Jennifer Mitcalf

# Percy the Pig and the Bacon-Eaters: The Politics of a Community Heritage Project in post-industrial Low Moor, Clitheroe

Between February 2016 and August 2017 this author facilitated the work of a local community heritage project in the village of Low Moor, Clitheroe: a former nineteenth century mill-town in Lancashire, UK. The project aimed to investigate the ways in which members of this community understand, engage with, and utilize their local history, and then, led by those findings, to perform a service to that local community. The creation of Low Moor Community Heritage Group was intended to facilitate the "grassroots activity of creating and collecting, processing and curating, preserving and making accessible" material on the village's history.[1] It did not begin with an established understanding of that community or as an attempt to define its margins.[2] The project hoped instead to attract all those who identified as having a stake in Low Moor's heritage. In a sense it was expected therefore to form a new "community," in providing a space for those people to engage in dialogue[3] and perform a sense of common interest.[4]

The project gained an unexpected boost at the midway point by attracting Heritage Lottery Funding (HLF) to the tune of £24,600: a transformative sum of money for what was, to that point, a modest community heritage project housed in Low Moor Reading Room and Club.[5] This sum of money facilitated the regular meetings of the core group, a number that fluctuated between 15 and 30 members for the duration of the project. It also helped to pay for the restoration of an important local cultural artefact: a taxidermied pig – named Percy – who had since 1907 or so been an iconic "mascot" attached to the "Ancient Order of the Bacon Eaters," a worker's club belonging to the locality and drawing on the rich traditions of workman's clubs and parades in this particular part of the UK. The Ancient Order of the Bacon Eaters had a banner, dating to 1925, and this too was restored

**1** Andrew Flinn, "Community Histories, Community Archives: Some Opportunities and Challenges," *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 28, no. 2 (2007): 151–76 at 152–54.

**2** Margaret Stacey, "The Myth of Community Studies," *British Journal of Sociology* 20, no. 2 (1969): 134–47 at 134.

**3** Paul A. Shakel, "Pursuing Heritage, Engaging Communities," *Historical Archaeology* 45, no. 1 (2011): 2–5.

**4** Richard Jenkins, *Social Identity* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2014).

**5** The HLF rebranded as The National Lottery Heritage Fund in 2019.

 https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111675930-008

under the HLF funding. In addition, three other local monuments were restored: a WWI Cenotaph, a memorial to the Royal Engineers, and the Garnett family mosaic above the door of the Low Moor Club.[6] The community in Low Moor has a very potent sense of local identity. It is bound to the locality and largely invisible to the outsider. While several published accounts of the history of Low Moor Mill exist, its cultural histories remain under-represented. The choice to locate the study in Low Moor was a recognition of this inequality and the insights it would therefore likely provide into the use of heritage in the contemporary political concerns of a small and isolated community.

Watson and Waterton's call for the "revival of the subject of community engagement in heritage" and for research into the "power relations that underlie these processes" was a central influence on the study. "To place the notion of community beside that of heritage is to revive a series of questions." "Community heritage" is typically discussed as if it were inherently valuable, on account of its intentions to democratize access to history.[7] Drawing on Nancy Fraser's "politics of recognition" and understanding of the word "community" as being inherently political and power-laden, this study takes the opportunity to dissect politically-engaged community heritage practice.[8] Community heritage production in this context is recognized as a "political and subversive… endeavour by individuals and social groups to document their history, particularly if," as it has been in this case, "that history has been generally subordinated and marginalized."[9]

---

**6** For a full report on the activities associated with the HLF project see Heritage Lottery Fund Evaluation Report – OH-15–05554: The Heritage of Low Moor Mill.

**7** Steve Watson and Emma Waterton, "Heritage and Community Engagement: Finding a New Agenda," in *Heritage and Community Engagement: Collaboration or Contestation*, ed. Steve Watson and Emma Waterton (Oxon: Routledge, 2011), 9–12.

**8** Ruth Lister, "(Mis)recognition, Social Inequality and Social Justice: A Critical Social Policy Perspective," in *(Mis)recognition, Social Inequality and Social Justice: Nancy Fraser and Pierre Bourdieu*, ed. T. Terry Lovell (London: Routledge, 2007), 157–76. See also Elizabeth Crooke, "The Politics of Community Heritage: Motivations, Authority and Control," *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16, no. 1–2 (2010): 16–29; Steve Watson and Emma Waterton, "The Recognition and Misrecognition of Community Heritage," *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16, no. 1–2 (2010): 4–15.

**9** Andrew Flinn and Mary Stevens, ""It is Noh Mistri, Wi Mekin Histri." Telling our Own Story: Independent and Community Archives in the United Kingdom, Challenging and Subverting the Mainstream," in *Community Archives. The Shaping of Memory*, ed. Jeannette Allis Bastian and Ben Alexander (London: Facet Publishing, 2009), 3. See also Edward W Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Knopf, 1994).

## History of Low Moor

Low Moor is situated approximately a mile south-west of the center of Clitheroe, a medieval market town in Lancashire, North West England. From 1799 to 1968 Low Moor was associated with the Ribble Valley's largest cotton mill, adjoined to the east by a purpose-built workers' residential hamlet, which remains today as the core of Low Moor. Although development since the twentieth century has almost entirely obscured the boundary between Clitheroe and Low Moor, it is still locally referred to as being a "village" separate from Clitheroe.

The original Eadsford Factory was built in 1782 on land leased by the Parker family, presumably chosen for its access to the river for power and proximity to Clitheroe's trade links. After several years of financial insecurity the original factory was destroyed by fire in 1791. A new five-storey mill was built to replace it, but in 1796 the Parker firm folded. The mill was passed into the hands of the Liveseys of Blackburn before being sold again in 1799 to Garnett and Horsfall, in whose hands it stayed for the remainder of its lifetime, manufacturing both yarn and cloth. The isolated position of Low Moor in relation to Clitheroe necessitated the provision of workers' housing, and the Parkers built 28 cottages to rent to workers. This is the origin of the Low Moor community of workers. From 1785 Clitheroe parish records describe residents of Low Moor collectively as mill workers. By 1827 the village had grown to 146 cottages. The expansion of the village's population reached its peak by 1841, and subsequently declined in line with the fortunes of the cotton industry.[10]

At its peak, the mill consisted of four main five-storey blocks of iron frame construction. In the 1851 and 1861 censuses there are many examples of full households being employed in the mill (upwards of 90 % of the village's population, in comparison to a total of 39 % for the population of Clitheroe as a whole). The severe depression of 1861 – 65's Cotton Famine, brought about by over-production, was a very difficult time for Low Moor. The Clitheroe Board of Guardians, chaired primarily by farmers, did not concern itself with distress in Clitheroe's cotton industry.[11] The surviving diaries of mill owner James Garnett[12] and weaver John

**10** Owen Ashmore, "Low Moor, Clitheroe: A Nineteenth Century Factory Community," *Transactions of the Historical Society of Lancashire and Cheshire* 73 – 74 (1966): 142; Owen Ashmore, *The Industrial Archaeology of North West England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1982).
**11** Rosalind Hall, "A Poor Cotton Weyver: Poverty and the Cotton Famine in Clitheroe," *Social History* 28, no. 2 (2003): 235.
**12** Ashmore, "The Diary of James Garnett, Part one," 77– 98, and "The Diary of James Garnett of Low Moor, Clitheroe, 1858 – 65: Part two," 109 – 11.

O'Neil,[13] both living and working in Low Moor, provide insights into the experience of the community at this time.

There were two Methodist chapels in Low Moor, both of which remain. The main provision for leisure in the village was the Mechanics Institute which opened in 1852, and then again in 1861, in one of the houses on the north side of High Street.[14] These were eventually replaced by the institute opened in 1903, now Low Moor Reading Room and Club. This club became the center of the HLF project and has been the de facto community center in Low Moor historically.

There is little record of the history of the village between 1870 and 1900, but these years marked a period of stagnation for the mill. As the mill reached the end of its life the community turned a great deal of attention to investing in the village's culture outside of the workplace. Between 1900 and 1940, several sports teams were established in the village and references to the villagers as the "Low Moor Bacon Eaters" begin to appear in the local press. Much of what has been preserved by the community project dates from this period and highlights a burgeoning associational culture in the village. Clitheroe's first Torchlight Procession took place in 1902, and Low Moor contributed a float themed on the Bacon Eaters, driven by a fictional "Lord and Lady Bacon." Percy the Low Moor Pig made his first appearance at the procession in 1911, but its origins are obscure. The "Ancient Order of the Bacon Eaters" banner, entirely unique for Clitheroe, was painted by local resident Elijah Bolton in 1925, replacing the original. The origin of the name is uncertain, but it is said to refer to the popularity of pig keeping in the back yards of the terraced housing as a means of providing for the family without spending money in Clitheroe.

The Garnett's Low Moor Mill celebrated its centenary in 1899, and it continued to operate successfully until 1930. The whole village belonged to the firm, and each of the 214 houses were offered for an annual rent of £2,900. It was ultimately sold off piecemeal to a number of buyers. By the 1990s, the village no longer had any of its own shops, as supermarkets in Clitheroe had provided a cheaper alternative. An account of growing up in the village in the early twentieth century was published by a local lady in 2005. For the author, the "wealth of Low Moor lay in the working community with its sense of neighborliness, compassion and absolute commitment to their work and responsibilities. Nowhere in the land could there have been a more complete community than this village at that time. The green fields where we played and which separated us from the town of Clitheroe were the barrier be-

**13** John O'Neil, *A Lancashire Weaver's Journal: 1856 – 1864, 1872 – 1875*, ed. Mary Brigg (Lancashire: The Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, 1982).

**14** Ashmore, "Low Moor, Clitheroe," 150 – 51.

tween our world and the other one – with its beginnings of greed, crime and over-affluent living."[15]

Since 2011 Low Moor has had a population of around 2,700, a significant number of which are descended from mill workers. The village's churches, Club, and sports teams are still operating. Land around the village has recently been sold for housing development, and the most recent addition to the north of the village was completed in 2012: Kingfisher Crescent, Mallard Row, and Heron Mews. As has been seen, development down Edisford Road and at Henthorn have entirely obscured the village's previous separation from Clitheroe, and much of this has come at the expense of the historic fabric of the village.

Since it came into existence, the village has been physically and socially isolated, and has a distinctive political tradition of voluntary community activism against inequality. The village has undergone periods of hardship and great losses which the community has been forced to endure in isolation. It has illustrated numerous faults along the lines of the village's relationship with Clitheroe, and tensions between worker and master. The community's culture is rooted as much in relations outside of work, and since the decline of the mill it has created a variety of symbols which reflect its sense of individuality. Today the core of the village stands as a monument to the Industrial Revolution in Lancashire. It is against the background of new housing development, at the expense of the historic fabric of the village, that Low Moor Reading Room and Club published an appeal for information about the Low Moor Banner in 2015. This provided the departure point for the project.

## Establishing a Low Moor Community Heritage Group

My personal interest in Low Moor began as a research project on Low Moor Mill I conducted as part of my undergraduate studies. Although I was brought up locally, I did not have any prior knowledge of the mill. Two years later I was employed by Waddow Hall, which was the previous home of the Garnett family. Although it is now managed by Girlguiding as a Training and Activity Center, it has a successful Heritage Committee which focuses its activities on researching the history of the house in general. In early 2015, supported by the Heritage Lottery Fund, they ran activities based on the history of the mill and as part of this I had the oppor-

**15** L. Wallbank Christy, *Old Clothes and Hotpot: A Story of Old Low Moor* (privately published, 2005), 27.

tunity to visit Low Moor for a tour of the village with a local resident. I was not aware until this point of the strength of the sense of separation Low Moor residents felt from Clitheroe. The richness of the stories she told, and the pride she had in presenting them to us, made an impression on me. The village she described no longer existed and was invisible to an outsider. I felt that if a record could be created it would make a highly valuable contribution to the local heritage resource.

I decided to pursue the project as the opportunity also came at a time when local libraries and museums were suffering from funding cuts and two local mill museums had announced they were being forced to close. Low Moor presented the opportunity to highlight the importance of local industrial heritage and I hoped to draw attention to the village's history of struggle for economic security as a resistance narrative.[16] From my previous visit, I knew that some members of the community felt threatened by the development of expensive new housing around the village and that it was considered to be to the detriment of the social and physical character of the village. The call for information relating to the banner in 2015 also demonstrated the desire to build on the village's heritage resources. From my point of view, in terms of timing, I could see the potential for an organized heritage initiative and I felt that it would be possible to combine our aims in a mutually beneficial relationship.

My intention was to enable a collaborative contribution to a shared and more representative memory of Low Moor, and I began the process as an attempt to initiate the creation of a heritage group as a forum for conversation. The project intended to emerge out of conversation with the community and for it to perform a service to it, and its success therefore depended entirely on support from the community. I sought at first to understand what the community valued about their history, and for the products of the process to then evolve out of that. The initiative would be initiated by myself but, taking heed of the conflicts that arose in a similar situation in the case of the Sedgeford Project,[17] I was hopeful the community would take ownership of it. In this sense it would be neither a "top-down" or "bottom-up" initiative, as I would be operating as a facilitator. There were time constraints to the project, in terms of it yielding useful results in terms of this chapter, which meant that at the outset I produced a project plan but limited my expectations to a loosely defined intention of assisting the community to create a heritage resource, as they had expressed the desire to do. Watson and Waterton's collection of case studies based on community heritage addresses projects led by heritage

**16** See Jeffrey Helgeson, "Chicago's Labour Trail: Labor History as Collaborative Public History," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 76 (2009): 60–64.

**17** Neil Faulkner, "The Sedgeford crisis," *Public Archaeology* 8, no. 1 (2009): 51–61.

professionals or those fully in community ownership. This case study hopes to address an absence in community heritage literature relating to the negotiation of such an approach,[18] and to explore the process of sharing authority.[19]

On the advice of the Chair of Waddow Hall's Heritage Group, who had previously made contact with the community, I arranged to meet with a local church leader, Reverend Pickett of St. Paul's church, in February 2016. As he was in a visible leadership position I felt this was an appropriate start. I openly explained the basis of my research and interest in public history, my personal background, and what I saw as the aims of the project. He was optimistic about the project being popular with the "old Low Moorites" but explained he wasn't heavily involved with the community as he had just been moved from a church elsewhere in Clitheroe and that many considered him to be an outsider. He put me in contact with the church warden. The initial meeting confirmed my expectations in terms of current local concerns and the challenges I could expect in terms of myself being an outsider.

The church warden agreed that St. Paul's could host the first meeting, and on their advice I advertised the launch of Low Moor Community Heritage Group in the parish magazine, at Henthorn Community Centre and at Low Moor Club. I created a Facebook page for the group. I intended to make the group as visible as possible and for the use of the word "community" to attract as broad a group of attendees as possible. I was contacted on February 27 by a committee member from Low Moor Club who told me about the plans for the banner and about correspondence they had had with the Heritage Lottery Fund. She asked if we could work together and if I would be able to help with the bid process. Before this point I had been concerned about the group appearing too much as if it was led by the Church. As I felt I now had a relationship with several members of the community, I was more confident that my approach would attract a broad cross-section. From that point onwards news of the meeting spread by word of mouth and I was contacted by several people who were interested in attending.

The introduction of the Heritage Lottery Fund bid was something I was unsure about at first, as I felt that as it would take a lot of my time and therefore be a strong influence on how the group developed. The Club planned to apply for the funds to provide for the restoration of the banner, Percy the Low Moor Pig, the Low Moor cenotaph, Royal Engineers' memorial, and the Garnett mosaic above the Club door. Community engagement activities were to include a booklet and

**18** Suzie Thomas, "Review of Watson & Waterton, eds., *Heritage and Community Engagement*," *Curator: The Museum Journal* 54, no. 3 (2011): 371–74.

**19** Lorraine Sitzia, "A Shared Authority: An Impossible Goal?," *Oral History Review* 30, no. 1 (2003): 87–101.

oral histories. I had not been involved with a HLF project before and my initial concern at this stage was that this might serve as a straitjacket for the interests of group members if it meant they were required to depoliticize their narratives. I could see, however, that it was necessary to secure the funds to produce a record of the village's history at all. As the initiative for it had come from within the community it was something I was ultimately happy to support.

The first meeting of Low Moor Community Heritage Group was attended by 25 people. Registration forms confirmed ten had heard about it through the church and ten through the Club. I was interested to see that these groups did not interact much with each other, and was later told that the Club has Methodist associations and that the groups do not usually socialize. The rest were from Henthorn Community Centre, and one had seen it on Facebook. All apart from one (who had heard about the meeting through Facebook and who lived on Riverside) were aged over 50, and there was an equal split of men and women. While I expected some members of the community will have been alienated by the time and location of the meeting, I was confident that my methods in terms of initiating the project were sound, as from what I was told by group member ER, the group reflected political relationships within the community.[20] The meeting was based on a roundtable discussion about the potential of the group,[21] the proposed HLF project, and then, based on what the vicar had told me, a look at historic maps. I hoped this would encourage people to share their opinions on the changes in the village in recent years and allow me to see if my assumptions about local attitudes to housing development were correct. One attendee said it was now "too late" to preserve the village's history in light of the housing development, and that someone ought to have established a group as a means of campaigning against it "twenty years ago." I invited attendees to complete registration forms and for them to suggest plans for subsequent meetings, but people were reticent to do so at this stage. Some people had brought photographs and had splintered into smaller groups to share them with each other, so I decided the second meeting should be given to allowing people to share their memories in smaller groups. This would, I hoped, enable me to speak to as many people as possible in order to understand what they saw as important parts of Low Moor's history and what they saw as the value of being involved with the group. As I was expected to lead the meetings, for the meantime at least, I could not take extensive field notes as I had planned and instead man-

**20** Shakel, "Pursuing Heritage," 2–5.

**21** I built my suggestions on Llanteg Local History Society's constitution as this offered an example of a highly successful community-driven heritage initiative based on a village of a size similar to Low Moor. The group intended simply to be "open to everyone" and to "bring like-minded people together," accessed December 28, 2015, http://llanteghistorysociety.blogspot.ie/p/constitution.html.

aged to record key quotes. Before the meeting I felt very anxious about my own role. I was regularly challenged about my own stake in the project but, as described above, remained open about my intentions, and considered the meeting to be a success. My previous visit to the village and links that could be made through Waddow Hall were sufficient to develop a rapport with attendees.

The second meeting was attended by upwards of 30 people. It was hosted by the Club, rather than St. Paul's, which meant that several members of the Church community did not attend. I invited people to bring any photographs, objects, or anything based on the village that they were keen to share. By May I felt that engagement with the group was growing and that my relationship with the community had been established, so I decided to focus the third meeting on discussing plans for the group. The meeting was fruitful in that one member offered to give a walking tour of the village, and a suggestion was made to open the Club for a Heritage Open Day in September. To ensure the project was community-driven as early as possible, I was keen to encourage members to take on an organizational role. This discussion revealed some disagreements. While from the outset my own interest in the village had been questioned, and I was openly keen for the group to be community-led, I was still considered to have a lot of authority simply for starting the group, but also due to the fact that I had some academic training. Members were satisfied to contribute to the meetings as a leisure activity while it was still in the early stages, but none presently had the time to organize the meetings. There were no organized heritage activities in Low Moor prior to my arrival so I was not surprised that it was still too early to take a more passive role, but I did not expect to find that I was considered to have so much authority.

The third meeting in June was based on the diaries of John O'Neil and James Garnett. This involved members bringing their copies and discussing them in smaller groups. July's meeting was based around a tour of the village, suggested by and led by a group member. By this point we had received news of the success of the HLF bid, which meant I was now a paid staff member responsible for delivering the community engagement project. As a result of this, encouraging someone to replace me became less of a priority while I created smaller focus groups for the booklet and oral histories. Now a heritage "professional" rather than a student and participant, I have a greater stake in ensuring the project achieves its HLF-sanctioned outcomes.

## Assembling a Community Heritage project

The history told by group members in heritage group meetings revealed important insights into their motivations for engaging with local history. Although it was not

possible for me to record each conversation, I recorded several quotes which revealed insights into local understandings of the value of local history. Important key quotes include a comment that the closure of the mill "stopped a village."[22] For DT, life in the village used to be "far better. It was a lot better. Everybody knew everybody." It is rare that post-1970 is mentioned. Discussions regularly lapse into sharing childhood memories, which are often impossible for an outsider to engage with. Sharing memories of the old shops and changes to street names are the most frequent topic of discussion.

Several members have expressed the desire to "build on records" relating to the village and to share resources with each other. The group's archive was initiated by group member SP in April. Contributed to by several members, it contained articles which focused on the decline of the village and years of hardship experienced by the community, but also on local celebrations and exceptionalism.[23] Members contributed maps, photographs, and newspaper articles relating to the shops which used to provide for the village, the destruction of the mill, the subsequent sale of the houses, and eventual intrusion of new housing into the village.

The community's choice of heritage assets, as revealed by the content of conversations and the Club's choice of physical artefacts to restore, illuminates the social and political essences of the local community's view of the value of heritage.[24] As was demonstrated at the beginning of this study, each of the objects chosen to be restored has historically been a marker of Low Moor's sense of independence and each is an expression of local sense of place. The choice to renew the local heritage resource and refresh local capacity for community action appears to reflect a desire to build and demonstrate resilience in the face of what is seen as negative change in the form of contemporary housing development. As demonstrated in chapter one, interesting relationships have been developed through the voluntary activities of the group which have seen this shared historical sense of place impact on the present by allowing members to build their networks. Beel et al. have observed this process in similar heritage initiatives in Portsoy and Lewis in Scotland,

**22** Unpublished notes taken by the author from conversations with heritage group meeting attendees, Low Moor Reading Room and Club, Clitheroe, between March 31 and July 27, 2016 (hereafter Author Notes, 2016).

**23** "Low Moor sale: All Cottage and Shop Property Disposed of. No Offer for Mill. Bad Times but this Mill has Known Worse," *Clitheroe Advertiser and Times*, July 24, 1930.

**24** Hobsbawm, *Primitive Rebels*, 150–53.

and understand it as evidence of purposeful attempts to preserve a sense of place and the use of heritage as a catalyst for community development in the present.[25]

The group's discussions about heritage focus primarily on change which is understood to have been to the detriment of the community. This is understood as the arrival of supermarkets in Clitheroe at the expense of local traders and therefore the village's ability to self-sustain, the sale of land for housing development and the subsequent changes to the social profile, and the physical proximity of the village to Clitheroe. Members of the group subscribe to a single romantic view of loss, which is a conversation that necessarily excludes residents of new housing, as exhibited by the departure of DB from group meetings and the demographic profile of attendees.

The project formed at the interface between institutional and community visions of the value of heritage. In distilling the power relationships implicated in the production of the history concerned, and their respective views on cultural value, it has shown how this history has been formed as a product of negotiations between localizing and nationalizing forces.[26] Respective viewpoints seek either to highlight the uniqueness of the heritage or to promote aspects of it which have universal resonance. The negotiation process between the apparently oppositional aims of the community and the HLF, although the project was accepted entirely on the community's terms, has raised the question of which of the interest groups will succeed in its objectives in the long term. The following section will dissect the political motivations at play in the context of this project, in light of the threats the community sees itself as subject to, in order to facilitate an evaluation of the success and failures of the project.

## What was at Stake?

Material contributed to heritage group activities by group members typically relates to what contributors consider the village to have lost. This usually addresses the closure of the mill and sale of the village, the original streets and shops in the paleo-industrial core of the village, and images of community activities which no longer occur. The choice of heritage assets has a "pivotal relationship to the politics of identity."[27] The cenotaph, Percy the Pig, the Garnett mosaic, Low Moor banner,

**25** D. Beel, C. Wallace, G. Webster, H. Nguyen, E. Tait, M. Macleod, and C. Mellish, "Cultural Resilience: The Production of Rural Community Heritage, Digital Archives and the Role of Volunteers," *Journal of Rural Studies* (2015): 1–10.

**26** See Jim Scott, *Weapons of the Weak* (Yale: Yale University Press, 1985).

**27** Stuart Hall, ed., *Questions of Cultural Identity* (London: Sage Publications, 1996).

and Royal Engineers memorial are expressions of the village's sense of individuality, and each is visible to an external audience. In identifying these things as symbols of the village's past[28] and essentially choosing to recreate them together in heritage group meetings, members thereby perform their sense of collectivity. The decision to present these assets to an external audience is an outward expression of this collectivity.

Although not referred to by members explicitly in those terms, the symbolic meaning of what has been selected as heritage assets reveals that the local community sees globalizing forces as having resulted in the homogenization of the village's physical space, economy, and culture, which has all come at the expense of the village's sense of community. There is an anguished sense of the breakdown of old security and self-sufficiency. As has already been illustrated, the boundary between Low Moor and Clitheroe is referred to as if it were the shoreline between local and global, and local heritage has been used to reinforce and now recreate that separation. Extensive housing development in recent years has further obscured the boundary, and this appears to have been the trigger for the decision to apply for Heritage Lottery Funding. As a single-industry village, with the mill as the traditional hub of the social structure, the community has a tradition of voluntary solidarity manifested in trade unions, Co-ops, and the Club itself. Subject from the beginning to the fortunes of the cotton industry and the decisions made by the Garnett family, the community now finds itself once again struggling to make its voice heard in the face of development by wealthy interest groups.[29] Memories of similar past struggles are used to help bind the community, and the group therefore operates at the interface between understandings of past and present. Low Moor has so far been denied the opportunity to express those feelings as it does not have the resources, in terms of finances but also perhaps in terms of skills, to produce and present a record of its history. The heritage group is seen, amongst other things, as a stage on which to perform that sense of exclusion and disorientation. Voluntary contributions to the group's activities, both in terms of the history produced and the social networks formed as a consequence, all contribute to the community's resilience and collective capacity to respond to change.[30]

---

**28** Hobsbawm, *Primitive Rebels*, 150–53.

**29** See Colin Bell and Howard Newby, *Community Studies: An Introduction to the Sociology of the Local Community* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1971), 166–71; Howard Newby et al., *Restructuring Capital: Recession and Reorganization of Industrial Society* (London: Macmillan Press, 1985).

**30** Beel et al., "Cultural resilience."

It is now worth considering the relationship between this understanding of the community's use of heritage and the threats the community considers itself to be standing in opposition to, in order to understand the significance of the roles played by various stakeholders in the group's activities. The history produced by the group is intensely territorial, focused on recalling the history of a community that is resilient as an inherent characteristic, based on a long history of having a sense of identity based on separation from Clitheroe. It is essentially inward-looking, using previous examples of the community's isolationism as a tool with which to renew it. Globalizing forces are discussed in terms of the homogenization[31] and destruction of the village's heritage, in both a tangible and intangible sense. The best response to the perceived threats, as illustrated by the activities of group members, is seen as resistance in the form of increased localization.

In light of the local community's approach to negotiations between localizing and globalizing forces, the introduction of the HLF was, in a sense, potentially a Trojan horse. The HLF aims to universalize access to historical narratives and develop the skills of participants. These aims, although of course well-meaning, are aligned with neoliberal definitions of productive and inclusive citizens, and are therefore aligned with the forces the community seeks to challenge.

Funding in the UK is moving in this direction at community level. On July 28, 2016 the Heritage Lottery Fund launched its "Resilient Heritage" scheme which aims to "build the skills of your staff and volunteers to better manage heritage in the long term" by helping them to acquire "new skills and knowledge." They only accept projects "defined at the outset" and which "have not yet started." Such projects must be in line with the HLF's "required outcomes for heritage, people and communities." This is loosely described as them becoming "better managed" by increased "skills development" and through "exploring new business models" in order to "build a firm financial footing" which will allow them to "take on new responsibility for heritage." This is problematic as said organizations must have the appropriate capacity at the outset,[32] therefore eliminating the smallest from applying for funding and necessarily controlling the behavior of the larger organizations. The adoption of the term resilience by external groups is problematic in any case, as institutional conceptualizations of community are necessarily externally defined and therefore force it to become an object of regulation. The consequence is the likely sanitization of locally-formed narratives.

---

**31** Jan Nederveen Pieterse, *Globalization and Culture: Global Mélange* (London: Rowman and Littlefield, 2015), x.

**32** Heritage Lottery Fund, "Resilient Heritage," accessed July 28, 2016, https://www.hlf.org.uk/looking-funding/our-grant-programmes/resilient-heritage & https://www.hlf.org.uk/about-us/media-centre/press-releases/heritage-lottery-fund-launches-new-%C2%A38million-resilience.

The activities of the Low Moor group were "very much contained within the micro-politics of place."[33] In its isolated position, however, the community has so far been unable to resist the forces it sees itself struggling against, as its voice is too small. Using heritage as a means of recreating social structures of years gone, as the group often does, negates progressive social change.[34] Refusing to engage with the HLF at all would have perpetuated existing inequalities and ultimately meant that local histories would be lost, as the community does not have the financial resources to produce a record of its own heritage, and least of all to challenge the sale of land in the village to property developers. Mackinnon and Derickson suggest that in such a situation, "resourcefulness" is a "more productive means of challenging the hegemony of neoliberal capitalism than to frame activism in a definition of resilience."[35] A more effective way of preventing the loss of local historical narratives, in this sense, is to build capacity in the community to enable it to enter negotiation with the oppositional forces, rather than resist them outright.

## Did it work?

The introduction of the HLF into the decision-making process added a complexity to the project and my own role in it. Despite my best intentions, I am of course implicated in the universalizing aims of the HLF in accepting to work with them, and beyond that my decisions are necessarily colored by personal judgement. As the community uses heritage as a means of resisting globalizing forces, I have had to think very carefully about how far I may have furthered the homogenization of the meaning of the community's heritage, rather than countered it. Crucially, the HLF project was initiated and formed by the Club, rather than myself, and was accepted on all of the original terms with which it was submitted. I prioritized the interests of group members at all times, as my involvement was based on their mandate.

The basis of the HLF-approved project is public "improvement." The instrumentalization of heritage for this purpose disregards the value communities attach to their heritage. Although willingly operating under the banner of the HLF, I do not suggest that my contribution "improved" the local community or locality. I as-

**33** Beel et al., "Cultural Resilience," 2–3, and D. MacKinnon and K. D. Derickson, "From Resilience to Resourcefulness: A Critique of Resilience Policy and Activism," *Prog. Hum. Geogr.* 37, no. 2 (2013): 253–70; see Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (London: Routledge, 2010).

**34** Mackinnon and Derickson, 253.

**35** MacKinnon and Derickson, 267.

sisted a historically subordinated community to articulate their own narrative and produce a record of their history, with their consent. The products, in my opinion, are at once outward-looking (in line with HLF objectives) and counter-hegemonic (in line with the group's objectives). The narratives produced highlight and celebrate local individuality without being oppositional and without sanitizing its meaning. I intended to facilitate a negotiation between these two interests. I think this was the best outcome the community could achieve in these circumstances.

The project and the activities of the heritage group involved over 150 community members, bringing together descendants of both the mill workers and the Garnetts alongside more recent arrivals in the village. It facilitated inter-generational contact and fostered the development of research skills and new relationships between the participants. It widened access to the Club and to engagement with local history through the collection and preservation of memories and stories at a critical time in which their loss was threatened. It allowed all those with an interest in the village to share their ideas and perspectives, therefore raising awareness of the village's history and allowing the Club to refresh its image as an inclusive and welcoming place.

In the years following the completion of the project, the photographs and articles collected were recorded on CDs which are held by the Club, and the oral histories were submitted to the archive at Lancashire County Council, so a permanent record of the project has been created. The booklet was distributed to local schools and copies are available in Clitheroe library. It was later referenced in the published work of a local historian.[36] Photographs collected by participants are now mounted in the Club's meeting rooms, and the restored memorials are on prominent display. The heritage group has not continued to meet regularly as the volunteers were not interested in leadership positions once the project was complete. While the failure to gain enough traction in this way is perhaps a failure of the project, each of the goals outlined in the Club's original project proposal were achieved. The products of the group's work have continued to benefit the community in the years since the project was completed and will continue to do so into the future.

**36** Roger Smalley, *Dissent: A Radical History of the Clitheroe Parliamentary Constituency* (Scotforth Publishing, 2018).