Making place, resisting displacement:
conflicting national and local identities in Scotland

Siân Jones

> The so-called homogeneity of 'Britishness' as a national culture has been considerably exaggerated. It was always contested by the Scots, Welsh and Irish; challenged by rival local and regional alliances; and cross-cut by class, gender and generation.
>
> (Hall 2000: 217)

Introduction:

In recent years, many commentators have stressed that cultural diversity and immigration are integral features of British history (e.g. see Hall 2000; Kushner 1992; Merriman 1997; Ramdin 1999; Walker 1997). Furthermore, 'four nations' histories of 'the Isles' have highlighted the fault lines of an internally divided series of cultures, which are emphatically hybrid and riddled with conflict (Samuel 1998). Nevertheless, the cultural fault lines that lie *within and across* the imagined national cultures making up the British Isles tend to be ignored or smoothed over in the context of museums and the presentation of archaeological and architectural heritage. Discourses of national heritage routinely focus on normative cultures which are presented as contained, coherent and homogeneous in essence (see Handler 1988; McCrone 2002), and Britain is no exception (Kushner 1992, Hooper-Greenhill *et al.* 1997). Admittedly, the 'Celtic margins' have been portrayed as a locus of cultural and racial difference in opposition to an English core lying at the heart of Britishness (Norquay and Smyth 2002; Harvey *et al.* 2002). But this tension has in turn often been associated with an emphasis on smaller-scale, normative, Scottish, Welsh, English and Irish national cultures (e.g. for Scotland see Cooke and McLean 2001; McCrone *et al.* 1995); a tendency that devolution threatens to enhance. *Within* these imagined national entities, cultural difference is almost always situated in relation to 'minority-"non-white"-immigrant' communities, with the 'majority-white-indigenous' population regarded as culturally homogeneous and unproblematic in this respect (Hesse 2000: 10; see also Hall 2000). Not surprisingly, strategies of social inclusion, which play a key role in the contemporary political discourse and social policy of New Labour, tend to mirror this dichotomy in the sphere of heritage and museums. Cultural difference is seen as a basis for exclusion and alienation amongst ethnic minorities, but amongst the majority 'white' population exclusion and marginality is attributed to economic depravation or physical factors, such as ill-health and disability (Sandell 2002: 3). The result of these combined strategies is that a core underlying homogeneous national heritage is maintained, with the 'problem' of cultural difference located either at national boundaries, or in terms of 'non-white', post-1945 immigrant multicultural heritage.[1] Thus, Britishness (and increasingly, in the context of devolution,

---

[1] Such an approach is starkly exhibited, for instance, by English Heritage's (2000) MORI-based survey, *Power of Place: the future of the historic environment.* Here statements concerning social exclusion and inclusion, broadening audiences and widening understanding, are almost entirely supported by reference to the 'MORI Ethnic Minority Focus Group' and not the main MORI survey with the implication that difference and marginalisation are absent from the latter constituency. Problematically, however, the dichotomy between core national normative culture and minority 'non-white' cultures is also perpetuated by the gulf between scholarly studies of 'four-nations' and 'multicultural' history. Indeed this gulf was also evident at the *British Island Stories* conference which

Englishness, Scottishness and so forth) is 'the empty signifier, the norm, against which "difference" (ethnicity) is measured' (Hall 2000: 221).

This distinction between 'majority-white-indigenous' heritage (whether conceived in terms of a single (British) national culture or four separate (Scots, Irish, English and Welsh) national cultures) and 'minority-'non-white'-immigrant' heritages is problematic in a number of respects. It allows multiculturalism and cultural difference to be situated outside of the constructed core of these normative national cultures. Thus, in the sphere of heritage and museums, cultural difference is largely addressed through 'social inclusion' strategies focusing on how to incorporate 'non-white' cultures into existing national spaces without fundamental disruption of existing heritage narratives.[2] At the same time, the denial of cultural difference at the heart of the imagined national cultures of the British Isles, and the explanation of tensions or fault lines in terms of economic (and sometimes social) disadvantage, enables the authority and stewardship of national heritage organisations to remain unchallenged at heart. Above all, the distinction prevents connections being made between the historical conditions of production of these spheres of heritage, which are artificially divorced from one another.[3] Historical processes, such as colonialism, agrarian reform and industrial revolution, population displacement, and the fragmentation of communities, as well as discourses of 'race', 'improvement' and 'civilisation', are central to both spheres. However, such politically and ideologically laden issues tend to be written out of mainstream heritage management and presentation. Furthermore, whilst they are sometimes addressed in the sphere of multicultural heritage, there is a tendency to simply celebrate cultural difference rather than risk disrupting mainstream national narratives through the introduction of subject matter which demands recognition of relationships of power (see Kushner 1992: 5-6; Hooper-Greenhill 1997: 9).

In this chapter I intend to question the notion of a contained and homogenous 'majority-white-indigenous' cultural heritage, and probe the limits of the nation as an imaginary site for the production of identity. In doing so, I will focus on the twentieth century biography of a specific nationally acclaimed monument derived from the maritime margins of north east Scotland – the ninth century AD Pictish symbol-bearing cross-slab known as the Hilton of Cadboll stone (see Figure 1). Often described as a 'masterpiece' and regarded as one of the most important pieces of early Medieval sculpture in Scotland, if not north-west Europe, the

---

fed into this volume. The conference deliberately incorporated both 'four-nations' and 'multicultural' agendas, but it was notable that much of the discussion, engagement and debate took place within rather than between them.

[2] In the sphere of heritage and museums such policies and strategies have started to make headway (see contributions to Sandell 2002 and Hooper Greehill 1997). However, as Hooper Greenhill (ibid: 5) points out the number of museums addressing cultural diversity are still disappointingly small. Tellingly much of the commentary focuses on repeated references to a few temporary or travelling exhibitions which have achieved almost iconic status, such as the *Peopling of London* exhibition at the Museum of London, and *Warm and Rich and Fearless* displayed at Bradford Museum and Walsall Museum and Art Gallery. There has been little progress in terms of large-scale exhibition projects and permanent displays. Furthermore, strategies of social inclusion focusing on cultural difference in the sphere of heritage are almost always restricted to heritage institutions situated in the heart of Britain's urban metropolises. In rural areas the emphasis is almost entirely on economically disadvantaged communities, and the social problems attributed to them.

[3] See Kushner (1992: 9-10) for a similar point regarding the dangers of leaving the history of minorities as an isolated specialism; 'By studying responses to minorities the identity and nature of majority society comes into focus.' (p. 10).

Hilton of Cadboll cross-slab is famous for its 'exquisite' carving and for its depiction of a hunting scene with a woman riding side saddle (see Carver 1999: 51; Ritchie 1989: 9).[4] This kind of early medieval sculpture, produced throughout much of Britain and Ireland under the influence of early Christianity, has figured prominently in the production of national heritage, particularly in Scotland and Ireland. However, as we shall see in the case of Hilton of Cadboll, the authority of national heritage organisations is often challenged when it comes to conserving, managing and (re)presentating these monuments (see Foster 2001 for further examples). Based on ethnographic research, involving in-depth qualitative interviewing and participant observation,[5] I will suggest that official representations of national heritage are frequently recast, reformulated and contested in the production of other kinds of meaning and identity (cf. Herzfeld 1997: 1-2). These processes, I will argue, form part of the way in which those 'pushed to the edges' (in this case geographically, as well as culturally, politically and economically) seek to resist their marginalisation and reclaim a space for themselves. Issues of cultural difference are equally relevant in the context of the predominantly white, rural community concerned, rather than merely economic disadvantage. Moreover, I will suggest that that the histories of displacement and fragmentation with which they are grappling, open up unexplored paths 'across the margins' that could contribute to a more radical remaking of heritage in the 'Atlantic archipelago'[6].

Hilton of Cadboll and the making of national narratives.

On descending to the 'Early People' galleries (from c. 8000 BC to c. AD 1100) in the basement of the new Museum of Scotland, one is encouraged to move along a broad 'walkway' surrounded by representations of people (see Figure 2). On either side, two groups of futuristic figures by the modernist sculptor Eduardo Paolozzi represent the four themes of the archaeology galleries ('A Generous Land', 'Wider Horizons', 'Them and Us', and 'In Touch With the Gods'), with cases for the display of prehistoric artefacts set within the modern sculptures. At the end of this almost 'processional' route, standing discrete on a raised and wired-off platform, is the Hilton of Cadboll cross-slab.[7] The elaborately carved images of the cross-slab, specifically the hunting scene in the central panel, are intended to provide

---

[4] The design incorporates a number of Pictish symbols (including a crescent and V-rod, a double disc, and double disc and Z-rod), and is framed by vine scroll border inhabited by birds (the vine scroll has stylistic parallels with contemporary Northumbrian art and is one of the parallels used for dating the sculpture to c. AD 800). It is referred to as a 'cross-slab' as it would originally have depicted a cross on the other face, the arms of which would not have projected significantly beyond the dimensions of the slab of sandstone.

[5] The field research on which this article is based was carried out over a period of three months between August and November 2001 with follow-up research trips in 2002. The research was grant-aided by Historic Scotland and aimed to investigate 'the meanings, values and interests associated with the Hilton of Cadboll cross-slab, and the ways in which these are manifested in the debates and commentaries concerning its conservation, location and presentation'. For a full discussion see Jones (2003 & in prep.).

[6] Here I have been influenced by the agenda set by Norquay and Smyth (2002), who adopted the term 'Atlantic Archipelago' (after Pocock 1975) in place of the more nation-centred, politically engendered terms that can be used to refer to Great Britain and Ireland; to use two of the prime examples.

[7] The special treatment afforded to Hilton of Cadboll is further reinforced through comparison with other examples of early medieval, and indeed Roman, sculpture in the exhibition. For the most part, these are displayed grouped together for comparative purposes and located in more discrete areas of the gallery. Furthermore, although a couple of are displayed behind glass, most are not fenced off from visitors who can approach them for close inspection, but also indirectly implying a lesser value.

visitors with their first encounter with the anonymous people who inhabited the prehistory and early history of Scotland.

The Keeper of Archaeology and curator of the new 'Early People' exhibition, David Clarke, explicitly tried to evade a nationalist agenda when designing the exhibition (Clarke 1996). Nevertheless, the very nature of the institution and the increasing pace of devolutionary politics have meant that national narratives seem to entwine themselves around the exhibits (Cooke and McLean 2002: 119-120). The Hilton of Cadboll cross-slab was deliberately used in an iconic fashion within the 'Early People' galleries (D. Clarke, pers. comm.). It is meant to provide a monumental visual statement that confronts visitors as they enter the galleries, and whilst some resist the anticipated route its placement at the end of the walkway is intended to encourage an engagement with this nationally and internationally acclaimed piece of Scottish sculpture. It can be argued that the juxtaposition of the Hilton of Cadboll cross-slab alongside the sculptures of Eduardo Paolozzi, one of the most acclaimed Scottish artists of the twentieth century, serves to create a connection between the distant past and the present, thus alluding to an indigenous national artistic tradition. Furthermore, the deployment of Christian-influenced early medieval sculpture from the eighth to tenth centuries AD in the 'Early People' gallery is arguably essential to the creation of a national artistic canon for the early (pre)history of Scotland with a strong 'indigenous' tradition of figurative art. Without it, the 'indigenous' artistic tradition in the 'Early People' galleries would be confined to the Pictish symbol stones and abstract prehistoric art, both of which are widely regarded as more 'primitive' forms of art, and the only figurative 'high art' would be represented by the classical tradition brought to Scotland by the Romans.[8] On the next floor up, in 'The Kingdom of the Scots' galleries (c. 900 to 1707), early medieval sculpture is employed again alongside earlier Pictish symbol stones, providing a material linkage between the early history of the nation and its prehistoric forebears.[9] Here such sculpture is situated within more explicit national narratives through the text panels that deal with the origins of the Scottish nation, its ethnic makeup and political formation.

The place of early medieval sculpture within such modern national narratives is prefigured in Scotland, as well as in other parts of the Atlantic archipelago, by longstanding traditions of enquiry into national origins; traditions that have often focused on early medieval peoples and which became increasingly racialised during the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (see Ferguson 1998; Kidd 2002). In Scotland, early medieval sculpture was the focus of

---

[8] Interviews with the Keeper of Archaeology, David Clarke, suggested that this had been an implicit aspect of the exhibition design, even if it had not been a fundamental guiding principle. For instance, with respect to the location of the Hilton of Cadboll cross-slab, he acknowledged that it had been important politically to have something 'indigenous' in such a prominent position, rather than something that would be associated with 'foreigners' such as an item of Roman monumental sculpture (e.g. the Bridgeness commemorative inscription or the Hawkshaw Head). Furthermore, although he argued that the Hilton of Cadboll cross-slab had enabled the introduction of abstract artistic components in the form of the Pictish symbols, which are not part of the classical artistic tradition, he acknowledged that by privileging the hunting scene in the text panel and audio-tour (as well as ensuring it was at eye level), visitors were likely to 'read' the sculpture in terms of the history of western figurative art. However, the concentration on figurative art at the beginning of the 'Early People' galleries is also a by-product of the broader exhibition narrative, which opens by introducing the inhabitants of Scotland's ancient past.

[9] The Pictish symbol stones (unshaped stones bearing symbols) are regarded as precursors of the Pictish symbol-bearing cross-slabs, and are conventionally dated to c.400-700, a period pre-dating the stated chronological framework for the 'Kingdom of the Scots' galleries.

antiquarian research from the eighteenth century onwards, and by the nineteenth century it was firmly embedded within Scotland's national heritage as the 'high art' associated with a formative period in the history of the Scottish nation (see McEnchroe Williams 2001 for an Irish comparison). The arguments of Joseph Anderson, Keeper of Archaeology at the National Museum of Antiquities (the forerunner of the Museum of Scotland) between 1869 and 1913, are instructive about the national symbolic value of monuments like the Hilton of Cadboll cross-slab. Anderson argued that centralised collection in museums is in the best interests of sculpted stone monuments themselves, preserving them from dispersion and weathering. But also that centralised collection is in the 'public interest' because:

> The formation of such a gallery of art materials in the country to which they are indigenous would […] restore to the native genius of the Scots the original elements of that system of design which are its special inheritance.
>
> (Anderson 1881: 134)

The relationship between such monuments and Scottish national heritage was further articulated by Anderson as follows:

> … if our monuments be all destroyed, it will be nothing to us that those of England or Ireland or France or Scandinavia are still preserved, for Scotland's antiquities are not the same as those of Scandinavia or England …. They belong to Scotland because they are inseparable features of her individuality, and they belong to Scotchmen in general in a sense which they can never belong to the holders of the lands on which they are placed [ie private landowners]
>
> (Anderson 1881: 9)

When the Hilton of Cadboll cross-slab entered the collections of the National Museum of Antiquities late in 1921, the furore surrounding its initial donation to the British Museum earlier the same year added further weight to its place in the production of Scottish national heritage. Although many of the articles and letters in regional and national newspapers focused on the detailed history of the cross-slab or issues of conservation, most were also couched in discourses of patriotism and nationalism. For instance, one article in the *Scotsman* compared Scotland's attitude to its national 'treasures' unfavourably with that of Ireland:

> Ireland, a poorer nation than Scotland, has never dreamed of parting with the Book of Kells, the Cross of Cong, and the other priceless treasures that make Dublin one of the most interesting cities in Europe. Why should Scotland be in such indecent haste to write herself down a mere tributary province, and part with the tangible expressions of the national soul?
>
> (*The Scotsman*, 14 February 1921)

The authors of much of the commentary were primarily concerned with its return to Scotland and not its subsequent locality of display. However, many felt that the National Museum of Antiquities in Edinburgh was the most appropriate location, serving to represent Scotland's national patrimony as a whole. The 1921 debate dealt with Scotland as a homogeneous entity and asserted a generic model of patriotic feeling and behaviour in relation to national heritage, which all 'Scotsmen' should conform to. Furthermore, the successful return of the cross-slab

to Edinburgh later in the same year has conferred upon it a further element of national symbolism in terms of the nation's rights to its own heritage.[10]

Fragments from the margins

In the Museum of Scotland the small, discrete text panel next to the Hilton of Cadboll cross-slab provides an approximate date (c. 800 AD) and a location map showing its find spot. The text reads:

> **A Female Aristocrat**
>
> Before the Romans invaded Scotland, images of people are very rare indeed. From then onward, there are more of them, almost always seen on monumental sculpture.
>
> Here a female aristocrat, riding side-saddle, is the central figure in an elaborate panel depicting a hunting scene. Hunting was a favourite aristocratic pursuit; and this scene is more concerned with honouring the aristocracy than with picturing a real hunt. The sculptor's placing of the woman in the scene is a tribute to the person who commissioned the cross – a woman of some importance.

The information provided is typical of the approach adopted throughout the 'Early People' galleries: one aspect of the multidimensional nature of the object is pulled out and used as a component in the exhibition narrative (D. Clarke pers. comm.). It would of course be naïve to suggest that there are no limits to the number of dimensions of any particular object that can be drawn out in a given exhibition. But the museum exhibit not only represents just one dimension of the narratives surrounding the monument, it also physically constitutes only one fragment of the monument (the largest), amongst numerous smaller fragments. The text panel concentrates on the original context in which the cross-slab was commissioned and carved, excluding any discussion of its later biography. Hence, it does not refer to the burial inscription to 'Alexander Duff and his three wives' carved onto one side of the sculpture in 1676; an act which entailed the removal of an elaborately decorated cross, creating thousands of small carved and uncarved fragments in the process. Nor does it mention the absent lower third of the monument, including a substantial part of a carved panel and the uncarved tenon that would have originally anchored it in the ground. Instead, there is an attempt to effect 'wholeness' by writing these elements in the biography of the monument out of the display even though the traces are inscribed on its material form. The side with the seventeenth-century burial inscription is placed at the back in the Museum and visitors are discouraged by the architecture and the signage from viewing it from that angle. The missing base is physically replaced by a copper plinth, to suggest the original height of the monument, and provide a reconstruction of the missing carving which is etched onto the copper surface, thus 'completing' the lower panel.[11]

---

[10] The relationship between cultural property and the construction and negotiation of identity, particularly in the context of repatriation, has been addressed in a number of publications (e.g. Barkan and Bush 2002; Simpson 1996). Elsewhere I have explored the relationship between the contested ownership of the Hilton of Cadboll cross-slab and the production of identity and place (Jones forthcoming 2004).

[11] Early in the exhibition design there had been plans to produce a multi-media database called Mosaic, which would have enabled visitors to explore multiple dimensions of the objects on display, including their later biographies (D. Clarke pers. comm.). However, financial constraints ultimately meant that the database was not constructed and the overriding emphasis in the display of objects is on their original meaning and function, rather than their biographies.

However, over the last five years a large section of the missing base containing elaborate carving, and thousands of the fragments making up the cross-face prior to its removal in 1676, have been discovered and retrieved from the Hilton of Cadboll chapel in Easter Ross where the cross-slab derived from (see Figures 3 and 4). The excavations leading to these discoveries took place in 1998 and 2001 (see James 2002; Kirkdale 1998 & 2001) and were stimulated in part by an intensification of local interest in, and grievance about, the absent cross-slab during the 1990s. During the mid-1990s, a full-scale carved reconstruction had been commissioned from sculptor Barry Grove and was erected at the site of the medieval chapel at Hilton of Cadboll in 2000 (see Figure 5). The reconstruction can be seen as a means to 'presence' the monument in the village in the absence of the original, but the subsequent discovery and excavation of the missing fragments provided the locus for conflict between heritage organisations and local inhabitants.[12] This conflict concerned the ownership and eventual location of the remains – whether they should be placed in the Museum of Scotland with the rest of the monument, or whether they should remain locally. At the outset of the last excavation season (12 August – 10 September 2001), which aimed to recover the small carved fragments and the larger section of the base, it had been assumed that these materials would be allocated to the National Museums of Scotland, and this was communicated in a public information leaflet produced by the funding bodies. The Hilton of Cadboll Chapel where the excavations took place is a scheduled monument and an Historic Scotland *Property in Care*. However, in this instance they did not adopt their normal policy regarding conservation of early medieval sculpture, which favours preservation within the landscape, or within a nearby historic structure. Instead, their response was to prioritise the integrity of the monument, and given the historic acquisition of the largest fragment by the Museums of Scotland, to favour that as the location for all of the fragments.[13] Nevertheless, local residents contested this position and stated that they would not allow the carved 'base' (effectively a lower portion of the cross-slab) to be removed from the village.

A public meeting at the site of the excavation provisionally resolved the stand-off when the Chief Inspector of Ancient Monuments for Historic Scotland agreed that, once lifted, the large decorated lower portion would not be removed from the village until ownership had been formally established through legal channels[14]. To date (August 2003) this lower portion of the monument remains in the village of Hilton of Cadboll in a secure location, and ownership and (re)presentation are still subject to negotiation and debate. For the rest of this chapter, however, I wish to move beyond the actual developments concerning ownership of the cross-

---

[12] Four organisations funded the excavations: Historic Scotland, National Museums of Scotland, Ross and Cromarty Enterprise, and the Highland Council. Local protest in Easter Ross largely focused on the former two organisations, which are based in Edinburgh in the Central belt of Scotland rather than the Highlands. These two regions which have been enmeshed in a core-periphery relationship associated with oppositions in many aspects of social and political life; a relationship which is also central to the historiography of Scottish identity (Withers 1996: 328).

[13] This latter response follows the principle enshrined in guidelines for the allocation of finds from excavations, where the integrity of the object or assemblage is privileged and therefore in cases where material from the same site (or object) is already part of a museum collection subsequent finds would normally be allocated to the same museum (see for example Scottish Executive 1999: 6).

[14] Initially attention turned to the Treasure Trove system as the legal context in which future ownership would be determined. However, in the early half of 2002 the Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer (the Crown's representative in the sphere of Treasure Trove) declared it to be outside the remit of Treasure Trove as he did not regard the new finds as 'ownerless'. The identity of the 'owners' has, however, not been specified.

slab, to examine the meanings, values and interests embedded in, and negotiated through, the cross-slab during 2001 and subsequently. Such an analysis reveals that, at heart, the conflict is about tensions between national and local narratives of identity and place (see Jones 2003; and in prep.). It is these tensions which I wish to focus on here, and in particular explore how historical processes of fragmentation and displacement are articulated in relation to the monument.

Hilton of Cadboll and the symbolic construction of community

The Hilton of Cadboll cross-slab is associated with an array of meanings, some of which have already been touched on. It is regarded as: a sculpture of national and international significance in the context of early medieval European art; '*one of the symbols of the nation's rights to its own treasures*' in the context of its 1921 sojourn in London and 'repatriation' to Edinburgh; a major 'document' in the early history of Christianity in Scotland; a monument intimately connected with the Picts and thus laden with the popular associations of an heroic, painted people who successfully resisted the Romans; a memorial to one of three drowned Norse princes in the context of local folklore; and a stone which is bound up in family stories and genealogical accounts in the context of local oral history on the Easter Ross Seaboard. But it is also associated with a range of metaphorical and symbolic meanings in local contexts, which are not immediately evident in terms of the meanings sketched here.

One of the most striking aspects of the meaningfulness surrounding the cross-slab, and indeed the Reconstruction, in local contexts, is the way in which they are conceived of as 'living things'. Sometimes such meaning is produced through the metaphorical attribution of organs, or processes, that are fundamental to life, to the monument. For instance, the cross-slab and the reconstruction are both referred to as having been '*born*', '*growing*', '*breathing*', having a '*soul*', '*living*' and '*dying*', having '*charisma*' and '*feelings*'. A few informants and interviewees were more explicit about this symbolic dimension of the monument drawing direct similes rather than relying on metaphor. For instance, one local resident, Christine, noted that the cross-slab (specifically discussing the large carved section of the base after it had been excavated):

> … *was like something that was born there and it should go back […]. It's, it's like people who emigrate or go away, they should always come back where they were born and I feel that that stone should go back.*

Another, Duncan, remarked that if the main part of the cross-slab returned from Edinburgh

> *there'll be a party maybe and there'll be things going on here that'll be absolutely unbelievable like a, like a how would I put it now, an ancient member of the village coming back, if that came through here on a, on a trailer and everybody would be here. […] Coming home where it's always been. […] If the stone had a soul it would be saying oh there's the Porst Culac you know, there's so and so's house you know I'm going over to the park and there's, there's the other bit of the stone and it broke off a hundred and fifty year ago or whatever.*

Furthermore, as the last quote highlights, the monument is not merely conceived of as a living thing, but as *a living member of the community*. Not only is a direct analogy drawn between the cross-slab and an 'ancient member of the village', but it is also attributed the kind of social knowledge which is essential to establishing a person's membership within the

community; knowing who lives in which house, recognising local landmarks and beauty spots, and so forth.

The use of discourses of kinship and 'belonging' in relation to the cross-slab also reinforces its place as a living member of the community. 'Belonging' is one of the key concepts in the identification of kinship and other relations of identity, particularly amongst the older generation who were born in Hilton and/or have spent most of their lives there (and see MacDonald 1997 for a discussion of the concept in a Western Isles context). Thus the term regularly crops up in daily conversation, for instance, in an interview with Maggie: '*she belongs, they're both Sutherland in their name*', or '*it was the first of the Sutherlands that belong to my granny*'. Such statements do not simply relate to actual kin relations, but are also extended to others who are considered part of the community. Indeed rather than a reflection of static relationships they provide a means of articulating and negotiating 'who is and who is not "part of the place", and who is and is not authentically "local"' (Macdonald 1997: 131). Given such usage the extension of the concept of belonging to the cross-slab by local residents carries a connotation of kinship. For instance, to give a few examples:

> *I still think that the stone belongs to the people here* (Mary)

> *… it's still not where it should be, it should be back up home where it belongs.* (Janet)

> *… there'd be a ceilidh, there'd be pipe bands there'd be absolutely amazing, […] that stone belongs here and that's part of the village so that would be, that would be one of the happiest days of my life to see that coming back to the village.* (Duncan)

The use of the concept of belonging in relation to the stone therefore symbolically confers it with the status of kin. Indeed the kinship metaphor is further reinforced in the case of the last quote where the cross-slab even becomes the focus of celebratory events and performances (a ceilidh and a pipe band), which typically accompany key rites of passage or events in a person's life, or the lives of their family and friends. One rite of passage that is of particular importance in terms of 'placing people' within a network of social relationships, and in particular negotiating degrees of 'belonging' is that of birth. Being born in Hilton, or related to someone who was born there, is central to being accepted as an insider or a 'local'. Again, this process of social identification is applied to the cross-slab; like people, the cross-slab belongs in Hilton because as Christine puts it, it is '*like something that was born there*', and '*that's where it was created*'. The close association between the monument and the soil, which local residents bore witness to during the excavation of the fragments, is also important metaphorically in terms of the life-force attributed to the cross-slab and its ability to 'breathe' and 'grow'.

There is thus a whole body of metaphorical and symbolic meaning which surrounds the monument in local discourse, concerning its place within the community. In this way it facilitates the negotiation of identities and the expression of boundaries. However, it should not be assumed that it simply allows fixed, pre-existing categories to be mapped on to it. On the contrary, the categories of 'local' and 'incomer', and through them the boundaries of community as a whole, are fluid and continuously subject to negotiation[15]. As well as being

---

[15] Once symbolically conceived as a living member of the community, the cross-slab itself (through its various fragmented forms) becomes a medium for the reproduction and negotiation of relationships. Thus, in the debates which surrounded the future of the new discoveries in 2001, 'locals' could

conceived of as a living member of the community, and therefore acting as a mechanism for the negotiation of personal identities and relationships, the monument is also simultaneously an icon for the village as a whole. This iconicity is expressed metaphorically in the following statement by one of the local activists that: '*that stone is the heart of Hilton*'. Here, it is portrayed in its entirety as one of the bodily organs of the community, the heart. Thus, the cross-slab is both a member of the village community and a microcosm of it in its entirety; symbolism which is central to its role in producing a sense of place.

Making place, resisting displacement

Anthropologists have recently turned their attention to a reconsideration of the relationship between community and territory, and in particular to the ways in which, in a world of deterritorialisation, people often deliberately and laboriously construct their places in particular locations. Gray (2002: 40) has argued that 'place-making and the resultant sense of place are an essential part of how people experience community' and that a sense of being in a community and a sense of its place emerge simultaneously and mutually constitute one another. Furthermore, it has also been observed by Gray (2002) and others (Gupta and Fergusen 1997; Kempny 2002; Nadel-Klein 1991) that processes of displacement, decline of community institutions and blurring of community boundaries, often lead to a more explicit and urgent emphasis on the production of a sense of *community as place*.

Given the way it mediates the symbolic construction of community, it is perhaps not surprising that the Hilton of Cadboll cross-slab also plays an integral role in the production of a sense of place. Conceived of as a living member of the community, the monument provides a mechanism for expressing the relationship between people and place. Place, and indeed placing people, is very important to people living in Hilton and the other Seaboard villages. There are constant references to who is related to whom, particularly amongst the elderly who were born and brought up there. People are said to 'belong' to places as well as to each other, for instance, someone might comment, '*she belonged over to the Nigg area*', or ask '*did he belong to here, or did he belong to Portmahomack*' (a village about 5 miles from Hilton). Thus, discourses of belonging incorporate a strong spatial dimension, and on this basis it can be argued that statements of belonging in relation to the cross-slab serve to conflate community and place. This conflation is captured, for instance, in the statement: '*it belongs to the village, it is Hilton*'.

Furthermore, the monument not only 'belongs' to the place, it is simultaneously constitutive of place and therefore part of the fabric of people's existence in that particular place. Associations between the monument and other aspects of the landscape, such as rocks and sea, serve to place it as an integral component of the landscape. For instance, one interviewee, Màiri, commented:

negotiate relative positions of authority and status through their association (and their forefathers' associations) with the biography of the monument. 'Incomers' on the other hand could negotiate greater degrees of 'insiderness' through adopting, or respecting, the socially constructed authentic position of 'the village' demanding that the new discoveries remain there. Indeed, those 'incomers' who played an active role in the informal local action group established at the time of the excavation became almost honorary 'locals' and their position was subject to special comment, such as, '*she's only lived in the village for* [x] *number of years but she feels for the stone as much as we do*'. In contrast, the few local residents who asserted that the base should go to Edinburgh were cast as 'incomers', thus questioning the authority of their opinion. For other case studies illustrating similar processes see Macdonald (1997), Mewitt (1986), Nadel (1984), Nadel-Klein (1991).

> *the Hilton stone, you almost feel attached to it, it's almost like being attached to rocks or the sea or it's always been here, it's part of the place and for generations, I don't know, it was a close community you know ...*

Such a conceptualisation of the monument, as one of the physical constituents making up the 'world', enables it to act as a metaphor for the relationship between people and place, referencing the closeness between people and the landscape, as well as the closeness of the community as a whole.

However, there is a tension underlying the process of place-making in Hilton and the other Seaboard Villages; they are not locales of timeless, stable relationships to place that are often attributed to such rural communities, particularly in the oppositions that are frequently made between urban and rural heritage (see Agyeman and Kinsman 1997). Although archaeological evidence indicates prehistoric, early medieval and medieval habitation along the Seaboard, the origins of the contemporary Seaboard Villages are largely tied to the history of population movements during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and to the development of the modern fishing industry. Between 1750 and 1850 the Highlands underwent fundamental change in the name of 'improvement'. The Improving Movement focused on both reorganisation of the rural landscape and agricultural practices, as well as the reform of rural peasantry who were regarded by the Improvers in racialised terms as primitive, indolent, unhygienic and uncivilised (Nadel-Klein 2003: 32-33; also Smout 1969). One of the most overriding transformations wrought by the Improvers was the massive depopulation of the Highlands of Scotland to make way for sheep farming, a process which involved the 'clearance' of people from what were densely populated valleys and glens. In the process it was assumed that the landless poor would be converted into an industrious and efficient working class, fully integrated into the capitalist economy (Smout 1969). In practice, the 'small and large evictions, voluntary and forced removals, … outright expulsion of tenants and resettlement plans' (Richards 2000: 6) carried out by lairds (landlords) and their factors (estate managers) were often forced upon an unwilling population, resulting in the pain of dislocation and the destruction of a way of life. Encompassed by the phrase 'Highland Clearances', these traumatic events in the history of the region became a prominent aspect of oral history and social memory, associated with a sense of anger and loss within the Highlands and beyond (elsewhere in Scotland and amongst Scottish diaspora communities) (Ascherson 2003; Basu 2002; Richards 2000; Withers 1996).

The population displacement associated with these processes resulted in migration to urban industrial centres and mass emigration to the New World. One further aspect, however, was the re-settlement of the remnants of Highland communities on the most marginal land, often coastal margins where it was assumed they would take up fishing or kelp working. The Seaboard villages of Hilton of Cadboll, Balintore and Shandwick provided a refuge for displaced people during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and grew rapidly as a result (Ash 1991: 156-7; Macdonald and Gordon 1971). A plan of Hilton in 1813, for instance, shows two streets with twenty four houses, but by 1832 there were fifty eight families (Macdonald and Gordon 1971, p. 18). Shandwick is regarded as having provided a haven for the Rosses evicted from Glencalvie near Ardgay, and Hilton for the MacKays displaced from Sutherland (ibid.). Furthermore, many people who were born in the villages recount personal genealogical connections with Clearance histories. The subsequent history of the Seaboard Villages was tied to the fishing industry, and following its decline in the Moray Firth during the earlier twentieth century, the North Sea oil industry took its place as one of

the main sources of employment for the local population during the 1970s, also attracting new residents from the Central Belt and elsewhere in Scotland. However, since the recession of the 1980s, employment opportunities have significantly declined, as has the socio-economic infrastructure of the villages.[16]

The particular social and historical contexts that have just been summarised make processes of 'place-making' in Hilton, and the Seaboard generally, distinctly fraught and problematic. There is an ambivalence associated with local residents' consciousness of place, for Hilton is both a place of deep significance and value, and a marginal place associated with deprivation, particularly as refracted through the eyes of those involved in social and economic development. Furthermore, social discourse surrounding this tension is replete with processes of historical emplotment, whereby current concerns about decline and marginality, as well as the need to fight against them, are framed by past events and injustices, such as the Clearances.[17] The history of the cross-slab means that it is eminently suited to the task of metaphorically dealing with dislocation between people and place, the resulting fragmentation of communities, and the pervasive sense of loss surrounding such processes. In the perception of many of the inhabitants the displacement of the upper part of the cross-slab in the mid-nineteenth century, and the recent excavation and possible further displacement of the new fragments, represent the power of certain individuals and organisations, notably landowners and national institutions, to forcibly move people/things against their will and without their consent. Furthermore, the fragmented nature of the monument can serve to provide an iconic image of the fragmentation of communities wrought by processes of displacement. The Highland Clearances provide the main focus for the historic emplotment of these processes of displacement and fragmentation and the frequent uninitiated references to them in conversations about the Hilton of Cadboll monument highlight its symbolic role in this respect. Such references take the form of a slippage between those with power and authority today and their perceived counterparts in the past, namely landlords and ministers. Or sometimes they even seem to involve a direct relationship between people's longing to reconstitute or reconstruct the Hilton of Cadboll cross-slab, and their desire to destroy other monuments associated with the Clearances and their landlords. For instance, one man noted in passing, '*Aye, we'll sort our stone and then we'll sort that stone*' referring to the controversial statue of the 1st Duke of Sutherland, on top of Ben Bhraggie hill overlooking the small town of Golspie in east Sutherland. The Duke of Sutherland is one of the most notorious and despised of the Clearance landlords, and his statue, which was erected in 1834, has been the focus of a campaign to knock it down, taking the form of formal requests through the Planning Office of the Highland Council from 1994 onwards.[18]

---

[16] On the basis of the 1991 census, the Highland Council and Ross and Cromarty District Council identified the Seaboard as the second most deprived area in the Region and the District respectively (Barr 1996). As a result the Seaboard Villages have been the focus of numerous development initiatives and projects over the last decade. The affect of this 'social disadvantage' and the associated concentration of development activity on people's consciousness is palpable. This sense of marginality is captured by one local resident in the statement that 'Hilton is a backwater on a backwater on a backwater'.

[17] See Nadel-Klein (2003: Chapter 5) for an analysis of the ways in which fisherfolk's experience of crises in the fishing industry is conditioned by specific historical processes, particulary the social memory of injustice and stigma, and a continuing experience of marginality. As Nadel-Klein explains, the past as remembered and reconstructed becomes 'an interpretive guide for action and inaction (ibid.: 161).

[18] As Withers (1996) points out in his analysis of place and memory in Highland Scotland, for those supporting the campaign the proposed destruction of the monument, which provides a symbolic

Thus, it can be argued that opposition to the recent excavation of the base of the cross-slab, and to its potential removal to Edinburgh, provides a means to symbolically resist the historic processes of displacement encompassed by the Clearances; processes which ironically contributed to the development of the villages in their modern forms. There is also a redemptive or restorative dimension to the role of the monument in place-making. The historical association of the monument with a wealthy and aristocratic group of people in archaeological and art historical accounts, as well as the national significance attached to the sculpture in heritage discourses, are actively appropriated in making Hilton a 'place of significance'; a place worthy of such a 'fine stone'. But of equal, if not more importance, is the way in which, when conceived as a living member of the community, it provides a means to metaphorically make the community 'whole' once again, against a historic background of fragmentation. For instance, reflecting on the impact of the carved Reconstruction on Hilton when it was erected in 2000, one woman suggested that:

> *I think people in Hilton were proud although they hadn't got the original stone they had something at last that they could associate with the Hilton stone. Because they had nothing and all they could say was oh, it's in Edinburgh. <u>But now they've got something, they can go and look at it and it is part of them.</u>* [...] <u>*I think Hilton became whole. Something was missing.*</u> *So erm, at long last something came back to what was taken away.* (Christine, my emphasis)

Furthermore, the metaphorical association between the fate of the stone and the fate of the community is also extended to the 'life' of the community in social discourse. Thus one man comments that:

> *I look at* [the] *Hilton stone when it's in the Edinburgh museum it's just a dead headstone among other headstones, just a dead you know whereas in Hilton it could be a living stone, hopefully as a focus of a living community again and also indirectly basically the catalyst for more development in the place.* (Alan)

Conclusions:

As pointed out at the beginning of this chapter, there is a danger that an artificial dichotomy is created between a 'majority-white-indigenous' national culture (perceived as settled and homogenous) on the one hand, and 'minority-"non-white"-immigrant' cultures (perceived as displaced and marginal) on the other. The conflict surrounding the Hilton of Cadboll monument exposes some of the limits of the nation as an imaginary site for the production of identity and brings into question the notion of a 'core', homogeneous and settled national culture and heritage. It reveals that the conservation, management and (re)presentation of heritage is actively involved in the negotiation of power and identity, and that issues of

---

representation of power within the landscape, was a means of erasing a dominant memory. However, others felt that it should be maintained as an icon of past iniquities and as an embodiment of memory and identity. Whichever stance is adopted, it is clear that the Duke of Sutherland monument provides a focus for the negotiation of power and identity in respect to memory. The connections that some local residents in Hilton made between this monument and the Hilton of Cadboll Stone serve to highlight similar processes at work surrounding this latter monument even if they are manifested in different ways.

displacement, fragmentation and marginality extend beyond post-1945 immigrant 'minorities'.

Attempts to conserve, manage, and (re)present early medieval sculpture in Scotland have been characterised by local protest and resistance. This resistance suggests that the official discourses surrounding these monuments and their designation as national patrimony are not shared by everyone. Hilton of Cadboll's fragmented history provides a unique window on these processes and illustrates how the meanings attached to objects change as they pass through different systems of classification (cf Clifford 1988: 189-251). In terms of its display in the Museum of Scotland, the biography of the monument is largely silenced and strategies are employed to effect wholeness through physical reconstruction. Furthermore, in relation to the collection of early medieval sculpture in the National Museums of Scotland, the Hilton of Cadboll cross-slab is seen as a key piece in representing a particular type of sculpture, without which the collection would be less 'complete', and thus less authentic (see Clifford 1988: 215 & 232). Here too then there is an emphasis on unity and wholeness, on the production of a complete representation of a particular type of national heritage in one place; a place which constitutes an abstract national space. In this way through the production of coherent, integrated collections in museums, or through the preservation of representative types of monuments distributed across the national landscape, representations of the nation as a coherent, homogeneous community are produced, creating a façade of national unanimity. However, in the case of the Hilton of Cadboll cross-slab, the discovery and excavation of the missing lower section and thousands of smaller fragments has thrown these processes into relief and contestation. At the outset of the excavation it was assumed by the national heritage agencies involved that the new discoveries would be allocated to the National Museums of Scotland in order to maintain the integrity of the monument. Although it is not the intention to physically reconstitute the cross-slab by attempting to put the original fragments back together, such an allocation would symbolically reinforce the completeness of the object through the incorporation of the material within the same collection. The anger and resistance to the removal of the new discoveries expressed by many in Hilton of Cadboll and the other Seaboard Villages revealed other processes at work.

In local contexts, the various fragments of the cross-slab act as a mechanism, mediator and metaphor for the production of embodied relationships between people and place; between Hilton the community, and Hilton the place. The national significance of the monument, and obvious excitement over the recent discoveries, are of course central to people's engagement of the monument in making Hilton a 'place of significance'. In this respect, whilst apparently contesting state authority in relation to the monument, local residents are also complicit in the reproduction of the cross-slab's national significance. However, at the same time the role of the cross-slab as a means of making place and identity serves to contest and recast official national discourses regarding heritage and national identity. As discussed above, these local discourses surrounding the cross-slab in its various forms – the largest fragment in the Museum of Scotland, the recently recovered fragments, and the Reconstruction – are embedded in culturally specific and localised meanings surrounding the monument. Conceived as a living member of the community, the cross-slab mediates the production and negotiation of identities both within and out with the village – of 'locals', 'incomers', and complete 'outsiders' or 'strangers' – and, through them, the expression of the boundaries of community. Furthermore, through the application of discourses of belonging to the cross-slab, reinforced by reference to its 'birth' and 'growth' in the village, it also serves to articulate the relationship between people and place. Here then the national significance of the monument is directly contested, as people use it to express and negotiate culturally specific discourses of

identity and belonging. These culturally specific discourses create what are perceived to be inalienable ties between the cross-slab and community; ties that are incommensurable with its significance as an important item of national patrimony.

However, perhaps the most far-reaching challenge to the imagination of a core national community posed by the conflict surrounding the Hilton of Cadboll cross-slab lies in its significance as an icon of displacement. The fragmented biography of the monument is integral in respect to this iconic role. Although dating to a much earlier period, the cross-slab is something (a 'living thing') that has been fragmented and displaced, and which is therefore eminently suited to the metaphorical task of engaging with, and contesting, the traumatic history of the Highlands between the mid-eighteenth and late nineteenth centuries. This history involved the displacement of communities in the name of agricultural and social 'improvement' supported by racial discourses about the primitive and backward nature of the Highlanders (see Ascherson 2003: 209-12). Large numbers of people either migrated to become part of the urban industrial labour force or emigrated to the New World, with the remaining fragmented communities pushed to the unproductive margins of the landscape. I have argued here that resistance to the further displacement of the fragmented remains of the cross-slab provides a means of symbolically resisting these historical processes of fragmentation and displacement. Such forms of resistance and negotiation surrounding heritage bring into focus the dislocation and uneven relations of power underlying the formation of modern nation states, which were embedded in contexts such as agrarian reform, industrialisation and colonialism. They also expose cracks in the façade of national unanimity which all too often underpins the conservation, management and (re)presentation of the past. The historical contexts and discourses underpinning this particular conflict, agrarian reform, industrialisation and so forth, as well as the discourses of race and 'improvement' which accompanied them, are related to those, which, at different times and places, underwrote the creation of 'multicultural Britain'. Local residents in Hilton and the other Seaboard Villages are seeking to resist their historical and contemporary marginalisation, and reclaim a space for themselves, just as Asian, African and Caribbean communities are doing elsewhere in the 'Atlantic Archipelago'. I do not wish to imply that their conditions and experiences are the same, but merely to suggest that the histories of displacement and fragmentation with which they are grappling open up unexamined paths 'across the margins'. These paths should be explored in the context of heritage conservation, management and (re)presentation, rather than closed down by a false dichotomy between core 'white' homogeneous national cultures on the one hand, and immigrant 'non-white' minority cultures on the other.

Acknowledgements

Macdonald, and the other residents of the Seaboard Villages of Easter Ross, and in particular Hilton, who provided a wealth of information and insight, and who tolerated my intrusions in their lives with patience, humour, and generosity. Helen Rees Leahy and Thomas Dowson at the University of Manchester provided incisive comments on earlier drafts of this chapter and pointed me towards other relevant research in museum studies, as did the editors of this volume. All of the above have alerted me to weaknesses in my analysis and argument. Any remaining shortcomings are of course entirely my own.

Conventions

Citations from interviews are in italics. All names used in relation to interview citations are pseudonyms, with the exception of individuals speaking or acting in an official capacity either in (or in relation to) public forums, whose identity is intimately tied to that official position.

References:

Agyeman, J. and P. Kinsman 1997. 'Analysing macro- and microenvironments from a multicultural perspective' in, E. Hooper Greenhill (ed.) *Cultural Diversity: developing museum audiences in Britain*, pp. 81-98. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Anderson, J. 1881 *Scotland in Early Christian Times (Second Series). The Rhind Lectures in Archaeology for 1880.* Edinburgh: David Douglas.

Ascherson, N. 2003. *Stone Voices: the search for Scotland.* London: Granta Books (Revised Edition)

Ash, M. 1991. *This Noble Harbour: a history of the Cromarty Firth*. (Edited by J. Macauley and M.A. Mackay). Invergordon: Comarty Firth Port Authority.

Barr, A. 1996. *Learning for Change: community education and community development*. London: Community Development Foundation in association with the Scottish Community Development Centre.

Barkan, E and R. Bush (eds) 2002 *Claiming the Stones, Naming the Bones: cultural property and the negotiation of national and ethnic identity.* Los Angeles: Getty Publications.

Basu, P. 2002. *Homecomings: genealogy, heritage-tourism and identity in the Scottish Highland Diaspora*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University College London.

Clarke, D. 1996. 'Presenting a national perspective of prehistory and early history in the Museum of Scotland', in J. Atkinson, I Banks and J. O'Sullivan (eds) 1996 *Nationalism and Archaeology*. Glasgow: Cruithne Press.

Clifford, J. 1988. *The Predicament of Culture: twentieth century ethnography, literature and art*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Cooke, S. and F. McLean 2001. 'Our common inheritance"?: narratives of self and other in the Museum of Scotland', in D. Harvey, R. Jones, N. McInroy and C. Milligan (eds) *Celtic Geographies: landscape, culture and identity,* pp. 109-122. London: Routledge.

English Heritage, 2000. *Power of Place: the future of the historic environment.* London: English Heritage.

Ferguson, W. 2002. *The Identity of the Scottish Nation: an historic quest.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Foster, S.M. 2001. *Place, space and odyssey: exploring the future of early Medieval sculpture*. Inverness: Groam House Trust.

Gray, J. 2002. 'Community as place-making: ram auctions in the Scottish borderland.' in V. Amit (ed.) *Realizing Community: concepts, social relationships and sentiments*, pp. 38-59. London: Routledge.

Gupta, A. and J. Ferguson 1997. 'Beyond 'culture': space, identity and the politics of difference', in A. Gupta and J. Ferguson (eds) *Culture, Power, Place: explorations in critical anthropology*, pp. 1-29. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Hall, S. 2000. 'Conclusion: the multi-cultural question', in B. Hesse (ed.) *Un/Settled Multiculturalisms: diasporas, entanglements, transruptions*, pp. 209-241. London: Zed Books.

Handler, R. 1988. *Nationalism and the Politics of Culture in Quebec*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Harvey, D.C., R. Jones, N. McInroy and C. Milligan (eds) 2002. *Celtic Geographies: old culture, new times*. London: Routledge.

Herzfeld, M. 1997. *Cultural Intimacy: social poetics in the nation-state.* London: Routledge.

Hesse, B. 2000. 'Introduction: un/settled multiculturalisms', in B. Hesse (ed.) *Un/Settled Multiculturalisms: diasporas, entanglements, transruptions*, pp. 1-30. London: Zed Books.

Hooper-Greenhill, E. 1997. 'Towards plural perspectives', in E. Hooper Greenhill (ed.) *Cultural Diversity: developing museum audiences in Britain*, pp. 1-11. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Hooper Greenhill, E. (ed.) 1997. *Cultural Diversity: developing museum audiences in Britain.* Leicester: Leicester University Press.

James, H. 2002. *Investigation of the Setting and Context of the Hilton of Cadboll Cross-slab, Recovery of the Stump and Fragments of Sculpture*. Unpublished Report, Glasgow University Archaeological Research Division.

Jones, S. 2003. *Early Medieval Sculpture and the Production of Meaning, Value and Place: the case of Hilton of Caboll.* Unpublished Report for Historic Scotland, Edinburgh.

Jones, S. forthcoming 2004. '"They made it a living thing didn't they…": Hilton of Cadboll and the production of identity, place, and belonging', in S. Foster and M. Cross (eds) *Able Minds and Practised Hands: Scotland's early medieval sculpture in the 21st century.* Edinburgh: Society for Medieval Archaeology.

Jones, S. in prep. *Fragments from the Margins: heritage, place and belonging in the modern state.*

Kempny, M. 2002. 'Cultural islands in the globalizing world: community-cum-locality of the Cieszyn Lutherans', in V. Amit (ed.) *Realizing Community: concepts, social relationships and sentiments*, pp. 60-83. London: Routledge.

Kidd, C. 2002. 'The ideological uses of the Picts, 1707-c.1990', in E.J. Cowan and R.J. Finlay (eds) *Scottish History: the power of the past*, pp. 169-90. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Kirkdale Archaeology 1998. *Hilton of Cadboll Chapel. 3rd August 1998*. Unpublished Report for Historic Scotland.

Kirkdale Archaeology 2001. *Hilton of Cadboll Chapel Site Archaeological Excavation. 7th March 2001*. Unpublished Report for Historic Scotland.

Kushner, T. 1992. 'Heritage and Ethnicity: an introduction', in, T. Kushner (ed.) *The Jewish heritage in British History: Englishness and Jewishness*, pp. 1-28. London: Frank Cass.

McCrone, D.A. 2002 'Nationalism, identity and history', in E.J. Cowan and R.J. Finlay (eds) *Scottish History: the power of the past*, pp. 253-71. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

McCrone, D., A. Morris, and R. Kiely 1995. *Scotland – the Brand: the making of Scottish heritage.* Edinburgh: Polygon.

Macdonald, J. and Gordon, A. 1971. *Down to the Sea: an account of life in the fishing villages of Hilton, Balintore and Shandwick.* Fort William: Ross and Cromarty Heritage Society (3rd edition, n.d.).

Macdonald, S. 1997. *Reimagining Culture: histories, identities and Gaelic resistance*. Oxford: Berg.

McEnchroe Williams, M. 2001. 'Constructing the market cross at Tuam: the role of cultural patriotism in the study of Irish high crosses', in C. Hourihane (ed.) *From Ireland Coming: Irish art from the early Christian to the late Gothic period and its European context*, pp. 141-160. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Merriman, N. 1997. 'The *Peopling of London* project', in E. Hooper Greenhill (ed.) *Cultural Diversity: developing museum audiences in Britain*, pp. 119-148. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Mewitt, P.G. 1986. 'Boundaries and discourses in a Lewis crafting community', in A.P. Cohen (ed.) *Symbolising Boundaries: identity and diversity in British cultures*, pp. 71-87. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Nadel, J. 1984. 'Stigma and separation: pariah status and community persistence in a Scottish fishing village. *Ethnology* 23(2): 101-115.

Nadel-Klein, J. 1991. 'Reweaving the fringe: localism, tradition and representation in British ethnography', *American Ethnologist* 18(3): 500-15.

Nadel-Klein, J. 2003. *Fishing for Heritage: modernity and loss along the Scottish Coast*. Oxford: Berg.

Norquay, G. and G. Smyth 2002. 'Introduction: crossing the margins', in G. Norquay and G. Smyth (eds) *Across the margins: cultural identity and change in the Atlantic Archipelago*, pp. 1-10. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Pocock, J.G.A. 1995. 'British history: a plea for a new subject.' *Journal of Modern History* 47: 601-21.

Ramdin, R. 1999. *Reimaging Britain: 500 years of Black and Asian history.* London: Pluto Press.

Richards, E. 2000. *The Highland Clearances*. Edinburgh: Birlinn.

Samuel, R. 1998. *Island Stories: unravelling Britain. Theatres of Memory, Vol II.* London: Verso.

Sandell, R. 2002. 'Museums and the combating of social inequality: roles, responsibilities, resistance', In R. Sandell (ed.) *Museums, Society, Inequality,* pp. 3-40. London: Routledge.

Sandell, R. (ed.) 2002. *Museums, Society, Inequality*. London: Routledge.

Scottish Executive 1999. *Treasure Trove in Scotland: information on Treasure Trove procedures, criteria for allocation and the allocation process.* Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Simpson, M. 1996. *Making Representations: museums in the post-colonial era.* London: Routledge.

Smout, T.C. 1969. *A History of the Scottish People 1560-1830.* (London: Fontana Press, Reprint 1998)

Walker, S. 1997. 'Black cultural museums in Britain: what questions do they answer?', in E. Hooper Greenhill (ed.) *Cultural Diversity: developing museum audiences in Britain*, pp. 32-49. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Withers, C.W.J. 1996. Place, memory, monument: memorializing the past in contemporary Highland Scotland. *Ecumene* 3(3): 325-44.