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INTRODUCTION

One of the key points raised by the “Chaco Landscapes White Paper” (Van Dyke, Lekson, and Heitman 2016) is that ancient monuments cannot be properly appreciated in abstraction but must be addressed in their visual, auditory, and haptic envelopes. It follows that the preservation of these structures for the benefit of future generations is not just a matter of drawing a red line around a dot on a map but must involve securing the entire landscape that is integral to their apprehension and understanding. This argument has been strengthened by the growth of “experiential archaeologies” since the 1990s (e.g., Thomas 1993; Tilley 1994; Van Dyke 2007). In the British context, the imperative to place isolated sites into their broader setting has a long pedigree, through General Pitt-Rivers’s investigation of the Bokerley Dyke in Dorset, to O.G.S. Crawford’s “field archaeology” and Crawford and Alexander Keiller’s Wessex from the Air and on to traditional landscape archaeology (Aston and Rowley 1974; Crawford 1953; Crawford and Keiller 1928; Darvill 2008; David and Thomas 2008; Pitt-Rivers 1887). Despite this, British efforts to protect monuments on the one hand and landscapes on the other have not always entirely harmonized: “buildings,”
“ruins,” and “countryside” have often been safeguarded by different people, and for different reasons.

In Britain, the historic environment has formed the focus for struggles based on class and property, but these are set against a constellation of philosophical viewpoints, distinguishing numerous interest groups (Bender 1998:114). These may be marked by mutual indifference or incomprehension but only occasionally by hostility. Equally, the priorities of the statutory bodies and legal frameworks charged with preservation have shifted through tangled histories, while generally remaining laudable. Here I will briefly outline changing circumstances in England over the past two centuries before addressing the Stonehenge landscape as a comparator to the Chaco situation. In so doing, I will consider the intellectual frameworks underpinning both conventional and “fringe” perspectives on monuments, landscape, nationhood, and identity. While the variety of stakeholders and interests that swirls around Stonehenge is entirely different from that in the Chaco region, the overall configuration provides an instructive parallel, and the closest affinity lies in the way that modern economic, political, and technological forces are presently encroaching on the fringes of a valued prehistoric landscape (transport infrastructure versus oil and gas exploitation) (see Van Dyke and Heitman, chapter 1 in this volume).

LANDSCAPE, NATIONHOOD, AND THE “NATIONAL PAST”

In the British and specifically English case, one complicating factor is the particular role of landscape in the formation and maintenance of national identity. David Lowenthal (1994:20) has argued that by comparison to other European countries, Englishness has depended less on formal symbols than on “scenic nationalism.” Notwithstanding the enhanced importance of the St. George Flag in these Brexit-y times, Englishness is grounded in a set of recognizable topographic images (the white cliffs of Dover, the Yorkshire Dales, the Lake District, the Wessex chalk), and the rural archetype of nucleated villages set in a patchwork of meadows, fields, and woodlands (figure 15.1). The English landscape is one that has been made and remade by former generations; has been crafted, cultivated, and ordered; and demands nurture and husbandry to avoid falling into disarray (Lowenthal 1994:21). In a related argument, the English and their landscape were identified as the products of a historical process of accretion, strengthened by successive waves of migrations, from prehistory through to the Vikings and Normans. In this way the later British colonization of an Empire was identified as a beneficial gift bestowed on other peoples (McNiven and Russell 2005:128).
Yet while landscape has long been connected with Englishness, the development of a “national past” arguably took longer in Britain than in other European countries. Modern nation-states may be “imagined communities” (Anderson 1983), but in Britain the ancient past only became integral to the national imagination in the later nineteenth century. Bruce Trigger (1995:269) argues that the shared cultures of modern states were grounded in “Romantic nationalism,” but for Britain this development was impeded by the divisions of property and class. In Scandinavia, the notion of a shared past that stretched back into prehistory had emerged by the start of the nineteenth century (Klindt-Jensen 1975:48). By 1807, Frederik VI had set up a Danish Royal Commission for the Preservation and Collection of Antiquities (Trigger 1989:75). Similarly, France had a commission on national monuments by 1837 and an official list of national monuments by 1889 (Chippindale 1983:3). But in England, private property was sacrosanct to Whigs and Tories alike, overriding any claim by the nation on antiquities held by an individual.

During the nineteenth century a growing public preoccupation with the past was fostered by the popularity of historical novels and the circulation of steel engraving images of historic buildings (Kehoe 1998:5; Thurley 2013:12). The visiting of historic sites such as Castle Acre Priory, the Tower of London, and Westminster Abbey became progressively more popular as people began to have more free time (culminating with the introduction of bank holidays in 1871), as the proliferation of railways and bicycles enabled them to travel more

Figure 15.1. A stone barn and drystone wall in the Yorkshire Dales, one of the iconic regional landscapes of England. Photo: Julian Thomas.
widely, and as guidebooks began to be produced (Bailey 2014:56). But it was only gradually that these sites came to be collectively identified as a national heritage (Fry 2014a:2; Thurley 2013:22). Both countryside and ancient ruins were generally understood as a precious inheritance that was best left in the careful stewardship of the landowning classes.

**The First Ancient Monuments Legislation**

As Christopher Chippindale has argued (1983:3), the classically educated landowners of Victorian England adhered to a narrative of civilization that focused on the Mediterranean and had no place for the ancient British, who had in any case been ousted by their own Anglo-Saxon ancestors. The Scandinavian three-age system, involving the progressive elaboration of technology, had been introduced to Britain by Daniel Wilson (1851) but only found wider approval in the context of a synthesis with Darwinian ideas in the work of John Lubbock (1865, 1870). It was Lubbock who, having been elected as member of Parliament for Maidstone in 1870, began stoically championing a private member’s bill for the protection of ancient monuments. In seeking to conserve specifically prehistoric remains, Lubbock’s contention was that new knowledge about the distant past can be derived from the archaeological study of monuments and that this knowledge substantiated the extreme antiquity of humankind, on an evolutionary timescale (Murray 2008:155; Thompson 2009:69).

Lubbock’s Bill was first introduced to Parliament in 1873, included a schedule of eighty sites throughout the United Kingdom worthy of protection, and would have established a national monuments commission, funded by the treasury (Kains-Jackson 1880). However, it was opposed by Tory MPs such as Lord Francis Hervey, who opined: “Are the absurd relics of our barbarian predecessors, who found time hanging heavily on their hands, and set about piling up great barrows and rings of stone, to be preserved at the cost of an infringement of property rights?” (Wright 1985:50).

Even Lubbock’s fellow Liberals considered the proposal unfeasibly costly. Over the following decade, Lubbock was able to convince a growing number of other MPs of the need for some form of legislation, but the notion that an independent board of commissioners might be given the power to compulsorily purchase threatened sites was universally unacceptable. A compromise was eventually found in the form of a government bill drafted by Shaw Lefevre, the first commissioner of works, which made provision for one or more inspectors of ancient monuments and which allowed landowners to voluntarily place sites into the guardianship of the state, without any
compulsion to do so (Chippindale 1983:17; Murray 2008:162). The resulting Ancient Monuments Act of 1882 contained a schedule of sixty-eight sites in England, Scotland, and Wales (excluding Ireland) that the state might choose to take into protection through purchase and made provision for other similar sites to be accepted by Order in Council (Fry 2014a:10).

Under the 1882 Act, the care of ancient monuments was placed in the hands of a government body, the Office of Works. The office had been established in the fourteenth century to build and maintain the royal palaces and castles (Thurley 2013:24). A consequence of this purpose was that the organization was somewhat aristocratic in outlook and also that it primarily perceived monuments as buildings. Consequently, prehistoric monuments were for long treated primarily as architecture, isolated from their surroundings. The very first monument taken into state care, the Kit’s Coty House dolmen in Kent (figure 15.2), was promptly enclosed within a set of railings (upon which a Cambridge undergraduate famously impaled himself in 1906) (Bowden 1991:97).
The first inspector, appointed in 1883, was General Augustus Pitt-Rivers, a close associate of Lubbock (Thompson 1977:64). Thereafter, Pitt-Rivers toured the country annually, with his own paid assistants, reporting on the condition of the listed sites and encouraging landowners to place their monuments into the care of the state (Bowden 1991:97). Pitt-Rivers saw a major part of the inspector’s job as making a record of nationally significant monuments and considered that the Ordnance Survey should have been given a role in this process, which would have integrated heritage protection with the practice of map-making (Thurley 2013:46). However, after the general’s death in 1900 the inspectorship effectively lapsed for a period, and the task of inventory of ancient monuments and historic buildings was given to three Royal Commissions on Historic Monuments, established in 1908.

Access to the Landscape

Early steps to safeguard ancient monuments took place alongside the development of an “open space movement,” dedicated to making the countryside available to the people. From the eighteenth century, common lands that had been collectively used for economic and recreational purposes began to be legally enclosed by larger landowners, on the grounds that they would provide better stewardship and management (Neeson 1993:259). This process of enclosure coincided with the concentration of population in the cities, and the right of working people to seek exercise in the open country was defended by the Commons Preservation Society (CPS) and the emerging rambling clubs during the 1860s and 1870s (Murphy 2002:19). The CPS, the National Footpaths Preservation Society, and the Kyrle Society were among a number of groups seeking to improve access to the countryside or enhance urban environments in the later nineteenth century, but they were all essentially small, elite pressure groups. In the Lake District of northwest England, threats ranging from the potential incursion of the railways to the private purchase of Lodore Falls had exercised the clergyman Hardwicke Rawnsley, who identified the need for a nongovernmental landholding body that could acquire places of natural beauty or historic interest on behalf of the nation. Influenced by John Ruskin’s belief that access to the countryside was a life-enhancing right that should be enjoyed by all people, Rawnsley, together with Octavia Hill of the Kyrle Society and Robert Hunter, the legal representative of the CPS, founded the National Trust in 1894 (Waterson 1994:36). The background of the National Trust was in the patrician radicalism of liberals and Christian socialists who operated through contacts and personal influence, and its main priority was
access, in contrast with Lubbock's focus on the conservation of monuments. The trust provided a means by which landowners could donate property to the nation, both for recreation and education. The first properties acquired were the coastline of Dinas Oleu in Wales and the wetlands of Wicken Fen in Cambridgeshire, but these were followed by a historic building: Alfriston Clergy House in Sussex, in 1896 (Morgan Evans 1996:28; Waterson 1994:42). So, interestingly, the Trust was capable of taking ownership of roofed buildings, while under ancient monuments legislation the Office of Works were initially restricted to “ruins.”

These developments provided the background to a transformation in the social significance of both landscape and ancient monuments during the earlier twentieth century. During this period relationships between the state and the citizen altered, arguably as a culmination of the process that Michel Foucault identified as the shift from sovereignty to progressively more encompassing forms of governmentality, regulating the production of political subjects (Foucault 2003:247). David Matless (2016:31) has argued that in the interwar period in Britain, planning and preservation became linked in a form of modernism that stressed both progress and tradition and, above all, order and discipline. Under these circumstances the landscape took on a new moral significance, as a space for the activation of both embodiment and subjectivity. The landscape became the context in which orderly, modern citizens achieved self-realization through their healthy leisure pursuits, in contrast with selfish, untidy, and immoral forms of recreation. This new kind of English citizenship was supported by a dramatic expansion of the open-air movement, with the foundation of the Youth Hostels Association in 1930 and the Rambler’s Association in 1935. Hiking was the paradigm example of this modernist self-formation, as it combined healthful bodily discipline with the observation of nature and navigation (Matless 2016:105). Yet while country walking was identified as a moral pursuit, the demand for access to the land had also taken on a more radical edge, manifested in the April 1932 mass trespass on the grouse moor at Kinder Scout in Derbyshire, supported by the communist British Worker’s Sports Federation (Hey 2011:208).

At the same time, an entirely different kind of modernist leisure activity was developing with the increasing popularity of motoring among the middle classes. Motor touring was often portrayed as a means of immersing oneself in an older England, as in H. V. Morton’s In Search of England (1932), which Matless describes as a “motoring pastoral” (2016:101). Here the English landscape comes to be identified as a set of experiences to be consumed and explicitly as a way of engaging with a premodern world. Morton’s writings
coincided with a popular upsurge of interest in archaeology within its wider landscape. This tendency was manifested in the popularity of the Ordnance Survey’s maps of Roman Britain and Neolithic Wessex, which opened up the possibility of visiting ancient monuments by car. Although motor tourists and hikers were otherwise unalike, they shared a fascination with England’s prehistoric past (Harris 2010:209).

In this new era the British state was increasingly willing to set aside the rights of private property in the public interest. The despoiling of the countryside was now often attributed to undisciplined development, including the proliferation of advertising billboards and the creeping expansion of the towns along the arterial routes, which Clough Williams-Ellis referred to as “the Octopus.” This extension of urban tendrils into the countryside had the effect of “averaging England out into a dull uneventfulness” (Williams-Ellis 1928:21). In place of unregulated growth, Williams-Ellis advocated orderly progress driven by planning, maintaining the separation of town and country, and restricting the spread of squalid bungalows. 1932 saw the passing of the Town and Country Planning Act, reflecting a desire to overcome unregulated development, property speculation, and a lack of designed order. “Preservation orders” could now be applied to inhabited buildings, affording them some level of protection (Thurley 2013:89).

**Tidy Monuments and Country Houses**

This same imperative for order, balance, clarity, and harmony manifested itself in an entirely different way in the activities of the Office of Works. Following the appointment of Charles Peers as inspector of monuments in 1910, a distinct Ancient Monuments Department was created, charged with producing plans, photographs, and guidebooks for all guardianship sites. With the 1913 Ancient Monuments Consolidation and Amendment Act, monuments were identified for the first time as material documents of national history, in which all citizens had an interest. As Simon Thurley points out, this development formed part of the general process by which the British state took responsibility for the nation’s history, also seen in the creation of the Public Records Office, the National Library, and the National Portrait Gallery (2013:80). Thurley also makes the important point that it was at this time that ancient monuments and historic buildings were first identified as a “national heritage collection,” a portfolio of properties that collectively had the function of educating the public about the past, rather than simply being preserved for their intrinsic value. As such, they constituted a kind of extended museum, dispersed across the nation.
So as the landscape became the space for the actualization of healthy, moral, clean-limbed citizens, monuments took on the didactic role of placing English identities into a chronological narrative of race and nation, complementary aspects of governmentality. At the same time, the 1913 act transformed the significance of the distinction that Lubbock had made between scheduled sites and monuments in guardianship, by offering a level of protection to the former on the understanding that not all places of archaeological importance would ever be taken into public ownership (Stout 2008:138).

Peers’s new approach also manifested itself in a new aesthetic for the presentation of ancient monuments. From the 1840s onward, many English churches had been reconstructed in an overenthusiastic manner, resisted by William Morris and the “antiscape” campaign of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, with the result that reconstruction had fallen into disrepute (Donovan 2007). Now, the Office of Works set about the ruthless clearance of many sites, removing any postmedieval additions in order to render the structure legible and comprehensible to the visitor (Thurley 2013:145). The emphasis on order and clarity was also reflected in the addition of neatly mown lawns, flower beds, and custodian’s huts so that in later years it was a common joke to refer to the “Ministry of Tidy Monuments” (Adams 2015:41).

While the public role of ancient monuments was being transformed, the National Trust was undergoing fundamental changes. In 1907 the National Trust Act gave the organization the ability to acquire property inalienably so that it could not be sold, mortgaged, or appropriated by the government. Parliament may not have fully appreciated how powerful a gift it was giving to the trust (Waterson 1994:53). An important statement of the trust’s changing philosophy was provided by G. M. Trevelyan’s Must England’s Beauty Perish? (1929), which demonstrated a growing interest in ancient monuments and historic houses, echoing the Office of Works’ new emphasis on their educational value. Yet Trevelyan also identified the importance of the landscape setting of monuments, arguing that a site such as Bodiam Castle is best appreciated amongst the beauty of meadows and trees. In 1934, Lord Lothian raised the issue of the breakup of country house estates at the trust’s annual general meeting, a process that had escalated since the First World War (Montgomery-Massingberd and Sykes 1994:181). Under the influence of James Lees-Milne, the secretary of the Country Houses Committee between 1936 and 1951, the trust began acquiring increasing numbers of great houses and developed a concern for Georgian as well as earlier architecture.

The country house policy of the 1930s was decisive in turning the trust away from its Christian socialist beginnings and toward domination by aristocrats,
connoisseurs, and senior academics (Nixon 2015:531; Waterson 1994:171). The trust’s shift from public access to preservation during this period was precisely opposite to the direction of travel of the Office of Works. After the Second World War, landowners who had fallen on hard times were generally more inclined to donate their properties to the trust than to the state, especially since the former would usually allow families to continue to occupy their ancestral homes. As a result, the trust received 168 new properties between 1949 and 1954 (Nixon 2015:532). Despite the comparative neglect of countryside and ancient monuments, the mushrooming scale of operations demanded an increase in staff and a more efficient organization. This expansion coincided with growing public affluence and leisure time and with increasing demand for access to the trust’s properties. In 1965 the trust launched Enterprise Neptune, an ambitious project intended to secure stretches of beautiful and unspoiled coastline threatened by development. However, Neptune served to expose internal tensions and contradictions, between preservation and conservation for public amenity or from the wrong kind of public access, as well as a perceived lack of internal democracy. The resulting Benson Enquiry of 1967 caused the rapid professionalization of the National Trust, with stronger management and an increased emphasis on the commercialization of its assets (Nixon 2015:548). Subsequently, the trust also increased its commitment to archaeology and began to understand many of its properties as historic landscapes that demanded systematic investigation (Thackray 1996:218).

The Office of Works was now demonstrating a greater interest in the landscape surrounding its monuments. The Ancient Monuments Act of 1931 empowered the commissioners to restrict building or other activity in the vicinity of monuments, in response to the threat of quarrying in the “wild and beautiful scenery” around Hadrian’s Wall (Thurley 2013:173). By the 1970s there was greater coordination in the protection of material heritage, with the listing of historic buildings and the scheduling of archaeological sites unified within the Directorate of Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings of the Department of the Environment (Thurley 2013:236). However, the end of the seventies saw the eclipse of the statist “planner-preservationism” and the emergence of a more neoliberal outlook within government. The 1979 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act brought a decisive end to the practice of bringing ancient monuments into state ownership, with greater protection for scheduled sites and an emphasis on management agreements negotiated with landowners (English 2002:7). The Office of Works, which had been subsumed into the Department of the Environment, was in 1983 replaced by a quasi-autonomous agency, the Historic Buildings and
The Monuments Commission for England (HBMCE), which operated under the title of English Heritage (complemented by its devolved equivalents, Historic Scotland and Cadw in Wales). English Heritage was charged with developing more imaginative strategies for presentation, education, and marketing, with a view to making the national monuments collection self-funding. Its first chair was Lord Montagu, who had been highly successful in commercializing his stately home, Beaulieu Palace House in Hampshire, where he had established a National Motor Museum and a jazz festival (Bender 1998:117). Since April 2015, the HBMCE has been retitled as Historic England, while the name English Heritage has been reassigned to a self-funding, nongovernmental charitable trust, which is licensed to manage the national heritage collection, the state properties that are now entirely separate from the scheduled and protected archaeological sites in private ownership (English Heritage 2015).

**Heterodox Perspectives**

The views of the bodies charged with the conservation of heritage and landscape in England have been diverse and unstable and much the same is true of the wider society. As Matless points out, the modernist planner-preservationism that dominated official discourse between the 1920s and 1970s was always shadowed by other perspectives, including various forms of organic ruralism and radical traditionalism (2016:32). From an archaeological point of view, one of the most significant and long established of these was modern Druidry. The Ancient Order of Druids was founded in 1781 on the model of freemasonry, but also drew on ancient texts such as those of Diodorus Siculus and on the opinions of antiquaries including William Stukeley and the somewhat suspect Barddas manuscripts of the Welsh poet Iolo Morganwg (Hale 2011:88; Hutton 2011:210). Although there is little evidence that the prehistoric Druids were linked to Stonehenge or other megalithic sites, Stukeley’s important insight that these monuments predated the Romans led him to attribute them to a generalized Druidic prehistory (Piggott 1985:80). This connection was picked up by William Blake in writing Jerusalem: The Emanation of the Giant Albion ([1804] 1991), which presented Britain as the original home of a primordial religion. Blake’s narrative is one that links the essential national spirit of Albion with the possibility of redemption in a fallen world (Fisher 1959:592). “All things begin and end in Albion’s ancient Druid rocky shore,” says Blake, and his illustrations make repeated use of the image of the Stonehenge trilithon (figure 15.3).

By the start of the twentieth century, modern Druidry had taken on a greater interest in magical ritual, informed by its encounter with the Order of the...
Golden Dawn (Worthington 2004:56). The Ancient Order first conducted rituals at Stonehenge on August 24, 1905, but the Universal Bond, a more radical group influenced by Theosophy and occultism, had already been visiting the site at the summer solstice for some years (Stout 2008:144). While there was some mutual distrust between the Ancient Order and the Universal Bond, they shared
the view that great wisdom, unequalled in the present, had existed in the past. This belief that people in antiquity were capable of brilliant feats, were sensitive to the earth’s energies, lived in balance with nature, and were morally superior to modern capitalist societies is foundational to many “alternative archaeologies” (Chippindale 2004:249). The notion of a lost golden age contrasts with archaeology’s increasing focus on evolution and progress as it became a professionalized discipline (Stout 2008:51). As we will see, it also explains why such perspectives proved so attractive to the counterculture from the 1960s onward, since they potentially serve to delegitimize the contemporary sociopolitical order. Yet while some contemporary Druids aligned themselves with the counterculture, others seek personal enlightenment and social respectability, and this remains a tension within the movement (Blain and Wallis 2007:38; Sebastian 1990:88).

A similar emphasis on the advanced achievements of past peoples distinguished a series of unorthodox viewpoints, which collectively fed into an alternative synthesis in the 1960s and 1970s. When Sir Norman Lockyer proposed an astronomical function for Stonehenge in 1906, it was resisted by archaeologists including Mortimer Wheeler and T. D. Kendrick, who preferred a funerary interpretation of the site (Michell 1977:17; Parker Pearson 2013:75). Subsequent approaches to archaeoastronomy have varied between the identification of megalithic monuments as computers capable of predicting lunar and solar eclipses (Hawkins 1965:98) and the more modest isolation of solstitial alignments (Ruggles 1999:41). Similarly, in proposing that “ley lines” (or straight, line-of-site trackways) connected significant sites of various periods in the British landscape, Alfred Watkins (1925) argued that they must have been laid out by skilled “men of knowledge,” whose methods are now lost to us. Watkins had originally hypothesized that leys were related to ancient trade and navigation, and “ley hunting” became popular between the wars, helped by the wide availability of Ordnance Survey maps (Stout 2008:178). Nonetheless, Major Tyler, Watkins’s successor as the central figure in the Old Straight Track Club, eventually resorted to the view that leys were an inheritance from a universal civilization originating in Atlantis (Stout 2008:206). Contemporary with Watkins was the ruralist, antimodern English organicism of H. J. Massingham, which disparaged evolutionism as “the religion of the modern state” (Radford 2010:108). Massingham presented the “Downland Man” of prehistory as possessing an instinctual bond with nature, which was broken by the introduction of metallurgy, beginning the descent into rootless urban life (Massingham 1926:145–6).

In the late 1960s, these various strands of unconventional thinking about prehistory and landscape were drawn together by John Michell, in his book
The View over Atlantis (1969). Although Michell was a central figure in the emerging London counterculture (Miles 2010:187), he identified himself as a “radical traditionalist” and advocated a return to a traditional society based on spiritual principals and a sacred monarchy. He viewed the modern world as disordered, degraded, and corrupt and followed Blake in arguing that England had a unique redemptive destiny (Hale 2011:79; Michell 2005:48). While there was already an interest in what have become known as “earth mysteries,” Michell synthesized ideas of sacred geometry, Druidry, ley lines, earth energies, archaeoastronomy, and numerology, paving the way for the esoteric boom of the 1970s (Devereux 1990:53). He specifically identified prehistoric monuments as a source of connection and continuity with a past that was spiritually richer than the present and suggested that they might have a role to play in regenerating a rural way of life articulated around a series of seasonal festivals (Blain and Wallis 2007:22; Hale 2011:87).

THE STONEHENGE LANDSCAPE

Nowhere have the contrasts between the philosophies and motivations affecting the protection of monuments and landscape been so conspicuous as at Stonehenge and its environs in Wiltshire. The Stonehenge landscape makes up one element of a “serial” World Heritage Site (WHS) (which also includes the area around Avebury in north Wiltshire), inscribed in 1986 under the 1972 UNESCO convention for the protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage. The Stonehenge part of the WHS covers an area of 2,600 ha, measures 5.4 km from east to west, and by the year 2000 contained a total of 196 scheduled ancient monuments (Bowden at al. 2015:9) (figure 15.4). The World Heritage Site status does not affect the ownership of the region: the monument itself is in the care of English Heritage, a large area of surrounding downland is owned by the National Trust, the land around Larkhill to the north is in the hands of the Ministry of Defence, and there are six other major landowners (English 2002:7; Wainwright 2000:334). Stonehenge itself is a monument whose significance has been debated for centuries, and successive surveys and excavations have not brought discussion and speculation to an end (Parker Pearson 2013). Stonehenge is both unique and anomalous (figure 15.5). It is composed of an earthwork bank and ditch constructed in the Middle Neolithic, around 3000 BC, immediately inside of which is a ring of fifty-six small pits known as the Aubrey holes, which probably originally contained a series of bluestone (dolerite, rhyolite, tuff, and sandstone) pillars that had been brought to Wiltshire from southwest Wales. A number of
cremation burials were associated with these features. Around 2500 BC an arrangement of much larger sarsen (or sandstone) uprights (probably from north Wiltshire) was set up in the center of the enclosure, first a set of five trilithons in a horseshoe shape and then a surrounding ring of uprights with a continuous lintel. The bluestones were repositioned as part of this central
setting, first as a double circle and later as a concentric circle and oval (Darvill et al. 2012:1026).

Although it is now possible to place Stonehenge into the broader traditions of Late Neolithic domestic and ceremonial architecture (Pollard 2009), its uniqueness only adds to its global recognition. Henry Browne, the semiofficial guardian of the site in the mid-nineteenth century, believed it to be a singular survival from before the biblical flood; Richard Atkinson argued that it was out of keeping with all other prehistoric buildings north of the Alps and must therefore have been of Mycenaean origin (1956:163; Chippindale 2004:146). The combination of architectural matchlessness and enduring mystery has rendered Stonehenge as a national symbol but one that can be claimed and understood in entirely different ways by different constituencies (Higgins 2019:9). The incompatibility of many of these interpretations has added to the perennial difficulty of presenting and granting access to Stonehenge. Different publics demand diverse experiences from the monument, just as the multiple authorities involved in its management have subtly different priorities of their own.

By the middle of the nineteenth century, the solstitial orientation of the central stone settings at Stonehenge was widely appreciated, and numbers of people were gathering at the site each year to witness midsummer sunrise (Chippindale 2004:156). After the 1890s the solstice crowd was sometimes over 3,000 strong and accompanied by entertainment in the form of brass or jazz bands, Morris dancers, and gramophones (Worthington and Deering 2005:6). Gradually, with agricultural intensification and the arrival of the railway at

Figure 15.5. Stonehenge: the façade of the sarsen circle, seen from the northeast. Photo copyright Adam Stanford/Aerial-Cam.
Salisbury in 1847 and Amesbury in 1902, Stonehenge began to be subject to encroaching development, and already by 1901 Hardwicke Rawnsley was regretting its “disenchantment” (Rawnsley 1901). By the 1930s the Druids had become closely associated with Stonehenge in the popular imagination (Stout 2008:157). The Amesbury estate (including Stonehenge) had been purchased by the Antrobus family in 1824, and for long the monument was openly accessible to the public and subject to damage caused by the chipping of the stones for souvenirs. However, following the collapse of one of the outer sarsen uprights and its lintel in 1900, and the reerection of the largest trilithon (which had begun to lean alarmingly) in 1901, Sir Edmund Antrobus fenced the site and began to levy an admission charge. Revealingly, this enclosure was resisted for contrasting reasons. Archaeologists such as Flinders Petrie were troubled by the prospect of overenthusiastic restoration following Antrobus’ resetting of uprights in concrete. Amesbury Parish Council complained that there was an established tradition of access to the downs for local people, while the National Trust argued that Stonehenge was a national monument and should be freely open to the public (Chippindale 2004:164). Sir Edmund then offered to sell Stonehenge to the government for £125,000, but threatened that if his price was not met, he would “sell the Stones to some American millionaire, who would ship them across the Atlantic” (Cole 2002:140). This danger was averted by the 1913 Ancient Monuments Act, which also protected the site from casual damage (Fry 2014b:12). Sir Edmund’s heir was killed in action in 1914, and following his own death the following year, Stonehenge was sold at auction in Salisbury, where it was acquired for £6,600 by Cecil Chubb (Chippindale 2004:176). Chubb bought the site for his wife on a whim but in 1918 donated it to the nation, being rewarded the following year with a baronetcy.

Stonehenge was now taken into the guardianship of the Office of Works, who began a comprehensive program of straightening leaning stones and reerecting fallen ones, which was integrated with a series of excavations under the auspices of the Society of Antiquaries of London. Both projects were directed by Colonel Hawley, who had already served as the representative of the Office of Works during World War I, with the intention of rendering the monument comprehensible (in keeping with the policies of Charles Peers). However, both were abandoned incomplete (Barber 2014:86). During the First World War, the immediate environs of the monument had been adversely affected by the expansion of the military camp at Larkhill, with the construction of a horse isolation hospital and an aerodrome nearby (Chippindale 2004:175). Northward from Larkhill, and overlapping the World Heritage Site, the Salisbury Plain military training area is still today in use for live firing
and tactical maneuvers. Despite damage by shell impacts and tracked vehicles, the lack of intensive agriculture has resulted in high levels of archaeological preservation (McOmish et al. 2002:2). However, the creep of military activity toward Stonehenge—together with the building of a café, several cottages, and a pig farm—had made the area increasingly untidy (Morgan Evans 1996:36). The last straw was the threat to build in the vicinity of the Avenue that links Stonehenge with the River Avon for what Williams-Ellis had epitomized vulgar, unregulated development: a row of holiday bungalows.

In 1929 a national appeal was launched by archaeologists, including O.G.S. Crawford and Alexander Keiller, to buy 587 hectares of downland surrounding Stonehenge, which, following the intervention of various celebrities, proved successful. The land was handed over to the National Trust, creating the curious situation in which the monument itself sat within a small triangle bounded by roads to the north and south that was held by the Office of Works (later English Heritage) but contained within a much more extensive tract of National Trust property. Once again, “ancient monument” and “landscape” were addressed in subtly different ways. The trust began the process of removing what were identified as unsightly elements in the landscape, eventually demolishing the Stonehenge Café in 1938. Initially, the land continued to be used for arable and pasture by tenant farmers, but more recently the trust has succeeded in returning much of it to a natural chalkland habitat (Worthington 2004:101). In 1999 the National Trust holdings in the eastern part of the World Heritage Site were increased by the purchase of 172 acres of Countess Farm. With the entire immediate environment of Stonehenge removed from private ownership, a lengthy deliberation began on the best way to display the site. The first step was the construction of a car park and somewhat brutalist concrete visitor facilities immediately to the north of the monument in 1968, linked to the site by an underpass beneath the minor road, the A344 (Fry 2014b:24). The local road system, as well as access to the stones, has been a central problem for the management of Stonehenge ever since.

**Festivals and Travelers**

The historical processes through which the interpretation and safeguarding of places of historic and scenic importance developed in Britain formed part of the concatenation of circumstances that hardened into conflict surrounding Stonehenge from the 1970s onward. The Druids had succeeded in popularizing the notion that the site represented a “national temple,” a view that began to resonate in unexpected ways. One of the utopian ideas that
emerged at the end of the 1960s was that of free music festivals, self-policing and spontaneously organized. This notion lay behind the tearing down of the fences surrounding the Isle of Wight Festival in 1970 and also the planning of the Glastonbury Fayre in Somerset in 1971 by Arabella Churchill and Andrew Kerr. Kerr was inspired by John Michell in seeking to hold the Fayre at Worthy Farm, close to the location to which Joseph of Arimathea had reputedly brought the Holy Grail, within the terrestrial “Glastonbury zodiac” identified by the Theosophist Katharine Maltwood and beside the supposed ley-line linking Glastonbury Abbey with Stonehenge (Kerr 2011:190). The iconic pyramid stage was built by Bill Harkin on the basis of Michell’s study of the Great Pyramid. Henceforth, esoteric views about the ancient past and the English landscape became integral to the free festival movement. From 1974 onward, official obstruction of the national free festival at Windsor Great Park led to the emergence of a Stonehenge Free Festival (figure 15.6) held at the summer solstice, inspired by countercultural figure Wally Hope (Phil Russell). This event was initially very small in size but gained in significance from 1976, when participants entered Stonehenge alongside the Druids in order to scatter the ashes of Phil Russell, who had died under suspicious circumstances in
police custody. By the final year, 1984, the festival attracted 100,000 people on National Trust land north of the A344 (Worthington and Deering 2005:5).

By this time many of the attendees were “New Age Travellers,” young people who had left the cities for a nomadic way of life in converted motor vehicles and who were viewed with suspicion by the authorities (Hetherington 1998:329; Martin 2002:724). For the travelers, Stonehenge had become a site of annual pilgrimage (figure 15.6). As Michell saw it, they “instinctively began to imitate their ancestors and gather at their national temple for free-spirited solstice ceremonies” (2005:60–61). However, the National Trust at best tolerated the festival, while the pressure of visitors on the site itself was increasingly being recognized, with access to the stone settings themselves being restricted from 1978 onward (English 2002:10). Fatefully, the travelers had attracted the attention of Margaret Thatcher’s Conservative government, becoming closely associated with the antinuclear protest movement after the deployment of US cruise missiles at Greenham Common and Molesworth air bases, and the establishment of “peace camps” at both sites. In 1985 it was announced that the festival would not be allowed to take place, and English Heritage and the National Trust took out injunctions against eighty-three named individuals, forbidding them to enter the vicinity of the monument, as well as excluding Festival Welfare Services and the St John Ambulance Brigade (Worthington and Deering 2005:25). A convoy of 140 traveler vehicles set out from Savernake Forest on June 1, 1985, intending to break through the police cordon and enter the “exclusion zone,” but at a roadblock at Shipton Bellinger they were turned into a field, where they were attacked by 1,400 police in riot gear. People, including pregnant women, were battered with truncheons, many vehicles were destroyed, and 500 were arrested. The tactics employed by the police echoed those used against striking miners at the “Battle of Orgreave” in South Yorkshire precisely a year earlier, and they demonstrated the government’s willingness to deploy force against its perceived “enemies within.” In 1991, twenty-one of the travelers received £28,665 in civil court damages for false imprisonment, damage to property, and false arrest (Aitken and Rosenberger 2005:147). The so-called Battle of the Beanfield explains why the question of access to Stonehenge became not only a matter of heritage management but of civil liberties.

After the Beanfield

The violent aftermath of the aborted festival, the exclusion of all members of the public from Stonehenge during the summer solstice, and the declaration of a parliamentary committee in 1975 that the visitor facilities represented
“a national disgrace” (Millar 2006) made it imperative to find a solution for the management of the site. The fundamental problem that such a solution must contend with is the contradiction between huge visitor numbers and the desire for an authentic experience of the site in its setting (Chippindale 2004:272).

In 1992–1993, a joint English Heritage (EH) and National Trust (NT) plan identified the main objectives as the closure of the A344; the diversion of the more major A303, which runs immediately to the south of the monument; and the creation of a new and more extensive visitor center farther away from the site. This immediately introduced another stakeholder into the equation, the Department of Transport. For while the EH/NT plan agreed that the best option for the A303 was to run the road through a bored tunnel throughout most of the WHS, the Department of Transport declared this too expensive and proposed a shorter cut-and-cover tunnel, which would be more archaeologically destructive (Kennet and Young 2000:949; Wainwright 2000:338).

Approaching the millennium, new attempts to solve the Stonehenge problem were prefigured by the return of the Druids for the solstice of 1998 and of a wider public under conditions of “managed access” in 2000 (English 2002:15). Under the aegis of UNESCO, a WHS Management Plan was published in 2000, which sought to harmonize the views of numerous landowners and statutory authorities on issues of landscape and heritage conservation, tourism, traffic, and archaeological research (English Heritage 2000; Hunt 1996:214).

However, the Management Plan was preempted by a “Stonehenge Master Plan” presented by EH and the NT with minimal consultation, which emphasized the importance of reestablishing the “dignity and isolation of the monument,” with a particular emphasis on the removal of the roads (Wainwright 2000:340). Some commentators believed that the “Master Plan” fell short of UNESCO’s requirements for the management of a World Heritage Site, which were embodied in the management plan (Fielden 2000:947). In particular, the latter emphasized the need for the A303 to be buried in a long bored tunnel and rejected the notion that the new visitor center should be placed in the hands of a commercial operator (Baxter and Chippindale 2000:944).

The management plan was complemented by a Stonehenge Research Framework (Darvill 2005:3), which followed the agenda set by the former, in identifying an agreed set of priorities for understanding the archaeology of the WHS through a resource assessment and a strategy for future work. This framework has now been upgraded to cover both the Stonehenge and Avebury areas, identifying common research themes between the two regions (Leivers and Powell 2010:12). Again, this framework has the benefit of achieving compromise between the different stakeholders involved in the WHS. Another recent achievement
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has been the creation of a new visitor center. After abortive attempts to build a facility at Larkhill, Fargo North, and Countess East, the new center at Airman's Corner in the west of the WHS was opened on December 18, 2013, following the closure and removal of the A344. The new center is intended to act as a “gateway” into the Stonehenge landscape and contains displays of artifacts as well as audiovisual facilities and a group of reconstructed Late Neolithic houses based on those excavated at Durrington Walls (figure 15.7).

More intractable has been the issue of the A303, which represents the principal trunk road from London to the southwest of England and passes within 165 meters of Stonehenge. Here the comparison with Chaco Culture National Heritage Park is clearest, for in each case the protection of the “core” monuments is not in doubt, but the integrity of the wider landscape is threatened by contemporary developments around its periphery (Higgins 2019:11). Years of stalemate over the best way to manage the Stonehenge landscape have meant that during the summer months, the overused A303 is regularly jammed with stationary vehicles with their engines running. Owing to expense, the plan for upgrading the A303 was again dropped in 2007, but in January 2017 it was reinstated as one of nine schemes managed by Highways England Southwest that will collectively create a southwest expressway. English Heritage have agreed to Highways England’s proposal of a 2.9 km bored dual carriageway tunnel, on the condition that the western portal is moved farther away from

Figure 15.7. The new Stonehenge Visitor Centre at Airman’s Corner in the World Heritage Site. Photo copyright Adam Stanford/Aerial-Cam.
the Normanton Down group of prehistoric burial mounds than initially intended. The proposal is opposed by the Stonehenge Alliance, composed of the Ancient Sacred Landscape Network, the Campaign for Better Transport, the Campaign to Protect Rural England, and Friends of the Earth and Rescue (the British Archaeological Trust). The alliance notes that the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS)-UK, the official advisor to UNESCO on cultural World Heritage Sites, has expressed concern over the 2.9 km tunnel and the 1.6 km of new dual carriageway that would be constructed within the WHS (Stonehenge Alliance 2019). Troublingly, the eastern part of this carriageway and the expressway flyover at the Countess Roundabout are perilously close to Blick Mead, a long-lived Mesolithic site with evidence for the hunting of aurochs and for far-flung social contacts (Jacques and Phillips 2014). A 4.6 km tunnel would remove the need for any new road, and a 6 km tunnel would remove the entire surface road from the World Heritage Site. Such long tunnel solutions are supported by the Council for British Archaeology (2017) and the Prehistoric Society, but at its Annual General Meeting in October 2017, the National Trust voted to support the Highways England Plan (Stonehenge Alliance 2017). It is apparently unlikely that government will accept such a model on the grounds of expense, and it is argued that the 2.9 km tunnel is the best compromise that can presently be achieved (Higgins 2019:10). However, it is open to question whether future generations will agree that the destruction of archaeological heritage in the name of political expediency is an acceptable outcome.

By complete contrast, a case has been made for the retention of the A303 in its present form, on the grounds that it represents an integral part of the historic landscape. Dan Hicks (2017) argues that the “scraping” of later elements from the surroundings of Stonehenge—including the café, the cottages, and the horse hospital—has the effect of creating an artificial “heritage landscape” that never existed in the past. It is a tasteful museum landscape that has stopped developing and become static, an embodiment of middle-class values and aesthetics. Hiding the A303 in a long tunnel has the effect of stopping passing motorists from viewing the stones as they head toward Devon and Cornwall on vacation, obliterating the valued democratic experiences of a mobile public.

CONCLUSION

The Stonehenge landscape is comparable with Chaco Canyon in that numerous different interests converge on the site and its preservation (see
Lekson, chapter 2 in this volume). As we have already noted, no direct equivalence exists between the stakeholders concerned in the two situations. While the connection between the Chaco great houses and contemporary Native American communities is uncontentious, it is arguable that the more mysterious past of Stonehenge draws it into multiple competing processes of contemporary identity formation. The central paradox that I have sought to emphasize in this contribution is that ancient monuments can only be fully appreciated in a landscape context, but that the reasons why different organizations seek to preserve ruins, buildings, and countryside are often quite different. In the case of England, the situation is complicated by the way that landscape is freighted with associations of national identity, while some ancient monuments have become contested sites through which competing versions of Englishness have been worked out. Conservation bodies—whether governmental or independent—have complex and unruly histories of their own, in which the competing objectives of preservation, access, educational instruction, recreation, and commercialization have fluctuated in their relative importance. These organizations, and different segments of the public, are not motivated primarily by class interest and economic or political advantage but by philosophical ideas concerning history, property, authenticity, value, nationhood, and identity. These ideas are themselves not static, since they are linked to changing social and cultural conditions. As we have seen in the case of the Stonehenge landscape, the views of the different constituencies involved gradually shift in relation to each other, creating moments in which positive developments are possible. Notable in this example have been the management plans and research frameworks promoted by UNESCO, which have provided a means for establishing consensus among the diverse factions involved.
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