

## 9 Taking up space

### Physical and affective geographies of intangible cultural heritage events

*Lucy Frears and Laura Hodsdon*

Cornwall, in the far south-west of Great Britain, is only seven miles wide at its narrowest point. Surrounded on three sides by the sea, it has among the lowest permanent population densities of the UK (Office for National Statistics 2021), and much of the region is served by a single main road. Historically, its main industries were fishing and mining; today, despite having towns and a city, Cornwall is marketed to tourists with a romanticised vision of its rural and coastal remoteness. Traditional industries would likely have left the landscape empty: with miners underground (though with ‘balmaidens’ smashing stones above ground) and fishermen at sea, there must have been a spaciousness, a lack of visible ‘busy-ness’ (Tuan [1977] 2008: 61). Yet the number of visitors in peak season clashes with the marketed image of quiet rurality that draws to some extent on this historic imaginary. Small fishing villages frequented by tourists easily become blocked by traffic. A boom in holiday rentals, plus an increase in new permanent and temporary residents, has resulted in many local people priced out of their town centres, previously the locus of the community (Duignan 2019). As Tuan observes, ‘ample space is not always experienced as spaciousness’ ([1977] 2008: 51), and ‘for everyone a point is reached when the feeling of spaciousness yields to its opposite – crowding’ (Tuan [1977] 2008: 59). The issue of space, clearly, figures prominently in the region’s social dynamics. In the context of its intangible cultural heritage (ICH), crowds have traditionally been essential for the liveliness of annual gatherings: the place to meet with extended family, to cook and have an open house, to meet new people, perhaps future partners (Frears 2010). In the present day, too, cultural events are widely acknowledged to be an opportunity to build community (e.g. Duffy & Mair 2014; Arcodia & Whitford 2006) to the extent that they are the annual focal point for many local people. But of course, alongside increased tourism and other demographic changes, it is not only the local community celebrating, as may have been traditionally the case. Known and unknown participants must share space and see each other close-up. Just as there are tensions between insiders and outsiders in Cornwall as a whole, these events offer ‘an arena where negotiation is forced upon us’ (Massey 2007: 154).

In this chapter, we consider the way space functions at two ICH events in Cornwall: both as microcosm of, and reaction to, the spatial relations that are enacted and negotiated within Cornwall’s wider socio-cultural landscape. We understand

space as socially constructed – that is, that ‘meaning is invoked in space through the practice of people who act according to their interpretations of space, which, in turn, gives their actions meaning’ (Cresswell 1996: 17). We use concepts of space and place together, and following Massey we consider ‘space as the product of interrelations; as constituted through interactions [...] as the sphere of the possibility of the existence of multiplicity [and] therefore of coexisting heterogeneity, [and] as always under construction’ (Massey 2007: 9). This heterogeneity constitutes the ‘throwntogetherness’ of place (Massey 2007: 140). At ICH events attended by all from insider to outsider, there is a ‘*practising* of place’ characterised by ‘the negotiation of intersecting trajectories’ (Massey 2007: 154, emphasis in original), in which ‘imaginings of space and place are both an element of and a stake *in* those negotiations’ (Massey 2007: 155, emphasis in original). Given these intertwining understandings – that people’s meanings affect space, and space affects people’s meanings – we consider how space constructs and is constructed by the interactions between insiders and outsiders at ICH events.

We focus on two events in Cornwall, UK: Padstow May Day, a centuries-old tradition in which people process through the streets behind costumed ‘Oss’ figures; and Golowan, a revived Midsummer festival in Penzance. Both events involve extensive use of public space, with the towns themselves providing a ‘stage’ as much as a backdrop for the activities, as will be explored in more detail below. On May Day, Padstonians walk, dance, play drums and accordions and sing while processing through the town’s streets with the Osses that come out of their ‘stables’ (two buildings co-opted for the occasion). ‘Mayers’ can be differentiated from spectators by wearing white trousers and shirt with neckerchiefs and ribbons in their party’s red or blue colours. Mazey Day is the main day within the week-long festival of Golowan. Local schoolchildren make costumes, ‘images’ (gigantic papier mâché creations that are carried on floats or the shoulders of those processing), banners and flags, and process them through the streets; and at other times participants form a skipping and hopping human chain to perform the ‘Serpent Dance’. We consider the events as examples of ICH events in Cornwall to explore how physical and affective space mediates insider–outsider relations within its socio-cultural landscape. In keeping with our lens that takes people and space as mutually constitutive, first we consider *Town as stage*: the performance space itself as a site in which the event takes place and across which people move and interact. Second, *People as actors*: the embodied space as taken up and experienced by individuals within the broader flows of people and activities.

### **Town as stage**

In this section we focus on how the event space is shaped by the physical features of the town. The interplay between the tangible, physical geography and the intangible performance of the event is, as this analysis will show, of paramount importance. As one interviewee put it: ‘Golowan is the festival of Penzance, so you couldn’t transpose it, and make Golowan happen somewhere else’ (K78). Indeed, the events are so rooted in place that, for some, the identities they express

are synonymous not with a broader imagined community of Cornish culture, but a community of place comprising those local to the town: ‘it’s a Padstow thing, not a Cornish thing’ (K85) (this may also be imbricated with a more local-level community of ancestry – see Moenandar, Moran-Nae & Hodsdon in this volume for different notions of community).

### *Town as inclusive*

As these interviewees suggest, the town plays a distinctive role in the events, shaping behaviour, and as setting, stage, and scene. The town has the potential both to co-create the event’s action and to provide a backdrop through which individuals can affectively experience it. Place and event develop around and within each other, as one Penzance local who moved to the town as an adult put it: ‘you’ve got such an incredible infrastructure here with these ancient granite port walls [...] it’s an absolutely amazing place to have a festival, it’s almost like the town was designed around the festival’ (K70). For some, the town’s physical infrastructure plays an active role in creating an immersive experience. Accordions and fiddles can be heard, drums boom – the invitation to people to participate is amplified (Duffy 2000), and participants can hear ‘the sound of Mazey Day just, like, reverberating around – that’s really cool’ (K83). In Padstow, too, the buildings’ sonic effect becomes an intangible feature reflecting the event back on itself: ‘we do have that nice compact town, with narrow streets, where the drums echo, and we can [...] all assemble in a big square’ such that, likewise, ‘it would be difficult to try and transplant that to somewhere else’ (K87). This rootedness in place reinforces for some a diachronic, as well as synchronic, link and sense of immersion. One interviewee who moved to Penzance as an adult pointed to the Cornish etymology of ‘Penzance’ – *Pennsans*, ‘holy headland’ – as evoking both spatial and spiritual connections, and vividly sketched the spatial relation of the processional route in relation to the town and its surrounding landscape:

the harbour and Chapel Street is such an ancient route that goes straight up to Madron, up onto the moors, up to the [prehistoric standing] stones. That processional route that we go up and down is being used for thousands of years.  
(K82)

Similarly, for the same respondent, landmarks within the town are associated with past communities: ‘The Turk’s Head, people have been using that pub and that road for at least a thousand years’, which is clearly anchored in personal meaning and experience. Here, an anchoring to place via heritage is established not via the individual’s own ancestry but rather via a personal, affectively and intellectually forged connection with the place itself.

The event offers an opportunity for intergenerational transmission on a shorter timespan, too. At both events, for many of those we spoke to participation seemed to forge a deeper connection with the place and its history. One Penzance local spoke about ‘All the children having a chance to process down the street. It’s almost like

an initiation [into] being a citizen of Penzance [...] People feel pride in it and feel very much that it is their festival' (K78). This in turn leads to the inextricable relationship between the place itself and the people's participation: 'Because there are so many ways in which people are involved, it's like, it's not like a festival that happens in Penzance, it's a Penzance festival' (K78). Interestingly, while ICH as 'transmitted from generation to generation' is an integral aspect of UNESCO's definition in the 2003 ICH Convention (ICHC), the sorts of transmission observed here in Penzance – which can just as fully be experienced by a recent resident newcomer, especially should they happen to have school-age children – implicitly fall outside of the notion that there is a definable group of culture bearers defined by intergenerational transmission. This aligns with a notion of ICH communities of place at its most literal and therefore at their most inclusive (see Moenandar, Moran-Nae & Hodsdon, this volume).

### *Town as exclusive*

Conversely, however, the slim streets and inclines of ancient towns like Penzance and Padstow – compared to the large, flat fields at music festivals, for example – can create restrictions. Some participants at Mazey Day felt that these physical barriers could restrict disabled access, exacerbate crowds, and limit access to seating and facilities. Although crowds were tolerated by some ('it's lovely to see the town busy, because you never see it like this' (K62)), they were one of the most prominent negative sentiments we encountered: 'I guess it's just the amount of people, trying to get through' (K32). For performers, too, this can have direct impact – such as for one Mayer who described being unable to operate the bellows on their accordion due to a crowd (K86). As we noted above, the gathering of many people is the defining feature of events such as these – and indeed, intrinsic to the very existence of ICH itself are the people to perform it. But ironically, the physical, practical constraints are a convincing rationale for limiting participation and attendance; indeed, as UNESCO has noted, in ICH contexts tourists are increasingly participating in festive events, and while there may be positive aspects to tourist involvement, the festivals often suffer (Convention Article 2: Definitions).

The physical space can also place limits on the event's content itself. The papier mâché images carried in the Mazey Day procession, key to displaying the creativity and shared labour of local participants, are increasingly colossal, meaning that since 'our streets are quite narrow [...] there are lots of things to negotiate in terms of how wide the processional images can be' (K79). With significant numbers of spectators and little or no signage (again, contrary to an event such as a music festival that is not spatially anchored), crowding is a logistical as well as a perceptual issue. Organisers have to adapt to work with available space, despite increasing spectator numbers. As argued above, to move an event from the specific locality because of overcrowding would render it wholly transformed, no longer the same event. And indeed, spatial restriction can spark creativity, influencing the form of the images, for example. The physical town – again operating as a co-creator – has

also led to the proactive creation of smaller events within the main event, such as a music stage or funfair, which help disperse and distract crowds.

While on one hand these smaller (often static, rather than processional) activities offer a greater range of opportunities for engagement, conversely some are not publicised and are thereby explicitly or, more usually implicitly, restricted (see Hodsdon, Ozoliņa & Zijlstra, this volume, on outsiders' navigation of these 'rules' of inclusion or exclusion). The town's spatial restrictions create an opportunity for smaller, more spontaneous acts and agency by insiders who leverage local connections, or benefit from their more intimate knowledge of the affordances of the space. Crucially, at Golowan this has inevitable implications for who is able to participate in them, despite the stated inclusiveness of the event, since

there is a sense, when there's tens of thousands of people who descend on your town to have a nice day out, there are certain things which you'd like to not publicise, so there aren't tens of thousands of people observing something that is more participatory.

(K78)

While many elements of Mazey Day are marked in the event programme, other elements are not advertised or are described only vaguely in terms of time and place, since 'It shouldn't all be in the programme [...] it's part of the magic. You shouldn't know everything that's going on' (K84). In Padstow, where there is no programme, spectators eager to know what's happening reveal themselves as outsiders: 'I've had people ask, when I'm going around collecting, "oh are you doing this or that..." If you've got to ask, then you're not going to know' (K85).

In their towns, then, insiders take control of space – and as such claim a certain power – for the day. They access information through connections, or hints that can lead them to key moments: 'you kind of know where things are happening, or something's about to happen because the people who are on the inside who are doing it will suddenly disappear down an alleyway or, or start moving in a certain direction' (K79). Part of participating as an insider is being able to read the signs in the crowd and work out a route spontaneously: knowing which 'little ginnels, hops, alleyways' (K80) to slip down to get around a knot of people. Visitors or incomers with less knowledge have to search for other clues, as one of our field notes from May Day describes:

There is a fairly large crowd gathered and an anticipatory atmosphere, people unmistakeably watching for something – so I join it. We can hear, quite faintly, the drums [...] I wait for about 10 minutes, and nothing changes. Then with no apparent sign, the crowd disperses. I [follow two people in white] and find I'm in a flowing crowd [...]. Another crossroads where there is another crowd waiting, standing expectantly. Finally the Red Oss party comes down the hill, and I can hear the accordions and see the procession.

(Field notes)

People thus have different spatial experiences depending on the extent of their insiderness. This results in ‘parallel’ event experiences: one for outsiders who may have difficulty navigating the space without the maps and guidance in a programme; and one for insiders whose intimate knowledge and connections mean that they can use the spatial limitations as an affordance to create, often spontaneously, the event for themselves without ever being explicit about who such activities are for.

There are implications here, too, for conceptions of public versus private space. The empowering effects of becoming ‘protagonists of [one’s] society’ by processing in public (Shevstova cit. Abercrombie & Longhurst 1998: 57), can have unintended consequences. On one hand the local, inward-oriented focus (as one Padstow insider put it, ‘we just want it to be just us’ (K88)), integral to the intended audience of insiders, can function to frame the town conceptually as temporarily quasi-private. But although May Day is, as described by another Padstonian, ‘something private that takes place in public’ (K85), this public-ness by definition removes physical, legal, or social barriers to entry, such as property boundaries, or pay-point gates. Town businesses, which, according to Padstonians (K87, K88), are now rarely owned by locals, seek to attract outsiders by ‘selling’ May Day as a visitor attraction within a host–guest tourism paradigm (see Hodsdon & Moenandar, this volume), to which many local people do not subscribe. The implication is that anyone is free to attend and move around; but, in reality, outsider spectators are not considered, by Padstonians, to be part of May Day or, indeed, necessarily welcome. The event spaces that visitors encounter are disorientingly, for them, *unlike* a touristscape, where

Space is organized to encourage a performative disposition to gaze upon such spectacles and scenes through visual consumption by various techniques such as the positioning of key features at the end of uncluttered passages, and the siting of information boards and markers, and the installing of benches at preferred spots, or even the injunctions inscribed on signs that recommend photographs be taken.

(Edensor 2007: 208)

The event site may be perceived, then, *simultaneously* as quasi-private by insiders but fully public by outsiders. The towns shape how the events develop, but their affordances can – either inherently or by design – exclude visitors or fail to accommodate their needs.

### *The town turned upside down? Repurposing and reshaping physical space*

The malleability (or not) of existing infrastructure in shaping and delimiting content and participation is mirrored (and perhaps reinforced) by a repurposing of that infrastructure that creates an illusory, ambiguous state. In both cases, the familiar towns undergo a transformation: greenery is cut in the early morning and already decorates lamp-posts and railings by the time many people emerge – de-urbanising the space and creating unfamiliar place-markers. Colourful flags line the streets.

The day is clearly a special day: the boundaries, meaning, and power dynamics of place have shifted, even if this only lasts until the leaves of cut branches wilt. The town, now a performance space, flexes during the event so that it ‘overlay[s] physical space, making symbolic use of its objects’ (Lefebvre 1991: 39). Roads are blocked off; crowds replace traffic; shops expand onto pavements; funfairs and marquees take over car parks. Markers within the space are repurposed: a former shop becomes an exhibition space; a statue of Penzance innovator, Humphry Davy, is dressed up; bollards, moorings, and walls become seats.

Space is also reclaimed from those who often take up or take over space. This reclamation might be over antisocial ‘others’, so that on event day for one Penzance local ‘it’s like it’s everybody’s space again, you know? [...] the idea that we could all share that space and be happy together again’ (K77). Or it might be over the usual hierarchy of traffic: people are prioritised over cars for the day, which can have not only a practical effect but an affective one in which the identification with place is consolidated and reinforces the sense that, for a Penzance local who moved there as an adult, ‘this is our town, this is our streets...’ (K66). Recasting space can also create a fantasy vision in which the town is a perfect version of itself, since ‘when you go through Penzance sometimes, it feels like it’s derelict. And we use that space at Golowan to celebrate our community and it doesn’t feel derelict at all. It feels magnificent. It feels vibrant, interesting’ (K77). This renegotiation of space can lead to an illusory impression that the transformation will continue to exert influence over the everyday world. Next day, the temporary rules are no longer valid, potentially leading to disorientation, when for one Padstonian, ‘quite literally, there is no distinction between road, non-road’ with the consequence that ‘quite often [...] afterwards, I have to be careful crossing roads because I literally forget that cars will not just stop for you’ (K85). Although certain markers of the day, such as colourful flags in Penzance, now stay up for months, most disappear quickly. While there are elements of carnival (especially at Golowan such as the ‘mock mayor’ election) that speak to possibilities for redrawing the social order, in these contexts the implications for social change seem to be manifest, rather, in the profound importance and value of the event in participants’ socio-cultural lives.

### **People as actors**

How individuals interact with space – and other people in that space – is, as we have just seen, intrinsically linked to their understanding of themselves and their positionality within it. Although, as we showed above, the physical features of the towns are intrinsic to the performance of the events, as Massey notes,

what is special about place is not some romance of a pre-given collective identity or the eternity of the hills. Rather, what is special about place is precisely that throwntogetherness, the unavoidable challenge of negotiating here-and-now [...] a negotiation which must take place within and between both human and nonhuman.

(Massey 2007: 140–141)



And indeed, our data suggest that these events perform the important function of providing space to reforge fragile connections when ‘it’s nice to bump into people you haven’t seen [...] ‘cos the only time you see them is once a year at this place’ (K41). One Padstow interviewee views this explicitly in the context of the wider social change that has fractured the sense of community:

...it’s a time when I connect with a community [...] that I genuinely don’t see elsewhere throughout the year because Padstow’s a community that’s been very hollowed out by economic and social changes and May Day is the time when that community exists and probably the only time it exists now, so it’s very significant to me.

(K87)

Gathering together physically in the same space is a human need (Duffy & Mair 2021), and ‘the impacts of this togetherness are almost immeasurable’ (Duffy & Mair 2021: 18). This impact is cemented by annual repetition – a feature that, as Hobsbawm & Ranger (1983) describe, plays a vital role in establishing, or implying, a link to the past, where one might think of lost friends and relatives and ‘hear their voices still when I go to things like Golowan’ (K77), affirming a diachronic community linking present practice to past generations. Notably, this intergenerational link has been firmly established at Golowan even though the event has only had the time of one generation (being revived in 1991) to embed itself in the socio-cultural fabric of the town. This association can also lead to different relationships with the physical landscape as the event is performed: one Padstonian (K85) described going to the town cemetery the day before May Day to ‘Put ribbons on the graves, flowers on the graves, drinks poured on the graves’. Not only does this practice continually remake connections with community members across as well as within time, it enables the individual to see themselves within that continuum, an eternal link to place and community enacted directly via the event: ‘I’ve already got a plot there [...] Not so much being remembered, but I’m still taking part’. This spirit is embedded in the more formal acts, but the celebration also creates space and time for small spontaneous moments that hold deep significance for individuals. One Padstonian described ‘an older guy who’s gone downhill’ to whom they were ‘able to bring the Obby Oss across to him, and I was able to see his face, and I was able to see his eyes widen and I was able to watch him clamber out of his wheelchair to stand up and hold the club – and that’s what May Day is, that’s what May Day means’ (K87).

This and other similar comments suggest that it would be hard to overstate the social and cultural importance of the events for those who celebrate them. This importance and local pride on the day of the event is manifested by insider bodies physically taking up space. Padstonians – clearly demarcated by their bright, white clothes – walking into town seemed, as one of us wrote in our field notes, ‘to carry themselves so that they are wider, taller, take more space and stride so that it’s clear who gets out of the way – us! Chests up, shoulders out, smart hair and flower, confident stride’ (Field notes). This observation is borne out by the way in



which interview respondents from Padstow described their experiences of space on the day, embodying the shift in power relations that the co-opting of public streets usually thronging with tourists enables:

I think when I walk around Padstow on May Day, I might feel like I own it. When I walk around Padstow in the middle of the summer, I feel like, I don't know where I am, I could be anywhere, but yeah, when we play those drums and we walk out of the Institute, it's ours, and it's not ours the other 364 days of the year [...] We don't own the roads, but for that day we do, and we don't own the town, or holiday homes or the pubs anymore, but we can stand there on May Day and we can stand around the maypole and it feels like we are in the right place: it's ours again.

(K87)

This statement vividly depicts the inextricable relation of the ICH felt as a microcosm of the wider social dynamics of place, where here – at least in the present moment, in 'the right place' – there is power to counter them. Similarly, one respondent from Penzance found that the embodied experience of the procession had a comparable effect: 'I think there's something in that idea of procession that is maybe about claiming your space, [...] claiming's not the right word, but maybe asserting your existence in this place, in this moment, as a community' (K78). On event days, the power relation at the level of the individual body between the local and the visitor, the temporary and new resident, is flipped. Local insiders take up space, assert their existence, reclaim and dominate space.

However, although insiders' spatial interaction undergoes a clear shift on the day, this new spatial landscape may not even be noticed by first time visitors. The lack of familiarity with regular place-markers may leave those unfamiliar with the town with no means of orienting themselves as to the shift in power dynamics between insiders and outsiders: 'It hasn't given me a huge insight into Cornish culture at all, it's just people dressed-up doing weird stuff, but it's great' (K52). Outsiders, even those aware of their positionality, still felt as though they were a part of the event. Tourists interviewed at the events often related embodied engagement with the culture: being moved by singing, drums and accordions, or literally consuming it – eating and drinking pasties or cider, traditional Cornish fare (and, of course, another form of ICH). This lack of awareness of the temporary redrawing of spatial boundaries can result in misalignment between the festival and non-festival planes, leading to dissonant, and potentially contested, spatial dynamics between those participating and those not, who may end up actively disrupting the event. One interviewee described jostling for space with a 'large black Land Rover' – a vehicle that often symbolises tourists in local parlance – attempting to make its way along the street in Padstow during May Day, and admits, 'I did put my pint on the bonnet because I thought what they were doing was gauche [...]. I don't think what they were doing was polite or in the spirit of the festival' (K91). How the 'perpetrator', the driver in this case, reacts to the spatial dissonance they have caused can in turn further affect the dynamic between the

participants and outsiders who have not adapted to the spatial rules of the day. This perhaps stands as a metaphor for the wider spatial struggles within the physical and social confines of Cornwall. Precisely the same dynamic was observed at the Livonian Festival in Latvia. A driver seemed oblivious to the speeches taking place and only reluctantly switched off his engine when the road was literally blocked by the bodies of the participants (Field notes). Crowds of outsiders not knowing how to behave during events – again, manifesting the co-existence of separate planes of experience in the same time and space – can increase tension as their behaviour may practically interfere with key elements of the event. For one Padstow interviewee, as mentioned above, it is ‘annoying’ when the streets are so crowded that ‘the accordions to have problems to actually play’ (K86). How bodies negotiate with each other, as well as with the confines and affordances of the space itself, can thus be read as a reflection of broader power dynamics taking place at a societal level around spatial, ‘economic and political encroachment’ (Taylor 2016: 153). There is a perpetual ‘jostle’ between insiders and outsiders as they seek to define and claim their spaces. Massey describes the ‘continuing daily negotiations and struggles, sometimes quiet and persistent, sometimes more forceful, through which day in and day out these spaces are produced’ (2007: 152).

Negotiation of insider and outsider space is not always a struggle. It can involve accepting an invitation to share space, although important in this is acknowledgement of one’s own outsidership and the implications that it has on participation. One holiday homeowner in Padstow described acting according to a self-reflective awareness of their positionality both on the day and as linked to the broader socio-cultural dynamics:

We always try and stay on the periphery and not get too close, because it’s such a special day for the people, and whilst it does attract a lot of visitors I think you have to be mindful of the importance of it, because it goes back hundreds of years.

(K13)

However, gauging one’s place in these dynamics and how they link to desirable behaviour can be hard to judge (see Hodsdon, Ozoliņa & Zijlstra, this volume), as one of us described in our field notes from the Livonian Festival:

I heard singing and stepped behind some stalls to find Livonian people dancing in a circle. Onlookers, especially children, were being urged to join in by gesturing arms. I really wanted to join in too: but was it culturally appropriate? I was grabbed by a couple of dancers who broke the circle to pull me in. Holding hands we laughed as I tried to pick up the steps from them. Allowed to participate I experienced, through my body, this threatened culture’s liveness.

(Field notes)

Sometimes such decisions are more actively required. When the Serpent Dance moves through the street at Golowan, one has two choices to make: to get out of the way of the long snake of linked dancing people, or ‘grab someone’s hand and hold on’ (K82). Some onlookers fail to make either of these choices, potentially resulting in being literally pushed out of the way:

Some years when I’ve done the Serpent Dance, there’s some person standing in the middle of the road with a camera and it’s like, duh, there’s 500 people running towards you: get out of the way. I’ve had people sat in the middle of the road with the Serpent Dance coming right for them. I’ve gone, “time to move” and they’ve said “we’re not moving” and it’s like, well you’re going to get trampled on. I did make a point of trampling on them.

(K82)

Similarly, a Mayer describes being able to ‘walk in a straight line through a crowd and know that everyone will move out of the way [...] I’m just going to walk through you otherwise, which people aren’t used to’ (K85). Crowded small spaces and the more or less conscious taking over of the spatial landscape can cause tension and dominant, even aggressive, body language and forceful interactions that are not normally acceptable. Bodies in space can thus reflect the agency and empowerment represented, albeit temporarily, by the event taking over the town.

### **Spatial negotiations**

Space, then, plays an important role in the performance of these ICH events. Its significance for insiders can be profound in the context of the everyday spatial tensions that are a feature of the socio-cultural landscape in Cornwall. Here, the carnivalesque opportunity to subvert norms for the duration of the event provides the impetus for insiders to physically take up space in their town and thus feel empowered, even if only temporarily. It also provides a space to make a distinctive intangible culture visible by placing it centre stage for a day. The physical features of the town provide the performance space to shape the event and help it to become indelibly linked with that particular place. In turn, the event is interwoven, literally and figuratively, into the town’s physical and affective fabric and thus works with the familiarity of the town as stage to underline the importance and significance of the day.

And yet, as the potential for space to act as a mechanism of exclusion, as described above, indicates, this act of reclaiming may not be perceived as such by those whom it seemingly has the potential temporarily to disempower. Although the celebration is experienced and navigated by outsiders and insiders in often contrasting and disjointed ways, there are equally varied experiences of connectedness that many people experience in the space where local tradition thrives. The embodiedness of this drawing together can be profound, as one Padstow visitor described their experience of the day as one that ‘wraps in and around you – it wraps all around you’ (K5). And crucially this participation is not necessarily contested

by insiders, who expressed concern over space chiefly when it has the potential physically to stop them performing as they wish – and indeed sometimes stated their openness to any bodies in the space joining in the performance of it:

.... you get a lot of people with flowers in their hair and stuff, and I don't really mind them, as long as they join in; it's when they just sit on the pavements and get in the way, then that's a bit annoying. On the whole, if you join in, then why not.

(K88)

Likewise, a Golowan insider talked about feeling 'pride that people that don't consider themselves Cornish are doing Cornish stuff', explaining that this was important because it is a means of 'bringing us all together. [...] They are part of the Cornish community then, and that that's hugely important to me' (K77). Although dress and body language can identify who is an insider participant and who is not, there are few strictly drawn boundaries between insider and outsider other than those quasi-sacred spaces related to the ritual elements of the respective Osses.

These overlapping but not congruent spatial experiences of the same event have the potential to create dissonance between how insiders and outsiders engage with, understand, and experience the event. In part, this results in constant negotiation of what is and should be accessible to whom. Insiders we spoke to were by and large inclined towards inclusion, but at the same time must balance this with the need to enforce their own sense of belonging, by definition excluding others. As they do so, spatial demarcations – between us and them; here and there; in and out – constantly shift. This negotiation can create intermediary positions (such as not quite private/not quite public; not quite in/not quite out) which undermine the very binary they need to establish their identity. So these ambiguities may also simply result in the event being perceived and experienced differently – in content, in movement, in affect – shaped by existing relationships with space, place, and each other. Space, then, is always negotiated – potentially contested, but open to collective construction and potential redrawing of boundaries. Greater awareness of who is in what space, and what their position is within it, is an important element in this negotiation. UNESCO has warned of festival popularity and overcrowding on a global level, and indeed the irony of ICH designation being a threat rather than source of resilience has been noted (e.g. Hafstein 2018). Taylor suggests that to protect ICH worldwide, organisations such as UNESCO must address 'problems of economic and political encroachment or appropriation of cultural practices by others, as well as the loss of the lands, objects, and traditions, and jobs that in turn lead to the migration of the younger generations' (2016: 153). But looking beyond the ICHC might prompt a more holistic response. Such a scenario as Taylor describes is clearly applicable to Cornwall as well as other rural regions where tourism is replacing traditional industries; the resultant broader conditions for resilience that may threaten these place-based practices of ICH are clearly manifest. Examples we have explored in this chapter suggest that conceptions of 'tourists' versus locals, and of an easy distinction between those whose cultural practices they are and

‘others’ is inadequate to conceptualise the way space is inhabited and interacted with at an ICH event, given the prominent and nuanced role that place – and emergent communities of place linked to it – plays in shaping the events and the way that people behave within it. Instead, the opportunities that this plurality presents for resilience and greater majority awareness can also be viewed as positive (Smith & Forest 2006: 139). Events can help connect the people in a place – whether people with historic links to a place, long-term and temporary residents, holiday home-owners, or tourists – simply through sharing and respecting the event and space. The power reversal may be temporary, the festive space may be illusory, and experiences may be incongruent. Ethical participation entails a self-reflectiveness that these events take place in a shared space, but one to which others may have more claim. As such, taking up space becomes a negotiation in which performance rather than identity becomes key. Insider–outsider relations become not so much about *where* one should be, or where one can go, but *how*.

## References

- Abercrombie N and Longhurst B (1998) *Audiences* London: Sage
- Arcodia C and Whitford M (2006) ‘Festival attendance and the development of social capital’ *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism* 8(2): 1–18
- Cresswell T (1996) *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
- Duffy M (2000) ‘Lines of drift: Festival participation and performing a sense of place’ *Popular Music* 19: 51–64
- Duffy M and Mair J (2014) ‘Festivals and sense of community: An Australia case study’ in Jepson A & Clarke A (eds) *Routledge Advances in Events Research*: 54–65 London: Routledge
- Duignan M (2019) ‘London’s local Olympic legacy: Small business displacement, “Clone Town” effect and the production of “Urban Blandscapes”’ *Journal of Place Management and Development* 12(2): 142–163
- Edensor T (2007) ‘Mundane mobilities, performances and spaces of tourism’ *Social and Cultural Geography* 8(2): 199–215
- Frears L (2010) *Churks, Clidgy & Doodle-Dashers. Hayle Tales and Trails* Hayle: Hayle Oral History Project & Hayle Community Archive
- Hafstein V (2018) *Making Intangible Heritage: El Condor Pasa and Other Stories from UNESCO* Bloomington: Indiana University Press
- Hobsbawm E and Ranger T (eds) ([1983] 2012) *The Invention of Tradition* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Lefebvre H (1991) *The Production of Space* Oxford: Blackwell
- Massey D ([2005] 2007) *for space* London: Sage
- Office for National Statistics (2021) *How Life has Changed in Cornwall: Census 2021* Office for National Statistics
- Smith M and Forest K (2006) ‘Enhancing vitality or compromising integrity? Festivals, tourism and the complexities of performing culture’ in Picard D and Robinson M (eds) *Festivals, Tourism and Social Change: Remaking Worlds*: 133–151 Bristol: Channel View
- Taylor D (2016) ‘Saving the “live”? Re-performance and intangible cultural heritage’ *Études Anglaises* 69(2): 149–161
- Tuan Y ([1977] 2008) *Space and Place* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press



# Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>