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CHAPTER 1
AN ANTHROPOLOGY OF SHARED HERITAGE

“There is no there there”¹

A common narrative in the late twentieth–early twenty-first centuries is that historic rural landscapes and cultural practices are in danger of disappearing in the face of modern development pressures. However, this narrative may be at least partially based on an ideological construct that wrongly objectifies such heritage. Efforts to preserve rural landscapes have dichotomized natural and cultural resources and tended to “freeze” these resources in time. They have essentialized the character of both “rural” and “developed” and ignored the dynamic natural and cultural processes that produce them. Rather than approach heritage as discrete sets of resources to be managed, in this dissertation I call for publicly-engaged and place-based models for cultural and natural heritage protection as a means to build social cohesion and sustainable socio-economic relations. In doing so, I propose an anthropological theory of shared heritage: a culturally mediated ethical practice that references the past in order to intervene in alienating processes of the present to secure a recognizable future for practitioners and prospective beneficiaries.

Hegemonic understandings of heritage and property have challenged scholars and advocates to acknowledge and support the social ethic that lies at the heart of shared heritage. In this dissertation I outline an agenda for critical and applied heritage research that reframes heritage as a transformative social practice (rather than the monumental relics of civilization) and challenges prevailing understandings of the private property

¹ Subheading quotes Gertrude Stein’s famous declaration upon visiting her childhood home as an adult (Stein 1993:298 [1937]).
regime. This agenda will explore alternative social relations sustained through property relations. My research follows a seismic shift in the social sciences and humanities to understand more reflexively how such research is embedded in wider sociopolitical contexts and how the power dynamic has often privileged the researchers’ interests over their research communities. Some contemporary scholars and community advocates have sought to destabilize expert knowledge, urging the development of community-driven, participatory models of heritage protection, which respect the substance of heritage identities and the diversity of heritage values (Ashworth et al. 2007; Graham and Howard 2008; Labadi and Long 2010; Silverman and Ruggles 2008; Smith 2006). Thus, I do not limit my research goals to the abstract theorization of shared heritage; I also concentrate on developing practicable methods to engage community members and scholars in shared heritage development.

I have a deep personal interest in this research problem, not only as an anthropologist and heritage “professional,” but also as a witness to my rural hometown’s transformations under the dual pressures of suburban and tourism development. I grew up in a northeastern Ohio township, which is nestled between the infamous urban metropolis of Cleveland, the idyllic countryside of Amish farms, and a 100-year old seasonal tourism enclave containing two major amusement parks. As a child, the city seemed far away from our town’s open fields, dairy barns, and 4-H shows. The amusement parks were thriving destinations that supported many local businesses, including my family’s. Today, the city has steadily expanded to our town’s borders, marked by its characteristic suburban sprawl of McMansions and Big Box stores. The shiny happy landscape of touristic amusement has since crumbled, leaving behind a new open “field” of empty
parking lots, collapsing roller coasters, and vacant storefronts. These may well be clichéd transformations that evoke my own clichéd, nostalgic response of sadness and wistfulness for what once was. But, this common narrative deeply affects many residents of previously “undeveloped” towns and rural landscapes and speaks to the importance of our childhood memories and attachments to certain places (Chawla 1992).

I acknowledge and even cherish my romantic nostalgia, but I am careful not to tread into the territory of what Boym (2002:49) terms “restorative nostalgia” in which the past becomes a “perfect snapshot.” Rather, I try to maintain a “reflective nostalgia” (Boym 2002) in which I consider my memories and related emotions as emblematic of a larger, meta-narrative concerning the nature of cultural change and the significance of heritage. Furthermore, I consciously fight the urge to adopt an ironic, detached, or even cynical attitude toward the future of modern development in rural areas. Instead, I seek to emulate the romantic idealism of Gibson-Graham’s (2008) “ethics of thinking,” which calls for scholars to create a new, hopeful ontology of agency, change, and potentiality in the field of community development.

In the subsequent chapters I document two case studies of rural residents implementing heritage protection strategies in the face of suburban and tourism development in Hadley, Massachusetts, and Eleuthera, Bahamas, respectively. I engage with these case studies at three distinct levels: (1) locating and critiquing the potential for a shared heritage ethics in the attempts to preserve private agricultural land in Hadley; (2) developing and applying a community-based heritage inventory assessment in Hadley; and (3) modeling an online content and constituent management system for supporting shared heritage development in Eleuthera. Taken together, this dissertation offers an
anthropological model for documenting and analyzing the discursive and material productions of cultural identities and landscapes inherent in heritage resource protection and a set of methods that heritage professionals and practitioners can apply to cultivate shared heritage.

**Evolving Concepts of Heritage**

**Defining Heritage**

Heritage confounds definition (Graham et al. 2000; Harvey 2001, 2008; Lowenthal 1985). For some, heritage may bring to mind treasured relics of Western civilization such as Gothic cathedrals, Classical Greek architecture, Italian Renaissance paintings, or ancient Egyptian pyramids. Additionally, heritage is often associated with seemingly timeless national icons, pastimes, and monuments such as the British flag, baseball, or the Eiffel Tower. For others, heritage may be connected to more personal concepts of familial inheritance, patrimony, and tradition. The vastness of semiotic ground that “heritage” covers, along with its nebulous nature, brings to mind U.S. Supreme Court Justice Stewart’s famous test for identifying pornography: “I shall not…attempt further to define the kinds of material I understand to be embraced…and perhaps I could never succeed in intelligibly doing so. But I know it when I see it” (378 U.S. 184 1964). A typical person may not be able to define heritage concisely or intelligibly, but give them a camera, and they’ll be shooting pictures of “heritage” in no time.

This “I know it when I see it” nature of heritage is due to its symbolic qualities (Peirce 1998). That is, heritage doesn’t simply represent something else or carry an inherent meaning; rather, it indicates a particularly meaningful relationship between its
referrer and referent (Peirce 1998): namely, one of inherited belonging. For example, the Liberty Bell is an icon, which to many U.S. citizens, symbolizes American freedom. When framed as heritage, the Liberty Bell indexes an historical sense of identity founded in freedom that Americans share. There is nothing inherently American about a bell, nor are there freedom-like qualities that bells possess. Rather, the particular artifact of the Liberty Bell has been invested with significance not shared by other bells through a historical sharing of narratives that associate the bell, the American people, and the ideal of freedom in a distinctive way (and which is not an entirely subconscious process).

Heritage is a measure of significance; objects identified as heritage carry this meaning and are dependent upon individuals to continue to value and share that meaning with others. This is what Araoz (2009a, 2011) means when he refers to heritage as “vessels of value” or when Gracia (2003) identifies cultural tradition as “new wine in old skins.” The Liberty Bell, as a heritage object, depends upon the continued use of its indexical qualities; without these investments of significance, the Liberty Bell will revert to being just a bell.

Although heritage may be difficult to define, its capacity to index a historical sense of group identity and belonging makes it a highly effective tool for cultural groups to deploy when demarcating external boundaries and internal hierarchies (Ashworth et al. 2007; Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996). Heritage is an excellent way to objectify cultural entities and to order the world’s complex social system of interrelated processes into Wolf’s (2010:6) famous “global pool hall in which the [social] entities spin off each other like so many hard and round billiard balls.” For instance, the development of national heritage gave substance to and ideologically legitimated the arbitrary geographical
groupings of people during the rise of nation-states (Anderson 1991; Ashworth et al. 2007; Graham et al. 2000; Silberman 1990; Trigger 1989). The creation and deployment of national heritage re-ordered ethnic groups into new cultural groups while minimizing internal diversity and emphasizing external difference.

Because of this capacity, heritage can be confused with the broader and related concept of culture. The differences between the two concepts are nuanced, inviting an abstract epistemological discussion along similar lines of explicating the differences between history and social memory. In this dissertation, I distinguish heritage from culture by its requirement to index or symbolize a shared historical sense of belonging; that is, heritage must reference the past in some way and distinctively denote a group’s shared future. Understood in this way, heritage is an element of cultural process. Furthermore, while the concept of heritage was popularized and professionalized in the modern era, I agree with Harvey’s (2001) assessment that heritage has long been a part of human cultural experience.

**Theorizing Heritage as Cultural Process**

In recent decades, anthropologists, historians, and cultural studies scholars have critiqued the hegemony of an “authorized heritage discourse” (Smith 2006), which over-values the monumental material culture of nation-states, the importance of preserving “original fabric,” and the experts’ role in presenting heritage to the public (Alanen and Melnick 2000; Araoz 2009b; Ashworth et al. 2007; Bouse 1996; Labadi 2005; Morgan et al. 2010; Mitchell 2008; Waterton et al. 2006). The authorized heritage discourse inscribes “The Past” as an objectively knowable realm, often under threat from the elements of time and the hands of the non-initiated (Smith 2006). Preserving the relics of
the past for posterity (e.g., “Saving the Past for the Future”) has been the profession of expert caretakers trained in material conservation, archaeology, architecture, historic preservation, museum studies, Classics, and similar disciplines since the birth of the nation-state and its attendant archival institutions (Nora 1989).

However, a new wave of scholars, many trained in these same disciplines and influenced by postmodern, poststructuralist, and postprocessual theories, have questioned the validity of the authorized heritage discourse and have offered an alternative lens of theorizing heritage as practice, rather than as object. I contribute to this emerging body of interdisciplinary literature, which theorizes heritage as a discursive process that concerns cultural identity in the present in reference to the past (Assmann and Czaplicka 1995; Graham et al. 2000; Harvey 2001; Smith 2006; Urry 1990; Weiss 2007). This process is contextually tied to specific places and historic moments (Chawla 1992; Glassberg 2001; Groth and Bressi 1997; Marcus 1992; Petzet 2009; Tilley 2006; Tuan 1979; Turgeon 2009). Scholars have shifted attention away from the traditional focus of monumental artifacts and original fabric toward the creative cultural production and existential relations humans make with others and the environment at the heart of heritage (Malpas 2008). Additionally, some have outlined how the objectification of heritage threatens to further alienate communities and entrench power relations, stressing the importance of practitioners over professionals (Brockington et al. 2008; Dicks 1999; Guldbrandsen and Holland 2001; Harvey 2001; Jacoby 2001; Morgan et al. 2006; Steinberg 1994; Walbert 2002; West 2006). Thus, heritage protection is being reassessed and imagined as an active form of community development and civic engagement and in ways that acknowledge the interdependencies of natural and cultural resources and tangible and
intangible elements (Alanen and Melnick 2000; Brown et al. 2005; Carlarne 2006; Corsane et al. 2009; Melnick 2000; Mitchell and Buggey 2000). Viewed through this lens, the velvet rope and glass case are no longer esteemed symbols or metaphors of heritage protection.

That is not to say that a new model has clearly replaced traditional heritage preservation strategies. In fact, the re-theorization of heritage as a dynamic component of cultural life has inhibited the adoption of a single solution to heritage safeguarding and presentation. Examples range from the competitive inscription of heritage destinations and “brands” via the World Heritage List (Cleere 2011; Labadi 2005) to experimental forms of community consciousness-raising at sites of conscience (Layne 2008; Sevcenko 2010). Today, the heritage industry is booming, and the need to assess these protection strategies to inform continuing efforts to safeguard heritage is perhaps more important than ever as communities discover the economic incentives to develop their heritage as commodities. A particularly ironic challenge is that heritage safeguarding seems even more important once communities learn to view their heritage as heritage. That is, heritage protection programs can and often do transform heritage resources into objects primed for economic development and exploitation, which in turn makes their safeguarding yet more imperative (e.g. Brockington et al. 2008; Labadi 2008; Silberman 2007, 2013; Wilson 2009).

**Theoretical Framework of Shared Heritage**

In theorizing heritage as a social process, I am not as concerned with what heritage should be or should look like, but how we should practice heritage. Similarly, I am hesitant to distinguish between “practicing heritage” and “protecting heritage” since
this leads to the objectification of heritage and an implied and misleading distinction between those who have heritage (typically the ethnic “other”) and those who save heritage (typically the heritage professional). Moreover, if the ethical goal of shared heritage is to practice heritage in ways that essentially protect heritage (as social process), reifying such a semantic distinction hinders this thesis and my attempts to “reframe” the hegemonic ontology of the authorized heritage discourse (Gibson-Graham 2006, 2008; Smith 2006). Rather, there are many modes of practicing heritage; for instance, a Navajo drummer practices heritage through his performances and sharing his craft with others, which sustains the measure of significance his community identifies in the drumming as being historically Navajo. Likewise, a museum curator practices heritage by commemorating Navajo drums in an exhibit that legitimates this historical narrative of shared identity. The two practices are not equal (and indeed can serve also to exoticize, marginalize, or essentialize the targeted heritage), but they are practices within a range of contemporary action. However, for the sake of semantic clarity, I tend to use “practice” and “protect” in slightly different ways, denoting different positions on this continuum of heritage practice. When I refer to practicing heritage or heritage practitioners, I refer to a less self-conscious maintenance of heritage values as continually created culture, typically by “insiders,” and more in keeping of the definition of heritage within the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization 2003). When I refer to heritage protection, I imply a more self-conscious (i.e. recognizing heritage as heritage) intervention or revival of heritage significance by heritage insiders and outsiders, which
is often, but not necessarily marked by objectivist rhetoric regarding authenticity. Ideally, the two concepts merge into a reflexive ethical practice.

In this dissertation I develop a social theory of heritage practice into an ethical framework of “shared heritage” (Natsheh et al. 2008a, 2008b, 2008c, 2008d; 2008e, 2008f; Ya’ari 2010). I understand shared heritage as a creative cultural strategy that anticipates the future while fostering an ethos of coexistence. Central to this framework is my recognition of two performative aspects of heritage: (1) its capability to intervene in or perpetuate alienating conditions of modernity; and (2) its capacity to unite and divide communities—to instill love and hatred. When approaching the question of how we should practice heritage, I start by making a case for the synchronous human need for heritage as being the fundamental basis of our ethics, rather than singularly focusing on the substance of heritage. In the following sections, I unpack these two features further: the anticipatory strategy of heritage as a means to intervene in alienation and the complications of a moral imperative for community coexistence.

**Heritage, Alienation, and Ontological Security**

The proliferation of heritage discourse in the nineteenth and twenty-first centuries marks the modernist anxiety over a perceived loss of control over one’s environment, social relations, and identity, which I associate with Marxist and post-Marxist conceptualizations of alienation (Fromm 1961:47; Marx 1983:131–146 [1844], 1990:163–177, 716 [1867]; Ollman 1971). This concept has been theorized in a variety of ways: scholars of collective memory have observed the alienation process as resulting in a form of collective amnesia (e.g. Berman 1982, Huysssen 1995; Jacoby 1975, Terdiman 1993, Yerushalmi 1982 as cited in Olick and Robbins 1998) or cultural forgetting (e.g.
Brockmeier 2002; Connerton 2009; Ricoeur 2006; Turgeon 2009), wherein subjects no longer relate historical events to their own lives or engage in nostalgic yearnings for romanticized pasts (Boym 2002). Scholars who approach the concept from a spatial dimension refer to the phenomenon as displacement or placelessness, wherein increasingly mobile citizens of global societies are challenged to form and maintain place attachments (Glassberg 2001; Malpas 2008; Tuan 1980). Recently, a group of Australian psychologists (Albrecht et al. 2007) has theorized this in the form of a new mental illness, “solastalgia,” a “psychoterratic” cousin of nostalgia, which presents as a form of anxiety caused by massive, unexpected changes to one’s environmental landscape.

I build upon this body of literature by exploring the interrelationships between social behavior, cultural knowledge, space, and time at the heart of alienation. At its most basic level, I understand alienation as the experience of a temporal discontinuity with regard to an expected dominion or range of action. When conscious, the experience of alienation is of a rupture with past expectations of future agency within one’s world. In other words, the unanticipated change to one’s physical surroundings, material culture, or social relations interferes with people’s familiar strategy for managing such change.

Some individuals anticipate and intervene in the potentially alienating side effects of their social conditions and ensuing cultural change by engaging in heritage, by which I mean the active “investment” of significance individuals make in a vast range of tangible and intangible resources, cultural practices, and landscapes through which they identify a shared temporal continuity. By engaging with their heritage (e.g. through creation, commemoration, celebration, communication, etc.), social actors establish a sense of control discursively and materially by bridging perceived or expected temporal ruptures.
between past, present, and future (Gracia 2003; Grenville 2007; Lowenthal 1975). By framing specific cultural practices and values as inherited traditions that they are obligated to pass to future generations, participants create a sense of routinized constancy that relieves anxiety about the uncertainty of the future (Giddens 1990:98; Grenville 2007; Hawkins and Maurer 2011; Padgett 2007). Historically, heritage preservation has been treated as the solution to the effects of alienation. However, I propose that it is both a symptom of and coping strategy for the same process (Labrador 2011a). Rather than propose heritage protection as a panacea, I ask: What are the common interests in heritage protection? How are they served? And for whom?

The preservation of the objects of heritage is a self-referential technology of anticipation that marks a heightened sense of anxiety toward alienation and a perceived failing of heritage-as-practice. This is akin to Williams’ (1973:120) assertion that “A working country is hardly ever a landscape.” When the people are not alienated from their land, the need for the ontological category of “landscape” is unnecessary since the meaning of landscape connotes “separation and observation” (Williams 1973:120). When the heritage process is effectively producing what Giddens (1990) terms “ontological security” the need to objectify and discuss it as such lessens. Thus, when communities begin discussing their cultural and natural heritage as heritage, I posit that alienation has occurred and is anticipated.

My conceptualization of heritage contributes to the emerging body of interdisciplinary heritage literature that theorizes heritage as a social process that concerns cultural identity in the present in reference to the past (Graham et al. 2000; Harvey 2001; Smith 2006; Urry 1990) and that is contextually tied to specific places and
historic moments (Chawla 1992; Glassberg 2001; Groth 1997; Marcus 1992; Tuan 1980; Turgeon 2009). Contemporary heritage scholars (Bollmer 2011; Harvey 2001; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2004; Labadi 2010; Lowenthal 1998; Mitchell 2008; Prosper 2007; Smith 2006) have honed a critique of the hegemonic discourse of heritage as object-oriented, backwards-looking, and focused on the built environment, and have offered a substitute theory of heritage-as-practice, which embraces those aspects of cultural knowledge and production that are transmitted through time and space. Anthropologists, environmental historians, geographers, and cultural theorists have made important contributions to the critique of dominant heritage discourse, outlining how the objectification of heritage threatens to further alienate communities and entrench power relations (e.g. Brockington 2002; Dicks 1999; Gulbrandsen and Holland 2001; Harvey 2001; Jacoby 2003; Morgan et al. 2006; Steinberg 2003; Walbert 2002; West 2006). While the old approach bounds heritage objects in space and time, heritage-as-practice attempts a more relational and dynamic view, but with this comes a paradox. In order to make sense as heritage, memory communities must maintain temporal linkages with the past to preserve a sense of identity over time, but because cultural practices and natural processes are transformative, heritage and heritage landscapes are also changing over time. Thus, we find ourselves in the midst of an exciting paradigm shift—rather than thinking about how heritage and cultural landscapes can be preserved, we are considering how communities’ abilities to practice heritage and inscribe landscapes can be protected in ways that allow for both continuity and change (Araoz 2009b).
My research moves beyond filling a gap in the anthropological literature on heritage. In shifting the research focus away from heritage objects toward heritage as a social practice that mediates cultural identity, materiality, and social relations, I contribute to a theory of heritage as a transformative action that is directed toward the future while referencing the past and recognizing the interdependencies between natural and cultural resources. The past-focus of heritage narratives has obfuscated the future-oriented goals of heritage practice. I refocus attention on these goals and their material and cultural effects. I join other scholars (e.g. Araoz 2011; Brockington et al. 2008; Gulbrandsen and Holland 2001; Holtorf 2012; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2004; Jacoby 2003; Smith 2006; Steinberg 2003; Turgeon 2009; West 2006) who have been changing the field’s guiding question from whether heritage protection successfully “salvages” or “preserves” threatened resources to: How does heritage protection produce new meanings, landscapes, and social relations? And how are heritage resources and their associated communities transformed in this process? In this dissertation, I take these theoretical developments one step further by outlining practical methods that heritage practitioners, including government officials, private practitioners, academic professionals, and community organizers can adapt and apply for their own needs.

**Communities and Commons: Tragedy or Opportunity?**

The model of shared heritage that I develop in this dissertation relies upon two problematic terms: community and commons. Just as Smith (2006) identified an “authorized heritage discourse” that constitutes a narrow and hegemonic understanding of heritage, I acknowledge that dominant understandings of “community” and “commons” may undermine the ethical goal of shared heritage, if not make it untenable or illogical.
Therefore, I explicitly engage with these terms to destabilize their meanings and to invite an openness about how shared heritage can be a medium for experimenting with alternative forms of community and commons.

“Community” has become a buzzword that conjures a romantic nostalgia for a pre-modern past that never was (Agrawal and Gibson 1999; Creed 2006a; Joseph 2002; Waterton and Smith 2010). Creed (2006a) comprehensively outlines the genealogy of this nostalgia, tracing it to evolutionary theories of social development wherein “community” became synonymous with pre-modern peasant societies and today serves as “a cosmopolitan replacement for a lost rural idyll” (2006a:23). The term has come to signify a lost past, one that is absent from present modernity, and one that we must pursue to have a better future—without literally going back to our peasant roots (Creed 2006a:25–26; Waterton and Smith 2010:6). As the nostalgic object of desire, the “traditional” character of the community is made ever more exotic, reifying its binary opposition to modernity (Joseph 2002:xxxii). It has been suggested that the increasing absence of (or threat to) that “traditional” character in modern life has ironically spawned an explosion of “traditional” community rhetoric (Gibson-Graham 2006:122; Waterton and Smith 2010:6–7).

Yet Waterton and Smith (2010) contend that the trope of community and community engagement has become an unreflexive solution to social problems rather than a methodological problem. More troubling, they charge that the objectification of “community” in heritage discourse “has rendered communities, as much as their heritage, as subject to management and preservation” (Waterton and Smith 2010:11; emphasis in original). Hart (2011) outlines three typical community-engaged heritage models that fall
short of their political goal of empowering community members and their relationships to their heritage: “single stakeholder,” “top-down,” and “marginalizing multivocal.” A better alternative may be to treat “community” as a political process rather than an object of study or engagement (Crooke 2010; Hart 2011). Furthermore, the goal of shared heritage is not to build consensus around a single heritage narrative, but to encourage an ethical framework that values the synchronous need for many heritages and a critical awareness of the dangerous uses of heritage.

I turn to the commons as a potential model for such a framework. The commons refers to a complex property system in which multiple stakeholders share an interest in sustaining a targeted resource (Bollier 2001:2). Common ownership includes a spectrum of resource management strategies that are neither solely Lockean (i.e. liberal private property ownership) nor state-managed socialist property ownership (Agrawal 2003:244). Stakeholders entrust each other with securing the future coexistence of their common interest in the property asset and must collectively manage their individual stakes. This framework maps well to my conceptualization of shared heritage ethics, which prioritizes the sustainability of heritage [significance] and the synchronicity of heritage practice.

Unfortunately, the dominant attitude toward the commons in the United States remains one of cynicism, codified by Hardin’s (1968) article, “The Tragedy of the Commons,” which claimed that any common pool resource would inevitably be over-exploited due to man’s natural instinct toward self-interest and self-preservation. This powerful narrative of liberal private property ownership seems to course through much of American politics, especially in rural areas. However, two discursive openings give hope to successfully and seriously wielding the commons as a pragmatic model. First, in the
realm of public policy, environmentalists have successfully argued that common property
management of natural and renewable resources is more efficient and economical than
purely market-based or state bureaucratic management (Agrawal 2003:246). Second, in
an oral history project that I conducted (Labrador 2011a), I found that citizens in one
rural New England town discussed liberal concepts of individualism and personal
freedom in ways that revealed and emphasized interdependencies within their social
networks, suggesting that although rural residents may value private property rights, they
also recognize a broader social context in which family and neighbors share a common
interest.

These openings in the contemporary hegemony of property rights invite
experimentation with alternative arrangements of property arrangements and exploitation
of the recent shift in moral philosophies of property ownership—away from the moral
rights of individuals toward corporate ownership that assumes its own risk (Gershon
2011; Hirsch 2010; Raymond and Fairfax 2002). A spate of experiments in community-
managed environmental resources and community economies is cited by Agrawal and
Gibson (1999) and Gibson-Graham (2006), respectively. Rural America is host to a
variety of these experiments including farmers markets, community gardens and coops,
common meadows and fisheries, community-supported agriculture programs, and public-
private partnerships for agricultural development. I argue that such experiments
constitute a new iteration of the commons and offer exciting opportunities to constitute
community through an ethical framework of shared heritage modeled on the commons.

Heritage protection strategies are part of a historic lineage of legal logic
concerning the organization of social relations around material and immaterial resources.
Recent legal scholarship (Carlane 2006; Harding 2009; Mahoney 2002) has explored how these strategies influence policies and jurisprudence in the United States, and a timely interdisciplinary study by Fairfax et al. (2005) traces this history with land conservation for environmental purposes and its current impacts on land tenure. Recent case studies within anthropology have begun to critique how such policies impact citizens’ environmental activism (e.g. Guldbrandsen and Holland 2001; Shoreman and Haenn 2009). However, this research has not considered cultural heritage resources in the same light, nor has it theorized the feedback loop between heritage protection, land tenure, and cultural identities within communities seeking to “preserve” their lifeways and landscapes.

I advance research about the social ethos of property regimes by suggesting that private land conservation is creating an iteration of the commons within the American private property regime and, thus, an exciting opening in the ontology of private property in America. On one hand, I refute Hardin’s (1968) model of “the tragedy of the commons” by proposing that a property ethic may sustain shared rights and responsibilities toward common-pool resources within fee simple (i.e. absolute) landownership. I build upon scholarship that suggests that commons are not antithetical to Anglo common law (e.g. Baviskar 2008; Bollier 2001; Donahue 2001, 2004; Ostrom 1990) and that political agents employ a range of strategies to negotiate alternative social relations within hegemonic systems (e.g. Gibson-Graham 2008). Rather than ask whether land conservation and its attendant political discourse is doomed within private property regimes, I reframe the questions to: What variation in social relationships have individuals negotiated within the private property system? Do agricultural conservation
programs serve to protect the cultural practices that produce and inscribe the targeted cultural landscapes? Does private land conservation allow for the dynamics of cultural change and diversity of cultural values that serve an engaged heritage protection model that values social cohesion?

**Research Goals and Case Studies**

**Objectives and Research Questions**

In this dissertation I develop (1) an ethical framework for shared heritage practice that values social tolerance and future security, (2) a model for the critical assessment of a heritage protection strategy’s potential for supporting a shared heritage ethic, and (3) a methodology for scholars, heritage advocates, and community leaders to enact shared heritage on a realistic scale. To do so, I draw upon two case studies of rural communities engaged in heritage protection: (1) a state-run agricultural land conservation program in Hadley, Massachusetts; and (2) a grassroots coalition for community development in Eleuthera, Bahamas. Hadley offers an example of a specific heritage protection strategy that has been in progress for 28 years within an actively agrarian community that is experiencing the pressures of suburban development. I use the Hadley case study to assess the potential for shared heritage within the popular private land conservation movement. Eleuthera presents a fledgling, island-wide initiative to organize heritage protection in the face of tourism development pressures on a relatively undeveloped Caribbean island. I use Eleuthera as a test bed for experimenting with digital tools for organizational capacity-building to support shared heritage on a larger scale. Both share in a similar struggle to plan for development in ways that bring economic opportunities while maintaining their rural identities and their landscapes’ rural character.
Central to this dissertation is my theorization of heritage as a social process and a call for publicly-engaged and place-based approaches to heritage protection organized around the social ethic I refer to as shared heritage. In framing a shared heritage ethic, I shift the research agenda from the question “what is heritage” (or its more insidious relative, what is authentic about this particular heritage) to “how should we practice heritage?” What is the common interest in heritage practice and protection? What are the many values that associated communities hold with regard to their heritage? What shared responsibilities do community members assume when practicing heritage? What decision-making strategies regarding the future sustainability of their heritage do communities employ? How are conflicting values or expectations mediated?

In calling for public engagement, I identify in my own research ethic the need to foreground community knowledge and the importance of taking an active part in heritage protection strategies. However, “community” is a loaded term and there is no single, knowable “public.” Therefore, I remain observant of the following questions: how is community constituted through heritage practice? What are the boundaries of affiliation? What are the benefits and costs of affiliation?

In valuing place-based models of heritage protection, in which local knowledge, context, and issues are foregrounded, I acknowledge that there is no one-size-fits-all solution, and that shared heritage manifests in various permutations. More specifically, I favor the recognition of local distinctiveness in heritage practice and protection strategies. However, I also acknowledge that spirit of place operates at multiple scales; for instance, diasporic communities may not be physically local to a place to which they feel strong associations. Perhaps heritage resembles an ecological system in which, for instance,
upwind or upstream communities impact distant communities? Therefore, to what extent can and should shared heritage ethics engage spirit of place at multiple scales?

Finally, I challenge traditional binaries that have structured heritage discourse and alienated heritage, namely nature/culture and public/private. In this dissertation I ontologically reframe these binaries by presuming their mutual constitution. In doing so, I find common ground for advocates who have traditionally been distinct if not at odds, such as historic preservationists, nature conservationists, and economic developers. Additionally, I identify a more nuanced array of civic rights and responsibilities and accountability frameworks.

**Cultural Landscape Protection in Rural New England**

In my first case study, sited in rural Massachusetts, I explore the relationships among cultural values, conservation practices, and the landscapes and social relations inscribed therein. Agricultural land conservation is a fertile site to theorize how cultural landscape protection can contribute to social cohesion and sustainable ecologies: agrarian land tenure challenges the conventional binary of nature/culture that has divided heritage resource protection strategies. The protection of agricultural land provokes advocates to consider how to protect working, cultural landscapes rather than preserving a pristine “nature” or frozen-in-time “history” (Alanen and Melnick 2000).

In the United States over the past thirty-five years, states, counties, and municipalities have developed agricultural land protection programs, which depend upon a complex web of cooperation among landowners, governments, and private land trusts to purchase development rights on farmland (Sokolow and Zurbrugg 2003). Although U.S. property law has traditionally challenged historic preservationists and environmental
conservationists in securing targeted properties, recently, private land conservation has surged. According to National Land Trust statistics, the rate of such conservation triples every five years (Aldrich and Wyerman 2005).

The preferred and fastest growing strategy for agricultural land protection in the United States is the negotiation of conservation easements with private landowners (Bernstein and Mitchell 2005), which can be a powerful, legal means of community intervention on behalf of heritage resources. Although easements have been used for at least 400 years under Anglo common law, conservation easements represent a significant departure from precedent (Harding 2009). Traditionally, property law has incorporated temporal limitations on rightholders to restrict future interests in property and support a free market among the living (Harding 2009). However, conservation easements are permanent, granting a perpetual right of restriction to the holder, which is maintained even if the parcel of land changes hands. Landowners must be provided with a persuasive incentive to voluntarily convey a perpetual easement. An array of tax incentives and purchase programs have arisen; yet, some research indicates that landowners are motivated by a strong sense of place and intergenerational obligation when conveying a perpetual easement (Bernstein and Mitchell 2005). I query this further and explore how private land conservation can enable community members to engage with a social ethic of shared rights and responsibilities beyond their own property boundaries, and thus be a constructive tool for shared and sustainable heritage practice.

Conservation easements have emerged at the forefront of cultural landscape protection strategies for several reasons. First, easements create social relations similar to those found in a common property regime without wholly forfeiting the private rights of
the fee simple landholder, which are foundational to the American property ethos. Second, the emphasis upon public-private partnerships in agricultural protection programs and the retention of fee simple rights are easier to accept in rural communities, who are traditionally wary of government intervention (Rome 2001; Shoreman and Haehn 2009). Finally, the new precedent of perpetual restrictions marks a heightened sense of anxiety toward the impending loss of the local and the familiar, which I suggest is a reaction to processes of alienation central to modernist subjectivity. I propose that agricultural land protection is one of many tools used to establish a sense of control over one’s cultural identity in the future by tying it to past and present practices. Negotiating an easement goes beyond securing a short term financial benefit; by seemingly purchasing the promise of a perpetual future of agrarian land tenure, participants are intervening in a march of time perceived to be threatening to the cultural and economic viability of rural life and landscapes. Whether this intervention combats or further entrenches alienation is an important matter of historical and methodological inquiry and a central concern of my research (West et al. 2006).

Traditionally, academic scholarship in the fields of archaeology, historic preservation, and heritage has focused on the objects of heritage and the resulting protection strategies have further alienated heritage resources from communities (Gulbrandsen and Holland 2001; Jacoby 2003; Steinberg 2003; West 2006). I refocus the theoretical dialog on the cultural practices that give meaning to such resources and explore the potential for agricultural land protection to intervene in processes of alienation by engaging landowners in a shared property ethic regarding historic resources and landscapes. In this case study, I combine ethnographic field methods with the
analysis of visual and spatial data to explore the following research questions: (1) What are the common interests or alliances in agricultural land conservation programs in rural areas? (2) How do such landscape conservation programs support or threaten these shared interests? (3) How do such programs affect community members’ property relations and the social and material production of their heritage landscapes?

Coalition-building for Heritage Development in the Bahamas

My second case study focuses on the community development work of the One Eleuthera Foundation on the island of Eleuthera, Bahamas. Whereas threats to Hadley’s agricultural heritage are primarily attributed to suburban sprawl and the economic hardships of farming in America, the people of Eleuthera grapple with another pressing international heritage threat: tourism and its associated development. The combination of numerous failed tourism developments with the current economic downturn has prompted some Eleutheran citizens to initiate an extralegal framework for long term planning. Seeking to build consensus around primary planning objectives, One Eleuthera is a membership-driven organization that builds capacity among the island’s diverse stakeholders to develop the island’s economy in ways that draw upon, but don’t alienate, the island’s shared heritage resources (Ingraham and Johnson 2011).

Eleuthera is an analog for many contemporary communities struggling to find the balance between economic development and natural and cultural heritage protection. Many citizens are motivated by development plans that result in jobs, educational and economic opportunities, and infrastructural improvements. Most of the island’s heritage-focused special interest groups don’t prioritize these goals; furthermore, they rely upon private, philanthropic funding to serve their distinct missions (e.g. coastal reef
preservation, sustainable agriculture, community access to books and the internet, historic architectural preservation, etc.). In many cases, the people who can afford to support these special interests are not the ones who may directly benefit from economic development and may even see such development as opposing their specific interests (e.g. preserving viewsheds, maintaining “quaint” villages, protecting marine resources).

As more special interest groups emerge and their projects are promoted to wider audiences via websites and social media, access to the philanthropic sector becomes even more competitive as an increasing number of non-profit organizations vie for donations from the same sources.

One Eleuthera attempts to mitigate these conditions by recognizing the shared interests in heritage development as a means for economic development. That is, the goal isn’t unbridled economic development, but identifying the range of Eleutheran heritage supported by the variety of special interest groups and working together to plan ways in which investing in those resources will bring economic, educational, and social opportunities to the citizens of Eleuthera (Ingraham and Johnson 2011). The organization relies upon a multi-tiered membership system in which non-profits, businesses, and individuals can become voting members with certain rights and responsibilities. One Eleuthera will work with its members to develop and promote projects around which fundraising campaigns can be strategically organized to optimize member support and prevent further dilution of the philanthropic market.

My contribution to One Eleuthera is the development of an online, interactive portal to support their initiative and coalition-building designed to work with existing social structures rather than imposing an external and irrelevant communicative model.
The One Eleuthera Web Portal is a centralized, digital hub for the coalition and its member organizations to present information, engage their publics, and manage their constituent and development data. In this case study, I combine ethnographic data with information architecture concepts to explore (1) how to model a shared heritage information domain and (2) how to implement the model to support shared heritage development among a variety of stakeholders and competing interests.

**Methods**

**Assessing Shared Heritage Potential in Private Land Conservation**

For the purpose of my first case study, I implemented a multi-faceted ethnographic approach to document and assess the social ethic of agricultural land protection in Hadley, Massachusetts. I identified three basic dimensions for data collection: property assets, stakeholders, and ethics (i.e. shared social values and their subsequently informed actions). By “triangulating” (Glesne 1999) three research methods: document-based research, participant observation, and Photovoice, I designed a methodology to efficiently gather relevant, compelling data and to build veracity among qualitative data sources.

**Archival Property Research and GIS Documentation**

In order to document the targeted landowners, properties, and their values within the Agricultural Preservation Restriction (APR) program, I conducted archival property research at the Hadley Town Hall. My initial goal was to compile a complete record of all protected parcels, including their landowners, their size and locations, their monetary values, the date of the restriction, and any information available about why the property was selected for the program. Upon starting my research, there existed no single,
computerized inventory of APR property; rather, the Hadley Conservation Commission
maintained a table of restrictions in Microsoft Word with a handwritten addendum, which
they cross-checked with a spreadsheet of select properties prepared by a local land trust
and an outdated printout provided by the state. Unfortunately, the Conservation
Commission had already identified various discrepancies among the datasets. The
county’s Registry of Deeds maintains the definitive record of agricultural preservation
restrictions, but although their records are online, they are not easily aggregated (as one
must access each deed individually). Similarly, the assessors’ records were only available
in print-form, and were filed by map and lot number; because multiple parcels are often
included on a single APR, these records were only useful as secondary references. The
Conservation Commission maintains carbon-copies of nearly all APR applications
submitted in Hadley, which provide a wealth of information not available via the
assessors’ cards or deeds, including open-ended questions regarding the applicants’
reasons for pursuing an APR.

I cross-referenced each dataset and transcribed the APR applications to compile a
master inventory, which I turned over to the Conservation Commission upon completion.
I created a relational database in FileMaker Pro to manage these data. The dataset was
particularly challenging to represent because each application relates to multiple parcels
and multiple deeds. While these relationships allowed me to model the complex mosaic
of assets, stakeholders, and values, I simplified the dataset considerably when exporting
my findings as a series of spreadsheets to the Conservation Commission.

While I considered the deed the ultimate authority on any given restriction, deeds
use a particular legalese to describe properties (i.e. metes and bounds), which are not
used by landowners nor assessors, who tend to use map, parcel, and lot numbers. Thus, managing spatial data was essential to accurately cross-reference the deeds’ property identifications with the assessors’ and APR applications. I began by using a hardcopy set of the assessors’ maps for the 4,000 parcels in Hadley, identifying metes and bounds described in deeds with the lot divisions and landforms on the parcel maps. This step resolved numerous conflicts between the various datasets. Following this manual cross-check, I procured a digital shapefile from the Pioneer Valley Planning Commission (PVPC) of all 4,000 Hadley parcels. Using ArcGIS, I integrated my restriction data with the PVPC shapefile. I created a layer of all APR restrictions, and I modeled a second representation using the APR closing date to create an animation of the spread of APRs across the landscape over time. These shapefiles were also donated to the Conservation Commission.

**Participant Observation and Informal Interviews**

During February 2010–December 2011, I documented the culture and politics of heritage conservation in Hadley by attending a range of public and private meetings (e.g. Selectboard, Town Meetings, Historical Commission, Community Preservation Commission, strategy meetings, private fundraisers, etc.), observing daily activity in the town hall, dining at a local lunch counter, and conducting informal, opportunistic interviews with political gatekeepers, advocates, and residents in town. This participant observation allowed me to establish a cultural baseline for heritage and property ethics in town while documenting insiders’ perspectives on cultural landscape and rural heritage values.
Photovoice

In addition to the tacit values I recorded through participant observation, I implemented a Photovoice project to document and generate explicit expressions of heritage values. As outlined by Wang (1999, 1997) and Harper (2009), Photovoice combines documentary photography, ethnographic focus groups, and public exhibitions to provide a forum for publicly-engaged, participatory research around public policy issues. I was compelled by the potential for the visual art of photography to get at the sensual dimension of cultural landscape values that other qualitative and quantitative methods can only describe, and in this I found similarities to the research plan proposed by Glassberg (2001) to document communities’ sense of place.

During October–November 2011, I worked with a group of seven volunteer photographers I recruited through local schools, the town hall and its committees, invitations sent to specific advocates and landowners, and word of mouth. I assigned the group six documentary assignments, and over the course of five meetings, we reviewed and discussed photographs each individual selected to share. During December 2011, I held three public focus groups with older residents in town, who were identified through my previous research and through a chain sample compiled via personal referrals from key social network “nodes” I identified in town. During November 2011–January 2012 I designed an online photo exhibit at http://www.hadleymaheritage.org (see Appendix A for reproductions of the photos from the online exhibit) and during January–February 2012 designed a print exhibit that incorporates select ethnographic findings, which was displayed at the Hadley public library during March–April 2012 and rehung at the Porter
Phelps Huntington Museum May–June 2012 (see Appendix B for the interpretive brochure that was available at both exhibits).

Through Photovoice I moved my research beyond observing heritage to providing a platform for creating and commenting upon heritage in a way that foregrounds local participants’ knowledge, which I understand as a goal of applied research under Gibson-Graham’s (2008) model. Additionally, Photovoice served as a more accessible mode of public dissemination for the theoretical component of my project to local stakeholders. The importance of recording and disseminating the range of community members’ values, desires, and anxieties is paramount to giving voice to those who may not have direct roles in agricultural land conservation practices. My intent with the exhibits was to explore non-essentializing notions of rural heritage in ways that celebrate the active practice of articulating rural community identity in an inherently unstable social field (Joseph 2002).

**Data Analysis**

Over the course of the three phases of this project I analyzed a range of data sources (documents, individual and focus group interviews, public political practices and speech, and visual media) following two main analytic methods—critical discourse analysis and cultural landscape interpretation. Following Waterton et al. (2006), I use critical discourse analysis to identify in language-based sources how heritage and its associated property relations are being discussed, managed, and in turn, enacted by participants in a field of power relations. The majority of non-language-based data in my study, such as the photographs produced by the Photovoice stage of research and the physical practices inscribed in the land were gathered secondarily through my research
partners and participants. In these sources, I focus my analysis on the “environmental perceptions” (Glassberg 2004:28–29) of cultural landscapes, applying critical discourse analysis to the ways in which research participants interpret the visual representations and physical qualities of the landscape. I supplemented these data with my own primary observations of the landscapes of Hadley and people’s interactions with them.

Photographers were identified by name (at their request and to attribute copyright) while focus group participants and other interview subjects were identified by codes and general descriptive categories (e.g. gender, old-timer/newcomer, farmer, etc.). In reviewing my field notes, interview transcriptions, and photographs, I identified emergent categories and noted self-imposed themes (such as the photography assignments). I organized these descriptive codes through a networked taxonomy of intent/anticipation, meaning/value, and practice/action themes that I maintained in a separate code index. I applied these codes to my interview transcriptions and field notes using TAMS Analyzer to identify patterns in the tacit and explicit social ethics of cultural landscape protection.

**Community Coalition-building for Shared Heritage**

In order to develop an internet-based tool that helps to constitute a community of shared heritage practice among a dispersed network of stakeholders, I adopted an anthropological approach to information architecture methodology used in the computer sciences for interactive website development. My methodological goal in building the One Eleuthera Web Portal was to design the technology in an informed manner, so as to leverage existing social networks and communicative media. Many software projects suffer from the “if you build it they will come” mentality, which often results in
ineffective and unpopular products. Rather, I preceded my development with ethnographic knowledge domain discovery and modeling, outlined below.

**Knowledge Domain Discovery**

First, I conducted exploratory research on Eleuthera’s heritage “information ecology” (Morville and Rosenfeld 2008:694) during two week-long fact-finding trips to the island in March and July 2011, followed by online research and strategy meetings. Following Morville and Rosenfeld (2008:700–702), I adopted a multi-faceted research framework to identify the three basic dimensions: context, content, and users, of the associated “knowledge domain,” which is a term used in computing to refer to a specific ontology tacitly shared by insiders (Witten and Frank 2000).

To document the domain’s context (Morville and Rosenfeld 2008:700), including the goals of One Eleuthera and its members; the island’s economy and the project’s funding strategy; the local, regional, and national politics of heritage development; and the available technology and staffing capacity, I conducted background research and assisted with a series of stakeholder workshops, interviews, and tours (Chilton et al. 2011). In order to assess the current and potential content to be supported by the One Eleuthera Web Portal, I conducted “heuristic evaluations” (Morville and Rosenfeld 2008:723) of members’ current websites and print media and identified potential content entities from the ethnographic field research. Finally, to understand the user dimension, I developed hypothetical use cases and personas for current and target audiences I identified through strategy sessions with One Eleuthera board members and in the ethnographic field research.
**Knowledge Domain Modeling**

While conducting knowledge domain discovery, I iteratively modeled the knowledge domain to inform an information architecture strategy. This methodological step included planning for the portal’s administration after the completion of my dissertation work; technology strategy; management model; and the navigation, metadata, and content structure and systems (Morville and Rosenfeld 2008:802–807). I documented these strategies in a white paper, diagram, and budget which I provided to One Eleuthera.

**Ethics**

In outlining an applied anthropology of shared heritage, I recognize an ethical obligation to support and protect shared heritage and to understand the implications of my research upon communities’ heritage practices. The purpose of my research is not simply to study heritage but to join practitioners in their ethical landscape and provide practical tools for intervention. However, since my research critiques the authorized heritage discourse and the preservation strategies it has traditionally engendered, I needed to explore new modes of heritage practice and protection. In other words, deconstructing the authorized heritage discourse is only a first step. But, I also wanted to avoid constructing a new heritage discourse that is just as universalizing as the old. In order to think (and act) my way through this quandary, I drew upon the ethical strategy of Gibson-Graham’s (2008) “ontological reframing,” which is an implementation of Sedgwick’s (2003) “weak theory.” Ontological reframing is an epistemological ethics, meant to guide the researcher away from structural frameworks (i.e. strong theory) toward recognizing the creative potential of everyday ethics. As a weak theory, ontological reframing shifts authority away from the researcher and her typical [academic] domain while opening up
an optimistic landscape of novel possibilities (Gibson-Graham 2008). Gibson-Graham’s seminal case study (2006) chronicles their ontological reframing of the concept of “the economy.” Rather than accepting the hegemonic understanding of capitalism as an overly-deterministic and closed system in which revolution or co-optation are the only options, Gibson-Graham (2006) posited that capitalism is an open field in which normal individuals routinely experiment with economic relations that could be classified as counterhegemonic. The authors reframed the ontology of capitalism as a dynamic and creative ground of social ethics while documenting their own struggles with adapting their academic and post-structuralist perspectives to accommodate an unorthodox recognition of multiple “alternative economies” synchronously existing within Western capitalism. As I understand it, ontological reframing is a way to counter hegemony without creating a new hegemony. In other words, it disavows universally accepted, dominant notions with an inquisitive and creative openness—without filling the vacuum with new universalities.

In addition to adopting ontological reframing, I followed more conventional professional ethics with regards to working with human subjects and sought Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval for the qualitative research I conducted with Hadley residents. I prepared formal consent forms for semi-structured interviews with town officials and heritage advocates, volunteer photographers, and focus group participants, as well as photo release forms for photographic subjects. The semi-structured interviews underwent local IRB human subjects review, while the Photovoice components underwent expedited review (due to the inclusion of minors and the receipt of external
funding). Protecting participants’ identities and dignities while accurately representing their thoughts and actions was my foremost concern.

The question of anonymity in both cases was challenging. Typically, ethnographers adopt pseudonyms for people and places. However, in place-based heritage research that focuses on cultural landscapes, I found that obfuscating my case studies’ locations would be awkward and unwieldy. My descriptions would make it easy enough to discover the location’s true identity, and in both cases, advocates were proud of their work and their landscape. West (2006:xiii–xxi) offers a tenable blended approach (i.e. naming the small village, NGOs, and all participants who requested their identity be maintained, and protecting those individuals requesting anonymity) that is self-aware of the politics of the ethnographic project and balances the goals of applied research (i.e. assessment and practicable policy recommendations) and anthropological ethnography (i.e. critical engagement with cultural knowledge production). I followed West’s approach and refer to the real locations of both case studies and use the actual names of certain stakeholders, such as the Hadley photographers, who specifically requested that their identities be revealed, and Shaun Ingraham and Michele Johnson, the documented founders of the One Eleuthera Foundation. I chose to obfuscate all other identities, and while local residents may be able to deduce some identities by their position in town politics, I was careful to not link such identifications with explicit ethnographic findings.

Roadmap

In this dissertation, I present two case studies and three “products” that form a portfolio of critical and applied anthropological heritage research. Throughout the dissertation I engage with the ethics of shared heritage. In Chapter 2 I outline my
assessment of shared heritage potential in private farmland preservation in rural New England in the form of a peer-reviewed research article published in *Heritage & Society* (Labrador 2012). I demonstrate my knowledge of several fields of scholarship including heritage studies, anthropological theory, and environmental history and contribute to theories of alienation, heritage as social practice, and the social aspects of private property. Drawing from this literature, I document my own approach to shared heritage and apply this framework to assess the potential for conservation easements on private farmland in Hadley, Massachusetts.

In Chapter 3 I build upon the Hadley case study and present the second element of my portfolio: the community-based Photovoice project, which demonstrates my on the ground methodology of a place-based and community-engaged survey of heritage landscape resources and values. My methodology reflects my blending of cultural anthropology and archaeology into a place-based, cultural landscape ethnography as well as my ability to curate visual and text-based ethnographic data for public dissemination.

I present my second case study and third portfolio element in Chapter 4: a web portal for shared heritage development in Eleuthera, Bahamas. In this chapter I document my ability to translate socially-engaged and ethnographically-informed heritage advocacy models to accessible online environments for community developers. The resulting internet and communications technology was the first of several proposed projects that form the basis of a larger partnership between the UMass Amherst Center for Heritage & Society and the One Eleuthera Foundation to provide practical information and tools for community activists to engage with their constituents around shared heritage development.
Finally, in Chapter 5, I conclude by reflecting upon lessons learned, outlining future research directions for an applied anthropology of heritage, and providing recommendations for the further development of shared heritage ethics.
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