Port Eliot Festival: a crucible of creativity

Jo Buchanan
Ireland

Jo Buchanan is an Independent Specialist in Cultural Heritage, and a Trustee of ICOMOS-UK and member of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) Committee. She is involved in projects to increase visibility and viability of ICH in the UK, which recognises the complexities and diversity of heritage, including minority heritages. The latter work includes exploring potential benefits of the recent ratification by the UK Government of the UNESCO Convention 2003 on the Safeguarding of the ICH and the ICOMOS ICH Charter. She adopts a critical methodology and commitment to issues of social justice. Jo holds a doctorate from Northumbria University and her thesis is titled 'Valorising Cornish Minority Heritage: UNESCO and Performative Heritage'. The research aimed to explore the complexities of how heritage is valorised, and the importance of creating dialogue on cultural diversity. Her research has contributed to international conferences and journals and will be in a forthcoming book by Routledge on the role of creative practitioners in heritage-making. She has extensive work in the cultural heritage sector that has involved close partnerships with creative practitioners in creating exhibitions and festivals within the heritage space. Dr Buchanan approaches her work from a trans-disciplinary perspective linking research and practice. Her research interests include intangible heritage, performance and democratisation of culture (focus on minority heritages)

Port Eliot Festival: a crucible of creativity

Jo Buchanan
Independent Specialist in Cultural Heritage

ABSTRACT

Professional discourses within the UK heritage industry have traditionally emphasised its built, tangible assets. Of these, historic houses have often been viewed as symbols of greatness, linked to immutable value and in need of saving from ruination – an embedded elitist perception of British heritage. Over the past decade, public debates on social justice have coalesced in foregrounding a commitment to inclusion and diversity in the heritage sector, to decolonisation in museums, and to a shift in cultural policy that calls attention to the way heritage is used and celebrated in informal processes and practices. In a response to this 'cultural turn' and diversity agenda, the UK Government ratified the UNESCO 2003 Convention on the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage to officially recognise the country's everyday or living heritage (UK Government 2024). Within this ratification process, during public consultation between December 2023 and February 2024, the UK Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) reiterated UNESCO's guidance on what is intangible cultural heritage (ICH) as '[t]raditional, contemporary and living at the same time: ICH does not only represent inherited traditions from the past but also contemporary rural and urban practices in which diverse groups take part' (UNESCO 2025). The term 'contemporary' reflects how heritage is increasingly understood as having a relationship with the past, but one that is present-centred (Harrison 2013) and embracing the dynamic, evolving and diverse forms of ICH within the United Kingdom.

This paper explores a case study of Port Eliot Festival, an annual contemporary event that took place in the grounds of a historic house in Cornwall, United Kingdom, The paper examines the festival's intermingling of tangible and intangible heritage, how it created a gateway for the expression and performance of ICH, and the role of creative practitioners in creating room for experimentation within this cultural space. Further, the study reflects UNESCO's 2003 Convention recognising the 'deep seated interdependence between the ICH and the tangible, cultural and natural heritage' UNESCO (2024.3). Festivals are therefore explored as a form of heritage that provides a social, loose, unpredictable, dynamic cultural space, in contrast to a fixed heritage site. This temporality challenges the assumption that the value of 'heritage' is immutable and fixed; what is important emerges through a personal, sensorial and embodied experience. The paper argues that the looseness of this cultural space is the 'heritage value', and as festivals are increasingly recognised officially in cultural policy as a strategic 'good' (a wellbeing/economic resource for local and regional growth/social cohesiveness), we need to be critical of why they are mobilised, who is involved in the decision-making and who benefits from them. Festivals (whether ancient, revived or contemporary) are more than an end product; they are a socio-cultural process of active valuing, with social interaction between people being a core aspect of this act of heritage-making.

Keywords

intangible heritage, festivals, cultural spaces, performativity

Introduction

Port Eliot is a historic estate in southeast Cornwall. Formerly an Augustinian priory, the house dates to the tenth century. Quite soon after the dissolution of the monasteries by King Henry VIII, the house was transferred to the Eliot family, who have owned it ever since.

Figure 1
Port Eliot Festival at dusk. Source: Photo by Louise Roberts.

The Grade 1–listed historic house has a mixed identity: it is a home for the Eliot family, a personal, unofficial relationship with 'heritage'; but it also exemplifies an official idea of heritage, having been chosen by experts as being worthy of protection and preservation, and hence its being 'listed'. In addition, the house and its artefacts align to cultural symbols of wealth and greatness and are intrinsically linked to empire and colonialism. Like many historic houses, it has stories to tell, including connections to the transatlantic slave trade and its legacy of inequalities that continue in the world today. While there remains some ambivalence in regard to this difficult past, and much work is needed to challenge race and inclusion within UK heritage research and practice (Ashley and Stone 2023), the UK Government has made some way forward in democratisation by recognising diverse forms of heritage through its ratification of UNESCO's 2003 Convention in 2024. The recognition of ICH has been a welcome shift in rebalancing what is seen and valued as heritage in the United Kingdom and embraces the complexities of this process (how people build a relationship with the past, and who is involved in producing cultural heritage spaces). The latter concern echoes Stuart Hall's inaugural work (1999), which re-examines British heritage as a living activity, not just the preservation of heritage buildings but also including traditions – as well as their arts, creativity and diversity of expression. Port Eliot was therefore interesting, as it exemplified British heritage – as a Grade 1–listed house and Humphry Repton–designed landscape – while being known, since the 1980s, for its festivals and creativity, which provided room for an embodied, immersive and sensorial living activity. The paper explores one of these events, the Port Eliot Festival, which was organised by the Eliot family between 2006 and 2019.

Background literature

Heritage management in the United Kingdom has historically emphasised preservation, leading to fossilisation and canonisation of assets, but it has rarely looked at facilitating this relationship with the past by providing a cultural heritage space. Ruth Adams (2013) illustrated how the politicised heritage movement in the 1970s to valorise the country house as a national asset was key to normalising the importance of these buildings in the national psyche, but she argues that the movement has potentially lost relevance today in a multicultural, questioning society. Critical engagement by civil society and academic research has shown that a huge number of country houses are linked (directly or indirectly) to slavery; however, a dominant discourse focuses on the owners of the houses and their wealth, not on how this wealth was made. Indeed, the imperial element is seen as peripheral (Barczewski 2014). Some country houses may hint at these intertwined stories if the more nuanced narratives are included, and yet visitors do not readily engage with these. Instead, they enter a museum site with a predetermined narrative (Smith 2021). In addition, Claire Monk (2012) argues that the problem is deeply embedded. The National Trust (which owns many United Kingdom country houses) has members who have experienced traditionalist, selective education in an era of certainties about cultural value, the literary canon and British superiority that are key to their cultural-political positions on heritage. This political use of heritage has seen academics such as Corinne Fowler (2024) threatened by criticism of the National Trust and the entwined colonialism within rural spaces, and she advocates for dialogue and openness as an antidote to cultural wars. Further, and importantly to this study, Fowler highlights the role of creative writers in this process of heritage-making (Fowler 2020).

Heritage sites can function as public spaces where diverse meanings of culture can be expressed and where different histories and identities can be affectively situated through performances and narrative (Ashley 2013). The social impact of this construction is seen by Landry as 'those affects that go beyond the artefacts and the enactments of the event or performance itself and have a continuing influence upon and directly touch people's lives' (1995, 29). Historic environments have changing meaningfulness; Jones and Leech argue that contemporary meanings of historic environments are not restricted to the official narratives and institutional process of signification. They offer a multidisciplinary

approach to provide a 'nuanced understanding of the dynamic role of the historic environment in the production of meaning, memory, identity and sense of place' (2016, 33). Research by Smith and Campbell on the valuing of heritage by non-professionals reveals that such people do not privilege the material and grand forms of heritage (e.g. castles and historic houses); rather, their understanding of heritage has more synergy with intangible associations that are 'personal, familial and geographical [...] recruiting a sense of the past to do various forms of identity work in the present' (2018, 15–16).

Festivals or festive events as examples of ICH also sit within the broader concept of intangible heritage – an embodied cultural practice that engenders meaning, identity and a sense of place. ICH embraces the skills and knowledge often understood by the layperson as cultural traditions – something passed down within the family or through social interaction. In addition, festive events illustrate how 'heritage' is a dynamic relationship with the past, one that communities, groups or individuals choose to connect with in the present (or not). Festive events can be ancient, constantly practised or revived, creating an interface between heritage, identity and memory in an act of heritage-making. This aspect of meaning-making reflects Victor Turner's work on the ritual process that outlines how individual and collective cultural experience is embodied in rituals, theatrical performance and festive celebrations (2008, 1982) and is a symbolic system of meanings, generating new materials by 'recombining traditional actions in new ways' (2016, 228). His concept of 'spontaneous communitas' outlines how societies re-create these ancient ritual conditions that emphasise 'happenings' or 'something magical'. They seek to be transformative, something that goes to the roots of a person's being, something that is communal and shared (2008. 138). This creates pleasure or delight and a value judgement on the experience (Long et al. 2017). Scholars also explore festive and ritual processes as the interruption of everyday life. Turner writes how the liminality in cultural performance becomes a space for subversion, 'an embodiment of mutational forces' (2016, 12). The inherent instability and in-betweenness of this liminality allows social norms to be suspended or challenged. Bakhtin (1984) elaborates how a carnival sense of the world pushes aside seriousness (inversion) and makes room for a multiplicity of voices and meanings. Oldenburg uses Bakhtin's concept of 'third space' to describe informal public socialising as time out away from everyday routine, 'life duties and drudgeries' (1984, 21) – which might also be characterised as 'looseness' (Franck and Stevens 2007). Kent (2018) also details the break from conventional order of living and the inversion of norms that operate in the texts and performances of Cornwall's many festivals. He writes of the plethora of processions in the Cornish calendar as rituals reflective of 'a mysterious past, embodied in strange and mystifying festive practice' (2018, 418) and describes an ancient mode of behaviour of convergence, revelry and temporary subversion. Kent notes that these public events and rituals are still valued as important for the greater good of the community, offering a sense of belonging to members of social, religious or geographical groups, and that, in the 'long term [they] contribute to group cohesiveness' (2018, 15).

The case study of the Port Eliot Festival also draws on performance studies to explain how festive processes offer a space for democratisation and personal agency in the act of heritage-making. Adopting the paradigm of 'heritage-from-below' (Robertson 2012), Hamzah Muzaini and Claudio Minca use the term 'heritagescapes' (2018, 1), which are 'spearheaded by non-elites' and people exercising their own agency as consumers *and* producers of the past. This concept is useful to the study of the Port Eliot Festival in addressing how performing afresh transforms a heritage place into a heritage space – creating space for an alternative to fossilising the past. This may include performance and affect as a tool for facilitating individuals and groups as active agents of heritage (Wetherall, Smith and Campbell 2018), not passive and peripheral to what Laurajane Smith (2006.11) terms the 'Authorized Heritage Discourse' (AHD) that is central to most 'managed' heritage (Waterton 2010). Franck and Stevens also refer to unstructured spaces when everyday functions are suspended, which produces loose space, whether permanent (as in ruins) or temporary (as in events). These spaces arise from the unfolding of social encounters in public, and the virtues of loose space are 'possibility, diversity and disorder' (2007, 17). Ashley (2016) has also studied how alternative spaces express diverse meanings of culture, where different histories and identities are affectively situated through performances and narrative. She explains further that public expression provides a layered vision of heritage, not only of pedagogical expressions of history or tradition, but also as active statements used to assert demands for recognition and legitimation. It is seen as important in this paper for marginalised citizens (in this case, national minorities) to

express resistance and reclaim public spaces.

The study was therefore grounded in performance and critical heritage studies formulated by my professional experience of working with the creative industries at the Port Eliot Festival. This leaned my study towards how people create value through experience within a loose heritage space and the role of creative practitioners in creating this space. Within the study, linking festive practice and performance theory was also hugely beneficial and helped in understanding subversion, negotiation and co-production within heritage-making, particularly through the work of Turner (1982, 2008, 2016) and Kent (2018). Their work provides an understanding of how heritage is performed in public and, in particular, how an ancient mode of behaviour is re-created in festive events, bringing people together to subvert everyday life, and is valued for being socially interactive. Cornwall's ancient, revived or contemporary festivals such as Port Eliot are therefore examples of loose expressive spaces that are rooted in the past. In addition, the festival as a social practice, or as intangible cultural heritage, provided a positive emotional heritage. The inclusion of intangible, affective dimensions in the study not only centred on the personal 'everyday heritage' but also enhanced my understanding of the complex valuations of heritage within the varied gazes, perceptions and narratives.

Finally, the case study of the Port Eliot Festival draws attention to the inseparability of intangible from tangible heritage, and calls for a holistic approach to heritage management (Nic Craith, Kockel and Lloyd 2019), challenging what Hill (2018:182) terms the 'Cartesian split' within official heritage of nature/culture and tangible/intangible. Increasingly, we are seeing the bringing together of UNESCO's 1972 World Heritage Convention and the 2003 ICH Convention (ICOMOS 2025), offering the potential to enrich official heritage processes and what is valued. The UNESCO ICH Convention text (2024) outlines an understanding of heritage that goes beyond monuments and natural sites to include cultural practices passed down through the generations. Importantly, the 2003 Convention (in theory) also offers an alternative heritage paradigm to top-down, expert-led decision-making. The Convention text (2024) outlines the importance of participatory practices that are ethical and equitable, bringing the community of practitioners and culture bearers to the centre of decision-making and empowerment, including obtaining their free and prior consent. The adoption of a holistic, rights-based approach outlined by UNESCO is key to safeguarding the ICH of marginalised communities, including some indigenous peoples.

Methodology

The Port Eliot Festival study inspected representational and non-representational data collected through a mixed methods approach over a period of six years. The methods included questionnaires, interviews, document searches, ethnography and media analysis, and examined more fully the complexity, dynamism and negotiation of cultural production. The study identified the everyday construction of heritage valorisation, exploring the motivations, perceived meanings and signification processes of the various stakeholder individuals and groups. The methods explored the social relations that form what is seen as heritage: who are the stakeholders who choose what to include and what are their motivations? For example, critical performance ethnography was chosen in the research as a method for understanding the layered meanings and relations that took place between social groups and networks connected to the festival through observation over a period of ten years, or 'deep hanging out' (Getz 2010). Being embedded in the festival team also helped in fostering contacts and situated the researcher within the 'place', facilitating a deeper connection with and increased access to the participants. The ethnographic approach was supplemented through interviews with stakeholders and images that provided phenomenological data (expressions of affect and emotions). In this performance-centred research, it was important to choose methods of data collection that could unpack the range of participants' sensory experiences. The inclusion of phenomenological data gave some insight into the personal embodied knowledge that heightens personal agency. The approach provided insight into affective, non-representational ways of 'doing' heritage and captured the emerging, fluid process of valuing created through something 'felt' or experienced (Thrift 2008) and situated in individual experiences. Further, the use of visual ethnography as a research process provided data from festival photographers (both official and unofficial) that was analysed to create a layered account of the experiences of those attending the festival. The collaboration with this artistic practice as a method of research methodology provided a more nuanced approach and reflected what Nicolescu (2006) describes as an emerging transdisciplinarity, working with narrative, visual and creative forms that provide a useful view through

multiple windows. This process is described as a fusion of disciplinary boundaries (practice and theory) that reclaim the spaces in-between. The study of the Port Eliot Festival therefore focused on methods for analysis and visualisation of public perceptions within this cultural landscape, and on the integration of the intangible as an emotional geography, but it also captured the expression and performance of ICH. The methodology captured ethnographic and phenomenological understandings of 'heritage' and illustrated the importance of applying this approach to a more inclusive heritage practice. In addition, the interviews included the many participants – artists, organisers and collaborators – who co-produced this space.

Figure 2
Port Eliot Festival in the Repton cultural landscape.
Source: Photo by Louise Roberts.

Discussion: Port Eliot Festival as a cultural heritage space

Port Eliot Festival was organised by the Eliot family and attracted up to 7000 people to experience this heritage site. It was preceded by the 'Elephant Fayre' (BBC 2019), and both events reflected a creative legacy passed down in the family. For example, Hester Booth (née Santlow) was a well-known professional ballet dancer in the 18th century whose daughter, Harriet, married into the Eliot family. Hester's portraits adorn the walls at Port Eliot. She was one of the first English female choreographers and often danced male ballet roles, reflecting her physical strength (Goff 2007). Her legacy of pushing the boundaries of creativity rippled down through the Eliot family and led to the renowned festival events. Louis Eliot, festival director and musician, says of this legacy, and of what motivated him to co-organise the Port Eliot Festival:

> *Well, my dad hosted an event called the Elephant Fayre, which was a free-spirited arts festival that ran until 1986. I loved growing up around that. It wasn't just the festival but the fun and excitement of the build-up as well.* (Interview, 2019)

The Port Eliot Festival also provided a 'loose space' (after Franck and Stevens 2007). Michael Barret outlined in an interview how '[t]he ancient estate is the star of the show, and you're encouraged to go wild and make the most of it'. In this context, the heritage site was more than representational; it was part of a process of heritage-making, creating space for looseness and self-expression that is further explored by Louise Roberts, the official festival photographer.

> *Port Eliot isn't the only festival created on an ancestral estate. But I do believe it's quite unique in the way the house participates in the festival. Not only are various rooms used – like the Round Room and the Big Kitchen – but also it really helps create the most wonderful atmosphere, whether that's someone sitting quietly and gazing upon the house, the sunset falling over it or when illuminated at night. You never feel like an imposter or an outsider[;] the house always welcomes you!*

The historic house was central to the cultural space. The festival re-enacted an ancient mode of festive behaviour of convergence (coming together), subversion of the everyday and revelry. The Port Eliot site was also part of an ancient pilgrimage. As a monastic site, pilgrims would travel to the adjacent Priory Church. Contemporary pilgrims still enact both secular and non-secular ritual processes, visiting either the Priory as part of the new Cornish Celtic Way or the music festivals as a process of self-actualisation, reflection or wellbeing. People travelled from afar for the Port Eliot Festival, and attendees reflected on how the festivalisation process provided social interaction and positive feelings that provided the glue to bind, somewhat fleetingly, this form of community or gathering. Research demonstrated that coming together and bonding among the social actors was a core motivation for attendees, along with spending time with family and friends, enjoying the eclectic lineup and the setting, and relaxing (questionnaire 2019). This social capital is further explored by Walters and Jepson, who highlight the role of families and collective memory in determining quality of life at events. They have identified three quality-of-life indicators: physical wellbeing, psychological/ emotional wellbeing,

and relationships with family (2019, 34). Positive emotional impacts were a key motivation for the organisers, as outlined by music director Louis Eliot:

> *Our ethos has always remained the same. We want people to come and have a wonderful time in beautiful surroundings.*

The public nature of the heritage space also connects with Victor Turner's (2016) concept of 'spontaneous communitas', which explains how Western society re-creates these ancient ritual conditions that emphasise happenings or something magical – a collective experience that engenders feelings of something shared. This creates pleasure or delight and a value judgement on the experience (Long et al. 2017). Ahmed (2010) explains that this sensational aspect of ritual creates a social bond. When groups cohere around a shared experience, this creates a social value – a value judgement on whether an experience is deemed worth investing in. The Port Eliot Festival is an example of a practice that brings the community together for socio-cultural benefits. The research affirmed how this festive space enhanced the bonding of social actors, providing a sense of community, be it a local connection or a 'felt connection' (Quinn and Wilks 2013, 28) and contributing to wellbeing (Jepson and Walters 2021). Alan Williams from the University of Plymouth also touched on the festival as an embodied sensorial heritage process, as people converged on the historic site to enact a cultural heritage experience:

> *Every July, people from across the world travel to a small village in southeast Cornwall to see famous faces from the realms of music, art, literature, food and more. But where Port Eliot differs from other festivals is that it offers the opportunity to truly immerse yourself in its unique atmosphere and indulge in new and exciting creative experiences.*

Further interviews outline sensorial, intangible aspects connected to a sense of place:

> *One of the unfailingly great moments for me is arriving at the ancient estate and feeling the atmosphere of the place. It's a combination of centuries of history, the beauty of the surroundings, having your mates all around and the prospect of what's to come over the weekend.*

Other attendees voice the senses of expectation, or of 'a happening'. Violet Wilson (2016) writes of the festival as 'magical', and journalist Jackie Butler describes:

> *Walking in a wonderland … accidental episodes sum up the eccentric gathering … To each of us it is a unique affair.* (*Western Morning News* 2010, 10)

Another anonymous writer (2017, 82) speaks of a 'festival fever' but equally of 'tranquillity in roaming the grounds'. The idea of something magical is also referred to by Louise Roberts as she is immersed in a choir's performance of ICH in the adjacent heritage site of St Germans Priory:

> *To see this choir perform in the church was such a unique experience. The acoustics are pitch perfect and so you can imagine how incredible this was to listen to. I also love the sense of culture here. Port*

Figure 3
The London African Gospel Choir in St Germans Priory.
Source: Photo by Louise Roberts.

Eliot is such a diverse festival: it has this amazing ability to really mix it up, and it just works. Take the London African Gospel Choir, add a 12th century church which is part of the ancestral seat of the Eliot family, and you get another piece of Port Eliot magic!

Colin Midson, associate director of the festival, also outlines how collaboration with the University of Plymouth's Creative Cultivator Unit brought about some memorable happenings. The responses from interviewees connect with positive feelings from their interaction within the cultural heritage space and felt experience (Thrift 2008). The heritage sites and festival event became about a sense of occasion, ephemeral and carnivalesque, that reflects literature on festive events both traditional and contemporary. Cohen's work (1961, 138) outlines how Western society re-creates ancient festive practices that emphasise 'happenings' or 'something magical'. They can be transformative, in that they may go to the roots of a person's being, but equally they are valued for being socially interactive, valued as time out from everyday drudgery (Bakhtin 1984; Oldenburg 1989; Jepson and Walters 2021), which might also be characterised as 'looseness' (Franck and Stevens 2007). 'Loose' space is characterised by the absence of determinacy, in contrast to 'tight' public space, which is valued for its homogeneity and order. Loose spaces arise from the unfolding of social encounters in public and have the virtues of 'possibility, diversity and disorder' (Franck and Stevens 2007, 17). The Port Eliot Festival programme, for example, provided timed, managed activities, but was regulated by people who created looseness according to a timetable of their own choosing. The liminality of the subversive festive process, however, restored the status quo of everyday norms once the festive event was over and people returned to everyday life.

Figure 4
Dancing within the landscape. Source: Photo by Louise Roberts.

An important aspect of the performance of heritage in a public space, therefore, is the enacting of agency and expression in a free space, with no formal organisation (Osterreith 1997). Of importance is an embodied movement through the landscape: dancing, walking, performing, creating, working or organising (actively participating).

Active participation was also encouraged within the historic house. The University of Plymouth, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, was the official Creative and Cultural Partner of the festival. One of the successful outcomes of collaboration between the university and the festival was an Augmented Reality project that provided a form of experiential learning about the Lenkiewicz mural in the Round Room at Port Eliot. Showcased at the festival, this creative response in digital visualisation enacted a tool for audiences to learn more about the artist and his work if they chose to do so. Millicent Weber (2016, 2018) also writes of how the festival created agency. She refers to the interactions and discourses between literary artists and audience members as they frame their contributions and questions as a fertile site for the study of power dynamics. She notes, however, that although the audience sought affective engagement and intellectual or cultural development, this agency came with some risks. For instance, one person's comments were described as 'ill-conceived xenophobia' and created discomfort for both artists and audience, who were grappling with their own emotions in this loose public space.

The role of the artist in heritage-making

From its inception, the process of producing the Port Eliot Festival organically emerged from a network of creative practitioners. Festival director Cathy, the Countess of St Germans, writes: 'Unlike many festivals, Port Eliot is not designed by committee[;] it's created by individuals. There's no formula" (*Cornwall Today* 2016, 23). The festival website described it as: 'The original free-ranging festival of ideas, which draws an unmatchable collection of artists, musicians, writers, comedians, performers, thinkers, makers, protagonists, agitators and scribblers to one of the most beautiful corners of the country' (Festival website 2018).

The Port Eliot Festival exemplified how a heritage

Figure 5
Rogue Theatre. Source: Photo by Louise Roberts.

site can become a cultural space. The festival provided a platform for hosting a diverse range of performance acts and had the potential to increase the visibility of diverse forms of intangible cultural heritage within the United Kingdom. For example, in 2017 the Cornwall-based Rogue Theatre Company created an enchanting performance in the woodland garden. The theatre group reconnected with Cornwall's theatrical tradition of taking theatre to the people. Kent (2010) and Coleman's (2015) research outlines how the ability to draw people together is integral to Cornwall's theatre tradition and describes this ritual behaviour as being integral to the medieval theatre of *plen-an-gwary*, or in-the-round theatre. Kent further argues that mobile performance spaces bring theatre close to communities by touring village halls and community spaces – a tradition that was reinvented in Cornwall in the 1970s by Footsbarn Theatre and continues today in Cornwall's contemporary theatres like Knee High Theatre, Rogue Theatre and Golden Tree Productions.

In addition to an eclectic range of performance acts, the festival provided a creative haven for people to experiment with fashion or to learn skills. The Fashion Foundation collaboration between Cathy St Germans and Sarah Mower (fashion writer and US *Vogue*'s chief critic) created 'The Wardrobe Department' at Port Eliot. As well as bringing influential figures in fashion to the festival, Mower invited new graduates to present their collections. Louise Roberts has captured the essence of festival fashion in her photography and writes:

> *In 2016, Michael Halpern's collection made its first debut outside of Central Saint Martins, in the walled garden. Modelled by festivalgoers Octavia, Imogen, Bea, Aggie and Lulu Warren and Rosanna Falconer, Halpern's high-octane, sequinned glamour lit up Port Eliot.*

Workshops in recent years also saw Central St Martins – University of the Arts London provide life-drawing classes, or Barbara Hulanicki and Sandy Powell leading a fashion-drawing master class for children. Louise Roberts's image captures this interaction in the 'Arts School' within the walled garden. She states:

> *It also gave everyone the opportunity of drawing and connecting with some amazing people. Zandra had been modelling for them to all draw and then, after[wards,] she spent time with everyone going over his or her sketches and doing a little critique. The woman with her in this shot was overjoyed by the experience.*

Figure 6
The orangery and walled garden Wardrobe Department.
Source: Photo by Louise Roberts.

Roberts described the Wardrobe Department in the walled gardens at Port Eliot as a unique participatory way to experience fashion:

> *It creates a place where everyone can be a part of the creativity and where the fashion world is accessible and fun.*

The collaboration between creative practitioners at the festival was also viewed as a gateway for passing on skills and informing future practitioners in arts and culture. The festival's collaboration with the University of Plymouth provided students with skills and knowledge to help them build their careers in the arts and cultural heritage sector. Alan Williams describes this transdisciplinary knowledge transfer by the University's Creative Cultivator unit as follows:

> *[It] exists to nurture and support external engagement, knowledge transfer and collaborations between academia, the creative industries and wider community. The collaboration has seen [a] range of activities taking place on the University campus and in the wider community[,] including an outreach project with local schools to highlight opportunities and progression routes in, and through, the creative industries.*

Violet Wilson (2016) also writes of the collaboration with creative writing students:

> *[It is a] means to nurture and enhance ties between academia and the creative industries – no other festival in the UK has thought to bridge this gap between the humanities and the literary industry and aid the next generation of writers in their future careers.*

This section of the paper has examined the Port Eliot Festival as a process that re-creates the festive form, where creative practitioners act as a catalyst that brings people together to have fun, engendering an emotional 'heritage' space. It has embraced heritage as a felt expression – a living, multisensory, embodied performance of meaning-making linked to creative practice. An important aspect of this performance of heritage in a public space is that it is a mode of communicating that involves agency and expression in a free space. Within the festive space, the body is not contained. Instead, 'heritage' becomes a cultural process – lively, fleshy, emotive and open-ended (Thrift and Dewsbury 2000). Through the more embodied, immersive experience of the Port Eliot Festival, the historic site then becomes a participatory process between the audience, creative practitioners and dominant stakeholders (festival organisers and sponsors).

Intangible cultural heritage, performativity and empowerment

In this section of the paper, the Port Eliot Festival is explored as a performative space. When the festival is examined in relation to Judith Butler's (1993) concept of performativity, the heritage site becomes a space for praxis and activism as artists increased the visibility of Cornwall's intangible cultural heritage, and specifically of its minority language. In doing so, the artists empowered voices that may have been omitted or sidelined (after Mouffe 2008). In 2014, the Cornish were recognised by the Council of Europe as a National Minority. This recognition placed them alongside the wider Celtic 'family' of Ireland, Scotland, Wales and Brittany and their diasporas. Cornwall acquired a Celtic identity in the Iron Age, one that Payton (2004) suggests set it apart geophysically. This created a distinct cultural zone, essentially Celtic in character, that was labelled as 'Cornish' and included a distinctive badge, a Celtic language of the Brythonic group, which reinforced this Cornish identity. During the Port Eliot Festival, several artists performed their connections with a Celtic heritage (including Cornish) and provided increased visibility of their ICH. For example, 'Gwenno', a musician and singer from Wales with Cornish family connections, performed at the festival in 2018. In interviews, she explores transcultural connections and language as an important part of her heritage and its continuity. Gwenno learned the language from her Cornish father and decided to record the album *Le Kov*, meaning 'The Place of Memory', entirely in Cornish. She outlined why the performance was important:

> *This album is a combination of accepting the culture which your parents have valued enough to want to pass on to you, regardless [of] how small, and utilizing it in a positive way to try and make sense of the world around you[. It's] also about having to accept and respect the nuances that make us all different and discovering that all of our stories share the same truth.*

In addition, Gwenno highlighted the lack of recognition

of, and support for the Cornish language:

> *The thing that I find really interesting about the Cornish language is that many people don't know that it exists because it doesn't get the coverage … Cornwall is a very small place[. It] doesn't get much funding [or] much government support.*

The artist has a 'passion for the survival of the Cornish language' and felt a sense of duty to make her album entirely in Cornish in order to create a document of a living minority language (Interview, BBC, October 2019). 'There are endless creative possibilities of a tongue that has a very small surviving artistic output, despite having been around for at least fifteen centuries.' The 'publicness' of this festival was an important aspect of this subversion. Gwenno's performance of *Le Kov* at the Port Eliot Festival increased the visibility and awareness of the Cornish language but also connected the album with wider societal debates on democratisation through its embrace and celebration of cultural diversity at a time when the United Kingdom is becoming insular. Through her performance at the Port Eliot Festival, Gwenno gave voice to a minority that was once silenced within official and historical processes. The artist-led performative heritage, which aimed to create a loose space that allowed room for diversity and subversion included expression of Cornish ICH and increased its visibility. The performance of heritage in a public space draws on Mouffe's research into how artists can 'question the dominant hegemony and challenge norms and social order' (2008, 12). The performativity at the festival also reflected Foucault's concept of heterotopia, where value lies in creating multiple transformational spaces (Quinn and Wilks 2017). Foucault (1986) refers to heterotopic sites within cultures as 'counter-sites' that simultaneously offer space for contestation and for representation. Turner (1982), in looking at the liminality of ritual practice, also describes such sites as alternative, more liberated and inclusive ways to be social as humans. Both concepts – of liminality and counter-sites – help us to understand how festive modes of behaviour (ancient, revived and new) offer subversion of the social order, and of how creative practice can create space for negotiation. This is along a continuum from everyday subversion to calls for longer-term praxis and social justice.

From the case study, the expression of a Celtic identity and its recognition appeared important both as a personal, active expression of self, but also as being integral to Cornish culture. Musicians like the Cornish band Black Friday, from the village of St Germans, also performed at the Port Eliot Festival. The band is an example of Cornish culture bearers who have fused their Celtic ICH, rooted in Cornish and Irish identity, into a contemporary sound. They described their music as '[h]igh-energy homebrew folk-punk and Celtic tunes' and influenced by their Irish and Cornish roots and their folk heroes (Black Friday 2019).

The band also performs Celtic green-grass, folk and country music as Tom O'Reilly and The Swaggers.

> *[We] weave memory and lore, striking colourful impressions of the verdant Cornish landscape, its surrounding sea and the haunts of both its living and dead.* (Tom O'Reilly and The Swaggers 2019)

The performance of Cornish music through these cultural tools at the festival made Cornwall's ICH more visible to a wider audience. However, the musicians' performances can also be seen as the expression of a personal need to continue and foster an ongoing relationship with their heritage. Performance of heritage in public is about (re)claiming space (Ashley 2016). Ashley outlines how alternative spaces express diverse meanings of culture, where different histories and identities are affectively situated through performances and narrative. Public expression provides a layered vision of heritage, she argues, not only of pedagogical expressions of history or tradition, but also as active statements used to assert demands for recognition and legitimation. This is seen as an important way for marginalised citizens to express resistance and reclaim public spaces. The intersection between heritage and creativity is rooted in performativity (Butler 1993), where the body is active, not passive, creating a site of negotiation and challenging everyday norms. Heritage performance can be seen as a conscious lens, mapping connections between the embodiment of festive form and social action.

David Guss maintains that cultural performances are 'recognised as sites of social action where identities and relations are continually reconfigured' (2001, 12). This alternative space can be seen as allowing negotiation of identity, plurality, and being heard or valued as part of a democratic process of producing self (Ashley and Frank 2016). People have a personal relationship with something connected to the past that fills a need in the present day. This is a very personal way of doing heritage as a sense

of inheritance that creates memories or a personal signification and value. In respect of the Port Eliot Festival, the stakeholders who participated in this heritage process included those who participated either actively (as organiser, performer, volunteer or creator) or passively (as a member of a live or film-mediated audience). Some of these participants performed their heritage as musicians, and this included expression as a Cornish Celt.

In this way, performance studies can be used as a means of analysis of cultural heritage, where the life of culture is seen in action as an unfolding process that Goffman (1959) terms 'dramaturgy'. Edith and Victor Turner (2016) theorise the socio-cultural practice of performance as dramatic episodes that vividly manifest the key values of a specific culture. They point out that these episodes are not a flat narrative but are richly contextualised and charged with meaning. Narratives around identity are often (re) constituted through performance and, in this case study, the performance of Cornish ICH was evident within the festive space.

Final thoughts: Port Eliot Festival as both an empowering and disempowering space

Throughout this paper, the focus has been on how festive spaces create a gateway for empowerment and agency (Buchanan 2022) – self-expression, a loose space, performing identities and activism. Adopting the paradigm of 'heritage from below' (Robertson 2012), this looseness and personal agency is integral to the festive event. However, when explored through a critical heritage lens with a deeper analysis of power and agency, we may view some contemporary festive events, such as the Port Eliot Festival, as being potentially disempowering. For example, there were emerging elements of elitism (Hodgkinson 2015), which reduced access for various members of the community. Some long-standing traders were lost, as the festival fees, tickets and food prices, increased after sponsors such as Fortnum & Mason appeared.

In light of the recent ratification by the United Kingdom of the 2003 UNESCO Convention, there may be ongoing discussions on whether some contemporary festivals such as Port Eliot should be recognised as a form of intangible cultural heritage. As was touched on earlier in this paper, UNESCO views intangible cultural heritage as traditional, contemporary and living. Arguably, recognition of contemporary festivals in the United Kingdom has

Figure 7
Performance of ICH at Port Eliot Festival. Source: Photo by Louise Roberts.

benefits. For example, the Belfast Mela is a new festival that increases the visibility of the plurality of ICH in the UK. In addition, during the UK Government public consultation in 2023, DCMS outlined that intangible cultural heritage can be from any time. 'We therefore do not place a historical start point or minimum 'age' for any item to be included in the inventory'. In connection to social practices (festive events and other celebrations) this opens a gateway for recognition of revived ancient ICH, as well as present, new and migrant ICH, thus acknowledging the dynamic evolving nature of ICH.

We do need, however, to be cautious and to ask critically: Who are these 'communities' that are nominating their ICH? Why are these events being revived or mobilised? Some academics have highlighted how festivals can become disempowering. When they become part of an Authorised Heritage Discourse (Smith 2006), chosen by professionals who are aligned to culture and heritage policy, they may appear to be inclusive but may in fact be exclusionary and embody a process of 'othering' (Clopot and McCullagh 2022). Participation may be viewed simplistically as active or passive (as described above), but then we have the interplay of universal human rights balanced with respect for cultural rights. Who comprises 'the community', and who gets to participate; and how 'the community' is effectively included in official heritage processes, remains a huge area of debate and is beyond the scope of this paper. Within this challenging dynamic terrain of ICH, conflict can arise.

One other area of increasing complexity is the consequences of combining ICH and sustainable

development (SD) in policy-based processes and the interface with on-the-ground practices. UNESCO's ICH Operative Directives (2016) outline that ICH is a 'strategic resource to enable Sustainable Development' and a 'powerful force for inclusive and equitable economic development'. The Operative Directives guide state parties to the 2003 Convention, promoting this link between ICH and SD (Bortolotto and Skounti 2024) and hence safeguarding ICH (Smeets, 2024). This is aligned to the wider 2030 agenda on sustainable development guidelines (SDG)s. In addition, culture is now recognised as further cementing ICH as a contributor to SDGs. However, the linking of ICH and SD in policy as a strategic 'good' can have consequences. Research already links ICH to economic growth, which raises the risk of misappropriation ((Ubertazzi 2024) and the difficult balancing act of managing risks of over-commodification by empowering local groups and ensuring that local benefits are key. An illustration of this is the Gangneung Danoje Festival (Saeji 2019). The festival through tourism contributes to local economic benefits, however risks of disempowerment from loss of ownership are negated as decision-making remains within the local festival organisers (tradition bearers). Festivals can provide sustainable urban development and an integrative site for both intangible and tangible heritage (Perry, Ager and Sitas 2019). In the case of the Port Eliot Festival, although it illustrates an 'integrative site' and a dynamic space of cultural expression and performance of ICH, it was a rural rather than an urban site, and there were questions over its sustainability. Due to changes in circumstances, it was not sustainable and ceased to be held in 2019. As outlined previously, the festival was spearheaded and managed by the family in an unstructured process. While this provided a wonderful creative space, when the Earl of St Germans died, the countess (director of the festival) left Port Eliot and the death of the creative designer, Michael Howells, saw the festival close. The new festivals at Port Eliot are owned and managed by external agents.

During its lifetime, the Port Eliot Festival was an important source of sustainable development, providing social interaction, wellbeing and an expression of intangible heritage. This echoes research on Hong Kong's festivals, which elicit strong affective responses as well as exhibiting traditional culture (Richards and King 2021). The Port Eliot Festival also benefited the local economy; for example, it contributed to village charities and groups while also earning income for the organisers. Some of the economic benefits, however, were only felt outside of Cornwall, when on-site accommodation or 'glamping' providers, traders and event organisers were not from within the county. The festival contributed to a positive regional cultural value by bringing attention to Cornwall as being creative and innovative (Cornwall Council 2016). This emphasis on socio-cultural value has seen an increasing number of creativity- and heritage-based initiatives within Cornwall (Cornwall Council 2021–2025) and throughout the United Kingdom (Heritage Alliance 2019). In the future, as the United Kingdom implements the UNESCO 2003 Convention, the government, during its public consultation, explored 'contemporary' festivals and some of them may be placed on the UK-wide ICH inventory. As yet, there is no guidance or publication from the DCMS on how they will connect 'contemporary' and ICH. I would argue that whatever ensues, it is important to encourage an approach that is bottom-up, holistic and rights-based, and which centres on the community as decision-makers and on local benefits. The outcome will hopefully balance inclusion or participation with respect and support for the community of practitioners in sustaining their heritage.

Conclusion

Heritage sites do function as public spaces for expressing the diverse meanings of culture, where different identities can be affectively situated through performances. The Port Eliot Festival has been explored as such a public space – a crucible for creativity that not only temporarily subverted the everyday but also created room for self-expression and celebrated personal emotional connections to a heritage site. In this context, 'heritage' is not viewed as static but rather as a reflexive cultural process where values and symbolic meanings are seen in action – a loose, dynamic, expressive space. This temporality challenges the assumption that the value of heritage is immutable and fixed; what is important emerges through creativity and experience (Jones and Leech 2016). The case study demonstrated how a heritage site is transformed through creative practice, and that within these public heritage spaces, people can come together, subvert everyday life and, in some aspects, create a gateway for praxis. For example, the artist Gwenno increased awareness of the Cornish, a national minority, and of their ICH. The publicness of these festive events was an important aspect. Artists have an important role in creating this cultural space by acting as a gateway for empowerment and agency. This reflects Mouffe's (2008) work connecting artistic practice to questioning hegemony

and empowering voices that may have been omitted or sidelined.

The paper highlighted that an exploration of ICH needs theory specific to heritage to be merged with paradigms from other disciplines – in particular, performance theory. Critically analysing heritage through a performance and creativity lens calls attention to the messiness and complexity of heritage processes and offers alternatives to the dominant understanding of heritage as being static and expert-led. While there has been a welcome shift in heritage research and practice to recognise personal and emotional heritage (Smith 2021), there are ongoing issues. The intangible should centre on personal agency; however, official heritage remains a top-down, expert-led process and can lead to misrecognition of intangible heritage (Smith and Campbell 2018). Furthermore, the intrinsic nature of emotions as non-static challenges the neat formulation of emotional work expressed in museum and heritage site narratives, which remain unequivocal and safe (Wetherall, Smith and Campbell 2018). The case study offered an example of how other areas of intangible heritage within heritage sites can offer other ways of 'doing' heritage that celebrate a multisensory, personal-embodied performance of meaning-making – one that is intrinsically a performative loose heritage process. When heritage is explored in relation to the concept of performativity, this not only provides a vehicle for understanding those who are marginalised outside an Authorised Heritage Discourse, (Smith, 2006) but recognises people as active agents in producing heritage. The performative nature of the Port Eliot Festival provided an unstructured heritage-making process that centred on the intangible – expression of self – but also created space for increasing visibility of ICH, thereby creating a shift from a heritage site to a cultural space.

REFERENCES

- Adams, Ruth. 2013. 'The V&A: the destruction of the country house and the creation of "English heritage"'. *Museum & society* 11, no. 1: 1–18.
- Ahmed, Sara. 2010. 'Happy objects'. In *The Affect Theory reader*. edited by Melissa Greg and Gregory J. Seigworth, 29–51. Durham, UK: Duke University Press.
- Ashley, S. L. T. 2016. 'Re-colonizing spaces of memorializing: the case of the Chattri Indian Memorial, UK'. *Organization* 23, no. 1: 29–46.
- Ashley, S. L. T., and Sybille Frank. 2016. 'Introduction: heritage-outside-in'. *International journal of heritage studies* 22 no. 7: 501–503. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2016.1184704.
- Ashley, S. L.T., and Degna Stone. 2023. *Whose heritage? Challenging race and identity in Stuart Hall's post-nation Britain.* London: Routledge.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1984. *Rabelais and his world.* Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- BBC. 2019. *Port Eliot: evolution of the 'Elephant Fayre' festival*. https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-cornwall-49074564.
- Barczewiski, Stephanie. 2014. *Country houses and the British empire 1700-1930.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Bortolotto, Chiara, and Ahmed Skounti. 2024. 'The rise of sustainable development in the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage'. In *Intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development: inside a UNESCO Convention.* Edited by Chiara Borlotto and Ahmed Skounti, 1–16. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Buchanan, Jo. 2022. 'Cornwall's festivals: a space for festivity, subversion and empowerment'. *Journal of festival culture inquiry and analysis* 1, no. 1: 36–51.
- Butler, Judith. 1993. *Bodies that matter: on the discourse limits of 'sex'.* London: Routledge.
- Clopot, Christina, and Catherine McCullagh. 2020. 'The construction of belonging and otherness in events'. In *Heritage and festivals in Europe: performing identities.* Edited by Ullrich Kockel, Christina Clopot, Biaba Tjarve and Maired Nic Craith, 47–62. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Cohen, Abner. 1993. *Masquerade politics: explorations in the structure of urban cultural movements.* Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press
- Coleman, William. 2015. *Plen an gwari – the playing places of Cornwall,* Redruth; Golden Tree Productions.
- Cornwall Council. 2016. *Culture white paper.* https://planforfalmouth.info/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/white-paper-for-culture-2016_web_aug2016.pdf.
- Cornwall Council. 2022–2025. *Creative manifesto.* https://www.cornwall.gov.uk/media/smsdab24/final-version-cornwalls-creative-manifesto-2021-2025-easy-read.pdf.
- DCMS. 2023. 'Consultation on the 2003 Convention for Safeguarding the Intangible Cultural Heritage'. https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/2003-unesco-convention-for-the-safeguarding-of-the-intangible-cultural-heritage/consultation-on-the-2003-unesco-convention-for-safeguarding-of-the-intangible-cultural-heritage.
- Foucault, Michel and Jay Miskowiec.1986. 'Of other spaces', *Diacritics*, 16, no. 1: 22-27.
- Fowler, Corinne. 2020. *Our green and unpleasant land.* Leeds: Peepal Tree Press:
- Fowler, Corinne. 2024. *Our island stories, country walks through colonial Britain. A*llen Lane: London
- Franck, Karen, and Quentin Stevens. 2007. *Loose space: possibility and diversity in urban life*. London: Routledge.
- Getz, Donald. 2010. 'The nature and scope of festival studies, *International journal of event management research,* 5, no.1: 1-21.
- Guss, David. 2001. *The festive state: race, ethnicity and nationalism as cultural performance.* Berkeley, CA, and London: University of California Press.
- Goff, Moira. 2007. *The incomparable Hester Santlow: a dancer–actress on the Georgian stage*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- 'Gwenno'. 2018. Interview with Gwenno Saunders: launch of 'Le Kov' album. http://www.itv.com/news/2018-08-02/singer-gwenno-saunders-launches-cornish-language-album/.
- Hall, Stuart. 1999. 'Whose heritage? unsettling "the heritage": Re-imagining the post-nation', in *The heritage reader.* Edited by Graham, Fairclough, Rodney Harrison, John Jameson and John Schofield. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Harrison, Rodney. 2013. *Heritage: critical approaches. London*: Routledge.
- Heritage Alliance. 2019. *Inspiring creativity, heritage and the creative industries.* https://www.theheritagealliance.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/InspiringCreativity_THAreport.pdf.

- Hodgkinson, William. 2015. 'Port Eliot Festival at St Germans, Cornwall'. *The Times.* https://www.thetimes.com/article/port-eliot-festival-at-st-germans-cornwall-d78nx6qg8c.
- ICOMOS. 2025. *The ICOMOS International charter and guidance on sites with intangible cultural heritage.* https://publ.icomos.org/publicomos/jlbSai?html=Bur&base=technica&ref=43849&file=2463.pdf&path=ICICH%20Charter%20EN-FR_final.pdf.
- Jepson, Allan S., and Trudie Walters. 2021. *Events and wellbeing.* Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Jones, Sian, and Steven Leech. 2016. 'Valuing the historic environment: a critical review of existing approaches to social value'. *AHRC cultural value report.* https://www.escholar.manchester.ac.uk/api/datastream?publicationPid=uk-ac-man-scw:281849&datastreamId=FULL-TEXT.PDF.
- Kent, Allan. 2010. *The theatre of Cornwall: space, place and performance,* Bristol: West Cliffe Books.
- Kent, Allan. 2018. *The festivals of Cornwall: ritual, revival and reinvention.* Bristol, UK: Redcliffe Press.
- Landry, Charles. 1995. *The social impact of the arts: A discussion document.* Stroud: Comedia.
- Long, Paul, Sarah Baker, Lauren Istvandity and Jez Collins. 2017. 'A labour of love: the affective archives of popular music culture'. *Archives and records* 38, no. 1: 61–79.
- Monk, Claire. 2012. *Heritage film and contemporary audiences.* Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.
- Mouffe, Chantal. 2008. 'Art and democracy: art as an agnostic intervention in public space'. In *Art as a public issue: how art and its institutions reinvent the public dimension.* Edited by Leisbeth Melis and Jorinde Seijdel, 25–37. Rotterdam and Amsterdam: NAI Publishers.
- Muzaini, Hamzah, and Claudio Minca. 2018. 'Rethinking heritage, but "from below"'. In *After heritage: critical perspectives and heritage-from-below.* Edited by Hamzah Muzaini and Claudio Minca, 1–22. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Nic Craith, Mairead, Ullrich Kockel and Katherine Lloyd. 2019. 'ICHC: absentees, objections and assertions'. In *Safeguarding intangible heritage.* Edited by Natsuko Akagawa and Laurajane Smith, 155–173. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Nicolescu, Basareb. 2006. 'Transdisciplinarity: past, present and future'. https://www.tercercongresomundialtransdisciplinariedad.mx/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Transdisciplinarity-past-present-and-future.pdf.
- Oldenburg, Ray. 1989. *The great good place.* New York: Paragon House.
- Osterreith, Alan. 1997. 'Pilgrimage, travel and existential quest', in *Sacred places, sacred spaces: the geography of pilgrimages.* Edited by Robert Stoddard and Alan Morinis. Louisiana: Lousiana State University Baton Rouge LA Geoscience Publications:
- Payton, Philip. 2004. *Cornwall: a history.* Fowey: Cornwall Edition Limited.
- Perry, Beth, L. Ager and R. Sitas. 2019. 'Cultural heritage entanglements: festivals as integrative sites for sustainable development'. *International journal of heritage studies* 26, no. 6: 603–618. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2019.1578987.
- Questionnaire. 2019. Port Eliot Festival. https://porteliotfestival.com/you-spoke-we-listened/.
- Quinn, Bernadette, and Linda Wilks. 2017. 'Festival heterotopias: spatial and temporal transformations in two small-scale settlements'. *Journal of rural studies* 53: 35–44.
- Quinn, Bernadette, and Linda Wilks, 2013. 'Festival connections: people, place and social capital' in *Exploring the social impacts of events.* Edited by Greg Richards, Marisa de Brito and Linda Wilks. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Richards, Greg, and Brian King. 2021. 'The experience of cultural festivals: evidence from Hong Kong'. *Journal of policy research in tourism, leisure and events* 14, no. 3: 296–309. https://doi.org/10.1080/19407963.2022.2033249.
- Robertson, Iain, J. 2012. *Heritage from below,* London: Routledge.
- Saeji, C. B. T. 2019. 'Replacing faith in spirits with faith in heritage: a story of the management of the Gangneung Danoje Festival'. In *Safeguarding intangible heritage.* Edited by Natsuko Akagawa and Laurajane Smith, 155–173. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Smeets, Rieks. 2024. 'The reorientation of a Convention: UNESCO, intangible heritage, and sustainable development'. In *Intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development: inside a UNESCO Convention.* Edited by Chiara Borlotto and Ahmed Skounti, 36–54. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Smith, Laurajane. 2021. *Emotional heritage: visitor engagement at museums and heritage sites.* London and New York: Routledge.
- Smith, Laurajane, and Garry Campbell. 2018. 'The tautology of intangible values and the misrecognition of intangible cultural heritage'. https://www.academia.edu/35563575/The_tautology_of_Intangible_values_and_the_misrecognition_of_intangible_cultural_heritage.

- Smith, Laurajane. 2006. *The uses of heritage.* Abingdon: Routledge.
- Thrift, Nigel. 2008. *Non-representational theory: space, politics and affect.* Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Turner, Victor. 2008. *The ritual process: structure and anti-structure.* Chicago: Alline Publishing.
- Thrift, Nigel and John, D. Dewsbury. 2000. 'Dead geographies and how to make them live', *Environment and planning: society and space*, no. 18: 411-432.
- Turner, Victor. 1982. *From ritual to theatre: the seriousness of human play.* New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.
- Turner, Victor. 2016. 'Liminality and communitas'. In *The performance studies reader*. Edited by Henry Bial and Sarah Brady, 97–105. London and New York: Routledge.
- Turner, Victor, and Edith Turner. 2016. 'Performing ethnography'. In *The performance studies reader.* Edited by Henry Bial and Sara Brady, 25–50. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Ubertazzi, Benedetta. 2024. 'Misappropriation, intellectual property, and ethics'. In *Intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development: inside a UNESCO Convention.* Edited by Chiara Borlotto and Ahmed Skounti, 89–105. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- UK Government. 2024. 'Scrutiny of international agreement UNESCO Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage'. *International Agreements Committee 5th Report of Session 2023–2024.* London: House of Lords.
- UNESCO. 2003. *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.* https://ich.unesco.org/en/intangible-heritage-domains-00052.
- UNESCO. 2016. Operating Directives 170, 173 and 176. https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ICH-Operational_Directives-10.GA_EN.pdf.
- UNESCO. 2024. *Basic texts of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.* Living Heritage Entity Culture Sector, UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2025) What is intangible cultural heritage. https://ich.unesco.org/en/what-is-intangible-heritage-00003.
- Walters, Trudie, and Stewart Allan Jepson. 2019. *Marginalisation and events.* Abingdon: Routledge.
- Waterton, Emma. 2010. *Politics, policy and the discourses of heritage in Britain.* London: Routledge.
- Weber, Millicent. 2016. *Audience in the spotlight: investigating literary festival engagement.* Clayton, Vic: Monash University Publishing.
- Weber, Millicent. 2018. *Literary festivals and contemporary book culture.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wetherall, Margaret, Laurajane Smith and Garry Campbell. 2018. *Emotion, affective practices and the past in the present.* London: Routledge.
- Wilson, Violet. 2016. *The Port Eliot Festival.* Norman, OK: World Literature Today.