



The Utility of Discourse Analysis to Heritage Studies: The Burra Charter and Social Inclusion

Emma Waterton , Laurajane Smith & Gary Campbell

To cite this article: Emma Waterton , Laurajane Smith & Gary Campbell (2006) The Utility of Discourse Analysis to Heritage Studies: The Burra Charter and Social Inclusion, International Journal of Heritage Studies, 12:4, 339-355, DOI: [10.1080/13527250600727000](https://doi.org/10.1080/13527250600727000)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13527250600727000>



Published online: 16 Aug 2006.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 3230



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 48 View citing articles [↗](#)

The Utility of Discourse Analysis to Heritage Studies: The Burra Charter and Social Inclusion

Emma Waterton, Laurajane Smith & Gary Campbell

This paper reviews the methodological utility of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) in heritage studies. Using the Burra Charter as a case study we argue that the way we talk, write and otherwise represent heritage both constitutes and is constituted by the operation of a dominant discourse. In identifying the discursive construction of heritage, the paper argues we may reveal competing and conflicting discourses and the power relations that underpin the power/knowledge relations between expertise and community interests. This identification presents an opportunity for the resolution of conflicts and ambiguities in the pursuit of equitable dialogues and social inclusion.

Keywords: Discourse; Burra Charter; Critical Discourse Analysis; Social Inclusion; Heritage; Community

The term 'heritage' has, in recent times, taken on a currency in popular, policy and academic discourse that verges on the promiscuous. Despite the increasing usage of the term, we do not believe that there is either a clear sense of what the term might mean or anything resembling a solid understanding of the social and cultural work heritage discourses actually do. The aim of this paper is to review a rigorous, critical method that can assist us in talking about how people talk about heritage. We believe this to be particularly important for a number of reasons; not least is the prevalence of an uncritical, common-sense understanding of what heritage entails. Smith refers to this as the Authorised Heritage Discourse (AHD) which, she argues, promotes a consensus approach to history, smoothing over conflict and social difference.¹ This representation, which incorporates a set of conservative, if not reactionary, and distinctly Western,

Emma Waterton, Laurajane Smith and Gary Campbell, University of York. Correspondence to: emmawaterton@yahoo.co.uk

social messages, has become ubiquitous in the public's understanding of heritage. It also has alarming resonance in the amenity societies, state heritage agencies, government policy, national legislation and international charters, and the cultural and professional values of those people with access to forms of expert knowledge who work to promote the conservation of heritage.

In this paper, we propose to demonstrate the utility of discourse analytic techniques, particularly those of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), in showing how a particular discourse acts to constitute and mould the various representations of heritage. The techniques reviewed provide the tools for two complementary projects: a broader, critical reflection of the discursive work underpinning and sustaining the AHD; and an engagement with a specific, concrete case study. This case study will be *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance* (1979, revised 1999). We have chosen the Burra Charter because of its international usage, its links to the philosophy of the influential *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, 1964*, or Venice Charter, and, most importantly, the extent to which the Charter has been used as a reference point in promoting community inclusion in heritage conservation.

The kind of analysis we propose has a number of useful consequences; not only does it prompt a critical discussion of what heritage is but it can also facilitate the development of more equitable dialogue between a range of stakeholders. In many Western countries there have been concerted moves by amenity and government bodies engaged with heritage conservation and preservation to promote the greater inclusion of a range of often-marginalised stakeholder groups into the management process.² As Smith points out, any attempts at engaging with community or stakeholder groups must take into account the power relations that underlie the dominant heritage discourse, as these may inadvertently work to discourage the equitable participation of those groups whose understandings of the nature of heritage are excluded from that discourse.³ It is also vital to understand how that discourse establishes the authority of certain speakers at the same time as marginalising others before any concrete sense of inclusion can be achieved. We here advocate the use of CDA, and identify the semiotically sophisticated—and socially relevant—contribution it is able to make to heritage research.

CDA—Application in Heritage Studies and the Burra Charter

The Burra Charter, originally drafted in 1979 by Australia ICOMOS, is a policy document designed to outline best practice within Australian heritage management and conservation processes, but has since become an international standard for such processes. It deals specifically with issues of cultural significance and aims to define the principles and procedures considered necessary for the conservation of 'important places'.⁴ In 1992, Domicelj noted that the Burra Charter was based on 'good sense and so it can be applied very widely'.⁵ Subsequently, in recent years it has been imported wholesale and adopted by countries such as the UK, where it has found synergy with many of the philosophies underlying conservation and heritage management there.

Indeed, the Burra Charter, while written for an Australian context,⁶ has become an integral part of the common sense of broader heritage management and conservation.

Its author, Australia ICOMOS, is part of the international professional organisation ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites), which carries substantive authority in making pronouncements about the nature and meaning of heritage. ICOMOS membership comprises heritage professionals and academics, and the organisation works to provide advice to national governments and international organisations about the philosophy, terminology and methodology for conservation and management practices in a range of policy contexts.⁷ In Australia, the Burra Charter is the single most important professional code of conduct, and shares discursive space with a range of governmental policies about heritage management. Internationally, it is part of a suite of similar policy documents that form a regulatory genre chain aiming to guide practice and influence national public policy and governmental conservation practices. The Charter is thus a document given particular *gravitas* by the authority of its authorship and the self-referential role it has enjoyed at both national and international levels. Moreover, along with several similar documents, it has also acquired a prominent, and globally dominant, reputation that is called upon to define the nature of cultural heritage.

With its original drafting in 1979, the Burra Charter incorporated and accepted the underlying philosophy of the Venice Charter, a canonical text of international policy.⁸ While the Venice Charter still enjoys immense popularity and has been recited in many succeeding charters and conventions, it has also begun to attract criticism, particularly aimed at its privileging of authenticity, and fetishism of the tangible and monumental.⁹ Indeed, the Venice Charter may be understood as the international repository of the authorised heritage discourse. From this perspective, heritage is conceived as an immutable, bounded entity, most likely to take the form of a site, building or monument, perhaps an historic park, garden or battleground, which is valued for its intrinsic qualities of age, rarity, beauty or historic importance.¹⁰ This discourse stresses the importance of nationalism and national identity, and champions an ancient, idealised and inevitably relict past for the assumed universal rights of future generations. The benefits of heritage afforded to present generations fall within the parameters of education, tourism and information.

In 1999, the Burra Charter underwent its third, and most substantial, revision, following minor revisions in 1981 and 1988. The aim of the latest revision was to incorporate 'new ideas':

... especially the broadening of the conception of cultural significance to include not only fabric but also use, associations and meanings. The revised charter also encourages the co-existence of cultural values, particularly when they are in conflict ...¹¹

This revision is thus part of a larger response to the active criticism of a range of commentators who have questioned the authorised view of heritage. Such criticisms come not only from external groups who intersect with the dominant discourse, but come also from heritage practitioners and commentators trying to practise within its constraints. These challenges collectively stress the idea of heritage as something

created and produced in, and as a resource for, the present.¹² Here, heritage becomes more about meanings and values than material artefacts.¹³ Recent initiatives and policy agendas aimed at combating social exclusion, racism and impositions of dominant interpretations of heritage globally have also challenged the authorised discourse.¹⁴ However, while it is important to acknowledge that the revision of the Burra Charter forms part of an attempt to incorporate changing attitudes to community inclusion, participation and consultation, this attempt remains largely unsuccessful. One of the primary reasons for this is that of discourse, and the uncritical acceptance of a dominant or authorised approach to heritage. The practice of heritage management is currently undergoing a process of transition, in which different interpretations, strategies of management and social groups compete for authority. This competition will play out partly in changes of discourse and partly in processes of social change, and the utility of CDA lies with its ability to harness the discursive level to the level of society. We apply the theoretical project of CDA to the social practice of heritage management to reveal not only that the AHD has achieved hegemony but also to understand how this hegemony is realised linguistically—and thus perpetuated.

Critical Discourse Analysis as a Way Forward

Although the idea of discourse is well established within heritage studies, it remains disappointingly ill-defined in terms of its utility as an analytical category. This oversight highlights the proposition that many of the concerns of current heritage management practices are, in large part, issues that are discursively constructed. In other words, the ways by which we create, discuss, talk about and assess heritage issues do matter. As such, the development of rigorous and usable strategies to understand the concept of discourse and the role it plays in the social practice of managing heritage needs to be attempted.

For us, CDA provides the way forward for understanding the implications of discourse in terms of how heritage is both understood (in abstract) and managed (in practice). Although it is not the only critical perspective that seeks to reveal the operation of language in social processes, CDA differs from alternative approaches in one key way.¹⁵ It provides a method that allows the analyst to perform an interlocutory role in the dialogues between texts and social interactions in its oscillations between the close and detailed inspection of texts and an engagement with broader social issues.¹⁶ As Fairclough, a key proponent of this approach, puts it, the analysis should not be an ‘either/or’:

On the one hand, any analysis of texts which aims to be significant in social scientific terms has to connect with theoretical questions about discourse (e.g. the socially constructive effects of discourse). On the other hand, no real understanding of the social effects of discourse is possible without looking closely at what happens when people talk or write.¹⁷

CDA is, therefore, an attempt to move beyond paraphrasing the content of text and speech towards understanding what it is ‘that it is doing’ in operation. It also develops past seeing things purely in terms of meaning and looks also to the structure, organisation

and management of language. Language thus becomes both an end in itself *and* a resource for a broader enterprise: the analyst studies language but uses this analysis as a tool for examining something else entirely in the pursuit of progressive, emancipatory and empowering social agenda.¹⁸

What Does Critical Discourse Analysis Do—Intellectually, Socially, Pragmatically?

In order to identify what CDA actually does—intellectually, socially and pragmatically—it needs to be unpacked in more methodological detail. Taken at its most basic, CDA, like many other approaches to discourse analysis, is the study of society through the study of language.¹⁹ While each approach arguably revolves around a handful of internal consistencies, they are nonetheless oriented to different principles of analysis, including the types of questions posed and the assortment of methodological tools used.²⁰ For CDA, Fairclough espouses these principles of analysis most clearly,²¹ although they are also associated with Wodak²² and van Dijk.²³ Recently, these principles have also found synergy with a number of other authors in a variety of texts,²⁴ journals²⁵ and Web pages.²⁶

Pragmatically, key concepts of analysis are applied to a social ‘problem’ with a focus on understanding how language and semiosis figure in that problem.²⁷ This problem may revolve around issues of gender, racism, identity, organisational or institutional discourse, social policy, environmental policy, media language and so on.²⁸ The intellectual programme of CDA is socio-political in stance, and imports a number of interrelated concepts from broader social theory. These have been adapted and moulded into a distinct framework for understanding the specific relationships that link discourse with society, so that CDA becomes the analysis of discourse as a form of social practice, based on the assumption that every social practice will inevitably have a semiotic element.²⁹ As Fairclough points out:

... what is going on socially is, in part, what is going on interdiscursively in the text ... and that the interdiscursive work of the text materialises in its linguistic and other semiotic features.³⁰

From this premise, discourses are seen both to constitute certain knowledges, values, identities, consciousnesses and relationships, and be constitutive in the sense of not only sustaining and legitimising the status quo but in transforming it.³¹ The impact of this construction of discourse is thus explicitly tied up with notions of power and ideology.³² Indeed, the CDA project becomes critical in the sense that it actively attempts to unpack and reveal instances of apparent ‘inevitability’, or, in other words, accounts that are dominant essentially through their appeals to represent common-sense or seemingly natural approaches.³³ Dominance, social force, discrimination, or organised power and control become accessible in an analytical sense through examinations of the ways by which this index of power is expressed, constituted and legitimised by the use of language.³⁴

Accessing this type of information unfolds through a multi-layered analysis, in which texts are linked in numerous ways to wider society in accordance to a degree of

distance. Close inspection of texts requires the analyst both to see and feel by reading, but also enter a more conscious and deliberate process of analysis in order to penetrate the complex layering of linguistic, rhetorical and semantic devices.³⁵ The description that emerges from this textual analysis is then considered with regard to how it is consumed in society, taking discourse at this stage to be a discursive practice and route to interpretation.³⁶ The final layer of enquiry requires the analyst to see discourse as a social practice, or the level at which the ideological effects, common-sense approaches and naturalisations meet with resistance or not.³⁷ All three stages are essential for making CDA exactly that—a critical discourse analytical strategy—with the latter stages providing social perspectives, and the former providing the elements that make it discourse analysis and not just an intense social analysis.³⁸

In order to analyse the operationalisation, or enactment of discourses, CDA draws upon a number of key concepts. Operationalisation is itself broken into three movements between text and society: genres, discourses and styles. ‘Genres’ are defined as ways of acting, ‘discourses’ as ways of representing, and ‘styles’ as ways of being. All three are revelatory of social identities and positionings.³⁹ Interactions through genres, discourses and styles loosely correspond to three different types of meaning-making in text: action, representation and identification.⁴⁰ We say loosely because these relationships, while durable, are also flexible.

Perhaps one of the most central concepts utilised in CDA draws from the implicit or explicit dialogues that exist between one text and others: intertextuality.⁴¹ Framing a text in relation to other texts implies choice, and highlights a sense of what is being excluded and insulated against, and what is being worked into the interaction. Policy documents developed at a national level have counterparts at international levels, and these interact across and between each other often in complex ways. For example, both the Burra Charter and the World Heritage Convention (*The Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 1972*) make reference to the philosophies espoused by the Venice Charter, which also makes links to the Athens Charter (*Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments, 1931*). Alongside these more obvious references to intertextuality, the above texts also construct meaning relations through text semantics and thematic continuity, embodying familiar principles of heritage management without ever stating them explicitly. As Lemke⁴² argues, this requires that a particular discursive formation, in this case heritage, will be interpretively prior to any particular text. The reader recognises the familiarity and context of the text, and uses this to ‘read’, predict and decipher meaning. Certain discursive framings of heritage are recurrent across these international texts, and together they work to construct what appears to be a cohesive and consensual approach to heritage and its management. Here, the idea of ‘heritage’ does not draw specifically upon its lexical meaning but rather reflects a subtly altered meaning that is recognisable, familiar and constant across the overall discursive patterning of the texts.

Intertextuality links with the linguistic conception of assumption, which likewise connects one text to others. However, the two concepts differ in their outcome: for the former, difference may be opened up with the injection of external voices, and for the latter, difference is overlaid and closed down through claims of common ground.⁴³ In

revolving around difference, both concepts make contrasting reference to dialogicality, but operate at different ends of a sliding scale. At one end, there is a purposeful engagement with other texts, and at the other, there is a diminishing of that conversation.⁴⁴ The degree to which a text enters into dialogicality is thus expressive of a willingness to negotiate and interact.

Importantly, then, minimal dialogicality, or the absence of it entirely, is illustrative of a completed process of naturalisation, in which conflict and difference have been suppressed. Degrees of dialogicality are assessed both through the analysis of vocabulary and with reference to modality. Essentially, modality is expressive of the commitment the author (and thus text) has made to a particular proposition of truth:

... [it] involves the many ways in which attitudes can be expressed towards the 'pure' reference-and-prediction content of an utterance, signalling factuality, degrees of certainty or doubt, vagueness, possibility, necessity, and even permission and obligation.⁴⁵

For example, 'may' or 'should' imply a greater scope for dialogical possibilities than 'is' or 'will'—the former are open to alternative suggestions, whereas the latter are categorical. Modality is thus a useful indicator of self-identity—if one is committed wholeheartedly to one thing, and not to another, a picture of how that individual represents the world begins to emerge.⁴⁶ To illustrate, the Venice Charter, a cornerstone of the international heritage policy chain, embeds a high degree of modality, or commitment, to the AHD, which can be seen in the preamble to the document:

Imbued with a message from the past, the historic monuments of generations of people remain to the present day as living witnesses of their age-old traditions ... The common responsibility to safeguard them for future generations is recognized. It is our duty to hand them on in the full richness of their authenticity.

Themes of stewardship and moral obligation radiate from the above statement, linked to the idea of age-old monuments or physical survivals from the past that are valued for their authenticity and historic content. These statements are making explicit, evaluative assumptions that are reinforced by their intersection with powerful markers of modality. Our duty is laid out as categorical, as is the content of that duty. Not only does the preamble illustrate a high level of commitment to the obligations laid down, this commitment it made on behalf of others—indeed, on behalf of all of us.

Subject positioning and social relations also offer a means by which to make meaningful analytical statements. Institutional policy documents, for example, serve particular interests and negate others. These interests are reinforced through the persuasive practices invoked to provide a sense of legitimacy and authority. From positioning we reach action, and begin to question what it is about language that allows some things to be done and not others.⁴⁷ This line of questioning brings in patterns of transitivity, in which verbs, as doing words, start to make revelations about the textual and social constructions of different participants and their positionings. Which participants are given mental, behavioural and/or relational capacities to act? What identities are being constructed, and how does this position the participant in terms of how they speak about, understand and interact with the world?

One final, but nonetheless important, contribution CDA holds for this paper lies with its ability to reveal and assess claims of inevitability. By making reference to an authorised heritage discourse we are also arguing that a particular understanding of heritage has been naturalised and fed into policy, allowing specific meanings and values to dominate as inevitable. We argue that this authorised discourse is at work within heritage policy documents, and provides ‘common-sense’ rules by which to act, speak and interact. Moreover, we argue that this discourse sustains, legitimises and bolsters particular identities, transforming them into a consciousness that makes it difficult for alternative perspectives to find voice.

With our analysis of the Burra Charter, part of what is at issue is the tension that emerges when calls for greater inclusion and plurality are placed within a context already dominated by the firmly established and authoritative discourse of the expert. The paradox, of course, revolves around attempting to loosen controls and create equitable dialogue, but doing so through a discourse that is by its very nature dialogically restricted. The application of CDA techniques thus allows us to look for and unpack the parameters in place within heritage management that dictate what can and cannot be said, from whom authority should come, in what forum and using what understanding of reality.⁴⁸

The Discourse of the Burra Charter

To operationalise CDA it is first necessary to identify the problem or issue, that here lies with the tension between the constitution of the text by its reliance on expert knowledge, and its attempts to make available discursive space for community participation in the management process. This is assessed in two ways: firstly, in conjunction with a broader analysis that situates the document within the social events and networks of practices that validate and authorise it; and, secondly, through the microanalysis of the discourse as it is asserted within the Charter itself. In the microanalysis we focus on the discursive construction of the Burra Charter, discuss its overall textual organisation, and isolate specific semantic and grammatical instances in which important discursive work is done. Key terms such as ‘fabric’, ‘cultural significance’ and ‘preservation’ are identified as examples that are able to demonstrate the extent to which particular discourses are invoked and utilised to create a distinct sense of what constitutes conservation practice.

A sense of self-referential authority emerges from the overall organisation of the text, in large part due to the lack of specificity with which key concepts are addressed and communicated. In conjunction with a direct and straightforward form of address, this vagueness ensures that the reader is never really sure who determines cultural significance, and by what criteria. For example, in the section ‘Who uses the charter?’ there is a sense of inclusiveness in the long list of interested parties who may find the Charter useful. However, this is undermined in the introductory paragraph, which notes that the Charter was initially drafted as a guide to practitioners, but that: ‘Anyone involved in the care of important places will probably make better decisions if they understand the charter.’⁴⁹ What this does is establish the understanding of the concerns of

practitioners as central to good decision making. Overall, the text reads more as a series of categorical statements that signal authority and expertise in an explicitly unidirectional flow of information, with a seriously diminished dialogicality of text. In short, there is a reduction of all differences of opinion into a text of consensus.⁵⁰ As Walker and Marquis-Kyle's commentary on the charter observes:

The Charter defines the common processes of caring for places—maintenance, preservation, restoration, reconstruction, adaption, and also interpretation.⁵¹

This sense of overarching authority is reinforced by the use of passive and impersonal language, a linguistic move that is dubious in itself considering the nature of the document, but which becomes particularly problematic when the Charter attempts to deal with plurality and multi-vocality. Essentially, the problem is one of contradiction. Contemporary calls for community participation and the inclusion of diverse associative values and meanings do not sit comfortably within the overall tone of the document when placed together with traditional notions of authority and expertise. Indeed, the distinctive styling of semantics works to construct an objective, factual, and thus seemingly natural, account of the conservation process, when it is in reality privileging a particular perspective.

With this in mind, it is possible to argue that the succession of optimistic changes that arrived with the 1999 revisions are put at risk and marginalised by precisely those assumptions that have remained implicit and uncritically accepted. It is worthwhile to consider what rhetorical purpose this vagueness actually serves, as while it may be largely unintentional, it is very revealing of an important set of key phrases that have assumed a sense of shared familiarity, and thus gone unexplored.

The term '*fabric*' is central. Indeed, the scope of the Charter is aimed explicitly at a tangible conception of heritage:

These principles and procedures can be applied to a wide range of places such as a monument, a ruin, a courthouse, a midden, a cottage, a road, a mining or archaeological site, a whole district or region.⁵²

They [places of cultural significance] are historical records, that are important as tangible expressions of Australian identity and experience.⁵³

The idea of historic fabric is thus the focus of concern for the Burra Charter, which details policies on the way fabric should be treated in terms of management, conservation, interpretation and so forth. The other key concept is that of cultural significance. Indeed, this idea of cultural significance provides the basic premise for the document:

All significant places should be conserved. This is not a matter of choice ... If cultural significance is not retained, then the processes are not conservation (and action is needed for conservation), or the management is not in accordance with the Charter.⁵⁴

The keystone of the Burra Charter is that nothing should be done to a place and its fabric that alters the cultural significance of that place. While these are useful philosophical principles, the construction of terms such as fabric and cultural significance inherently contradicts attempts of social inclusion and community participation for reasons that will be explored throughout the analysis.

Within the Charter, cultural significance is defined as ‘aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations’.⁵⁵ ‘Fabric’ is defined as ‘all the physical materials of the place’.⁵⁶ For the Charter, cultural significance is ‘embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting ...’.⁵⁷ This idea of fabric assumes that cultural significance is inherently fixed within, thus becoming physically manifested and subject to conservation, management and other technical practices. What is problematic here is the naturalisation of cultural significance as a material concern, which gives the appearance of an unproblematic and natural relationship between the subject of the Charter and those experts in the material sciences. This conceptualisation of heritage has antecedents back to antiquarian assumptions that artefacts embodied, or even contained, a fixed meaning that could be unlocked through simple possession and observation.

The sense of the appropriateness of experts, their authority and ability to unlock the nature of cultural significance of heritage places, is reinforced by a series of legitimising techniques that work to underpin the moral weight of the expert. These words, used in conjunction with that of fabric, are ‘respect’, ‘caution’, ‘evidence’, ‘safeguarded’, ‘protection’, and the cautionary use of terms such as ‘distort’ and ‘conjecture’. All these terms implicitly make reference to the cognitive validity of conservation professionals. Another example is:

In this illustrated *Burra Charter* Australia ICOMOS aims to illuminate and explain the **sensible** advice contained in the Charter.⁵⁸

This statement makes an explicit value assumption regarding the content of the Charter, marking it out as sensible, from which the reader can read the implicit message that processes of conservation that deviate from this framework are undesirable. Further techniques that reveal the assumed appropriateness of the expert are found in the moral evaluations rehearsed in the text. A particularly clear example is found in Article 5, in which values of objectivity and precision are called upon to underpin ‘good practice’ in understanding significance:

This article warns against bias and subjectivity in understanding significance and deciding what to do—bias that may easily develop if not enough skill, care, rigour or goodwill is applied.⁵⁹

Again, this type of language makes appeals to impersonal, ‘unbiased’ thinking capable of providing rational decisions. This is based on the existential assumption that ‘unbiased’, objective thinking is, indeed, a possibility.

The sense of expertise created through appeals to objectivity and moral evaluation is juxtaposed with new inclusive statements that attempt to prioritise public interest, such as:

... *conservation, interpretation* and management of a *place* should provide for the participation of people for whom the place has special *associations* and *meanings*, or who have social, spiritual or other cultural responsibilities for the place⁶⁰

and

Co-existence of cultural values should be recognised, respected and encouraged, especially in cases where they conflict.⁶¹

Not only do these things sit problematically together because there is no active sense of what participation actually means, there is also a failure to identify to what extent, or how, the expert should give ground or engage with community and/or non-expert participation. Perhaps more importantly, the idea that the conservation values of experts might be just another set of cultural values is entirely absent in the discursive construction of the text, and for that matter all texts of this sort. The frequent discursive use of cultural significance in the singular belies a sense of inclusion of multi-vocal understandings of the nature and meaning of heritage places. Further, this multi-vocality is obscured by the regulatory genre employed by the Charter which requires that the central defining phrases are unambiguous. There is little room left in this genre for counter-arguments or dialogue. What is significant here is the lack of explicit examination of the inherently dissonant nature of heritage within a Charter redesigned to address community contestation of the dominant heritage discourse.

In addition, non-expert values are relegated to terms such as value and meaning, which are vaguely defined in the Burra Charter, and are never associated with the all-important term cultural significance with its added authority through its physical embodiment in fabric. In terms of discourse analysis, perhaps the most interesting point here is the application of modalisation, which alters the authority of the concepts under discussion. When considering cultural significance, non-modalised, categorical assertions are used; for example:

Cultural significance *is* embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects.⁶²

Cultural significance *means* aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present and future generations.⁶³

Both explicitly attribute a fixed meaning to the term through this use of non-modalised language, along with exhaustive lists. By contrast, discussions of value and meaning are conducted in modalised language, and are thereby dialogically open to a number of possibilities. For example, 'A place may have a range of values for different individuals or groups'⁶⁴ and 'Such cultural values might include political, religious, spiritual and moral beliefs that are broader than the cultural significance of the place.'⁶⁵ What this suggests is a willingness to relinquish some control over the mediation of value and meaning, but a staunch unwillingness to give ground when dealing with cultural significance—an unwillingness that may well be tied up in the existential assumption that cultural significance is embodied in the fabric itself. As such, while cultural significance and values and meanings may appear to be given equal weight, the semantic relations within the sentences dealing with their definition suggest what Fairclough terms a perceived 'logic of difference'.⁶⁶

Some articles demonstrate the construction of community and non-expert participation as another area of technical concern for the expert to deal with or an audience for expert opinion rather than active participants. This is revealed, for example, by examining patterns of transitivity in which the use of particular verbs reveals the behavioural capacities assigned to different subject positions:

Groups and individuals with *associations* with a place as well as those involved in its management should be provided with opportunities to contribute to and participate in **understanding** the *cultural significance* of the place. Where appropriate they should also have opportunities to participate in its *conservation* and management.⁶⁷

Indigenous people are the primary source of information on the value of their heritage and how it is best conserved, and **must be offered** the opportunity for an active role in any project or activity involving their heritage.⁶⁸

For many places, the role of people with skills and experience in conservation is **to respond to requests for advice** from people with spiritual or other cultural responsibilities for the place.⁶⁹

The **obligation to involve people** is accompanied by the responsibility of those involved with management or undertaking a project to listen, learn and respond.⁷⁰

Effectively, the textual relations are setting up the specific subject positionings. The use of verbs such as 'offer', 'involve', 'oblige' and 'provide' relegate groups and individuals to audience status wherein they are required to 'understand' the significance of the place under the 'direction and supervision' of people with 'appropriate knowledge and skills'.⁷¹ 'Participants' are contrasted with 'the experts', pushed into the role of beneficiaries, and thus made passive. The experts, as activated subjects, become 'those who make things happen'.⁷² Attempts to activate non-experts through the inclusion of participatory clauses and recognition of multiple values thus remain textured in a process of creating passivity that accentuates their subjection to the conservation and management process. The vagueness of 'where appropriate' also begs the question of who determines what becomes appropriate.

The definition of preservation offered in Article 1.6 'maintaining the fabric of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration' is also illustrative of the contradictory bind described above.⁷³ The act of preserving fabric is an act, following the logic of the Burra Charter, of preserving cultural significance. The Burra Charter intertextually incorporates and invokes a 'conserve as found' ethos, through both explicit and implicit links with the Venice Charter and the authorised heritage discourse, where heritage, as both Urry and Emerick argue, become frozen moments in time, separated from the present and the cultural landscapes in which they occur.⁷⁴ Significance thus becomes immutable, and expert pronouncements become binding legislative statements.⁷⁵ The immutable nature of cultural significance thus established means that the expert does not have to give ground on their sense of significance, as cultural significance becomes something non-experts have to understand rather than contribute to. Further, it implies that expert evaluation need not necessarily change the cultural significance of a place in response to community participation, which makes the inclusion of community participation in the Charter inherently tokenistic.

Conclusion

Our purpose in writing this paper is to facilitate critical self-reflection, informed by techniques that have yet to be extensively explored in heritage studies. Clearly, our agenda is one of promoting community participation that does more than simply let

community groups share existing conservation and heritage practices. In our view, community participation must hinge on the concept of negotiation, not only over conservation and heritage values but also over the very meaning and nature of heritage, so that the conservation ethic itself is open to renegotiation and redefinition. For us, discourse analysis is an important methodology for identifying, problematising and unpacking the constitutive discursive field of heritage. This identification allows analysis of the work that the discourse does in maintaining the intellectual frameworks that govern practice and regulate the boundaries between the communities of authority and other community interests. This process is integral to any attempts to develop an inclusive heritage practice that does more than simply assimilate, but rather engages in communications with communities that are dialogically open to criticism and self-reflection.

The discourse analysis of the Charter that we have conducted suggests that, although laudable and sincere attempts have been made to incorporate a greater sense of social inclusion and participation in the Charter's revision, the discursive construction of the Burra Charter effectively undermines these innovations. It is useful, therefore, to ask whether those privileged by the discourse have an 'interest in the problem not being resolved'.⁷⁶ Whether the construction of the discourse is an active attempt to maintain the privileged position of expertise in management and conservation processes, or is an unintended outcome of a naturalised and self-referential approach, is no longer at issue. Indeed, there are elements of truth in both statements. Certainly, the discourse is deeply naturalised and part of the common sense of the conservation and heritage ethos—indeed, it is constitutive of the practice of heritage conservation. Something is at issue, however—the consequences of the discourse. Intentionality thereby becomes either irrelevant or secondary to what Foucault refers to as the power/knowledge consequences of discourse, which establish regimes of truth, and forms of power and subjectivity that have social and material effects.

Notes

- [1] Smith, *Uses of Heritage*.
- [2] See, for instance, Newman and McLean, 'Heritage Builds Communities'; Byrne et al., *Social Significance*; Derry and Malloy, *Archaeologists and Local Communities*.
- [3] Smith, *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*.
- [4] Walker and Marquis-Kyle, *The Illustrated Burra Charter*, 7.
- [5] Domicelj, 'Foreword'.
- [6] Walker and Marquis-Kyle, *The Illustrated Burra Charter*, 7.
- [7] *Ibid.*, 6.
- [8] Starn, 'Authenticity and Historic Preservation', 9.
- [9] Smith, *Uses of Heritage*.
- [10] Kuipers, 'The Creation of Identities by Government Designation', 206; Smith, *Uses of Heritage*.
- [11] Walker and Marquis-Kyle, *The Illustrated Burra Charter*, 4.
- [12] Hall, 'Whose Heritage?'; Littler, 'Introduction'; Smith, *Uses of Heritage*; Bagnall, 'Performance and Performativity', 89; Graham, 'Heritage as Knowledge', 1004; Dicks, 'Encoding and Decoding the People'.
- [13] Graham, 'Heritage as Knowledge', 1004.

- [14] Naidoo, 'Nevermind the Buzzwords'; Littler, 'Introduction'; Littler and Naidoo, 'White Past, Multicultural Present'.
- [15] Blommaert, *Discourse*, 21.
- [16] Fairclough, *Analysing Discourse*, 3; Fairclough, 'The Discourse of New Labour', 229.
- [17] Fairclough, *Analysing Discourse*, 3.
- [18] Fairclough, 'The Discourse of New Labour', 230; Taylor, 'Locating and Conducting Discourse Analytic Research', 15.
- [19] The wider landscape of discourse-analytical strategies incorporates traditions such as systemic functional linguistics (SLF), Foucauldian discourse analysis, functional linguistics, Reinhart Koselleck's concept analysis, conversational analysis (CA), visual analysis, the discourse-historical approach, Laclau's discourse analysis, Hajer's discourse analysis, Dryzek's discourse analysis and interactional socio-linguistics—some of which are complementary and will be included in this discussion.
- [20] Blommaert, *Discourse*, 21; Tonkiss, 'Analysing Discourse', 246–47.
- [21] Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis*; Fairclough, 'Critical Discourse Analysis'; Fairclough, *Analysing Discourse*; Fairclough, 'The Discourse of New Labour'; Chouliaraki and Fairclough, *Discourse in Late Modernity*.
- [22] Wodak, 'What CDA is About'; Wodak, 'Critical Discourse Analysis'; Wodak, 'Gender Mainstreaming and the European Union'.
- [23] van Dijk, *Discourse as Social Interaction*.
- [24] Lazar, *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis*; Chilton and Schäffner, *Politics as Text*; Marston, *Social Policy and Discourse Analysis*; Wetherell et al., *Discourse Theory and Practice*; Tonkiss, 'Analysing Discourse'.
- [25] *Critical Discourse Studies*; *Discourse and Society*; *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*; *Language in the New Capitalism*; *Discourse Studies*.
- [26] <http://www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/staff/norman/norman.htm>; <http://www.discourse-in-society.org/>; <http://www-english.tamu.edu/ds/discours.html>
- [27] Fairclough, 'The Discourse of New Labour', 232.
- [28] Martin and Wodak, 'Introduction', 5.
- [29] Fairclough and Wodak, 'Critical Discourse Analysis', 258; Fairclough, 'The Discourse of New Labour', 234; Martin and Wodak, 'Introduction'.
- [30] Fairclough, 'The Discourse of New Labour', 240.
- [31] Fairclough and Wodak, 'Critical Discourse Analysis', 258.
- [32] Fairclough and Wodak, 'Critical Discourse Analysis', 258; Janks, 'Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Tool', 329; Chouliaraki and Fairclough, *Discourse in Late Modernity*, 4; Blommaert, *Discourse*, 24–25.
- [33] Fairclough, 'The Discourse of New Labour', 229.
- [34] Martin and Wodak, 'Introduction', 6.
- [35] Janks, 'Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Tool', 58.
- [36] Blommaert, *Discourse*, 27.
- [37] Ibid.
- [38] Fairclough, 'The Discourse of New Labour', 238.
- [39] Fairclough, 'The Discourse of New Labour', 235.
- [40] Fairclough, *New Labour, New Language*, 28.
- [41] Chouliaraki and Fairclough, *Discourse in Late Modernity*, 118–19; Fairclough, 'The Discourse of New Labour', 233; Lemke, 'Intertextuality and Text Semantics', 85–87.
- [42] Lemke, 'Intertextuality and Text Semantics', 90.
- [43] Fairclough, *Analysing Discourse*, 41.
- [44] Ibid.
- [45] Verschuere, 1999, cited in Fairclough, *Analysing Discourse*, 165.
- [46] Fairclough, *Analysing Discourse*, 166.
- [47] Janks, 'Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Tool', 56.

- [48] McKenna, 'Critical Discourse Studies', 14.
- [49] Walker and Marquis-Kyle, *The Illustrated Burra Charter*, 7.
- [50] Fairclough, *Analysing Discourse*, 41.
- [51] Walker and Marquis-Kyle op. cit. (note 4) commentary on the Australia ICOMOS, *The Burra Charter*, Article 1, 11.
- [52] Walker and Marquis-Kyle, *The Illustrated Burra Charter*, 7.
- [53] Australia ICOMOS, *The Burra Charter*, preamble.
- [54] Australia ICOMOS, *The Burra Charter*, Article 2.
- [55] *Ibid.*, Article 1.2.
- [56] *Ibid.*, Article 1.3.
- [57] *Ibid.*, Article 1.2.
- [58] Walker and Marquis-Kyle, *The Illustrated Burra Charter*, 7 emphasis added.
- [59] Australia ICOMOS, *The Burra Charter*, Article 5.
- [60] *Ibid.*, Article 5.1, original emphasis.
- [61] *Ibid.*, Article 13.
- [62] *Ibid.*, Article 1, emphasis added.
- [63] *Ibid.*, Article 1, emphasis added.
- [64] *Ibid.*, Article 1, emphasis added.
- [65] *Ibid.*, Article 13, emphasis added.
- [66] Fairclough, *Analysing Discourse*, 88.
- [67] Australia ICOMOS, *The Burra Charter*, Article 26.3, bolded emphasis added, other emphasis in original.
- [68] *Ibid.*, Article 12, bolded emphasis added.
- [69] *Ibid.*
- [70] *Ibid.*, Article 26.3, bolded emphasis added.
- [71] *Ibid.*, Article 30.
- [72] Fairclough, *Analysing Discourse*, 148.
- [73] Australia ICOMOS, *The Burra Charter*, Article 1.6, original emphasis.
- [74] Urry, 'How Societies Remember the Past'; K. Emerick, 'From Frozen Monuments to Fluid Landscapes: The Conservation and Preservation of Ancient Monuments from 1882 to the Present', unpublished PhD diss., University of York., 2003.
- [75] Bauman, *Legislators and Interpreters*.
- [76] Fairclough, *Analysing Discourse*, 10.

References

- Australia ICOMOS. *The Burra Charter*. Australia: Australia ICOMOS, 1979.
- . *The Burra Charter*. Australia: Australia ICOMOS, 1999.
- Barthel, D. *Historic Preservation: Collective Memory and Historical Identity*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1999.
- Bauman, Z. *Legislators and Interpreters*. Oxford: Polity Press, 1987.
- Blommaert, J. *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Byrne, D., H. Brayshaw and T. Ireland. *Social Significance: A Discussion Paper*. Hurtsville: NSW National Parks and Wildlife Services, 2003.
- Chilton, P. A. and C. Schäffner, eds. *Politics as Text: Analytical Approaches to Political Discourses*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002.
- Chouliaraki, L. and N. Fairclough. *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999.
- Derry, L. and M. Malloy, eds. *Archaeologists and Local Communities: Partners in Exploring the Past*. Washington, DC: Society for American Archaeology, 2003.

- Domicelj, J. 'Foreword'. In *The Illustrated Burra Charter: Making Good Decisions About the Care of Important Places*, edited by P. Marquis-Kyle and M. Walker. Sydney: Australia ICOMOS, 1992.
- Fairclough, N. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Essex: Pearson Education, 1995.
- . *New Labour, New Language?* London: Routledge, 2000.
- . 'The Discourse of New Labour: Critical Discourse Analysis'. In *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*, edited by M. Wetherell, S. Taylor and S. J. Yates. London: Sage, 2001: 229–66.
- . 'Critical Discourse Analysis'. In *How to Analyse Text in Institutional Settings: A Casebook of Methods*, edited by A. McHoul and M. Rapley. London: Continuum, 2001: 25–38.
- . *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Fairclough, N., P. Graham, J. Lemke and R. Wodak, 'Introduction'. *Critical Discourse Studies* 1, no. 1 (2004): 1–7.
- Fairclough, N. and R. Wodak, 'Critical Discourse Analysis'. In *Discourse as Social Interaction*, edited by T. A. van Dijk. London: Sage, 1997: 258–84.
- Hajer, M. 'Discourse Coalitions and the Institutionalisation of Practice: The Case of Acid Rain in Britain'. In *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*, edited by F. Fischer and J. Forester. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1996: 43–76.
- Janks, H. 'Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Tool'. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 18, no. 3 (1997): 329–42.
- Kuipers, M. J. 'The Creation of Identities by Government Designation: A Case Study of the Korreweg District, Groningen, NL'. In *Senses of Place: Senses of Time*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005: 205–18.
- Lazar, M., ed. *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Gender, Power and Ideology in Discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Lemke, J. L. 'Intertextuality and Text Semantics'. In *Discourse in Society: Systemic Functional Perspectives. Meaning and Choice in Language: Studies for Michael Halliday*, edited by P. H. Fries and M. Gregory. New Jersey: Ablex, 1995: 85–114.
- Marston, G. *Social Policy and Discourse Analysis: Policy Change in Public Housing*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
- Martin, J. and R. Wodak. 'Introduction'. In *Re/reading the Past: Critical and Functional Perspectives on Time and Value*, edited by J. R. Martin and R. Wodak. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003: 1–16.
- McKenna, B. 'Critical Discourse Studies: Where to from Here?' *Critical Discourse Studies* 1, no. 1 (2004): 9–39.
- Newman, A. and F. McLean, 'Heritage Builds Communities: The Application of Heritage Resources to the Problems of Social Exclusion'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 4, nos. 3&4 (1998): 143–53.
- Smith, L. *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- . *The Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Taylor, S. 'Locating and Conducting Discourse Analytic Research'. In *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*, edited by M. Wetherell, S. Taylor and S. J. Yates. London: Sage, 2001: 5–48.
- Tonkiss, F. 'Analysing Discourse'. In *Researching Society and Culture*, edited by C. Seale. London: Sage, 1998: 245–60.
- Urry, J. 'How Societies Remember the Past'. In *Theorizing Museums*, edited by S. Macdonald and G. Fyfe. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996: 45–65.
- van Dijk, T. A., ed. *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage, 1997.
- van Leeuwen, T. 'Discourses of Unemployment in New Labour Britain'. In *Challenges in a Changing World: Issues in Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by R. Wodak and C. Ludwig. Vienna: Passagen, 1999: 87–100.
- Walker, M. and P. Marquis-Kyle. *The Illustrated Burra Charter: Good Practice for Heritage Places*. Burwood: Australia ICOMOS, 2004.
- Watt, P. and K. Jacob. 'Discourses of Social Exclusion'. *Housing, Theory and Society* 17 (2000): 14–26.
- Wetherell, M. 'Editor's Introduction'. In *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*, edited by M. Wetherell, S. Taylor and S. J. Yates. London: Sage, 2001: 9–13.

- Wetherell, M., S. Taylor and S. J. Yates, eds. *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*. London: Sage, 2001.
- Wodak, R. 'What CDA is About—A Summary of its History, Important Concepts and its Development'. In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by R. Wodak and M. Meyer. London: Sage, 2001: 1–13.
- . 'Critical Discourse Analysis'. In *Qualitative Research Practice*, edited by C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. F. Gubrium and D. Silverman. London: Sage, 2004: 197–213.
- . 'Gender Mainstreaming and the European Union: Interdisciplinarity, Gender Studies and CDA'. In *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Gender, Power, and Ideology in Discourse*, edited by M. M. Lazar. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005: 90–113.