

Sacred Sites, Contested Rites/Rights
Contemporary Pagan Engagements with the Past

Six-Month Pilot Project 2001
Funded by *Sheffield Hallam Centre for Human Rights*
Discussion document and report of current research

Dr Robert J Wallis
Department of Archaeology
University of Southampton

Dr Jenny Blain
School of Social Science and Law
Sheffield Hallam University

Contents

- 1. Abstract..... 3
- 2. Acknowledgements..... 4
- 3. Introduction..... 5
- 4. State of current information..... 7
- 5. Rationale for selection of sites for analysis and discussion..... 9
- 6. Contemporary Paganisms..... 10
- 7. ‘Sacred Sites’..... 12
- 8. Why do Pagans engage with sacred sites? 13
- 9. Stonehenge..... 16
- 10. Avebury..... 21
- 11. Stanton Moor..... 28
- 12. Conclusions..... 30
- 13. Future Research..... 32
- 14. Appendix A: Methodology..... 34
- 15. Appendix B: How this document has been disseminated..... 36
- 16. References..... 37

1. Abstract

This discussion document (also available online www.sacredsites.org.uk) is the primary means of disseminating research conducted by the *Sacred Sites, Contested Rites/Rites* pilot project to implicated parties (see Appendix B). Funded initially by *Sheffield Hallam Centre for Human Rights* and conducted by an archaeologist (Wallis) and an anthropologist (Blain), the project was conducted over six months and involved participant observation among contemporary Pagans at three significant sacred sites of contest – Stonehenge and Avebury in Wiltshire and Stanton Moor (especially the Nine Ladies) in Derbyshire, all of which are classified by archaeologists as ‘henge monuments’ or ‘stone circles’. This document sets out who Pagans are, how and why they engage with archaeological monuments – or ‘sacred sites’, as they are increasingly becoming known to both Pagans and Heritage personnel – and also outlines some implications for those concerned, including heritage managers, archaeologists, local communities, the tourist industry, and of course, Pagans themselves. We also offer some preliminary guidelines for pragmatic action, particularly regarding reciprocal dialogue, and outline the directions of our future research. This discussion is not intended as a definitive document, final word on complex issues, or even a representative overview of Pagans and ‘sacred sites’ in England (indeed the project in its entirety will extend to the British and Irish Isles). In every sense it is a first step in research and poses more questions than it answers. We welcome constructive feedback from anyone with an active interest in ‘sacred sites’ and can be contacted as follows:

Dr Robert J Wallis
Department of Archaeology
University of Southampton
The Avenue, Highfield
Southampton SO17 1BJ
023 8059 2911
rjw2@soton.ac.uk

Dr Jenny Blain
School of Social Science and Law
Collegiate Crescent Campus
Sheffield Hallam University
Sheffield S10 2BP
0114 225 4413
J.Blain@shu.ac.uk

2. Acknowledgements

This project would not have been possible without the many Pagans and others who consented to our interviews and other intrusions into their activities at sacred sites. Grateful thanks in particular to Karin Attwood, Paul Devereux, Clews Everard, Christopher Gingell, Graham Harvey, Jon Humble, Ronald Hutton, George Lambrick, David Miles, Andy Norfolk, Diana Paxson, King Arthur Pendragon, Melanie Pomeroy, Clare Prout/Slaney, Tim Sebastian and Philip Shallcrass. Thanks also to the many Pagans at various sites and on a variety of email discussion lists whose perspectives on the past contributed to the development of the project. Valuable feedback was also given at the 4th Annual Cambridge Heritage Conference, and BASR (British Association for the Sociology of Religion). The *Sacred Sites, Contested Rites/Rights* six month pilot project was initially funded by *Sheffield Hallam Human Rights Fund* and was supported by the School of Social Science and Law, Sheffield Hallam University and the Department of Archaeology, University of Southampton.

3. Introduction

'The condition of heritage', including prehistoric 'monuments', is a matter of concern to archaeologists and heritage managers (e.g. Cleere 1989). It is such also to increasing numbers of 'alternative' interest groups, most notably 'contemporary Pagans'. Yet where the impact of tourists, unscrupulous land owners and farmers is often addressed by archaeologists (e.g. Morris 1998), the problematic or otherwise actions of Pagans or, more pejoratively but more generally, 'spiritual tourists' are only now being recognised. Recently, therefore, heritage management in the UK seems to be adopting – or co-opting – a new term: the 'sacred site'. This advent begs analysis: what range of meaning is encompassed by this term 'sacred', to whom, and what implications does it have for the future of heritage management?

English Heritage, the National Trust, and other bodies appear increasingly aware of this concept which is finding its way into (for instance) the Conservation and Management Plan for the Rollright Stones (Lambrick 2001) and other documents. The English Heritage World Heritage Site Management Plan for Avebury argues: 'Paganism may well be the fastest growing religion in Britain and this is linked with the increasing interest in the mystical significance of Avebury as a "sacred" place' (Pomeroy 1998: 27). Commenting on his negotiations with Pagans, David Miles (Chief Archaeologist, English Heritage) used the term 'sacred site' when referring to 'Seahenge', stating: 'the experience of working and discussing with [Pagans] was extremely fruitful' (Wallis & Lymer 2001:107). However, the concept of Pagan uses of sacred sites appears problematic: Pagans create 'ritual litter' and demand open access policies. In this light Pagans are perceived as a monolithic group, as people who engage in 'strange' practices and leave 'offerings' such as flowers or tea-lights, and who may cause graffiti, fire or other damage to ancient 'monuments'. Within existing reports, the preservation ethos appears in binary opposition to the 'visits' of Pagans, travellers, and others who seek to use sacred sites for spiritual/community purposes.

More sophisticated treatment appears in work by Chippindale, and Bender (e.g. Bender 1993, 1998; Chippindale 1986; Chippindale et al. 1990). A multiplicity of views is presented in this work, although it focuses on Stonehenge. Yet even with this famous site, the management plan (English Heritage, 2000) assumes a passive 'visitor' experience – educated 'consumers' will experience the site or its visitor centre as directed by experts. Critiques such as those of Baxter et al (2000) point to various problems here, and a recent discussion paper by Baxter and Chippindale (2002), calling for recognition of the extent of foot-traffic, stresses that visitors to Stonehenge do indeed want to see the stones, rather than a visitor centre. Yet even such critiques once again omit the concept of 'sacred site' or active 'spiritual experience'. The multiplicity of meanings relating to Stonehenge are in danger of disappearing yet again.

Studies emerging from archaeological and heritage management communities, then, focus on the sites. This is understandable: but we see a need to focus also on people, as active site-users, on relations between Pagans, site managers and others, and identify a clear need for foregrounding meaning and its construction among 'visitors' to sites – notably Pagans whose meanings and approaches are most at odds with the concept of 'visiting' promoted by management plans. As one of our informants commented, 'visiting is what you do in someone else's house': members of the Pagan and traveller communities may speak not of visiting as tourists (for incisive discussions of tourism and heritage see e.g. Urry 1990; Boniface & Fowler 1993), but of 'coming home'.

Clearly, there are some radical differences of worldview and hence approach to sacred sites taken by the interest groups, most obviously heritage managers and archaeologists vis-à-vis Pagans. However, we see the situation as not one of binary oppositions, but of diversity. And, while there is some common ground and negotiation based around the heritage ethic, there is also dissonance and contest. These themes of plurality and multivocality form the linking thread in this discussion, a document which, as the following literature – or lack of it – review makes clear, is timely.

Whereas our project makes use of participant observation and interviewing, in this discussion much of our focus is on written materials - documents, internet sites - together with some interview material, as we attempt to demonstrate some of the understandings of site, sacredness, and pagan site use surrounding three 'case study' sites. We therefore submit this document for consideration by all concerned, and welcome comments from all sides in this contested area. Our aim is to 'broker' ideas and to promote understanding, to facilitate policies and solutions.

4. State of current information

Despite its standing as a much publicised and enduring issue, it is surprising that there has been little serious discussion of Pagan interactions with ‘archaeological sites’, nor the politics surrounding site management. Or perhaps not so surprising: the term 'Pagan' still arouses concern or embarrassment in some quarters, and it is only now that, as numbers of those identifying as 'Pagan' steadily increase, academic is beginning to register 'paganism' as a substantial cultural and spiritual strand within the UK population. Paganism is diverse, and some sources discussing this diversity are given in section 6 and subsequently.

This preliminary document establishes that current datasets – and analyses resulting from these – are extremely limited. Further research is necessary:

1. While Pagan engagements with ‘sacred sites’ have been identified in previous literature, these comments tend to be slight and stereotypical. Early comments by Chippindale (1985, 1986, Chippindale et al. 1990) take a markedly balanced standpoint for an academic archaeologist, but are focussed entirely on Stonehenge and are now much dated.
2. Bender’s (1998) discussion is by far the most detailed and pertinent (see also Bender 1993), but again the focus on Stonehenge is limited and there is no direct engagement with the approaches of heritage managers (in fact the voice of English Heritage is invented in her 1998 discussion).
3. Pagans and ‘sacred sites’ have, only recently, been discussed by heritage managers (though not in any literature on Stonehenge, such as the Stonehenge Masterplan), but the National Trust Avebury Management Plan (1997) and English Heritage Avebury World Heritage Site Management Plan (Pomeroy 1998) homogenise the diversity of Pagan practices and offer no strategies for addressing the situation at the Avebury complex (a more balanced approach is taken to the ‘Seahenge’ fiasco by Champion 2000).
4. In terms of gauging perspectives on sacred sites, the Avebury Visitor Research 1996-1998 (Calver, 1998) conducted by Bournemouth University for the National Trust is an important contribution, but once again is site-specific and in not moving beyond general comment it fails to establish specific Pagan engagements with sites and their implications.
5. More recently, a section of Wallis’ (1999b) PhD thesis discusses the history of Pagan engagements with a number of ‘sacred sites’, principally Avebury and Stonehenge, from an autoarchaeologist’s point of view (see also Wallis 2001). Again, while this is timely and potentially important document (e.g. Wallis forthcoming), the focus is quite narrow, with limited interviews. And, while a guide to the Avebury region attempts to engage Pagans with the conservation of sites, and dialogue between the interest groups is promoted, no other guidelines are offered.
6. The most current examination of some issues this project tackles is found in various papers approaching alternative archaeology in a volume co-edited by Wallis (Wallis & Lymer 2001), including a paper by Blain (2001) critiquing Pagan interactions with Scottish rock art, and transcription of a debate which brought heritage managers, Pagans and alternative theorists together in dialogue. Comments here provide challenging, if highly personalised points for consideration in our project.

Overall, the current dataset is clearly quite limited. Conferences such as ‘New approaches to the archaeology of art, religion and folklore’ (Southampton, Dec. 1999) and ‘Ancient Sacred

Landscape Network' (ASLaN) (Banbury, June 2000) attempt to bring together archaeologists, heritage managers, and practitioners. But until our small-scale Sheffield Hallam *Sacred Sites, Contested Rites/Rights* project, no academic study has attempted to address the range of responses and effects, the potential magnitude of implications (e.g. for tourism), and the phenomenon of Pagan adoption of 'sacred sites' as a part of relations between people and 'the land' or 'landscape'. In a 'post-processual' climate in which archaeologists, heritage managers and others must be reflexive, transparent, and open up their research/data to external scrutiny, it is imperative that the diversity of Pagan engagements with 'archaeological sites' is examined, as well as guidelines offered which pragmatically address the issues. This discussion document attempts a first step in this regard, by examining three case examples in depth.

5. Rationale for selection of sites for analysis and discussion

Our work is focussed on three very different sacred sites: the relatively well-documented politics of Stonehenge; the less represented but now more heavily impacted Avebury; and the rather different situation at the Nine Ladies stone circle, Stanton Moor, Derbyshire, the focus of a small protest site.

(For documentation of Stonehenge politics, see e.g. Chippindale 1986; Chippindale et al 1990; Bender 1993, 1998; Bender & Edmonds 1992; *Stonehenge Campaign Newsletter*; *Stonehenge Campaign* online at <http://www.phreak.co.uk/stonehenge/psb/stonecam.htm>; *The Stonehenge Peace Process* online <http://www.greenleaf.demon.co.uk/sppmenu.htm>; *Stonehenge Alliance (Save Stonehenge)* online <http://www.savestonehenge.org.uk/>. For Avebury see e.g. Fielden 1996; Pitts 1996.)

Stonehenge, the world's best-known stone circle, is an 'icon of Britishness': access has been problematic, the centre of an on-going struggle between free festivalers, so-called 'New Age' travellers, Pagans, Druids, members of the 'alternative' community, English Heritage, landowners and local police. Avebury is a 'honeypot' open access site, attracting numerous Pagans: the associated West Kennet Long Barrow is a focus of Pagan engagements and suffers ongoing deposition of 'ritual litter', from votive offerings of flowers, feathers, stones, crystals, coins and incense, to chalk marks and occasionally scratchings and defacement. By contrast, Pagans are among those protesting the reopening of quarrying nearby the Nine Ladies stone circle and who are having an 'impact' on the site they wish to protect.

Before going further, we will point out that while pagan engagements as referred to above can be associated with 'ritual litter', many pagan engagements, quite possibly the majority, leave little obvious trace, those pagans leaving 'only footsteps'.

Our comments on these three sites cannot provide a comprehensive overview, but they do offer case studies of sites illustrating the diversity of Pagan engagements with sacred sites, and a sample with which to demonstrate how three very different 'stone circles' have been implicated in debates over 'sacred sites'. Before so doing, it is necessary to provide some indication of what 'Paganisms' are, why the term 'sacred site' is used, and why it is that Pagans seek to engage with such sites.

6. Contemporary Paganisms

'Paganism' as a generic term encompasses several recognised and coherent sets of beliefs and practices (e.g. Harvey 1997). Loosely put, Paganism (or more correctly but also more cumbersome 'Paganisms') comprises a variety of 'paths' or 'traditions' which focus on direct engagements with 'nature' as deified, 'sacred', or otherwise animated and containing 'spirits', wights, sprites and/or other 'other-than-human-persons'. As such it is a relative newcomer to the British social/religious scene. Estimates of numbers of adherents have previously ranged from a 'conservative' 25,000 (*Pagan Hospice and Funeral Trust*, 1998, available online: <http://www.demon.co.uk/charities/PHFT/what-is-pag.html>) to the 110-120,000 suggested by Professor Ronald Hutton for the Multi-Faith Directory of Religions issued by the University of Derby (Weller 1997). *The Pagan Federation*, currently campaigning for recognition of 'Paganism' as 'a religion' (perhaps more accurately a set of allied or associated religions) can claim a membership of only one to two percent of 'Pagans', who tend to prize their individualism: but PF representatives point out that non-member Pagans tend to contact their organisation when they feel their rights are threatened. Such threats to individuals have ranged from job loss and child custody loss, to lack of provision for pagan children in schools and media sensationalising of paganisms, as mentioned in the Home Office report on religious discrimination (Weller et al 2001). Current PF estimates of numbers of pagans, based on Hutton's estimate, above, and allowing for growth since the mid-90s, are now at around 250,000 (pers. comm, PF spokesperson Andy Norfolk).

Not all individuals and groups with alternative interests in 'archaeological sites' are Pagans, and not all Pagans engage with such sites. The diversity of interest groups – including Dowsers, Pagans, Goddess worshippers, Druids, Free Festivalers, Heathens, Wiccans, Earth Mysteries enthusiasts, Modern/New Antiquarians and Travellers – makes the umbrella term inadequate, but given this explicit caveat, such a term cannot be avoided¹. The close interactions and connections between these interest groups means it would be misleading to examine only one of them, divorced from the wider context of the others. Thus we use the term 'Paganisms' but acknowledge that it is insufficient and misleading, and meanwhile emphasise the diversity of site engagement.

These engagements are not restricted to specific occasions: a Pagan is as likely to visit Avebury on their birthday, a weekend or a public holiday as at one of the eight most common Pagan festivals which mark and celebrate the seasonal changes seen in nature during the ever-turning 'wheel of the year'. The festivals place an emphasis on the agricultural cycle, however, and adherents use these times to connect with the land, reflect on how the changes in nature reflects changes in self and community, observe long-term patterns of stability and change, and to make ritual and celebration. The following dates are somewhat arbitrary since they may depend on other factors such as planetary alignments (at the equinoxes and solstices), the proximity of sunrise and sunset, the festivals tend to last for some days (particularly when happening at a weekend) and not all these festivals are celebrated or accepted by all Pagans. In order, these festivals are: Samhain (Halloween) 31st October, Yule (winter solstice) 21st December, Imbolc 2nd February, Spring equinox 21st March, Beltane (May Day) 1st May, Summer solstice 21st June, Lammas 31st July, Autumnal equinox 21st

¹ Further, pagans may not be easily classifiable into categories, and individuals may engage with several different paths or practices. While editing this document, Blain, a heathen, participated in a Druid ritual for Beltane at a small stone circle. Passers-by who stopped to watch and discuss both ritual and stone circles included a hedge-witch and a Pagan who were there to dowse a nearby circle and spend time looking for cup-marked stones. None of these activities left overt physical traces.

September. For full discussion of their meanings, see Harvey 1997. For further academic interpretations of Pagans and Paganisms we refer you to Harvey (1997), Hutton (1999), Greenwood (2000), Blain (2002), Lindquist (1997), Wallis (1999a).

7. 'Sacred Sites'

The term 'sacred site' perhaps entered Pagan discourse via comments on and publications by indigenous spokespersons, with which Pagans are often familiar (e.g. papers in Layton 1989a, 1989b; Carmichael et al 1994)². It has also, recently, entered Heritage management literature. This general acceptance should not detract from the contentiousness and fluid nature of such a term, however, since 'sacred' means different things to a wide variety of people: no doubt, Pagans, Goddess worshippers, Christians and heritage managers will perceive a 'sacred' site in very different ways; Pagans may promote direct engagement with sites, Goddess worshippers may contest the disregard for sacredness inherent in some masculinist archaeologies, some Christians might propose the erection of a 'monument' to celebrate Christ's second millennium (e.g. The Eden Millennium Project monument adjacent to Mayburgh henge, see <http://www.stonehenge.ukf.net/edenarts.htm>), and heritage managers, on the other hand, such as David Miles (Chief Archaeologist, English Heritage; Wallis & Lymer 2001:107) and Clews Everard (Site Director, Stonehenge, pers.com.) use 'sacred' in terms of 'conservation' or 'preservation'. This implication of the 'sacred' in political contestations of site marginalisation behoves all parties using the term 'sacred site' to be explicit about what they mean, lest they appear to be supporting ideas that, quite obviously, they are not. Hubert (1994) has drawn attention to discrepancies between Christian and Indigenous concepts of 'sacredness' as applied to place: peculiarly, a church can be 'deconsecrated', whereas in many indigenous understandings 'sacredness' is inherent in place or in non-human manifestations there. Such understandings are increasingly current among today's pagans, and we are exploring these dimensions in our current work (e.g. Blain and Wallis, 2002a).

The history and contest of the term 'sacred site' beyond this brief summary is outside the remit of this document, but certainly worthy of further attention, and a major goal of our project as it continues, is to investigate interactions of 'sacredness' and identity..

'Sacred', 'archaeological', 'monument' (and indeed 'site'), and other variations, are value-laden, not given; specific to particular realms of discourse, which foreground one interpretation of these places over others. Thus, archaeologists might label these places 'archaeological sites' or 'archaeological monuments', while Pagans might prefer 'sacred site'. Since we are exploring practitioner meanings and identity, and since 'sacred site' has increasing currency among Pagans and heritage managers, we use 'sacred sites' in this document for consistency – but, with full recognition that this term is contested and requires problematising and theorising, something which will comprise a fundamental area of future work by our project. The central concern of our discussion, rather than one of terminology and definition, though, is why Pagans engage with sacred sites and the implications of such interactions.

² Engagements between Pagans, neo-Shamans and others, and indigenous communities are complex and the subject of fierce debate. Since it does not affect our discussion directly, we refer readers instead to Wallis' (e.g. 1999a, 1999b) discussion of the issues.

8. *Why do Pagans engage with sacred sites?*

Our research indicates there is a wide variety of reasons why Pagans engage with sacred sites. Gordon ‘the toad’ MacLellan, a neo-Shamanic environmental educator, thinks ancient sites ‘offer places of stillness, connection with ancestors’ (pers. com.), while Barry, also a neo-Shamanic environmental educator, suggests there are dangers: ‘too much activity of the wrong kind can cause harm to the natural energies of a famous or popular place...I’ve found a lot of sites that were closed down or seriously abused because they were well known’ (pers. com.). This abuse may, according to some, also take place on a ‘spiritual’ level. Fleming suggests meddling with a site’s energies is ‘psychic vandalism’ (Fleming 1999) and argues – in a markedly fundamentalist tone – that many forms of Pagan ritual constitute site damage:

I find it unnecessary to perform any ritual at a prehistoric site unless the site is actively involved in the ritual...[I]f the ritual could be performed in exactly the same way in any other location then the site is providing no more than an atmospheric backdrop and that is insufficient reason to expose a delicate and unique monument to the risk of damage (Fleming n.d.a; see also n.d.b).

The Druid Philip ‘Greywolf’ Shallcrass, Joint-Chief of the British Druid Order, offers a different, more detailed and community focussed perspective on why places like Avebury and Stonehenge are spiritually important to Pagans:

Many Druids like to make ritual at ancient stone circles since there is a strong feeling that they are places where communion with our ancestors may be made more readily than elsewhere. There is also a sense that making ritual at such places energises and benefits both the sites themselves and the land around...I am drawn to Avebury...because it is my heartland, i.e. the place where I feel most spiritually ‘at home’. The first time I visited, more than twenty years ago, I felt I belonged there. That feeling has never left me. I work with spirits of place. This is a strong part of Druid tradition. I feel the spirit of place most strongly most often in Avebury. Six years ago, I was asked to make a Druid rite for an eclectic gathering at Avebury. I composed a rite that left space for people of all traditions to experience their own faith together in one circle with those of other faiths. It worked so well that similar open, multi-faith ceremonies are still being held there and elsewhere, both in Britain and overseas. Avebury is a very welcoming place in which to make ritual. I am not the only person who has experienced the spirit of the place as a great mother with open arms, welcoming all who come (pers. com.).

This diversity of approaches notwithstanding, there is a common theme underlying Pagan engagements with sacred sites: such places are perceived, simply, as ‘sacred’; as places that are ‘alive’ today, where connections can be made with ‘ancestors’, where the Earth Goddess/God can be contacted, where the spirit/energy of the land can be felt most strongly. Increasing numbers of people make pilgrimages to these places throughout the year, with a surge in numbers around the eight Pagan festivals. In terms of preservation, this direct physical contact is being noted, increasingly and necessarily, by archaeologists and site managers. Pagans also propose interpretations of these places which may contrast markedly with those of site curators (e.g. Dames 1976; Devereux 1992; Cope 1998; Gyrus 1998). Long-standing rights issues implicating Pagans and archaeologists focus on access to sites construed as ‘sacred’: chiefly Neolithic and Bronze Age constructions, but also Iron-Age, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon constructions (e.g. the Sutton Hoo mounds).

There is no single Pagan relationship with such places. Positions range from adopting the official 'preservation' ethic promulgated by English Heritage, the National Trust and other organisations (e.g. Cruithni www.cruithni.org; Save Our Sacred Sites [SOSS] <http://www.rollrights.org.uk/cp.html>; ASLaN www.symbolstone.org/archaeology/aslan/docs/charter_en.html) to claiming individual divine inspiration for whatever practices seem appropriate at the time, often involving the deposition of 'ritual litter' - flowers and other offerings, candlewax and tea-light holders; the decoration of specific places with symbols such as spirals or pentacles; and the insertion of crystals, coins and other materials into cracks. The more destructive practices involve lighting 'ritual' fires at 'sacred sites' with detrimental effect on the stones, and there have been instances of deliberate vandalism. Much Pagan use takes place with little knowledge of either archaeological interpretation, or what practices are detrimental or problematic for other users. In an extreme example, Peak District archaeologist John Barnatt (1997) describes a stone circle being 'altered' by a group who apparently held that the stones were wrongly positioned, according to their information obtained from dowsing. However, Pagans have also come forward as 'guardians' of sites, and recently in Cornwall Pagan groups worked with English Heritage to restore Men-an-Tol, a site which had been vandalised with an ersatz napalm-like substance by a group calling themselves *Friends of the Stone*.

Without doubt, the politics surrounding Pagan uses of sacred sites are extremely complex. The situation at the timber circle dubbed 'Seahenge' at Holme-next-the-Sea in Norfolk exemplifies the diversity of Pagan and other opinions. Some Pagans were outraged at the proposal by English Heritage to *not* conserve the timbers:

[I] asked if I could arrange a meeting with all of them, in a sacred manner. They all agreed so last Tuesday [22.6.99] we had eleven people from wildly different backgrounds holding hands, invoking our Ancestors and Great Spirit (which saves a lot of explanation and debate) and Awening³. And within five hours we had a remarkable agreement. The timbers would be removed and preserved but returned to the village, possibly within a new Bronze Age village that would be built to house them. In the meantime, the site would be recreated with new timbers, with the proviso that if it caused tourism that impacted the birds it would be removed. And any ceremony for the removal of the timbers would be welcome...[A]ll those who were in the meeting were gracious and giving and we got a fabulous result (Prout in submission to Nature Religions email discussion list 7.7.99).

There are other, conflicting narratives of the Seahenge fiasco. Some Druids protested against the excavation of the circle (as shown on Time Team). And meanwhile, the local community felt their views were completely ignored, with the result that one of them supported the legal actions of Druids against Norfolk Archaeological unit. Local pagan Chris Wood describes the controversy in terms of local wishes (for the circle to remain until it was eventually taken by the sea) being overruled by outsiders, notably archaeologists, who stressed preservation (see Wood, 2002). Indeed, there was some dissent amongst archaeologists too. An article in the widely read journal *British Archaeology* by its editor, Simon Denison, expresses disgust with the way Seahenge was 'yanked out of the sands': 'The excavation...was destruction, nothing

³ Many Druids chant the 'Awen' during their ceremonies. One description of its meaning, though not necessarily definitive, is by Shallcrass' (2000:48): 'a feminine noun variously translated as 'muse', 'genius', 'genius', 'inspiration', 'poetic furor', and 'poetic frenzy'. It is made up of two words: 'aw' meaning 'flowing', and 'en' meaning 'spirit'. So, literally, Awen is the 'flowing spirit'.

short of vandalism' (Denison 2000: 28). Controversially perhaps, for an archaeologist versed in the preservation – or at least conservation – ethic, Denison argues: 'The only way to truly cherish an ancient monument or other historic feature is to leave it alone, avoid it, plan round it. And if it is necessary, *absolutely necessary*, to plough a road through it, or abandon it to the waves, then my judgement is we should photograph it, film it, write about it – and let it go' (Denison 2000: 28, original emphasis). In *Heritage Today* (Issue 47, September 1999), on the other hand, English Heritage are presented as having a common-sense approach (excavating the timbers as quickly as possible for preservation) in contrast to the rather hysterical responses of Druids and others in this presentation (see also Pryor 2001).

Despite the differences of opinion and approach, it is clear that a change in mindset – towards dialogue and mutual understanding – is required to resolve, or at least address the issues. The example of Seahenge marks dissonance, but, as the following chapters demonstrate – with three specific case studies – there are other instances where such dialogue is already in effect, and though perhaps strained, is resulting in reciprocal negotiations.

9. Stonehenge

Since the ‘Peoples Free Festival’ (Windsor, in 1974) which was disrupted by the authorities and the ‘battle of the beanfield’ between travellers and police at the summer solstice of 1985,⁴ access to Stonehenge has been a hotly disputed subject (e.g. NCCL 1986; Hetherington 1992). English Heritage’s reasoning behind the restricting of access is a perceived physical threat to the ‘monuments’ from the free festival – though according to some archaeologists, at least, ‘there was very little vandalism’ (Bender 1993:275) – and EH were under considerable pressure from the police and local politicians. Pagans, some Druids, Heathens and travellers in particular, think Stonehenge belongs to everyone and that their focus on Stonehenge for spiritual events such as the Summer Solstice, should mean access is free and open: ‘we would like to see access improved for all responsible groups, not just Druids, not just ourselves’ (Shallcrass 1998/9:17). Until recently, the curators’ perspective was that they could not privilege one group (i.e. Druids) over another (i.e. festivalers). Indeed, no single group has a more authentic or legitimate claim on the henge, including archaeologists (see also Bender and Edmonds 1992; Bender 1998), although the day-to-day set up at Stonehenge stipulates everyone has to pay an admission fee and cannot get beyond the rope cordoning off the stones. In effect, the groups most spiritually connected to the stones (including travellers) have argued they are marginalised at all times and until very recently not allowed any admittance during annually auspicious dates: and admittance even now must be specifically negotiated, is not automatic, and may not necessarily be on the dates they request.

During the exclusion zone years English Heritage has, on occasion, allowed a small number of celebrants into Stonehenge at the summer solstice. In the meantime, any group may pay to enter at any other time of the year, and Druid groups have used Stonehenge at other auspicious times such as the winter solstice. It is the time of the Summer solstice that is most political because of the free festival linked to it and the aftermath of ‘the beanfield’. The situation at the site has changed rapidly over the last four years or so, however, during and since the preparation of initial drafts of the Management Plan (from 1998) required for a World Heritage Site (Stonehenge having been designated such, as part of the Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites World Heritage Site in 1986). In terms of access, in 1998, an English Heritage press release promised that despite an enforced police exclusion zone at the summer solstice, one hundred people would be allowed into the stones on a (free) ticket only basis. They would be driven into the area from outside the exclusion zone, in coach-loads. This group, the first officially permitted to enter in fourteen years, would consist of English Heritage and National Trust persons, local interested individuals, archaeologists, the press, and a handful of Druids and other Pagans. The event went peacefully – without violence or police arrests – although the opinions of Druids at the stones do not attest to a particularly ‘spiritual’ occasion, or even one of celebration. Their reports suggest the presence of the press was so intrusive that it was impossible to feel at ease and enjoy the solstice:

⁴ We need not recount these events as they have been well documented elsewhere (e.g. Chippendale 1986; Chippendale *et al.* 1990; Bender 1998). Stone (1996) gives a powerful account of events at the ‘beanfield’ based on the TV documentary *Operation Solstice*: ‘It is a film which should be seen by everyone...so that they know that evil exists’ (1996:153). Various internet accounts are available - see e.g. http://www.spectacle.co.uk/syn_solstice.html Further violent confrontations happened the following year (1986), and in 1995 when protestors commemorated the tenth anniversary of the ‘beanfield’ by attempting to gain access to Stonehenge at the solstice.

As I stepped off [the coach] there was a TV camera in my face. I walked around the front of the coach into three or four camera flashes, and crossed the road to pass through two banks of massed press...As we arrived at the stones, there was more press there as well; this was to be a total invasion. An EH member of staff was getting angry with a photographer who wouldn't shift their [sic.] gear off a stone. There were journalists everywhere (McCabe 1998/9:20).

Add to that the internal politics of the various Druid orders represented, and the situation seems as fraught as ever:

When the whole of the centre circle was then monopolised by one small group of antagonistic Druids...celebrating a ritual which was to many deeply embarrassing, and in the full gaze of the media, any last vestige that the event was a victory for Druidry was lost...For a group who claimed to be demanding access to the monument 'for the people of England' to then noisily claim the centre circle, unaware that the only members of the general public (including many Druids) who were at all interested in their ritual were the cynical media seems profoundly ironic...For many the ritual that was performed in the centre was a very long way from any spirituality they could relate to. I would only pray that next year it is made very clear that Stonehenge is a site that belongs to the people: everyone should have access without the intrusion of either the media OR another group's spiritual practice (Restall Orr 1998/9:23).

On the face of it, and following the 'success' of this event in 1998, things looked to have taken a further step towards open access. As it turned out, 'open' became a little too open the following year for the liking of many people. Greywolf's predictions were more relevant to what happened:

[Stonehenge] has been fraught with difficulties over access and other issues for many years. I got involved in doing rituals there to try to resolve some of the difficulties plaguing the site. In doing this, the atmosphere at and around the site has improved considerably and access has become much more widely available. Stonehenge was built by and for a military, social, spiritual and political elite, so it is still a difficult site, particularly for those with unresolved issues around authority in their psyches...My thoughts are that the summer solstice sunrise this year is likely to be utterly chaotic. But then it was a shambles last year too. It's traditional. I will be there since several members of the BDO have expressed an interest in being there and I need to be there with them. I'll also be there out of a sense of duty, having been heavily involved in access negotiations over the last few years that led to the summer solstice celebration returning after a decade away. However, as W.C. Fields so succinctly put it: "On the whole, I'd rather be in Philadelphia." Stonehenge on the morning of the summer solstice is not a place I'd recommend if what you're after is a spiritual experience. If, on the other hand, you want to be photographed for the papers, listen to political rhetoric and other hot air, get jostled by a motley crew of local and national dignitaries and officials, journalists, archaeologists, Pagans, witches and others, and be deeply saddened by the crassness and insensitivity of modern humanity, Pagan and otherwise, then I can highly recommend it!

One of us (Wallis) was present at the 1999 solstice events, as an 'eye-witness' (for another view, see 'Twitter of Blisted' 1998). Wiltshire council's application for the exclusion zone was turned down by the House of Lords earlier in the year, and the police stated (in a phone

call Wallis made to Wiltshire Constabulary) that despite a high profile they would not be stopping people from getting to Stonehenge (or at least to the fence separating the henge from the road). The exclusion zone was down for the first time in fifteen years. English Heritage doubled the number of tickets for entry to the stones to two hundred, and the press profile was tempered. But, at about 2am a group of people pushed down the perimeter fence, reached the stones, and some of them climbed on top of the trilithons. Around dawn, many more people jumped over the fence to reach the stones. Half a dozen or so ended up on the trilithons, with around four or five hundred standing within the stones, 'illegally'. Thereafter, the police, in the form of horse mounted officers, riot gear and dog-handlers, put people off crossing the fence, and most people who remained outside the fence, celebrating the sunrise on the road and in the field of the Stonehenge avenue. This included the Druids and others with tickets who were then not allowed into the stones because English Heritage cancelled the event in view of the illegal actions of those in the circle. The Druids proceeded to conduct their own ceremonies where they could, but the tension all around could not be ignored.

Television and newspaper reporters painted a gloomy picture of the scene, claiming the solstice was more about 'anarchy' than spirituality. The press called those that 'invaded' the stones 'smellies' (The Sun), 'hippies' (The Daily Mail), 'ravers' (3rd Stone magazine), and 'New Age travellers' (The Times: De Bruxelles 1999:13; The Daily Telegraph: Fleet 1999:4; The Independent: Davison et al 1999:3; Orr 1999:5), stereotyping all present and echoing the headlines of 1985 including 'sponging scum', 'invasion of the giro gypsies', and 'Stonehenge scarred in raid by travellers' (cited by Bender 1998:162). Views of the press that took a negative slant were inevitably coloured by close timing of the Miner's Strike in 1985, and by the presence of 'travellers' at the Anti-Capitalist carnival protest turned riot in London a few days before the 1999 solstice, respectively. Mostly, people of all interest groups were annoyed about the actions of those rushing into the circle since it did nothing to promote good relations or the opening up of access. The majority of archaeologists would perhaps agree with Clews Everard's (English Heritage Director at Stonehenge) comment that climbing the trilithons may damage them, destabilise them and could result in them falling on people and killing them (television news interview). Others, including Pagans, might respond by pointing out that the area is heavily excavated and therefore not in an 'original' condition to allow it to be damaged, including having concrete supports and net meshing implanted around the trilithons. And more than this, people touching or leaning on the stones can hardly compare with the impact of MOD forces elsewhere on Salisbury Plain⁵, police trenches to block access (in 1985), and of course, archaeological excavation – an intrinsically destructive procedure.

Many travellers have strong links with Stonehenge (e.g. Craig 1986; Bender 1998). The free festival marked a time when this nomadic group was able to gather together and celebrate their lifeway at a meeting place which is thousands of years old, a 'monument' that may, they say, have been used for similar seasonal rituals in prehistory. One aid,

I object to the Druids monopolising the circle. English Heritage has cherry-picked a few Pagan groups and witches who have no link with the place and a bunch of loonies in white cloaks. Why should the Druids get access over everyone else? (Davies 1998:24).

The sentiments of these travellers were presented in *The Big Issue* released just before the 1999 solstice. But the situation has not been as simple as defining insiders (those allowed in,

⁵ It might also be argued, on the other hand, that the military have more recently safeguarded many monuments under their jurisdiction

including – but not exclusively – heritage personnel, the national Press, and Druids) versus outsiders (those who refused to pay, could not pay, or just couldn't get in due to the restricted number of tickets allowed at this time). While the solstice occurrences in 1999 might have upset proceedings in the short term, continued negotiations between site curators and access interest groups meant that English Heritage took – or, depending on your viewpoint, were pushed to take – the bold step of pressing ahead with plans for increased access at the solstice in following years, culminating with open and free access for all between 23.30 and 7.30 at the summer solstice in 2000 (as reported by Blain 2000a, 2000b) and between 20.00 and 9.00 in 2001 (Blain & Wallis 2001).

Clearly, fruitful negotiations – with a significant amount of compromise on all sides – between the interest groups are possible, even at this most contested of all archaeological or ‘sacred sites’. Management strategies aiming to atrophy the (consensus opinion) appalling visitor’s centre, restructure the A33 road, etc (e.g. Wainwright 1996, English Heritage 2000), are still far from being agreed, completed and implemented (e.g. Goodwin 1997a, 1997b; Clover 1997, 1998), but the Stonehenge Masterplan (for perspectives during the long and protracted history of this plan, see e.g. Chippindale 1983, 1985; Golding 1989; Pryor 1998; Fielden 1999; Baxter et al 2000) certainly indicates that access will be more open in the future, with the stones apparently unfenced in the landscape. But the extent to which this will be full, open access, without a rope and security guards is unclear. Indeed, a recent document (Baxter & Chippindale 2002) suggests the Stonehenge Management Plan’s ‘promise’ that people ‘would...be able to walk freely amongst the stones’ has been ‘cancelled’. Further, the strategy of this plan ‘focuses on conservation, presentation and packaging for tourists. But what of intellectual and spiritual access to Stonehenge?’ (Bender 1993:269). We, following Bender, argue that alternative interest groups – Druids, travellers, free-festivalers – are again largely excluded. The issue of ‘intellectual’ access (which may not be distinguishable from spiritual and physical access for Pagans) needs also to be scrutinised more carefully by the interest groups. We do not see such scrutiny in the heritage and academic literature: that *Bournemouth University Archaeology Group’s 2001 Stonehenge Research Framework Project* (available online: <http://apollo5.bournemouth.ac.uk/consci/stonehenge/intro.htm>), despite its aims for inclusivity and plurality – and despite discussing both ‘physical access’ and ‘human experience’ of the landscape – does not mention Pagan interests; and that there is only cursory mention of such interests in *The Open Meeting* convened by RESCUE to debate *The Stonehenge Issue* (available online: www.rescue-archaeology.freeserve.co.uk/rescuenews.rm79/shengmtg.htm), reveals much about what is deemed to be the appropriate breadth of that inclusivity and plurality.

To reduce the tensions surrounding these issues of access to ‘the stones’, suggestions have been made for a Stonehenge ‘festival’ of some sort some distance from the stones. The proposal has been voiced primarily by Tim Sebastian of SOD (Secular Order of Druids), and according to him, an organic farmer and host of the Big Green Gathering festival has offered land for the event. Perhaps then all the ‘party goers’ will be less inclined to gather at the stones (discussed also in Wallis & Lymer 2001). However, so far as we are aware, no heritage body or related institution has yet considered these proposals with any seriousness.

In the meantime, negotiations for solstice 2002, and subsequently, continue. Within the concerned traveller/Pagan/Druid communities, and among free party people (for whom partying is a means of political/spiritual action: see e.g. various articles in McKay, 1998, and online sites such as <http://www.thewarpexperience.org/stonehenge/>), there has been a

concerted, and often contentious, effort to plan ahead. However access in 2002 is likely to be for a shorter period of time (19.00 to 7.00 which does not actually include the specific time of solstice) and the community is faced with the possibility of having to deal with revellers on their way to the Glastonbury festival, cooking their heels in Wiltshire for the intervening week with nowhere to celebrate or party. We are watching this situation with interest and concern. Our future work will reflect the outcome of Solstice 2002.

Meanwhile, Stonehenge's sister World Heritage Site of Avebury is becoming increasingly politicised, as many of those who might once have celebrated at Stonehenge now make pilgrimages there.

10. Avebury

Under cover of darkness on the morning of the 19th June 1996, a number of stones of Avebury's Neolithic West Kennet Avenue were painted with white and black 'pseudo-magical symbols' (Carpenter 1998: 24), perhaps executed by 'New Age crazies' (Antiquity 1996). At the summer solstice a few days later, hundreds of Pagans and other alternative interest groups/persons visited the Avebury 'monuments'. Some of the less responsible left candle wax and scorch marks on West Kennet long barrow's sarsen stones, while others ascended Silbury Hill which is closed to the public. In the years since, more and more Pagans have chosen Avebury as their place of 'pilgrimage'. In June 1999, two more stones were vandalised, one daubed with the word 'cuckoo', the other covered in red and green paint, and most recently, at the Summer Solstice 2001, scratch marks – apparently unreadable – were made in West Kennet. The situation is clearly reaching crisis point in a landscape with free and open access to a wide variety of 'monuments'.

The National Trust and English Heritage custodians of Avebury have responded to these issues. Addressing the issues comprises a part of the National Trust Avebury Management Plan (1997)⁶ and English Heritage Avebury World Heritage Site Management Plan (Pomeroy 1998)⁷, and Bournemouth University's Avebury Visitor Research⁸ (Calver 1998), conducted for the National Trust, reports on the significant numbers of 'spiritually motivated' visitors and their impact on the area. Outspoken archaeologists express concerns about the level of impact on Avebury at the times of Pagan festivals and the journal *Antiquity* has devoted considerable space to this discussion (e.g. Fielden 1996; Gingell 1996). A string of events – including the graffiti – contributing to damage of the archaeology, prompted these debates. Archaeologists accuse Pagans of damage to West Kennet Long Barrow during 'sleep-overs' when celebrating the Pagan festivals. The custodians state camping is not allowed and clearly

⁶ The National Trust plan states their strategy is to: 'Continue to attempt to accommodate 'new religions' and other visitors drawn to Avebury at Solstice and other calendar events, on the understanding that the National Trust does not discriminate on the basis of why people come but is concerned with how they respect the sites and other users (Objective H, section H.10, pp.29-30). Also: '[to] Encourage Pagan, Druid and other new religious groups to avoid concentrating their ceremonies at vulnerable 'honeypot' sites like Avebury' (Objective L, section L.6, p.42).

⁷ The English Heritage plan reports that 'Spiritually, Avebury is still a "temple" for many people who visit...Paganism may well be the fastest growing religion in Britain, and this is linked with the increasing interest mystical (sic.) significance of Avebury as a "sacred" place...[A] growing proportion of visitors do visit Avebury for spiritual reasons' (section 3.5.2, p.27). Also, 'Issue 41' states 'At certain times of the year when large numbers of people gather at Avebury...the conservation of the monuments and the freedom of all visitors to enjoy them, as well as safety and security issues, are of paramount importance'. Furthermore: "Many people stay at the monuments for several hours, or for one or several nights. At the same time, unauthorised parking and camping overnight or over several days can potentially cause damage to the monument (especially through the lighting of fires and visitor erosion), disruption to the local community, and detract from the enjoyment of other visitors. In addition, a wide range of safety and security issues, such as large numbers of people gathering on Silbury Hill or in West Kennet Long Barrow, are of paramount importance" (section 8.1.7, pp64-65).

⁸ Bournemouth's research suggests: 16% of their sample of user groups expressed 'spiritual motivation' as their reason for visiting Avebury. 11% said 'personal meditation' was the purpose of their visit. Also, 'some groups expressed disappointment that there was not more information about ley lines and other astrological features that is felt by some to be the original purpose of the site' (p.21). The report concludes: 'Avebury...is still an important centre of pantheist worship', and 'These groups use the monuments extensively and return on many occasions for the various celebrations that have significance to them' (p.22). Indeed, 'At certain times of the year/day this group can be in the majority within the WHS' (p.32). It is interesting to note that 193 people responded to a questionnaire supplied in the Spring of 1995 by *Stones Restaurant* in Avebury (Pitts 1996), of which 63% agreed 'the stones still have some mysterious power' (p.130).

did not bargain on people sleeping in the tomb or resting in sleeping bags at midsummer. One problem concerns the amount of litter (beer cans, cigarette butts, even, by some accounts, condoms and tampons) left after a night's celebration. This is offensive to the site managers who must clear up the mess, and to the public who visit the next day and who may feel intimidated by the remains and/or those still celebrating. There is also the risk that parties in the barrow threaten its conservation because it is a small space for a lot of people; often it is impossible to get deeper than the first side chambers at festival dates because so many people fill the tomb. A common example of damage is chalk markings, tracings of peoples' hands, pentagrams (a symbol of import and identity to many Pagans), runes and other graffiti. And it is graffiti: perhaps unbeknown to the 'artists', chalk can endure for many years. There is also the problem of fire damage in West Kennet, caused mainly by the lighting and thoughtless positioning of candles, but fires have also been lit in the entrance (and on top of Silbury Hill), causing damage to the sarsens⁹. Candles comprise an important part of some Pagan ceremonies (for some, representing the fire of the sun and/or one of the four elements) so people will continue to use them, especially when it is dark. Christopher Gingell, the National Trust site manager for Avebury states,

There are large scars on the blocking stones, spalled by the heat of camp fires, and a great cavity in the oolitic walling of the main chamber burned by incessant placing of candles. We have carried out resin repairs to the blocking stones, but burned sarsen turns to the texture of lump sugar and will not last (<http://www.rollrights.org.uk/chris.html>).

Discussing the problems at Avebury, Clare Prout, co-ordinator of Save Our Sacred Sites (SOSS) describes how:

Back in October 1995 a Wiltshire local paper printed a story about the National Trust employing security guards to ensure that visitors to West Kennet long barrow behaved 'properly'. This was necessary, we were told, because of increasing damage to the barrow...so I took a trip to the barrow to see the damage for myself...The interior of the barrow...was scorched and flaking. Greasy black grime from candle flame ran the height of the stones which were also covered in chalk symbols, and decomposed fruit, noisy with flies, at the back of the central chamber. The exterior bore witness to several fires, while beer cans and smokers' detritus littered the site.

Visitor impact is also a problem at the other Avebury 'monuments'. Silbury Hill has been officially closed by the National Trust since the mid-1970s. The sign detailing this situation and the fence erected to stop access has not stopped people climbing the hill anyway. On our visits to Avebury there is always a handful or so of people – Pagan or otherwise – on the top, and during festivals dozens of people gather there to watch the sunset and sunrise, many of them resting in sleeping bags (there has also been the occasional tent). Interestingly, since the vertical shaft in the hill collapsed due to bad weather, Pagans joined local people and heritage managers at the 2001 summer solstice, requesting other Pagans and interested persons to not climb the hill for reasons of safety and the risk of further collapses. Foot weathering is perhaps worst at the banks of Avebury henge, although this is a result of increased public visitations, not just Pagan engagements (e.g. Jones 1998). The problems of Pagan actions at Avebury do not end here. Clare Prout argues:

⁹ One forecourt stone was so badly damaged that a fractured piece of it had to be repaired with a gluing agent.

[Pagans] want to continue a heritage of ceremony, returning and receiving some spiritual nature through ritual. And that's really all right. Sacred places should be used for sacred purposes. It's just that archaeology doesn't often find evidence of prehistoric fires being lit against sacred stones. They don't find beer cans and condoms and tampons in long barrows...I started Save Our Sacred Sites 3 years ago after a visit to West Kennet long barrow. Avebury National Trust (NT) were warning that security guards and closing times may have to be imposed on the site to preserve it from the ravages of visitors and I didn't believe them. After visiting the barrow I did. Chalk graffiti is one thing but piles of putrid fruit was quite another (Prout 1998:6-7).

Apart from the use of candles, a common practice among Pagan pilgrims to Avebury is the leaving of offerings; to the 'spirits of the place', 'ancestors', 'the Goddess' or other spiritual entities. 'Gifts' include flowers, food, drink and more permanent objects such as crystals, unusual stones, and other personal ritual objects – even, at winter solstice 2000, a Christmas tree in the long barrow! We have some photographic records of items: inside this tomb, piled against the backstones of the main chamber and placed in every available crack and hollow elsewhere; also commonplace on top of Silbury Hill, at the foot of stones in the Henge, by trees on Windmill Hill, and interlaced with the concrete markers of the Sanctuary. What Pagans feel about the site managers clearing them away varies. Some want their offerings to be left so that as they degrade, the spirits may benefit. Others hope individuals in need will use a crystal they have finished with, or hope their offering will encourage other people to do the same. For the most part it seems Pagans who leave offerings would not wish their gifts to be collected and discarded by the site custodians.

Pagan 'offerings' at Avebury may not be a world apart from those made by Neolithic peoples studied by archaeologists today. Are the crystal, bone and flint offerings aspects of modern material culture worthy of archaeological study in terms of contemporary ritual deposition and its relation to the past? (see also Finn's 1997 discussion of New Age deposits in Chaco Canyon, New Mexico). In these terms then, acts of deposition at Avebury (and other sacred sites) at least are intended as offerings of genuine good intent. On the other hand, some Pagans consider such deposits as 'litter'. SOSS (e.g. <http://www.rollrights.org.uk/cp.html>), for example, and Cruithni (www.cruithni.org) in particular, come from the perspective of the preservation ethic and set out guidelines to encourage people not to leave anything behind at sacred sites (see also the Sacred Sites Charter produced by ASLaN, available online: http://www.symbolstone.org/archaeology/aslan/docs/charter_en.html).

Without doubt, open access and the considerable numbers of visitors is causing conservation problems at Avebury, with Pagan engagements intensifying the issues. The curators state there should be no camping, lighting of fires or damage caused, and the Criminal Justice Act and Public Disorder Bill deny 'raves', large gatherings and processions of certain people. These guidelines seem reasonable because few people wish to deface the monuments or have the intention of creating unrest where locals are concerned. But where they are supposed to limit what Pagan groups wish to do (or should not do) at the sites, the reality of the situation is altogether different. In the light of the Stonehenge fiasco, it is difficult to know the best course of action the custodians might take to address the situation. In the past, there have been suggestions that worryingly mirror the Stonehenge situation, such as a Trust ban on Druid ceremonies, an exclusion zone, filling the barrow with sand at the festivals, and hiring security guards to watch over the sites. Fortunately for all concerned (including the taxpayer), certain unofficial policies have been implemented instead.

The basic stance taken by the National Trust is that ‘closing’ Avebury during Pagan festivals would be impractical and expensive. The last thing anyone needs is another Stonehenge situation. So people may come and go as they please, at any time of day or night. To cater for those needing to sleep, the policy of ‘no camping’ is lifted in two areas: the henge car park and Silbury car park. Here, dozens of tents are sometimes erected at the festivals and at the Summer Solstice of 1998 a sound system was set up; all basically contravening the Criminal Justice Act. Interestingly, the police presence at Avebury at these times is virtually nil. The Trust is certainly making considerable concessions to keep clear air between themselves and Pagans. Camping near Silbury has in the past seemed to sanction the fact that people are going to climb Silbury despite its closure. Gingell informs us¹⁰ that allowing camping here aims to at least keep camping controlled, but perhaps this also acknowledges that climbing Silbury Hill is part of some people’s pilgrimage to the Avebury region. Increasing visitors puts a sharper edge on the protocols the Trust implement at Avebury¹¹. At some point the car park party may grow to big, the camping near Silbury may spill too far onto the mound, and one too many candles will be left unattended in West Kennet long barrow.

In the meantime, the appearance of ‘Silbury Hole’ (spotted and reported initially by an ‘illegal’ climber of the hill) and serious attempts to prevent climbing has involved some pagans in informal monitoring activities. Pagans responded to English Heritage’s call (relayed through ASLaN) for ‘guardians’ at Summer Solstice 2001. Some are now actively seeking to repeat this at solstice 2002, seeing dangers and problems and wanting to help prevent these. We discuss elsewhere (Blain and Willis 2002b) some interventions and responses to the Silbury crisis.

All these considerations of Pagans at Avebury demand further attention, and as mentioned, the National Trust and English Heritage Avebury management plans do address such issues. Gingell’s strategy is well thought out: the spontaneity of Pagan events means that strategies outlined in the management plan are not easily implemented. Instead, he says the National Trust is taking a ‘re-active’ rather than ‘pro-active’ strategy; precautions are taken as far as is possible considering the unpredictability of Pagan activities, and situations are then responded to as they arise. This informal approach is certainly more pragmatic than the official strategies in English Heritage’s management plan. The National Trust’s admirable aim at Avebury is to not exclude anyone, but also not to give precedent to anyone else. English Heritage, on the other hand, are rather more conservative (perhaps reflecting their more distant role at Avebury compared to the National Trust’s hands-on role) presenting a more disturbing picture in their management plan: ‘a minority of visitors believe that no owner or statutory body has any right whatsoever to regulate, manage, prevent access or use of the monuments’. It seems undemocratic to not identify who these particular ‘visitors’ are and this is certainly a political statement which risks stereotypical metanarrative. English Heritage acknowledge the importance of ‘free access’, but stress the need to ‘respond’ to ‘inappropriate use...through a variety of [unstated] practices and measures’. In their favour, English Heritage argue for a balance between a ‘non-confrontational management approach’, and the ‘risk of unrestricted growth in the use of the site’, although there is still the perceived threat of this growth ‘potentially leading to the development of free festivals’ (all quotes Pomeroy 1998). These

¹⁰ Unless otherwise indicated, the opinions of Chris Gingell were gained when interviewed by Wallis at Avebury on 8.9.99.

¹¹ It is interesting to note that The Coach House pub in West Kennet has been granted a license for conducting civil weddings, just a short walk from the West Kennet Avenue (*Pagan Dawn* 1999:8). In my mind this clearly predicts the number of people who would like to lawfully marry, having conducted their Pagan hand-fasting in the region.

statements contrast with the unofficial and low-key re-active strategy of the National Trust that is already dealing with so-called 'free festivals' quite effectively.

It is also worth discussing Gingell's assertion that Pagan activities are largely 'self-policed', and the highly productive and co-operative strategies currently in operation that have resulted from the collaboration and negotiation between the National Trust and Pagans. The ideas proposed by Clare Prout's Save Our Sacred Sites (SOSS) are particularly noteworthy:

I'm a Pagan. That is, I try to honour the Land, perceiving it as a sacred and sentient creature, and I, along with an estimated 100,000 others, will make a pilgrimage to a sacred site, places like West Kennet, during one of Paganism's eight major festivals...[W]e, along with many other visitors, need to learn new and less damaging ways of living with these delicate and vulnerable sites. At the same time, the managers of sites, often English Heritage or the National Trust, have got to come to terms with the fact that a large and growing percentage of the population view ancient monuments as places of worship, with good archaeological evidence to back us up...[H]aving spoken with Chris Gingell...it seemed that the time was right to begin an organisation that could be a forum for tourist organisations, land managers, Pagans and other spiritually-motivated visitors, Parish and local councils and so on, to discuss the future (<http://www.rollrights.org.uk/cp.html>).

Emerging from the success of SOSS has been the National Trust Guardianship Scheme at Avebury. According to Gingell, reports on the effectiveness of the scheme in the Pagan magazine *Pagan Dawn* (#124, Lammas 1997) resulted in many Pagans 'from all over Britain' offering their services, so many in fact that Gingell had to write a letter in a subsequent issue (#126, Imbolc 1998) pointing out that the National Trust was too 'decentralised' to deal with all the inquiries. With all this co-operation – in sharp contrast to the 'old days' at Stonehenge – the future for Avebury looks optimistic. Indeed, with such an onus of responsibility felt by Pagans towards sacred sites, the recent negative events at Stonehenge and Avebury may be some of the last we see. The future may arguably rest in the hands of negotiation, communication and education. The two former strategies are, as commented upon, in action, but the latter may be somewhat lacking. The majority of Pagans are not political creatures like Clare Prout/Slaney. They may not realise that chalking esoteric symbols or putting a candle on a sarsen stone may potentially damage it. They probably don't think twice about climbing Silbury Hill - they have not heard about the 'hole' or if they have, may even consider this is a 'story' put about specifically to keep them away. The site custodians do not seem to have addressed this interest group in any way. All the literature, such as site guides, is aimed at middle England (see appendix A). SOSS is working to address the problem from within the Pagan domain, producing various guidelines for approaching and respecting sacred sites when making ritual. There is the standard 'please do not climb on the stones' strategy in ASLaN's Sacred Sites Charter that states in a rather boring way 'Don't leave artificial materials...Please don't bury things...Don't take stones' which is good, but not particularly innovative. Most Pagans will listen, but others might feel their non-normative spiritual connection overrides this mundane request. So it is refreshing to see a fine attempt to reach this audience elsewhere in their Charter.

Latham and Norfolk go further. For instance, this is how they specifically addressed the deluge of Pagans on sacred sites in Cornwall at the time of the 1999 solar eclipse:

...we are informed that the world and his wife will be visiting our land [in August 1999] to experience the total eclipse of the sun...Local Pagans, who care lovingly for the sites all year round, have decided that the best way to minimise the possibility of any damage to the sites is to hold celebrations in order to focus the energy appropriately. For this reason we are working to co-ordinate eclipse celebrations at the major sacred sites in West Penwith. These open rituals will also be a way of protecting these special places from the over-enthusiastic, under-educated and ignorant visitor who may be thinking of altering them. This decision has the full support of local landowners, Penwith District Council, Cornwall Archaeology Unit and English Heritage...We realise the land belongs to no-one and that no-one can claim rights over it, however we do appeal to peoples' sense of courtesy and respect for the sacredness of the land and for the genius loci at these places (Latham & Norfolk 1998/9:27).

Their strategy is a clever alliance of 'please do not' and Terry Pratchett-like tongue in cheek humour that resonates well with Pagan sensibilities. It therefore ought to be rather effective in instances apart from solar eclipses:

We can't be held responsible for the consequences to anyone who crassly blunders into sacred places with the intent of taking over to become part of a media circus. Which brings us neatly to the subject of Spriggans...from the Cornish "sperysyan" meaning spirits...They can be particularly vicious and live only in Penwith in West Cornwall, for which the rest of Britain should be very relieved. Spriggans haunt all the sacred sites, the weird and wonderful cairns, the hilltop castles, the stone circles, quoits and standing stones and what they hate more than anything, and will attack without quarter, are those who are miserly, mean-spirited and who threaten their homes...[W]e will be working rituals to wake up – slowly, gently and very carefully all the wild elemental spirits in which Cornwall abounds...We intend Britain to have a magically throbbing big toe by August...If the European Community was up for it we'd also be applying for Magical Objective One Status to get our fair share of European Magical subsidy...WARNING. Be afraid – be very afraid – if you have any ideas of being disrespectful to any of our sacred sites...In normal times you are likely to be seen or heard if you get up to no good. [During the eclipse] you may get set upon by Spriggans who are known for their wicked sense of humour and timing, and don't count on Spriggans understanding the concept of proportionate response. If you do decide to visit their abodes you are advised to add nothing nor take anything away. Spriggans like their homes just the way they are and don't take kindly to anyone doing a spot of redecorating without permission!...We leave the rest to your imagination (Latham & Norfolk 1998/9:27).

SOSS, ASLaN and their intermediaries have been increasingly prominent in their aim to educate Pagans towards what they perceive as greater respect and care for 'archaeological sites'. Andy Norfolk who has pioneered Hallowed Ground 2000 with Clare Slaney, comments on how the scheme works and its potential benefits for archaeologists and Pagans:

We have a basic record sheet for volunteers to fill out about their local sacred site or sites. This will give us a snap-shot of the condition of these places with information on any threats to them. We can use this to alert those with responsibilities for the care of the site to any problems. We also ask about the spiritual significance of the site(s). This should help make the "authorities" and owners aware of the great significance these places have to all kinds of people, but especially Pagans. This will fit in well with the NT's new policy of preparing "Statement of Significance" for all their properties. We

also hope that the project will have value as a record of beliefs relating to ancient sacred sites (pers.com.).

The existence of these organisations can only be good news for archaeologists and they testify to the fact that many Pagans are aware of the issues facing their engagements with sacred sites. And, reflecting on the problems, they have chosen to make an active step towards raising awareness and changing attitudes among their communities. Unfortunately, the Sacred Sites Charter is not freely available at the sites themselves but appears mainly in Pagan journals such as *Pagan Dawn* and *The Druid's Voice* (but see Scott 1999:70-74), which though fairly popular are not read by the majority of Pagans. Recently there have been calls for ASLaN and SOSS to be more pro-active, more evidently doing something that pagans recognise – ironically so, as SOSS has put pressure on English Heritage, though calling demonstrations, for EH to be seen to be tackling the Silbury problem.

We feel that the Sacred Sites Charter clearly should be on site, and accompanying it ought to be site guides which target the growing Pagan audience. Similar guides also ought to target those people who are less supportive of the preservation ethic and whose site etiquette (or lack of it) needs to be addressed in other ways. Indeed, the Nine Ladies stone circle, our next case study, presents a different, albeit related, set of issues which require a site-specific line of approach.

11. Nine Ladies stone circle, Stanton Moor, Derbyshire

Stanton Moor, within the Peak Park, is currently the subject of controversy: it includes the Nine Ladies stone circle, an extensive area of bronze-age burials. Quarry operators Stancliffe Stone Ltd., on the basis of permission received in 1952 to extend the operation of Stanton Lees and Endcliffe quarries, applied to reopen and develop the quarries having bought the land in 1995. Their reapplication (NP/DDD/0299/082) to work the quarries for 40 years using 'modern' working conditions and techniques was contested by local activists via the Stanton Lees Action Group (SLAG), and by archaeologists and English Heritage concerned about destruction of large areas (30 acres) of the Stanton Moor 'archaeological site', and biologists and English Nature concerned about wildlife habitat destruction. Since autumn 1999 a protest camp of Pagans and 'Eco-Warriors' has occupied land near the Nine Ladies circle. A complex and difficult planning decision for the Peak District National Park Authority, several times postponed and due in late May 2002, has been again postponed, with Marshalls, who have succeeded Stancliffe Stone as permission-holders, requesting increased time to make their case, and is now expected during summer or autumn of 2002. Protestors are lobbying the Park Authority to use the 1995 Environment Act to stop the quarrying plans, and have requested the Secretary of State for the Environment to 'call in' the application for determination (see <http://www.stonehenge.ukf.net/nineladies.htm>).

Protestors list the following problems with the proposals:

1. Further degradation of the hillside and setting of the Nine Ladies Stone Circle and Stanton Moor
 2. The old 1952 consent is wholly inappropriate today and runs contrary to Peak Park policies
 3. Dangers of quarrying on a geological landslip
 4. Threat to the local water table including a spring supplying local residents
 5. Dangerous lorry traffic and access to and from the sites
 6. Decimation of wildlife habitats including badger setts, bat roosts, and rare plants such as heath cud-weed
 7. Noise and dust pollution
 8. Effect on visitors and tourism
- (available at <http://www.nineladies.uklinux.net/>)

And, in their own words, they suggest:

[A]t the time of purchase there was an existing planning permission to re-open the two quarries at Endcliffe and Lees Cross, which had lain dormant since the early 1950's. This permission was granted before the Peak District National Park was founded, and would be entirely inappropriate for today. However, the planning authority seem content to accept the application. If this scheme goes ahead it will not only destroy a part of the world's second most popular National Park (the most popular is in Japan) including a Grade II Listed building (the Earl Grey Tower, a monument erected to commemorate the passing of the 1832 Reform Act) and threaten a sacred site, the Nine Ladies Stone Circle and the rich archaeological landscape of Stanton Moor (<http://www.nineladies.uklinux.net/>).

The protest website uses the image of an apple 'core' remaining of the moor, holding the Nine Ladies and a single birch tree 'stalk', but with little else remaining, the quarries having taken their 'bites'. Some of these 'bites' are in negotiation. A recent announcement indicated that one

'bite' at least will bite less closely - at New Pillhough on the edge of the moor, rather than closer to the circle - but other threats remain present. In this 'alternative' representation of Stanton Moor by the protest website, the circle becomes a metaphor for the moor, and pagans and others identify with the circle. However, this living landscape means different things to different groups of pagans: many treat the circle as a ritual focus, a place to meet ancestors or spirits of the moor: others engage with spirit-lines or tracks, or leylines. Some perform ritual at the circle to give energy to stones and land. The Dragon Network has suggested a ritual to awaken earth-energies of moor and stones - this being a ritual that people can perform elsewhere, so that imagining or imaging the landscape is apparently enough. Certainly it is less eroding, and less potentially damaging than some of the ritual manifestations that occur there: our observations at the site, following those of English Heritage (<http://www.stonehenge.ukf.net/nineladies.htm#English%20Heritage>) regarding visitor impact, suggests the increasing engagement of Pagans – such as involving fires, burned poles, and hundreds of joss-sticks stuck into the eroding turf – is having a detrimental affect on the Nine Ladies.

Parts of the circle and its environs were excavated during 2000-1, to investigate extents of recent erosion. Notably, local archaeologists took pains to explain purposes of the excavation to protestors and visitors - some of whom decorated the site with a pentacle, perhaps to protect the land or bless the excavation. In 19th century illustrations the circle shown encloses a small mound - this area is now flat. People - walkers, ritualists, neo-shamans, pagans and others - interact directly, leave their mark, sometimes more deliberately: the (broken and mended) 'King Stone' holds 19th century graffiti of 'Bill Stumps'. In 2001, protest rituals by a busload of Birmingham pagans, King Arthur, and a Dorset druid group, included an attempt to 'raise energy' to 'protect the stones', and an effort to pick up the scraps of litter and cigarette ends festooning the site. Our monitoring of the site, including diversity of engagement, is ongoing and future reports will examine this case example in greater detail, particularly in light of the planning decision forthcoming in 2002.

12. Conclusions

As the examples of Stonehenge, Avebury and Stanton Moor demonstrate, Pagan engagements with 'sacred sites' are far from passive or monolithic, and direct Pagan involvement with the politics of site management and presentation is increasing. In some instances, respectful and diplomatic – if not dogmatic; it is still site managers who make decisions – negotiations between the interest groups reap positive results, 'perhaps to the extent that Seahenge will be the last disturbance of a 'sacred site' without prior consultation and compromise' (Bannister 2000:13). The debates over Seahenge have been documented elsewhere (e.g. Wallis forthcoming, Champion 2000, Wood 2002) but they have implications for the way in which all 'sacred sites' are managed: the unifying force that facilitates such a melding of wills is the preservation ethic, a belief that not all the interest groups profess – the travellers who climbed the trilithons of Stonehenge, for instance. And it is impossible to ignore the way in which the view of Pagans and archaeologists tend to appear irreconcilable, from Maisie Taylor's judgmental comment on Druid protests to the excavation of Seahenge: 'What's interesting is the people who are objecting to us digging the circle don't actually seem to want to know any more about it', to Tim Sebastian's (Secular Order of Druids) statement that he once viewed archaeologists as 'the enemy' (Sebastian 2001:128). But of course it is not that Druids, Pagans and other neo-Shamans do not want to know about the past, it is that they *do* want to know about the past and engage with it, in ways which contrast markedly with those of archaeologists (see also Dowson 2001). The very significant issue raised here concerns forms of knowledge and power: power over which approach to the past determines how sites are managed and presented, and indeed who demarcates what constitutes 'knowledge' and legitimate use, who is able to define methods of accumulating such 'knowledge'.

With these issues of diversity of interests in mind, some of the issues arising, within the Pagan communities and their interaction with sacred sites and managers, identified by this pilot project, include:

1. Most obviously, a diversity of groups desire greater access to sacred sites on auspicious occasions, from 'families with children' (*The Times*) including Pagans, to groups of free festivalers (who may of course be pagans and/or have children). This highlights other issues: e.g. intellectual access to 'archaeological monuments' by non-academics, and questions of how sites should be managed in the future to balance the needs of both active engagement and heritage conservation.
2. Contestations over how 'sacred sites' are regarded, and indeed what makes a place 'sacred'. There is a wide diversity of uses of the term, and it is by no means certain that the adoption of the term by heritage management include adoption of this range of meanings: in some cases, the adoption may be part of a marginalising of some site users.
3. While various alternative interest have been articulate regarding sites, these do not appear to be addressed by, e.g. the Stonehenge Management Plan.
4. Also neglected to date have been the range and diversity of Pagan and non-Pagan interests (as opposed to the media image that only 'Druids' attend sites and that Druids are comical and harmless while travellers are disruptive) and the types of ritual engagements with sites: heritage managers appear to promote a 'look but do not touch' concept of passive ritual, which is obviously at odds with views of Pagans who leave offerings, etc.
5. A further unexamined issue is that of the treatment afforded human remains from eras pre-dating Christianity: Pagans and others are currently issuing calls for excavated

remains to be reburied with suitable ceremony and respect (see e.g. journals such as *The Druid's Voice*). The *Sacred Sites, Sacred Rites/Rights* project has produced a separate paper on the British reburial issue (Wallis & Blain 2001).

Such issues indicate the context for future research directions, which we outline in the final section of this document.

13. Future research

The results of this pilot project indicate further study is required in a number of areas. These broadly include the following:

1. how Pagans approach and interact with, and inscribe meaning in 'sacred sites';
2. site custodians'/archaeologists' perceptions of and responses to these engagements, and;
3. the implications of both these perspectives for the theorising of identity, community archaeology, and UK Heritage Management

More specifically, we suggest the following are pertinent areas for future research, which we will undertake in the second phase of the Sacred Sites project, commencing May 2002.

1. identity construction and theorising of identity: Maffesoli (1996) suggests post-modernity lends itself to a form of 'neo-tribalism', in which people form dynamic and changing communities around various identity foci which are discursively constituted. Boundaries between groups are shifting and unclear. The various groups of Pagans, today inventing and identifying with varied discourses of 'the sacred', form an ideal community in which to apply, explore, and develop this theoretical approach, where the establishment of these new 'tribes' (in both a theoretical sense, and their own usage of the word) has a direct impact on policies and practices elsewhere.
2. other users, and potential conflicts of interest. Some Pagans to whom we have already spoken refer to their 'right' to practice in their ways at 'sacred sites'. Others see the presence of traces of ritual as unwisely 'imposing a context' on the site – a concern which is itself, of course, imposing a context.
3. current heritage management policies. As already indicated, these tend to focus on conservation, and deal with site-users as passive 'visitors' only.
4. future plans and policies for preservation versus use. As indicated, the Stonehenge Management Plan, though saying that some visitors may consider the site 'sacred', discuss the 'visitor experience' in terms of enhancement by (official) 'interpretation', saying that 'without an insight into their history and origin visitors cannot appreciate their full significance' (Part Three, p. 24). By contrast, Pagan users may have other ways of knowing, their own 'interpretations', and consider that these contradict or are superior to 'official versions' presented to them.
5. the contribution of these to British culture. Both past and present contribute to understandings of the 'heritage' of various sub-cultural groups. Stonehenge is an icon of British culture to some, just a pile of stones to others, and the 'temple of the nation' to other still. Similarly, ideas about 'ancient peoples' and their connection with land, spirituality, and stone circles are fairly widespread. Pagans are drawing on imagery and experience which is more widely shared. Stonehenge (with its recent history of conflict) has become a symbol of freedom; other small stone circles link today's people with those of the past. The image of an archaeologist taking a chainsaw to the timbers of 'Seahenge' aroused comments from many who were not Pagan, along with those who were.

There is a tension here between concepts of insularity and freedom, expressed in some of the interview material given us at solstice 2001, and hinted at elsewhere. Part of our task, therefore, is to examine overlapping constructions of identity, among Pagans and others, and the role played therein by heritage. It is worth noting again, then, that in the Stonehenge

management plan, while 'research' is identified as a specific goal, no reference is made either to other, non-archaeological research or ways of knowing, or constructions of meaning within the site today.

14. Appendix A: Methodology

In a practitioner-Pagan / academic based collaborative project of this sort, we deem it imperative to be transparent regarding the methodology used in the Sacred Sites project. We provide this explanation in this appendix: for those readers who are interested in such 'auto-' research, to avoid disrupting the logical flow of the report, and so that other readers need not get 'bogged down' by the intricacies of methodology.

With existing links to Pagan and other 'alternative' groups, and members of the heritage management and archaeological communities, through our academic involvements, earlier research projects, memberships of email lists and other groups, and attendance at Pagan events, we are uniquely placed to conduct this research. For this project, we combine the benefits of traditional ethnographic research - participant observation, interviewing, etc. - with specifically 'insider' experiential research.

Traditional ethnography has been critiqued for imposing an artificial boundary between ethnographer and practitioners, and for positioning the 'subjects' of research as 'Other'. Denzin (1997) and others have called for traditional ethnography to gather a new lease of life by 'coming home' - by turning the anthropologist's detailed gaze on everyday life in western societies, and by rendering the familiar 'unfamiliar', examining constructions of meaning and practice. Recent developments within ethnography have continued the critique by examining ethical implications of studying the 'exotic other', and discussing possible alternatives, especially auto-ethnography (Reed-Danahay 1997, Blain 2000c, 2002) and experiential anthropology (e.g. Young & Goulet 1994). In archaeology also, researchers have been increasingly reflexive, addressing the implications of their research on the communities with which they work (e.g. Southampton University's Quseir al-Qadim project, Egypt: see <http://www.arch.soton.ac.uk/>) and in relation to other interest groups (e.g. Hodder 1997; Hodder et al 2000). Blurring these genres (as Clifford Geertz might have put it) and taking these developments in both anthropological and archaeological thought forward, Wallis (2000) has proposed an autoarchaeology informing the theory and methodology of this project.

The project thus has three specific methods of data-collection:

1. participant-observation of Pagan engagements and rituals at the three 'archaeological sites'.
2. audio-taped interviews with a broad spectrum of interviewees, including Pagans, tourists and local people on-site.
3. participant observation in internet and email discussion; and collation of materials from this and from 'official' and semi-official statements and documents from interested groups and individuals.

This study is qualitative and ethnographic. materials and 'data' gathered are subject to both thematic and narrative/discourse analysis. Throughout, concepts of location (of 'informants' and practitioners of all kinds, ourselves included), and 'voice', are paramount.

Our intention was to purposely select people and events, to reflect a broad spectrum of 'Pagan' approaches to sacred sites. The specific sites are chosen to facilitate this. Through previous research (see previous citations) we have established contacts in both heritage management and Pagan communities. However, there is no single 'Paganism': rather,

practitioners follow a variety of 'paths' or traditions which are associated or allied in various ways, for example, by 'spiritually' engaging with nature and ancestors. Recognising that Paganism is, per se, extremely heterogeneous, this project appreciates that it would be impractical and naïve to attempt a definitive or exhaustive analysis of Pagan site users. A potential problem is ensuring that voices of well-known individuals or groups do not predominate: some groups are harder to contact than others, and have more distrust of academia; however, Pagans tend to congregate at the sites we are examining at festival times, or for protests, etc, and we have ongoing contact with the communities. Our goal is not to represent 'Pagan opinion' in general but to reflect and examine some of the diversity of perspectives. We are confident our initial work to date, and network of contacts, has provided and will continue to provide access to a suitable representation of heterogeneity of Paganisms.

Ethnographic work, by definition, involves some intrusion into the lives of others. We are aware of ethics issues, particularly over use of interview transcripts and photographic presentations where some Pagans may have concerns about breaches of confidentiality (see Weller et al 2001). We undertook to maintain confidentiality where appropriate, e.g. in small group or private situations we used photography only where informed consent could be obtained, and confidentiality was assured to interviewed informants who requested such when prompted.

15. Appendix B: How this document has been disseminated

Ancient Sacred Landscapes Network (ASLaN)
British Druid Order (BDO)
Cruithni
English Heritage (London)
English Heritage (Stonehenge)
Flag Fen Wetland Centre
Glastonbury Order of Druids (GOD)
National Trust (London)
National Trust (Avebury)
Norfolk Archaeology
Northern Earth
Order of Bards Ovates and Druids (OBOD)
Peak District Archaeology
Ring of Troth (Europe)
Rollright Trust
Save Our Sacred Sites (SOS)
Savestonehenge.org
Secular Order of Druids (SOD)
Stanton Lees Action Group (SLAG)
Stonehenge Peace and Reconciliation Committee
The Pagan Federation

The document is available on the project website, and availability announced via email lists including Britarch, Small-triple-A, Stones, StonehengePeace, UKPML and UKHeathenry.

16. References

- Antiquity. 1996. Reports: The Future of Avebury, Again. *Antiquity*. 70: 501-502.
- Bannister, V. 2000. A Load of Old Rubbish. *Pagan Dawn: The Journal of the Pagan Federation* 135 (Beltane): 12-13.
- Barnatt, J. 1997. Excavation and Restoration of the Doll Tor Stone Circle, Stanton, Derbyshire, 1994. *Derbyshire Archaeological Journal* 117: 91-85.
- Baxter, I and C. Chippindale; K Fielden; and W. Kennet and E. Young 2000. *The Stonehenge we don't deserve: responses to Geoffrey Wainwright's report, 'The Stonehenge we deserve'*. Online, Available HTTP: <http://www.savestonehenge.org.uk/deserve.html>
- Baxter, I. and C. Chippindale, 2002. A sustainable and green approach to Stonehenge visitation: the 'brownfield' option. Discussion paper circulated by I. Baxter, February 2002.
- Bender, B. 1993. Stonehenge - Contested Landscapes (Medieval to Present Day). In: Bender, B. (ed.). *Landscape, Politics and Perspectives*.:245-280 Oxford: Berg.
- Bender, B. 1998. *Stonehenge: Making Space*. Oxford: Berg.
- Bender, B. and M. Edmonds. 1992. De-Romancing the Stones. *The Guardian* 15th June.
- Blain, J. 2000a. 'Old Religion', new conflicts: Newspapers, nationalism and the politics of alternative spirituality. *International Conference on Cultural Studies*, Birmingham, June 2000.
- Blain, J. 2000b. Report on Summer Solstice 2000 at Stonehenge (sound recording). Electronic document: <http://easyweb.easynet.co.uk/aburnham/pers/sounds.htm> (accessed 16.12.01).
- Blain, J. 2000c. Speaking shamanistically: seidr, academia and rationality. *DISKUS*: Online: Available HTTP: <http://www.uni-marburg.de/religionswissenschaft/journal/diskus/blain.html> (accessed 13.5.02).
- Blain, J. 2001a. Shamans, Stones, Authenticity and Appropriation: Contestations of Invention and Meaning. In: Wallis, R.J. and Lymer, K. (eds.) *New Approaches to the Archaeology of Art, Religion and Folklore: A Permeability of Boundaries?*: 47-55. BAR International Series 936. Oxford. British Archaeological Reports.
- Blain, J. 2002. *Nine Worlds of Seidr-Magic*. London: Routledge.
- Boniface, P. and P. Fowler. 1993. *Heritage and Tourism in the 'Global Village'*. London: Routledge.
- Blain, J. and R.J Wallis 2001. *Stonehenge Solstice access, 20-21 June, 2001. Report by the Sacred Sites, Contested Rites/Rights Project*. Online: Available HTTP: <http://www.sacredsites.org.uk/reports/StonehengeJune2001.html> (accessed 13.5.02).
- Blain, J. and R.J. Wallis, 2002a. A living landscape? Pagans, archaeology, and spirits in the land. *3rd Stone*, forthcoming June 2002.
- Blain, J. and R.J. Wallis, 2002b. Contemporary Paganism and Archaeology: Irreconcilable? Conference paper given at Archaeology in the Public Domain, Sheffield, March 2002. Online: Available HTTP: <http://www.sacredsites.org.uk/papers/aypublic.html> (accessed 13.5.02).
- Calver, S. 1998. *Avebury Visitor Research 1996-1998*. Bournemouth University Report on Behalf of the National Trust.
- Carmichael, D.L.; Hubert, J.; Reeves, R. and A. Schanche. 1994. (eds.). *Sacred Sites, Sacred Places*. London: Routledge.
- Carpenter, D. 1998. Symbolic Stupidity. *The Right Times* 2 (Summer Solstice): 24.
- Champion, M. 2000. *Seahenge: A Contemporary Chronicle*. Aylsham, Norfolk: Barnwell's Timescape.
- Chippindale, C. 1983. What Future for Stonehenge? *Antiquity* 57:172-180.

- Chippindale, C. 1985. English Heritage and the Future of Stonehenge. *Antiquity* 59: 132-137.
- Chippindale, C. 1986. Stoned Henge: Events and Issues at the Summer Solstice, 1985. *World Archaeology* 18(1): 38-58.
- Chippindale, C.; Devereux, P.; Fowler, P.; Jones, R.; and T. Sebastian. 1990. *Who Owns Stonehenge?* Manchester: Batsford.
- Cleere, H. F. 1989. (ed.). *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*. London: Routledge.
- Clover, C. 1997. Stonehenge Fails to get £22m Grant from Lottery. *The Daily Telegraph*, 14th June: 7.
- Clover, C. 1998. Traffic will be hidden by £125m Stonehenge Tunnel. *The Daily Telegraph*, 1st August: 4.
- Craig, S. (ed.). 1986. *Stonehenge '85: Souvenir Issue – A Collection of Material to Commemorate 'The Battle of the Beanfield' June 1st 1985*. Glastonbury: Unique Publications.
- Dames, M. 1976. *The Silbury Treasure*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Davies, A. 1998. Return of the Men in White. *The Big Issue* 288 (15th-21st June): 22-26.
- Davison, J.; Brace, M. and A. Mullins. 1999. Mayhem at midsummer's dawn as travellers storm Stonehenge fence. *The Independent* 22nd June: 3.
- De Bruxelles, S. 1999. Violence wrecks the solstice celebration. *The Times* 22nd June:13.
- Denison, S. 2000. Issues: One step to the left, two steps back. *British Archaeology* 52 (April): 28.
- Denzin, N.K. 1997. *Interpretive Ethnography: ethnographic practices for the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Devereux, P. 1992. *Symbolic Landscapes: The Dreamtime Earth and Avebury's Open Secrets*. Glastonbury: Gothic Image.
- Dowson, T.A. 2001. Afterword: Permeating Boundaries. In: R.J Wallis and K.J Lymer (eds) *A permeability of boundaries: new approaches to the archaeology of art, religion and folklore*: 137-138. BAR International Series 936. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.
- English Heritage. 2000. *Stonehenge World Heritage Site Management Plan*. London: English Heritage.
- Fielden, K. 1996. Avebury Saved? *Antiquity* 70: 503-507.
- Fielden, K. 1999. Stonehenge – The Masterplan. *Pagan Dawn: The Journal of the Pagan Federation* 131 (Beltane): 23-24.
- Finn, C. 1997. Leaving More Than Footprints: Modern Votive Offerings At Chaco Canyon Prehistoric Site. *Antiquity* 71: 169-178.
- Fleet, M. 1999. A Midsummer nightmare at Stonehenge. *The Daily Telegraph* 22nd June: 4.
- Fleming, S. 1999. Psychic Vandalism. *The Right Times* 5 (Spring Equinox): 12-14.
- Fleming, S. n.d.a. *Organising Ritual at Prehistoric Sites*. Available online: www.ravenfamily.org/sam/pag/ritualmeths.html
- Fleming, S. n.d.b. *The effects of Physical Damage to Sites*. Available online: www.ravenfamily.org/sam/pag/site_dam.html
- Gingell, C. 1996. Avebury: Striking A Balance. *Antiquity* 70: 507-511.
- Golding, F.N. 1989. Stonehenge – Past and Future. In: Cleere, H. F. 1989. (ed.) *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*: 265-271. London: Routledge.
- Goodwin, S. 1997a. Druids to go Free as Stonehenge Plans to Drop Entrance Charges. *The Independent* 6th June: 3.
- Goodwin, S. 1997b. Stonehenge Restoration Plan Meets Brick Wall. *The Independent* 14th June.

- Greenwood, S. 2000. *Magic, Witchcraft, and the Otherworlds*. Oxford: Berg.
- Gyrus. 1998a. *The Goddess in Wharfedale*. Available online: <http://www.suresite.com/oh/v/verbeia/>
- Harvey, G. 1997. *Listening People, Speaking Earth: Contemporary Paganism*. London: Hurst & Co.
- Hetherington, K. 1992. Place, Space and Power: Stonehenge and the Travellers. *Here and Now* 12: 25-28.
- Hodder, I. 1997. 'Always momentary, fluid and flexible': towards a reflexive excavation methodology. *Antiquity* 71: 691-700.
- Hodder, I. 2000. Developing a reflexive method in archaeology. In: I. Hodder (ed.) *Towards Reflexive Method in Archaeology: the example at Çatalhöyük*: 3-14. McDonald Institute Monographs: British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara Monograph 28. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hubert, J. 1994. Sacred beliefs and beliefs of sacredness. In Carmichael, D.L.; Hubert, J.; Reeves, R. and A. Schanche (eds.). *Sacred Sites, Sacred Places*. 9-19. London: Routledge.
- Hutton, R. 1999. *The Triumph of the Moon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, K. 1998. The State of Large Earthwork Sites in the United Kingdom. *Antiquity* 72: 293-307.
- Lambrick, G. 2001. *Rollright Conservation and Management Plan*. The Rollright Trust.
- Latham, C. and A. Norfolk. 1998/9. A Press Release on Behalf of the Genius Loci of West Penwith. *The Druid's Voice: The Magazine of Contemporary Druidry* 9 (Winter): 27.
- Layton, R. 1989a. (ed.). *Who Needs the Past?: Indigenous Values and Archaeology*. London: Routledge.
- Layton, R. 1989b. (ed.). *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*. London: Routledge.
- Lindquist, G. 1997. Shamanic Performances on the Urban Scene: Neo-Shamanism in Contemporary Sweden. Stockholm: Stockholm Studies in Social Anthropology.
- Maffesoli, M. 1996. *The Time of the Tribes: The Decline of Individualism in Mass Society*. London: Sage.
- McCabe, M. 1998/9. A Day at the Circus. *The Druid's Voice: The Magazine of Contemporary Druidry* 9 (Winter): 20-21.
- McKay, G. (ed.) 1998. *DiY Culture: Party and Protest in Nineties Britain*. London: Verso.
- Morris, R. 1998. Measuring the Destruction of Monuments. *British Archaeology* (June): 15.
- National Trust. 1997. *Avebury Management Plan, April 1997*. Produced by the National Trust.
- NCCL (National Council for Civil Liberties). 1986. *Stonehenge: A report into the civil liberties implications of the events relating to the convoys of summer 1985 and 1986*. London: Yale.
- Orr, D. 1999. Do the right thing, please. *The Independent* 22nd June: 5.
- Pitts, M. 1996. The Vicar's Dewpond, the National Trust and the Rise of Paganism. In: Morgan, D.; Salway, P. and D. Thackray. (eds.). *The Remains of Distant Times: Archaeology and the National Trust*: 116-131. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press for the Society of Antiquaries of London and the National Trust.
- Pomeroy, M. 1998. *Avebury World Heritage Site Management Plan*. London: English Heritage.
- Prout, C. 1998. Saving Sacred Sites. *The Right Times* 2 (Summer Solstice): 6-7.
- Pryor, F. 1998. The Great Prize of Starlit Stonehenge. *British Archaeology* (December): 15.
- Reed-Danahay, D.E. 1997. (ed.). *Auto/Ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social*. Oxford: Berg.
- Restall-Orr, E. 1998. Not My Faith. *The Druid's Voice: The Magazine of Contemporary*

- Druidry* 9 (Winter): 23.
- Scott, N. 1999. *Total Eclipse: Souvenir Guide to the once in a lifetime event*. London: Highbury House Communications PLC.
- Sebastian, T. 2001. Alternative archaeology: has it happened?. In: R.J. Wallis and K.J. Lymer (eds) *A permeability of boundaries?: new approaches to the archaeology of art, religion and folklore*: 125-135. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.
- Shallcrass, P. 1998/9. English Heritage, Stonehenge and Some Druids. *The Druid's Voice: The Magazine of Contemporary Druidry* 9 (Winter): 16-20.
- Stonehenge Campaign. News Website. Electronic Document: <http://www.phreak.co.uk/stonehenge/psb/stonecam.htm> (accessed 12.5.02).
- 'Twitter of Blisted'. 1998. Free Stonehenge. *The Right Times* 3 (Autumn Equinox): 11-12
- Urry, J. 1990. *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage Publications.
- Wainwright, G. J. 1996. Stonehenge Saved? *Antiquity* 70: 9-12.
- Wallis, R.J. 1999a. Altered States, Conflicting Cultures: Shamans, Neo-shamans and Academics. *Anthropology of Consciousness* 10 (2-3): 41-49.
- Wallis, R.J. 1999b. Autoarchaeology and Neo-shamanism: The Socio-Politics of Ecstasy. PhD Thesis, Department of Archaeology, University of Southampton.
- Wallis, R.J. 2000. Queer shamans: autoarchaeology and neo-shamanism. *World Archaeology* 32(2):252-262.
- Wallis, R.J. 2001. Waking the Ancestors: Neo-shamanism and Archaeology. In: N. Price (ed.). *The Archaeology of Shamanism*: 213-230. London: Routledge.
- Wallis, R.J. Forthcoming 2003. *New Shamans: Ecstasy, Alternative Archaeology and Contemporary Paganism*. London: Routledge.
- Wallis, R.J. and J. Blain 2001. A British Reburial Issue? Statement by the *Sacred Rights/Rites, 'Sacred Sites'* Project. Available HTTP: <http://www.sacredsites.org.uk/reports/reburial.html> (accessed 12.5.02).
- Wallis, R.J. and K. Lymer (eds) 2001. *A Permeability of Boundaries? New Approaches to the Archaeology of Art, Religion and Folklore*. BAR International Series 936. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.
- Weller, P. 1997. *Religions in the UK: directory 1997-2000*. Mickleover, Derby: University of Derby.
- Weller, P., Feldman, A. and Purdam, K. 2001. *Religious discrimination in England and Wales*. Home Office Research Study 220. Online: Available HTTP: <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs/hors220.pdf> (accessed 12.5.02).
- Wood, C. 2002. The Meaning of Seahenge. *3rd Stone*. Forthcoming June 2002.
- Young, D.E. and J-G. Goulet. (eds.). 1994. *Being Changed By Cross-Cultural Encounters: The Anthropology of Extraordinary Experience*. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press.