

The Constitution and Mechanics of the ‘Scales’ of Heritage: Sociopolitical Dimensions

Darrin Lee Long
Clare Hall, University of Cambridge

This paper discusses the constitution and mechanics of the ‘scales’ of heritage: local heritage, national heritage and World Heritage, and draws attention to the differences between the ways in which these scales relate to one another in theory and in practice. A case study from Australia is used to illustrate the tension and interaction between the three heritage scales. Particular emphasis is given to how certain ideas drawn from postcolonial thought and theories of globalisation can help archaeologists and heritage managers to understand better these complex interactions, and to how this knowledge can contribute to theorising archaeological heritage management.

Keywords

Archaeological heritage management, globalisation, local heritage, national heritage, postcolonialism, scales of heritage, World Heritage

In an increasingly globalised world, the theorisation of heritage and its management is undergoing rapid change. This process can be described as moving away from the idealisation of heritage – that is, what people think it should be – to developing an understanding of what heritage *is*, and what it *does*, both within the discipline of archaeology and in modern social life in general. This theoretical shift is occurring at a time when an awareness of the sociopolitical impacts of managing cultural heritage has increased markedly. The wider sociopolitical dynamics of archaeological heritage management (AHM) highlight not only its globality as an institutional practice, but also the localised and specific nature of heritage.

It is the aim of this paper to discuss the sociopolitical dimensions of the scales of heritage. There are three recognised formal scales of heritage: local, national and international – or global – heritage. It will be argued that, in the rapidly transforming sociopolitical situations of today, archaeological heritage management must develop outward looking ideas and practices that correlate more closely to real world events and attitudes, rather than being generated from managerial approaches.

A Response to the Management and Representation of Cultural Heritage

In a case study of the management and representation of the cultural heritage of local communities in far north Queensland, Australia, I investigated the formal management regimes and the various understandings of heritage by working closely with a range of organisations and a local indigenous community, the Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji. Ideas from globalisation and postcolonial studies are useful in addressing the issue of how local and indigenous communities engage in and transform heritage and its management. I drew upon these particular theoretical frameworks because these ideas seek to establish the voice of excluded communities (Featherstone 1990; Spivak 1999). Moreover, the idea of locality – a key theme of global field theories – converges with some of the main themes of postcolonial theory, such as the ideas of ambivalence and mimicry (Bhabha 1994).

I have in particular found it necessary to introduce concepts and arguments that can be used to highlight and understand the contingency of heritage, the liminality of heritage production, and the ongoing tension between the formally recognised and valorised heritage and the continuous production of heritage at local levels. By employing these ideas I demonstrated that, while AHM and archaeology exert a profound influence upon the creation and legitimation of heritage, local and indigenous communities also have a substantial impact in a range of ambivalent, fluid situations that both limit and give licence to the creation of local heritage (Lee Long 2003). My investigation is grounded in extensive qualitative analysis, surveying the attitudes, policies and practices of government agencies, community groups and individuals in their engagements with AHM.

The Cultural Heritage of the Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji Clan

The following is an excerpt from an interview, conducted by the author, with Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji elders, Malanda, Queensland:

Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji Elder 1: Where our people come from, they were back here in the scrub, right, living off the land. Doing everything that Ab-origines did. Living a happy life. Along comes this *Migloo* [white man]. He comes in and starts... he wants this land, so what does he do, he grabs that land, so what does he do to get that land, if he can't get it, he's gonna shoot them, kill them, or get some other people to take 'em over and teach them to be... to work for them, teach them how to work, to eat all that rubbish that we're eating now. And put them on that sort of *tucker* [food]. So the black fella come away from here now, he leave his country there, he come up here now where the white man is. And he start to learn to eat what the white man eat, and he live that. As he goes down the line, he's learning how to live the white man's style. He's starting to learn things, what *Migloos* teaching him. Up here this end, where we are, we want to try and get back there. We can't. There's a barrier there that tells us we can't do that.

Author: What barrier is that, Aunty?

Elder 1: I don't know... there's this world heritage.

Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji Elder 2: The world's greatest barrier.

Elder 1: And there's world heritage... national park, you name it. We can't go back there to get our food. We can't go back and live there because it's against the law for us to even go and stand in the bush!

(Interview conducted 20th April 1998)

The above interview excerpt was recorded at a time when the Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji were in the midst of a period when the community was trying to formulate and implement a plan to care for their cultural heritage. These machinations were occurring against a backdrop where both the Queensland and Australian governments were laying the foundations for the comprehensive management of the wet tropical rainforests

of northeast Queensland, Australia (Lee Long 2003). The Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji are one of the groups included in the unique rainforest Aboriginal culture identified by Tindale in his comprehensive study of Australian tribes in the late 1930s (Tindale 1974; Tindale and Birdsell 1940). They were distinguished from other groups by their distinct material culture and lifestyle that they adapted to living in the close confines of the rainforest. The Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji are *Bama* (people) who are seeking to (re-)establish links with both their *Mija* (land, country, habitable place) and their cultural heritage.

The ability of the Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji to (re-)establish links with both their *Mija* and culture has been constrained by an administrative framework that reflects the colonial circumstances of their recent history. Indeed some 15 international, national, regional and local organisations are directly or indirectly involved in the formulation and execution of programmes designed to regulate and conserve Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji cultural heritage (Lee Long 2003: 134). For the Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji, the notion and sanctioned existence of 'World Heritage' in, and adjacent to, their *Mija* has exerted the single greatest influence upon the recognition and treatment of their archaeological heritage. The declaration, in 1988, of the Wet Tropics World Heritage Area (WTWHA) over 75% of their *Mija* has meant that the global scale of heritage, in the form of World Heritage, has been interposed. As a result, this is the lens through which their cultural heritage (i.e. local heritage) is viewed in order to re-establish its value, as well as to construct management plans for its long-term protection. It is interesting to note that the declaration was made in recognition of the natural heritage of the WTWHA. Cultural heritage was seen as supplementary to natural features and therefore of secondary concern to the original listing (see also Omland 1997).

The Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji have articulated a particular range of responses to this situation which can be categorised into two broad groups. Firstly, normative responses to the mobilisation of World Heritage in their locales were identified. These views tend to be publicly-stated positions and endorse the non-indigenous schema being used to ascribe value to both the cultural and natural heritage of the WTWHA. These responses concur with the sanctioned heritage of the region (Lee Long 2003). An example of these normative responses can be found in the philosophical foundations and stated aims of the Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji Community Development Plan (CDP; Ngadjon Tribal and Cultural Corporation n.d.). Here, the objectives of the CDP are derived from the management precepts of the WTWHA.

The CDP's management principles are based on natural heritage values. The use of these principles has not transformed the constitutive elements of Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji cultural heritage, nor how the Ngunginbarra clan interact in the wider community as indigenous Australians. Instead, the employment of natural resource management principles in the CDP has changed how Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji regard the nature and importance of their cultural heritage in the living present.

The management goals of the WTWHA are focused upon finite and quantifiable elements of the natural environment that, to all intents and purposes, have known limits. The uncritical importation of this ideology into the CDP by its authors has transformed

the public position of the Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji on their cultural heritage into one that denies and/or disregards the post-contact history of their clan – the experiences of colonisation, assimilation, subjugation and domination. The Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji thus emphasise that, prior to colonisation, their culture was ‘traditional’ and allowed their people to live in symbiotic harmony with nature. Over time, their culture became ‘tainted’ through contact with Euro-Australian culture.

Such a strategic articulation of an essentialised ‘golden age’ corresponds with the political mobilisation of indigeneity and/or ethnicity that has been observed by researchers elsewhere (Kohl and Fawcett 1995; Murray 1993; Rowlands 1994; Swidler et. al. 1997). Jacobs, however, notes that:

Essentialised constructions, although reaching into the past, are produced in the present in order to negotiate the inequities of power produced in the modern [world, therefore]... strategies of fixing identity in place are also important for marginalised groups who want to distinguish their claims from the hegemonic.

(Jacobs 1996: 161-162)

The second group of subject positions articulated by the Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji reflects alternative constructions of the past, which demonstrate an awareness of their postcolonial circumstances and of globalisation. My research reveals that these opinions are privately held within the group and have not usually been declared publicly (Lee Long 2003: 168-191). These responses may represent a deliberate tactic on the part of local and/or indigenous communities of mobilising global attitudes about the fluidity and hybridity of culture within local contexts. Such awareness means that Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji explanations acknowledged the diversity of their colonial history and cultural heritage. These subject positions also serve as a source of empowerment for them in the face of asymmetric power relations (Chambers and Curti 1996; Chjowai Housing Association 1992; Lee Long 1995; Leone et al. 1995; Papastergiadis 1998; Rassool 1999).

The subversive responses demonstrated by the Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji hint that colonial and global influences play a larger role than they formally acknowledged in the creation and propagation of their cultural identity. Examples of these pragmatic responses include:

- a) The subversion of the term ‘traditional’ to include the post-contact historical experiences of mining and the beef and dairy industries (i.e. the *jackaroo/jillaroo* as a ‘traditional’ Aboriginal vocation).
- b) The appropriation of negative *Bama* stereotypes constructed by non-indigenous people, notions used strategically to frustrate or undermine the power relationships at play (i.e. by manipulating the stereotyped image of the lesser intelligence of *Bama* to undermine non-indigenous domination in politics and economics).
- c) Viewing the indigenous land claim process as a means to gain parity with the wider non-indigenous community

(Lee Long 2003).

The Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji work inside hegemonic sanctioned discourses to construct their identities, and attempt to subvert heritage management programmes from within. This subversion is conducted at two levels. Firstly, the Ngunginbarra clan lobbied for an active part in managing their *Mija* by strategically mobilising an essentialised notion of 'traditional culture'. This idea informs their dealings with government and the wider community. Secondly, the Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji appropriated negative stereotypes of Aborigines to counter the uneven power relations between colonisers and the colonised. By employing this approach, they also demonstrate a pragmatic sensitivity to the hybrid and liminal nature of their sociopolitical and familial circumstances.

The practical implications of Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji responses to current heritage management in the *Mija* are that their heritage is either dismissed as peripheral because of the lack of recorded archaeological sites, or that it is granted legitimacy as an adjunct feature of natural heritage. In each case, those same authorities dedicated to conserving Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji heritage overlook the complexity and irony that mark it. Moreover, the Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji do not effect management of their cultural heritage in any meaningful manner (Lee Long 2003: 170). The clan's aspirations to management are confined to the strategic formulation of heritage management plans and to seeking employment as tour guides and/or rangers. In effect, AHM is an abstract idea that has yet to be realised.

Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji cultural heritage is confronted by many challenges. Its future conservation is hampered by a lack of knowledge about the extent of Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji archaeology. A comprehensive archaeological survey is urgently needed to supply an exhaustive account of Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji archaeology and to form the basis for a heritage management plan. Abstract notions of the past are used by the Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji to bolster their claims for involvement in the management process. These ideas of heritage and identity are characterised by a visible difference between their public pronouncements and their private ideas of the past. At this moment, the conservation and management of Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji cultural heritage lies between the potential and the actual.

Like many local or indigenous communities, the Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji are compelled to use their position on the margins of society as a site of resistance. In doing this, they construct a heritage that is neither fixed nor static. More importantly, its nature is such that the present structures of AHM do not support or aid them in building these interpretations. Quite simply, what heritage managers see as the limits of managed cultural heritage, the Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji regard as the beginning of free space. Here they develop ideas of who they are, where they came from, and where they are going. It is the start of their identity space.

The 'Scales' of Heritage

This case study is a specific example of a socio-cultural group that is trying to engage with, negotiate and transform the nature of their archaeological heritage through the formal structures of AHM. In producing these understandings of their cultural heritage,

this local group is confronted with systems of management that channel their desire for involvement into an administrative framework that also responds to national and international imperatives. The key feature is the issue of scale, which informs this debate and subsequently influences the sociopolitical dimensions of managing archaeological heritage in wider society. Commonly, these debates revolve around three levels or 'scales' of heritage: local heritage, national heritage and international – or global – heritage. Indeed, the emergence of a 'World Heritage' in the early 1970s has increasingly caused the formal management of archaeological and cultural material to be considered within, and administered by, this tripartite hierarchy of heritage. The extent to which this also affects the definition and understanding of what constitutes 'heritage' should not be underestimated.

This Australian case study suggests that pragmatic resistance to the hegemonically global level can also be found at the local level. This insurgency occurs in the private rather than public domain, yet is not an outright rejection of global trends. Instead, marginalised local communities actively select particular global ideas, processes and fora to consolidate and support their arguments. As Hodder observes:

...passion [local heritage] and play [global processes] are not opposed in some simple opposition. In the global process they interact and feed off each other in myriad ways, equally emboldening and undermining the other... The fragmentation within and across globalisation processes needs to be reflexively engaged with.

(Hodder 1999: 139)

Research in AHM has already alerted archaeologists to the complexities and interwoven nature of the relationship between these three scales (Omland 1997; Pearson and Sullivan 1995; Sullivan, H. 1996; Sullivan, S. 1992). In particular, analysis of the link between the local and national scales of heritage reveals a key point. At a practical level, the national scale is critical due to the central position of the modern nation-state in bringing into being international policies on the protection of archaeological heritage (Appadurai 1990: 307). The national scale can be viewed as the transitional, indeed transformational, juncture between local and World heritage (Bond and Gilliam 1994; Byrne 1991; Hodder et al. 1995; Sullivan 1992; Swidler et al. 1997).

The structure of World Heritage can be understood as a tripartite hierarchy of 'heritages' where World Heritage occupies the apex, local heritage forms the broad foundation and national heritage comprises the intervening layer. There is an unequal degree of recognition between the three scales of heritage. The local scale of archaeological heritage is dependent upon the definition given to it in relation to both the national and global scales of heritage. Moreover, there is a real difference to be discerned between the formative scales of heritage, as outlined here, and the qualitative differences amongst this trio. Local heritage is the scale least vulnerable to change, because it has an inherent capability to exist without official recognition. The immediacy, proximity and tangibility of the local scale engender a process where both global and national processes and values are transformed to correspond with local meanings.

The power to protect and regulate world and local heritage occurs at the national scale. As such, national heritage could be regarded as the cohesive element, or 'glue', between local and World heritage. Without the national scale, neither local nor global heritage could be sustained, because effective legal capability is afforded through nation-states who provide the necessary legislative instruments to sanctify and legislate for the other scales (Featherstone 1990, 1995, 1997; Featherstone and Lash 1995; Nederveen Pieterse 1995; Omland 1997; Robertson 1995).

The Constitution of Scale in Global Archaeological Heritage Management

Since the beginning of formal archaeological heritage management as an institution-alised state enterprise in the mid-19th century, the manner in which its various aspects have been executed has been instrumental in the theoretical development of the various notions of cultural heritage. Of these notions, one of the more interesting in terms of scale is a fundamental tenet of world cultural heritage: that "the archaeological heritage is common to all human society and it should therefore be the duty of every country to ensure that adequate funds are available for its protection" (ICAHM 1993: 2). Further, the custodianship of World Heritage is a "moral obligation upon *all* human beings; it is a collective public responsibility" (ICAHM 1993: 2; my emphasis). The stress placed upon the commonality of human cultural heritage by global AHM has been founded largely upon the Enlightenment view of history as progress.

The nature of the relationship between western metropolitan nations and the rest of the world has also determined the character of global AHM to a large extent. These historical and geopolitical relationships have been shaped by European imperialism and subsequent colonial enterprises. This circumstance, as it relates to AHM, has been described as a "hegemony" (Byrne 1991), and is seen by some researchers as constraining many newly independent and often (but not always) non-western nations from the (re-)formation of cultural identity and maintenance of distinct cultural and national attitudes toward their archaeological heritage (Byrne 1991; Smith 1994; Trigger 1984).

A comparison of the characteristics of 'local' and 'world' heritage reveals a difference that is distinguished by the uncommon and specific nature of local heritage as opposed to the common and generalist ideals of its global counterpart. Furthermore, the definition of the rights of public engagement with World Heritage is generally unproblematic (i.e. everyone is entitled to engage with World Heritage sites). This approach contrasts with the challenges faced by heritage managers when managing archaeological sites of national and/or international importance within local contexts, where the immediate population may value these same places in ways that differ from or contrast with the formal significance ascribed to them (e.g. the attitude of the Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji towards the WTWHA).

The creation of 'World Heritage' by UNESCO – although an arbitrary supra-national construct – has resulted in it becoming the benchmark for cultural significance, against which the relative value of local and national heritage is determined. The current model of World Heritage and its values are drawn exclusively from the efforts of western academia (Cleere 1984, 1989; Lipe 1984a, 1984b). Although the values used to con-

struct cultural heritage significance criteria have been modified to be more inclusive of local heritage – particularly of indigenous conceptions of cultural heritage (i.e. the inclusion of cultural landscapes within the framework for World Heritage cultural properties) – the specific characteristics of these newly recognised measures still tend to be determined and negotiated by and from within the intellectual framework of World or global heritage (Burnham 1974; Greer 1995; Kristiansen 1989, 1993, 1998).

The idea of a universalised human heritage is sometimes deployed (for example, the manner in which the Queensland Government initially sought to exclude indigenous community participation in the management of the WTWHA) to counter claims made by subaltern groups unhappy with their treatment by national governments. Conversely, World Heritage is often used by marginalised socio-cultural groups to bolster their claims for recognition of their cultural heritage and/or involvement at the national heritage scale. This happens when their calls for involvement have previously been ignored by government at the national and provincial levels.

There is a common perception amongst many heritage managers and researchers that, because of the enormous sociopolitical importance placed on the international scale of heritage within global AHM, this scale therefore dwarfs, and ultimately subsumes, the local scale of heritage. This process is considered to be an aspect of globalisation. In this context, globalisation has been understood to mean the steady socio-cultural, (geo-)political and economic homogenisation and/or westernisation of the globe by an ascendant western hemisphere. Recent studies from anthropology and sociology into globalisation and postcolonialism have, however, challenged this crude delineation of the ‘West’ versus the rest of the world’ (Said 1993: 1-15), and offer AHM other ways in which to view the dynamic global processes that manifest themselves at the local level (Bhabha 1994; Nederveen Pieterse 1995; Said 1978, 1993; Spivak 1987, 1990, 1995, 1999). Such insights offer archaeology a different range of analytical and theoretical tools with which to comprehend the manifold outcomes of the interactions between global processes and local responses, and the inherent volatility of heritage production.

Reactions to and against the rigid parameters created by this hierarchical scale can be observed at the ground level. Such engaged responses to World Heritage can be witnessed in the private views of Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji, who, as well as acknowledging their weak sociopolitical position within wider society, are actively subverting the sanctioned heritage canon constructed by the formal heritage scales and are forging new, hybrid conceptions of who ‘they’ are. The Ngunginbarra Ngadjanydji are then employing these dynamic representations within the framework of AHM as foundations from which to undermine the fixed notions of the ‘local’ created by both national and global scales of heritage (for other examples see Hodder 1998 : 124-139; 1999: 165-169).

It is vital for archaeologists to understand that the global-local relationship should be seen as ‘mutually implicative’ (after Featherstone 1995 and Robertson 1995), with local elements achieving a global reach (e.g. didgeridoos in London, Irish theme pubs in Tokyo), and global components and practices being correspondingly transformed

by local contexts, meanings and practices (e.g. the use of camcorders by indigenous communities in the Amazon rainforests). The formal scales of heritage in this context are shown to be static and unreflexive against the backdrop of the fluid and interrelated processes of culture and heritage production.

Consequently, the concept of a common human cultural heritage is constantly being challenged by local (or indigenous) socio-cultural groups. This current definition of World Heritage is at times a homogenising category that has been used by central authorities to alienate and disempower local groups by failing to recognise their differences. Local communities are therefore challenging the right of national governments to employ such exclusive interpretations, and have used the notion of heritage scales as a means to validate local claims to that heritage and subsequent rights to economic benefit and, sometimes, to political self-determination.

AHM and Local Agency

Heritage managers and researchers have found it difficult to respond to the ongoing production of cultural heritage or to the demands of local communities for greater involvement based upon creolised notions of heritage within the current management frameworks. One reason for this is a paucity of theories in AHM that can aid archaeologists in comprehending these processes. There are, however, some ideas to be drawn from outside archaeology that can assist the discipline in becoming more aware of the complexities involved in the global-local dynamic. Concepts such as hybridisation, ambivalence and mimicry can assist in comprehending human agency in the creation of heritage and support the notion of globalisation as a product of the imperial process that results in the "global creation of locality" (Featherstone and Lash 1995: 4).

I feel it is appropriate to underpin the theoretical aspects of my paper in this manner because locality is a unifying feature of these concepts, and all offer constructive insights into locality, particularly its contradictory and reflexive nature. By judiciously employing such theories, heritage managers and researchers can develop a more sensitive understanding of the global-local dynamic as it is manifested in AHM.

Nederveen Pieterse suggests that global processes are agents for, and a consequence of, hybridisation (1995). Derived from linguistics, his notion of hybridisation involves "the mixture of phenomena which are held to be different [and function]... as part of a power relationship between centre and margin... [which] indicates a blurring, destabilisation or subversion of that hierarchical relationship" (Nederveen Pieterse 1995: 55-56). He sees globalisation as being plural, multi-dimensional and having considerable time-depth, stressing that 'glocalisation' (or global localisation) exists where "the tandem operation of local/global dynamics... is at work" (Nederveen Pieterse 1995: 49). Indeed, Nederveen Pieterse understands the increasing complexity and reflexivity of global socio-cultural formations and representations by considering these processes as the "*creolisation* of global culture" (Nederveen Pieterse 1995: 53; emphasis in original). Hybridisation is thus anti-essentialist, and promotes the notion of 'crossover culture', which may be "describe[d as] global intercultural osmosis and interplay"

(Nederveen Pieterse 1995: 54). By stressing the historical depth and hereditary nature of hybridity, he suggests that a “*continuum of hybridities*” (Nederveen Pieterse 1995: 56; emphasis in original) can be said to exist, and describes the two extremities of this continuum as follows: “on one end, an *assimilationist* hybridity that leans towards the centre, adopts the canon and mimics the hegemony, and at the other end, a *destabilising* hybridity that blurs the canon, reverses the current, subverts the centre” (Nederveen Pieterse 1995: 56-57; my emphasis).

The idea of a ‘continuum of hybridities’ can be extended to AHM. Here, this notion may be employed to envisage a flexible and dynamic notion of both the production and management of cultural heritage, management that can be seen as a practice that is hybrid in nature, but with institutional tendencies. Such an idea can be used to comprehend the existence of mixed forms of symbols and representations within heritage that have been observed in former colonies, and have become increasingly evident in metropolitan societies.

Nederveen Pieterse’s rendering of hybridisation links global processes to colonialism, and stresses the fluidity of the social encounters that can be found in these contexts. Writing about these situations, Bhabha (1994) mobilises two important ideas that aid in understanding the socio-cultural consequences of colonialism, and the destabilising activities of local or indigenous peoples. These ideas – ambivalence and mimicry – underline the complexity of interactions between the colonisers and the colonised. They highlight the limits of conceiving culture in binary terms and stress the interstitial circumstances in which these engagements occur.

Bhabha links ambivalence to resistance and understands the idea in the following terms:

Resistance is not necessarily an oppositional act of political intention, nor is it the simple negation or exclusion of the ‘content’ of another culture, as a difference once perceived. It is the effect of an ambivalence produced within rules of recognition of dominating discourses as they articulate the signs of cultural difference and reimplicate them within the deferential relations of colonial power – hierarchy, normalization, marginalization and so forth.

(Bhabha 1994: 110-111)

The ambivalence of colonial relations therefore gives rise to mimicry of the attitudes and ideas of the dominating power: “Colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognisable Other, *as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite*” (Bhabha 1994: 86; emphasis in original). Bhabha sees mimicry as disrupting the colonial power/knowledge nexus, because “it is a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline, which appropriates the Other as it visualises power” (Bhabha 1994: 86). That is to say, in disrupting or subverting the dominant discourses, local or indigenous peoples ape or imitate the views and practices of the colonisers. By doing so, the knowledge of the Other, which has been created to control and govern local or indigenous communities, is effectively subverted from within.

Conclusion

Based on World Heritage, the structure of the global AHM framework finds local heritage forming its broad foundation, with national heritage comprising the intervening layer and World Heritage the apex. In this arrangement, it is the national scale that defines and legitimates the other two, as well as being the arbiter of difference between global and local heritage.

The formal structure of heritage scales is at times static and ill-equipped to comprehend and provide for the range of engagements with archaeological heritage by community groups in wider society. This deficiency is especially pronounced when compared to the dynamic and fluid production of cultural heritage and identity. To date, AHM theory has been unable to account for these processes, especially when the recursive influences of globalisation and postcolonialism are considered in both the production and management of heritage. The approach presented here will be of benefit to heritage managers and researchers: the ability of AHM as a global discipline to respond meaningfully to the demands of local communities can be increased when proper attention is paid to the theoretical concepts of hybridisation, ambivalence and mimicry. By becoming aware of the structural inadequacies of the formal scales of heritage, heritage professionals can acquire a new perspective on a global discipline whose concerns, influences and actors are most often to be found at the opposite end of the scale.

References

- Appadurai, A. 1990. Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy, in Featherstone, M. (ed.) *Theory, Culture and Society*. London: Sage Publications, 295-310.
- Bhabha, H. K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bond, G. C. and Gilliam, A. 1994. Introduction, in Bond, G. C. and Gilliam, A. (eds.) *Social Construction of the Past: Representation as Power*. One World Archaeology 24. London: Routledge, 1-21.
- Burnham, B. 1974. *The Protection of Cultural Property Handbook of National Legislations*. Tunisia: International Council of Museums.
- Byrne, D. 1991. Western Hegemony in Archaeological Heritage Management. *History and Anthropology* 5, 269-276.
- Chambers, I. and Curti, L. (eds.) 1996. *The Post-colonial Question: Common Skies Divided Horizons*. London: Routledge.
- Chjowai Housing Association 1992. *Aboriginal Tourism Strategy for the Wet Tropics Area*. Cairns: Chjowai Housing Association on Behalf of the Rainforest Aboriginal Network.
- Cleere, H. 1984. World Cultural Resource Management: Problems and Perspectives, in Cleere, H. (ed.) *Approaches to the Archaeological Heritage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 125-131.
- Cleere, H. 1989. Introduction: The Rationale of Archaeological Heritage Management, in Cleere, H. (ed.) *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*. London: Unwin and Hyman, 1-19.
- Featherstone, M. 1990. Global Culture: An Introduction, in Featherstone, M. (ed.) *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. London: Sage Publications, 1-14.
- Featherstone, M. 1995. *Undoing Culture*. London: Sage Publications.

- Featherstone, M. 1997 [1995]. *Undoing Culture: Globalization, Postmodernism and Identity* (2nd Edition). London: Sage Publications.
- Featherstone, M. and Lash, S. 1995. Globalization, Modernity and the Spatialization of Social Theory: An Introduction, in Featherstone, M., Lash, S. and Robertson, R. (eds.) *Global Modernities*. London: SAGE Publications, 1-24.
- Greer, S. 1995. Archaeology, Heritage and Identity in Northern Cape York Peninsula, in Ulm, S., Lilley, I. and Ross, A. (eds.) *Australian Archaeology '95: Proceedings of the 1995 Australian Archaeological Association Annual Conference*. Tempus 6, 293-299. St Lucia: University of Queensland.
- Hodder, I. 1998. The Past as Passion and Play: Çatalhöyük as a Site of Conflict in the Construction of Multiple Pasts, in Meskell, L. (ed.) *Archaeology Under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*. London: Routledge, 124-139.
- Hodder, I. 1999. *The Archaeological Process: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hodder, I., Shanks, M., Alexandri, A., Buchli, V., Carman, J., Last, J. and Lucas, G. (eds.) 1995. *Interpreting Archaeology: Finding Meaning in the Past*. London: Routledge
- International Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management (ICAHM). 1993. The Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage. *Antiquity* 67, 402-405.
- Jacobs, J. M. 1996. *Edge of Empire: Postcolonialism and the City*. London: Routledge.
- Kohl, P. and Fawcett, C. (eds.) 1995. *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kristiansen, K. 1989. Perspective on the Archaeological Heritage, in Cleere, H. (ed.) *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*. London: Unwin Hyman, 23-29.
- Kristiansen, K. 1993. The Strength of the Past and its Great Might: An Essay on the Use of the Past. *Journal of European Archaeology* 1(1), 3-32.
- Kristiansen, K. 1998. Between Romanticism and Rationalism. *Archaeological Heritage Management in the 1990s*. *Current Swedish Archaeology* 6, 115-122.
- Lee Long, D. 1995. Building a Bridge: A Case Study of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage of the Atherton Tableland, Far North Queensland, in *Australia International Council on Monuments and Sites Moving on Conference – Charters Towers*. Sydney: Australia International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), 4-5.
- Lee Long, D. 2003. *One Big Picnic Basket: Local Agency and the Management of Heritage*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cambridge.
- Leone, M. P., Mullins, P., Creveling, M., Hurst, L., Jackson-Nash, B., Jones, L., Jopling Kaiser, H., Logan, G. and Warner, M. 1995. Can an African-American Historical Archaeology be an Alternative Voice? in Hodder, I., Shanks, M., Alexandri, A., Buchli, V., Carman, J., Last, J. and Lucas, G. (eds.) *Interpreting Archaeology: Finding Meaning in the Past*. London: Routledge, 110-130.
- Lipe, W. D. 1984a. Value and Meaning in Cultural Resources, in Cleere, H. (ed.) *Approaches to the Archaeological Heritage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-11.
- Lipe, W. D. 1984b. World Cultural Resource Management: Problems and Perspectives, in Cleere, H. (ed.) *Approaches to the Archaeological Heritage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 125-131.
- Murray, T. 1993. Communication and the Importance of Disciplinary Communities: Who Owns the Past?, in Yoffee, N. and Sherratt, A. (eds.) *Archaeological Theory: Who Sets the Agenda?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 93-104.
- Nederveen Pieterse, J. 1995. Globalization as Hybridization. In Featherstone, M., Lash,

- S. and Robertson, R. (eds.) *Global Modernities*. London: Sage Publications, 45-68.
- Ngadjon Tribal and Cultural Corporation. n.d. *Community Development Plan*. Unpublished report.
- Papastergiadis, N. 1998. *Dialogue in the Diasporas: Essays and Conversations on Cultural Identity*. London: Rivers Oram Press.
- Omland, A. 1997. *World Heritage – and the Relationship Between the Global and the Local*. Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Cambridge.
- Pearson, M. and Sullivan, S. 1995. Assessing the Value of Heritage Places, in Pearson, M. and Sullivan, S. (eds.) *Looking After Heritage Places*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 126-186.
- Rassool, C. 1999. The Rise of Heritage and the Reconstitution of History in South Africa. Paper presented at The Idea of Heritage: Past, Present, Future Conference, London Guildhall University, September 1999.
- Robertson, R. 1995. Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity, in Featherstone, M., Lash, S. and Robertson, R. (eds.) *Global Modernities*. London: Sage Publications, 25-44.
- Rowlands, M. 1994. The Politics of Identity in Archaeology, in Bond, G. C. and Gilliam, A. (eds.) *Social Construction of the Past: Representation as Power*. One World Archaeology 24. London: Routledge, 129-143.
- Said, E. 1978. *Orientalism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Said, E. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage.
- Smith, L. 1994. Heritage Management as Postprocessual Archaeology? *Antiquity* 68, 300-309.
- Spivak, G. C. 1987. *In Other Worlds*. London: Methuen.
- Spivak, G.C. 1990. *The Post Colonial Critic*. London: Routledge.
- Spivak, G. C. 1995. Can the Subaltern Speak?, in Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. and Tiffin, H. (eds.) *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, 24-28.
- Spivak, G. C. 1999. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.
- Sullivan, H. 1996. Visitor Management at Painting Sites in Kakadu National Park, in Ward, G. K. and Ward, L. A. (eds.) *Management of Rock Imagery. Proceedings of the Symposium H of the Second Australian Rock Art Research Association (AURA) Congress, Cairns 1992*. Occasional AURA Publications 9. Melbourne: AURA, 82-87.
- Sullivan, S. 1992. *Sacred Landscapes: A Conversation with Sharon Sullivan*. [http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/newsletters/7_2/sacred.html] [Accessed October 2005].
- Swidler, N., Dongoske, K. E., Anyon, R. and Downer, A. S. (eds.) 1997. *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground*. Walnut Creek: Altamira Press.
- Tindale, N. B. 1974. *Aboriginal Tribes of Australia: Their Terrain, Environmental Controls, Distribution, Limits and Proper Names*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Tindale, N. B. and Birdsell, J.B. 1940. Results of the Harvard-Adelaide Universities Anthropological Expedition, 1938-1939: Distribution of Australian Aboriginal Tribes – A Field Survey. *Transactions of the Royal Society of South Australia*, 64, 140-231.
- Trigger, B. 1984. Alternative Archaeologies: Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist. *Man* 19, 355-370.