Contents

Introduction 1

Heritage as Persuasion

Kathryn Lafrenz Samuels

Against the backdrop of increasing social change, an urgency courses through contemporary life for weaving the past into the present. The process of folding past conditions into present ones is selective; it has to be, given the richly textured inheritance bestowed on each passing generation (Trouillot 1995). The result over the past century plus has been a gradual refining of practices and ways of talking about what came before, encompassed by the concept of 'cultural heritage.' Cultural heritage is variously invoked as something (some object, site, building, landscape, traditional practice) with historic connections that must be properly tended to, as well as the field of expertise that has developed around this care.

Over time, or at critical moments provoked by shifting events, these practices and languages of heritage became incorporated into political and legal institutions with jurisdiction over local, regional (e.g., state), national, or international bodies of governance. National standards have traditionally been the most influential in institutionalizing how heritage is dealt with, but increasingly so too are international norms codified within an expanding oeuvre of global conventions, recommendations, lists, safeguards, management guidelines, and reports picked up as 'best practices.' This expansion at the national and international level

follows broader social trends within which cultural heritage bears increasing relevance. Concomitant with increasing relevance, heritage must be made to work within these systems whose thrust is to norm and generalize. In this volume we offer one particular intervention into these joined processes of expansion and codification within the field of heritage.

We explore the *rhetoric* of cultural heritage, and we do so in two respects.[1] First, we ask how heritage acts as a kind of rhetoric ('heritage as persuasion'), being mobilized creatively within a wide array of social, political, economic, and moral contexts where it gives persuasive force to particular standpoints, perspectives, and claims. This kind of heritage rhetoric can be witnessed especially within appeals to social justice, public sentiment, and the international community, as well as within struggles over cultural resources, where the object or site takes on significance well beyond its more mundane historical value. 'Heritage as persuasion' foregrounds the innovative reworking of cultural heritage and its expansive propensities flowing from its will to relevance. Yet, second, to have greatest efficacy such arguments must be made through existing institutional mechanisms and discourses, an existing 'rhetoric of heritage' that maps out the strength and range of possible uses and meanings within which cultural heritage can be mobilized. For the 'rhetoric of heritage,' one example would be the "Authorized Heritage Discourse" (AHD) outlined by Laurajane Smith (2006). However, accounts of AHD run the risk of painting a fairly bleak picture, of a consistent and hegemonic system immune to external challenges and change. Focusing on the 'rhetoric of heritage' will tend to emphasize codification and institutionalization. The point is that both sides of rhetoric—heritage as persuasion, and rhetoric of heritage; expansion and codification—are required in order to better account for change and development in heritage and foreground the creative work of heritage today.

Certain words give resonance to the tasks of heritage. As Raymond Williams (1976; revised and updated by Bennett, Grossberg, and Morris 2005) undertook in *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, there are "significant, binding words in certain activities and their interpretation" where "certain uses bound together certain ways of seeing culture and society" (Williams 1976: 15; quoted in Aldenderfer 2011: 487). We argue that heritage is an important lens for seeing culture and society in the present-day, and this volume addresses certain binding words for heritage, e.g., cultural property, intangible heritage, authenticity. However, the collection here is not exhaustive, nor would it attempt to be. We resist codification insofar as this volume highlights heritage as dynamic and resourceful, and we do so through a focus on rhetoric. Communities or practitioners may actively push back against such attempts at

codification, and even succeed in changing the field of heritage practice. Such changes may in turn become the subject of codification. For example, the concept of intangible heritage coalesced as a critique of the material-based focus on built heritage and cultural property, and intangible heritage has since seen elaboration across a suite of international conventions, lists, and sites.

In other words, the process is iterative and open-ended, so any collection on heritage key concepts is necessarily provisional. At the same time, individual keywords gain important advantages from having coherent definitions, when the aim is to work through institutional mechanisms for change. Again, though, we place emphasis on mechanisms of change, and not definitional coherence endstop. Contributors to the volume showcase the creative possibilities of heritage unbound from codifying gestures, rather than attempt a synoptic 'authoritative' account of the particular heritage keyword under discussion.

We argue that through rhetoric we can begin to theorize and put into practice mechanisms for transforming prevailing heritage vocabularies, encouraging alternate meanings, and innovating new terminologies. Some terms face rhetorical culs-de-sac of sorts, whereby their narrow and increasingly empty usage circumscribes their potential for inspiring a diversity of meanings and perspectives. Other terms bear a rich history of legal and extra-legal uses, and might be characterized by specific institutional mechanisms for altering their legitimate meaning. In these cases extra attention must be paid to such mechanisms, to work from within institutions for transformation. Further, no term or concept exists in isolation, but together form persuasive assemblages, where each is contingent on the shifting relationships between other components embedded within a given context. The concept of 'cultural heritage' itself could be outlined via such assemblages of terms and their mobilizations, some of which I trace in the following discussion.

CULTURAL HERITAGE

First, it is also helpful to consider briefly how cultural heritage has been defined within the primary heritage conventions and literature on the subject. The UNESCO 1972 *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* specifically takes cultural heritage to mean monuments, groups of buildings, and sites (of outstanding universal value). The 1972 *Convention* addressed these categories of 'immovable cultural heritage,' in distinction to the moveable cultural heritage (e.g., paintings, sculptures, coins, manuscripts, etc.), called 'cultural property' at the time, covered by the

UNESCO 1970 *Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property.*

The idea of 'intangible heritage' introduced in the UNESCO 2003 *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* effectively extended the concept of cultural heritage to include "practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills," e.g., spiritual practices, folklore, song, dance, cuisine, etc., "as well as the instruments, objects, artifacts and cultural spaces associated therewith" (Article II.1). The Council of Europe's 2005 *Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society* (known as the Faro Convention) defined cultural heritage in relation to communities as "a group of resources inherited from the past which people identify, independently of ownership, as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions. It includes all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and place through time" (Article 2a). The definition provided by the Faro Convention situates cultural heritage within its broader social and political contexts, emphasizing the active role of individuals and communities in sustaining cultural heritage and transmitting it to future generations.

Such is the way cultural heritage has been codified within the international system, and national approaches are so numerous that it makes little sense to catalog them here. However, other conceptions of cultural heritage can be found within the growing literature on the subject. Cultural heritage is rarely explicitly defined by scholars, but one of the earliest interlocutors, David Lowenthal (1997: 4), quipped heritage to be "antiquities, roots, identity, belonging." He likened the new focus on heritage to the semantic shift seen in French *patrimoine* (patrimony) from "goods inherited from parents," to "bequests from remote forebears and cultural legacies in general." Sharing sensibilities with 'history' and 'tradition,' Lowenthal noted that heritage nevertheless enjoyed a much more extensive social relevance and reach (Lowenthal 1997: 3). Blake (2000: 68) reminds us that this social relevance is central to conceptions of heritage, comprising the 'cultural' half of the term 'cultural heritage.' In a similar vein, "heritage is that part of the past which we select in the present for contemporary purposes, whether they be economic or cultural (including political and social factors), and choose to bequeath to the future," the worth of which "rests less in their intrinsic merit than in a complex array of contemporary values, demands and even moralities" (Ashworth and Graham 2005: 7). This societal relevance, moreover, is tightly interwoven with instigating change: "the major use of heritage is to mobilize people and resources, to reform discourses, and to transform

practices . . . Don't be fooled by the talk of preservation: all heritage is change" (Hafstein 2012: 502).

THE RHETORICAL EDGE OF CULTURAL HERITAGE

Why rhetoric? We frame the volume around rhetoric to emphasize the creative capacities of heritage. In the following I explain in further detail why attention to the rhetorical nature of heritage is worthwhile for giving firmer grip to the present relevance of heritage. Recent work in anthropology has pursued the rhetorical nature of culture, where culture is understood not as a set of defining practices and beliefs, but rather a spectrum of possible actions and responses, a range of strategic practices acceptable in a given society (e.g., Coombe and Herman 2004; Meyer and Girke 2011; Strecker and Tyler 2009). Michael Carrithers (2005a, 2005b, 2009) has given the most penetrating vision on culture as rhetoric, arguing that it provides more direct access to the historicity and creativity of social life. He positions anthropology as a "knowledge of possibilities and not just of certainties" (Carrithers 2005a: 434), in which rhetoric can raise in sharp relief the historicity of social life, because "the schemas of culture are not in themselves determining, but are tools used by people to determine themselves and others . . . to persuade and convince, and so to move the social situation from one state to another" (Carrithers 2005b: 581). The only constant is creativity.

Further, a number of previous works in archaeology and heritage studies can be pointed to that are of kindred spirit to a rhetoric approach, such as attention to narrative (Habu, Fawcett, and Matsunaga 2008; Joyce 2002; Pluciennik 1999), language (Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2009), semiotics (Preucel and Bauer 2001; Bauer 2013), dialogue (Harrison 2013), and discourse (Smith 2006; Waterton, Smith, and Campbell 2006). Rhetoric depends on narrative forms, language, semiotics, dialogue, and discourses, but we suggest rhetoric is more.

Rhetoric specifically *mobilizes* and *motivates*, giving reasons and courses for action. We are interested in the rhetoric of heritage because of the increasingly strategic role that heritage plays in a wide range of social, political, and economic struggles in our contemporary world. The past is mobilized in the present: it becomes a standpoint, a performance, a metaphor, an ironic juxtaposition, an alternative vision, or a competing narrative for making strategic moves in broader struggles. The will to relevance that distinguishes cultural heritage as a social phenomenon means that heritage must constantly adapt to changing social and political exigencies. We use rhetoric as a focusing device that illustrates transformative action and future-oriented possibilities,

drawing on the past to suggest new social formations. For these reasons, we focus on heritage as a kind of strategy ('heritage as persuasion'), examined in this volume across the wide spectrum of contexts and agendas in which the past is implicated.

Therefore, investigating the rhetorical edge of cultural heritage might draw on elements of communication like narrative, discourse, and semiotics, but does so specifically with an eye toward its persuasive capacity to mobilize and motivate specific actions, especially actions that effect social and political change. Contributions to this volume do so by positioning heritage as a social practice, redefining conceptions of community, foregrounding the central role played by expertise, highlighting democratic practice, and above all underscoring mechanisms of change in cultural heritage.

For example, several chapters present daily practices and material culture as rhetorical strategies that break beyond discourse. A call for more research on heritage practices, alongside discourse, is highlighted by Malcolm A. Cooper (Chapter 10) based on his experience in cultural resource management in Great Britain. Cooper argues that discourse takes on a more determining character than actually exists because of the tendency to focus on discursive evidence like policy and legislation, without also taking into account associated heritage *practices*. Legislation and policies become translated through processes of decision-making that are influenced by, among other things, political pressure, media, public opinion, legal interpretation, and the specific perspectives brought by different disciplines, professions, departments, even individuals.

Robert Preucel and Regis Pecos (Chapter 14) also foreground practice, noting the practice-oriented nature of placemaking, which proceeds through both discursive and material practices including social institutions and technical practices. Placemaking is "a technology of reordering reality, and its success depends upon the degree to which this refashioning generates habitual action." Concepts like 'place,' 'heritage,' and 'cultural resource' have no separate meaning for the Cochiti Pueblo in the American Southwest, and "fail to express the core values of what it means to be *of Cochiti*." However, such terms are used strategically by combining them with Cochiti traditional core values, and provide an example of alternative heritage discourses being placed alongside dominant discourses, without being reduced to them.

Embodied ritual practice and performance are meanwhile the focus of Anna Karlström's (Chapter 2) reworking of the well-established term 'authenticity' in heritage research and management. Like Preucel and Pecos, her account makes room for alternate worldviews to coexist with prevailing heritage

practices. Specifically she advocates for the acknowledgment and toleration of multiple frames of reference, in this case "alternative perceptions of materiality and preservation" where authenticity arises through embodied practice in local popular religion in Southeast Asia. Moreover, Karlström argues that for concepts deeply embedded in heritage management, like authenticity, they can not and should not be rejected outright, but rather worked through internally to pull out the fluid and dynamic strands of the concept.

Images are also a powerful rhetorical medium, especially for showcasing material culture. Paul Lane (Chapter 16) analyzes both images and texts circulating within the tourism industry to promote East Africa. Drawing on the five canons of rhetorical argument—invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery—developed from the works of Aristotle and Cicero, Lane demonstrates how indigenous knowledge is presented as the "epitome of sustainable practice," even though heritage tourism obliges pastoralists into a long-term sedentism that threatens the ecological fabric of a landscape. As raised by several contributors to the volume, it is the temporal character of heritage that gives it especial purchase in some rhetorical concepts (like sustainability) more than others. Orthogonal to the temporal dynamism that cultural heritage supports, sustainability rhetoric instead has an ossifying effect for East African pastoralists and their way of life, freezing seasonal movements and adaptive capacities.

RHETORIC AND REDESCRIPTION

It is necessary to note, too, what rhetoric is *not*, at least within the purposes of this volume. This is because rhetoric bears a deep history within the western classical tradition and has animated such a number of interlocutors that its meanings are varied. Rhetoric is not pursued here as empty talk that twists in any manipulation to win an argument, being unconcerned with moral consequences or social facts. Nor does it take heritage today as 'mere rhetoric,' another form of empty talk that assumes no purpose or responsibility for connecting with practical matters. It would be wrong to presume that individuals or communities are simply 'using' cultural heritage, unscrupulously, as some kind of realpolitik, except insofar as "the form of rule shape[s] the form of revolt against it" (Mamdani 1996: 147). As Mahmood Mamdani described ethnicity in colonial contexts, ethnicity "was never just about identity. Its two contradictory moments involved both social control and social emancipation. This is why it makes sense neither just to embrace ethnicity uncritically nor simply to reject it one-sidedly" (1996: 147). We make the same case for heritage,

except the conditions of power have changed, so that whereas ethnicity 'made sense' in the particular racializing rubric of colonialism, now heritage is both "social control and social emancipation" within present-day conditions of post-colonialism and globalization.

In what Richard Rorty coined 'the rhetorical turn' (cf. Simons 1990; Palonen 1997) and Bryan Garsten (2011) called the 'rhetoric revival,' political philosophers have lifted rhetoric from ill regard to a new positive reception. In particular, the renewed interest in rhetoric has been driven by work on deliberative democracy, which we draw on to suggest deliberative approaches to heritage. This volume seeks to demonstrate how the transformation of rhetorical language and the innovation of new vocabularies—a process that Rorty (1989) has called 'redescription'—can provide an incisive tool for the work of heritage in our world today. Redescription shares affinities with the conceptual and intellectual history of Reinhart Koselleck (2004), who speaks of the 'carrying capacity of a word,' and Quentin Skinner (1988: 282), who emphasized what he called the 'anthropological justification' for studying conceptual change. We aim to investigate how, as Wittgenstein (1984: 46) put it, 'words are deeds,' motivating forces for change.

Rorty (1989) provides an account of redescription in *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*, where he agues that "the chief instrument for cultural change" is "a talent for speaking differently" (1989: 7). The idea is to radically transform a vocabulary that has become calcified, "an entrenched vocabulary which has become a nuisance" (1989: 9). The main trouble is that discussion and analysis inevitably meet a dead-end of intractable problems of inquiry. Rorty gives as an example dualisms inherited from the Platonic tradition that now compose Western thinking: e.g., appearance-reality, matter-mind, subject-object, and the related subjectivism-objectivism. The issue of dualisms in heritage is picked up by a number of contributors, and discussed in further depth in Trinidad Rico's conclusion to this volume (Chapter 17). Attempts to resolve such intractable issues are invariably "inconclusive or question-begging" (Rorty 1989: 9), because arguments against a vocabulary must be phrased in terms of that vocabulary, which has already set the parameters and standards of justification of what makes for coherent, consistent, and meaningful argument. Therefore, the goal of redescription is to rearrange and show matters in a different light:

> to redescribe lots and lots of things in new ways, until you have created a
> pattern of linguistic behavior . . . it says things like 'try thinking of it this
> way' . . . It does not try to pretend to have a better candidate for doing the same
> things which we did when we spoke in the old way. Rather, it suggests that we

might want to stop doing those things and do something else. But it does not argue for this suggestion on the basis of antecedent criteria common to the old and new language games. For just insofar as the new language really is new, there will be no such criteria. (Rorty 1989: 9)

The goal then is not to argue against current ways of describing the world, but to offer more attractive vocabularies, metaphors, and modes of speech, which over time will become more literalized (Rorty 1989: 44).

The study of heritage and daily practices that surround its care similarly face challenges of description. Such challenges in describing the condition of heritage in our contemporary world limit the capacities for what can be said about heritage and therefore how it is understood and how it is mobilized. Some may argue that the language of heritage at our disposal is sufficient, and that redescription is therefore an obfuscation or waste of time. However, the will to relevance that characterizes cultural heritage argues against status quo contentment (as the conditions of contemporary life change so too must heritage), especially within pursuits of social and global justice. Another argument for redescription is the central role of designation in heritage management. That is, much of the work surrounding cultural heritage is definitional in nature, concerned with recognizing what is, and is not, heritage. With so much riding on defining heritage, questioning the meaning of heritage keywords is part of a healthy system of checks-and-balances vis-à-vis the designation process. Further, the codification of heritage keywords that takes place at the international level is bound up with an ineffectual institutional system of governance in danger of becoming moribund. The significant challenges confronting the international system (e.g., UNESCO, see Meskell 2013a, 2013b), coupled with its lowest common denominator political aspirations as a result of slow negotiations, weak enforcement, and power imbalances between states (Hale and Held 2011) means that heritage terms composed to work within this system will be similarly outmoded.

Rorty's interpretive method of redescription has been picked up by political philosophers interested in reviving rhetoric along Aristotelian lines (e.g., Abizadeh 2002; Fontana, Nederman, and Remer 2004; Garsten 2006; O'Neill 2002; Yack 2006). It was the dualism between rhetoric and reality that was reinforced by the sophistic tradition, critiqued by Plato, and is responsible for the pejorative connotations associated with rhetoric today. However, this dualism dissolves in Aristotle's account of rhetoric, which saw rhetoric as "the faculty of observing in a given case the available means of persuasion" (*On Rhetoric* 1355b25–27). Aristotle's account offers rhetoric as a form of reasoning,

designed not "to unmask the pretensions of reason but instead to analyze how reasoning works in public" (Garsten 2011: 169). In addition to logical argument (*logos*), other forms of public reasoning include appeals to emotions (*pathos*) and building the audience's trust in a speaker, i.e., in the character of the speaker (*ethos*).

In the realm of political theory, rhetoric has been of particular importance to deliberative democracy, which is a theoretical orientation meant to supplement and enrich the quality of existing democratic practices (Chambers 2012: 53). In everyday language, deliberation is typically understood as careful consideration before a decision. Like rhetoric it is inherently practical in orientation, asking "what is to be done?" and seeks reasons for or against following particular courses of action. The opposite of reason-giving is manipulation and coercion (2012: 58–59). Further, reason-giving can come in many forms, which is where rhetoric entered into scholarly discussion on deliberative democracy. Rhetoric offered a more capacious account of deliberation, for example in drawing out affective registers of public reasoning and directing attention to audience. The turn to rhetoric was in response to the narrow terms of deliberation developed by Jürgen Habermas (1996) and others (Cohen 1989; Benhabib 1996; Gutmann and Thompson 1996), who were concerned with producing democratically legitimate outcomes and therefore excluded some forms of discourse and speech because they were seen as potentially coercive, threatening the listeners' autonomy by moving them in some respect (Garsten 2011: 167).

Importantly, rhetoric in deliberative situations regularly draws on cultural heritage. This is especially the case once deliberation is reconceptualized from the idealized Habermasian approach to a systemic approach, which link together the many nodes of deliberative activity that takes place in society, from venues like news media and town hall meetings to chats with friends over coffee (Parkinson and Mansbridge 2012; Dryzek 2010a, 2010b; Bohman 2007). Scott Welsh (2002: 680) notes that effective rhetoric:

> constantly aims to modify prevailing cultural terminologies that constitute the common points of reference and governing meanings of a political collectivity. Inasmuch as such common meanings make cooperation and productive communication possible, they are equally understood as sites of intense struggle. We would be better served by thinking of public deliberation as a common struggle over cultural resources marshaled in day-to-day politics.

More than being a kind of background material from which arguments are constructed, Welsh argues that cultural resources are the "'source' and 'goal' of

effective political speech" (Welsh 2002: 690), producing new vocabularies and meanings, alternative metaphors, narratives, ironic juxtapositions, and reinterpreted historical events (2002: 691). Therefore the goal is not necessarily to change the minds of individuals as much as "to effect a shift in prevailing relationships between the meanings of key cultural-political terms, events, or narratives" (2002: 690). This is an important distinction, and positions heritage as itself composing a unique and integral rhetorical strategy, providing agonistic sites of struggle and conflict over broader social and material vocabularies.

Rethinking Community and Scale

Welsh's (2002) argument also highlights the symbiotic relationship between participatory democracy and deliberative democracy, with participatory approaches being focused on cooperation and dialogue, and deliberative approaches on difference and plurality. Attention to struggle, strategy, and difference can therefore complement the aims of participatory and collaborative approaches to heritage and archaeology, so that rhetoric has the potential to be a powerful tool for more equitable and inclusive research programs. Within political theory, the relationships between participatory and deliberative democracy have been variously imagined (Hauptmann 2001; Fung 2004; Mutz 2006; Wojcieszak, Baek, and Delli Carpini 2010). For the purposes of cultural heritage, one productive intersection between deliberative and participatory approaches would be to focus on how rhetoric shapes a sense of community, for example "by accommodating itself to the particular, substantive, beliefs and desires of the listeners it addresses" (Beiner 1983: 101), or by 'bridging' together the concerns of disparate groups (Dryzek 2010b).

In part, the purpose of this volume is to offer deliberative heritage as a complement to participatory methods for the purposes of strengthening heritage engagement. For example, participatory methodologies work well for small-scale or face-to-face collaborations. Deliberative models meanwhile articulate with a broader scale of relations that are necessary to enter into given the conditions—globalization, mobility, mass communications, mass democracy—of our present era. These broad-scale dynamics are not independent of, or antithetical to, local ones (which is why analyses that pit local vs. global are simplistic at best), but instead arise from and share mutual constitution with situated cultural processes at the local level (Labadi and Long 2010; Meskell 2009). Nevertheless, matters of heritage that reach beyond small-scales require additional tools in order to foster broad engagement representing diverse perspectives.

Participatory approaches to heritage and archaeology are well established and place outreach and community engagement at their core. The stakes of communities living near or otherwise connected to sites of heritage has been a focal point for efforts to better distribute access to heritage and associated resources that accrue from this access (e.g., economic or educational). In recent years, scholars have worked with collaborative approaches to archaeological practice (Atalay 2007, 2010; Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008; Hodder 2003; Nicholas et al. 2011; Silliman 2008), introduced a politics of engagement (Mullins 2011), and employed participatory action research (PAR) methods (Hollowell and Nicholas 2009; Pyburn 2009). An especially burgeoning field is 'community archaeology,' in which archaeologists position communities as the primary participants and target beneficiaries of archaeological research programs (Agbe-Davies 2010; Moser et al. 2002; Moshenska 2008; Smith and Waterton 2009; Watson and Waterton 2010). Other new directions in participatory heritage employ social media (Giaccardi 2012) and theorize new forms of sociality (Simon and Ashley 2010).

The concept of community continues to be problematized and reworked through the course of such activities. A number of chapters in this volume deal with such questions that arise around community in contexts extending beyond the local or small-scale. Benedict Anderson's (1983) work on 'imagined communities' and nationalism has been particularly influential in archaeology and heritage studies for theorizing community where face-to-face interaction is not possible. Since Anderson's landmark analysis, the effects of globalization have brought new formations of 'imagined' communities, which is why his work continues to bear special purchase even as the power of the state wanes. As in Anderson's account, heritage continues to be a key ingredient.

Alexander Bauer (Chapter 5) proposes that 'metaphysical communities' (cf. Urban 1996) have developed around the international circulation of heritage objects, replacing tired debates over cultural nationalism versus cultural internationalism within which cultural property has been caught for at least the past three decades. Truer to the UNESCO 1970 *Convention*, the newfound sense of collaboration, reciprocity, and shared stewardship is what Bauer calls "a kind of *kula* ring of important antiquities moving among previously competing parties," recalling the gift economy first outlined by Bronislaw Malinowski for an exchange system in the Trobriand Islands of Papua New Guinea. This sea change moreover has tracked alongside a shift in emphasis from 'cultural property' to 'cultural heritage' in international policy, as well as the rise of 'intangible heritage.'

Klaus Zehbe (Chapter 11) offers a rich account of intangible heritage as a kind of 'thought style' (after Fleck 1981) that undergoes observation and stylization, and is transmitted through a community of experts—a 'thought collective' (Fleck's term) or an 'epistemic community' (after Haas 1992)—to its eventual institutionalization. To render strange a familiar topic like intangible heritage, Zehbe discusses the concept of 'brain death' as an instructive metaphor for intangible heritage. Citing the work of philosopher Masahiro Morioka (2000), brain death is found not in the person whose brain has ceased functioning, but rather in the human relationships surrounding this person. So too Zehbe emphasizes that intangible heritage exists not with individuals but as a nexus of relations between humans, being maintained and transmitted through communities both expert and traditional.

Policymaking and management practices for cultural heritage have also followed broader trends in global democratic governance, which adapt the notion of 'community' within specific socio-political roles: civil society and citizenship being the two most prominent. Sigrid Van der Auwera (Chapter 3) addresses the growing importance of 'civil society' within heritage work, focusing in particular on efforts to protect cultural property during armed conflict, where civil society is seen to bear primary responsibility. Though such rhetorical deployment of civil society is seen to promote 'bottom-up' grassroots engagement from society, Van der Auwera argues that projects remain principally 'top-down,' lacking in the inclusive, pluralistic, multilayered communities that effective protection would require. As she notes, mobilizing 'civil society' in and of itself is no game-changer, as civil society can be equally apt to destroy cultural heritage as it is to protect it. Overall, her chapter offers a thorough and welcome analysis of how 'civil society' is envisioned within heritage policy and practice.

Turning to the role of citizenship, Alicia McGill (Chapter 4) shows in the case of education programs in Belize how an appreciation of cultural heritage is seen to aid the development of productive citizens. Belizean children are brought into the global market logics of their national economy and foreign tourism, where knowledge of their country's cultural diversity and rich past will position them as good tour guides and ambassadors for Belize. McGill's chapter is a valuable contribution to the study of education as both transmitter of state and cultural values and as a field of cultural production as these values are reinterpreted and contested. Her work usefully lays plain that education is an active arena for institutionalization and change in heritage rhetoric.

Heritage and Democracy

The preceding discussion on participatory and deliberative democracy raises important issues. Why draw on democratic approaches at all, whether participatory or deliberative, for cultural heritage? What can heritage experts hope to achieve? Is there the potential of doing more harm than good? Of intervening with an ill-fitting framework to social contexts governed by principles other than democratic ones? These kinds of questions increasingly confront heritage scholars and practitioners, especially as the scope of heritage work extends beyond well-known and politically unambiguous national frameworks to face a diverse range of social and political contexts both locally and globally. Such questions are also of growing importance as heritage and archaeology have variously been redescribed as social action (Byrne 2008), activism (Atalay et al. 2014; Pyburn 2007; Starzmann 2008), and political action (McGuire 2008).

As a starting point, it is important to underline that democracy itself bears a great diversity of meanings across the globe. Some of the greatest injustices done in the name of democracy have been due to forcing a one-size-fits-all model. Cultural anthropologists have provided some of the most compelling accounts of 'actually existing democracies,' demonstrating the need for contextual studies of democracy that understand the specific configurations and challenges of democratic practice (Caldeira and Holston 1999; Greenhouse 1998; Holston 2008; Paley 2002, 2008). Focusing on the connections between heritage and democracy in specific contexts can achieve similar and complementary ends.

For example, Albro (2006) details how cultural heritage came to define alternative conceptions of democracy in Bolivia. The passage of the Public Participation Law in 1994 granted full recognition to indigenous political groups via legal recognition of 'customary law' (*usos y costumbres*), "establishing legal precedent based on continuity with the past" (Albro 2006: 393). It was through appeals to customary law that indigenous groups gained traction for remaking democratic practice and participation, arguing that democracy needed to be 'reclaimed' (*reivindicar* or *recuperar*) "as a collective political birthright, a birthright they actively 'remember' and rhetorically relocate as a cultural heritage upon which to build for the future" (2006: 402). Here groups looked to the Andean institution of *ayllu*, which is defined by its principles of service, rotating leadership, substantive consultation, communal consensus, and equitable distribution of resources.

However, in some heritage contexts a democratic state or democratic practices may not exist, in which case the political environment of heritage and working conceptions of social justice must be ascertained. In more cases the

articulation between cultural heritage and democracy may be poorly under-stood, and would profit from further inquiry. Several contributions to the vol-ume examine the relationship between democratic practice and cultural heri-tage. My own contribution (Chapter 15) looks at the construction of heritage rights in the context of heritage development projects seeking to 'build capac-ity' in pre-Revolution Tunisia. I suggest that under the repressive conditions of now-deposed President Zine El Abidine Ben Ali's administration, heritage rights could be redescribed as the capacity for heritage and its management to support or constrain social imaginaries.

Cecilia Rodéhn (Chapter 6) gives an insightful survey of the deliberative productions of academics on democratic practice in museums. She asks how, in the course of writing about democratization processes, scholars become part of the process they are writing about. The effect, she argues, is to create a temporal map of museum democratization, whereby the past is viewed nega-tively, the present (the time of the writing) is considered a time of transforma-tion, and the future a state of democratic practice. The quest for fair and equal representation, improved access, participation, and social inclusivity often masks an unequal distribution of political power of greater importance, and democracy is wielded as the sole arbiter of political legitimacy and correctness. Based on her extensive analysis of scholarly deliberations, Rodéhn suggests that "democratization should be understood as a long process of open-ended social constructions" and "eclectic negotiations of power, ideas, and interests."

Like Rodéhn, Jeff Adams (Chapter 8) undertakes a broad comparative analysis, here to provide a perceptive account of 'equity' in sustainable tourism projects and their outcomes in international development contexts. Adams points to the alarming and pervasive disjuncture between project ideals and outcomes. Whereas projects assume that tourism revenues can improve social equity, instead tourism exacerbates already existing social inequalities. Given this state of affairs, he argues that equity talk serves as a "normative signpost" and "justificatory index of program legitimacy," circulating across international heritage policy as "both a conscious strategy to promote the lasting self-adoption of best practices and a practical necessity in the absence of alternatives." Taking the above into account, he asks several provocative questions: "to what extent should heritage managers aspire to be in the social justice business? . . . Can heritage preservation in and of itself . . . nonetheless have the power to promote lasting, endogenous, positive social and economic change?"

With this Adams raises the issue of expertise in cultural heritage, a topic that is picked up in several other chapters as well. Trinidad Rico (Chapter

9) argues that the concept of risk is a tool—"an established instrument of rationalization"—used by heritage experts to police the boundaries of acceptable and unacceptable discourse for identifying and constructing what is 'heritage.' This is in counterpoint to the need for flexibility within terms commonly deployed in heritage work, in order to create discursive space for contextual, embedded meanings. Likewise, the baseline against which risk is assessed should be composed of articulated values and, ideally, shared ones. Taking these points together, the regime of risk presently in place tells us more about expert mentalities than it does the state of a given heritage property, which is why we should give care to the production of heritage constructs, discourse being a central technology in this production.

Similar sentiments are expressed by Melissa Baird (Chapter 13) with respect to the deployment of 'nature' to erase histories: "what seems natural or organic is in fact imagined and constructed." This tendency becomes more dangerous when enshrined in legislation and codes of practice. At the same time, what is referred to as 'heritage' continues to grow, and expertise lags behind even as heritage experts cite authority and obligation, colored with possession, in rationalizing their involvement. As Baird notes, heritage is being called upon for environmental conservation, and with the many environmental challenges facing our world today, this gives greater urgency to understanding how concepts like 'heritage' and 'nature' gain relevance and traction vis-à-vis one another. Overall, the contributions from Adams, Rico, and Baird underscore expertise as the locus for setting the frames and limits of deliberation, for 'setting the agenda' around which talking points become articulated and echoed.

This leaves us with the unsettling sense that changing the conversation is not an option, unless from concerted expert action. Certainly we can point to this as a particularly direct means for redescription, but other routes exist, and indeed one purpose of this volume is to raise that possibility. For example, fostering participation encourages more inclusive, democratic engagement with heritage. However, participatory approaches work best at the small-scale or local level, and increasingly heritage matters extend beyond this to encompass national, international, and diasporic interests and audiences. What is needed are democratic approaches capable of engaging these audiences too. Turning the analytical gaze to deliberative practices helps delineate productive areas or mechanisms for greatest impact on the day-to-day affairs of heritage and its management. Moreover, such approaches move focus 'up river' in the stream of influence, 'studying up' (Nader 1972) in order to target the makers of messaging and policy.

Mechanisms of Change

The strategic redescription and transformation of heritage rhetoric provides one productive avenue for moving global heritage agendas and recontextualizing heritage work within its strengths: the specific historical contingencies, traditions, and contemporary community uses that characterize heritage itself. This volume challenges and takes apart the reified character and foundational assumptions of key heritage categories and terms by demonstrating their alternative and open-ended possibilities. To craft new vocabularies and descriptions of heritage requires a detailed and oftentimes creative understanding of legal and institutional mechanisms, so as to strategically pursue those paths with the most productive results or possibilities for change. Working within such institutional frameworks also allows groups to capture national and international attention and support for pushing forward redescriptions of key terms in heritage, effectively shifting the terms of debate itself.

For instance, chapters in this volume deal with terms of heritage vocabularies and rhetoric derived and drawing force from national legislation, international law and conventions, and professional codes of ethics. The chapters contribute directly or indirectly to ongoing research on law and society, on the mutual constitution and interconnections between the two. In this respect, institutional change might be seen as one end-goal among many, rather than the means and end. Meanwhile, heritage vocabularies developed or redescribed from the grassroots level may penetrate legal and institutional vocabularies of heritage. In such contexts, what rhetoric loses from a lack of institutional backing, it gains in more radical revisioning of how we conceive and talk about heritage.

A number of contributors to this volume highlight specific mechanisms for change in heritage. For example, Cooper (Chapter 10) underscores the translation of policy into practice as a key mechanism for change, where even if the policy or legal wording remains the same, the 'spirit' of the law has changed in line with changing social conditions. He also suggests the importance of public opinion in swaying management and policy decisions, which opens up an important avenue for grassroots efforts in redescription. In the case of setting the global agenda for heritage, Adams (Chapter 8) raises the need for closing the gap between inspirational or delusional talk, to more closely fit agenda-setting rhetoric to what is feasible and doable. Rodéhn (Chapter 6) highlights the key role played by the scholarly literature in setting the terms of debate, and she warns against pursuing constant transformation without concomitant pauses to review and take stock of achievements.

The chapter by Bauer (Chapter 5) gives us a clear account of redescription already taking place, in the shift from cultural property to cultural heritage in

the international discourse of law. As he notes, this shift was prompted by a confluence of changing social perspectives and several key court cases. McGill (Chapter 4) foregrounds the negotiations of meaning that take place in educational contexts: between teaching plans, the degree to which these plans are interpreted by teachers, and how lessons are understood and received within the existing worldviews of students. Karlström (Chapter 2) and Preucel and Pecos (Chapter 14) demonstrate the possibility of parallel co-existing discourses, for example Preucel and Pecos show how Cochiti conceptions of heritage/place are set alongside dominant heritage vocabularies without being diminished by them. Images can also be a powerful tool for communication, as related by Lane (Chapter 16), and therefore represent a material mechanism for shifting conceptions of heritage.

Another mechanism for redescription is breaking down a keyword into parts, as suggested by Gabriel Moshenska (Chapter 12) for 'memory.' Moshenska argues that the term 'memory' elides a range of different and specific concepts, thereby confusing and obscuring the work of powerful actors and processes that shape popular conceptions of the past. He suggests instead the use of terms such as 'remember' and 'commemorate' that bring back agency and context to analysis by foregrounding the processual nature of memory, as actions. In breaking apart 'memory,' Moshenska identifies three generative processes composing the term: (1) the creation of narratives within small groups, (2) the promotion and amplification of specific narratives through various media, and (3) disagreement in the public sphere over opposing narratives. In thinking through mechanisms for redescription, Moshenska's chapter offers a straightforward approach: dismantling a keyword into component parts to highlight the agency and contexts of heritage work. More importantly, he raises the issues of scale, audience, and disagreement that are so central to deliberative concerns, as discussed in this introduction.

Rather than breaking apart a term into more useful constituent parts, some terms compose a constellation of related concepts. The case of difficult heritage addressed by Joshua Samuels (Chapter 7) demonstrates how key terms in heritage come into being through scholarly deliberation on finding the 'right' word. As Samuels points out, terms like 'negative heritage' and 'undesirable heritage' were discarded for unintended valences the words carried. The literature seems to have settled on 'difficult heritage' as the best word for describing painful, contested, or awkward heritage. At the same time, Samuels suggests that something is lost in the process of arriving at 'difficult heritage,' watering down the force that other terms carried, and being not entirely satisfactory in its own right. Samuels' chapter raises the important point that scholarly

discussions and management strategies require some baseline understanding of key concepts in order to ensure communication and mutual intelligibility. However, we cannot forget the process by which terms came into being and acquired consensus, and that key terms—like 'difficult heritage'—are never wholly satisfactory. The search for 'right' words must still continue.

CONCLUSION

In this volume we are interested in the mechanisms by which redescriptions of the past into present-day purposes take hold and spread, gaining collective currency. These mechanisms might be material, discursive, legal, institutional, or unconventional. More specifically, this volume explores how such mechanisms might be channeled in the pursuit of visionary change. How does the translation of past into present proceed, and how does this translation garner broad acceptance and legitimacy? Further, how does a social focus on heritage enable strategic engagement in contemporary issues? Taking all of these questions together, how might communities, organizations, and individuals mobilize heritage to challenge and reshape the status quo of established norms and relations?

Heritage is particularly well suited to this task of social change. In looking to the deep reserve of times past, heritage draws on a wide diversity of experiences and what, in hindsight, we might call 'social experiments,' demonstrating the limitless possibilities of the human condition. History gives the world today important perspective: that present conditions have not always existed, life is not everywhere the same, alternatives exist, and in fact diversity and creative strategies are the norm and catalyze social transformation. The recent interest in heritage rights, social justice, and participatory models of heritage research signal the utopic potential redescribed from the many pasts of our world. These strengths and successes in heritage research inspired us to put together the present volume.

One of the most fascinating aspects of cultural heritage is its 'living' quality, wherein the past is constantly recreated, remade, and redescribed to align with present conditions and sensibilities. The past is made anew; even efforts to halt the passage of time and preserve its moments requires a great deal of work and reworking. Indeed, this will to relevance defines cultural heritage concerns.

NOTE

1. The contributions to this volume were developed from papers given in two sessions titled "The Rhetoric of Heritage" held at the American Anthropological

Association annual meeting in Montreal, November 2011, and at the Theoretical Archaeology Group in Birmingham, December 2011. Several invited papers were also included.

REFERENCES

Abizadeh, Arash. 2002. "The Passions of the Wise: Phronesis, Rhetoric, and Aristotle's Passionate Practical Deliberation." *Review of Metaphysics* 56: 267–97.

Agbe-Davies, Anna S. 2010. "Concepts of Community in the Pursuit of an Inclusive Archaeology." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16 (6): 373–89. http://dx.doi .org/10.1080/13527258.2010.510923.

Albro, Robert. 2006. "The Culture of Democracy and Bolivia's Indigenous Movements." *Critique of Anthropology* 26 (4): 387–410. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/03 08275X06070122.

Aldenderfer, Mark. 2011. "Editorial: Keywords." *Current Anthropology* 52 (4): 487. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/661743.

Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Aristotle. 2007. *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. Trans. George A. Kennedy. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Ashworth, G. J., and Brian Graham. 2005. "Senses of Place, Senses of Time and Heritage." In *Senses of Place: Senses of Time*, ed. G. J. Ashworth and Brian Graham, 3–12. Farnham, UK: Ashgate Publishing.

Atalay, Sonya L. 2007. "Global Application of Indigenous Archaeology: Community Based Participatory Research in Turkey." *Archaeologies* 3 (3): 249–70. http://dx.doi .org/10.1007/s11759-007-9026-8.

Atalay, Sonya. 2010. "'We Don't Talk about Çatalhöyük, We Live It': Sustainable Archaeological Practice through Community-based Participatory Research." *World Archaeology* 42 (3): 418–29. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00438243.2010 .497394.

Atalay, Sonya, Lee Rains, Randall H. McGuire, and John R. Welch, eds. 2014. *Transforming Archaeology: Activist Practices and Prospects*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Bauer, Alexander A. 2013. "Multivocality and 'Wikiality': The Epistemology and Ethics of a Pragmatic Archaeology." In *Appropriating the Past: Philosophical Perspectives on the Practice of Archaeology II*, ed. Chris Scarre and Robin Coningham, 176–94. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beiner, Ronald. 1983. *Political Judgment*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Benhabib, Seyla. 1996. "Toward a Deliberative Model of Democratic Legitimacy." In *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, ed. Seyla Benhabib, 67–94. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bennett, Tony, Lawrence Grossberg, and Meaghan Morris. 2005. *New Keywords: A Revised Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Blake, Janet. 2000. "On Defining the Cultural Heritage." *International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 49 (1): 61–85. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S002058930 006396X.

Bohman, James. 2007. *Democracy across Borders: From Dêmos to Dêmoi*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Byrne, Denis. 2008. "Heritage as Social Action." In *The Heritage Reader*, ed. Graham Fairclough, Rodney Harrison, John H. Jameson, Jr., and John Schofield, 149–73. New York, NY: Routledge.

Caldeira, Teresa P. R., and James Holston. 1999. "Democracy and Violence in Brazil." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 41 (4): 691–729. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017 /S0010417599003102.

Carrithers, Michael. 2005a. "Anthropology as a Moral Science of Possibilities." *Current Anthropology* 46 (3): 433–56. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/428801.

Carrithers, Michael. 2005b. "Why Anthropologists Should Study Rhetoric." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 11 (3): 577–83. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467 -9655.2005.00251.x.

Carrithers, Michael, ed. 2009. *Culture, Rhetoric, and the Vicissitudes of Life*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books.

Chambers, Simone. 2012. "Deliberation and Mass Democracy." In *Deliberative Systems: Deliberative Democracy at the Large Scale*, ed. John Parkinson and Jane Mansbridge, 52–71. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org /10.1017/CBO9781139178914.004.

Cohen, Joshua. 1989. "Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy." In *The Good Polity: Normative Analysis of the State*, ed. Alan Hamlin and Philip Pettit, 17–34. Oxford: Blackwell.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip. 2009. "Myth of the Anasazi: Archaeological Language, Collaborative Communities, and the Contested Past." *Public Archaeology* 8 (2/3): 191–207. http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/175355309X457222.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip, and T. J. Ferguson, eds. 2008. *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira.

Coombe, Rosemary, and Andrew Herman. 2004. "Rhetorical Virtues: Property, Speech, and the Commons on the World-Wide Web." *Anthropological Quarterly* 77 (3): 559–74.

Dryzek, John S. 2010a. *Foundations and Frontiers of Deliberative Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199562947 .001.0001.

Dryzek, John S. 2010b. "Rhetoric in Democracy: A Systemic Appreciation." *Political Theory* 38 (3): 319–39. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0090591709359596.

Fleck, Ludwik. 1981. *Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact*. Trans. Fred Bradley and Thaddeus J. Trenn. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Fontana, Benedetto, Cary J. Nederman, and Gary Remer, eds. 2004. *Talking Democracy: Historical Perspectives on Rhetoric and Democracy*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Fung, Archon. 2004. *Empowered Participation: Reinventing Urban Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Garsten, Bryan. 2006. *Saving Persuasion: A Defense of Rhetoric and Judgment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Garsten, Bryan. 2011. "The Rhetoric Revival in Political Theory." *Annual Review of Political Science* 14 (1): 159–80. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.040108 .104834.

Giaccardi, Elisa, ed. 2012. *Heritage and Social Media: Understanding Heritage in a Participatory Culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Greenhouse, Carol J., ed. 1998. *Democracy and Ethnography: Constructing Identities in Multicultural Liberal States*. Albany: State University of New York.

Gutmann, Amy, and Dennis F. Thompson. 1996. *Democracy and Disagreement*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Haas, Peter M. 1992. "Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination." *International Organization* 46 (1): 1–35. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017 /S0020818300001442.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1996. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Habu, Junko, Clare Fawcett, and John M. Matsunaga, eds. 2008. *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies*. New York, NY: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-71825-5.

Hafstein, Valdimar. 2012. "Cultural Heritage." In *A Companion to Folklore*, ed. Regina F. Bendix and Galit Hasan-Rokem, 500–19. Malden, MA: Blackwell. http:// dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781118379936.ch26.

Hale, Thomas, and David Held, eds. 2011. *Handbook of Transnational Governance: Institutions and Innovations*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Harrison, Rodney. 2013. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. Abingdon / New York, NY: Routledge. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199602001.013.021.

Hauptmann, Emily. 2001. "Can Less Be More? Leftist Deliberative Democrats' Critique of Participatory Democracy." *Polity* 33 (3): 397–421. http://dx.doi.org /10.2307/3235441.

Hodder, Ian. 2003. *Archaeology Beyond Dialogue*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Hollowell, Julie. J., and George Nicholas. 2009. "Using Ethnographic Methods to Articulate Community-Based Conceptions of Cultural Heritage Management." *Public Archaeology* 8 (2/3): 141–60. http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/175355309X457196.

Holston, James. 2008. *Insurgent Citizenship: Disjunctions of Democracy and Modernity in Brazil*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Joyce, Rosemary, ed. 2002. *The Languages of Archaeology: Dialogue, Narrative, and Writing*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470693520.

Koselleck, Reinhart. 2004. *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*. Trans. K. Tribe. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Labadi, Sophia, and Colin Long, eds. 2010. *Heritage and Globalisation*. London: Routledge.

Lowenthal, David. 1997. *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mamdani, Mahmood. 1996. "Indirect Rule, Civil Society, and Ethnicity: The African Dilemma." *Social Justice* 23 (1/2): 145–50.

McGuire, Randall H. 2008. *Archaeology as Political Action*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Meskell, Lynn, ed. 2009. *Cosmopolitan Archaeologies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/9780822392422.

Meskell, Lynn. 2013a. "UNESCO and the Fate of the World Heritage Indigenous Peoples Council of Experts (WHIPCOE)." *International Journal of Cultural Property* 20 (2): 155–74. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0940739113000039.

Meskell, Lynn. 2013b. "UNESCO's World Heritage Convention at 40: Challenging the Economic and Political Order of International Heritage Conservation." *Current Anthropology* 54 (4): 483–94. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/671136.

Meyer, Christian, and Felix Girke, eds. 2011. *The Rhetorical Emergence of Culture*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books.

Morioka, Masahiro. 2000. *Nōshi no Hito*. [Brain Dead Person]. Tokyo: Hozokan. Available in English online at http://www.lifestudies.org/braindeadperson00 .html.

Moser, Stephanie, Darren Glazier, James E. Phillips, Lamya Nasser el Nemr, Mohammed Saleh Mousa, Rascha Nasr Alesh, Susan Richardson, Andrew Conner, and Michael Seymour. 2002. "Transforming Archaeology Through

Practice: Strategies for Collaborative Archaeology and the Community Archaeology Project at Quseir, Egypt." *World Archaeology* 34 (2): 220–48. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0043824022000007071.

Moshenska, Gabriel. 2008. "Community Archaeology from Below: A Response to Tully." *Public Archaeology* 7 (1): 51–52. http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/175355308X306004.

Mullins, Paul R. 2011. "Practicing Anthropology and the Politics of Engagement: 2010 Year in Review." *American Anthropologist* 113 (2): 235–45. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1433.2011.01327.x.

Mutz, Diana C. 2006. *Hearing the Other Side: Deliberative versus Participatory Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511617201.

Nader, Laura. 1972. "Up the Anthropologist—Perspectives Gained from Studying Up." In *Re-inventing Anthropology*, ed. Dell Hymes, 284–311. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Nicholas, George P., Amy Roberts, David M. Schaepe, Joe Watkins, Lyn Leader-Elliot, and Susan Rowley. 2011. "A Consideration of Theory, Principles, and Practice in Collaborative Archaeology." *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 26 (2): 11–30.

O'Neill, John. 2002. "The Rhetoric of Deliberation: Some Problems in Kantian Theories of Deliberative Democracy." *Res Publica* 8 (3): 249–68. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1020899224058.

Paley, Julia. 2002. "Toward an Anthropology of Democracy." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31 (1): 469–96. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.31.040402.085453.

Paley, Julia, ed. 2008. *Democracy: Anthropological Approaches*. Santa Fe, NM: School for Advanced Research Press.

Palonen, Kari. 1997. "Quentin Skinner's Rhetoric of Conceptual Change." *History of the Human Sciences* 10 (2): 61–80. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/095269519701000204.

Parkinson, John, and Jane Mansbridge, eds. 2012. *Deliberative Systems: Deliberative Democracy at the Large Scale*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139178914.

Pluciennik, Mark. 1999. "Archaeological Narratives and Other Ways of Telling." *Current Anthropology* 40 (5): 653–78. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/300085.

Preucel, Robert, and Alexander Bauer. 2001. "Archaeological Pragmatics." *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 34 (2): 85–96. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00293650127469.

Pyburn, K. Anne. 2007. "Archaeology as Activism." In *Cultural Heritage and Human Rights*, edited by Helaine Silverman and D. Fairchild Ruggles, 172–83. New York, NY: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-71313-7_10.

Pyburn, K. Anne. 2009. "Practicing Archaeology—As if It Really Matters." *Public Archaeology* 8 (2/3): 161–75. http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/175355309X457204.

Rorty, Richard. 1989. *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511804397.

Silliman, Stephen W., ed. 2008. *Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Simon, Roger I., and Susan L. T. Ashley. 2010. "Heritage and Practices of Public Formation." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16 (4–5): 247–54. http://dx.doi .org/10.1080/13527251003775471.

Simons, Herbert W. 1990. *Preface to The Rhetorical Turn*. Ed. Herbert W. Simons, vii–xii. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.7208 /chicago/9780226759036.001.0001.

Skinner, Quentin. 1988. "A Reply to My Critics." In *Meaning and Context*, ed. James Tully, 231–88. London: Polity Press.

Smith, Laurajane. 2006. *The Uses of Heritage*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Smith, Laurajane, and Emma Waterton, eds. 2009. *Heritage, Communities and Archaeology*. London: Duckworth.

Starzmann, Maria T. 2008. "Cultural Imperialism and Heritage Politics in the Event of Armed Conflict: Prospects for an 'Activist Archaeology.'" *Archaeologies* 4 (3): 368–89. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11759-008-9083-7.

Strecker, Ivo, and Stephen Tyler, eds. 2009. *Culture and Rhetoric*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 1995. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Urban, Greg. 1996. *Metaphysical Community*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Waterton, Emma, Laurajane Smith, and Gary Campbell. 2006. "The Utility of Discourse Analysis to Heritage Studies: The Burra Charter and Social Inclusion." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 12 (4): 339–55. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080 /13527250600727000.

Watson, Steve, and Emma Waterton. 2010. "Heritage and Community Engagement: Collaboration or Contestation?" *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16 (1-2): 1–3. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13527250903441655.

Welsh, Scott. 2002. "Deliberative Democracy and the Rhetorical Production of Political Culture." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 5 (4): 679–707. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353 /rap.2003.0020.

Williams, Raymond. 1976. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1984. *Culture and Value*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Wojcieszak, Magdalena E., Young Min Baek, and Michael X. Delli Carpini. 2010. "Deliberative and Participatory Democracy? Ideological Strengths and the Processes Leading from Deliberation to Political Engagement." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 22 (2): 154–80. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/edp050.

Yack, Bernard. 2006. "Rhetoric and Public Reasoning: An Aristotelian Understanding of Political Deliberation." *Political Theory* 34 (4): 417–38. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0090591706288232.