Introduction

1.1. Foreword

This book examines interactions and relations between the heritage and archaeological professions and the British Pagan community in the first dozen years of the 21st century. In terms of British Pagans, it focuses particularly on Druid groups, as these were the most active in matters relating to heritage. Relations between the contemporary Pagan community and the heritage and archaeological professions in the UK have often been somewhat strained during the period in focus and perhaps for some time leading up to it. The book examines issues of contention and contestation between these groups, such as sensitivities over excavation of ancient sacred sites, access to ancient monuments and especially issues surrounding excavation, storage and display of ancient human remains. It explores the consequent relations between them and the underlying attitudes of members to one another. Decades of defamation, dismissal and sometimes discrimination left parts of the Pagan community with a disjointed and sometimes hostile range of interactions with 'establishment' organisations: on the one hand there has been a desire to maintain anonymity thus avoiding discrimination, but on the other there has been a desire to demand equal rights with other religious and spiritual groups in order to challenge discrimination. Within the archaeological community and across the heritage sector there has been concern that if all the demands coming from the modern Pagan community were to be granted it would become difficult for archaeologists and heritage workers to fulfil their professional responsibilities and perhaps even their ethical obligations. Prejudices, misunderstandings and errors have given rise to conflict which, I shall show, has caused much distress and expense to all concerned. This book will analyse the ideas and arguments involved and set out suggestions to improve future interactions. In this introductory chapter I define the communities central to this study and describe the issues being contested.

1.2. Defining Terms

Before a study of these groups can begin, it needs to be established who they are. Another fundamental question is what is meant by the term 'community'. Are these groups actually communities and how do they fit into the broad canvas of contemporary British society? This will have a bearing on issues of inclusion and exclusion especially those investigated in chapter 5.

I suggest that an understanding of community is vital in understanding contestation between groups. Discourses on community and society in the humanities tend to derive from the work of Ferdinand Tonnies (1955:16-18, 37-39). He explains the concept of community (*gemeinschaft*) comparing it with and situating it within society (*gessellschaft*). He describes community as held together by the natural will, a shared morality and kinship, whilst society is held together by rational will that has contractual and legal frameworks. He characterises society as large-scale, impersonal and modern while community is seen as small-scale, traditional and involving face-to-face communication. However, much has changed since the 19th century: Appadurai (1996:8) has described 'communities of sentiment' influenced by large-scale migration. Licklider & Taylor (1968) appear to have been the first to suggest the idea of online communities of interest. Boyd (2012:191) suggests that 'communities of interest' develop a sense of cognitive ownership that ought to be recognised. Smith & Waterton (2009:18) remark that community is not homogenous but varied and fluid. Some may be geographical but others linked by religion or 'a range of social and cultural experiences'. They point out that a single individual might belong to several communities at the same time (Smith & Waterton 2009:18). Moore (2001:71-72) has argued that increasing individualism has harmed feelings of community and identifies obstacles to community including 'intense nationalism – and related "isms"… and a strong tendency to scapegoat outside groups'

The concept of a Pagan community is perhaps made problematic by the lack of a single cosmology, pantheon, or set of values or commandments. There is little or no concept of orthodoxy within specific traditions of contemporary Paganism (Jennings 2002:7-8). However, anyone active within such groups will know there are meetings known as 'moots' to which all who identify as Pagan or are interested in Paganism are welcome. Many moots take place in pubs and are either plain social gatherings or include a speaker on a topic of Pagan interest. Pagan societies also exist in many universities and several organisations exist to represent the interests of Pagans within professions or large organisations. These social groups along with events (such as camps, games and eisteddfodau[1]) at which Pagans of any tradition or sect are welcome provide a sort of communal space in which the type of social relations which unite and define a community may be negotiated. This along with the shared identity as Pagans provides a sense of community. I therefore argue the term is justified in this case.

Since they have disparate aims and objectives it may be argued there are several archaeological communities rather than a single unified one. However, the connecting

---

[1] Recitals or performances of poetry, song, music or drama

threads such as conferences and professional organisations which cross the social boundaries dividing archaeologists into distinct communities make this problematic. I have therefore chosen to refer to a single archaeological community.

Similarly the heritage sector has its own professional bodies such as the Museums Association; there are journals and conferences. Arguably, many 'shop floor' level employees are less likely to enjoy the face-to-face communication Tonnies (1955:16-18, 37-39) refers to beyond their specific workplace. Mattessich et al (1997:7) acknowledge that a shared profession is a basis for a community; however, to some heritage employees it is a job rather than a profession. The difference is that a profession may be defined as a vocation with shared standards involving a high degree of competence, skill and/or experience (Darvill 2012:375; Everill 2009:6) as opposed to a simple paid job which may be transitory in a person's life while a profession is something much more sustained and self-defining (Robbins 1993:34). Laurajane Smith and Emma Waterton (2009:19) consider that 'archaeologists, heritage managers and museum professionals can be defined as a community group' which they collectively describe as 'heritage professionals'.

Tonnies' (1955:16-18, 37-39) definition of community includes neither contemporary Pagans, heritage professionals nor archaeologists which, I would argue, indicates a weakness in his definition. If, as Wittgenstein (1933:51-61) suggests, use is meaning then the use of 'Pagan community' means it is a 'correct' use of language but that the context provides the meaning. The rise of electronic interaction via computers has brought about self-describing online communities.

Subcultures and Counter-Cultures

As groups within British society it is worth considering whether contemporary Pagans, archaeologists and heritage professionals may be termed subcultures. Hodkinson (2002:7-33) and Hebdige (1989:1-19) explain that subcultures are often elective and self-defined using a particular style, visual or dialectic, to differentiate themselves from the hegemonic mainstream. These are often, but not always, united by a common interest or belief. Indeed a trend may be discerned which began with the multicultural permissive society developing from the late 1950's and into the 1960s which has since been accelerated massively by the information revolution. This has made the concept of a British cultural mainstream problematic. Britain now appears a society of overlapping subcultural groups rather. I base this contention on what I perceive to be a distinct lack of cultural phenomena which are common across British society but distinct from other European societies. Archaeologists may form a sub-culture; there are particular styles common especially among field archaeologists such as high-visibility waterproofs and gilets or military surplus jackets and trousers, heavy working boots and broad-brimmed hats

(Holtorf 2007:96-98). Archaeology also has a dialectic involving excavation and archaeological theory as well as a vocabulary of its own with words like: material culture, potsherd, stratigraphy, section, geophysics, artefact etc. which either have a different use in mainstream discourse or are seldom used if at all. There are also words like Neolithic and Palaeolithic which have entered mainstream vocabulary specifically from archaeology. I am less certain if heritage professionals can be said to form a coherent sub-culture. I have not identified a particular style and although this community has its own jargon which may give it a linguistic distinction I am unsure whether that is sufficient to justify the use of the term sub-culture.

If it is characterised by systematic dissidence and opposition to dominant cultural values, a subculture may be classified as a counter-culture (Dowd & Dowd 2003:20-35). Ivakhiv (2001:46-51) and Greenwood (2000:8) refer to spiritual or religious counter-culture to describe not just Pagans but New Age spiritualities and other New Religious Movements. Wallis (2000:253) describes Paganism (which he describes as Neo-Shamanism) as 'queer' meaning consciously outside the mainstream and I consider it significant that, when examining discourses on counter-culture, Timothy Leary (1994:53) emphasises the counter-cultural credentials of the Woodstock Pop Festival by describing it as 'pagan'. England and Scotland still have established churches. Anglican Christianity has been woven into the unwritten constitution of England and Presbyterianism into that of Scotland (Davie 1994:39-159). National ritual and pageantry has a Christian flavour and seldom actively involves non-Christian clergy. The 2011 census returns showed Christianity as the largest religious identity with 59.3% of people in England and Wales describing themselves as Christian (Office for National Statistics 2012).

The relationship between Paganism and Christianity has been neither uniform nor consistent. As people within faiths vary so their interactions will also inevitably vary. I believe that the general character of relations between these religions, although improving, is not good. Several Pagans of my acquaintance have moved away from Christianity and Judaism because these faiths failed to satisfy their yearning for spiritual enchantment but others left their parents' religion because they felt that Abrahamic scriptures contained much that was ethically problematic to them. Polytheism in particular is not easy to reconcile with mainstream Christian cosmology. Add to this a legacy of vicious persecution of early Christians by pagan Romans and centuries of denigration of Paganism and magic and a basis for bad relations appears strongly ingrained. Also since many Pagans define themselves against the 'Christian other' a further obstacle to good relations exists.

The second most popular religious orientation in contemporary Britain after Christianity is atheism (the denial of all religion) with just under fifteen million recorded in the 2011 census (Office for National

Statistics 2012). Atheists have often viewed Pagans as being ignorant and superstitious, sometimes more so than Christians. In fact personal experience and remarks by others lead me to conclude that many atheists are even less tolerant of Paganism than of Christianity or than Christians are of Paganism. Paganism is therefore sufficiently contrary to mainstream religious thought in Britain today that it fulfils the requirements of a counter-culture (Greenwood 2000:8). Although I acknowledge that all Pagans are to some extent counter-cultural, I believe a spectrum between hard counter-culturalism and integrationalism can be identified. The counter-cultural side is especially focused on the narrative of oppression and adamantly disinclined to trust authority figures in general, but especially those outside their community. They are less likely to be in regular paid employment which can be derived from opposition to the capitalism of mainstream society and many follow or idealise a nomadic existence. They hope to change society from outside. The integrated Pagans function as members of mainstream British society, are generally content to live settled lives in houses and hold down jobs. They may also feel that society could learn lessons from Paganism but work within existing frameworks to effect social change.

1.2.1. Contemporary Pagans

Yvonne Aburrow in one of her blogs explained that referring to Neo-Paganism is best avoided since the term is used pejoratively both within the Pagan community and outside (Aburrow 2008a). Therefore the terms 'contemporary Paganism', sometimes abbreviated to 'Paganism' will be used throughout this study. Capitalisation is used on Paganism and Pagan since it is customary to use it in the case of other self-adopted religious identities such as Christian. Non-capitalised 'pagan' and 'paganism' will be used to refer to the ancient pre-Christian spiritualities which have inspired contemporary Pagans but which were only defined as pagan by outsiders. Harvey (2005:84) describes Paganism as 'a diverse but cohesive array of nature-centred spiritualities or nature religions'. They tend to celebrate the natural world (Harvey 2000:155) and be non-evangelical, non-dogmatic, lacking an established orthodoxy (Crowley 1995:21-24; Harvey 1997:1-2, 216, 223; Jennings 2002:7-8; Luhrmann 1991:7). This lack of evangelical behaviour is beginning to change as will be seen in chapter 7. Some people within contemporary Paganism are uncomfortable with describing themselves as religious preferring the term spiritual. Asked about this, one informant explained: 'religion is hierarchical and dogmatic. Paganism isn't. I prefer to think of it as spirituality rather than religion'.

Accurate and verifiable numbers of UK Pagans are not known. The 2001 Census provided several self-identifications accepted by the Pagan Federation as Pagan totalling 41,050 individuals (Miller 2005:17) which works out as about 0.07% of the UK population. The 2011 Census recorded those who identified specifically as Pagan had risen to around 57,000 with about another 20,000 identifying as Witches, Wiccans, Druids, Heathens, Shamans etc. (Office of National Statistics 2012). The same survey showed 39,000 Spiritualists, 7,906 Rastafarians, 5,021 Baha'is and 4,105 Zoroastrians. This would suggest that Pagans comprise one of the larger non-Abrahamic religious groupings. However, Miller admits that many Pagans at the time were reluctant to be publicly identified as such and may have opted not to declare their religious identity. I have observed an increasing tolerance of Paganism over the last thirty years and so more of these invisible Pagans may have come out of what has been colloquially known as 'the broom closet'. Cooper (2010:22) cites a BBC survey as indicating the number of UK Pagans in 1997 as about 100,000. Greenwood (2000:5) cites an unnamed participant as suggesting there may be up to 250,000 Pagans in the UK. Jennings (2002:16) asserts that unlike Buddhists, Muslims and Christians, Pagans do not actively proselytise and attempt to win converts. He argues that most Pagans do not choose to convert to Paganism but rather come to the realisation that their existing ideas and beliefs are Pagan (Jennings 2002:16). Jennings (2002:16) also suggested that people might be drawn to Paganism for reasons including spiritual experiences, involvement in environmental activism or rejection of or from their previous religious group.

Unifying Characteristics in Contemporary Paganism

The Pagan Federation, which exists to bring Pagans together and to promote and educate people about Paganism, defines Paganism as 'a polytheistic or pantheistic nature worshipping religion' (Pagan Federation nd). This definition replaces the three 'Principles of Paganism' which it formerly used to provide a definition:

- Love for and Kinship with Nature
- The Pagan Ethic: 'Do what thou wilt, but harm none'
- The concept of Goddess and God
          (Pagan Federation 1992:4; Jennings 2002:9)

The boundaries of contemporary Pagan identity are inevitably (considering the diversity it encompasses) fluid and negotiable (Harvey 2004a:245). Shallcrass (2000:3) describes Druids as being opposed to dogmas and suggests they hold to more mutable ideas held as long as they stand scrutiny, which he terms catmas. Defining Paganism is therefore hampered by its diversity and fluidity (Pagan Federation 1992, Harvey 1997). However, most branches of contemporary Paganism incorporate one or more of the following beliefs:

- Duotheism or Polytheism: participants recognise two or more distinct deities (Zwi Werblowsky 1987:436, Harvey 1997:175). In the case of duotheism, these deities can be a generic god and goddess but most commonly either a Lunar (often triplicated as maiden, mother and crone by phase) or an Earth goddess and either a solar or horned/antlered god of nature and fertility. Polytheists may pick and choose deities from different pantheons but are more likely to devote

their spirituality to one particular cultural/historic family of divinities such as the Tuatha De Danaan of Irish mythology, the Olympian gods of Greece or the Egyptian gods (Jennings 2002; Harvey 1997). The ways in which the divine is perceived varies significantly within the contemporary Pagan community. Wiccans and some of the more political and counter-cultural (i.e. non-integrated) Druids tend to be more inclined to duotheism with 'The God and The Goddess'. Those who are more reconstructionist in their theology will tend to honour a whole pantheon of named gods and goddesses whilst maybe giving particular devotion to one above the others.

- Pantheism considers the material world and the divine to be one indivisible whole while Panentheism recognises the divine as being manifest in the material world, but also to exist beyond it. This is often characterised as a belief that all living things contain a divine essence or spark (Kauffman 1975:343-4; Hartshorne 1987:165; Harvey 1997:176).

- Animism is a word originally coined by E. B. Tylor to describe what he saw as a primitive and erroneous belief that animals and landscape features (even sometimes human-made objects) have souls and consciousness and can interact with humans and that non-divine spirits dwell around us and influence our lives (Harvey 2005:xi; Kauffman 1975:33; Bolle 1987:296). Harvey (2005:xi) prefers to define animism as the recognition 'that the world is full of persons, only some of whom are human, and that life is always lived in relationship with others'. Increasingly people within the Pagan community are identifying themselves specifically as animists often asserting a unity of body and soul or spirit and matter (monism) proposed by Harvey (2005:192-193) and promulgated by Emma Restall Orr (2012:104). This worldview is of key importance to many reburial campaigners but is not without problems as I shall demonstrate in Chapter 7.

- Magic, sometimes spelled magick to differentiate it from sleight of hand conjuring, illusionism, escapist romanticism and spiritualism (Crowley 1986:XI-XII; Harvey 1997:97), was defined by Aleister Crowley (perhaps the most famous occultist of modern times) as 'any event in nature which is brought to pass by will' (Crowley 1986:107). However, this definition might include such simple and everyday actions as toasting bread. Sir James Frazer defined magic as 'practices designed to bring spiritual or supernatural forces under the control of human agents' (Hutton 2001:66). Within the Pagan community, Doreen Valiente (1993:73), one of the first Wiccan high priestesses, cited a definition of magic as 'the science of the secret forces of nature' which she attributed to S.L. MacGregor Mathers. Another definition of magic attributed to the early 20ᵗʰ century occultist Dion Fortune (1932:21) is 'The art of causing changes in consciousness at will' (Butler 1977:12, Starhawk 1999:42). Luhrmann (1991:7) describes the core concept of magic as the belief 'that mind affects matter' and that therefore magical practices are those intended to focus the mind to bring about change in the

physical world. Susan Greenwood (2003:195) goes so far as to suggest that a belief in magic and Paganism are two names for the same thing but I have encountered several people who identify as magical practitioners but not as Pagan and many others who identify as Pagan but do not practise magic. For the purposes of this study I suggest a more useful definition of magic is 'the belief that, through ritual activity or psychic power, humans can access hidden information or bring about change in themselves, others or the world around them' (my words derived from Kauffman 1975:299 and Harvey 1997:87-106).

Additionally, Philip Shallcrass (p.c. 2011) of the British Druid Order suggests that reverence for the ancestors is a characteristic of contemporary Paganism but although common I am unsure if this is sufficiently universal to be considered characteristic of Pagan spirituality. Most Pagans identify strongly with peoples of the pre-Christian past and to a greater or lesser extent feel that they are carrying on or resurrecting the paganisms of the past (Maughfling 2000a:46). As such they will tend to identify strongly with people of the past and derive a sense of tribal communion with them, thus, in some cases, they feel entitled to act as spokespersons for them (Davies 1998, BAJR 2008).

If this diversity of belief and thought were not enough, York (2005:69) and Harvey (2005:28, 2013:206-210) argue that defining spiritualities or religions by beliefs is, in itself, problematic and that what members do (praxis) is a better way to categorise them than their beliefs. Many Pagans (particularly Witches and Druids) carry out ritual in circular spaces (York 2005:63) but some, especially polytheist reconstructionists, do not. Pagans also often leave offerings of various kinds to gods, ancestors and other spiritual beings at sacred places but others, e.g. Restall Orr (1996:27) are opposed to the practice. Thus it may be seen that clear boundaries between 'Pagan' and 'not Pagan' are diffuse, fuzzy, hard to define, and often a matter of opinion.

Branches or Traditions of Contemporary Paganism

The most numerous and well-known types of contemporary Paganism in the UK are:

- Witchcraft, of which the largest element, Wicca, is a tradition invented (some would say revealed or reinvented) by Gerald Gardner in the 1940s (Hutton 2001:205-252). Witchcraft tends to be duotheistic and involves the practice of Magic(k) (Harvey 1997:35-52; Pagan Federation 1992:6).

- Druidry, in which subversive Christian and eclectic occult groups have given rise to Pagan groups throught the 1980s and 1990s (Bonewits 2006:80-81; Cooper 2010:71; Cunliffe 2010:128; Hutton 2006:249-253, 2007:196-200, 2009:418). Many Druid groups however, include Christian members and argue that their philosophies and practices are not exclusively Pagan. Druidry tends to concentrate on 'Celtic' lore

coming from Welsh, Irish, Scottish and Breton sources as well as from classical literature (Harvey 1997:17-34). Contemporary Druids are normally divided into three grades through which initiates work sequentially: Bards who specialise in performance and the arts, Ovates who concentrate on divination and healing and Druids who specialise in ritual, magic and philosophy (Shallcrass 2000:47-139; Green 1997:171). The Druid community is, broadly speaking, split between those orders which concentrate on spiritual training, generally with an ideal of peace-making and those which are more actively political and adopt a warrior ethos, involving themselves in protests in support of religious freedom and green issues (Hutton 2006:256-257).

- Shamanism in Britain is often described as urban or neo-Shamanism to emphasise differences with Shamanism in traditional societies (Jakobsen 1999:147-205). It draws primarily on American Indian practices and cosmologies but also on Siberian Shamanism, African traditions, European Paganism and other influences. It is based around spirit communication ecstatic or trance work and tends strongly towards an animistic worldview (Jakobsen 1999:147-205; Harvey 1997:107-125; Pagan Federation 1992:9).
- Asatru, Heathenism or Odinism is largely based on adherence to the perceived or researched values and deities of 'Viking' or Anglo-Saxon pre-Christian cultures (Harvey 1997:53-68; Pagan Federation 1992:8). Large numbers of deities and other supernatural beings are recognised as well as magic and a degree of predetermined fate (Wyrd or Orlog). Honour, truth, bravery and hospitality are core values among this group (Jennings 2002:94).

There are also many other groups: Some concentrate particularly on the Divine Feminine often from a radical feminist perspective (Hutton 2001:341-251; Pagan Federation 1992:10; Raphael 1999). Some Pagans concentrate on a single pantheon or set of deities associated with a particular historical culture and try to remain as true as possible to the Pagan religions, traditions, values etc. surrounding them, carefully researching historical and archaeological resources to construct and inform their spiritualities. These Pagans are commonly termed Reconstructionists (Aburrow 2008a; Blain 2004:221; Bonewits 2006:304-305; Filan & Kaldera 2013:159-183). An important, perhaps even defining, feature of Reconstructionist Paganism is the scholarly learning associated with it. I suggest that within Paganism as a whole there is a spectrum of reconstructionism versus eclecticism. Jennings (2002:113) describes eclectics as unable or unwilling to limit themselves to one culture. They are happy to combine deities and spiritual practices from a variety of sources and also to include more personal revelation and inspiration into beliefs and practices. Critics describe this as pick and mix spirituality (Jennings 2002:113) and indigenous groups complain of cultural appropriation (Jennings 2002:113). I disagree with Cooper (2010:72) when he describes the Loyal Arthurian Warband as Reconstructionist. LAW is a Druid group which includes Christian members and their liturgy and rhetoric refer to 'The Goddess' rather than named deities from Romano-British, Gallo-Roman and Welsh, Scottish and Irish mythological sources. Witchcraft is frequently unashamedly eclectic whilst Asatru tends towards the firmly reconstructionist end of the spectrum. I suggest that in Druidry a tension between predominantly reconstructionist and more eclectic groups increased throught the 1990s and early 2000s (see Hutton 2006:257; Pendragon & Stone 2003:81-82).

Misconceptions Regarding Pagans

Those not familiar with contemporary Paganism have sometimes, mistakenly or deliberately, conflated Paganism with Satanism as well as with the New Age Movement. This spurious association with Satanism has, in the past, featured in lurid media reports and continues to be promulgated by scandal-hungry reporters and some evangelical Christians, who feel threatened or upset by the increasing prominence of contemporary Paganism (La Fontaine 1998:42-46, 163-166; York 1995:122-123, 131-132, 182).

Pagan traditions are not devil worship or Satanism. The Devil is a construct of Abrahamic cosmology whereas branches of Paganism have their own cosmologies and mythologies (Jennings 2002:12). References to 'Pagan Devil Worship' have however, surfaced in the Press from time to time (Hutton 2001:255, 259-60, 319) and have even been referenced in information panels at major heritage sites such as Avebury to the anger of many Pagans (BBC 2009). Assertions of devil worship are countered by pointing out that the devil does not figure in Pagan cosmology since Pagans usually adopt non-Abrahamic cosmologies, therefore they cannot worship something they do not believe exists (Pengelly & Waredale 1992:3; Pagan Federation 1992:3). There are, however, a few people who identify themselves, and are accepted by others, as contemporary Pagans who work within an Abrahamic cosmology. They are generally those who integrate or restore concepts of 'the divine feminine' to these traditions by recognising characters like Asherah or Lillith as goddesses (Raphael 1999:42; Oringer 1998-2001).

Contemporary Paganism definitely has connections and commonalities with the New Age Movement including features such as diversity and lack of dogma. Pagans tend to emphasise a distinction between themselves and New Agers and may even use the term pejoratively, often accompanied by the term 'fluffy', against those they perceive as being undisciplined, excessively eclectic or in denial of some of the less comfortable aspects of their tradition (Harvey 2004a:245; Jennings 2002:37; Pearson 1998:45; Shallcrass 1998:168; Wallis 2003:29; see also Brown 2012:138). Many New Agers to whom I have spoken maintain a Christian or Buddhist cosmology or use an Abrahamic concept of divinity rather than Pagan ones.

Contested Heritage

Paganism and Occultism are also related but not identical. Occult is defined as that which is kept secret, the esoteric, the mysterious (Greenwood 2000:2) and while many, perhaps most, Pagan traditions fall into this category, others (particularly reconstructionists) do not as there are certainly Pagans who do not practise magic (Raphael 1999:134). Likewise there are occultists who are not Pagan. One of my research participants identified himself as a Crowleyan Magickian and objected strenuously to being referred to as Pagan on the grounds that he did not acknowledge or pay homage to any Pagan deities.

Oppression and Discrimination

Misunderstanding about the nature of contemporary Paganism, and consequent prejudice, has diminished over the last few decades. However, fear of discrimination still remains to some extent, especially amongst the older generations. When studying the contemporary Pagan community, it should be borne in mind that as recently as the 1990s, Pagans were dismissed from their jobs for their beliefs (Pagan Federation 1996:7), had their houses vandalised (Greenwood 2000:5) and had supervision orders placed on their children (Hutton 2001:328), attempts were even made to have their children taken into care (Worthington 2005a:130). Satanic ritual abuse allegations in the late 1980s and early 1990s (e.g. Bell 1988; La Fontaine 1998) created a great deal of fear in the UK Pagan community although few Pagans were accused. La Fontaine (1998:38-55) even went so far as to suggest that the abuse idea was promulgated specifically by US based evangelical Christians to discredit contemporary Paganism. During the 1980s people dubbed by the Press 'New Age Travellers', many of whom had Pagan spiritual beliefs, even had their mobile homes damaged or destroyed by police (Worthington 2005a:130, 142). I argue that the memory of this kind of repression, combined with the myth that mediaeval and early modern witchcraft trials and executions represent an attempt to wipe out a Pagan religion (Hutton 2001:348), still influences Pagan relations with 'establishment' organizations such as government, heritage agencies, the media and the academic world (Hutton 2006:262-264; York 1995:131-135).

Pagan Ethics

The most common example of Contemporary Pagan ethics is the Wiccan rede 'An it harm none, do what thou wilt' (Crowley 1989:78). The archaic language of the rede opens it to several interpretations. One of these is: in order to harm none, follow the true will of your heart or higher self but the most common understanding is: provided your actions harm none, do as you please (Howe 2008:44-45). Howe (2008:44-45) also points out that Wiccans draw ethical guidance from the 'Law or Threefold Return', which states that all you do comes back to you threefold, and also from the ideal of perfect love and perfect trust. Wicca has been enormously influential on other Pagan practices and beliefs and so eclectic Pagan

groups who do not identify themselves specifically as Wiccan often draw on Wiccan ideas such as these. Other Pagan ethical frameworks stress virtues such as the Nine Noble Virtues of Asatru: courage, truth, honour, fidelity, hospitality, discipline, industriousness, self-reliance and perseverance (ADF 2009:86). The Order of Bards, Ovates and Druids (OBOD nd) promotes a nine fold Code of Ethics constructed by Athelia Nihtscada inspired by early mediaeval Irish Brehon Laws:

1. Every action has a consequence that must be observed and you must be prepared to compensate for your actions if required.
2. All life is sacred and all are responsible for seeing that this standard is upheld.
3. You do still live in society and you are bound by its rules.
4. Work with high standards.
5. Make an honest living.
6. Be a good host as well as a good guest.
7. Take care of yourself.
8. Serve your community.
9. Maintain a healthy balance of the spiritual and the mundane.

(OBOD nd)

Many Pagans are keen to present their ethics and morality as superior to Abrahamic codes such as the Ten Commandments. The Pagan Federation (1992:4), for example, describes the Wiccan Rede as 'a positive morality rather than a list of thou shalt nots'.

Origins of Contemporary Paganism

Jones & Pennick (1995:212-214) and Hutton (1996:4, 2001:3-204) describe Wicca as arising from several roots including the Romantic Movement and particularly its interpretations of Classical paganisms, European Occultism, secret societies such as the Freemasons, Folklore and folk magic. These threads were brought together by Gerald Gardner and his collaborators (Hutton 2001:205-252) before being further developed by others including Alex and Maxine Sanders (Hutton 2001:319-339).

Druidry can be traced back further but may be argued to have only become Pagan in the last three decades or so (Bonewits 2006:80-81; Cooper 2010:71; Cunliffe 2010:128; Hutton 2006:249-253, 2007:196-200, 2009:418). Antiquarians such as John Aubrey (1626-1697) and William Stukeley (1687-1765) suggested that the Druids mentioned by Roman writers might have been the builders of the megalithic stone circles thus inspiring an enduring fascination with Druids in Britain (Green 1997:140-57; Souden 1997:24; Bahn 1996:44). William Camden established an image of the Druids as monotheistic proto-Christians by mistranslating a Greek text thus making Druids acceptable to a Christian audience (Hutton 2008:14). Stukeley was so enthusiastic about Druids that he chose to identify himself as one but that he

was unable to find anyone to join him (Hutton 2008:7). Claims that John Aubrey considered himself a Druid remain unsubstantiated and are generally dismissed by those who have made detailed studies of him. Although Stukeley was unsuccessful in recruiting new Druids, a couple of generations afterwards through the late 18th and 19th centuries, quasi-masonic gentlemen's friendly societies calling themselves Druids such as the Ancient Order of Druids had appeared (Bonewits 2006:70-73) and by 1905, the AOD were holding ceremonies at Stonehenge (Stout 2008b:119; Worthington 2005a:57). Edward Williams (1747-1826), a Welsh stonemason, was a passionate Welsh patriot and poet. In his enthusiasm to promote both Welsh culture and the religious philosophy of Deism he took on the Bardic name Iolo Morgannwg and sought out evidence for continuity of belief and practice to restore this tradition (Green 1997:153). When he failed to find such evidence, he resorted to his remarkable imagination and skilfully forged it (Hutton 2009:313-4; Harvey 2011:277-8). In doing so, he produced the foundations of the Welsh National Eisteddfod (Green 1997:154-7) and a liturgy which has continued into contemporary Druidry. Around 1908 George Watson MacGregor Reid formed a spiritual group calling itself the Universal Bond. By 1912 this was renamed the Ancient Druid Order and was holding ceremonies at Stonehenge (Hutton 2009:348; Stout 2008a:125-7, 2008b:118-9). Worthington (2005a:57) characterises Reid's ADO as influenced by theosophy and occultism producing a Druidry which I would describe as moving away from Christianity. Nevertheless, by the early 1980s Wiccans and other Pagans still perceived the Druids of the time as Christian. In 1964 Ross Nichols, a friend of Gerald Gardner and described by Bonewits (2006:78) as adhering to an eclectic mix of liberal Christianity, Buddhism and Sufism influenced by Celtic mythology, founded a splinter group from ADO which he named the Order of Bards, Ovates and Druids (OBOD) (Bonewits 2006:78; Hutton 2009:399). This new order did not long survive Nichols death in 1975 but was re-founded by Nichols' protégé Philip Carr-Gomm in 1988 with a distinctly Pagan character (Carr-Gomm 1990:9-11). The new OBOD was not exclusively Pagan but had an increasingly Pagan focus. The late 1980s and 1990s saw the emergence of new orders such as the British Druid Order, Cotswold Order of Druids, Insular Order of Druids, Loyal Arthurian Warband and Glastonbury Order of Druids, many of which were thoroughly Pagan in character (Bonewits 2006:80-81; Cooper 2010:71; Cunliffe 2010:128; Hutton 2006:249-253, 2007:196-200, 2009:418).

The history of Germanic Heathenry can be traced back to the late 19th or early 20th century through Guido von List (1848-1919) and Willibald Hentschel (1858-1947) in Europe but its history in Britain is hard to trace back much further than the 1980s, when a group calling itself The Odinic Rite achieved recognised charity status (Jones & Pennick 1995:219, Toynbee 1996). Since then numerous groups such as Ring of Troth and The Odinist Fellowship have emerged. Heathens have been finding historical evidence suggesting that the heathenry of pre-Christian times incorporated Shamanic practices and several have been experimenting with such techniques (Harvey 2011:284-285). The most popular sources on this area are Brian Bates' *Way of Wyrd* (1996) and Jenny Blain's *Nine Worlds of Seidr Magic* (2002).

The word Shaman originates from the Tungus of Siberia and has come to be applied to practitioners of ecstatic or trance based ritual practices involving mastery of or alliance with spirit beings in many cultures around the world (Jakobsen 1999:2). Wallis (2003:24) asserted that European interest in Shamanism may be traced back to the 17th century. However, perception of Shamans in a positive light in Britain only goes back to the latter part of the 19th century and the romanticisation of American Indians in the mould of a 'Noble Savage'. American Indian spiritual beliefs also inspired environmental campaigns, notably that of Archibald Belaney (1888-1938), a British man, who presented himself as an American Indian named Grey Owl (Anahareo 1972:177-179; Wallis 2003:61, 201). His campaign demonstrates that British People had begun to see American Indian traditions as admirable nature-focused spiritualities to be emulated. Wallis (2003: 25) suggests that occultists working in Britain in the first half of the 20th century such as Blavatsky and Spare may have been influenced by ideas of Shamanism. However, it was probably not until Carlos Castañeda, working on the basis of academic work such as that of Mircea Eliade, published six books explaining the work of a, probably fictional, Shaman named Don Juan that significant numbers of people in Britain began to identify themselves as Shamans (Dutton 2012:147; Hardman 2007:38-40; Jakobsen 1999:157; Wallis 2003:39-42). Subsequently Michael Harner, Joan Halifax and others publicised Shamanism to spiritual seekers (Jakobsen 1999:158-9). In my opinion, Shamanism has had a great influence on the other strands of contemporary Paganism with Witches, Druids and Heathens adopting Shamanic practices.

Pagan Community Leaders

Throught the 1990s and 2000s there have been several prominent spokespeople for contemporary Paganism. Within Druidry, Emma Restall Orr has featured on radio programmes and television broadcasts talking about Pagan beliefs, ethics and practices but has now retired. Arthur Pendragon has also caught the media's attention and has even referred to himself as a 'media tart' (Pendragon & Stone 2003:249). He co-wrote an autobiography which details his campaigns up to the end of the nineties (Pendragon & Stone 2003). Other Druid leaders have included Rollo Maughfling (Glastonbury Order of Druids), Philip (Greywolf) Shallcrass (British Druid Order), Phillip Carr-Gomm (Order of Bards Ovates and Druids), Veronica Hammond (Cotswold Order of Druids), Mark Graham (Charnwood order of Druids), Phil Ryder (The Druid Network) and Steve Wilson (Druid Clan of Dana). Influential and well-known witches have included Shan Jayran, Maxine Sanders, Vivianne and Chris Crowley,

Patricia Crowther, Janet Farrar and Gavin Bone. Within the Heathen/Nordic/Asatru community there have been several groups, each with different leaders. Three of the most prominent names within this community have been Freya Aswynn , Pete Jennings (formerly head of the Pagan Federation) and Runic John whom I spoke to briefly on a field trip to Thornborough Henges. It was harder to identify community leaders among contemporary Pagan Shamans but one prominent practitioner and writer on the subject has been Gordon (the Toad) MacLellan. Among non-Germanic Reconstructionists, the most significant names I encountered were Nick Ford and Robin Herne. Based on an engagement with the contemporary Pagan community extending about twenty years I would suggest that leadership is built in a manner similar to Lewellen's (1992:84) model for tribal or band leadership in which leadership is not conferred from one leader to another but rather dies with the outgoing leader and is then built up by the new leader through charisma and respect. Such community leaders may even be better able to shape opinion within the community than those who have leadership passed on to them. However, they have seldom been as didactic as clergy in established 'world' religions as adherents are generally keen to make their own decisions and authoritarian behaviour tends to alienate the kind of free-thinking counter-cultural individualists who tend to be drawn to Paganism. Additionally ideas from others, most notably scholars like Hutton, Pryor and Parker Pearson, have been enthusiastically adopted into Pagan beliefs. I argue that Pagan community leaders neither fully shape nor reflect the opinions of their communities due to the diversity of opinions they encompass. However, they do need to maintain at least a degree of reflection or representation to maintain their position and are therefore worthy of recognition and consideration.

1.2.2. Defining Heritage Professionals

A professional may be defined as a person practising a vocation or calling, particularly an academic or scientific one, or someone who displays the competence, conduct and standards appropriate to such a vocation or calling (Darvill 2012:375). Thus heritage professionals are those whose vocation or calling lies in that sector, but how can the heritage sector be defined?

Defining the Heritage Sector

Much debate has occurred surrounding definitions of heritage (Carman & Sørensen 2009:11-24). An example of a simple dictionary definition of Heritage is the Oxford English Dictionary's (Pearsall & Trumble 2003:660) "Inheritance, a nation's historic buildings, monuments, countryside etc". Darvill (2003:176) expands this to include 'images, ideas, sentiments and practices' which he refers to as intangible heritage. He also comments on a distinction, sometimes drawn between 'natural heritage', which is natural landscape and ecology, and 'cultural heritage', created/modified or built places and material culture (see also Harrison 2010:11). It may be argued

that places without any obvious human modification can be deemed cultural heritage if they have important cultural significance (Harrison 2010:12-13). However, Smith (2008:11) famously argued that 'there is no such thing as heritage' suggesting that the term is misapplied to material things being rather a set of processes. John Carman (Carman & Sørensen 2009:12) pointed out that a 'one-and-for-all' definition of heritage would have to be so vague as to be almost meaningless, arguing rather for flexible contextualised understanding of what heritage entails. Carman and Sørensen (2009:14) have suggested that the development of the concept of heritage came about with a more collective ownership of the material aspects of heritage. Carman (2005:119-121) has expanded on this observation criticising the way in which heritage sites and artefacts are owned. Other criticisms include Wright's (2009:105,136,193-194,218) and Hewison's (1987:53, 143-144) identification of a middle class bias and avoidance of narratives of class division and political unrest. Hewison also (1987:43-45) asserted that commodification of heritage has led to an imposed set of criteria for determining heritage value. However, this assertion has been challenged by Urry (1990:110) who has argued that heritage value is ascribed from the grass roots, citing the 1.5 million membership of the National Trust in 1987. I argue that the situation is actually more fluid and dynamic with consumer opinions being influenced by managers, media and academics but also influencing them as well. It could be argued that funding bodies, like the Heritage Lottery Fund, have been either arbiters or a means of heritage professionals to enforce the Authorised Heritage Discourse. However the latter view has seemed less likely with the increasing expectation that funding should be contingent on an expressed need at grass-roots level. Smith and Waterton (2009:11) have dismissed discourses on protection as rhetoric and assert that archaeologists' and heritage professionals' 'interest in the past is no more or less legitimate or worthy of respect than anyone else's' arguing that all communities with interests in heritage should have equal authority in how it is defined, interpreted and presented. This assertion is not unproblematic and I shall address this in section 8.3.3.

If a broader definition of heritage is adopted, much that is not archaeological may be considered heritage. However, Skeates, Carman & McDavid (2012:1-8) point out that little if any archaeology is not heritage. Thus the issues of sites and monuments, access, protection, interpretation and ownership and those relating to the treatment of human remains can be comfortably considered heritage issues.

Origins of Heritage Attractions

Museums and heritage organisations are seen by some as part of the 'establishment', at least in part, due to the government connections with organisations such as the British Museum, English Heritage and, arguably, The National Trust. Museums are perhaps the oldest method of presenting the past to the British public in a way

recognisable as heritage. The origins of museums are found in the 'cabinets of curiosity' containing archaeological, anthropological and other items of interest which the wealthy collected and displayed to visitors in the 17th and 18th centuries (Parry 2007:30; Bahn 1996:36-7). David M. Wilson (1990:13), former director, explained the British Museum was created by an Act of Parliament in 1753 when Hans Sloane left his collection to the nation. This, along with other collections, became the core of the British Museum which was the first public corporate museum in the world (Burnett & Reeve 2001:11-12; Wilson 1990:13).

The National Trust was created as a charitable foundation in 1895, and subsequently regulated by acts of parliament, to purchase and preserve places of historic interest and natural beauty in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (Salway 1996:1). It has become one of the largest owners of heritage sites in the UK and, at the time of writing, recorded over 3,700,000 paid up members (National Trust nda). With the increase in tourism since the 19th century heritage sites have become popular tourist attractions with a recent survey indicating that 68% of British adults have visited a museum and 38% have visited an archaeological site (BDRC nd). Government regulation of heritage began in 1882 with Lubbock's Ancient Monuments Act to prevent destruction of ancient monuments (Her Majesty's Government 1882; Worthington 2005a:96). This act and its successors ensure oversight and protection of all scheduled monuments. Subsequently many such sites were gifted to the nation and direct management of them, as well as oversight of all scheduled monuments, was undertaken by the ministry of works. In 1984 the Thatcher government reorganised state heritage management setting up English Heritage, the first of the independently managed regional Quangos (quasi-autonomous non-governmental organisations) who are now responsible for overseeing scheduled monuments and managing those in public ownership (English Heritage ndd; Chippindale 1986:42). Since then the regulatory, oversight and statutory advisory role has been removed from EH and invested in a new body: Historic England.

Heritage Aims and Ethics

Heritage organisations may be government controlled and subsidised, subsidised but independent, or independent in both means and governance. As previously explained most of the largest heritage organisations have had some affiliation to government and thus heritage organisations in general are likely to be regarded as part of the 'establishment' by Pagan activists. The mission statements of heritage organisations give a strong indication of how they see their role. Examples of these drawn from their websites are as follows:

> English Heritage exists to protect and promote England's spectacular historic environment and ensure that its past is researched and understood
> (English Heritage nda)

English Heritage helps people understand, value, care for and enjoy England's historic environment.
(English Heritage ndb)

Cadw, the statutory heritage body in Wales explains:

> We aim to:
> protect and sustain, encourage community engagement in, improve access to the historic environment of Wales. This includes historic buildings, ancient monuments, historic parks, gardens and landscapes, and underwater archaeology.
> (Cadw nd)

The National Trust describes its mission thus:

> We protect historic houses, gardens, mills, coastline, forests, woods, fens, beaches, farmland, moorland, islands, archaeological remains, nature reserves, villages and pubs. Then we open them up forever, for everyone.
> (National Trust ndb)

In chapters 3, 5 and 8 I shall offer evidence suggesting that heritage organisations do not always live up to these lofty aims and can, in fact, be exclusionary not merely in terms of keeping people physically outside sites but also with regards to historical and interpretative narratives relating to them.

Who Shapes Policy in the Heritage Sector?

I have already cited Hewison's and Urry's arguments that heritage has been imposed from above or influenced from below but there have been other influences as well. All heritage organisations must operate within the law and many are affiliated with professional bodies with Codes of Practice such as the Museums Association (2008). For quangos, such as English Heritage (ndf), most funding and hence some direction has been supplied by the Department for Media, Culture and Sport or its equivalents in the Scottish and Welsh governments for Historic Scotland and Cadw. These organisations are also bound by international treaties such as the UNESCO (2010) Conventions and the Valletta Agreement (Council of Europe 1992). Their directions are also charted by their own senior management. Charitable trusts are managed by a board of trustees but may to a greater or lesser extent give a voice to signed-up members (Dickson et al 1998:9-14). Privately owned and run heritage ventures are largely influenced by issues of profitability which in turn will be largely the result of consumer choice. Consumer choice however, may, at least to a degree, be driven by media coverage of heritage, history and archaeology. Heritage researchers including Hewison (1987:53, 143-144), Smith (2006:155-156) and Wright (2009:105,136,193-194,218) point out a middle class bias in the management of Heritage. However, I would also suggest that academics and through them a rationalistic, mechanistic worldview are also highly influential in how heritage is perceived and managed. If academic discourses

on heritage through sociology, economics, archaeology, history, art history etc are studied by managers, as they surely are, they will inevitably influence the way heritage organisations are run.

Professional ethics are usually more strictly codified than Pagan ethics. I judge the most important ethical principles regarding heritage management to be the requirements to make heritage attractions as inclusive to all as possible and to optimise access with explanations for any restrictions (Museums Association 2008:12). Issues surrounding heritage ethics will be examined in detail in section 6.1.5 with regard to access and inclusivity and section 6.3.1 with regard to human remains.

1.2.3. Defining Archaeologists

In order to define the archaeological profession it is first necessary to define what archaeology itself is. Darvill (2003:21) defines archaeology as "The study of past human societies and their environments through the systematic recovery and analysis of material culture and physical remains". Philip Rahtz (1991:1) describes it as 'The study of *things*, tangible objects which can be seen and measured...the physical manifestation of human activities'. Francis Pryor (2003:xvii) explains that archaeology (unlike history) is a 'hands-on' approach to studying the past. He also describes archaeologists reconstructing past thoughts and behaviour from 'discarded prehistoric rubbish' (Pryor 2002:xix). Cornelius Holtorf (2007:63-95) explains how archaeologists are perceived by the public, which has almost inevitably fed back into how the profession expresses its own identity. He describes archaeologists as being: adventurers, detectives, revealers of profound truth, guardians of the past or a combination of these. Archaeologists, therefore, are the people (both professional and amateur) who conduct, teach or participate in the study of the past through material remains. The discipline of archaeology grew out of the antiquarianism of the 17th to 19th centuries. Antiquarians were generally made up of the landed gentry, clergy, and aristocracy who were developing an interest in the land they owned. In this aspect archaeologists share some common ancestry with contemporary Pagans (particularly Druids) who can include members of the antiquarian tradition among the progenitors of their movement (Hutton 2008:5-8, 2009:86-117). While Paganism blended a romantic vision of the past with classicism, secret societies (such as the freemasons) magic and occultism (Hutton 2001:3-131), archaeology applied increasing academic rigour and scientific techniques to become the respected discipline it is today (Darvill 2012:374-381; Stout 2008a:17-36).

Before World War 2, there were two broad theoretical schools: Cultural Historical archaeology and Settlement archaeology. The latter was championed by the German archaeologist Gustav Kossinna (Bahn 1996:136-8). He was opposed by Vere Gordon Childe who championed his cultural historical approach (Stout 2008a:71). Both theoretical paradigms mapped characteristic artefacts and remains to attempt to ascertain areas controlled by distinct groups. Childe preferred to think of these groups as cultures and was not keen to associate them with contemporary nations or ethnicities. Kossina, on the other hand, was keen to do so. Although he died in 1931, Kossina's ideas found favour in Nazi Germany but were discredited after 1945 (Bahn 1996:216-8). Whereas in Europe, archaeology was seen as being most closely allied with history, in the United States it was seen as being a sub-discipline of anthropology (Johnson 2006:28). In the mid-1960s a new archaeological theoretical paradigm emerged, initially known as 'The New Archaeology' but subsequently known as Processual Archaeology (Johnson 2006:12-30). It was championed by Lewis Binford, a young American archaeologist who advocated a more scientific and anthropological approach to data gathering and interpretation (Johnson 2006:20). It is less interested in the spatial limits of cultural groups so much as how groups, individuals and their cultures changed through time (Johnson 2006:22, 25). It emphasises the use of ethnographic parallels to interpret archaeological finds and tends to speak about the past in positivistic scientific language (Johnson 2006:48-63).

From the 1980s this positivism was being called into question by archaeologists such as Ian Hodder who proposed an idea of Interpretive Archaeologies. In this paradigm, a wide range of methodologies and tools (technological and cognitive) might be employed (Johnson 2006:98-115). Perhaps driven by a public desire to know more about the lives of their ancestors, the current interpretive archaeologies theoretical paradigm tends to focus on the everyday lives of individuals in the past more than that of the previous theoretical schools. Although some archaeologists, such as myself (see section 2.2) prefer to think of our hermeneutic theories as cognitive tools to be applied or discarded according to utility (p.c. Hanks 2009), many archaeologists define themselves by hermeneutic theoretical schools such as Marxist, Functionalist and Structuralist.

Types of Archaeologist

Probably the most widespread archaeological employment is in the contract or rescue sector. This work includes managing archives, assessing impact of development proposals and advising developers on the anticipated need of archaeological intervention. It also involves surveys, watching briefs on developments in progress and, where necessary excavation of sites prior to development thus 'preserving by record' evidence of the past before it is destroyed by building and construction work (Barber et al 2008:31; Carver 2009:365-367; DCMS 2009:22; Spoerry 1993:32-34). Archaeologists, as specialists in the past, are also often employed in the heritage sector (BAJR nd IfA nd). A second area of employment for archaeologists is academia. Academic archaeologists' work consists largely of research and/or teaching, mostly in universities. Finally there is Public and Community Archaeology which encompasses outreach by commercial and academic

organisations but also includes community based groups often consisting of amateurs. Archaeology has always attracted many enthusiastic amateurs, who may or may not have formal qualifications in the discipline. Most famously the author Agatha Christie was involved in excavations in Mesopotamia (Bahn 1996:243).

Archaeological Ethics and Codes of Practice

Vardy and Grosch (1999:4) remarked that the word 'ethics' originates from a word meaning character but has come to refer to behaviour of virtuous character. Blackburn (2003:4) asserted that humans are 'ethical animals' on the basis that we 'grade and evaluate, and compare and admire'. Scarre and Scarre (2006:1) suggested that ethics govern or inform 'what sort of people we should be, what kind of acts we should perform or avoid, and how we should treat our fellow human beings'. They proposed that the fundamental purpose of archaeological ethics is to provide a framework within which practitioners may operate to ensure that information regarding the past is gathered and shared in a manner which minimises loss of data whilst avoiding causing harm to anyone or anything (Scarre & Scarre 2006:3). The most fundamental rules governing archaeological work are enshrined in law, for example: the 1979 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (Her Majesty's Government 1979) makes unauthorised disturbance of scheduled archaeological sites and ancient monuments a criminal offence and the 1857 Burial Act requires government licences to be issued before excavation of human remains can be carried out in England and Wales with similar legislation covering Scotland (Roberts 2009:26-7). Guidance beyond the basic requirements of the law may be found through professional associations such as the Museums Association (MA), which publishes a *Code of Ethics* (Museums Association 2008), and the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA), which publishes a *Code of Conduct* (IfA 2010). Organisations employing archaeologists and heritage professionals may also have policy documents specifying standards and procedures for professional practice. In chapters 5 and 6 this book will examine how these laws; codes and policies affect and inform the interactions of archaeologists and heritage professionals with contemporary Pagans.

Contesting Archaeology

Contestation of archaeology and heritage is not, of course, restricted to Pagans or to the United Kingdom. Issues of contestation include disturbance and appropriation of archaeological material have been largely addressed through legislation and by attempting to inculcate an appreciation of their value as an archaeological, educational and tourism resource: Tomb robbery was campaigned and legislated against (Little 2009:39, 2012:399-401). In the UK, metal detectorists have, to some extent, been brought into the archaeological fold by use of arrangements such as the portable antiquities scheme (Bland 2005:440-447, 2004:272-291). More relevant to Pagan contestation of archaeology is the way in which the archaeological

community and ethnic minority or indigenous groups in colonised areas have addressed conflicting aspirations for sites through polyvocality and recognitions of stakeholdership and/or cognitive ownership (Coleman 2013:156-175; Carmichael et al 1994:5-7; Davidson 1995:3-5; McDavid 2002:310-312, 2009:217-234; O'Regan 1994:95-106; Watkins 2012:663).

1.2.4. Pagan Archaeologists and Heritage Professionals

So far I have acknowledged the crossover between the archaeological and heritage communities. However there are members of those communities who also identify as Pagan. Several student archaeologists of my acquaintance, several heritage workers and three field archaeologists have identified themselves as Pagan to me but most expressed a desire for colleagues in their sectors not to know about their spirituality expressing concern that doing so may affect their working relationship with colleagues and opportunities for career advancement. I therefore think it difficult to design an accurate quantitative survey to assess the proportion of people working in this sector who consider themselves Pagan.

1.3. Situating the Researcher

In keeping with Davies' (2002:4, 87-90) principle of reflexivity (see also section 2.5) I should ensure the reader is aware of where I situate myself regarding these groups. There is a more detailed, reflexive statement in section 2.5 but the most important points are as follows. I consider myself an insider in each of the communities on which this book focuses. I have identified myself as a Pagan, albeit a slightly agnostic one, for over twenty-five years. On the strength of academic qualifications and work in the sector I claim membership of the archaeological community. I have also worked in the heritage sector as a tour guide, storyteller and costumed historical interpreter. Therefore I consider myself an insider in the Pagan, archaeological and heritage communities. This joint affiliation gave me a better understanding of their core values and shared ideologies. Francis Pryor's (Time Team 1999) assertion that Pagans and archaeologists share a concern for ancient monuments and ought to get on better with one another particularly helped to inspire this project. Conducting the research and writing this book has been a transformative journey of discovery. My initial position was critical of archaeological and heritage approaches, especially regarding human remains. Learning more about how archaeologists and museum professionals act and feel regarding them and engaging critically with the arguments surrounding the reburial issue has moved to a position considerably more critical of the Pagan campaigners.

1.4. The Structure of the Book

Having defined the most important terms in this study and stated my personal position regarding the groups involved, the structure of the book requires some explanation. Chapter 2 explains how the research was designed and

implemented as well as lessons learned in the field. The main focus of the Book however, consists of two main areas of contestation between contemporary Pagans and the archaeological community and heritage sector. These are: the treatment of prehistoric human remains and the management of ancient monuments/sacred sites.

In chapters 3, 4 and 5 this Book explores matters relating to sites described as ancient monuments by archaeologists and heritage professionals but seen as sacred places and used for ritual and/or worship by Pagans. Chapter 3 focuses on contestation of access to sites, chapter 4 on the preservation of sites and chapter 5 on the interpretation and ownership of sites.

Chapters 6 and 7 investigate contestation of human remains or Ancestors. Chapter 6 explains the reasons why ancient human bodies and bones are of interest to archaeologists and why they are displayed in museums. It examines the legislative, professional and institutional regulations which govern the treatment of human remains. Finally it explores the reality of how remains are excavated, analysed, and stored, displayed or reburied. Chapter 7 examines in detail the way in which Pagans have contested archaeological examination and museum display of remains and the ideas and arguments involved.

The Book concludes in chapter 8 by bringing together analysis of contestation from the separate issues previously examined. I interrogate the reasons for contestation through the examination of concepts of moral ownership, guardianship, advocacy, culture clash and lack of a shared epistemology.

Overall this Book provides a description and analysis of interactions between archaeological/heritage professionals and contemporary Pagans through investigating issues of contestation involving both. It explains that fundamental failures in inclusivity policies and practices over decades have exacerbated a situation where incompatible worldviews and dialectics lead to lack of a common discourse which in turn has exacerbated mistrust and disrespect.