



Authentic livelihoods? Navigating authenticity and change in the Lake District cultural landscape

Faye Shortland^a, Steven B. Emery^{b,*}

^a School of Architecture and Cities, University of Westminster, 35 Marylebone Road, London, NW1 5LS, UK

^b Centre for Rural Policy Research, Faculty of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, University of Exeter, Devon, EX4 4PJ, UK

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Heritage
Livelihood
Farmers
National trust
Autonomy
Rewilding
Commons

ABSTRACT

Cultural Landscape heritage designations imbue an unresolved tension between authenticity and change, which is uncatered for in UNESCO guidance and inadequately addressed in the academic literature. This leads to management dilemmas, and potential threats to the status of designations as conflicts over management play out in practice. In this paper we propose a particular interpretation of livelihood as heritage to redress this tension and to provide an operational framework for decision-making in Cultural Landscapes that directly addresses the unresolved questions inherent in Poullos' *Living Heritage Approach*. To do so we combine the principles of a Sustainable Rural Livelihoods Approach with the anthropology of work and value alongside the invocation of the *Georgic ethic* within the context of the Lake District World Heritage Site, UK. Through an ethnographic vignette approach, we explore how farmers and a major conservation landowner (The National Trust) negotiate (authentic) change in relation to the management of the farmed landscape. We argue that authentic changes should be interpreted as those which are mediated by the enactment and reproduction of local livelihood strategies, whilst conforming with vernacular value interpretations of work and betterment. We show, however, that the category of 'local' or 'indigenous' is not immutable and nor are the practices and interventions that are deemed acceptable. We caution, therefore, against renditions of local communities as being resistant to change and provide examples of how endogenous pivots toward environmental practices and tourism can be incorporated into an authentic livelihood strategy.

1. Introduction

In this paper we argue for a broadened interpretation of livelihood as heritage in cultural landscapes based on research conducted in the period immediately following the designation of World Heritage Site status to the English Lake District in 2017. Our overarching aim is to demonstrate how a livelihood-as-heritage approach provides a theoretical, ethical and operational basis for addressing the central challenge of managing for socio-material continuity and change in cultural landscapes.

The English Lake District was designated in the class of 'Cultural Landscape' denoting 'combined works of nature and humankind' expressing 'a long and intimate relationship between peoples and their natural environment' (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2024). The Lake District is classified as a subcategory 2.ii 'Continuing Landscape' – denoting one that 'retains an active social role in contemporary society closely associated with the traditional way of life, and in which the

evolutionary process is still in progress ... [whilst] ... exhibit[ing] significant material evidence of its evolution over time' (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2024). More specifically the Lake District inscription combines three *distinctive* but inter-linked characteristics: its agro-pastoral traditions based on local breeds of sheep and commons grazing; its role in the development of the Picturesque and Romantic movement, generating new ideas about the relationship between humanity and its environment, and; the development of the idea of the universal value of scenic landscape and its role in the development of a global conservation movement (LDNPP, 2024). This designation immediately implicates the Lake District within key debates around authenticity, change, and nature/culture definitions.

Continuing Landscapes have also been referred to as living landscapes (Hingley, 2011) on account of the reimagining and reworking of these landscapes over time. In this paper we consider the interactions between alternative interpretations of 'living' to help comment on/unpick regnant debates in the management of Cultural Landscapes. First a

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: s.b.emery@exeter.ac.uk (S.B. Emery).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2026.104143>

Received 19 May 2025; Received in revised form 10 March 2026; Accepted 12 March 2026

Available online 19 March 2026

0743-0167/© 2026 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

'living' landscape denotes that there are people living within it. Second, it denotes that the landscape is alive, agentive and therefore changing. Thirdly we can consider it denotes a landscape in which livings are made; as a site and mutually constituted product of livelihood. This third interpretation, we contend, involves not only income generation but the living of a decent and worthwhile life (De l'Estoile, 2014; Narotzky and Besnier, 2014). Focussing on the third interpretation, we argue, allows us to engage with debates in heritage studies that relate to the first and second interpretations; namely the place for people and change within designated landscapes (Poulios, 2008, 2010, 2011).

Much of the literature on Cultural Landscape designations grapples with conflicts over authenticity and change inherent in the need to uphold landscape heritage value and the role and viability of resident communities (Winter, 2004; Baillie, 2006; Harvey, 2015). Maintaining livelihoods has been a recurrent theme within such literatures but this has been poorly theorised and/or narrowly interpreted in practice; often as the need for new income streams linking the heritage designation with tourism (Brumann and Berliner, 2016; MacRae, 2017; Zhang, 2022). In this paper we argue against renditions of livelihood that are seen as either:

- i) in conflict with heritage
- ii) as passive beneficiaries of heritage opportunities

In other words, we argue against renditions of livelihood as *apart* from heritage. Instead, we argue for a broadened interpretation of livelihood as heritage in Cultural Landscapes. To do so we borrow from the Sustainable Rural Livelihoods Literatures (e.g. Bebbington, 1999; Scoones, 2009) and the anthropology of work (e.g. Wallman, 1979; Gudeman, 1986; Emery, 2010), with livelihood interpreted not only as a realm of instrumental action, but also for hermeneutical and emancipatory action (Bebbington, 1999: 2022). In doing so, our work directly addresses the unanswered questions inherent in the *Living Heritage Approach* of Poulios (2015: 171); namely, in how to define a 'core' community without essentialising, and how to account and manage for changes and heterogeneity within and between different communities whilst maintaining heritage continuity. We demonstrate how authenticity (in terms of livelihood) is not contingent upon longevity or autochthony but is culturally negotiated in the intercourse of everyday life and work. This has important implications for exogenous management interventions, and the means and mechanisms through which changes are interpreted, judged and qualified.

The paper is based on ethnographic research with farmers and management stakeholders in the Lake District conducted by Shortland in the period following WHS inscription. A specific focus is on the relationship between farmers and the National Trust – the UK's largest conservation and heritage landowner. In recent years the National Trust has pivoted its focus toward biodiversity, nature recovery and other environmental priorities. This has led many in the Lake District, and beyond, to argue that the National Trust is failing to uphold its obligations toward heritage and, in particular, to the farming communities whose work and practices have shaped landscapes of significant heritage value. On one hand, the case of the Lake District and the role of the National Trust is distinct: the tripartite designation of the WHS and the dual role of the National Trust as both conservation organisation and agricultural landlord create particular management tensions. On the other hand, the Lake District serves as an exemplar of the management debates taking place across Europe's cultural landscapes on account of a hermeneutical resurgence of the nature-culture dualism ushered in under the spectre of rewilding (Drenthen, 2018; Krauß and Olwig, 2018; Massenberg et al., 2023). Whilst many conservation organisations in Europe, including the National Trust, would not explicitly ascribe to such a dualistic vision of humanity's place in nature, nor to the logics of capitalist accumulation and dispossession, many contemporary approaches have not realised a biocultural or socio-ecological vision of landscape's dynamism (Rotherham, 2015; Plieninger and Bieling, 2012).

Moreover, in the case of the Lake District it has also been suggested that rewilding initiatives represent a modern form of 'virtual enclosure' (Olwig, 2016) through which farmers are intentionally or otherwise, deprived of their customary rights on Common Land.

2. Literature review

In this section we introduce the tensions over authenticity and change within heritage management and critically engage with the questions that remain to be answered by a *Living Heritage Approach*. We follow Cohen's (2009) call for the *Georgic Ethic* to provide a moral framework for decision-making in agricultural landscapes, and tie this to a broadened conceptualisation of livelihood through recourse to the Sustainable Rural Livelihoods Approach (SRLA). Finally, we explore the cultural values of *betterment and hard work* that are fundamentally wrapped up in farming livelihoods and inform farmers' attitudes towards change and authenticity in the conduct of their landscape practices (Emery, 2010; Emery and Carrithers, 2016).

2.1. Authenticity, change and community in living heritage

In terms of the practical management of cultural landscapes, tensions often arise over the extent to which the material landscapes (and the types of practices that produce them) should be 'frozen' to preserve the heritage in question versus the need to accommodate and indeed facilitate (the 'right types' of) change (Bender, 1992; Poulios, 2008; Wheeler, 2014). Practically, the two ideas of preservation and change often rub up against one another in the designation of World Heritage Cultural Landscapes (Winter, 2004; Baillie, 2006; Hingley, 2011; Wheeler, 2014). Wheeler (2014) argues that the example of the World Heritage designation of Cornwall and Devon as a mining landscape is a prime example of how World Heritage status can lead to the 'museumification' of a landscape (see also Caravello, 2023) and provides no framework for change. In contrast, other work has explored the implications of 'too much' or the 'wrong type' of change on the authenticity of cultural landscapes as a consequence of tourism, urban development and natural disasters (Mosler, 2009; Maxim and Chasovschi, 2021; Reeves and Long, 2011; Rindrasih and Witte, 2021). Carter (2010), meanwhile, explored the tensions between nature and culture at the Fraser Island World Heritage Area, Australia, in which the authentic engagement of indigenous communities in landscape management was stifled by an overly 'naturalistic gaze' on the part of planners and decision-makers.

In the Lake District, and other sites designated under the 'Continuing Landscape' sub-category, the tension between change and preservation is written into the designation itself: with the landscape being part of an 'ongoing evolutionary process' whilst also exhibiting 'significant material evidence of its evolution over time'. This suggests that changes should be permitted -in fact required – as part of landscapes' inherent dynamism, whilst simultaneously preserving a record of its evolution (rather than any one particular landscape configuration from a moment in time). How, exactly, this tension is to be managed, and what constitutes the right type or amount of change, however, is left unanswered in UNESCO guidance (Porcal-Gonzalo, 2023).

Beyond UNESCO's recognition of living heritage as an ontological category, Poulios (2008, 2010, 2011) has also put forward a *living heritage approach* to guide the interpretation and management of heritage value, which goes beyond material- and values-based approaches (Poulios, 2010). Poulios demonstrates that a values-based approach recognises the subjectivity of heritage values and the need for a multi-stakeholder perspective, but still relies on the reproduction of an Authorised Heritage Discourse (Smith, 2006; Poulios, 2010) under the patronage of an overseeing set of heritage conservation managers. Under such a guise, he argues, community engagement may be tokenistic, or highly conflictual as different voices are given equal but limited power to influence decision-making and the place for change remains ambiguous, or constrained at the hands of heritage conservation

managers. In contrast, Poullos' *living heritage approach* puts change and community empowerment front and centre. Rather than change being anathema to authenticity Poullos argues that authenticity is achieved simultaneously through continuity and change; whereby the continuity of the original function of a heritage designation is ensured through an evolving process of change, as interpreted and enacted by the original or 'core' community with which the heritage is associated (Poullos, 2010: 175–181).

Whilst the *living heritage approach* addresses some of the shortcomings of material- and values-based approaches, such as its repositioning of change and local communities in decision-making, it is clear that it raises new questions. In Poullos' efforts to empower the often marginalized communities associated with heritage sites, and in his efforts to embrace material changes to heritage features, he has tended to present communities themselves and heritage 'functions' as essential, static and homogeneous. In 2011 Poullos described continuity as "much more than the association of a local or a dwelling community; it is the association of the original (and not a changing or evolving) community" (Poullos, 2011: 151, our emphasis). So whilst the core community may be empowered to embrace and validate particular material changes as part of heritage continuity, it appears that the community itself should stay the same. But if we accept, as Smith (2006) asserted, that all heritage is intangible then how can we envision heritage change without the potential for a concomitant change in associated community? Are communities any more preserved in aspic than landscapes? Moreover, how are the categories of 'original' and 'function' to be reconciled within a dynamic and socio-materially entwined interpretation of heritage? In his later work Poullos acknowledges some of these questions and presents a more nuanced view. In 2015 he clarified that the core community should not be "seen as a fixed and coherent community, but as one consisting of several smaller community groups with partially divergent views" and that just like "heritage itself" communities "including the core community ... are considered to continually evolve over time" (Poullos, 2015: 169). He further recognised three challenges requiring further attention in a *living heritage approach*: "(1) how to embrace both continuity and change/evolution; (2) how to distinguish the core community from the other communities without yet essentialising it ... and (3) how to prioritise the core community while embracing, at the same time, the other communities" (Poullos, 2015: 171).

Within the context of farmed cultural landscapes, we propose in this paper that a combination of a livelihoods approach with a focus on the enactment and incessant negotiation of cultural values in work and landscape transformation can begin to answer some of these questions. With an empirical focus on the inherent diachronicity of lived experience and an ethical focus on the moral authority of labour and livelihood, we propose that a livelihood approach offers an operational tool for addressing the central challenge of managing change in cultural landscapes.

2.2. Experience, knowledge and moral authority in decision-making

Whilst the literature and official rhetoric around the authenticity of local interpretations of heritage has developed, much of the critical work into actual examples of heritage management demonstrate a continuing mismatch between heritage managers' perspectives and those of local communities (Brumann and Berliner, 2016).

Harvey (2015, p. 921), exploring the relationship between heritage and landscape, puts forward the idea of developing a "heritage sensibility" in which an awareness of people's personal biographies, experiential understanding of place, knowledge creation, and customs and communal rights should be developed. This derives from a processual and dynamic understanding of both landscape and heritage, which, he argues, is more closely related to indigenous epistemologies, does not preclude indigenous representations and focusses on the communal-political rather than the self-centred.

In perhaps the most considered recent elaboration of the role of

farmer knowledge in decision-making Cohen (2009) has reinvigorated the Georgic ethic to demonstrate and argue that human interactions with the land should be the basis of knowledge production and to emphasise the moral importance of asking "whose practice, in what forms, from which value basis, and towards what ends matter" (Cohen, 2009: 162, emphasis in original). Cohen contrasts the Georgic ethic with the Pastoral ethic which, we contend, is explicitly evident (and arguably part of the management problem) in the World Heritage designation for the Lake District. That Pastoral ethic, argues Cohen, 'espouses a sense of appreciation for non-human nature ... [which] ... stands outside the realm of labour or work' and thus limits the ethicist's ability to 'fully examine agricultural experience as a space of work' (Cohen, 2009: 154). Cohen thus argues for an academic, ethical and management focus on *interaction* and *experience* as the basis of moral authority and authenticity in decision-making associated with agricultural landscapes. It is from this basis that we here develop an argument that interaction and experience through the heuristic of a more broadly interpreted understanding of livelihood is essential for our grappling with issues of authenticity and change within the management of Cultural Landscapes.

2.3. Heritage and livelihood

Much of the literature relating to livelihoods in heritage sites and heritage management has focussed on the tension between the livelihoods of local populations and the preservation and protection of heritage (Brumann and Berliner, 2016; MacRae, 2017). In relation to the World Heritage designation in Bali, for instance, MacRae (2017: 856) describes the 'frictions' or 'zones of awkward engagement' when the very lives and livelihoods of local communities are 'defined as world heritage – and thus appropriated by a form of collective global ownership'. Other research has examined examples whereby heritage has been managed by local governments and decision-makers to try and enhance livelihoods through the development of tourism. In the Samaba Rice Terraces of Yunnan, China, Zhang (2022), for example, shows how a Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS) designation was used by local officials to stimulate rural economic development through tourism. Most of the local farmers, however, lacked the skills and interest in developing tourist enterprises and would prefer to escape the drudgery of rural labour if they had the capacity. Efforts to promote tourism, therefore, have been shown to exacerbate rather than redress the tensions between heritage and livelihood, as the financial benefits of tourism are concentrated in the hands of a few (or to incomers from outside the local community) whilst the rest of the community is expected to keep farming under the difficult conditions that help maintain the heritage designation.

For local-level heritage managers, therefore, emphasis has often been placed on trying to manage the frictions between livelihood and heritage, or in developing new opportunities to enhance livelihoods on account of a heritage designation. What both of these interpretations do, however, is treat livelihood as a narrowly instrumental and financial concept and fail to acknowledge its wider, social, cultural, material, political and affective dimensions. The examples from MacRae (2017) and Zhang (2022), above, hint at a significant mismatch between the importance and meaning attached to both livelihood and heritage between local communities and heritage managers within the context of cultural landscape designations. Several studies have explored this issue more deeply by exploring contexts in which indigenous patterns of work and life are fundamental to the heritage designation itself, and by employing a broadened conceptualisation of livelihood through mobilisation of the SRLA.

The concept of Sustainable Livelihoods (SL) emerged around the same time as Sustainable Development in the machinations of the Brundtland Commission and became firmly established in 1992 in a Working Paper for the Institute of Development studies by Chambers and Conway (Scoones, 2009). It recognised that livelihoods were sustainable when they were resilient to stresses and shocks, did not

undermine the natural resources upon which they depended and could maintain or enhance their capabilities and assets. Crucially, assets were extended to include social as well as material 'resources' (Scoones, 2009). Bebbington (1999) further extended this idea of assets to what he called the five capital assets of 'produced, human, natural, social and cultural', whilst stressing the implication that assets are not merely the means of making a living but also give meaning to a person's world (Bebbington, 1999: 2022). Going further, he suggests assets as combined 'vehicles for instrumental action (making a living), hermeneutic action (making living meaningful) and emancipatory action (challenging the structures under which one makes a living) (ibid.). This resonates with literature from economic anthropology which emphasises a broadened emic conceptualisation of 'work' and the 'economy' away from a purely instrumental interpretation (Cohen, 1979; Wallman, 1979; Godelier, 1980; Gudeman, 2008; De l'Estoile, 2014; Long, 1984; Mitchell, 2014; Narotzky and Besnier, 2014).

The SL concept has often been mobilised as part of decolonising the western development project through emic conceptualisations of livelihood, whilst also stressing its attendant developmental benefits. More recently, it has also been applied, either directly or in principle, to studying heritage within the context of cultural landscapes; in other words in contexts in which livelihood itself is integral to the heritage designation.

Su et al. (2016) and Liu et al. (2022) have used the SRLA to critically interrogate heritage management in China. Both papers argue that the sustainability of livelihoods is diminished by the priorities of tourism and heritage conservation within designated sites. Such priorities, they argue, are too singular and do not allow sufficient control for indigenous communities over the direction of local tourism and management practices. What the papers leave undeveloped, however, is the impact of exogenously imposed or engineered livelihoods on the heritage designation itself and, in particular, on how livelihoods should be approached in heritage management to deal with the central problems of authenticity and change. Su et al. (2016) do support the case that local communities should have the freedom to choose their own livelihood strategies (following Wu and Pearce, 2014) and that tourism should be integrated into the existing mix of livelihood strategies. Meanwhile, Liu et al. (2022) do point out that a preoccupation with the material aspects of authenticity creates a discontinuity between the heritage of the past and the community of the present and, in so doing, isolates the community from social change. We argue, however, that there is more to be said about managing the interface between livelihoods and heritage by paying greater attention to local communities and their own cultural conceptualisations of authenticity and change.

Cooper et al. (2022), working with artisanal fishers in Tanzania have explored precisely the complex interaction between livelihood and heritage from the perspective of the fishers themselves. As opposed to heritage practitioners/designators' tendency to seek to reify or preserve heritage practices, they show how the fishers maintain a vernacular conception of heritage that is founded on a customary right to earn a living from the sea with an ongoing and unsentimental receptiveness to change their material culture as their breadwinning activities are subject to the transformational pressures of economy, ecology and society. This resonates with Martindale's doctoral research with fishing communities in Southwest England in which he showed that skill transmission and survival between generations was founded on dynamism and movement rather than stability (Martindale, 2012: 308). Moreover, he showed how tourism *could* become part of an authentic livelihood for fishing communities where it was seen as permitting the extension of the culturally valued notion of self-sufficiency.

To bring change and authenticity back into sharper focus relative to the Lake District case study, we wish to develop these ideas through recourse to the anthropological literature on the cultural value ascribed to work and betterment within farming communities. It is necessary to do so because, as demonstrated within the SL framework, the different capital assets associated with livelihood are fundamentally integrated,

inter-dependent and mutually co-productive of cultural value.

2.4. Cultural values and work

In long-term ethnographic research with farmers in England, Emery has explored this interdependency between cultural values, farm work and practices and the symbolic appearance of the landscape (Emery, 2010, 2014, 2015; Emery and Carrithers, 2016). Whilst arguing that cultural values are plastic, open to ideological manipulation and interpretation during social intercourse, Emery identifies vernacular interpretations of culturally important values that tend to oppose those of ideological doctrine and serve to inform and direct farming practices that are wholly suited to the environment in which the farming activity takes place. Of particular relevance to our purposes here, Emery has explored vernacular interpretations of the longstanding farm values of work and betterment. In contrast to the ideological and productivist interpretations of work being valued in terms of its economic outputs and betterment being valued in terms of the doctrine of Agricultural Improvement (signalled by rapid, large-scale changes directed at profit maximization), Emery shows how value ascribed to being hard-working is related to the process and activities of work undertaken, whilst betterment is valued in terms of steady, small-scale, continuous and incremental changes (referred to as *fettling*).

In a similar vein Sheild Johansson (2013) explores the values attached to work, practices and landscapes in an Andean ayllu (Kirkiyawi). Sheild Johansson shows how in Kirkiyawi there is no straightforward separation between the spheres of work and non-work and that the culturally valued interpretation of work as expressed through the Quechua term *llank'ay* carries the meaning of transforming the land. This interpretation, she demonstrates, goes beyond a narrowly economic or subsistence interpretation of work and is demonstrative of a set of culturally valued practices which are co-productive of farmed landscapes and personhoods. Unlike urban labour, she argues, this type of work never really starts or finishes but is an ongoing set of relational practices and ideas.

What we see, therefore, in both the English and Andean case is a culturally specific interpretation of both work and change which is fundamentally wrapped up within a broader conceptualisation of livelihood, cultural heritage or 'way of life' within indigenous farming communities. The argument developed through the empirical material presented below, therefore, is that i) a broadened understanding of livelihood is at the heart of cultural landscape designations; ii) those livelihoods carry with them their own culturally and materially justified conceptualisations of authenticity and change, and should, therefore, iii) serve to guide the management interpretations of change and authenticity within designated cultural landscape sites.

In summary, our theoretical framework draws together insights from the sustainable livelihoods approach, from the anthropology of work and cultural values, and the Georgic ethic. We should clarify that our empirical analysis does not constitute an application of the SRLA in its entirety, but rather draws on its underlying principles. We understand livelihood as a nexus between cultural value, praxis and the material landscape through which continuity and change is interpreted, judged and qualified. We view the *sustainability* of a broadened conceptualisation of livelihood as fundamental in achieving social justice for rural communities, and as providing robust refutation to narrowly economic interpretations of livelihood value that may be codified in more authorised heritage discourses. The anthropology of work and value, meanwhile, provides not only insight into the salient values associated with farmed cultural landscapes, it also provides a conceptual apparatus to understand and qualify processes of cultural change. Firstly, by understanding values as 'story seeds', which give 'narrative accountability' (Carrithers, 2009) to transformational actions and practices. Secondly, by viewing cultural values as incessantly negotiated through everyday social intercourse and embodied practice we can move beyond essentialised and static renditions of community. Finally, the Georgics

provides an ethical framework for judging the relevant community who, at any one time, speak with an authentic voice; not as those who are originary or unflinching, but as those with a communal-political convergence (Harvey, 2015) across the dimensions of instrumental, hermeneutical and emancipatory action.

3. Methodology and ethical considerations

The methods of data collection for this research were informed by previous examples of ethnographic research in rural locales (Rapport, 1993; Gray, 1999; Waterton and Watson, 2013), which allow for the creation of more embodied knowledge and a deeper understanding of the community under study.

The empirical data collection for this paper was conducted as part of PhD research which took place between 2017 and 2020. Ethical approval was granted by the University of Birmingham ethics committee in April 2018. The two main methods of data collection were semi-structured interviews and participant observation. Interviews were organised in the period between April–June 2018 and then took place over a 13-month period from June 2018 to July 2019. Forty-five interviews were conducted in this time with farmers and management stakeholders, as well as living and working on a hill-farm in the Lake District Cultural Landscape for five weeks in the Spring of 2019. In addition to this, continuous participant observation took place every month over the 13-month period and included attending events, seminars, meetings, and maintaining a field diary (Shortland, 2021). As a young female researcher without a background in farming Shortland approached the fieldwork with some trepidation. However, it was clear that the farmers took a great deal of pleasure in her willingness to learn, to listen and demonstrate a genuine interest in their work and views. As suggested by Chiswell and Wheeler (2016) the farmers appeared to find the experience of engaging with the researcher as ‘cathartic’ and an opportunity to express their concerns and to be heard without judgement. As we will later show, this approach of listening and learning was also that that gained the Kilcullen family, as incomers, acceptance among the local community, and contrasts with the types of interactions experienced by farmers with heritage or conservation management authorities.

The selection of cases to be included in the vignettes presented in this paper is partly based on the richness afforded by their relational connectedness to the main period of participant observation, and partly because they supported analytical generalisation based on a theoretical sampling approach (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). As is often the case with on-farm participant observation, case selection was somewhat opportunistic and facilitated by existing relationships between the farm family and a colleague at the University of Birmingham. The authors, however, did not know the family prior to undertaking participant observation with them. Initial analysis of the wider data set revealed tensions between farmers and the National Trust, the everyday negotiation of cultural values, and questions around lineage and authenticity as common themes. The two families, therefore, were selected to capture and integrate these wider themes within a particular locale, and with a distinct set of relationships between and among farmers and management practitioners. Upon completion of the data collection a sequential process of open coding (Crang and Cook, 2007), grounded analytical coding, and axial coding (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Benaquisto, 2008) was used across the data generated. Along with the relationship between cultural values, heritage and authenticity this process also led to empirical focus on the experience of landscape across stakeholder groups and the politics of partnership working across an abiding nature-culture divide. Throughout the process Shortland also kept an analysis diary (Lorne, 2015), to allow for triangulation and reflection on the themes emerging across different data sources (see Shortland, 2021 for a full account of the analytical process and wider research project).

All of the participants signed a consent form or verbally gave consent, and were allocated a pseudonym, as well as having their precise

ages changed. Interviewees representing particular organisations were also anonymised but retained their organisational affiliation. Material derived from secondary, publicly available, sources has not been anonymised. The presentation of the empirical material proceeds on the basis of vignettes, which were written and informed by a situated synthesis of the interviews, participant observation, field-notes, analysis diary, and personal experience/recollection. The narrative format of a vignette was adopted in order to succinctly represent an ethnographically rich and diverse data set collected over an extended period of time (Jacobsen, 2014; Sampson and Johannessen, 2020).

4. Family and livelihood in the Lake District

In this section we demonstrate a broader understanding of the constituents of, and values attached to farming livelihoods through the examples of two farming families within the Lake District Cultural Landscape: The Johnson and Kilcullen families. The Johnsons have a long inter-generational history of farming in this part of the Lake District, whereas the Kilcullens are first generation new entrants to farming. At face-value they thus represent what may be perceived as very different ‘types’ of farmer. What we wish to demonstrate and emphasise, however, is how, despite their differences, they share and value similar types of work, landscape and lifestyle. We argue that the example of the Kilcullens complicates renditions of authenticity that are linked to indigeneity as a form of time-served autochthony. On the contrary, we demonstrate that authenticity constitutes an ascription to a shared socio-spatial and cultural relationship between place, livelihood and practice that is, in turn, reproduced through the enactment of that relationship. In both cases, the livelihoods encountered are shown to be understood as extending beyond a purely instrumental and monetary conceptualisation.

4.1. The Johnson family and the National Trust

The Johnson family have a long history within the Lake District. Scott and Frieda live at Coates Farm and Scott has lived in the same valley for fifty-eight years, since he moved with his parents. This was initially on a different farm, which eventually became amalgamated with two other farms. This amalgamation is now Stag Fell Farm where Scott and Frieda's son and his family live and have done so for the past fifteen years. The reason for the amalgamation was that one farm could not provide enough income for a whole family. Once Scott and Frieda's son took over Stag Fell Farm, Scott and Frieda moved up the road to Coates Farm and are now on a fifteen-year tenancy with the National Trust.

Established in 1895 The National Trust is Europe's largest conservation charity and is funded by millions of paying members. The Trust owns and manages 250,000 Ha of farmland, 780 miles of coastline and over 500 historic places, gardens and nature reserves. Within the Lake District it owns approximately 20% of the National Park, much of which is tenant-farmed. From its foundation its aim has been to protect land and built heritage for its natural, historical and scenic importance and to protect and open-up such places for the benefit and enjoyment of the nation. Recently, however, concerns have been expressed that the National Trust has begun to prioritise large-scale nature restoration objectives on its estate at the expense of its objectives toward heritage and the historic environment. Restore Trust is a forum established to hold the National Trust to account in the fulfilment of its original mandate and has expressed strong concerns about the Trust's pivot toward nature restoration objectives within and beyond its own estate:

The National Trust's remit is to look after the places in its care. The quixotic aspiration to ‘restore nature, not just on National Trust land, but everywhere’ is unrealistic, to say the least, and risks taking the focus away from the properties in the charity's care. On the Sherborne Estate fields are overgrown with weeds while farm buildings

and cottages stand derelict as they wait to be transformed into a tourist attraction, contrary to the wishes of the donor, who gave the estate so that it would remain a farming community. The National Trust is strangely unwilling to take its obligations seriously. (Restore Trust, 2025)

In short, much of the fervour relates to a perceived prioritisation of nature objectives over and above those of history and heritage. This has played out in relation to the extent that the National Trust is investing in historic building restoration vis-à-vis nature restoration, but for our purposes here it has also had significant implications for the management of their farmed estate. In their latest Strategy titled *People and Nature Thriving*, released in January 2025, the National Trust sets out a vision to restore nature by 2035 across 250,000ha, which is precisely the same area of farmland under its ownership. This has led to vociferous responses from the farming community and publicity through the mainstream media. A 2025 article in *The Telegraph* in response to the new strategy captured the sentiment with the title: *Farms under threat in National Trust rewilding drive* (Gatten, 2025). Despite the new strategy, however, this perceived pivot toward nature restoration and rewilding at the expense of valuing the tangible and intangible heritage of farming and farmed landscapes has been playing out on the ground for many years. Stories abound in the farming press of the National Trust not renewing tenancies to farming families or making demands on farming tenants that prioritise environmental objectives at the expense of maintaining the viability of farming livelihoods. A notable case in the Lake District concerned the National Trust's purchase (over the asking price) of the land, but not the farm buildings at Thorneythwaite Farm in 2015. This was seen as an act of excluding the local farming community from the opportunity to purchase and farm the land and of permanently severing the combined cultural and natural forces that had hitherto shaped the landscape in that part of the Lakes. Despite the Trust denying that their intention was for a wholesale rewilding project on Thorneythwaite Farm they were certainly motivated by wildlife conservation and appeared to abandon the idea that the farm could be viable. Quoted in *The Guardian* in a 2016 article James Rebanks captured the anger and hurt felt by the farming community:

For us, breaking the lands from the historical farmstead sets a terrible, terrible precedent. The Trust exists to counter threat. They did not establish there was a threat to those lands, but they mindlessly waded in all the same. It's not just about Thorneythwaite now. It's about their values and whether our land is safe with them – or have they got another agenda that doesn't include us, the farmers? (James Rebanks, in Cooke, 2016).

Today the National Trust continue to pay a contracted shepherd to sympathetically graze Herdwick Sheep on the land at Thorneythwaite, while it is promoted as a 'Picnic and Waterfall Walk' on the National Trust website. The walk allows visitors to take-in the three-parts of a hill farm, whilst seeing the management measures being put in place to restore hay meadows and wood pasture on the farm.

Rewind another twenty years and the National Trust was actively buying farming properties in order to protect them as working farms on account of their traditional role in producing heritage landscapes. As reported in *The Independent* in 1994 the National Trust purchased Heber Farm in the Yorkshire Dales for the express purposes of rescuing it from tourist/second home development. The article quotes the National Trust's local Land Agent at the time as saying:

that buying the farm was of 'critical importance' in retaining hill farming in the dale ... If the farm had been converted into holiday cottages, the whole character of the place would have changed. This way, tradition will carry on. (Dorothy Fairburn, in Pithers, 1994)

Whilst a lot of time has passed since Heber, there was clear concern among its own employees that the National Trust's remit continues to be internally conflicted, especially within the context of the World Heritage

Designation in the Lake District:

The National Trust is still trying to fathom out, it ebbs and flows, whether it's a holistic cultural organisation, it's got new redefined policies, as nature conservation sits higher up the hierarchy of importance really (National Trust Employee 2)

My god it's amazing how we can go full circle, twelve months ago that would have all been about nature and improvements to the environment and public benefits and public payments for public benefits but now twelve months later it's all about farming culture and supporting our squeezed upland farmers and you just think god if we could just take a moderate centre course rather than flip flopping between nature, culture, nature, culture, we wouldn't look so ridiculous (National Trust Employee 1)

From the perspective of other Lake District management stakeholders the National Trust were also referred to as acting in 'underhand' ways and being 'part of the problem'. These perceived shifts in value, and criticisms of the National Trust thus form an important part of the context through which farmers in the Lake District respond to threats to their livelihoods and their own conceptions of change and authenticity. In returning to our case of the Johnson family, we can see that such changes do not preclude the greater incorporation of environmental values and methods into their farming.

Vignette 1 – The Johnsons

I met with the Johnsons in their farmhouse, I was taken through to the kitchen and offered a pot of tea. They were quick to tell me that the farm was never about making money. It's about pleasure and making enough to just survive. Frieda described it as a mentality; it's something they love, and they want to be proud of their stock and the quality produce they provide. The idea of work was discussed, and it was reiterated from both Scott and Frieda that they find caring for these old buildings, dry stone walls, and nature part of their work and they enjoy it immensely. In the past ten years they changed to organic farming and seem to be reaping the benefits. They have more wildlife on the farm and enjoy showing this to their grandchildren. They both seemed to enjoy the inter-generational element of farming; frequently mentioning their children, grandchildren, and commenting on the fact that Scott's father lived and breathed farming before them.

The Johnson's were particularly irked on one occasion when their Landlord, the National Trust had referred to them as 'part-time farmers'. They explained that this demonstrated how the National Trust had no idea about the realities of farming and pointed out that they would often work 14 or 15 hour days. Tensions between the Johnsons and the National Trust figured prominently in discussions around the current threats to their livelihood and the lack of understanding of the role and value of traditional hill farmers.

The Johnsons, then, demonstrate that they conceive of work as a form of care (cf Krzywoszynska, 2016) which combines care for their stock and care for the survival of their farming operation alongside care for the natural environment and the built heritage features of the landscape. These elements are fundamentally intertwined, rather than being in tension and their own practices are viewed as reproductive of and a constituent of the valued landscapes in which they work. Whilst, therefore, the National Trust might conceive of them as 'part-time' farmers by virtue of the fact that their farming operations yield only modest financial returns, this betrays a wider conceptualisation of livelihood as incorporating different ideas of work and of value that may also be understood as hermeneutic and emancipatory (Bebbington, 1999). In stressing the importance of both past and future generations, the Johnsons also show how it is through their own vernacular values and conceptions of livelihood that the 'living' is put into conceptualisations and designations of 'continuous Cultural Landscapes'.

4.2. The kilcullen family

The Kilcullens – Peter and Edith, live and work at Rosings Farm. Their farmhouse stands tall in the village landscape, the whitewash stone, striking wooden beams, and the old village hall which became part of the farmhouse in the early 20th Century, make it an interesting building architecturally. The oldest part of the farmhouse is 16th Century, and the original beam can be found in the centre of the house. The farm is 280 acres including 30 acres of woodland. This farm has only had three family lineages owning and working on it since the 16th Century, of which Peter and Edith are the current and third family. Despite the long history of the farm itself, Peter and Edith are, relatively speaking, newcomers into the Lake District. They had only been at Rosings Farm for 6 years at the point in time when Author 1 stayed with them and they have no familial connection to the farm at all. Peter and Edith live with their young daughter and Peter's brother and nephew both of whom help out on the farm on a daily basis. They have also diversified their income by operating a campsite on the farm.

Vignette 2 – The Kilcullens

I stayed with the Kilcullens in Spring (2019), during lambing season. I was immediately thrown into working on the farm with Peter and working the campsite with Edith. Peter regularly spoke in detail about how farmers have always 'done nature' and that the National Trust needed to leave farmers alone to just get on with it. I found it interesting, considering at this point they'd only been on the farm for six years, Peter had a lot of similar views to neighbouring farmers who had been farming all their lives. Peter was definitely accepted, and was very involved in the local community. From chairing the parish council meetings and organising farmers to respond to external forces such as the Lake District National Park Authority. Neighbouring farmers commented on Peter in a positive manner and often joked that he was alright for someone who wasn't 'from here'. The family as a whole seemed to be accepted and be seen as a force for good in the valley.

On one occasion Peter made a comment when we were out on the fells, walking and talking, he said any good upland farmer will be doing what we're doing, walking the sheep out every day and there is no way round it, this is just the slow process to avoid chaos in the fields. So, these upland farmers get to know their sheep and land really well due to walking it every day, multiple times a day. Proven by the fact Peter can point out to me who has just lambed, where they lamb, and who is about to lamb. While we continue on Peter states that the farm makes no money, it's just his passion and he just keeps going because of how much he loves it.

Despite having lived and worked in the valley for only six years it is remarkable how Peter speaks with, and on behalf of, the farming community. He demonstrates a clear alignment with farmers' time-served narratives about their role as custodians or stewards of the farmed environment ('farmers have always done nature') (e.g. McEachern, 1992; Darragh and Emery, 2018) and equally others himself from the shared enemy that is the National Trust (leave us farmers alone to get on with it). This alignment may have been fostered or hastened by Peter's political involvement in the local community but there are also hints in the vignette above that it is Peter's engagement in the valued practices/work of upland shepherding through which he has gained cultural alignment and acceptance from the local farmers. Through the cultural motif of the good farmer (Burton et al., 2020) Peter demonstrates his knowledge of good farming practices within the community and how he himself is reproducing them and therefore upholding the cultural values of the community ('any good upland farmer will be doing what we're doing'). The valued work, moreover, is characterised by the slow, incremental and constant engagement with land and livestock which is contradistinguished by Peter from work that yields financial reward (Emery, 2010, 2014; Sheild Johansson, 2013). It is a value born of

experience (Cohen, 2009). This demonstrates a broadened conceptualisation of livelihood through which human-environmental relationships are mediated and authenticity and belonging established. The valued work described by Peter also points toward a conceptualisation of authentic change, which stands the farmers apart from external decision-makers. These notions of authenticity and change in relation to livelihood and heritage are explored further in the following section.

5. Authentic change: autonomy over livelihoods

In this section we consider how conceptions of authentic change are mediated by livelihood within the context of a 'continuing' or 'living' Cultural Landscape. By looking at two examples of change relating to the environment and tourism development we look to highlight how similar modes of change may be more or less compatible with the World Heritage Site designation depending on their conformance and consistency with indigenous livelihood strategies. We demonstrate how autonomy, another recurrent cultural value expressed by British and international farming communities (Emery, 2015; Stock and Forney, 2014), combines with culturally specific conceptions of work and change in farmers' choices over their own livelihood strategies. We draw on examples from the two farming families introduced in the previous section as well as the views and reflections on heritage and nature management from the National Trust.

At the heart of Lake District farming livelihoods, and central to the WHS designation itself, are sheep and shepherding (and more specifically of the traditional Herdwick breed). Any threat to the continuation of such practices is thus seen as an existential threat to the farming community and the cherished landscape that it has created.

Vignette 3–

Peter commented that the whole rural community is sewn together by the farmers. He argued that removing sheep removes farmers and then the whole rural community would break down. As we walked back to the farm house Peter also explained that he thinks the National Trust are using back door policy to get new tenants into the farms who were conservationists not farmers, and he later described the National Trust as an organisation that runs grand houses with carparks attached and that they weren't qualified for making decisions about farming and what should and shouldn't be done on the fells.

These strong sentiments about the National Trust were also shared by Scott Johnson, who argued that the shepherding of sheep on the Lake District is 'fundamental to the type of farming in the Lake District and the World Heritage designation supported that'. He could not understand, therefore, 'how or why the National Trust were pushing-on with the removal of the sheep'. As illustrated in Vignette 2, conceptions of good farming in the Lake District are strongly tied to the slow and laborious process of actively shepherding sheep, and of caring for the landscape by virtue of caring for the sheep.

In their *Commons Stories* series the Foundation for Common Land interviewed the National Trust's General Manager for the North and West Lakes, Jane Saxon (Foundation for Common Land, n.d.). During the interview Saxon recognised the importance of shepherding as a form of heritage and stressed a particular commitment to maintaining hefted flocks¹ on the Lake District commons. When asked about her own idea of

¹ Hefted flocks are those that retain an intergenerational territorial connection to a specific parcel of land within a larger Common. Hefting facilitates management of flocks across multiple farmers by reducing straying and inter-mixing of flocks.

what made a 'good commoner',² she stressed that it entailed a pride in heritage but was also about having good relationships:

So 'good commoning' comes down to how commoners get on, and it's also about relationships with organisations like ourselves, the landowners in many cases; it's about having good relationships and being able to work together. I don't think that's always been there in the past

It is important to distinguish here between good commoning and good farming, since commoning already implies working together by virtue of the shared resource on which it takes place. The quote above, however, hints at the tensions that have been present between the National Trust and commoners ('I don't think that's always been there in the past'), and suggests that good commoners should work with rather than against the National Trust. These tensions emerge in other parts of the interview too. Saxon discusses how the priorities of the Trust have shifted toward redressing 'declines in biodiversity and build[ing] resilience in the face of floods, droughts and climatic extremes.' She mentions that whilst some commoners have been engaged with this shift, others have been reluctant to make changes through planting trees or hedges. She suggests that fear of change often underlies this resistance and sees it as her job to 'try to get people on board with the conversation'. Later in the interview she discusses how nature management priorities are being put into the particulars of the farm tenancies that they re-let and that new entrants 'aren't afraid to talk about a tree plan ... or to say what they'd like to learn ... perhaps hedge-laying or dry stone walling'. The Trust are looking, she says, to work with farmers to set up a hub for rural skills training, and link this with opportunities to learn about water quality, soil quality and resilience'. Toward the end of the interview Jane reflects on her own move to the Lake District and the 'journey' she has been on, from seeing the Lake District fells 'as a playground' to learning to appreciate 'how much work goes into looking after them'.

A deeper critical reading of the above points can help us reflect on the differences between the National Trust and the local farmers that have been perceived to demonstrate resistance to change. Before doing so, however, it is important to consider these points within the wider context of the interview and emphasise many of the positive statements it contains. These include how the National Trust is working to protect traditional shepherding practices, demonstrates a willingness to compromise with farmers, involves them in future visioning exercises and has a motivation to overcome differences for the benefit of everyone. Whilst these sentiments and management efforts are laudable and well-intentioned, however, much of the interview quietly expresses and reflects the existential threat that farmers relay and the associated tensions within the World Heritage Site designation of the Lakes as a continuous Cultural Landscape.

Let us start at the end and first imagine how management decisions and preferences differ when a landscape is conceived of as a 'playground' as opposed to a living and working landscape. Going one step further we might also imagine how management decisions and preferences differ again when that landscape is not only conceived of as living, but is lived and worked in a wholly embodied way (Cohen, 2009). Whilst Jane Saxon admits to having been on her own journey of discovery around this, it demonstrates the vastly different starting point from which the local farming community and the National Trust approach the complex array of management issues that the Lake District faces.

Secondly, we might read into the comments above that the 'good tenants' are those that are willing to engage with the National Trust's changing priorities and to 'get on board with the conversation'. Note the difference here, between getting farmers 'on board' with the existing conversation as opposed to listening or responding to their concerns; to

letting them reframe the conversation. Rather than being willing to hear and accommodate alternative viewpoints, these seem too easily disregarded as being driven by fear, or some kind of defensive conservatism.

Thirdly, we are given the impression that when new tenancies become available³ these are attracting new entrants who can demonstrate an existing 'relationship with nature', but may not have the associated farming skills such as dry-stone walling and hedge-laying. Along with shepherding, such landscape management skills are precisely the kind of intangible heritage on which the Lake District World Heritage Site designation rests. We are left not to worry about the loss of this intangible heritage, however, as we learn that skills training will be offered alongside training in environmental protection! Does this represent the severing of skills from their associated livelihoods (Rotherham, 2013) and their refashioning as discrete training 'consumables' or as forming part and parcel of a wider package of skills that are seen as defining attributes of the modern National Trust tenant?

One such farming family who may have been branded fearful of change by the National Trust is the Johnson family.

Vignette 4—

The Johnsons explained to me that it wasn't easy to keep track of what the National Trust, Lake District National Park Authority or anybody else wanted. They explained that there were frequently changes imposed on them from the 'top' and that the ultimate aim of the National Trust seemed to be to get rid of farming and give all the land over to nature. They went on to describe this as depressing and disrespectful to generations of farmers, and depressing in the sense that younger generations had nothing to look forward to. The Johnsons were not happy with the ideas of the National Trust being imposed on them. They enjoyed what they had chosen to do for nature – going organic, and encouraging more wildlife on their farm. They felt they should just be left to get on with that and not have any outside interference from the likes of the National Trust telling them which trees to fell or how many more trees to plant.

This vignette demonstrates how the Johnson's resistance to change – according to the preferences of the National Trust – is driven neither by fear of change itself nor an unwillingness to engage in farming approaches that benefit the environment. Their opposition, rather, stems from the existential threat to the traditional practices of sheep farming and their desire to maintain their own autonomy as a culturally constitutive component of their livelihood. On the contrary, the Johnsons repeatedly point out that they have embraced change, but it is a type of change that is consistent and compatible with their livelihood strategy and cultural values. The shift to organic farming, then, could be accommodated since it did not detract from their core purpose of rearing sheep, it would provide additional financial income, permit the continuation of slow, steady and industrious work practices and was a decision that they had ultimate control over.

In the case of tourism, the example of the Kilcullens also demonstrates how there is not a resistance to change per se, or to tourism per se, but that tourism will be deemed an authentic livelihood strategy where it complements and permits the survival of farming and shepherding activities alongside it, without compromising the expression and reproduction of culturally important values (Martindale, 2012).

Vignette 5 –

Peter has plans. He plans to open a café as well. So, in total they would have the farm, the campsite, the shop, and the café. This is all his and Edith's decision, nobody else seems to have influenced them.

² A commoner being a farmer with rights – among other things – to graze livestock on the shared commons.

³ We do not come to learn about the circumstances under which re-letting takes place but we know from examples in the media that the National Trust has not renewed tenancies to farmers on the grounds of their unwillingness to engage with new environmental expectations and obligations.

They see this as a positive change, one they have decided to make. There has been no interference such as that at the Johnsons farm: no National Trust, no Lake District National Park Authority. Just the planners, who need to give permission. Interestingly, the planners see this as a positive and welcome change – it'll increase the number of tourists in the area for sure, but they seem happy about that as this is the component of their livelihood strategy where they make the most money. They don't make any from the farm so they need to make it elsewhere. The other neighbours seem happy with the idea, I walked around and spoke to some of them about it. They see Peter as a force for change and a force for good, they seem to have accepted him due to the fact that when they bought the farm, he learnt from the local farmers about all the practices and customs associated with hill farming. He listened to them and he worked with them. This seems to have paid off in the long run as now they are listening to him and are accepting of his new ideas and understand that tourism is needed.

Peter went about taking over the farm in a very savvy manner. He bought the farm, moved his family to it, and learnt from the neighbours. He spent a significant amount of time learning everything there was to learn about hill farming. He got shown how to gather sheep, he got shown how to shear them, and he got invited to the Shepherd's Meets. He did not, in the way described earlier by the Johnsons in relation to the National Trust, impose change without sensitivity to the local context. Peter made connections, he spoke to people, he attended events and meetings, he threw himself into this life. He carved out his own livelihood and survival strategy by maintaining the practices such as gathering, keeping a specific breed of sheep, and partaking in Shepherd's Meets, whilst also encouraging tourists, building a new cafe, and (much like the Johnsons) taking an interest in wildlife and trying to improve the environment on the farm.

As 'outsiders' introducing more tourism to the local area, it is understandable that the Kilcullens may have been viewed with trepidation and suspicion by the local farming community. As well as concerns about the National Trust's prioritisation of environment over heritage, we already know, for instance, that local farmers and campaigners have equally raised concerns about the Trust's insensitive prioritisation of tourism around their assets. Such sentiments are captured in the earlier quote provided in Section 4.1 by *Restore Trust*. The quote simultaneously raises concerns about nature restoration and the transformation of farm buildings and cottages 'into a tourist attraction, contrary to the wishes of the donor'. This relates to wider concerns in the literature about the 'museumification' or 'disneyfication' of rural space and heritage (Kennedy and Kingcome, 1998; Wheeler, 2014; Caravello, 2023), and the tensions that this creates in a continuous Cultural Landscape. At a deeper level these criticisms can also be understood as reflective of multidimensional livelihoods rubbing up against narrow economicity (Mitchell, 2014). In other words, both nature restoration (through the increasing potential for dividends through Payments for Ecosystem Services schemes [Wynne-Jones, 2014; Sullivan, 2013]), and tourism (by changing landscape and heritage into sites of material consumption [Schmitt, 2022]) may be interpreted as giving primacy to income generation over and above wider social, cultural and environmental benefits, and as running contrary to the charitable purposes of the National Trust.

Relative to the Johnsons, the Kilcullens were in the privileged position of owning their farm and not being beholden to the wishes of the National Trust as their landlord. This gave them far more autonomy over how they farmed the land and navigated their livelihoods. What is crucial, however, is that the Kilcullens did not seek autonomy from their neighbours, which has been upheld as an ideological impediment to farmer cooperation in the UK (Emery, 2015). Where the National Trust sought to 'get farmers on board' the Kilcullens 'listened'; where the National Trust were unsympathetic, the Kilcullens were sympathetic; where the National Trust lost trust, the Kilcullens gained trust; where the

National Trust set out to train the 'right' set of skills 'into' their tenants the Kilcullens set out to learn *from* their neighbours. Where the National Trust were seen to make impositions from afar the Kilcullens proved themselves by 'getting stuck in' to work alongside their neighbours. It would, of course, be wrong to suggest that the Kilcullens had simply done a better PR job with the local farming community than had the National Trust: there's was not a communication strategy linked to a new agenda but a genuine desire to become a part of the community into which they moved.

The case of the Kilcullens demonstrates that even rather radical changes instigated by what might be seen as 'outsiders' can still be deemed acceptable and authentic within the context of local farming livelihoods. The Kilcullens have aligned themselves with the instrumental and hermeneutical dimensions of local livelihoods, as well as the culturally specific conceptualisations of work, change and autonomy which are expressed and reproduced in their everyday engagements with the cultural landscape. Moreover, the Kilcullens have brought their own skills in organising and lobbying to enhance the emancipatory potential of a politicised form of livelihood by representing and standing up for the farming community at a time when they are feeling increasingly under threat. As described by other farmers, they were perceived as a 'force for good' and have presented an alternative route for livelihood survival through the development of tourism. This example had been followed by another local farmer who had set up a Bed and Breakfast following Peter's lead and others were also interested in doing likewise.

6. Discussion and conclusion

The WHS designation of Continuous Cultural Landscape incorporates an inherent tension between continuity and change within its very definition. No guidance, however, has been provided by UNESCO on how this tension should be practically resolved or worked-through on the ground (Porcal-Gonzalo, 2023). The tension, moreover, is particularly acute in the case of the Lake District on account of its tripartite designation for the farmed landscape, the environmentalist movement and the picturesque movement.

In this paper, we have combined Cohen's (2009) evocation of the Georgic ethic alongside the principles of the SRLA and the anthropological study of cultural values within farming communities, to propose a conceptual and practical way of managing for authentic change that addresses the key challenges identified in Poullos' *living heritage approach* (Poullos, 2015). Primarily these included how a 'core community' should be defined without essentialising, and how to accommodate change and heterogeneity within and among different elements of a local community.

Our analysis presented in this paper showed how farmers' livelihood strategies serve to mediate the tension between changing work practices (which may impact upon the material landscape) and continuity and conformance with the cultural values which underlie an important aspect of the heritage designation. We showed how authenticity was not associated with resistance to change in terms of livelihood, and nor was it associated with values and interests that were only accessible to time-served autochthonous members of the local community. We showed, for instance, how Peter Kilcullen as a recent new entrant to farming in the Lake District was able to uphold and even stretch the cultural conceptualisations of authentic livelihoods among his longer-standing farming peers. At the same time, we showed how farmers' own self-directed changes toward environmental management and tourism could be contradistinguished to changes perceived to be imposed from outside the farming community – and particularly by the National Trust, who have continued to uphold a pastoral ethic (an appreciation for non-human nature which stands outside the realm of work) (Cohen, 2009), and a management approach mediated through the Naturalistic gaze (Carter, 2010). Such imposed changes were deemed unacceptable and inauthentic to the heritage designation, precisely because they were not

Table 1

Authentic and inauthentic change through the lens of livelihood within continuous cultural landscapes.

	Changes that are more likely to be perceived as inauthentic	Changes that are more likely to be perceived as authentic
Locus of impetus for change	Exogenous to local 'relevant' community	Endogenous to local 'relevant' community (pursuant to the heritage designation)
Livelihood interpretation	Narrower focus on instrumental and material dimensions of livelihood	Broad incorporation of multiple dimensions of livelihood which are interdependent (economic, social, cultural, natural, hermeneutic, instrumental, emancipatory)
Relationship between livelihood and heritage	Separate. Livelihood may be seen as in tension with heritage objectives, or heritage may be seen to offer new (instrumentally focussed) livelihood opportunities	Livelihood as heritage. Mutual interdependence
Accordance with vernacular cultural values and understandings of work and change	Management changes are proposed that do not accord with vernacular interpretations of work/change	Management changes are acceptable where they accord with vernacular conceptions of work and change
Role and value in traditional practices	Traditional practices may be valued but seen as substitutable or as independent activities divorced from an embedded livelihood	Maintenance of traditional practices remains central but non-traditional practices/changes are not precluded where they do not threaten the main practice
Underlying ethic	Pastoral ethic and tendency toward a naturalistic gaze	Georgic ethic, emphasis on experience and engaged work

invoked through a culturally conformant frame of reference. These findings help us begin to answer the questions posed by Poullos (2015) of the *Living Heritage Approach*. They provide a culturally sensitive, de-essentialised and dynamic framework for interpreting, judging and qualifying continuity and change in cultural landscapes and their associated communities, whilst also identifying when, why and how it may be appropriate to privilege certain voices over and above others. It remains, of course, semantically and ontologically challenging to know how best to refer to the communities we find in association with heritage. Whilst we have inevitably, at times, had to refer here to 'local community' or 'farming community' as shorthand for our primary interlocutors, it is important to stress that such conceptualisations are always of the moment. Moving away from 'original' and 'core' communities, we might better refer to 'relevant communities', which are never absolute or historically defined but arise in the ebb and flow of everyday social interaction and socio-material engagements: characterised as an ongoing negotiation between cultural values, praxis and the material landscape that lies at the heart of a livelihoods approach. Moreover, within the context of cultural landscapes, we may also think of heritage continuity not through an idea of 'original function', but through the lens of that nexus between values, practices and the material landscape: by thinking of livelihood as heritage.

Whilst we do not wish to claim that authentic versus inauthentic changes can fit neatly within a binary ontology (as Orbaşlı (2025) cautions against), we provide the following table to emphasise how a particular view of livelihood, of cultural values and an emphasis on the experiential might help us to better evaluate authenticity within the context of cultural landscapes.

Throughout the paper we have demonstrated that farmers are not resistant to, or fearful of change per se and do not respond to management impositions through a form of conservative protectionism. Instead, we have argued that a broadened interpretation of livelihood lies at the heart of cultural landscapes and those livelihoods carry with them their own culturally and materially justified conceptualisations of authenticity and change (especially in relation to work and the embodied landscape). In judging and justifying change, we further demonstrated that farmers also invoked a cultural value in autonomy over the practices. Importantly, however, this is not to suggest that cultural values are fixed and non-negotiable, and nor is it to suggest that farmers are unwilling to engage with ideas and incentives from outside of their community. The cultural values that underlie farming livelihoods are incessantly negotiated through social interaction and in dealing with the circumstances and situations that are encountered in the flow of life (Emery, 2010). Change is thus accommodated. We may present Table 1, then, as a blueprint for managing change within continuous cultural landscapes, that should be of interest to heritage practitioners and communities across international contexts. It is important here to

reassert, however, how Poullos envisions the role of the heritage manager within a *living heritage approach*. Whilst the 'core community' should be actively empowered with "the ability to set the agenda, take decisions and retain control over the entire process" heritage conservation professionals are proposed to "provide an enabling framework of support, guidance and assistance", their role is different but "by no means debased" (Poullos, 2015: 23). Until such an approach is adopted in the Lake District and other cultural landscapes, however, then well-meaning heritage and conservation practitioners run the risk of being complicit in wider ideological processes of cultural severance, dispossession and virtual enclosure (Rotherham, 2013; Olwig, 2016).

Throughout the paper, and as represented in Table 1, we have argued that a broadened interpretation of livelihood should be seen as the foundation of heritage within continuous cultural landscapes. Livelihoods cannot oppose heritage and nor can they be interpreted anew as a means to co-exist alongside heritage priorities. Such interpretations, we argue, may simultaneously devalue and undermine the relevant community and the heritage designation itself. This is particularly the case in 'Cultural' or 'living' landscapes, in which the cycles of human labour and their interaction with the landscape have been responsible for its very production, maintenance and management. At a superficial level, we may be able to identify 'farmers' and 'shepherding' as the relevant community and 'function' of (one part of) the WHS designation but we must not take these categories as absolute. We saw at Thorneythwaite how the National Trust employed a 'contract shepherd' to manage grazing on the land that had been severed from its farm holding, and we saw how they were providing a form of transactional training to new nature-conservation minded tenants to learn the traditional skills of dry stone walling and hedge-laying. We must take care, therefore, when judging changes that appear to represent continuity in terms of both community and function but actually represent severance and discontinuity from an embodied and experiential livelihood perspective.

Here, though, we must introduce an important caveat and call for further work. Our focus in this paper has been on farming livelihoods which are central to the WHS designation. But since conservation value and artistic value are also inscribed in the WHS designation should we not also be attendant to conservation and artistic livelihoods? We believe that we should. In Poullos' terms, the Lake District designation would incorporate three distinct, and potentially conflictual 'core communities' (Poullos, 2010, 2011). Perhaps by thinking about conservation and scenic priorities through the lens of livelihood we can better appreciate and work through the sites of tension and compatibility between local stakeholders from different backgrounds? How have changes in conservation practice and artistic sensibilities, for instance, been culturally negotiated within the livelihood strategies of the communities or conservationists and artists that work in the Lake District? How might understanding conservation and art as forms of experiential

and interactive work with the landscape undermine our portrayals of decision-makers' value in landscape as abstracted and disembodied (cf Setten, 2001)? Whilst we have indeed demonstrated differences and points of misunderstanding between farmers and, in particular, the National Trust, perhaps a conjoined focus on livelihoods from both perspectives can help us better navigate the management dilemmas encountered in cultural landscapes. Of course, introducing a 'core' or relevant community that may be associated with the historical reproduction of an Authorised Heritage or Conservation Discourse (Smith, 2006) would also raise additional questions about power differentials across relevant communities. Further work in this direction would be very welcome.

A continuing landscape should be thought of as a living landscape in the broadest possible sense: as a lived-in place, that is itself alive on account of the combined forces of human and more-than-human endeavour, and which is mediated by authentic livelihoods; those multi-dimensional amalgams of the instrumental, hermeneutical and emancipatory that belong to the various relevant communities whose life and work has been pivotal in the physical and symbolic 'creation' of that landscape of outstanding heritage value.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Faye Shortland: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Writing – original draft. **Steven B. Emery:** Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing – original draft.

Declaration of competing interests

We have nothing to declare.

Acknowledgements

We extend our gratitude to the Kilcullen family for hosting Shortland during fieldwork and to all the participants in the research. We also thank the three anonymous reviewers who provided valuable suggestions for improving the paper.

The research was funded by an Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) PhD Studentship.

Data availability

The data that has been used is confidential.

References

- Baillie, B., 2006. Conservation of the sacred at Angkor Wat: further reflections on living heritage. *Conserv. Manag. Archaeol. Sites* 8 (3), 123–131.
- Bebington, A., 1999. Capitals and capabilities: a framework for analyzing peasant viability, rural livelihoods and poverty. *World Dev.* 27 (12), 2021–2044.
- Benaquisto, L., 2008. Axial coding. In: *The Sage Encyclopaedia of Qualitative Research Methods*, vol. 1. Sage Publishing, pp. 51–52.
- Bender, B., 1992. Theorising landscapes and the prehistoric landscapes of stonehenge. *Royal Anthropological Institute* 27 (4), 735–755.
- Brumann, C., Berliner, D. (Eds.), 2016. *World Heritage on the Ground: Ethnographic Perspectives*. Berghahn Books.
- Burton, Rob J.F., Forney, Jérémie, Stock, Paul, Sutherland, Lee-Ann, 2020. *The Good Farmer*. Routledge, Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY : Routledge, 2021. | Series: Earthscan food and agriculture series, ISBN 9781315190655. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315190655>. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/97813151749756>. (Accessed 13 September 2020).
- Caravello, E., 2023. Preserving cultural landscapes in the face of globalization. *The musealization of Sicilian heritage. AIMS Geosci* 9, 697–712.
- Carrithers, M., 2009. Story seeds and the inchoate. In: Carrithers, M. (Ed.), *Culture, Rhetoric and the Vicissitudes of Life*. Berghahn Books, pp. 34–52.
- Carter, J., 2010. Displacing indigenous cultural landscapes: the naturalistic gaze at fraser island world heritage area. *Geogr. Res.* 48 (4), 398–410.
- Chiswell, H.M., Wheeler, R., 2016. 'As long as you're easy on the eye': reflecting on issues of positionality and researcher safety during farmer interviews. *Area* 48 (2), 229–235.
- Cohen, A.P., 1979. *Symbolic Construction of Community*. Routledge.
- Cohen, B.R., 2009. The once and future georgic: agricultural practice, environmental knowledge, and the place for an ethic of experience. *Agric. Hum. Val.* 26, 153–165.
- Cooke, R., 2016. The challenge is to provide for everyone: the national trust under fire. *Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/nov/13/challenge-provide-everyone-national-trust-under-fire-heritage-thornethwaite>.
- Cooper, J.P., Ichumbaki, E.B., Blue, L.K., Maligisu, P.C.M., Mark, S.R., 2022. When the 'asset' is livelihood: making heritage with the maritime practitioners of bagamoyo, Tanzania. *Heritage* 5, 1160–1197.
- Crang, M., Cook, L., 2007. *Doing Ethnographies*. Sage, London.
- Darragh, H.S., Emery, S.B., 2018. What can and can't crowding theories tell us about Farmers' 'Environmental' intentions in post-agri-environment scheme contexts? *Sociol. Rural.* 58 (2), 370–391.
- De l'Etoile, B., 2014. Money is good, but a friend is better" uncertainty, orientation to the future, and "the economy. *Curr. Anthropol.* 55 (S9), S62–S73.
- Drenthen, M., 2018. Rewilding in layered landscapes as a challenge to place identity. *Environ. Values* 27 (4), 405–425.
- Emery, S.B., 2010. In: *Better Fettle: Improvement, Work and Rhetoric in the Transition to Environmental Farming in the North York Moors*. Durham University. PhD Thesis. <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/379/>.
- Emery, S.B., 2014. Hard work, productivity and the management of the farmed environment in anthropological perspective. In: Hamilton, L., Mitchell, L., Mangan, A. (Eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Management*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 90–104.
- Emery, S.B., 2015. Independence and individualism: conflated values in farmer cooperation? *Agric. Hum. Val.* 32 (1), 47–61.
- Emery, S.B., Carrithers, M.B., 2016. From lived experience to political representation: rhetoric and landscape in the north York moors. *Ethnography* 17 (3), 388–410.
- Foundation for Common Land, (n.d). National trust in the Lake district : a view from Jane Saxon: <https://foundationforcommonland.org.uk/commons-stories/jane-saxon-national-trust-cumbria>.
- Gatten, E., Farms under threat in National Trust rewilding drive, *The Telegraph*. <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2025/01/10/farms-under-threat-in-national-trust-rewilding-drive/>, 10th January 2025.
- Glaser, B., Strauss, A., 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Mill Valley. Sociology Press, California.
- Godelier, M., 1980. Work and its representations: a research proposal. *Hist. Workshop J.* 10 (1), 164–174.
- Gray, J., 1999. Open spaces and dwelling places: being at home on hill farms in the Scottish borders. *Am. Ethnol.* 26 (2), 440–460.
- Gudeman, S., 1986. *Economics as Culture: Models and Metaphors of Livelihood*. Routledge, London.
- Gudeman, S., 2008. *Economy's Tension: the Dialectics of Community and Market*. Berghahn Books.
- Harvey, D., 2015. Landscape and heritage: trajectories and consequences. *Landscape Res.* 40 (8), 911–924.
- Hingley, R., 2011. Living landscape: reading Hadrian's wall. *Landscapes* 12 (2), 41–62.
- Jacobsen, A.J., 2014. Vignettes of interviews to enhance an ethnographic account. *Ethnogr. Educ.* 9 (1), 35–50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17457823.2013.828475>.
- Kennedy, N., Kingcome, N., 1998. Disneyfication of cornwall — developing a polidark heritage complex. *Int. J. Herit. Stud.* 4 (1), 45–59.
- Krauß, W., Olwig, K.R., 2018. Special issue on pastoral landscapes caught between abandonment, rewilding and agro-environmental management. Is there an alternative future? *Landscape Res.* 43 (8), 1015–1020.
- Krzywoszynska, A., 2016. What farmers know: experiential knowledge and care in Vine growing. *Sociol. Rural.* 56 (2), 289–310.
- LDNPP, 2024. Lake District National Park Partnership's Management Plan 2020-2026: A National Park and World Heritage Site. https://www.lakedistrict.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0013/63220/July24-update.pdf.
- Liu, Y., Wang, Y., Dupre, K., McIlwaine, C., 2022. The impacts of world cultural heritage site designation and heritage tourism on community livelihoods: a Chinese case study. *Tour. Manag. Perspect.* 43, 100994.
- Long, N. (Ed.), 1984. *Family and Work in Rural Societies: Perspectives on Non-wage Labour*. Tavistock, London.
- Lorne, C., 2015. *The Multiple Trajectories of Coworking: Reimagining Space, Work and architecture*. University of Birmingham [Unpublished thesis].
- MacRae, Graeme, 2017. Universal heritage meets local livelihoods: 'awkward engagements' at the world cultural heritage listing in Bali. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 23 (9), 846–859. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2017.1339107>. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13527258.2017.1339107>. (Accessed 2 September 2017).
- Martindale, T., 2012. *Livelihoods, Craft and Heritage: Transmissions of Knowledge in Cornish Fishing Villages* (Doctoral Dissertation, Goldsmiths, University of London).
- Massenberg, J.R., Schiller, J., Schröter-Schlaack, C., 2023. Towards a holistic approach to rewilding in cultural landscapes. *People Nat.* 5 (1), 45–56.
- Maxim, C., Chasovschi, C.E., 2021. Cultural landscape changes in the built environment at world heritage sites: lessons from bukovina, Romania. *J. Destin. Market. Manag.* 20, 100583.
- McEachern, C., 1992. Farmers and conservation: conflict and accommodation in farming politics. *J. Rural Stud.* 8 (2), 159–171.
- Mitchell, T., 2014. Ecomentality: how the future entered government. *Crit. Inq.* 40 (4), 479–507.
- Mosler, S., 2009. Aspects of archaeological heritage in the cultural landscapes of Western Anatolia. *Int. J. Herit. Stud.* 15 (1), 24–43.
- Narotzky, S., Besnier, N., 2014. Crisis, value, and hope: rethinking the economy: an introduction to supplement 9. *Curr. Anthropol.* 55 (S9), S4–S16.

- Olwig, K.R., 2016. Virtual enclosure, ecosystem services, landscape's character and the 'rewilding' of the commons: the 'Lake district' case. *Landsc. Res.* 41 (2), 253–264.
- Orbaşlı, A., 2025. Authenticity determination in the context of universalized heritage discourses and localized approaches in the arabian region. *Architecture* 5 (3), 62.
- Pithers, M., 1994. Dales farm rescued from tourism plan: National trust pays pounds 534,000 to keep upper wharfedale farming tradition alive in the face of a threat from developers. *Independent*, 28th June 1994. <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/dales-farm-rescued-from-tourism-plan-national-trust-pays-pounds-534-000-to-keep-upper-wharfedale-farming-tradition-alive-in-the-face-of-a-threat-from-developers-malcolm-pithers-reports-1425792.html>.
- Pleninger, T., Bieling, C. (Eds.), 2012. *Resilience and the Cultural Landscape: Understanding and Managing Change in human-shaped Environments*. Cambridge University Press.
- Porcal-Gonzalo, M.C., 2023. Exploring the heritage dimension of vineyard landscapes based on a critical approach to their inscription on the world heritage list. *Int. J. Herit. Stud.* 29 (7), 643–663.
- Poulios, I., 2008. Living sites: the past in the present - the monastic site of meteora, Greece towards a new approach to conservation. Available at: <http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1444472/1/U591777Redacted.PDF>.
- Poulios, I., 2010. Moving beyond a values-based approach to heritage conservation. *Conserv. Manag. Archaeol. Sites* 12 (2), 170–185.
- Poulios, I., 2011. Is every heritage site a "Living" One? Linking Conservation to Communities' association with sites. *Hist. Environ.: Policy & Practice* 2 (2), 144–156.
- Poulios, I., 2015. Gazing at the "Blue Ocean" and tapping into the mental models of conservation: reflections on the Nara+ 20 document. *Herit. Soc.* 8 (2), 158–177.
- Rapport, N., 1993. *Diverse World-Views in an English Village*. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Reeves, K., Long, C., 2011. Unbearable pressures on paradise? Tourism and heritage management in luang prabang, a world heritage site. *Crit. Asian Stud.* 43 (1), 3–22.
- Restore Trust, 2025. The national trust turns 130 but what is the plan? <https://www.restoretrust.org.uk/restore-trust-issues/the-national-trust-turns-130-but-what-is-the-plan>.
- Rindrasi, E., Witte, P., 2021. Reinventing the post-disaster cultural landscape of heritage tourism in Kotagede, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *J. Herit. Tourism* 16 (2), 136–150.
- Rotherham, I.D., 2013. Cultural Severance and the Environment. *the Ending of Traditional and Customary Practice on Commons and Landscapes Managed in Common*. Springer, Dordrecht.
- Rotherham, I.D., 2015. Bio-cultural heritage and biodiversity: emerging paradigms in conservation and planning. *Biodivers. Conserv.* 24 (13), 3405–3429.
- Sampson, H., Johannessen, I.A., 2020. Turning on the tap: the benefits of using 'real-life' vignettes in qualitative research interviews. *Qual. Res.* 20 (1), 56–72.
- Schmitt, T.M., 2022. The commodification of world heritage: a Marxist introduction. In: 50 Years World Heritage Convention: Shared Responsibility–Conflict & Reconciliation. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 377–389.
- Scoones, I., 2009. Livelihoods perspectives and rural development. *J. Peasant Stud.* 36 (1), 171–196.
- Setten, G., 2001. Farmers, planners and the moral message of landscape and nature. *Ethics Place Environ.* 4, 220.
- Sheild Johansson, C.M., 2013. 'To work is to transform the land': Agricultural labour, personhood and landscape in an Andean ayllu. Doctoral Thesis - London School of Economics and Political Science.
- Shortland, F.L., 2021. 'Living Heritage' and living heritage: the ontology and experience of cultural landscapes in the English Lake District. Doctoral thesis - University of Birmingham. <http://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/11459>.
- Smith, L., 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. Routledge, New York.
- Stock, Paul V., Forney, Jérémie, 2014. Farmer autonomy and the farming self. *Journal of Rural Studies* 36, 160–171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2014.07.004>. <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0743016714000928>.
- Su, M.M., Wall, G., Xu, K., 2016. Heritage tourism and livelihood sustainability of a resettled rural community: Mount Sanqingshan world heritage site, China. *J. Sustain. Tourism* 24 (5), 735–757.
- Sullivan, S., 2013. Banking nature? The spectacular financialisation of environmental conservation. *Antipode* 45 (1), 198–217.
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2024. Cultural Landscapes. Available at: <https://whc.unesco.org/en/culturallandscape/>.
- Wallman, S. (Ed.), 1979. *The Social Anthropology of Work*. Academic Press, London.
- Waterton, E., Watson, S., 2013. Framing theory: towards a critical imagination in heritage studies. *Int. J. Herit. Stud.* 19 (6), 546–561.
- Wheeler, R., 2014. Mining memories in a rural community: landscape, temporality and place identity. *J. Rural Stud.* 36, 22–32.
- Winter, T., 2004. Landscape, memory and heritage: new year celebrations at Angkor, Cambodia. *Curr. Issues Tourism* 7 (4–5), 330–345.
- Wu, M.Y., Pearce, P.L., 2014. Host tourism aspirations as a point of departure for the sustainable livelihoods approach. *J. Sustain. Tourism* 22 (3), 440–460.
- Wynne-Jones, S., 2014. Reading for difference' with payments for ecosystem services in Wales. *Crit. Policy Stud.* 8 (2), 148–164.
- Zhang, S., 2022. Agricultural heritage tourism development and heritage conservation: a case study of the samaba rice terraces, Yunnan, China. *J. Herit. Tourism* 17 (3), 357–370.