in primary schools" [72], and the Feis[73], which started over thirty years ago in response to concerns about the decline of Gaelic culture (language, crofting and music).

However, stakeholders observed that for partnership working to constitute good practice, certain conditions must apply. One such condition was "an even power relationship", which necessitated the meeting of "bottom up" and "top down" approaches: "People aren't aware of the value of intangible heritage, and that it may be at risk. 'Top down' is good at identifying vulnerable threads of culture, but not so good at what to do with them. This needs people on the ground. " Good practice was also considered to involve the exercise of "social justice"… "It's important to have an ethical approach when working with communities." The processes involved in such projects were likely to involve as an academic observed

> "…. asset mapping, sitting down with the communities to gather information; documenting the process so that it's clear that the community has identified the need, and why, and its beneficial outcomes."

While these perceptions of what constitutes good practice, inevitably sound "top down", the Paul Hamlyn Foundation's Our Museum programme was cited precisely because it addresses the unpredictability that working "bottom up" with communities embraces. A museum curator observed that

> "Funders often support projects with predetermined outcomes - they want to define what those are going to be from the outset. But, participatory projects involving the community are less predictable - you might not know what the outcomes will be…"

3. 1. 4 The role of digital technology in encouraging participation in, and the conservation of, intangible heritage

Interviewees were generally positive about the role of digital technology - even if some were unable to specify why.

---

[69] http://www. stbfportsoy. com
[70] http://www. itma. ie
[71] http://www. ecodyfi. org. uk
[72] This is being driven by several Cornwall County Council councillors and has arisen as part of the work around the devolution agreement for Cornwall https://www. gov. uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/447419/20150715_Cornwall_D evolution_Deal_-_FINAL_-_reformatted. pdf. "In April 2014, the Government formally recognised the distinct identity of the Cornish under the European Framework for the Protection of National Minorities giving it the same status as the UK's other Celtic peoples the Scots, Irish and Welsh". https://www. gov. uk/government/news/cornish-granted-minority-status-within-the-uk
[73] http://www. feisean. org/en/

One example of its use was in bringing together collections of languages, dialects, oral histories and other traditions. The world's biggest digital archive of English folklore at EFDSS was singled out to exemplify how digital media has made it simpler to capture, record and archive forms of intangible heritage. It has also enabled people to contribute to the record, use and access it themselves without the previously necessary mediation of museums or archives. Heritage projects' website can bring collections, themes and stories together and make sense of them "bringing research into everyone's home" as with the Keys to the Past[74] website for County Durham.

In terms of safeguarding intangible heritage, many countries (in particular, developing countries) have signed up to the UNESCO inventories. Trinidad & Tobago, for example, have linked their inventory to Facebook, and it generates considerable responses from the diaspora. Moreover, digital technologies network people and allow them to exchange information. The North Sea Ring[75] set up by the Port Soy Boat Festival links organisations with an interest in traditional boat building around the North Sea and Scandinavia.

Digital media have created a platform for the wider interpretation of collections. The People's Collection Wales[76], for example," is attempting to democratise the sharing of memories in photographs, sound recordings (including oral testimonies) documents, videos and stories and to celebrate Welsh communities, families, villages, towns and cities, industries and traditions. Anyone can log on…. "The Scottish living culture wiki [77], for example, was observed to have become "a central flank of the Scottish strategy around intangible heritage". And "Everyone can now contribute oral histories - they only need a telephone and to be able to put something up online".

As one interviewee put it, "digital recordings allow the emotion of a particular event, or story, to be captured and shared." Youtube and Instagram enable people to photograph, film and share experiences, trends and material that might otherwise be considered "ephemeral". The use of QR codes in landscape and outdoor interpretation was seen as a means to show traditional craft making and use. Conversely some museums are using GIS to re-locate objects in the place they were made and used.

For traditional crafts, selling on line was seen to be important, as was learning and sharing skills through video. Learning resources available for formal and informal learning was considered invaluable for traditional music, dance and customs.

In Northern Ireland, the Conflict and Politics in Northern Ireland web archive has been used to support creating an archive of artists' responses (across all art forms) to the Troubles[78]. At the time the artworks were being made, "it was a highly sensitive area… and much work has been lost".

Digital media are also contributing to institutional cultural change.

Historic England is planning to launch an online initiative to parallel the National Heritage List for England, "Enriching the List", which is expected to go live in May 2016, is intended to crowd-source the peoples' own list, and is

[74] http://www. keystothepast. info/Pages/Home. aspx
[75] http://northsearing. com
[76] http://www. peoplescollection. wales/
77 Now intangible heritage Scotland, this was handed over to MGs in 2011 and is . Available at http://www. ichscotland. org/
[78] http://www. troublesarchive. com

bound to include intangible aspects - what places mean to them; what happened there. In this sense, digital technologies could be said to be democratising aspects of heritage.

It was suggested that certain digital practices might count as intangible heritage in themselves - gaming, the conventions that developed around early online discussion groups, and the use of avatars to create separate identities. These provides autonomous spaces, within which networks form to share practices. They "create the very conditions within which intangible heritage can flourish".

However positively most stakeholders viewed the relationship between intangible heritage and digital technology, they also identified a number of problems. It was suggested that some forms of intangible heritage were more likely to be "digitally represented" than others. Stakeholders also doubted the sustainability and long-term preservation of digital projects. A consultee from one of the UK government agencies commented:

> "We have unrealistic expectations of communities. Scotland's Rural Past[79] is supposed to belong to everyone. But who is going to look after it in 15 years time? Which council or government is going to volunteer to take it on?"

Certainly, stakeholders were aware of their own institutional shortcomings. One insisted, "We *have to be,* and *should be,* managing it better". Digital has its own issues around copyright, licencing, loss of community ownership and the misuse of people's and community materials.

Institutions' levels of resources, money and staff capacity with which it might develop the role of digital media was an issue: larger organisations were seen to have a greater advantage, although small museums were seen to be making increased use of mobile technology.

There was concern about the volume of community-generated material and heritage organisations' ability to care for and make it accessible. With funders emphasis on engagement and participation community projects don't allow sufficient time to create the project archive. A funder led improvement was suggested, "In my view a functional listed archive is fundamentally more important than the evaluation report. It is important that depositing an archive is seen to have a strong relationship with intangible heritage."

Stakeholders were also aware that projects' websites often disappear.

The fact that "they're subject to short-term vision" implicitly raises issues of longevity. "Who's going to keep those projects' websites going? How will they [the websites] contribute to [the projects] long-term sustainability?" Moreover, digitised intangible heritage was seen to become "…frozen in time and things that would normally develop, move on, become fixed."

However democratic they appear, digital media were considered by some stakeholders to be the very opposite. An academic consultee regarded them as reinforcing privilege:

> "We don't all use digital media now, and it doesn't magically solve problems of access. Some older people might be excluded because they can't use, or access, digital media. There are still class connotations around heritage, which may inhibit ethnic communities who also can't easily access digital media."

[79] http://www. scotlandsruralpast. org. uk/

Other stakeholders referred to digital initiatives, which were intended to be democratic, but failed to connect with their target communities. This was exemplified by the first version of the Scottish listings wiki: "It sought to engage with the world at large, but was hardly populated. Since there was nothing there to respond to, nothing happened. MGS revamped it. But it's still seen as a top-down process, which has been hard to respond to. " At the other extreme, Swedish and wikis were reported to have had to balance openness with controls - "who gets to post things, who edits the material and who controls the gateway?"

3. 1. 5 The challenges, and lessons learnt, from supporting intangible heritage

Interviewees' perceptions of the challenges, or lessons learnt, from supporting intangible heritage varied enormously. Some had "no idea" what these might be. Intangible heritage's very intangibility was identified as its major difficulty: "it makes it very hard for people to know what you might be talking about". A number of stakeholders commented, "the fact that heritage professionals don't know what intangible heritage is a real challenge." However, not to engage with this challenge: "Risks the use of heritage, as continually underpinning a normative view of culture …"

For others, challenges lay in definitions and remit. Working definitions were evidently crucial; what kind of support public sector agencies were offering for intangible heritage, according to what terms, and why, and what did they hope to achieve though it. These were understood to be driven by politics, public policies and accountability.

Critiques of the present situation sometimes implied that they expected to find some kind of coherence across the sector. As one interviewee put it: "The big challenge is that things get lost between, say, NGOs and governments. Academics might consider it appropriate for the focus of intangible heritage support to be around policy issues, like community cohesion and development", whereas other constituencies of interest might think it more apposite "to go back to the fact that intangible heritage is about people doing things". This suggested that support was usually considered in relation to preservation and living culture. Some proposed that both concerns could be addressed: "The purposes of support are to keep intangible heritage practices alive and in our memories". But, others maintained that it was crucial to "separate preserving and supporting of it". A museum curator, for example, stipulated that

> "Recording it is not the same as representing it. The challenge that funders have to face is whether they are supporting archival records… or whether they want to energise communities and their sense of identity. There are big differences between the two."

Preserving intangible heritage was seen as particular issue. In the context of public funding, by definition, certain forms of intangible heritage are privileged over others. While intangible heritage doesn't appear to require the same level of funding as say a Grade I listed building, HLF was perceived to have only awarded intangible heritage small-scale grants. Even within the field of intangible heritage, it was regarded as "highly problematic to fund some things and not others". Several interviewees criticised the implications of the UNESCO Convention's emphasis on preserving intangible heritage: "In practice, fixing intangible heritage practice for tourists implies that it won't change and no longer has a place in living culture". Museums' position on this was considered to be problematic. A museum interviewee provided an example:

> "Look at heritage crafts. An open-air museum … might still have the

buildings like the Woollen Mill[80] and a weaver, trained by someone who came out of the community. The knowledge of weaving that been passed on is intangible, but the buildings, the machines and the products are all tangible. The weaving patterns are both tangible and intangible.

But, of course, the purpose of the weaving has changed.

There's a vast difference between the craft that was once practised within the community, and what's now practiced in the museum. We might be able to record it, but we can't reinvent the social and historical context within which it took place."

Several interviewees thought, "If things don't change, they're dead".

This suggested that the recording of intangible heritage for archives and museums was a strictly "academic exercise". As a museums specialist noted

"People with linguistic skills use recordings to understand the complexities of dialects; they collect words that are dying out. But, there's a vast difference between doing research and study and giving people confidence in their own heritage and energising that. "

For one interviewee, recognising the challenge of museum objects being "dead" meant that they had refocused their work around basket making, to locate the skills and craft in a current economic and leisure context. Work with contemporary makers enabled the museum to better understand this rural craft and their collections.

Within the context of recording and preserving intangible heritages, the single most contentious issue was oral history. It raised numerous questions about distinguishing between the value of individual and collective experiences, and between oral history capturing intangible heritage, and being a form of intangible heritage. A heritage learning specialist explained:

"Oral history comes up in the context of lots of other material collections - family and community archives. We keep things that represent different kinds of experiences, and different passions. We can count all of those as intangible heritage. There are lots of different kinds of intangible heritage. "

In the view of a consultant

"…intangible heritage doesn't include the memory of an individual person recorded as oral history and stored for archival … purposes. It might include oral traditions, such as folklore, epic tales or other oral expressions that are repeated over time or constantly recreated. . . . But, a recording that's never retold isn't living heritage. It might remain important as oral history, and as part of the historical record… I suppose some oral history might become a mantra for the current generation, and be told by different people again and again. That would fall into what I would interpret as intangible heritage. "

According to a civil servant whom we interviewed

"Intangible heritage is about tangible things. So in relation to the Travellers - their stories are about sites, which might just be fields, and

---

[80] http://www. museumwales. ac. uk/stfagans/buildings/woollen_mill/

not important for any especially historic or aesthetic reasons. But, they're replete with memories, stories and associations. Digital recordings make that more tangible. In this case, the oral histories aren't just the recollections of a single individual, but come from a culture that's genuinely shared. The issue here is about a marginalised culture, which we want to recognise, and we need to know how the group feels about it. "

Stakeholders were acutely sensitive to the difficulties of working on projects that are intended to bestow status on particular communities' intangible heritage. "Because we work in a traditional, civil service way, we tend not to be so good at it". For one interviewee, "The way in which we're working around intangible heritage now involves engaging (more resource intensively) and struggling with those whose values, we are concerning ourselves with".

The lessons learned were that "It's very difficult to win the trust of people and, of course, in order to get people engaged an awful lot of investment in preparatory work is necessary. We need to be creative". Historic Scotland's consultation around the Tinkers' Heart, arguably, exemplifies this[81]. The agency had to ask community leaders how to reach the Travellers to consult with them, and found that it needed to advertise on the radio.

Interviewees were also aware of having too high expectations of community groups to deliver grant-funded projects, or to sustain their investment. "For many of those involved in intangible heritage, it's not their day job. It's just their passion - so it's hard for them to dedicate the time to it and it's less professionally competent".

An archive officer observed that

"When there's lots of funding around, more is done to engage communities. In the last few years, some organisations skilled-up and had the capacity to do more. But, the cuts have made it very difficult to prioritise those areas, and they'll sink to the bottom of the list. So, the issue is about how intangible heritage projects are valued. They won't be sustained alongside other projects, and they're not income generating. People come to community heritage in a voluntary capacity, and without a supportive infrastructure, intangible heritage will ultimately be abandoned. "

From our expert stakeholders' perspective, the community's "capacity" to deliver projects was thought to be limited. They needed to become more aware of, and practiced in, the techniques and skills through which intangible heritage is collected and preserved. "This would have to be done very sensitively, so that it wouldn't be classified as top-down. But, if people don't know that it [intangible heritage] is under their noses, they're unlikely to invite investigations into it. You have to engage with the community to do this. "

Tensions around the leadership of work and projects are apparent in the expectations of community groups' freedom to determine intangible heritage and bureaucratic constraints. With the latter challenges attach to the provision of grant funding itself. These include accountability, and the need for an "end product", which could be that "The product of good intangible heritage [projects] is people know more than they did, and are practicing it."

[81] http://www. historic-scotland. gov. uk/index/news/indepth/tinkers-heart-consultation. htm

In identifying value, "It's really down to the people within the community to identify what's important, to be granted status and respect for that, and bring others' attention to it". Put another way, "If it matters to you, it matters". But, "a community might not regard what's under its nose as being of value, and there'll be a disparity between what it expects and what the 'experts' think." This becomes very evident in relation to historic building statutory protection with the graded listing of buildings.

Interviewees referred to the fact that value is seen to reside in official recognition; "People feel that if something's not listed, it doesn't count; if it's not in the records, the establishment doesn't endorse it". But, as someone from a culture organisation explained

> "In order for something to be included on the list there has to be evidence of value to the community. Often, there's a problem about identifying and delimiting the community. So, for example, if the community is a village on the Scottish borders - you'd have to ask - how it can be accessed; whose values does it represent; who represents the village and who should be dealt with. All those questions are left open. 'Community' is both a cosy term, and highly problematic. "

Others took the view the problem lay in the methodologies to determine statutory protection or significance in the historic and natural environment. However, to regard intangible heritage as community-led, is to beg the question of how a community might be identified: "…where the boundaries of a community begin and end are not necessarily fixed, who are the stakeholders, and who has a say or not."

3. 1. 6 The links between tangible and intangible heritage
There was a high consensus amongst stakeholders that separating tangible and intangible heritage is very hard, if not undesirable. The intangible is considered to give meaning to the tangible: "You can't possibly understand particular objects of tangible heritage, without the intangible relationship". Ultimately, "…All heritage is intangible. Heritage is more of a process then a thing in itself; it's more about the spirit of a place than it is about the physical atoms that make up the place itself. " And more specifically, "The tangible is absolutely no use without intangible heritage, we don't know when to use things and we don't know when not to, we don't know how to use things or how to fix them."

Interviewees exemplified this - not only in relation to places - but also, buildings and objects including tools and musical instruments: "intangible heritage ultimately produces tangible objects, which might be a folk song, a narrative or dance. " All these kinds of objects were described as "intimately associated with intangible heritage practices whose significance often resides in their non-material associations - the knowledge, emotions, memories, families and relationships." "I think that tangible heritage is a physical manifestation of intangible heritage and that intangible heritage value is part of what gives particular places their significance." While "Intangible heritage moves beyond the tangible", it was also acknowledged that there is "a continuum from intangible to tangible", and that not all intangible heritage has, or requires, a tangible dimension. "

A landscape specialist, two culture professionals, an academic and a consultant variously suggested that:

> "Intangible heritage practices shape and create the natural world. If you look at ancient woodland, you'll see the signs of that in the landscape - the physical manifestation of intangible heritage practices. "

> "A sense of place cannot be put onto a specific feature of the landscape. It is woven in, and experienced. Every bit of a tangible landscape has intangibles. "

> "The link between tangible and intangible is locale, where people are, where they live, their everyday landscape where heritage takes place. For example, a festival occurs in a place that has some meaning for the event. "

> "The relationship and knowledge about communities is more important than the things produced."

> "We often link practices to places where communities pass practices on through successive generations. And, places sometimes enable, or determine, certain practices. So, for instance, the cathedral choir may get fixed up - but the act of conserving intangible heritage may result in stopping people using the choir stalls because they're regarded as too fragile. In practice, this prevents it being used as a church, and it doesn't allow the practices associated with the place to continue. "

Other interviewees used "loss" to exemplify the enforced separation between tangible and intangible heritage. An academic proffered the example of

> "…Tower Hamlets in the East End of London. It's continuously being threatened by increased development and gentrification. So, if you go to Brick Lane, there are more curry houses closing all the time. They're being replaced by trendy wine bars. It's necessary to preserve the community's identity, which is being lost on both its tangible and intangible forms. "

Several stakeholders emphasised that not understanding the links between tangible and intangible heritage, might well lead to "a tendency to underpin normative culture around the physical."

3. 1. 7 Stakeholders' knowledge of HLF support for intangible heritage and its impact

Interviewees (even those who had previously attended HLF's round table discussions on the subject) often had little, or no, knowledge about HLF's support for intangible heritage and were even less aware of its impact. "HLF has done a lot of work on intangible heritage, but precisely what I don't know." Their perceptions of HLF were dominated by its funding of buildings and other forms of tangible heritage. As one interviewee put it, "Really, the only things I know about are from the website, or have crossed my desk or I've been rung up for advice about." Another said that they "know a bit about the bidding process and the importance of tangible assets in that. I'm not aware of any intangible heritage work, maybe photographs and 'little' stories of Pakistani women. "

Examples of what stakeholders knew (or thought) to have been supported by HLF (even if this was not the case) included:

- oral histories including those related to Sikh soldiers in World War 1[82] and Traveller communities[83]; local history societies, and invitations for people, in general to share their stories;

- the provision of "useful and robust advice. Available for tackling tangible heritage", including oral history guidance and training opportunities for heritage craft skills;

- skills funding with a perception of an emphasis on heritage building skills;

- MGS's work in Scotland;

- *All Our Stories*[84];

- landscape partnership work, including the Kent Orchards for Everyone project[85], which links place and intangible heritage;

- *Parks for People*[86] with projects bringing communities together;

- community heritage partnerships, including involving, for example, the Royal Geographic Society, the British Library and the Museum of London.

This question prompted several interviewees to return to questions about what was, or wasn't, intangible heritage. "I think that there's a problem with the intangible heritage umbrella, where they've parked oral histories. It's not necessarily useful to lump everything together."

Conversely, it was also suggested that HLF's definition of intangible heritage was exclusive. Although one interviewee thought that HLF funded performance, it was suggested, "The general feeling within the arts community is that HLF's definition of heritage is limited. Traditional music groups assume that they're not encouraged to approach it."

In terms of its impacts - as one stakeholder put it: "I don't know anything whatsoever about the impact. HLF's website lists a lot of things that intangible heritage can do, but I have no idea how to find out whether any of those have actually succeeded."

Another interviewee felt that having to go to the website to find out about the impact of HLF's intangible heritage work, "isn't good." A curator observed that

> "There aren't any reports on the website. It may be impossible to access the impact of many projects yet. But, it'll be really important to feed those [impacts] back in terms of future funding. However, it demands a long view and so, it's a matter of five or 10 years down the line."

Stakeholders were aware of HLF's work around oral history. While that was viewed positively, it was not without certain caveats. A heritage organisation commented

---

[82] http://southasiansoldiers. org. uk/2015/10/08/press-release-exhibition-about-sikhs-in-ww1-tours-to-the-asian-centre/
[83] https://www. hlf. org. uk/about-us/media-centre/press-releases/filling-gap-travellers%E2%80%99-tales
[84] A grant programme which supported community heritage, delivered in 2012. https://www. hlf. org. uk/looking-funding/our-grant-programmes/all-our-stories
[85] http://www. kentdowns. org. uk/aonb-partnership/orchards-for-everyone
[86] https://www. hlf. org. uk/looking-funding/our-grant-programmes/parks-people

> "There seems to be a lot of documenting, for example oral history…. It is a matter of what's seen to be important. There's a tendency to look at the bigger things in history. But family and community heritage is equally important. . . Groups [inevitably] apply for grants for what's seen to be important to the funder, but other things may be equally important."

Other impacts of HLF's intangible heritage support tended to be described in terms of instrumental outcomes. Stakeholders' singled out work with groups (including Travellers) as having been very important - "especially to those communities - because it identified their culture as distinct, and acknowledged that culture is not necessarily fixated on objects, which has been much appreciated".

HLF's investment in oral history was also credited as having contributed to the holdings of local archives. "So, there's a legacy there…". But, interviewees also questioned whether such documentation actually sustains practice.

Support for the digitisation of the EFDSS collection (*The Full English*) [87] was credited as being central to the folk music revival [88], which is becoming more mainstream as evidenced by Stuart Maconie's BBC Radio 6 *Freakier Zone* on Sundays. "There seems to be a more tangible desire to bring that tradition away from its real ale and sandals image. Without EFDSS and others, it wouldn't have happened". Others suggested that the impact of *The Full English* has "probably been overlooked by the heritage sector itself, "because it's not in a museum".

3. 1. 8 Other sources of funding for intangible heritage

Few stakeholders had firm views about sources of funding for intangible heritage other than HLF. It had never occurred to them to think about it. HLF was evidently regarded as "the biggest name", although "it doesn't have a monopoly." There were "probably various sources - as here would be for any other form of heritage". They were, however, conscious of the difficulties of raising partnership funding for intangible heritage projects: "It's rather obvious, but I should think it's probably much harder to fund raise for intangible heritage than [tangible] heritage". This had been raised at the ICOMOS UK 2014 conference. [89] As a heritage organisation interviewee put it

> "It might be easier for a museum to get intangible heritage funding since they carry more weight and have a higher profile than small organisations. When we approach funders, we usually focus on educational or other aspects of the project, but not on the intangible heritage front."

The fact that several stakeholders regarded intangible heritage as "really a concept" meant that it might just be a matter of thinking how those "concepts translate, and could be reinterpreted in the light of contemporary policy drivers". Certainly, intangible heritage wasn't regarded as a special case:

---

[87] http://www. efdss. org/efdss-the-full-english
[88] http://www. theguardian. com/music/2015/may/13/spiro-leveret-english-folk-music-reviving-old-tunes
[89] Intangible Cultural Heritage in the UK: promoting and safeguarding our diverse cultures ICOMOS UK conference September 2014. It is planned to publish conference proceedings. http://www. icomos-uk. org/uploads/sidebar/PDF/ICOMOS-UK%20intangible heritage%20Conference%202014_150914. pdf

" I don't see that intangible heritage has any more problems than any other heritage form".

Nevertheless, it was accepted that other sources of funding would be limited. Local authorities and voluntary sector organisations would be affected by cuts in funding. While they were never major sources of support, "The kinds of projects that were supported on the old days are unlikely to be possible now".

Interviewees were unsure if UNESCO funds projects. Alternative sources might include Arts Council Wales, Arts Council Northern Ireland, Creative Scotland, ACE and the Crafts Council (even though it is not a funder) as supporters of traditional arts and museum collections. Other charities funded cultural practices for reasons other than supporting "heritage" per se.

Examples of instrumental support included community education projects, such as those supported by Paul Hamlyn, Esmée Fairbairn, the Radcliffe and Wellcome Trusts. The Coalfields Regeneration Trust, for example, was known to indirectly fund intangible heritage. Refugee projects were also seen to include an element of intangible heritage. A government agency interviewee noted

> "People, who work around equalities, often provide pointers for us when we're concerned with communities who might seem marginal. But, in many respects, heritage is irrelevant to them - it's not something they would claim to have, or considered valuable enough to explore. "

It was imagined that there would probably be some element of crowd funding on a small scale too. "It could be that HLF looks to those models". The EU's Culture programme and Europa Nostra[90] were likely to provide a rich source of support. Indeed, *Seeing Stories. Recovering Landscape Narrative in Urban and Rural Europe*[91], part of the Scottish Storytelling Festival[92], had been supported by the Culture Programme of the European Union.

But, based on the assumption that funding was needed for research "rather than anything else", the most likely sources were two of the UK's research councils, the AHRC and ESRC. But, as an academic interviewee noted, in general….

> "The political agenda increasingly suggests that the HLF and universities have common interests, although they look very different. HLF tends not to fund academics, and academics tend not to work on HLF projects. Perhaps they need to work together more."

However, the discussion about other sources of funding for intangible heritage was constrained by those interviewees who thought that intangible heritage, as "living heritage" doesn't need support. A government agency interviewee explained that

> "In a personal capacity. I think that intangible heritage is effectively self-defining and fluid. So, if people don't think something is valuable, then it's not valuable. It's something that people themselves choose to continue and perpetuate… I'm less sympathetic to the issue of saving minority languages. If they're not used, then people evidently don't want to use them. I think that the funding needs of intangible heritage will be considerably less than those for tangible heritage. So, since it

[90] This is described as "a rapidly growing citizens' movement for the safeguarding of Europe's cultural and natural heritage", see http://www. europanostra. org/who-we-are/
[91]   seeing stories
[92]   tracscotland seeing-stories

doesn't need funding for repairing the building fabric, for example, what does it actually need support for - recording or sharing?"

Others thought that "living heritage" did require funding, and that HLF should show a lead to other funders. The community may also have a funding role, albeit through local businesses or in kind: "Community give and take is part of the intangible heritage culture and is very important. . . there's an element of bartering and exchange. This [latter] doesn't get measured and should, as it shows sustainability. "

3. 2 Present needs

3. 2. 1 Support needed for organisations to build on, and sustain work intangible heritage work

As already mentioned, some stakeholders maintained that certain intangible heritage activities need no support: "Take, for example, the Burning of the Clavie[93], which takes place every January, and is a celebration of intangible heritage. People have been doing it for the best part of 100 years regardless of any outside support. "

Nevertheless, a number of interviewees emphasised that "organisations need the wherewithal to get on with it." A civil servant, for example, described needing help to consult with communities.

> "We struggle to engage those who are beyond the usual user base. . . The problem is to get them to consult with us, get them to consultation events, and get them on social media. We need rich sources of evidence for what we decide to do in terms of intangible heritage support".

A culture organisation thought that funders themselves needed a better understanding of intangible heritage:

> "The best form of support might be in letting us know how best to go about delivering intangible heritage, how you might preserve it, how you might apply new technology to it. Enabling us to share our experience and learn from others. Building up our skills and experiences are crucial. "

More generally, intangible heritage was thought to need advocacy and be brought into the mainstream. A heritage specialist noted

> "If I look at a list of the Heritage Alliance's members, no one jumps out. So, I guess it's crucial for somebody to be advocating on behalf of intangible heritage, making the case for it, and explaining why it's important. . . Maybe it would be best to get a mainstream organisation, like the National Trust, to recognise that that's what they actually do, and to champion the cause."

Others endorsed this: "intangible heritage it isn't something separate that you can deal with if you've got a bit of money left over." It needs to be "embedded in organisations' work [and supported] with core funding". This "needs to be done at the top of the organisation... then filter down in to practices at field level." It follows, that there was seen to be a need for "investment in the workforce", and learning from long-running successful intangible heritage projects. "It is about ways of [organisations] changing their sense of value and significance."

[93] http://www. burghead. com/clavie/

Some aspects of intangible heritage were considered to be more in need of support, than others. Local authorities, for example, were seen to need access to expert advice in the context of community planning in Northern Ireland. In contrast, however, oral history was singled out as not needing more support. It was even thought to have undermined support for intangible heritage more generally. "We haven't been good enough about understanding intangible heritage, because of the emphasis on the collection of oral history, which has been so much easier."

Stakeholders were, nevertheless, clear that different forms of intangible heritage were likely to need of different kinds of support. Museums (such as the Museum of Rural Life) and archives, like the EFDSS, which record and preserve snapshots of what already exists, have very different needs than the living cultures of communities and social groups".

Others argued that support should be targeted at communities: "Intangible heritage really comes out of communities… intangible heritage is part of the lifeblood of communities, and it's either there or not. No organisation is going to produce it. "This implied that the best way for HLF to support intangible heritage would be "to look for people to tell them what they need, and how they need to broaden the net. It would be dangerous to identify particular problems ahead of doing that". In short, HLF's support should be responsive rather than proactive. "Community champions" were mentioned: they could assist communities to understand intangible heritage practices as "relevant to their own lives", to identify intangible heritage that "might be in danger of being lost", support skills for working with intangible heritage such as "handling internal conflicts", and making "funding applications".

While the issue of skilling-up the community was crucial. Some stakeholders regarded HLF's privileging of community and grassroots' projects to date as synonymous with the elimination of expert skills. An academic, for instance, commented that

> "While community members are encouraged to carry out interviews and transcribe them, it loses the fact that these are very skilled jobs. Perhaps there'd be some advantage in supporting skilled professionals to work alongside communities engaged in those projects. It could, of course, be that that's happening already - I have no idea".

Others suggested support for intangible heritage-based businesses - "bread making, cheese making and beer making. They clearly make a contribution to place making" but might need help to develop their own networks and grow more sustainable. "Business skills were vital: "The technical aspect of a craft is irrelevant if no one wants to buy your work. You can't make a living if you don't connect with people who might be your customers." By comparison, those involved in traditional music making, for instance, might benefit from support for musical instruments. For local groups, like the Grenoside Sword Dancers [94], support has already enabled them to repair the props they use. Others might need help with hiring venues.

But, while groups might benefit from support being "more focused", it might take as long as the "lifespan of a generation "to achieve success in securing intangible heritage practices. Consequently, stakeholders doubted that external support could be expected to sustain community practices for

---

[94] http://www. rapper. org. uk/relations/longsword. php

their own sake. "It comes down to politics, social impact, activism - all those are very difficult issues for outsiders to influence."

3. 2. 2 increasing the number and range of organisations working with intangible heritage

Interviewees were almost unanimous on two points: one was that "we don't need more heritage organisations. There are quite enough as it is"; the other, as a government officer stipulated, was getting

> "…More people involved with intangible heritage. Maybe we're not articulating loudly or clearly enough. We need to be able to engage people, and need to be able to do that by touching on what they consider valuable."

This could involve museum and existing heritage groups recognising intangible heritage as part of what they already do. At the very minimum, this implied "exploring more of the links between intangible heritage alongside tangible heritage - perspectives of intangible heritage informing the value of places."

Stakeholders argued for not only maintaining "local interest in culture" but emphasising its importance. "There aren't really enough who understand its significance - so it's really about getting that out more" and extending its definition to involve more activities considered important at a community level. HLF was encouraged "to describe a range of possible different projects, put some ideas out, and then start looking at things beyond the scope that it had itself specified. ' There seemed to be considerable potential: "At the moment, very little of what it does is about food or culinary practices."

3. 2. 3 Ways of working that might support and enhance work in intangible heritage

Raising awareness and embedding intangible heritage in heritage organisations' ways of working was regarded as fundamental. Partnerships are valued for developing work, sharing skills, knowledge, capacity and the potential to work at a larger scale. Several stakeholders envisaged that more could be achieved in the future through stronger working relationships between heritage organisations and higher education; and between archives, libraries, museums and communities.

But, for the present, there was ample room for improvement. "The local library needed to be seen to take an interest and be known for taking an interest in intangible heritage. This would help to build critical mass". In Birmingham Library, for example, "more project materials are being deposited and made accessible, and training has raised community awareness and confidence."

Some stakeholders doubted the veracity of particular partnerships. "National Nature Partnerships", for example "tend to be between institutions, and aren't porous to local voices. A balance of institutions and local or street level perspectives is what's needed. Balancing top down and grass roots expertise is absolutely necessary for realising the potential in investing in intangible heritage."

Other forms of partnership were considered essential to the success of work around intangible heritage. There was little doubt that collaborations were the way "to bring energy to the issue". But, they required people with "a shared outlook". Work with local voluntary groups and volunteers were also

assumed to be important to intangible heritage. Moreover, this shouldn't be restricted to heritage or history groups, but should embrace the values that existing networks "arts, crafts and festivals" might bring.

3. 3 Future

Interviewees generally had less to say about the future, albeit about HLF's strategic priorities or other organisations' potential roles in supporting intangible heritage, than they had about any of the other issues put to them. Views on the future were also touched on in responses to earlier questions.

3. 3. 1 HLF's strategic priorities for intangible heritage and how these might be achieved

Several interviewees professed to have "no idea ", or "couldn't say" what HLF's strategic priorities for intangible heritage should be. Others conceived HLF's strategic priorities in terms of specific headlines: "greater visibility, more funding and better politics". Others proposed the rather simpler strategy of "providing cheap spaces where people could practice" - even listing "HLF approved" spaces. These would, they thought, "fit into its general ecology of support and help people achieve things".

This section considers interviewees' recommendations in terms of HLF potentially prioritising a:

- clearer definition of intangible heritage and HLF objectives for intangible heritage;

- more challenging approach to heritage;

- greater advocacy for intangible heritage;

- greater focus on 'the people'; and

- greater insistency on the legacy of its intangible heritage funding.

Because "mainstream heritage will always absorb the lion's share of heritage resources", stakeholders thought that HLF should prioritise defining intangible heritage and be very clear about HLF specific objectives for it. " It's absolutely fundamental - if it doesn't define intangible heritage, HLF won't be able to get the message out." But, "for that to work, HLF will have to help organisations by explaining what importance it attaches to intangible heritage, and why."

It has to be realistic about what it can contribute: "intangible heritage dies when something happens to community, its traditions and its own presentation of its heritage. Dealing with that is really a political issue, and is way beyond funders like HLF. "

It also needs to be purposeful: "We have to be careful about shoving too much under the umbrella of intangible heritage, and we need to draw some boundaries." If the label, intangible heritage, is "used so loosely that it only refers to 'significance', the discourse will never be challenged or expanded."

Stakeholders thought it important for HLF to be seen to be advocating for intangible heritage. By prioritising the message that "all heritage is intangible", HLF should ensure that its own internal heritage discourse authorises intangible heritage, and that it isn't consigned a separate framework. "Heritage is more of

a process then a thing in itself…. Many of those who work in our profession would do well to remember that". HLF should therefore, locate intangible heritage wherever its programmes deal with tangible heritage. "Intangible heritage elements - albeit around memories, storytelling, whatever - should be placed at the heart of everything it does".

Advocating for intangible heritage outside the organisation will involve HLF in "networking and high level conversations". In this, it could build on its previous partnership work, including in Northern Ireland where the requirement for local authorities to prepare Community Plans constitutes an opportunity. But, to do this, HLF needs both capacity and expertise.

Stakeholders acknowledged that HLF had already made great strides in terms of focusing on communities, small-scale grant funding, and emphasising the social value of its funding. But, they were still concerned that intangible heritage - the peoples' history - was getting "missed out". "The record" is still regarded as exclusive, and associated with certain classes. HLF should make up for the establishment's "previous neglect" and address more diverse, ethnic minorities and immigrant communities. Stakeholders generally thought that it was important for the value of marginalised communities' cultures to be promoted, especially those that had been devalued under colonial power. Raising awareness of these invisible, if not hidden, cultures would surely serve to empower immigrants, ethnic minorities and diaspora communities, whose identities are almost always bound up with intangible cultural practices.

The redevelopment of Brick Lane, in London's East End, was cited as an example of the community's identity being lost along with manifestations of its tangible and intangible heritage. As an academic noted

> "Of course, communities change and are reborn. That's not necessarily a bad thing, but all changes bring loss, and that's part of what we're concerned with here. When communities are taken over, there are no resources to preserve the tangible heritage. So, the focus here is about publicly funded projects that could preserve, and make statements about the value of particular parts of London or particular aspects of British history. A single family's stately home under threat is still much more likely to be preserved then a place attached to a particular community. "

But, despite the call for HLF to focus its intangible heritage projects on migrants, disenfranchised, rural communities and those living in areas blighted by industrial decline, some stakeholders wanted HLF to move away from "peasants", "the folk canon" and immigrants' cultures. "In that sense, intangible heritage is always about 'the other'. HLF is actually very well placed to undercut that, and look at things rather differently."

Stakeholders were concerned that HLF should be clear about whose voices should be heard, and involve more people in its decision-making. They might come from different academic disciplines; community leadership; local and national agencies; networks that cut across major players; those already involved in intangible heritage, and individual activists, who already function as "community shapers". "It should ensure that the experts it engages aren't just heritage professionals, but local people who also bring expertise." It should also take account of the different nations and "promote an awareness of intangible heritage in England, in particular, where there is a [serious] lack of awareness".

Apart from considering who should be involved, stakeholders called for HLF to prioritise what might be involved. They referred to "neglected areas" or "different domains" such as "language, dialect, songs and stories. Maybe it

should look to the influences exerted by successive waves of migration. " Food and the performing arts were also mentioned, both seen as "relatively undervalued" in the UK's intangible heritage. "HLF could do with being much clearer about the boundaries that it implies between the arts, culture and intangible heritage" as well as oral history and oral traditions. Another, cultural organisation suggested that HLF just laid itself open to suggestions

> "Mainstream British bodies really need to think a bit more 'out of the box' and let organisations know that 'weird and wonderful' might be up their street. So, whether it's a marketing or a PR issue, people just need to feel secure that any applications would be favourably considered. "

HLF should resolve its position on looking back (in the sense of collecting and recording) and looking forward (and taking on new things as a matter of course - migration, technology). While recordings of performances would never reinvigorate intangible heritage itself, "HLF might do well to encourage research about local traditions, like the Grenoside Sword Dancers[95], and the emergence of new traditions in folk culture (such as the evolution of Fluffy dancing from Morris Dancing) to help maintain and preserve those traditional practices. "

Last by not least; stakeholders were concerned with the legacy of HLF- funded intangible heritage projects, precisely because what they produce isn't necessarily engrained in the day-to-day operations of heritage organisations. They called for HLF to prioritize sustaining the outputs of those projects and ensure that its investments were used more productively. An academic referred to being

> "…very conscious of the mass of oral history sound recordings that have already been funded, but wonder about the outcomes. Where are they all? It's not always is possible to access them. It would be good to identify what's out there, and how to maintain them. There needs to be greater accountability, and for HLF to take a strategic look at the longer-term deposit of material and its accessibility. "[96]

Moreover, understanding the longer-term impacts of what had already been funded should inform what happens in the future. As a museums specialist saw it,

> "HLF will need to instigate adaptive evaluations by revisiting the projects and people, who were involved in them five to ten years ago. It's like trying to understand changes in social impact and well-being, and requires long-term assessments to see how successful these were. "

3. 3. 2 The role and responsibility of other agencies and organisations in identifying, caring for, safeguarding and supporting intangible heritage

Stakeholders mentioned various organisations as potentially having a role in identifying, caring for, safeguarding and supporting intangible heritage. These include the National Trust, National Parks, the Woodland Trust, Higher Education, Research Councils, the larger museums, libraries and archives, specialist third sector groups (including the Folklore Society, the Anthropological Society and EFDSS) and professional bodies. Local authorities were also considered, although their contribution was doubtful given the current financial climate. It is worth noting that no Black and Minority Ethnic organisations or organisations supporting marginalised communities were referred to.

[95] http://grenosword2010. apwb. com/
[96] HLF support for the British Library's 'Save our Sounds' is predicated on this point Jo Reilly pers com.

Different agencies were envisaged as potentially associated with different areas of intangible heritage. They might have different roles to play: "Perhaps broadcasting has a role especially around language and dialect"; "Museums could be really important for developing intangible heritage in a number of different ways that relate to a more expansive approach to living culture"; "NGOs could serve to safeguard intangible heritage". But, stakeholders knew very well, that "intangible heritage often slips through the net and is not a priority."

Few stakeholders referred to the UK not being a signatory to the UNESCO Convention. Those that did either worked in intangible heritage, or were connected to ICOMOS UK. They assumed that each nation was likely to take an independent line on intangible heritage, and communities "would be treated as part of, and informing, strategic local agendas".

More generally, and as they had, in relation to the other issues they were asked about, stakeholders recognised that the management of intangible heritage in the UK depended on how it was defined - whether by the sector overall, or by HLF's specifically.

Several stakeholders regarded responsibility for intangible heritage as being "really part of civic society activity." "I don't think any organisations can actually be responsible - that needs to reside with the grass roots." At best, according to an anthropologist

> "Organisations might be able to guide and focus projects, but they can't be the drivers. Interventions led by people with authority will undermine it, which will prevent communities identifying with it and will undermine the status it might bring to them."

This ultimately informed stakeholders' view of the role and responsibilities of the HLF. It could potentially "influence, broker and champion intangible heritage, if it so chooses." More specifically, it was envisaged as having "an important role in making intangible heritage part of the strategic heritage and culture agenda, [alongside] the heritage, landscape and funding agencies in each nation." It might serve as "a partner, rather than leader" and it could well promote "community-led identification of intangible heritage." It was also acknowledged that HLF was well- placed "to advocate at government level for intangible heritage and "…give the intangible authority to the extent that it can be put on a Minister's desk."

Stakeholders based in other agencies admitted that they should do more themselves, but were constrained by limited resources. There seemed little question that "HLF could serve as a model to show that it's possible to include intangible heritage in its strategic priorities, and that it can be visible - so that others can emulate it. "Where HLF goes, others follow."

4 Observations and recommendations

The observations draw on both the literature review and stakeholder summary though the latter has more prominence. Some issues were dealt with in more depth by the literature, in particular the academic literature. These include; human rights, culture and heritage, sustainability from a social and environmental perspective, and analysis and critique of the socio-political context in which culture and heritage operates. Aside from reflecting the concerns of academic discourse these issues acknowledge that cultural diversity, human rights and sustainability form part of the context for the 2003 UNESCO Convention (UNESCO, 2003:1).

Unsurprisingly, the issue of "rights" is more prominent as part of the context in which heritage and culture in Northern Ireland operates (Northern Ireland Assembly, 2011) and where there is greater strategic awareness of intangible heritage; the MGS November 2015 conference[97]. As one interviewee observed,

> "I realised that I had not thought a lot about intangible heritage since doing museum studies, where intangible heritage was looked at and talked about in museological theory. When you are working in a museum it doesn't come up a huge amount."

4. 1 Observations

> "This research is very welcome in opening up the debate. It is very important that intangible heritage is acknowledged as part of heritage and steps are taken to record, preserve and keep intangible heritage for future generations".

This was expressed by many of the stakeholders interviewed. They viewed HLF's serious consideration of intangible heritage as timely not least in anticipation of in England the DCMS Culture White Paper (2016), and as constituting the next stage of the journey that has HLF embarked on since 1994.

> "At the outset, it [HLF] dealt with the Great and the Good, and the best heritage. Then it started to recognise that there is another element- namely, what communities' value. What matters to them isn't just tangible. And, intangible heritage isn't determined by the Great and the Good. Communities define it. Progress is being made to HLF seeing a total heritage view."

By virtue of the public investment it has made across the historic and natural environments, and its remit to engage across the historic and natural environment, HLF is uniquely placed to engage with, and promote a debate on intangible heritage. The interdependency of culture, heritage and nature is noted in the Convention (2003: 1).

Individual stakeholders raised a number of themes in common. The most urgent of these was the need to assign intangible heritage parity, and equal footing, with tangible heritage. They were in no doubt that the intangible gives meaning to the tangible. Conversely, there is no tangible without the intangible, "Heritage is simultaneously tangible and intangible. The non-tangible is not separate".

---

[97] http://www. museumsgalleriesscotland. org. uk/about-us/news/news-article/634/intangible-cultural-heritage-symposium-legacy-materials

While HLF is one of few funders which supports intangible heritage, stakeholders were conscious of a considerable disparity between its funding for intangible and tangible heritage. Moreover, they were not always clear about what HLF understood intangible heritage to comprise, what it has funded, what that funding had achieved, or what it was currently supporting. The consensus was that HLF's approach to intangible heritage is ambiguous and that it should clearly state and communicate its working definition of intangible heritage, explain how it supports it and why.

Stakeholders asked if HLF was willing to challenge conventional, "normative", ideas about heritage. Would it be willing to "acknowledge that intangible heritage is not necessarily the same as oral history" and is it "prepared to create an even broader sense of what heritage is than it has already?"

Our observations, therefore, focus on seven issues:

1. questions of definition;

2. questions of time;

3. language;

4. the relationship between intangible and tangible heritage;

5. politics;

6. risks; and

7. safeguarding.

The recommendations that follow have been made in relation to these issues.

4. 1. 1. Definition
What HLF has implicitly regarded as its priorities for intangible heritage will also emerge as a result of the parallel research into *HLF's support for Intangible Heritage: Projects Review.*
Stakeholders attributed particular importance to questions of definition albeit it at the risk of analysis paralysis, "…the debate about definition can involve a lot of navel gazing that could go on forever." However, a number of definitions of intangible emerged from the interviews and academic literature, and ranged from more open to more specific definitions.

1. Intangible heritage is anything that is not physical or material heritage is intangible heritage - "you can't touch it".

2. Intangible heritage is also about the ordinary, the everyday and family. It may not be grand or spectacular.

3. Intangible heritage is living heritage (or living culture) and as such it is identified and defined by communities and embodied in individual and community skills, knowledge and understanding. It comprises forms of heritage that are practiced, transmitted, shared and passed on across generations. It is, therefore, contemporary and open to change.

As defined by UNESCO (2003), where in the context of cultural diversity, sustainable development, human rights, and cultural heritage generally and safeguarding, specific areas of cultural heritage are referenced: "oral traditions and language; performing arts; social practices, rituals and festive events, knowledge and practice concerning nature and the universe" and "traditional craftsmanship".

Stakeholders were divided about HLF's investment in intangible heritage being so substantially biased towards oral history and memory. Several argued that these did not constitute intangible heritage *per se* though when collected forms part of the record of intangible heritage. This supports transmission of intangible heritage.

4. 1. 2 Time

Stakeholders took different views about the relationship between intangible heritage and the relationship between the past and present. As living heritage, intangible very clearly belongs to the contemporary. When it ceases to be practiced, intangible heritage is "dead" and consigned to history.

Stakeholders directly, and indirectly, asked how old a practice has to be before it might be deemed to constitute intangible heritage. Might digital games and gaming cultures count as intangible?

What was intangible heritage's relationship to revival? Some stakeholders argued that when a language ceases to be spoken it was history. Others saw the revival, of say, Cornish as positive and not possible without existing records.

There was a view that HLF in focusing on heritage as past did not acknowledge the present and current nature of intangible heritage. Some interviewees expressed a concern that intangible heritage can be "lost" in the space between different strategic organisations. It was suggested that this in part relates to 'boundaries' between funders, suggesting heritage is as much defined by funding as it is by practice.

4. 1. 3 Language

Quite apart from its definition, the nomenclature and language used in relation to intangible heritage is regarded as difficult and ambiguous. Yet, as some of HLF's previously commissioned research (Britainthinks 2015: 25, HLF 2002: 45, Centre for Public Innovation: 23) has already indicated, it is these areas of heritage that people are most attracted to, understand and value the most. As one stakeholder, who works with community groups, observed "when I explain the term intangible in workshops it is well received and understood. People can easily relate to things that are not physical heritage." It is perhaps time for HLF to actively use the term intangible heritage.

4. 1. 4 Relationship between intangible and tangible heritage

Stakeholders were clear that the intangible gives meaning to the tangible, and to peoples' experiences of heritage. The relationship between the two might be described in three ways:

1. As contiguous and completely overlapping;

2. As a continuum from intangible to tangible - seasonal celebrations such as well dressing.

3. All tangible heritage has an intangible dimension. However, some aspects of intangible heritage neither have, nor necessarily produce an associated, tangible heritage - oral tradition such as storytelling.

4. 1. 5 Politics

The political nature of intangible heritage was much discussed. Intangible heritage is generally regarded as "bottom up, not top down". However, this implicitly carries a number of complications. The continuing debate amongst communities' about the preservation of the murals in Northern Ireland related to the "Troubles" exemplified such difficulties. One such project was 'Re-imaging'[98]:

> "…where communities if they wish can change the images. Some people saw this as 'white washing history. By their nature murals are community signposts and some became very iconic and rooted in the community- living history. Now post troubles they have become obsolete and the question is do we keep them or preserve them in other ways?"

Communities' relationship to experts in terms of identifying and granting significance to tangible and intangible heritage was another issue. This was raised in respect of the landscape, in particular, although it applies across heritage. Academic literature review implied that heritage professionals and experts' interventions in intangible were regarded as a problem rather than a solution.

Both the literature and the stakeholder interviews emphasised the importance of local and community knowledge and understanding, insisting that it should be valued on equal terms with expert opinion. It was, however, acknowledged that communities might need help and skills to both identify, and care, for their intangible heritage. The most valuable contribution that sector specialists and organisations could make was seen as being to provide support. This includes HLF.

4. 1. 6 Risks

A number of different risks were associated with the management of intangible heritage including definition, heritage practices and instrumentalism.

A clear definition was deemed necessary to identify intangible heritage at risk. Too broad a definition or description such as that employed by HLF suggests that intangible heritage could well remain invisible and any risks to it may not be identified.

Areas considered to be at risk included heritage crafts, languages and dialects - Yiddish and the Norfolk dialect were examples that were mentioned, alongside traditional music, dance and storytelling. As well as the customs and practices that had developed around forms of work and industry that had since declined or disappeared.

Other forms of intangible heritage at risk included those attributed to disabled communities, Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic communities, LGBT communities and migrant communities. In this sense, risk is directly implicated with the persistence of "… inequalities in access and involvement with heritage… documented in previous research" (Maeer et al, 2015: 6; BOP, 2012: 2)

---

[98] http://www. artscouncil-ni. org/images/uploads/publications-documents/Re-Imaging_Final_Evaluation. pdf

This raises a concern as to whether HLF has clarity about distinguishing between acknowledging the heritages of diverse communities for their own sakes, and a concern to be seen to be inclusive by addressing diversity. The former might be categorised as intrinsic; the latter, as instrumental.

Stakeholders proposed that what was often described and funded as 'outreach', should not substitute for heritage organisations' challenging their internal culture and organisational approach to diversity.

Other types of risk associated with instrumentalism include the promotion of community traditions in support of "resilient places". In this respect, intangible heritage was seen as being used as a tool for urban and tourist development. But stakeholders worried that using intangible heritage contributed to the perception of places as "timeless and traditional", not only risked undermining the potential for intangible heritage as living culture, but invested it with associations that it might not necessarily have claim to. What Hobsbawm & Ranger (1983) had referred to as "the invention of the tradition paradigm".

4. 1. 7 Safeguarding
Despite criticisms of heritage professionals, stakeholders identified the loss of their skills as a potential risk to work around intangible heritage. Funding cuts and the project based nature of support was blamed. The converse was also perceived as a risk: the lack of heritage professional skills is likely to mean that intangible heritage goes unrecognised and is not safeguarded. Some interviewees imagined that the UK not being a signatory to the UNESCO convention constitutes a risk, but in general it was assumed that much could be achieved independently of it. However, different approaches in the home nations prompted some interviewees to suggest that intangible heritage in England is more at risk.

Good practice is generally considered to be synonymous with safeguarding - and the contributions of top-down and bottom-up interventions are considered critical. This is exemplified by the experience of establishing the ICH Scotland list and communities initial lack of contribution to the list. For some interviewees' issues with the UNESCO listing could work against the need for intangible heritage to be able to change, as once registered there may be a perception that it is fixed. Good practice in safeguarding is assumed to involve intangible heritage being recognised as part of a living, and self-supporting, community culture. This includes communities' capacity to raise funding to support that culture, as and when required.

Digital technology and media are regarded as facilitating recording, sharing, learning and networking. Stakeholders were nevertheless, alert to the fact that digital resources created as project outputs, such as websites, but not be maintained, sustained or used once a project had been completed were wasteful. This may be related to seeing digital as an end point, rather than a means.

Stakeholders were concerned about the volume of digital materials created by community projects and the heritage sector's ability (and willingness) to care for these and make them accessible. There are also significant issues around intellectual property and loss of communities' control of intangible heritage.

Stakeholders' emphasised HLF's ability and position, to advocate for intangible heritage. However, HLF would need to be clear about what it can and can't do in terms of the promotion and support of intangible heritage.

Other organisations also have a role. These include ICOMOS UK, the culture and heritage strategic bodies in each nation, the National Trust, National Parks, Higher Education, Research Councils, the larger museums, libraries and archives, specialist third sector groups and professional bodies. Local authorities' current funding situation may make their contribution doubtful.

There are opportunities. The development of Community planning in Northern Ireland, for example, suggests that there is potential for communities to lead approaches in partnership with culture and heritage organisations.

Once developed and tested, these whole place approaches could be emulated in the other nations.

4. 2 Recommendations
Stakeholders identified a number of future priorities for HLF:

- a clearer definition of intangible heritage and objectives for intangible heritage;

- a more challenging approach to heritage;

- a greater focus on "peoples history" and "the everyday";

- advocacy for intangible heritage;

- both more and more focused funding support; and

- greater insistence on the legacy of its intangible heritage funding.

On the basis of our observations and stakeholders' views, we propose a number of recommendations that the HLF should address both internally and externally.

1 HLF should consider its current approach to defining (or, preferring not to define) heritage and to take a strategic view as to whether this advantages or disadvantages intangible heritage, not least in relation to tangible heritage.

This recommendation is made in the light of stakeholders' desire for intangible heritage to have equal value and recognition as tangible heritage, and to be recognised as a constituent part of the historic and natural environment.

From this, it follows that HLF[99] should make clear what it expects of applicants (and grantees) with regard to intangible heritage.

2 HLF should revise the definition and description of intangible heritage, currently referred to as Cultures and Memories.

This research suggests a number of options, which are not necessarily mutually exclusive:

1. A broad definition, including all heritage that is neither physical nor and material (though it may have associated physical and material culture). For example, this option might encompass intangible heritage practices, oral history and memory. The weakness of this option would be an insufficient focus on identifying intangible heritage at risk.

2. A definition focused on living heritage. This would be defined by a community, practiced, and shared by them with skills, knowledge and understanding passed on across generations. As such, this version of intangible heritage is both current and open to change. This definition would be expected to emphasise an inclusive approach to heritage, recognising the living heritage of rural and urban communities and of diverse communities.

This option would support the identification of intangible heritage at risk through the implicitly critical engagement of communities. It would require HLF to consider how it works with the agencies responsible for arts and creativity in each nation, where living heritage is also recognised as forms of contemporary art and creative practice.

3. A definition based on the UNESCO Convention (2003), which identifies particular areas of concern including oral traditions, languages and dialects, performing arts, social practices, rituals, festive events, knowledge and practices relating to the natural environment and universe, traditional crafts. Recognising and valuing cultural diversity is a core element of the Convention, as is safeguarding intangible heritage. While a focused definition may constitute a strength, this could be interpreted by the heritage sector as intangible heritage only refers to cultural diversity or the loss of 'traditional culture'. This risks defining diverse communities' cultures as 'other', and, for example, in England traditional cultures as 'folk culture'.

4. A broad definition including all forms of heritage that are neither physical nor material (though it may have associated physical and material culture), within which living heritage is separately recognised- enabling some aspects of intangible heritage at risk to be identified and supported.

This approach enables oral history and memory to be part of intangible heritage, alongside living heritage.

A revised definition of intangible heritage would also require HLF to consider its definition of Community Heritage, which is

"…anything that makes your area unique and worth celebrating. But much of community heritage can be forgotten or lost, and with it our sense of belonging and pride in where we live."
[100] HLF what-we-fund/community-heritage

Clearly, some aspects of Community Heritage may be living heritage.

Any revision should also be in relation to issues and recommendations from the parallel research into *HLF's support for Intangible Heritage: Projects Review.*

3 HLF should strategise what role it assigns to (a potentially redefined) intangible heritage in relation to tangible heritage and, therefore, to the majority of its funding programmes, funded projects, operations and their likely impacts. This needs to ensure that, depending on the approach HLF takes, intangible heritage is a visible component of all its programmes and is part of its future programme development across the historic and natural environment.

Issues to address will include heritage professionals' low awareness and lack of understanding of intangible heritage. For example, it will be vital to make clear the role of intangible heritage in museums' capital projects in developing, collecting, understanding, caring for, conserving, and interpreting collections. The role of intangible heritage in Landscape Partnerships and Parks for People may also need to be highlighted in the understanding of, engagement with, conservation, and management of the natural environment. Intangible heritage also has a part of play in the role of digital technology in supporting communities in identifying, practicing and caring for intangible heritage.

Other issues to be considered include the role that HLF may seek in supporting building community capacity to engage with intangible heritage. This may require raising awareness of HLF amongst community agencies and organisations that have the skills and knowledge with which to broker work with communities, and in supporting economic regeneration through place and tourism based initiatives that may support or impede communities' engagement with intangible heritage.

Two immediate opportunities were identified in the course of research for this report. In Northern Ireland, the requirement for all Councils to produce a Community Plan provides an opportunity HLF to work with other culture agencies and communities in order to embed intangible heritage in the community planning process. In England, there is an opportunity to place intangible heritage in the "cultural citizens", leadership and place, and "Great Place" initiatives, and work with Historic England who will lead on "Heritage Action Zones"(DCMS, 2016: 24, 34, 35 and 37).

4 HLF should assess what resources HLF will require to embed intangible heritage within the full range of its operations, provide support for it in terms of staffing, training and development needs not least in relation to developing a comprehensive

- understanding of intangible heritage;

- the impact HLF expects funding support to have;

- support for funding applicants;

- its ability to assess and monitor projects, and

- advocacy.

5 HLF should identify a critical role for itself as regards the external

foregounding of intangible heritage within the heritage sector, the wider cultural sector and beyond, building on the roles and expectations of other organisations and bodies. This should be based on HLF defining its role and remit around intangible heritage vis-à-vis the culture and heritage agencies in each nation, organisations with a particular remit for intangible heritage and, potentially, with higher education institutions.

6 HLF should develop a communication plan, including examples of good practice around intangible heritage, based on a set of clear messages to communities, the heritage and culture sector and each of the UK nations' governments and agencies. Key messages to the heritage sector, from the stakeholder interviews, include acknowledgement of the equal value of intangible and tangible heritage and an equal voice for communities in making decisions about heritage.

A communication plan should take account of stakeholder interviewees' low awareness of what HLF has achieved to date with regard to intangible heritage, their welcoming of HLF commissioning this research, and recognition of the significant role and impact that HLF could bring to intangible heritage.

References

1 Introduction

DCMS (2016) *The Culture White Paper*. Available at https://DCMS_The_Culture_White_Paper12) *Written Answers to Questions* (Monday 21 May 2012) publications parliament 0521/text/120521w0001.htm

HLF (2014) Unpublished Round Table Discussion on Intangible Heritage (Friday 28 March 2014). London: HLF

Northern Ireland Assembly Research and Library Service (2011) *Heritage and Cultural Rights International Standards Northern Ireland Assembly*. Available at http://archive. niassembly.gov. uk/researchandlibrary/2011/2611.pdf

O'Brien, D (2010) *Measuring the value of culture: a report to the Department for Culture, Media and Sport*. Available at https://www. gov. uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/77933 /measuring-the-value-culture-report.pdf

Schifferes J (2015) *Heritage, Identity and Place*. *Seven themes from the Heritage Index*. Available at file:///Users/selwood/Downloads/Seven%20themes%20from%20the%20 Heritage%20Index%20(1).pdf

Smith, L & Akagawa, N (eds) 2009, *Intangible Heritage*. NY: Routledge

2 Literature Review

Alivizatou, M. , (2006) *Museums and Intangible Heritage: The Dynamics of an 'Unconventional' Relationship*. Available at http://www. pia-journal. co. uk/articles/10. 5334/pia. 268/

Albro, R. , (2005). Managing Culture at Diversity's Expense? Thoughts on UNESCO's Newest Cultural Policy Instrument. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 35(3) pp. 247–253. Available at http://web. a. ebscohost. com. libezproxy. open. ac.uk/ehost/pdfviewer pdfviewer?sid=0f58808a-73d7-4e97-92a1-749392d15e47%40sessionmgr4005&vid=1&hid=4106

Amescua, C. , (2013). Anthropology of Intangible Cultural Heritage and Migration: An Uncharted Field, in *Anthropological Perspectives on Intangible Cultural Heritage* (pp. 91–106). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Verlag, . Available at https://www. researchgate. net/publication/278703701_Anthropology_of_Intangible_Cultural_Herit age_and_Migration_An_Uncharted_Field

Andrews K (2014) *Culture and Poverty*. Cardiff: Welsh Government. Available at http://gov.wales/topics/cultureandsport/tackling-poverty-through-culture/culture-and-poverty-harnessing-the-power-of-the-arts-culture-and-heritage-to-promote-social-justice-in-wales/?lang=en

Andrews, C. , Viejo Rose, D. , Baillie, B. , & Morris, B. , (2007). Conference Report: Tangible-Intangible Cultural Heritage: A Sustainable Dichotomy? The 7th Annual Cambridge Heritage Seminar, *International Journal of Intangible Heritage*, *8*(3) 174–176. Available at

http://www2. arch. cam. ac. uk/heritage/conferencereports/ijintangible heritageintangible. pdf

Applejuice (2008). *Social Impact of Heritage Lottery Funded Projects.* London: HLF. Available at http://www. hlf. org.uk/social-benefits-involvement-heritage-projects

Arantes, A. A. , (2012)*Beyond Tradition: Cultural Mediation in the Safeguard of ICH*. Available at http://www. ichresearchers-forum. org/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/ARANTES_ichforum-2012.pdf

Arts Council England (2013) *Great Art and Culture for Everyone*. Available at http://www. artscouncil. org. uk/media/uploads/Great_art_and_culture_for_everyone.   pdf

Arts Council Northern Ireland (2016) *Traditional Arts webpage* . Available at http://www. artscouncil-ni. org/the-arts/literature-language-and-culture/traditional-arts

Arts Council Wales (2014) *Inspire Our strategy for Creativity and the Arts in Wales*. Cardiff: Arts Council Wales . Available at http://www.arts. wales/arts-in-wales/inspire

Baggott, I. , Moyes, C. , & Eccles, N. , (2013) *HLF Parks for People Impact Evaluation*. London: HLF. Available at http://www. hlf. org. uk/parks-people-evaluation

Bashir, N. , et al. , (2015a) *Evaluation of Heritage Lottery's First World War centenary activity: Year 1 report*. London: HLF https://www. hlf. org. uk/first-world-war-centenary-evaluation

Bashir, N. , et al. , (2015b) *Evaluation of Heritage Lottery's First World War centenary activity: Year 1 case studies*. London: HLF https://www. hlf. org.uk/first-world-war-centenary-evaluation

Bond, S. , (2009) *Evaluation of Conservation Outcomes from HLF funded Projects*. London: HLF. Available at http://www. hlf. org. uk/conservation-outcomes

BOP (2009) *Assessment of the Social Impact of Participation in HLF funded projects*. London: HLF. Available at http://www. hlf. org.uk/social-benefits-involvement-heritage-projects

BOP (2010) *Assessment of the Social Impact of Volunteering in HLF funded projects Yr2*. London: HLF. Available at http://www. hlf. org. uk/social-benefits-involvement-heritage-projects

BOP (2011) *Assessment of the Social Impact of Volunteering in HLF funded projects Yr3*. London: HLF. Available at http://www. hlf. org. uk/social-benefits-involvement-heritage-projects

BOP (2012) *Responses from the consultation on under represented heritages*. London: English Heritage. Available at https://content. historicengland. org. uk/images-books/publications/responses-from-the-consultation-on-under-represented-heritages/responses-from-the-consultation-on-under-represented-heritages/

BOP (2015) *HLF Major Grants- The First 100*. London: HLF. Available at http://www. hlf. org.uk/hlf-major-grants-—-first-100

BritainThinks (2015). *20 years in 12 places*. London: HLF. Available at http://www. hlf. org.uk/about-us/research-evaluation/20-years-heritage

Brown, M. F. , (2003) *Who owns Native Culture?* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press

CADW (2016) *Historic Environment Policy webpage* . Available at
http://cadw. gov. wales/historicenvironment/policy/?lang=e

Centre for Public Innovation (n. d.) *Evaluation of the Young Roots
programme 2008-2011*. London: HLF. Available at http://www. hlf. org.
uk/young-roots-evaluation

Chetwyn, D. (no date) *Neighborhood Plans Road Map Guidance*. London:
Locality. Available at http://locality. org. uk/resources/neighbourhood-
planning-roadmap-guide/

Clarke, R. , Mount, D. , and Anteric, M. , (2011) *Evaluation of the Heritage
Lottery Fund Landscape Partnership Programme*. London: HLF .
Available at http://www. hlf. org. uk/landscape-partnerships-
evaluation

Conan, M. , (2009). Gardens and Landscapes: At the Hinge of Tangible and
Intangible Heritage. *Intangible Heritage Embodied*, pp. 53–78.
Available at https://www. researchgate.
net/publication/226737004_Gardens_and_Landscapes_At_the_Hinge_
of_Tangible_and_Intangible_Heritage

Coombe, R. J. , (2011) Possessing Culture: Political Economies of Community
Subjects and Their Properties, In Mark Busse & Veronica Strang, eds. ,
Ownership and Appropriation. London: Berg Publishers, pp. 105-127.
Available at http://papers. ssrn. com/sol3/papers.
cfm?abstract_id=2463930

Creative Scotland (2014) *Unlocking Potential Embracing Ambition*. Edinburgh:
Creative Scotland. Available at http://www. creativescotland.
com/what-we-do/the-10-year-plan

Crystal, D. , (2008). *What is standard English?* Available at www. davidcrystal.
com/?field=-4008

CyMAL (2010) *A Museums Strategy for Wales*. Cardiff: Welsh Assembly
Government. Available at http://gov.
wales/docs/drah/publications/100615museumstrategyen.   pdf

DCMS (2016) *The Culture White Paper*. Available at https://DCMS Culture
White Paper
t_data/file/509942/DCMS_The_Culture_White_Paper__1_.pdf

DC Research (2013a) *Assessment of the impact of Heritage Lottery Fund
Collecting Cultures Initiative Final Report*. London: HLF. Available at
https://www. hlf. org.uk/collecting-cultures-evaluation

DC Research (2013b) *Assessment of the impact of Heritage Lottery Fund
Collecting Cultures Initiative Case Studies*. London: HLF. Available at
https://www. hlf. org.uk/collecting-cultures-evaluation

Deacon, H. , & Bortolotto, C. , (2012) *Charting Away Forward: Existing
Research and Future Directions for ICH Research Related to the
Intangible Heritage Convention*. Available at http://www.
ichresearchers-forum. org/?page_id=10

Deacon, H. , & Smeats, R. , (2013) Authenticity, Value and Community
Involvement in *Heritage Management under the World Heritage and
Intangible Herltage Conventions Heritage and Society*, Vol 6. 21-15.
Available at http://icich. icomos. org/index.
php/library/publications/25-authenticity-value-and-community-

involvement-in-heritage-management-under-the-world-heritage-and-intangible-heritage-conventions?tmpl=component

Department of Culture, Arts and Leisure (2011) *Northern Ireland Museums Policy*. Belfast: DCAL. Available at https://www. dcalni. gov. uk/sites/default/files/publications/dcal/northern-ireland-museums-policy-document_1. pdf

Department of Culture, Arts and Leisure (2012) *DCAL Corporate Plan and Balanced Scorecard.* Belfast: DCAL. Available at https://www. dcalni. gov. uk/publications/dcal-corporate-plan-and-balanced-scorecard-2011-2015

Department of Culture, Arts and Leisure (2015) *Strategy to Enhance and Develop the Ulster-Scots Language, Heritage and Culture.* Belfast: DCAL. Available at https://www. dcalni. gov. uk/articles/ulster-scots-language-heritage and-culture-strategy

Department for the Environment (2015) *Statutory Guidance for operation of Community Planning.* Belfast: DoE. Available at https://www. doeni. gov. uk/publications/circular-lg-2815-–-statutory-guidance-operation-community-planning

Department for the Environment (no date) *Heritage and Community Planning webpage.* Available at https://www. doeni. gov. uk/articles/heritage-and-community planning

Department for the Environment (no date) *Land and Landscapes webpage. Available* at https://www. doeni. gov.uk/topics/land-and-landscapes/landscapes

Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (2011) *The Natural Choice: securing the Value of Nature.* London: DEFRA. Available at https://www. gov. uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/22884 2/8082. pdf

ECORYS (2015)*Our Heritage Evaluation An interim report.* London: HLF. Available at http://www. hlf. org. uk/our-heritage-evaluation-–-interim-report-2015

English Heritage (2014) *Neighbourhood Planning and the Historic Environment*. Available at http://content. historicengland. org. uk/content/docs/planning/neighbourhood-planning-information-aug14. pdf

Flow and Collections Trust (2010)*Mapping the use of Digital Technologies in the Heritage Sec*tor London: HLF. Available at http://www. hlf.org. uk/mapping-use-digital-technologies-heritage-sector

Freeman, C. G. , (2010)Photosharing on Flickr: intangible heritage and emergent publics, *International Journal of Heritage Studies,* Volume 16, Issue 4-5, 2010 Special Issue: Heritage and Practices of Public Formation. Available at http://www. tandfonline. com. libezproxy. open. ac. uk/doi/abs/10. 1080/13527251003775695

Garon, J. , (2010)*Localism as a Production Imperative: An Alternative Framework to Promoting Intangible Cultural Heritage and Expressions of Folklore*. Available at http://papers. ssrn. com/sol3/papers. cfm?abstract_id=1687179

George, E. W. , (2010)Intangible cultural heritage, ownership, copyrights, and

tourism. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 4(4) pp. 376–388. Available at http://www. emeraldinsight. com. libezproxy. open. ac. uk/doi/full/10. 1108/17506181011081541

GHK (2008)*Assessment of the Local Economic, Employment and Training impact of HLF funded projects.* London: HLF. Available at http://www. hlf. org. uk/heritage-and-economy

GHK (2009)*Economic Impact of HLF Projects- Volume 1 Main Report*. London: HLF. Available at http://www. hlf. org. uk/heritage-and-economy

GHK (2010)*Economic Impact of HLF Projects- Volume 1 Main Report*. London: HLF. Available at http://www. hlf. org. uk/heritage-and-economy

Gorman, M. , (2007)The wrong path and the right path: The role of libraries in access to, and preservation of, cultural heritage. *New Library World*, 108(11/12) 479-489. Available at

http://www. emeraldinsight. com. libezproxy. open. ac. uk/doi/full/10. 1108/03074800710838236

Graham, B. , & Howard, P. , (2008)*Heritage and Identity. The Ashgate Research Companion to heritage and identity,*

Graham, B. , & McDowell, S. , (2007)Meaning in the Maze: the heritage of Long Kesh *Cultural Geographies*, July, vol. 14, 3: pp. 343-368. Available at http://web. a. ebscohost. com. libezproxy. open. ac. uk/ehost/detail/detail?sid=878a428f-88b5-4365-8f2b-128b1c4e3f0a%40sessionmgr4001&vid=0&hid=4104&bdata=JnNpdGU9 ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#AN=25817173&db=a9h

Gu, J. , & Wang, X. , (2008)Research on Evaluation System of Exploitation Value of Intangible Culture Heritage Resource. *Resource Development & Market*, 9. Available at http://en. cnki.com. cn/Article_en/CJFDTOTAL-ZTKB200809009.htm

Hafstein, V. , (2015)Intangible Heritage as Diagnosis, Safeguarding as Treatment. *Journal of Folklore Research*,52(2) 281-298. Available at http://web. b. ebscohost. com. libezproxy. open. ac. uk/ehost/detail/detail?sid=8a54c3a5-6a0b-4cf3-858a-14e35559f75a%40sessionmgr111&vid=0&hid=116&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZW hvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#AN=108675145&db=a9h

Harmon S. H. E. , Waelde, C. , & Whatley, S. , (2014) "Disabled Dance: Grounding the Practice in the Law of 'Cultural Heritage'", *European Journal of Current Legal Issues* 20(3)Available at http://webjcli. org/article/view/370/472

Harrison, R. ,(2012) *Assembling and Governing Cultures 'At Risk': Centers of Collection and Calculation, from Ethnographic Museums to UNESCO World Heritage Lists,* SAR Press

Historic England (2015) *Valuing our Past and Enriching our Future 2015-2018* . Available at https://content. historicengland. org. uk/images-books/publications/he-corp-plan-2015-18/he-corp-plan-2015-18. pdf/

Historic Environment Forum (2014) *Heritage 2020 strategic priorities for England's Historic Environment*. Available at http://www. theheritagealliance. org. uk/tha-website/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Heritage-2020-framework.pdf

Historic England et al (no date) *Planning for the environment at*

neighbourhood level. Available athttp://content. historicengland. org. uk/content/docs/planning/planning-environment-neighbourhood-advice. pdf

HLF (2002)*Broadening our Horizons* London: HLF. Available at https://www. hlf. org. uk/broadening-horizons-heritage-heritage-lottery-fund-strategic-plan-2002-–-2007

HLF (2008)*Valuing our heritage Investing in our future* London: HLF . Available at http://closedprogrammes. hlf. org. uk/aboutus/howwework/strategy/Pages/Strategy.aspx

HLF (2012)*A lasting difference for heritage and people: Our strategy* 2013-2018 London: HLF. Available at http://www. hlf. org. uk/lasting-difference-heritage-and-people-our-strategy-2013-2018

Howell, H. , (2013)The Intangible Cultural Heritage of Wales: a Need for Safeguarding? *International Journal of Intangible Heritage,* Vol. 8. Available at file:///Users/selwood/Downloads/IJIH-Vol.

8%2528eng%2529%2528David%20Howell%2529%20(4)pdf

ICF GHK (2013)*Interim Evaluation of Skills for the Future, Cohort 1: Project manager and trainer surveys.* London: HLF. Available at http://www. hlf. org.uk/our-heritage-evaluation-–-interim-report-2015

ICF GHK (2013)*Trainee Case Studies.* London: HLF. Available at http://www. hlf. org.uk/skills-future-evaluation

ICF GHK (no date a)*All Our Stories evaluation.* London: HLF. Available at https://www. hlf. org.uk/all-our-stories-evaluation

ICF GHK (no date b) *All Our Stories Case Studies.* London: HLF. Available at https://www. hlf. org.uk/all-our-stories-evaluation

ICH Scotland (2016) *About webpage.* Available at http://www. ichscotland. org/about

Jacquet, S. , & Waterman, J. , (2015)*Evaluation of the Sharing Heritage Fund*. Unpublished HLF report.

King, A. , & Clifford, S. (1985) *Holding Your Ground* Aldershot: Wildwood Press

Kuutma, K. , (2012)*Communities and the Contested Politics of Representation.* Available at http://www. ichresearchers-forum. org/?page_id=10

Lenzerini, F. , (2011)Intangible Cultural Heritage: The Living Culture of Peoples, *European Journal of International Law*, 22(1) pp. 101–120. Available at http://web. b. ebscohost. com. libezproxy. open.ac.

uk/ehost/detail/detail?sid=03bc2f55-84a2-447c-96f2-74f9349a7867%40sessionmgr111&vid=0&hid=116&bdata=JnNpd GU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#AN=59961715&db=a9h

Lloyd, S. , & Moore, J. , (2015)Sedimented Histories: Connections, Collaborations and Co-Production in Regional History, *History Workshop Journal*, issue 80.

Lovell, J. , (2013)*Cities of imagination : staged authenticity in historic cities*. PhD, University of Kent

Maeer, G. , Mattinson, D. , & Knox, A. , (2015)20 years in 12 places. London: HLF. Available at http://www. hlf. org. uk/about-us/research-evaluation/20-years-heritage

Mirchandani, S. , Norgorve, K. , &Goddard, J. , (2013)*Review of Heritage Lottery Fund's investment in Oral History Projects.* Unpublished HLF report.

Moghadam, V. M. , & Bagheritari, M. , (2005)*SHS Papers in Women's Studies/Gender Research. No. 1 Cultures, Conventions, and the Human Rights of Women: Examining the Convention for SafeguardingIntangible Cultural Heritage, and the Declaration on Cultural Diversity.* Available at http://www. unesco. org/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/SHS/pdf/Cultures_Conventions_HR_Wo men. pdf

Natural England (2014) *Natural England Corporate Plan 2014-2019.* Available at https://www. gov. uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/30074 6/ne-corporate-plan-2014-2019. pdf

Nightingale, E. , (2015)*Intangible heritage in 20 Years in 12 Places: 20 Years of Lottery Funding for Heritage* Lottery Fund. Unpublished HLF report.

Northern Ireland Assembly Research and Library Service (2011) *Heritage and Cultural Rights International Standards Northern Ireland Assembly.* Available at http://archive. niassembly.gov. uk/researchandlibrary/2011/2611.pdf

Northern Ireland Environment Agency (2010) *Heritage-led Regeneration Derry City Council Area.* Belfast: NIEA. Available at https://www. doeni.gov. uk/sites/default/files/publications/doe/derry-city-heritage-led-regeneration. pdf

Ohnuki, M. , (2012)*Documentation as a Tool for Safeguarding a Community's Intangible Cultural Heritage on the Verge of Disappearing .* Available at http://www. ichresearchers-forum.org/?page_id=10

PBL (2010) *Interpretation Plan for The Princes of Gwynedd .* Available at http://cadw. gov. wales/docs/cadw/publications/InterpplanPrincesGwynedd_EN.   pdf

Prott, L. V. , (1999)*Some Considerations on the Protection of the Intangible Heritage: Claims and Remedies.* Available at http://www. folklife. si. edu/resources/Unesco/prott. htm

Reeve, A. , & Shipley, R. , (2013)*Townscape Heritage Initiatives Evaluation Ten Year Review Report.* London: HLF. Available at http://www. hlf. org. uk/townscape-heritage-initiative-evaluation

Schifferes, J. , (2015)Heritage, *Identity and Place. Seven themes from the Heritage Index .* Available at file:///Users/selwood/Downloads/Seven%20themes%20from%20the%20 Heritage%20Index%20(1)pdf

Smith, R. , (2009)Finding the 'First Voice' in rural England: the challenges of safeguarding intangible heritage in a national museum, *International Journal of Intangible Heritage.* Available at http://www. ijih. org/volumeMgr. ijih?cmd=volumeView&volNo=4&manuType=02&lang=ENG

Smith, L. , & Waterton, E. , (2009)'"The envy of the world" Intangible heritage in England', in Smith, L & Akagawa, N (ed.) *Intangible Heritage*, Routledge, Abingdon, England, pp. 289-302.

Solanilla, L. , (2008)The Internet as a Tool for Communicating Life Stories: A New Challenge for Memory Institutions. I*nternational Journal for Intangible Heritage, 3,* pp. 103–16. Available at http://www. ijih.

org/volumeMgr.
ijih?cmd=volumeDtlView&volNo=3&lang=ENG&dVolId=38&manuType= 02

Scottish Government (2014) *Our Place In Time The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Government. Available at http://www. gov. scot/Resource/0044/00445046.pdf

Scottish Natural Heritage (08. 06. 2015) *About Scotland's Landscapes*. Webpage . Available at http://www. snh. gov. uk/about-scotlands-nature/scotlands-landscapes/

The British Library (2015) *Living Knowledge The British Library 2015-2023*. Available at http://www. bl. uk/aboutus/foi/pubsch/pubscheme3/living-knowledge-2015-2023.   pdf

The National Archives (2012)*Archives for the 21st century refreshed: 2012-2015*. Available at http://www. nationalarchives. gov. uk/documents/archives/archives21centuryrefreshed-final.   pdf

The Scottish Government (30. 04. 2015) *Gaelic Language Plan consultation* webpage . Available at http://www. gov. scot/Publications/2015/04/6007

The Scottish Government (01. 10. 2015) *Historic Environment webpage*
. Available at http://www. gov. scot/Topics/ArtsCultureSport/arts/Historic-environment

The Scottish Government (07. 03. 2016) *Scots Language* webpage. Available athttp://www. gov.scot/Topics/ArtsCultureSport/arts/Scots

Tohmé-Tabet, A. , (2001)*Women , intangible heritage and development in the Arab world.* Available at http://www. unesco. org/culture/ich/doc/src/00161-EN.pdf

UK Government (2012) *European Landscape Convention*. Available at https://www. gov. uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/23609 6/8413. pdf

UNESCO (2003)*Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Available at http://www. unesco. org/culture/ich/en/convention

Welsh Government (2014) *A living language: A language for living Welsh Language Strategy 2012-17. Action Plan 2014-15*. Cardiff: Welsh Government. Available at http://gov. wales/docs/dcells/publications/140331-a-living-language-a-language-for-living-action-plan-2014-15-en.pdf

Wen yan, X (2010)Study on the application of tourism exploitation to intangible cultural heritage protection. *Tourism Research*, 4. Available at http://en. cnki. com. cn/Article_en/CJFDTOTAL-KMDX201004005. htm

Widdowson, D. A. , (2010)Folklore Studies in English Higher Education: Lost Cause or New Opportunity? The twenty-eighth Katharine Briggs Memorial Lecture, *Folklore*, Volume 121, Issue 2, 2010. pp125-142. Available at http://web. a. ebscohost. com. libezproxy. open. ac. uk/ehost/detail/detail?sid=660f770a-998e-4784-9a23-5fe7de8a8e56%40sessionmgr4004&vid=0&hid=4104&bdata=JnNpdGU9 ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#AN=51981927&db=a9h

Appendix 1: Intangible Heritage Literature Review and Stakeholder Interviews

This will take stock of current knowledge available through existing reports, evidence and information pertinent to the project. Information will be gathered from formal research sources, 'grey' literature (such as blogs, web sites and press articles) and, where available, unpublished material.

Document review template

Document review template	Input information
Title:	.
Author:	.
Journal / Place of publication: publisher	.
URL (for online publication)	.
Date: (only back to 2005)	.
Coverage: abstract/ intro/ concl • **oral trad** and expression ☐ • languages and dialects☐ • oral history ☐ • memory ☐ • **performing arts** and arts☐ • **social practices**, rituals and festive events ☐ • plus other social practices ☐ • **nature & the universe** ☐ • **craft** ☐ • **intangible** ☐ • tradition ☐ •	.
Reference area • UK ☐ • E ☐ • W ☐ • S ☐ • NI ☐ • Non UK ☐ detail	.
PROMPT Quality indicators	.
Presentation (Is the information clearly communicated?) Look at language, layout, structure, etc.	.
Relevance • Does this source match the information needs? Yes £ No £ If no, stop here	.
Objectivity • Whose opinions are expressed?	.
Method • How was data gathered? • Were	.

Document review template	Input information
the methods appropriate, rigorous, etc.? •If statistical data is presented, what is this based on?• Was the sample used really representative? Qualitative ☐ Quantitative ☐	
Provenance • Is it clear who produced this information? Peer reviewed ☐ Grey literature ☐ Advocacy ☐ (i. e. justifying, promoting specific need, attitude)	.
Timeliness• Has the climate/situation changed since this information was made. Available? (e. g. pre/post recession; devolution)	.
Type of heritage & IH definitional issues	
Buildings & Monuments ☐any issues around definition	
Industrial, Maritime & Transport ☐any issues around definition	
Cultures & Memories (IH) ☐any issues around definition	
Land & Natural Heritage ☐ any issues around definition	
Museums, Libraries & Archives ☐ any issues around definition	
Community Heritage ☐ any issues around definition	
Generic ☐ any issues around definition	
Themes	
IH association with **diversity** (i. e. • carry burden? support greater diversity in participation• attract new, diverse	
Reference to the use of **digital** technology to mobilize **community** engagement • engage people with, and to encourage the **conservation** of, intangible heritage	
Reference to the use of intangible cultural heritage materials and practices in the **school** curriculum	
Exploration of the **connections** between tangible and intangible heritage and other forms of culture (e.g. museum collections, landscape, townscape,	

Document review template	Input information
culinary practices. Are these explicit or implicit?	
Reference to **communities defining** their own heritage, and/or community **empowerment.**	
Reference to **growth areas in** IH (e. g. culinary) and/or **heritage at risk.**	
Management	
Policy development and trends in policy thinking and strategic priorities (including resilient places and communities, devolution)	
Leadership and **attitudes** to IH (e. g. understanding, ambivalence or support)	
IH's **role** in creating participatory and /or innovative ways of working	
Partnerships **role** in IH	
Practices	
The **safeguarding** and **transmission** of IH.	
IH's role in **intercultural** and /or **intergenerational** dialogue	
Ways in which difficult, **controver ***sial or dissonant heritage have been addressed (e.	
The exploration of **hidden** or **marginalised** heritage (gender, ethnic origin, national origin, sexual orientation, gender re-assignment,	
Examples or **good practice** (however defined or implied) within and outside the UK (by nation) not funded by HLF	
Outcomes	
Any impact on **social cohesion**	
The facilitation of peoples' i**dentity** with, and **belonging** to, a community or **place** and/or awareness of **environmental**	
Lasting **benefits** for heritage, people and communities.	

Appendix 2: Intangible Heritage Stakeholder interview topic guide Introduction
In addition to funding work to buildings, collections and landscapes, the Heritage Lottery Fund has invested in a substantial number of intangible heritage projects throughout the UK. To date, a significant area of HLF's support has been in the area of oral history but funding has also supported projects in other areas of intangible heritage and as defined by UNESCO – oral traditions (including storytelling, language heritage and dialect); heritage of performing arts (traditional music, dance and theatre); social practices, rituals and festive events; knowledge and practices concerning the nature and the universe; traditional craftsmanship. In short, it is the transmission of non-material culture from one generation to the next.

Intangible heritage projects can:

- encourage communities to define their own heritage;

- safeguard and transmit intangible heritage at risk;

- contribute to the creation of resilient places and communities;

- involve new, diverse audiences in heritage;

- address difficult, controversial or dissonant heritage;

- explore hidden or marginalised heritage;

- increase awareness of environmental impacts; and

- contribute to participatory and innovative ways of heritage working.

The areas we would like to discuss with you include:

- your understanding of intangible heritage and views on its importance, or otherwise;

- your knowledge of good practice or otherwise linked to intangible heritage within and beyond the UK;

- HLF and others' support of intangible heritage to date;

- the needs of communities, decision makers, the heritage and cultural sectors in relation to intangible heritage; and

- HLF's support for intangible heritage in the future.

Issues, opportunities and challenges with regards to support for intangible heritage

1 What do you understand by the term intangible heritage?

2 Do you consider intangible heritage to be important, why and in what ways? Are there particular needs or areas that are 'at risk' within the UK?

3 What good practice (not necessarily HLF's or UK based) are you aware of in understanding, supporting, and safeguarding intangible heritage?

4 Has digital technology played any part in encouraging participation in, and the conservation of, intangible heritage?

5 What are the challenges or lessons learnt from supporting intangible heritage to date?

6 What do you perceive are the links between tangible and intangible heritage?

7 What knowledge do you have of HLF's support for intangible heritage and its impact?

8 Do you know of other sources of funding for intangible heritage?

Present needs

9 What support do organisations delivering intangible heritage need to build on and sustain their work?

10 What might increase the number and range of organisations working with intangible heritage?

11 Are there ways of working, for example partnerships that would support and enhance work in intangible heritage?

Future

12 What should HLF's strategic priorities for intangible heritage be and why?
13 How might the strategic priorities be achieved?

14 What is the role and responsibility of other agencies and organisations in identifying, caring for, safeguarding and supporting intangible heritage?

Appendix 3

We are grateful to all of those who contributed to this research, including:

Ben Cowell	Historic Houses Association
Barbara Cummins	Historic Environment Scotland
Harriet Deacon	Archive and Public Culture Research Initiative
David Edwards	Forest Research - the research agency of the
Forestry Commission	
David Francis	Traditional Arts and Culture Scotland
Helen Graham	University of Leeds
James Grayson	The Folklore Society
Irene Knox	Libraries NI
Deborah Lamb	Historic England
Judy Ling Wong	Black Environment Network
Jonathan Lloyd-Platt	Heritage Crafts Association
Chandan Mahal	Sounds of Britain
Thomas McKean	Elphinstone Institute Aberdeen University
Noirin McKinney	Arts Council Northern Ireland
Izzy Mohammed	University of Birmingham
Máiréad Nic Craith	Heriot-Watt University
Anindya Raychaudhuri	University of St Andrews
Hugh Rollo	Locality
Joanne Rosenthal	Jewish Museum
Katy Spicer	The English Folk Dance and Song Society
Beth Thomas	Amgueddfa Cymru-National Museum Wales
Maria Tierney	Disability Cornwall
Paul Walshe	ICOMOS UK Cultural Landscapes and Historic Gardens Committee
Tamara West	Ironbridge International Institute for Cultural Heritage University of Birmingham
Robin Wood	Heritage Crafts Association
Nicola Wright	LSE Womens Library