

# Introduction

## Intangible cultural heritage at the margins of Europe

*Laura Hodsdon, Kadri Koreinik,  
Sjoerd-Jeroen Moenandar, and Valts Ernštreits*

Each year on 23rd December, the Cornish village of Mousehole celebrates Tom Bawcock's Eve. According to local legend, Tom Bawcock braved terrible storms to bring back a huge catch of fish to feed the village, which the villagers made into a 'Starry Gazey' pie. The relatively recent, but now-traditional, celebrations involve lantern processions through the streets, serving the pie (a dish of pilchards, egg, and potatoes, the fish heads and tails emerging through the crust of the pastry), and singing 'Tom Bawcock's song' in the village pub. Mousehole is a picturesque fishing village in the far south-west of Cornwall, UK, a region whose industrial past of fishing and mining has been replaced by over 5 million visitors a year and an estimated one in ten houses as holiday homes, as well as an increasing number (particularly following the COVID-19 pandemic) of permanent incomers working remotely or retiring to a rural idyll. Over time, in a village well on the 'tourist map', the event increasingly attracted attention from ever larger numbers of visitors. The narrow streets became over-crowded, and sometimes raucous, until one year many villagers no longer felt comfortable for their children to process along the street. The next year, the event was held incognito and low-key inside the village hall, limiting who could participate and spectate to those who were, literally, insiders.

But *were* the spectators mostly tourists, or was this a narrative that picks up on broader discourses responding to the social change the region has seen? If these additional bodies owned holiday homes in Mousehole and were residents for some but not all of the year, were they village 'insiders' to be included in the 'invitation only' event, or 'outsiders' in the same category as tourists? Or does their position depend on their relationship with the village outside of the event itself – in which case how do we consider a 'community' formed around an intangible cultural heritage (ICH) event such as this as distinct from other kinds of community? Does a person with Cornish ancestry born and bred in the nearby town of Penzance have any more or less right to be considered an 'insider' at the event than a Mousehole resident who has recently moved from London? Are there differences in the ways that all these people should, ethically, relate to and participate in the event? And, most importantly, how might any of them navigate the answers to these questions – and gauge their position and behaviour accordingly – so that the event remains resilient and social relations remain positive?

### **National minority cultures and the margins of Europe**

These and similar dynamics play out not only in other places across Cornwall but also in other post-industrial, rural regions where a traditionally distinctive cultural space has become increasingly intertwined with a globalising dynamic that brings individuals, organisations, and influences from the national majority and beyond. Many of these spaces have in common a peripherality in relation to urban centres and the national majority, and are, literally, at the physical margin of their respective nation-state; they are places where a touristic imaginary of a rural (often coastal) idyll has replaced traditional industries; and are cultural landscapes imbricated with a minority culture that is, to varying degrees, separate from – although also embedded in – that of the national majority. These physically marginal areas are, not by coincidence, also often places of social, cultural, and economic marginalisation due to their distance from urban centres and majority culture. Along with some 200 other groups in Europe protected as national minorities, these cultures often include elements that distinguish them within, or across, national borders. Such variations are increasingly leveraged as a strategy of place-making at local or regional scales. But they can present a complex picture relative to the national or European normative cultural imaginary, as variance from dominant identity practices may activate narratives of alterity. Stereotypes used to construct ‘us’ and ‘them’ often associated with spatial distance (such as ‘East’ and ‘West’ (Said 1995); see Macdonald 2013: 19; Nic Craith 2008) can provide the discursive basis for a contemporary, exoticised ‘other’ within the same territorial space, even while manifesting their specifically European origin (Macdonald 2013: 20), as will be seen on several occasions in this book.

Despite these characteristics, these cultures remain imbricated within the political, economic, and socio-cultural life of the nation state, meaning identities have long been hybridised in myriad ways. This creates potential for a more permeable inter-group dynamics between ‘majority’ and ‘minority’, accompanying a fuzziness of spatial or discursive boundaries between the two, as might be manifest in the vignette with which we began this chapter. Despite recognition, such as through the Council of Europe’s Framework Convention on the Protection of National Minorities (FCPNM), in Europe national minority cultural spaces are often unknown or poorly understood, even by many who live within the same national boundary (even, indeed, within the minority cultural space itself), for whom the state represents a contemporaneously, if not historically, more homogenous whole. This ambiguity underlies much of the dynamics around ICH – and the potential implications, whether positive or negative – that frame the inquiry in this book, since the circumstances that can ensure ICH remains resilient are, we argue, linked to the social and cultural interplay between majority and minority (see Chapter 1). Minority heritage is at risk of being appropriated by the majority (Xanthaki 2019), in no small part due to its lack of visibility and commensurate lack of majority awareness about its distinctive cultural value. This can allow these groups to become discursively invisible (Grote 2006; Donaldson 2006), where ‘European minority’ is used instead to refer to in-migrant groups or others who have been, and continue to be, marginalised.

By the same token, work within regional studies has observed that peripheral-ity is itself narratively constructed (Paasi 2010; Plüschke-Altof 2016) as part of those macro-economic processes that structure centre—periphery relations within a nation state. This has tangible implications on the economic and socio-cultural resource available to peripheralised places; however, this does not mean that periph-erality cannot be contested (e.g. Pfoser 2018; Willett 2020), including by appeals to a European identity that acknowledges ‘unity in diversity’ more than the nation state might (Crepaz 2019). Whether within a framing that appeals to constructs of Europe or otherwise, articulation of collective identity is key; indeed, one definition of national minority culture is those that ‘show, if only implicitly, a sense of soli-darity, directed towards preserving their culture, traditions, religion, or language’ (Preece 1998: 28). While other definitions are available (see Molloy 2013 for a summary), we draw on the principles of the FCPNM to understand ‘national minor-ity culture’ to refer to groups that have a long-standing link to a territorial area that does not align with national state borders (Council of Europe 2016). In this book, we focus on a cross-section of these: Cornish in the UK, Frisian in the Netherlands, and Livonian in Latvia and Estonia. These manifest shared cultural and geopolitical characteristics and also represent a contrasting sample of minority cultures at the spatial and socio-economic margins of their respective countries. They range in size and critical mass from small in number, geographically dispersed and critically en-dangered (Livonian), to a fragile but revitalising tradition (Cornish), to an unbroken tradition and nearly half a million native speakers (Frisian).

Cornwall (*Kernow* in Cornish) has remained to some extent distinct from England, having Celtic origins and links with Welsh and Breton cultures. Kernewek, the Cornish language, had waned by the late 18th century: although classified by UNESCO as critically endangered, since the 1900s it has undergone a revival, alongside other Cornish cultural traditions. Cornish identity was recognised by the UK government in 2014 under the FCPNM; in the 2021 UK Census, 18% of re-spondents in Cornwall indicated they identified as Cornish (Office for National Sta-tistics 2021). Physically and economically peripheral (its GDP 30% lower than the UK average), tourism brings around £2bn to its economy each year: a double-edged sword for cultural identity. Arguably most famous for beaches and attractions such as the Eden Project or Minack Theatre, Cornwall has a rich tangible cultural herit-age, including the UNESCO Cornwall and West Devon Mining World Heritage Site. Its intangible heritage is equally rich but less visible in the national imaginary, or subject to imaginaries rooted in the romanticised tourist gaze (Moseley 2013). Nar-ratives of Cornwall abound with pirates, quaint seaside villages, or rugged mining communities. It has been described as a ‘perpetual destination’ amid ‘romantic trav-eltogue, period drama location and seasonal tourism journalism’ (Monk et al. 2019).

Livonian culture (*līvõ kultūr* in Livonian) is indigenous to Latvia and south-western Estonia. One of Europe’s most endangered minority groups, its language is spoken fluently by fewer than 20 people. Historically inhabiting much of mod-ern Latvia and modern Estonia, by the mid-19th century Livonians endured in two isolated areas either side of the Gulf of Rīga: Salaca Livonians across the Latvian-Estonian border; and Courland Livonians on the Courland peninsula (the ‘Livonian

Coast'), where they remained until they were exiled following the two world wars and Soviet occupation. The Livonian Coast today is peripheral, its infrastructure underdeveloped amidst nature reserves and beach resorts for leisure tourism. Only a minority of residents in these areas have Livonian roots; most are majority holiday homeowners. Widespread belief that Livonians became extinct in the 13th century dominated until the 2000s, and Livonian heritage remains largely absent from the tourism narrative (Šuvcāne & Ernštreits 2018). Nevertheless, over the last two decades Livonian heritage has become increasingly visible, and the Livonian community in exile retains links with its historical area through cultural events. In the Salaca Livonian area on the Latvia-Estonia border, Livonian heritage has left traces on the cultural landscape: in its Livonian-like dialect of Latvian, place names, as well as offering-caves, hillforts, and other tangible remains. A resurgence of interest in Livonian heritage is noticeable here, too – a renewed interest stemming in part from the Livonian Cultural Space's 2018 inclusion on Latvia's national list of ICH. Livonian ancestry gatherings have begun; there are burgeoning linguistic, folkloric, and archaeological research and exhibitions; and Livonian is increasingly appearing in creative practice such as poetry and music.

Frisia (*Fryslân* in Frisian), with its 650,000 inhabitants, is the only officially bilingual province of the Netherlands and has developed a strong cultural infrastructure of its own. Far removed (by Dutch standards) in the north from the large urban centres such as Amsterdam and Rotterdam, many people, including inhabitants of Frisia itself, see it as peripheral. Some 450,000 people speak Frisian, the majority of whom live in Frisia. Culture and the arts are increasingly directed outwards as well as inwards, with tourism and the branding of Frisia as destination in the contemporary experience economy. Due to processes of globalisation, digitalisation, and immigration, as well as policies regarding Frisian language as an institutionalised part of the province's government, the public sphere and education are gradually shifting from maintenance and revitalisation through language itself, to seeing Frisian as part of a larger multilingual ecology, in which an essentialised Frisian collective identity seems to lose ground.

As has been frequently observed – and as can be seen in the diversity as well as commonality of our case studies – 'Europe' is a fuzzy concept, confounding attempts to delineate its borders (e.g. Kockel et al. 2020; Nic Craith 2008). Its institutional, experiential, and spatial manifestations and borders (Paasi 2001) have been explored by different schools of researchers from across a variety of disciplines; and as Whitehead and colleagues observe, there will always be 'multiple and competing ideas of European heritage, as actors call upon different pasts or connote them differently' (2020: 11). As they also note, heritage has been deployed in various ways to play an active role in shaping these, including into 'a positive identity narrative rooted in a rich and varied, and yet shared, European past' (Whitehead et al. 2020: 3), which has in turn shaped what is and is not seen as heritage (Smith 2006). Indeed, shared policy instruments at the European level articulating European cultural heritage inevitably continue to shape it (e.g. Kockel et al. 2020: 12; Zito, Eckersley & Turner 2020). Although authorised heritage discourse is linked with the formation of nation states (Smith 2006; Graham, Ashworth & Tunbridge 2000), Europe as an imaginary has, as its policy instruments imply,

been the subject of a self-reflective discourse about its shared yet diverse heritage (Kuutma 2013; Macdonald 2013, 2012; Schreiber 2019; Tauschek 2011). Appeals to a shared European heritage narrative comprise a ‘repertoire’ of ‘distinctive – though not exclusive or all-encompassing – [...] ways of doing and experiencing the past’ (Macdonald 2013: 2; see also Nic Craith 2008).

Narratives of a shared Europe, then, can be shaped according to particular agendas, some of which are more inclusive than others (as e.g. Whitehead and colleagues explore (2020)). Whether in a European context or outside it, ultimately the ‘entanglement of heritage in both the politics of togetherness and the politics of division needs to be recognised by contemporary heritage policy and practice’ (Whitehead et al. 2020: 227), and it is this dynamic that underpins the chapters that follow. In this volume, we consider descriptors where relevant (such as ‘European’, ‘English’, ‘Cornish’) as shaped and reshaped via identity practices, key among which is ICH, and view them in relation to the practice and performance of the ICH itself, rather than seeking to define them. Likewise, we consider our cases in terms primarily of the (more or less) shared socio-cultural history of Europe’s nation states that has shaped the fluid, ambiguous contexts in our marginalised regions, along with the possible illusion of homogeneity between majority and minority (rather than taking ‘Europe’ or ‘European-ness’ as a variable, as do recent volumes on European heritage such as those of Kockel (2021) and Whitehead (2020) and colleagues). That is, the ICH we study is in and from Europe – with no implications as to the boundaries around that space.

## **Heritage**

This is a book about ICH; but it is not a book about UNESCO. As many have noted, the former can barely be discussed without the latter, the discursive object being inextricably linked to its origin within the 2003 UNESCO Convention on the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (hereafter ICHC; e.g. Hafstein 2018; Melis & Chambers 2021; Munjeri 2009; Stefano 2012). UNESCO was founded following the Second World War to leverage the power of positive inter-group contact in fostering good relations (cf. Stoczkowski 2009), and as such is driven by a desire for social cohesion, as is the research presented in this volume. As noted above, national and international bodies have been instrumental in shaping and defining what counts as heritage, and of these, UNESCO must be counted as a particularly powerful voice (cf. Hafstein 2018). The role of these dynamics is described in Laurajane Smith’s widely used concept of authorised heritage discourse (AHD), and many authors have drawn attention to the specific processes by which hegemonic notions of heritage are adopted (e.g. Waterton 2010) as well as related processes of inclusion and exclusion (e.g. Hall 1999; Naidoo & Littler 2004).

The ICHC was developed in part in response to calls for a less hegemonic, Western-centric conception of what heritage is, and aims to recognise and empower cultural traditions that did not fit within previous frameworks. It defines ICH as the

tradition, practice, or living expression of a group or community, particularly expressed through the domains of oral traditions and expressions, performing

arts, social practices, rituals and festive events; knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe, and traditional craftsmanship [sic].  
(UNESCO 2003)

Although the mobilisation of ICH has made inroads into the AHD, it is far from dismantling it, and may in some ways perpetuate it (Akagawa & Smith 2019; Smith 2015). Alongside the operation of the AHD and inherent power hierarchies of national and international cultural and political institutions, in our context of national minority cultures, likewise, hegemonic framings of these edge spaces abound (as will be discussed further in the next chapter and throughout this volume). Indeed, the very terms ‘majority’ and ‘minority’ inherently describe a hierarchical relationship, one that threads throughout ICH practices no less than through society at large.

Inherent in the context of our inquiry, then, is the socially constructed use of the past in the present (cf. Graham, Ashworth & Tunbridge 2000: 11) with all the attendant power relations of the society, or societies, by which it is constructed. Of course, to many of the insiders at Tom Bawcock’s Eve, whether the event can be considered heritage, ICH, or anything other than ‘Tom Bawcock’s Eve’ is likely irrelevant. Although in principle, at least, the event may be said to fall within UNESCO’s definition of ICH (as articulated in the ICHC), as has frequently been observed this does not imply any particular self-consciousness on the part of those practising it, until it is actually listed (and becomes a ‘metacultural product’ (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2004)); nor did these practices suddenly come into being in 2003 with the inscription of the ICHC, as has been noted not least by folklorists and anthropologists. Traditional cultural practice as ‘just something we do’, enfolded into the everyday activities of life (cf. Robertson 2012), may not always be labelled as heritage – nor even may its ‘pastness’ be foremost in the mind of its practitioners – but may still be profoundly and strongly valued as such by those who consider themselves its owners. The identity expressed via the practice may be a Mousehole identity, a Cornish identity, a familial one, an event organiser’s one, or all of these. Indeed, the scale at which the ICH is practised in our case studies (e.g. village, town, region) varies in terms of the extent to which it can be seen as an expression of the minority cultural identity more broadly. It may be that ICH and the culture broadly intersect, as in Livonian; that local (town or village level) practices can be distinct from minority culture, while being part of the same ecosystem, in Cornwall; or that the ICH is common across the culture but performed locally at the village level, as in Frisian; with, of course, variations between individuals as to what particular identity is being performed. And a more important element than a metaculturalised ‘ICH’ from the perspectives of people in Mousehole and other places like it might be one that relates to the practice’s broader social, cultural, and economic context, which affects the values, social dynamics, and resources that go along with it. As well as the resilience of the ICH itself, then, at stake are the nature of the social relations that interconnect with it (see Chapter 1). These can provide the basis for leveraging the benefits of ICH in a way that is inclusive but appropriate, and the possibility of positive, sustainable cultural and social development.



In this volume, we build on the body of work within critical heritage studies, and related disciplines such as folklore, that attends to structural power and privilege and that considers ICH increasingly as distinct from its UNESCO context (albeit while acknowledging the discursive dominance of the ICHC) (e.g. Hafstein 2018; Stefano 2016; Stefano, Davis & Corsane 2012). Unlike many critiques, however, the research in this volume does not respond to the ICHC itself; rather, it explores a less frequently discussed aspect of ICH – less prominent in part *because of* the limited discursive possibilities created by the dominance of the ICHC. Rather than rehearsing again the benefits and challenges of the ICHC as applied to our particular contexts, we de-centre ICH within UNESCO as the object of inquiry, while acknowledging its role in shaping knowledge and policy by taking the ICHC definition of ICH as the basis for discussion. And although we focus on ICH, we are less interested in practices *per se*, since the social context of the ICH as much as the practice itself will help us better understand different perspectives. Instead, we take as our starting point the ambiguity of these marginalised European contexts, and ask what the plurality of majority and minority individuals and organisations in a minority cultural space might mean for its ICH. We accordingly focus on live cultural events linked to past practices in a national minority cultural space – with interest in the most invested insider to the accidental tourist but crucially (an area that is much neglected) also including those who fall in between. We thus seek to tread a balance between the ICHC and everyday socio-cultural contexts. Valdemar Hafstein has described ICH as a ‘diagnosis’ for post-industrial societies in need of a ‘cure’ from UNESCO experts (2015, 2018); a cure that is, crucially, ‘not without its side effects’ (2018: 157). The chapters in this volume seek both to better understand the ‘anatomy’ of the patient and so to prescribe preventative measures that may help mitigate the need for a visit to the doctor at all – or perhaps to enable minoritised cultures themselves to assess the risks and benefits of doing so. The inquiry is thus on the discursive object of ICH but not its governance, while acknowledging the inextricability of UNESCO from the academic and policy discourse around ICH (discussed further in Chapter 1).

ICH in European national minority contexts, then, sits somewhat uneasily at several crossroads: invisible yet hyper-visibly ‘othered’; part of the majority cultural space but separate within it; boundaryless yet boundaried. There is an AHD that challenges and is challenged by new conceptions and ownership of ICH, in which European national minorities variously do or do not feature; and traditional cultural practices that may or may not be seen in the context of heritage or identity at all by those who practise them (yet who are arguably those whose experiences matter the most in a social justice perspective). This book focuses on the intersections of these crossroads, and in so doing charts a path between notions of heritage from critical, popular, and policy perspectives of what is needed to safeguard ICH in national minority contexts, within the context of the social relations that are inextricable from them. This ground-up perspective allows us to surface broader dynamics, and so to ask what happens to the ICH of the national minorities who historically occupied these geographical and economical peripheries, in light of their becoming increasingly attractive to tourists, holiday homeowners, and permanent incomers for work

or ‘escape’ to the rural idyll; a plural ecosystem sometimes accompanied by tense social relations amidst jostling for space, resource, and voice. Dorothy Noyes has suggested that ‘The most important arenas for recognition, participation, and dignity remain those at the human scale in which bodies encounter one another and actions excite and demand answering action: where responsibility cannot be deferred, deflected, or denied’ (2015: 172). This is the scale at which we direct our inquiry.

### About this book

Our focus, then, is on examples of live cultural events linked to past practices in a national minority cultural space, incorporating the events’ broader social contexts. Although none happen to be inscribed under the ICHC, all arguably fall within its criteria for the definition of ICH. There are of course many different arenas in which ICH is practised and performed, all of which will vary in terms of how these dynamics play out; but such events are an apt place to study the intersections and interactions we have described, since they can be ‘a focal point for the merging of local and global narratives, and as an occasion when, and a space where, relations between global, national, regional, and local levels are discussed, negotiated, and, perhaps, redefined’ (Selberg 2006: 298; see also e.g. Clopot & McCullagh 2020; Picard & Robinson 2006); as places ‘for the making, unmaking and remaking of group identities’ (Kockel et al. 2020: 2) yet constituting, as Hansen describes them, an ‘important element in the indication of spatial affiliation’ (2004: 29).

Focusing on one or more of the case study contexts (Cornwall, Frisia, Livonian areas), each chapter applies a different lens to explore the core theme of majority and minority interplay through, and engagement in, national minority ICH. This book is underpinned by a dataset collected during a European Joint Programming Initiative on Cultural Heritage (JPICH)-funded research project, *Revoicing Cultural Landscapes: Narratives, Perspectives, and Performances of Marginalised Intangible Cultural Heritage* (2021–2023), or *Re:voice*.<sup>1</sup> The project grew from JPICH’s prompt to consider ‘How do different groups understand, experience and value heritage?’ and the observations this question inspired within our national minority settings. The diversity of the project team (which comprised individuals who identify as members of the respective national minority culture and those who do not) facilitated an interdisciplinary approach, and the chapters in this volume draw from a range of disciplines, including sociolinguistics, cultural geography, narrative studies, politics, event studies, and creative practice. As such, they offer a kaleidoscopic lens on the cultural landscape, with insights across a range of domains, drawing from the dataset from all three contexts.

Part I of this book, *Contexts*, considers some of the broader issues at play. In Chapter 1, Hodsdon elaborates on the contexts and questions described above and sets out the conceptual framework of this book, including what is meant by ‘revoicing’. In Chapter 2, Moenandar, Moran-Nae, and Hodsdon address the much-discussed notion of ICH ‘community’ in the context of the approach and findings of this book, arguing that different perspectives on what sort of community is being described co-exist both within and between individuals at any



one time. In the final chapter of this Part, Koreinik and Hodsdon consider how heritage discourse can contribute to revoicing, suggesting that both critical and appreciative (also called ‘positive’) modes of discourse analysis can be a fruitful means of both understanding and amplifying how minoritised ICH is positioned with respect to the majority.

Part II, *Analyses*, considers the interplay of majority and minority via a number of case studies. Section 1 focuses on different manifestations of *Voices*. First, in Chapter 4 Hodsdon and Moenandar present an analysis of how Cornish ICH events have been portrayed in the media, finding a range of presentations from erasure to exaggeration of difference, and offer a model of heritage mediation as a tool for analysis and self-reflection. In Chapter 5, Ernštreits, Kļava, Vaivade, Vītola, Ozoliņa, Pajusalu, and Balodis consider the Livonian language as ICH, suggesting that, in this critically endangered context, rather than language being a means of transmitting ICH, ICH can also be a vehicle for transmitting language, an understanding that presents both challenges and opportunities for the involvement of the majority in both ICH and language preservation. Chapter 6 also considers language, as Zijlstra, Aardema, and Moenandar ask how both Frisian and non-Frisian attendees of Frisian theatre performances construct their identities in relation to the ICH, the language, and their sense of belonging. Section 2 approaches the central theme via the notion of *Spaces*. In Chapter 7, Willett sees ICH ecosystems as complex adaptive assemblages, and analyses them in this light to consider what sorts of world-making are involved by all those within the assemblage, and what this might mean for the ICH’s futures. Chapter 8 takes the physical landscape as the context for considering majority–minority dynamics, and Vītola, Ozoliņa, Hodsdon, Koreinik, and Vaivade analyse the semiotic landscape in Livonian regions of Latvia and Estonia to consider both locals’ and incomers’ perspectives on the cultural presence (or absence) of Livonian signs, and what these mean in terms of a distinctively Livonian cultural landscape. In Chapter 9, Frears and Hodsdon consider how event insiders and outsiders use, move around, and interact in the towns of Padstow and Penzance in Cornwall during the events of May Day and Golowan respectively. In the final empirical Section 3, authors consider more explicitly the *Negotiations* that can take place around ICH events between majority and minority, or insiders and outsiders in an event context. In Chapter 10, Hodsdon, Ozoliņa, and Zijlstra use normative and non-normative elements of ICH events to explore how outsiders evaluate, monitor, and calibrate their positionality and behaviour in an unfamiliar context, arguing that given the potential for even a small faux pas to entrench existing divisive narratives, a sensitive outsider awareness of the cultural space they are entering is paramount. Chapter 11 takes its cue from the ubiquity of filmmaking in these cultural contexts, and Monk, Tattersall, and Santi focus on the history of the audio-visual archive of Padstow May Day in Cornwall over the last century and more up to the present, to consider how outsider filmmakers’ positionality can have impact far beyond their own relationship with the insiders whose heritage they seek to document, and how the changing nature of capturing archive presents opportunities for revoicing how it is shared and safeguarded. Finally, in Chapter

12 Semley and Hodsdon use stakeholder theory to analyse how event organisers across all three contexts can negotiate external forces – positive and negative – to retain ownership of their event while ensuring its continued resilience.

Part III offers two chapters by way of bringing together the preceding discussion and laying the foundation for future research. Chapter 13 takes the findings from the dataset from four European countries and extends it into two contrasting non-European contexts as a first step in applying the inquiry globally. In it, Ginoza, Te Maro, and Tweed reflect, in conversation with Hodsdon, on their own contexts of Okinawa (Japan) and Aotearoa (New Zealand) respectively – a conversation that suggests the themes and findings here have much to offer in other contexts beyond those from which the data were derived. Finally, in Chapter 14 the editors share examples of revoicing in practice from the case study contexts, reflect on the findings of this book both within and outside the ICHC, outline how revoicing can offer a practical, adaptive framework to safeguard ICH and advance positive social relations, and suggest the limitations and opportunities for future investigation and practice offered by the research that gave rise to this book.

## Note

- 1 Detail on the event case studies can be found in Appendix I, and on the methodology and dataset in Appendix II.

## References

- Akagawa N and Smith L (2019) *Safeguarding Intangible Heritage: Practices and Politics* London: Routledge
- Clopot C and McCullagh C (2020) ‘The construction of belonging and otherness in heritage events’ in Kockel U, Clopot C, Tjarve B and Nic Craith M (eds) *Heritage and Festivals in Europe: Performing Identities*: 45–62 London: Routledge
- Council of Europe (2016) ‘The scope of application of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities’ *Thematic Commentary* 4, 25 May 2016
- Crepaz K (2019) ‘Europeanization and the “regionalization” of national minority identity’ *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe* 18: 47–57
- Donaldson A (2006) ‘Performing regions: Territorial development and cultural politics in a Europe of the regions’ *Environment and Planning A* 38(11): 2075–2092
- Graham B, Ashworth G and Tunbridge J (2000) *A Geography of Heritage* London: Arnold
- Grote R (2006) ‘On the fringes of Europe: Europe’s largely forgotten indigenous peoples’ *American Indian Law Review* 31: 425–443
- Hafstein V (2015) ‘Learning to live with ICH: Diagnosis and treatment’ in Foster M and Gilman L (eds) *UNESCO on the Ground: Local Perspectives on Intangible Cultural Heritage*: 143–160 Bloomington: Indiana University Press
- Hafstein V (2018) *Making Intangible Heritage: El Condor Pasa and Other Stories from UNESCO* Bloomington: Indiana University Press
- Hall S (1999) ‘Whose heritage? Un-settling “the heritage”, re-imagining the post-nation’ *Third Text* 13: 3–13
- Hansen K (2004) ‘Festivals, spatiality and the new Europe’ *Ethnologia Europa* 32(2): 19–36

- Jackson Preece J (1998) *National Minorities and the European Nation-States System* Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett B (2004) 'Intangible heritage as metacultural production' *Museum International* 56(1–2): 163–174
- Kockel U, Nic Craith M, Clopot C and Tjarve B (2020) 'Heritages, identities and Europe' in Kockel U, Clopot C, Tjarve B and Nic Craith M (eds) *Heritage and Festivals in Europe: Performing Identities*: 1–17 London: Routledge
- Kuutma K (2013) 'Between arbitration and engineering: Concepts and contingencies in the shaping of heritage regimes' in Bendix R, Eggert A and Peselmann A (eds) *Heritage Regimes and the State*: 21–36 Göttingen: Göttingen University Press
- Macdonald S (2012) 'Presencing Europe's pasts' in Kockel U, Nic Craith M and Frykman J (eds) *A Companion to the Anthropology of Europe*: 231–252 London: Wiley
- Macdonald S (2013) *Memorylands* London: Routledge
- Molloy T (2013) 'Introduction' in Molloy T (ed) *Minority Issues in Europe: Rights, Concepts, Policy*: 13–24 Berlin: Frank & Timme
- Monk D, Browne F, Moseley R and Berry M (2019) *Ragdres Hwithrans Darlesor Gonis Poblek Kernewek Agwedh Onan – Studhyans Arhwilas Derivas | Cornish Public Service Broadcaster Research Project* Truro: Cornwall Council
- Moseley R (2013) "'It's a Wild Country. Wild ... Passionate ... Strange": Poldark and the place-image of Cornwall' *Visual Culture in Britain* 14: 218–237
- Munjeri D (2009) 'Following the length and breadth of the roots: Some dimensions of intangible heritage' in Smith L & Akagawa N (eds) *Intangible Heritage*: 131–150 London: Routledge
- Naidoo R and Littler J (2004) 'White past, multicultural present: Heritage and national stories' in Brocklehurst H and Phillips R (eds) *History, Identity and the Question of Britain*: 330–341 London: Macmillan
- Nic Craith M (2008) 'Intangible cultural heritages: The challenge for Europe' *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures* 17(1): 54–73
- Paasi A (2001) 'Europe as a social process and discourse: Considerations of place, boundaries and identity' *European Urban and Regional Studies* 8(1): 7–28
- Paasi A (2010) 'Regions are social constructs, but who or what "constructs" them? Agency in question' *Environment and Planning A* 42: 2296–2301
- Pfoser A (2018) 'Narratives of peripheralisation: Place, agency and generational cohorts in post-industrial Estonia' *European Urban and Regional Studies* 25: 391–404
- Picard D and Robinson M (eds) (2006) *Remaking Worlds: Festivals, Tourism and Social Change* Clevedon: Channel View Publications
- Plüschke-Altob B (2016) 'Rural as periphery per se? Unravelling the discursive node' *European Spatial Research and Policy* 13: 11–28
- Robertson I (ed) (2012) *Heritage from Below* Farnham: Ashgate
- Said E (1995) *Orientalism* London: Penguin
- Schreiber H (2019) 'Intangible cultural heritage, Europe, and the EU: Dangerous liaisons?' in Jakubowski A (ed) *Cultural Heritage in the European Union: A Critical Inquiry into Law and Policy*: 324–364 Leiden: Brill
- Smith L (2006) *The Uses of Heritage* London: Routledge
- Smith L (2015) 'Intangible heritage: A challenge to the authorised heritage discourse?' *Revista d'etnologia de Catalunya* 40: 133–142
- Stefano M, Davis P and Corsane G (eds) (2012) *Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage* Newcastle: Boydell Press

## 12 Revoicing Intangible Cultural Heritage

- Stefano M (2016) 'Critical heritage work: Public folklore in the United States' *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16(2): 585–587
- Stoczkowski W (2009) 'UNESCO's doctrine of human diversity: A secular soteriology?' *Anthropology Today* 25: 7–11
- Šuvcāne B and Ernštreits V (2018) 'Chasing Livonian heritage on the Livonian Coast' *Eesti Ja Soome-Ugri Keeleteaduse Ajakiri. Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics* 9: 109–128
- Tauschek M (2011) 'Reflections on the metacultural nature of intangible cultural heritage' *Journal of Ethnology and Folkloristics* 5(2): 49–46
- Waterton E (2010) *Politics, Policy and the Discourses of Heritage in Britain* London: Macmillan
- Whitehead C, Daugbjerg M, Eckersley S and Bozoğlu G (2020) 'Dimensions of European heritage and memory: A framework Introduction' in Whitehead C, Eckersley S, Daugbjerg M and Bozoğlu G (eds) *Dimensions of Heritage and Memory: Multiple Europes and the Politics of Crisis*: 1–25 London: Routledge
- Whitehead C, Eckersley S, Daugbjerg M and Bozoğlu G (eds) (2020) *Dimensions of Heritage and Memory: Multiple Europes and the Politics of Crisis* London: Routledge
- Willett J (2020) 'Challenging peripheralising discourses: Using evolutionary economic geography and complex systems theory to connect new regional knowledges within the periphery' *Journal of Rural Studies* 73: 87–96
- Xanthaki A (2019) 'The cultural heritage of minorities and indigenous peoples in the EU: Weaknesses or opportunities?' in Jakubowski A, Hausler K and Fiorentini F (eds) *Cultural Heritage in the European Union*: 269–293 Leiden: Brill
- Zito A, Eckersley S and Turner S (2020) 'The instruments of European heritage' in Whitehead C, Eckersley S, Daugbjerg M and Bozoğlu G (eds) *Dimensions of Heritage and Memory: Multiple Europes and the Politics of Crisis*: 50–71 London: Routledge