

## **‘They have different ways of doing things’<sup>1</sup> Cemeteries, diversity and municipal spirituality**

Keywords: cemeteries: multiculturalism: identity

Dr Katie McClymont<sup>1</sup>

### *Abstract*

*Cemeteries offer a unique window into questions of multiculturalism in contemporary European cities; and a unique set of problems for planners to deal with. As the second largest type of urban greenspace, cemeteries form an important if forgotten aspect of most cities. However, as places of bodily disposal and remembrance, as well as (potentially) recreation and biodiversity, they present different challenges for planning than those of other green infrastructure, especially in the context of a multifaith population.*

*This paper draws on research from cemeteries in the UK which questions their role in presenting and promoting local identity, and accommodating multifaith and multicultural practices. This reveals different understandings of group and individual identities- between those seen as ‘indigenous’ or ‘immigrant’ with assumptions of homogenous wishes for members of the latter category- demonstrating the ongoing power of ideas of ethnic or religious difference - or deviance from an imagined ‘norm’.*

*The paper goes on to suggest that a more nuanced understanding of cultural and religious difference can not only provide more appropriate places of remembrance for everyone, but also demonstrate the importance of a different type of sacred space. This is defined in the idea of municipal spirituality: places which demonstrate and allow access to non- instrumental, or transcendental values without being part of, or ‘owned’ by any organised religion. This is not only important in the planning of new cemeteries, but in reasserting the value of other places which can also fulfil this purpose.*

Keywords: cemeteries, place attachment, multiculturalism,

### **1. Introduction**

Cemeteries, and ‘deathscapes’ (Maddrell & Sidaway, 2010) more widely (all places of death and remembrance), express something intrinsic about the meaning of existence, the beliefs, hopes and emotions of both individuals, families, communities and wider society (Kellahear, 2007). Moreover, public cemeteries, although sharing many characteristics with other ‘deathscapes’, hold a unique position in as much as they aim to serve the entire local population regardless of faith. They are simultaneously public open space with all the attendant issues of (in)appropriate behaviour that this engenders (Deering, 2010). They are places where fundamental beliefs about existence and meaning can be simultaneously expressed and practiced in divergent ways. They function as ‘a cultural text about society and the individuals that have found their last place of rest in its burial lots’ (Reims, 1999, p150) and by their nature, multi/non-faith cemeteries provide a public record of the deceased inhabitants of that place, become a physical representation of the changing cultures who live and die within that city.

However, the meaning and interpretation of this space by and for diverse groups is not readily accessible. This is especially the case in relation to their role in facilitating ‘continuing bonds’ between the dead and living (Maddrell, 2009a, 2013). Cemeteries, and other ‘deathscapes’, can be the

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Geography and Environmental Management (University of the West of England, Bristol, UK)  
katie.mcclymont@uwe.ac.uk

physical location of relationships between bereaved people and their deceased friend or relative. As such, they are important in the maintenance and expression of identity, of both the living and the dead. They mediate representations of personal, group and civic identity. As built form, they are part of the public representation of collective memory, or the landscapes which influences our ability to make sense of our own lives (Hayden, 1997). This complex role as a material repository for memory has implications for the public memory of the city: ‘public memorial practices, monuments, and other highly symbolic markers inscribe meaning on space’ place’ (Graham & Whelan, 2007, p488, see also Burk, 2003). Place and identity are entwined in a complex symbiosis. Within these physical and psychological battle grounds the way diverse groups are constructed and dealt with by the state are negotiated. The physical manifestation of identity are played out within dominant power structures, with certain groups being more able to claim somewhere as theirs, or as part of their story: ‘particular narratives will always be privileged in attaching memory to place’(Graham & Whelan, 2007, p488).

This paper presents research into contemporary UK cemeteries which begins to unveil divergent conceptions about place attachment and memorial practice between those who are seen as ethnic or religious ‘others’, versus the majority ‘indigenous’ population. To do this, the paper draws on interviews with cemetery managers, and extensive visual data of the cemeteries in the same cities.

## 2. Research Background

This research engages with the current discussion within academic literature around cemeteries, place attachment, and about multicultural and national identity. It raises issues which frame the consideration of cemeteries’ role in multicultural cities.

### 2.1 Cemeteries in the city

This section will outline the ideas and issues relevant in discussions of cemeteries and place identity, and public history. It is now a well-rehearsed argument (Massey, 2005) that places and spaces are not static backdrops to be filled with meaning by actors or by a notion of culture which can be separate from the place in which it happens; “space, like other commodities, is *itself actively produced*”(Merrifield, 2006, p105, p107 emphasis in original). More specifically, the paper begins with a discussion about the role and purpose of cemeteries, and what the implications of this are for thinking about multicultural cities: or how the production of cemetery space represents and creates the society within which it is found.

Contemporary cemeteries simultaneously play both a public and private role in society, however their exact status is less clear now than in previous decades. Established in the eighteenth century are a ‘proper place of death’, cemeteries were seen as a hygienic alternative to overcrowded churchyards. Moreover, their expansive green landscapes were seen as offering recreational spaces to a wider population than the deceased and their families, and also playing a symbolic role as public landscape (Rugg, 2006). Since their inception in the eighteenth century, their status as a ‘proper place of death’ has become eroded. These different aspects of cemetery space place competing demands on the same site, only added to by the increasing diversity of cities, and the attendant range of diverse faith based requirements these contain. Francis et al (2005) see potential issues with the cemetery’s role as green space, seeing parks as active places, but cemeteries, particularly referring to Abney park cemetery in London as places of tranquillity and *inaction*. This issue will be discussed further with reference to the notion of municipal spirituality, or the role cemeteries could play in offering inclusive, spiritual spaces.

This ongoing tension between cemeteries as a place of public promenade, and private reflection, coupled with a shift away from burial and towards cremation further confuses their spatial significance. As Rugg (2006) argues, “after World War II, cemeteries had begun to lose their importance as a communal context in which grief could be framed” (p225). The notion that cemeteries have been losing their shared meaning in the post war period also has implications for memorialisation of other parts of the city. Partly due the loosening ties of religion and societal convention, and partly due to changes in technology, Kellacher and Worpole (2010) argue that there is

“increasing temporal and spatial separation of the forms of bodily disposal and rituals associated with the commemoration of the deceased” (p161). This implies that as the context for grief and mourning has become more personal or individualised, the shared space of the cemetery in the city no longer holds shared meaning amongst its citizens. The diversification of faith and cultural practices will play a part in this, however, they are not explicitly considered within this literature. This loss of shared meaning has implications for both how practices within the cemetery can be deemed legitimate or not and its overall role in the city.

This notion of (il)legitimate behaviour is especially visible in the debates about (in)appropriate memorialisation. As has been well documented in both academic literature and the popular press, the ways in which graves and other memorials in cemeteries are marked has caused recent controversy. Issues around what sorts of items are suitable to be left on graves or trees, as well as inferring assumptions about good taste, also relate to ideas of what is legitimate in a space which is neither exclusively public nor private. Woodthorpe argues ‘there are powerful normalising discourses in the cemetery about what constitutes ‘fitting’ memorialising activity’ (2010, p131). This in turn has implications for practices which are deemed as outside the UK cultural norm: practices pertaining to ‘other’ faiths and traditions. Further, “memorialisation can be interpreted as a form of mourning activity that can be subjected to scrutiny” (Woodthorpe, 2010, p123). It is something which can be observed, and from these observations judgements can be made about what sort of practice this is. This raises the question of who is doing the judging, and how personal memorialisation interacts with public policy or civic and national ideology. Cemeteries and other public memorials are placed within their wider context, and contribute to the politics and meaning of this context. Looking at mourning practice therefore investigates more than just cemetery aesthetics. As Graham & Whelan argue, ‘individual and collective identities are inflected by conflicting ethnonationalist ideologies that entwine private grief with memorial practices sited in public space’ (2007, p478). This is vital when considering the role of cemeteries as part of the public memory of multicultural cities. The methodological implications of this are discussed in greater depth later in the paper.

These issues raise further questions about the role of the cemetery in the city: what is their role when cities are no longer so unitarily ordered, and places take on multiple individualised, personalised or privatised meanings? This links to concerns about public management of multicultural identities and ‘alternative’ spiritualities. Further, what legitimacy do civic authorities have in deeming behaviour as appropriate or inappropriate? Despite these concerns and questions about their civic function, ‘each and every cemetery is the most concentrated repository of mystery and secret that is available to modern, urban twenty-first century people’ (Francis et al, 2005, p215). Cemeteries, or ‘deathscapes’ more widely offer access to a sense of ‘something beyond’ the materiality of everyday life. Without being owned by of any given religion they are places for ‘expressing continuing bonds embodying and evoking an active sense of the absence-presence of the deceased in the lives of the bereaved’ (Maddrell, 2013, p510). Therefore, they are very importance, if not sacred, places to a wider range of people who may not express this attachment in the same way. It is therefore necessary to consider ideas of place attachment, and what this means in contemporary multicultural, multi-ethnic multifaith cities.

## **2.2 Place attachment and belonging**

There has been a marked increase in research around ideas of place attachment in the last ten to fifteen years, with the literature spanning geography, economics, ecology and social psychology (Lewicka, 2011, Manzo & Devine-Wright, 2014), discussing both the personal and societal implication of attachment to place, how it manifests amongst different groups and in multiple geographies and time periods, and the appropriate methods for researching the concept. Lewicka argues ‘that despite the growing number of the so called non-places...not only have places not lost their meaning but their importance in the contemporary world actually may have grown’(2011, p209) invoking the persistence of ‘dwelling’ as a key aspect of being human (Heidegger, 1962; Tuan, 1977). This is something which is echoed in the deathscapes literature, around places of continuing bonds.

Lewicka's (2011) review covers an extensive range of issues such as difference between urban and rural attachment, homogenous and heterogeneous communities, issues of scales and notions of 'home'. However, this review reveals little research into in-migrants sense of place attachment, be these people from different regions of the same nation or beyond. There is some consideration of visitors to places of high natural amenity value, and suggestions that length of residence increases place attachment, but beyond this, the topic remains largely unresearched in these specific terms.

However, issues around immigrant groups and established minority communities role in the symbolic making of the nation raise important issues for thinking about place attachment. This is considered in work about immigrant identity and hybridity (Bhabha, 1994, Hall, 1996). Hybridity is the merging or blending of an 'old' identity with a new one, based on a shift in geographic location: or migration. The concept has been criticised for assuming stability or naturalness of identity (in either old or new context) and for not seeing the temporal, cultural or political construction of these identities. However, the concept of multiple, differently rooted identities, and how these play out politically on the built form of cities, specifically within cemeteries, is important and underresearched. Importantly, 'the question is how well the immigrant sense that he or she is indeed 'home' and the extent to which he or she can shape this new home to reflect his or her own sensibilities'(Kaplan & Chacko, 2015, p129). With regard to deathscapes and memorialisation this raises importance questions around final resting places, connections with the (new) home versus bodily repatriation to country of birth or ancestry. This matters beyond the cemetery as 'places of memory act as a means to give them visibility as persons and citizens in the countries of reception' (Buciek & Juul, date p119). Cemeteries therefore hold the possibility of establishing the legitimacy of immigrant and minority ethnic groups as part of the 'host' society. However, this is a difficult and complex issue as expressed by Reims in her research into Swedish cemeteries and immigrant graves:

'Because Swedish identity is the norm at a Swedish cemetery it does not need to be enhanced. Symbols and customs have to deviate from the norm, thereby creating a boundary against the majority in order to serve as markers ad expressions of ethnic or cultural identity. However, when practices in accordance with Swedish norms are deployed on immigrant graves, *they deviate from the tradition of provenance* and consequently become significant as markers that express a far from self-evident identification with the surrounding culture '(Reims, 1999, p152, emphasis added)

This means that it is not as simple as migrant/minority groups simply assimilating to 'host' practices to become part of that nation. Their very nature as 'other' disallows this, and in turn, unsettles the meanings of the traditional indigenous practice. Moreover, these issues raise more fundamental questions about who can be part of a 'nation', and how identity is claimed or denied to different groups. This process of differentiation, or 'othering' is shaped by the legacy of colonialism and creation of a nation by a process of excluding those deemed as others (Anderson, 1983, Said, 2003 Gilroy, 1986, Young, 2000). The legacy of this ideology remains and goes beyond immigrant groups: people born in the UK, whose parents were also born in the UK are still placed into this 'other' category because of assumptions about their religion and phenotype, and how this differs from the assumed 'norm' of the nation of Britain. This leads to certain groups being reified and fixed as stable 'others' with specific needs and requirements which deny differences within that group.

As Beebeejaun (2012) clearly argues in relation to minority ethnic community engagement in planning, laudable 'efforts (for inclusive public participation) were undermined by the persistence of an older discourse of race and ethnicity which stressed the essential, natural, cultural nature of difference, and downplayed the socially constructed, contingent and contested nature of communities'(p545). Local government officials consulted with established faith or cultural group 'leaders' to try to understand the needs and wishes of these groups whose voices had been previously excluded or underrepresented. However, by establishing these groups as the spokespeople of the 'others', their position as beyond mainstream UK society is reinforced. Moreover, by establishing certain fixed groups who have specific and unchanging ways of doing things, power relations within those designated groups are reinforced, with negative implications for many, but especially women and younger people (Okin et al, 1999).

This research illustrates the ongoing impact of this orientalist thinking, and considers what it means for cemeteries as sites of public memory in diverse and multicultural cities.

### **3. Methodology- visual and verbal**

The paper has so far presented discussion of theories of identity: both place identity and perceived or imposed national identity, and the importance of these ideas for thinking about the role of the cemetery in the contemporary, multicultural city. This section outlines both the methods undertaken to investigate these issues- interviews and photographs-and considers their relevance, importance and limitations as ways of knowing about multiculturalism and (place) identity. In particular, it discusses the importance of visual methods in this research, and in researching cities more generally.

By their nature, places provide ‘an assault on all ways of knowing’(Hayden, 1997, p18), so the question of how they can be researched and represented is a perennial one in geography and related spatial disciplines. Discussion of visual, and other non-textual methods is becoming well developed within geography, anthropology and sociology (Pink, 2001, Rose, 2012Harper, 2012). This covers both the analysis of photographs as (neo-colonial) text, photographs for use as discussion points in interviews, and creative methods in which participants are asked to take photographs, often as part of wider ‘sensuous’ ways of understanding places (Johnston & Lorimer, 2013).

Photography is associated with demonstrating a ‘true reality’ of any situation and of documenting everyday life, conveying a feeling that ‘visual methods give better access to the immediate lived and felt everyday world. Hence, visual methods can help researchers to ‘come closer to lived life’ (Oldthrup & Carstensen, 2012, p226). However, this idea of photography as anything other than another produced interpretation is widely critiqued (Crang, 2010). Photographs are as situated, constructed and interpreted as any other form of research data: ‘the meaning of photographs are arbitrary and subjective; they depend on who is looking’ (Pink, 2001, p51). This does not undermine the importance of visual evidence and experience, and insurmountable difference between it and written or spoken material remains: ‘the world that is photographed, drawn or otherwise represented visually is different from the world that is represented through words and numbers’(Harper, 2012, p4).

When research multicultural identity in cemeteries, my position as a white western researcher is problematic. In looking for immigrant and minority ethnic grave markings/memorial practices, I define, and therefore reinforce these orientalist, supposed boundaries of who is an ‘insider’ and an ‘outsider’ from a position of power, both in my cultural upbringing and also my position as an academic. This may be particularly problematic in photography as the object photographed has no voice in the way interview participants do. However, the photographed object itself is represented more literally, more completely, than edited and analysed interview transcripts. However, my choice of what to photograph and present is unavoidable.

With these considerations in mind, this research consists of in-depth, semi-structured interviews with nine cemeteries managers from across England and Wales. When quoting from the interviews, the text has been anonymised with a number replacing a name/place of work. This is so that the reader can identify quotes from the same person. It also consists of photographs from the cemeteries in the same cities. The paper presents a small sample of these, and the comments and analysis are made on the basis of the wider range of images. In the following discussion about identity and exclusion, photographs are used to both support and challenge the assumptions which come out of the interview data. Although readers will interpret them in different ways depending on individual background, experiences, and interest, positioning the photographs in this way- as illustrates- position them within the argument they are there to illustrate.

#### 4. Findings

The following sections discuss how cemetery managers perceive place attachment in their sites, and how this is represented visually. Both accounts clearly demonstrate the importance of local identity in continuing bonds with the deceased. Further, the interviews with cemetery managers demonstrate their understanding of the need for culturally sensitive provision in multi-ethnic, multi-faith communities. However, these two understandings of the public diverge, and faith needs or attachments replace place ones, rather than overlap or mingle. This reinforces the notion of insiders and outsiders, those who belong, and those who are guests. Moreover, the research also indicates that matters may not be this simple. Firstly, cemetery managers observe that practice amongst ‘non-indigenous’ groups does not simply adhere to stipulated religious or cultural rules or norms. Secondly, as demonstrated by the photographic research, non-indigenous religious or cultural practices do not necessarily exclude local place attachment. These points are set out in turn below, with detailed discussion of photographs and interview data.

##### 4.1 Place attachment matters



Figure 1: Flag above graves in Blackley Cemetery, Manchester; Scarves on memorial bench in Allerton Cemetery, Liverpool; Wales flags on graves in Thornhill Cemetery, Cardiff

Visually, cemeteries demonstrate that place matters. Within the cemeteries photographed in this research, place of origin or residence of the deceased what frequently inscribed on gravestones and memorial plaques (See also Maddrell, 2009b) or grave markers (flags, balloon, trinkets, scarves) express locally based identity. Figure 1 further illustrates this.

All interviewees mentioned both local attachment to cemeteries and different (minority) religious/immigrant groups. There was a strong view, across all cities, that local residents remained closely attached to their local cemetery, rather than happy to use any within the city that offered space, better financial value or any extra facilities. A sense of shared belonging in local identity was expressed in statements such as ‘they’re disappointed that they haven’t still got their local cemetery’ (Cemetery manager 1), and ‘its almost a tribal thing where they’re linked to that particular cemetery’(Cemetery manager 2) emphasising a collective being (they), when referring to the difficulties seen in some cities with getting people to accept new sites. This sense of neighbourhood identity was so much so that it was often cited as influencing disposal choices: ‘families that are local there, would even consider cremation...rather than be buried at (other cemetery on other side of the city)( Cemetery manager 3). Managers stated that they either provided space, or planned to provide space, for the scattering of ashes and memorial plaques in cemeteries which were otherwise full, for residents of that neighbourhood or local community. This sense of local attachment often went beyond a desire to be buried/memorialised near to living loved ones, as many managers stated that a sense of local identity was so strong that people often wanted to be buried back in cemeteries which are close to their ‘original’ home, despite where they may have resided at the time of death. This

further suggests that there are ‘continuing bonds’ with place as well as with people, and that place identity is fundamentally intertwined with individuals’ sense of their self, that place is part of the ‘sacred quality...associated with a sense of ‘continuing bonds’ (Maddrell, 2009b, p36).

#### 4.2 A different sort of attachment?

Issues surrounding cemetery provision for multicultural, or more frequently, multi-faith communities came up in all of the interviews. Cemetery managers saw their sites as mirroring the society and cities of which they are a part, ‘we all...live...with different beliefs and denominations when we’re alive, you know, so why not when we’re dead?’ (Cemetery manager 4)



Figure 2 (clockwise from top left): Chinese war graves, Efford Cemetery, Plymouth; Grave with Sikh markings, Blackley cemetery, Manchester; Polish Roman Catholic Grave, Hollybrook Cemetery, Southampton; Belgium war graves, Southampton Old Cemetery

Figure 2 illustrates some of the different national, religious and ethnic identities visible in the cemeteries within the study. Simply by marking the death of much of a city’s population, they provide public memorials to the diversity of the city. There are important caveats about both faiths and individuals who choose not to be buried, nor to have their cremated remains marked in a public cemetery, but cemeteries physically memorialise and display a more diverse public history that any other aspect of most cities (cf Hayden, 1997). The images of Belgian and Chinese war graves illustrate a less seen war history, questioning a notion of nationhood, and national soil dominant in such narratives. Symbols of Sikhism and Roman Catholicism are evident next to graves without such notable religious markers, and are illustrative of many multi-faith areas seen and photographed across the nine cities. The images represent a small sample of the visual material evident in UK cemeteries, demonstrating their potential in telling a more diverse history of their attendant cities that dominant nationalist discourse may show.

The above images illustrate UK cemeteries as mixed multi-faith, multicultural spaces. This was backed up by the comments made in interview by all the cemetery managers. Most stated the importance of non-denominational, interfaith space in statements such as ‘I have Hebrew and Muslim and they’re next door to one another...that’s what this cemetery’s about’ (Cemetery manager 5), however, this was not always reflected in practice and interaction with community groups. Most managers stated that they had been approached by faith groups wanting to establish specific areas

within the cemetery. Responses ranged from ambivalence about whether this would cause future problems by not leaving enough space without designation, to responding positively to requests: *'if we've been approached by any particular culture that have asked us to reserve an area for them, that's something we've done, and would still be willing to do'* (Cemetery manager 3). Further, some national or cultural groups, though not creating officially designated areas within the cemetery, would be buried close to others from a similar background as *'they tend to want to be in the same sort of location'* (Cemetery manager 6). This illustrates the diverse practice in the management of cemetery space, but one which is informed by a mind-set of 'insiders' and 'outsiders'. Cemetery managers talked about the general public as 'they', but differentiated this 'they' from the seemingly established and fixed group identified given to those belonging to an 'outsider' community. This is further illustrated in the following quotes:

*'The West Indian community for example, generally the women will sing and the men will backfill the grave at the end of the service, you know, and that's something that the West Indian community often do'* (Cemetery manager 4)

*'The Polish Community tend to be right on the case in terms of maintenance, and do visit regular. Whereas some of the other faiths, you don't see people from one year to the next'* (Cemetery manager 6)

*One of the reasons the Asians come here is they can park their coaches, they can't park them at (facility in neighbouring authority)'* (Cemetery manager 2)

The way cemetery managers dealt with faith/cultural/national groups is markedly different from their discussions of members of the public not designated in this way. The importance of local identity in relation to the cemetery is not mentioned. Identity for those groups is about their religious or cultural needs rather than any continuing bonds with the local area. This is not to be critical of cemetery managers, or to suggest that they making prejudice assumptions or treating certain people in a less valued way. Judgements which divide between 'insiders' and 'outsiders' in terms of national identity are framed by dominant ideologies of the nation, which frame how public official deal with 'diverse groups' (Beebeejaun, 2004, 2012).

### 4.3 Hybrid attachments?

However, evidence from the research illustrates that this is more complicated. A number of managers noted that memorial practices did not always stick to the 'rules'; either the rules of the cemetery, as is well noted more widely in the literature (Woodthorpe, 2010) or the 'rules' of the religion. Specifically managers commented on large ostentatious headstones on Muslim graves<sup>2</sup>, when the assumed 'rule' is not to mark the plots: *'the Jewish section particularly is very strict and controlled, like the good old days of the other cemetery. The Muslim section is now, is actually starting to get away from it, they now are having western headstones, and they also have an awful lot of solar lamps'* (Cemetery manager 1). This comment which is typical of many made by cemetery managers illustrates that cultural practices are neither fixed nor bounded. Further, there are local differences rather than static religious practices which do not alter between locations, as evidenced by the range of services offered in different locations. Some authorities offered burial within twenty-four hours, including weekends,

---

<sup>2</sup> The majority of such comments were directed towards practices in the local Muslim community, rather than Jewish or other faith groups. This may be because Muslim populations were larger and more prevalent in the cities in this research than other faith/immigrant groups. Further, it may be because, at the time of writing, British Muslims were subject to a large amount of Islamophobia and hence their practices coming under sharper scrutiny by those outside the faith. It may be because Jewish burial ground and space within municipal cemeteries are more historically established and hence more taken for granted rather than problematized. It is beyond the scope, focus and findings of this research to do more than speculate on this matter, but it has been noted as both potentially important and interesting.

for religions that ‘required’ this; others did not as there was not seen as the demand for this, especially if it meant an increase in burial fees despite areas having similarly sized Muslim and Jewish populations. Despite cemetery managers working assumptions about cultural or religiously bounded identities, evidence from cemeteries suggests that this is an oversimplification. One manager commented on this, saying *‘I think we’re a bit hoodwinked...I think because we don’t really know, we tend to listen, and different parts of the community want different things, and we end up jumping through hoops in case we get it wrong! I think we deliver far over and above that they would actually deliver for themselves’* (Cemetery manager 7 *emphasis added*). This quote is revealing on two grounds. First, it acknowledges that there are difference between Muslims, and that cultural practices can be, and are, negotiated on grounds of practicality and cost. Second, despite doing this, it reinforces the idea of ‘them’ and ‘us’, as evidenced in the final part of the quote. The next section turns to the photographic data to discuss why this position is potentially inaccurate and problematic



Figure 3: Efford Cemetery, Plymouth, Hollybrook Cemetery, Southampton Gravestone, Highwood Cemetery, Nottingham

Figure 3 illustrates three examples of gravestones which demonstrate the complexity of identity and reject simplistic, discreet and fixed notions. They can be seen as examples of hybridity, but going beyond a notion of this as something which is only meaningful for ‘immigrants’. The first photograph illustrates graves of people both of SE Asian (Chinese) descent and of white British origin. It is traditional for SE Asian graves to display photographs of the deceased, but what can be noted here is this is also displayed on the white British grave, paralleling cultural interchange discussed by Reims (1999) but in this case with ‘natives/nationals’ taking on ‘immigrant’ practices, raising problematic questions about authenticity, and suggesting hybridity can be a two way concept. This seen elsewhere in the cemeteries visited. Dual, or multiple, identity- simultaneously a Jewish and British war grave, but also located in a particular place (Southampton) are can be seen in the next photograph. This suggests connection to place, country and faith/culture; tentatively indicating that these identities are not mutually exclusive. The third photograph is perplexing and hard to draw any definite conclusions from. A western/English name and inscription are below stylised Arabic characters, suggesting some sort of cultural crossover/blurring of boundaries, again problematising hybridity as a phenomena only of ‘incomers’.



Figure 4: Muslim graves, Hollybrook cemetery, Southampton, Gravestones (2), Filton Cemetery, Bristol

The photographs in Figure 4 further emphasise this point. The first, bearing an inscription partially in Arabic, and located within a Muslim section of the cemetery, point to minority faith adherence, whilst the statement ‘resident of this isle since March 1958’ indicates the importance of local place attachment. The second two gravestones in this figure express local place attachment for people born outside of the UK: ‘finding freedom, peace and final rest in Bristol’ and ‘great Hairdresser to the community’. If this was not of importance to either the deceased or their relatives, it is unlikely that it would be included on a gravestone inscription.

All the images in figure 4 suggest a greater degree of cultural flexibility and multiplicity than a simplistic notion of a majority who negotiated continuing bonds, and connect to community and meaning through their local place, and a minority who do the same only via religion or national (diasporic) identity. It further undermines claims of insiders and outsiders, based on shared national identity and values, placed in opposition to ‘foreigners’ who are constitutively different. The photographs are representative of other graves, but as stated in the methodological section, products of the research and open to interpretation. The paper suggests that these images undermine dominant discourse of nation and belonging, rather than understand the motivations or emotions of those who placed these stones. This, in turn, raises questions about the role of the cemetery in the city, as places which can firstly represent (and promote) a different understanding of local identity, and secondly offer a space which connects with spiritual or transcendental values without being owned by one designated, fixed identity. The following section explores the implications of this in greater depth.

## 5. Discussion

The paper has illustrated that cemeteries in contemporary UK cities act both as markers of national, religious and cultural diversity, and concomitantly question the meaning, fixity and interpretation of these categories of identity. Their practical and symbolic functions in the city are therefore contested. Practically, they are ‘multifunctional’ (Woodthorpe, 2011), offering space for both recreation and remembrance, and having to manage the competing interests that these different functions bring. Symbolically, as ‘cultural landscapes (they) function as significant sources for unravelling present geographies of contested political and cultural identities’ (Graham & Whelan, 2007, p477). Moreover, they are places which remain largely forgotten by UK planning (McClymont forthcoming b). This leaves them as complex, important spaces which UK planning does not deal with satisfactorily. This may be because of this complexity of meaning and function, but also because cemeteries offer access to non-instrumental values, something that planning has limited or no vocabulary for. Cemeteries offer spaces for public memory which illustrate different constructions of identity that those within dominant discourses. Simultaneously, they are places of spirituality and mystery, of connection to that which is beyond material existence (Francis, et al, 2005, Maddrell, 2013). Furthermore, public, local authority cemeteries do this outside of any established religious framework, offering spaces of ‘municipal spirituality’ (McClymont, forthcoming a). Municipal spirituality is a language which planning could use to promote and defend places such as cemeteries, which offer access to shared human values which are beyond instrumental rationality. In so doing, it would be able to promote their value as shared, diverse, tangible civic history, one which diverse identities can legitimately claim shared yet separate local place attachment.

## 6. Conclusions

Cemeteries are places where both grief and continued bonds with the dead are allowed to continue beyond the ‘legitimate’ timescales afforded by modern sociality (Maddrell, 2013.) Attachment to this space is therefore of utmost importance. Cemetery managers can see this with regards to the needs of bereaved people being their key priority. But the way they see the bereaved is still framed by neo-colonial ideas of ethnicity and difference, meaning that ethnic/religious others are given faith/cultural attachment instead of local place attachment. This leads to questions of how the cemetery operates as a material site of public memory. On the basis of the interviews, public memory is one of separateness, rather than one of shared and changing of local history. However, the photographs suggest that this is not the case: local place attachment and minority ethnic religion are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

Managers' differential views of minority and (assumed) majority groups are problematic, as it appears to suggest that minority religious faith/practice and local place attachment in the UK are non-compatible. In terms of practical considerations, there were no discussions as to whether groups or individuals from minority religious faiths would also prefer cemetery space in their immediate locality, whether local identity also was part of their notion of continuing bonds.

The importance of the cemetery, according to the managers, is different for 'immigrants' than for the indigenous local populations, and the groups are articulated as discrete entities. For the former it is about expressing a religious, and different (Reims, 1997) identity- and it is within this religious practice and tradition that continuing bonds, and all the attendant meanings described above, are expressed. For the latter, it is about expressing attachment to place and continuing bonds with the deceased- through place and local identity- what it means to be me.

Moreover, this maintenance of 'insider/outsider' as primary categories of (local) identity diminishes the role of cemeteries as public memory of whole, multi-cultural city. Instead, it still operates as finding a space for 'immigrants' positioned as guests rather than participants or citizens. These assumptions and relations have specific implications when considering cemetery *space*. Whether planning is able to rearticulate these spaces as places of shared access to different sets of values- ones which stand against the dominance of economic rationality remains to be seen, as does whether these places could challenge the neo-colonial discourses of 'otherness' in place attachment.

## 7. References

- Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined communities reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*, London, Verso
- Beebeejaun, Y. (2012) Including the Excluded? Changing the Understandings of Ethnicity in Contemporary English Planning, *Planning Theory & Practice*, 13(4) 529-548
- Beebeejaun, Y. (2004) What's in a nation? Constructing ethnicity in the British planning system *Planning Theory & Practice*, 5(4), 437–451
- Bhabha, H. (1994) *The Location of Culture*, New York, Routledge
- Buciek , K. and Juul, K. (2008) 'We Are Here, Yet We Are Not Here' The Heritage of Excluded Groups, Graham, B. & Howard, P. [Eds.] *The Ashgate research companion to heritage and identity*, Aldershot , Ashgate pp 105-124
- Burk, A.L. (2003) Private griefs, public place, *Political Geography* 22 pp 317-333
- Crang, M. (2010) Visual Methods and Methodologies, in DeLyser, D., Herbert, S., Aitken, S., Crang, M. And McDowell, L. [Eds.] *The SAGE handbook of Qualitative Geography*, London, Sage pp208-224
- Deering, B. (2010) From Anti-social Behaviour to X-rated: Exploring Social Diversity and Conflict in the Cemetery in Maddrell, A. and Sidaway, J [eds.] *Deathscapes : spaces for death, dying, mourning and remembrance*, Farnham, Ashgate, pp 75-94
- Francis, D. Kellaher, L. and Neophytou, G. (2005) *The Secret Cemetery*, Oxford, Berg
- Graham, B and Whelan, Y. (2007) The legacies of the dead: commemorating the Troubles in Northan Ireland, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 25 pp47-495
- Gilroy, P. (1987) *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack: The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation*, London Routledge
- Hall, S. (1996) Introduction: who needs identity? In Hall, S. and Du Gay, P. *Questions of Cultural Identity* London, Sage, p1-17
- Harper, D. (2012) *Visual Sociology*, London, Routledge
- Hayden, D. (1997) *The Power of Place* MIT, Cambridge, Mass; London.

- Heidegger, M. (1962) *Being and time*, Harper & Row, New York
- Johnston, C. & Lorimer, H. 2014, "Sensing the city", *Cultural Geographies*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 673-680
- Kellehear, A. (2007) *A Social History Of Dying*, Cambridge, CUP
- Kellehear, A. & Worpole, K. (2010) Bringing The Dead Back Home: Urban Public Spaces as Sites For New Patterns of Mourning and Memorialisation, in Maddrell, A. and Sidaway, J [Eds.] *Deathscapes : Spaces For Death, Dying, Mourning And Remembrance*, Farnham, Ashgate p161-180
- Kaplan, D and Chacko, E. (2015) Placing immigrant identities, *Journal of Cultural Geography*, 32:1 p129-138
- Lewicka, M. (2011) Place attachment: How far have we come in the last 40 years? *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 31(3), Pages 207–230
- McClymont, K. (2015a) Postsecularism, planning and the challenge of the sacred: the idea of municipal spirituality and the case of cemeteries. Paper submitted to *Planning theory and Practice*
- McClymont, K. (2015b) “That eccentric use of land at the top of the hill”: stories of the city, planning and cemeteries. Paper submitted to *Mortality*
- Maddrell, A. (2013) Living with the deceased: absence, presence and absence-presence, *Cultural Geographies*, 20 (4), pp 501-522
- Maddrell, A. (2009a) A place for grief and belief: the Witness Cairn, Isle of Whithorn, Galloway, Scotland, *Social and Cultural Geography*, 10(6) pp675-693
- Maddrell, A. (2009b) Mapping Changing Shades of Grief and Consolation in the Historic Landscape of St Patrick’s Isle, Isle of Man, in Smith, M, Davidson, J., Cameron, L .and Bondi, L[Eds.] *Emotion, place and Culture*, Ashgate, Farnham, pp35-55
- Maddrell, A. And Sidaway, J [Eds.](2010) *Deathscapes : Spaces For Death, Dying, Mourning And Remembrance*, Farnham, Ashgate
- Massey, D. (2005) *For Space*, London, Sage
- Manzo, L.C. & Devine-Wright, P. (2014) *Place attachment: advances in theory, methods and applications*, Routledge, New York; London.
- Merrifield, A. 2006, *Henri Lefebvre: a critical introduction*, Routledge, New York; London.
- Okin, S.M., Cohen, J., Howard, M. & Nussbaum, M.C. (1999), *Is multiculturalism bad for women?* Princeton University Press, Chichester; Princeton, N.J.
- Oldrup, H. & Carstensen, T. (2012) Producing Geographical Knowledge through visual methods, *Geografiska Annaler: Series B Human Geography*, 94(3) 223-237
- Petersson, A. (2010) The Production Of A Memorial Place: Materialising Expressions Of Grief In Maddrell, A. And Sidaway, J [Eds.] *Deathscapes : Spaces For Death, Dying, Mourning And Remembrance*, Farnham, Ashgate P141-160
- Pink, S. (2001) *Doing Visual Ethnography*, London, Sage
- Reims, E. (1999) Death and identity: graves and funerals as cultural communication, *Mortality* 4(2) pp 147-166
- Rose, G. (2012) *Visual methodologies: an introduction to researching with visual materials*, SAGE, London.
- Rugg, J. (2006), Lawn cemeteries: the emergence of a new landscape of death, *Urban History*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 213-233.
- Said, E.W. (2003) *Orientalism*, Penguin, London
- Tuan, Y-F. (1977) *Space and place: The perspective of experience*, The University of Minnesota Press, Minnesota
- Woodthorpe, K (2011) Sustaining the Contemporary Cemetery: Implementing Policy Alongside Conflicting Perspectives And Purpose, *Mortality*, 16(3)259-276
  
- Woodthorpe, K (2010) Private Grief In Public Spaces: Interpreting Memorialisation In The Contemporary Cemetery In Hockey, J., Komaromy, C.

And Woodthorpe, K [Eds.] *The Matter Of Death : Space, Place And Materiality*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

- Young, I.M. (1990) *Justice and the politics of difference*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J

