1st of the question has be to asked, what is identity? According to Bornman, this processes whereby either an individual / society, is defined as both similar and unique within its self-concept within either a psychosocial or cultural context (Bornman, 2001, pp.4-5) (Hauge, Ashild Lappegard, 2007, p.4). So how then does a sense of place / belonging relate to this concept? Well from what I have learnt from doing this unit, is that I have found that a sense of place / belonging is bound up within an identity process. So what then then is a sense of place? According to Vancly, a sense of place is; “A biophysical, social and spiritual concept, which is deemed to be special to someone.” p.3 (Vancly, 2008, p.3). In fact I would argue that it’s via the processes of memory and belonging / place attachments that we attain an individual / social identity. I will survey this process within the context of memory and via a belonging / place attachment processes. Why then is memory relevant in creating a sense of place? According to Anderson having a memory of place, influences feeling / attitudes of well-being / pride etc., and this would also include imagined community processes. While it also creates sense of place within a historical context, such as incorporating place relationships with traditions, customs, laws and values, etc. (Anderson, B, 1991, pp.5-7). In fact Lengen and Kistemann, suggest that having an autobiographical memory, (memories), which relives specific, contextual experiences of space / place, is an essential component in developing an identity / self (Lengen, Kistemann, 2012, p.1169). Indeed the question could also be asked why is the recognition of the, “other” significant in creating a sense of place? Because according to Brown, if recognition of another is given within a space / place then this can create dynamics of both tolerance and indifference from both individuals and societies. For instance, if different stories / languages / cultures are distributed throughout an already established space / place, then this create both empathy of another and also tensions, (identity crisis), of tolerating another in an already established community (Brown, 2010). However, probably, the most important question to be asked is why belonging / place attachment is so essential in creating a sense of place? This is because belonging / place attachment processes, are such an important concepts within individual / social identity formulations, that not incorporating such processes within the development of identity processes, would thus indicate, that there is no intrinsic or innate, (personal), development process evolving at all (Lengen, Kistemann, 2012, pp.1163-1166) (Hernandez, Hidalgo, Laplacea, Hessc, 2007, pp.310-311). In fact, for humans from prehistory to the late 16th century, there was such a strong concept of belonging / attachment to place, that it was embodied within their very existence, more so than in today’s world, where belonging to a place is relative to where you want to be, etc. (DeMiglio, Williams, 2008, p.22). Indeed research into belonging / place attachment processes, probably began early in the 19th century, by Husserl and continued into the 1960s, with geography studies, influencing the philosophers, Heidegger and Merleau Ponty’s, phenomenological processes (Lewicka, 2011, p.223). Thus these markers, memory and belonging / place attachment are essential processes within sense of place context, in nurturing / forming individual and social identity concepts.
How then does memory, via a *sense of place* process, create an individual / social identity? While also Taking into account Relph’s findings, where memory, via a sense of place context, is *ontological* in structure (Relph, 2008, p.36). Thus it’s within, such an identity based *ontological*, memory - sense of place context that I will peruse in this essay. In fact according to DeMiglio and Williams, an “instrumental / nostalgic” sense of place, which consists of an identity finding meanings within what places provide, is an essential process in identity building. For instance, certain environments, landscapes, shops, factories etc., have sights, sounds, smells and tactile processes etc., which remind an individual of specific places, where one has frequented or inhabited. These senses in turn impact on an individual, on an unconscious level, so that in turn, an individual reflects upon these “instrumental / nostalgic” place memories, to form personal opinions, values and attitudes within the present. (DeMiglio, Williams, 2008, pp.18, 25). However as indicated by Ashworth, it may be true that some memory / place identity processes are personal / locally focused, in some place based orientations, however the majority of memory / place identity processes are engaged within global / universalism memory / place identity processes. For example, individuals / societies are identified within world heritage registers, the United Nations concept, via internet access, and via increased mobility / travel and mass media exposures etc. Thus all these processes in turn, make the global, seem like a local, (personal), place as well (Ashworth, 2008, pp.187, 189,193). Moreover according to Lengen and Kistemann, they imply that memory of a place, is triggered by the *hippocampus* brain cells, or brain spatial / space orientations and if these *hippocampus* brain cells – processes, are altered / damaged in some way, then there is no connection to place (Lengen, Kistemann, 2012 p.165-167 ). As a result place perception has little influence, on how an individual’s / societies identity is constructed. For instance, its only after an individual perceives a place, a second time, that they recognise it and thus identify with it, yet for example, as with Alzheimer’s patients such a process does not happen (Ibid, p.165.). Indeed I would counter the above argument, by suggesting that when individuals are displaced, then this too effects an individual’s / societies identity processes. For instance, as indicated by Gupta and Ferguson, they imply that if an individual loses their past and present, (memory) connections to their “home” place, a sort of self - identity failure concept evolves, whereby cultural / traditional connections to place are lost (Gupta, Ferguson, 1997, pp.6, 13, 14-15). In addition such a process is evident, when stories / narratives are lost, due to displacement / memory loses, which in turn, creates place identity failures as well (Lewis, 2011, p. 506). In fact the concept of *place referent / congruent continuity*, as indicated by Twigger – Ross and Uzzell, confirms how / why memory is an important property within identity building. Because when an individual memorises a place, it becomes embedded within their unconscious, until a dialogue / talking process operates, which then transfers place memories onto a self / identity, by this dialogue process (Twigger – Ross, Uzzell, 1996, pp.211, 217).

In fact the key question in this essay, is weather we gain a “belonging / place attachment process,” via a sense of place process, so that we can in turn, can construct our own individual / social identity processes? I will endeavour to look at this question, as others have, by concentrating upon places in general and looking at why parochialism and exclusion concepts can become embodied within places and how this impacts upon an identity process (Relph, 2008, p.36). Consequently the question has to be asked, is a sense of place the same as belonging? Whereby belonging is defined as; Phenomenological - *being in the world*, or having a sense of – *Dasein*, by Heidegger (Bullock, Trombley, 2000, p.71). In-fact, within this
essay I would imply that both sense of place and belonging, are to be perceived to be similar within their contextual relevance. For instance, belonging can be seen as a measurement/tool concept for sense of place/attachments, etc. (Lewicka, 2011, pp.225-226) (Hernandeza, Hidalgo, Laplacea, Hesse, 2007, p.311). This is evident in a research/survey process, where respondents were asked, how long they lived in a particular place and if they felt attached to a specific place (Giuliani, Ferrara, Barabotti, 2003, pp.113-121) (Hernandeza, Hidalgo, Laplacea, Hesse, 2007, pp.313-318). As a result, of Giuliani, Ferrara and Barabotti research, it was indicated that many respondents indicated that yes, the longer they lived in a particular place, the more they felt attached/belonged to a/their specific place (Giuliani, Ferrara, Barabotti, 2003, pp.113, 120). This in turn, implies that identities are constructed within places (Vancay, 2008, pp.5, 8). Challenging this proposal is the notion that spatial/space concepts help create identity construction and that modern technologies have created a placelessness process, in which homogeneous identities have evolved (Hernandeza, Hidalgo, Laplacea, Hesse, 2007, p.311). Indeed it has been suggested that spatial/space concepts, are the key identity construction, as this creates an “allocentric identity,” which is focused upon, important liminal/spatial/geometric orientations of identity, rather than on a personal place based, identity construction (Lengen, Kistemann, 2012, p.1168) (Low, 2003, pp.1-10). For instance, according to Isaac Newton, space is an entity unto itself, it thus conquers place, this is because its ignorant of any belonging processes that may inherent within either a social, cultural or landscape place based concept (Agnrew, 2011, pp. 2 ,5,8,13,19-20,25). In addition, it has been implied that globalisation within a belonging/place attachment context, has also created placelessness and thus enhanced homogeneous identities (Bornman, 2001, pp.7, 14, 21). As a result this has become evident with the rise of the “cosmopolitanism identity,” which is an identity that is truly mobile, intellectual and appreciating of all diversities within the world (Ibid , p21) (Lewicka, 2011, pp. 173-181). This is evident in the fact that food and its enclaves, reinforce familiar traditions, cultures and etiquette, for individuals and thus are prone to be an identity building construct (Ibid, p.182). In fact a study indicated that as much as 37% of respondents suggested that the social dimension is what defines a place/their identity and that this especially relevant for those who have basic educational levels (Giuliani, Ferrara, Barabotti, 2003, p.117). All of this of course in turn, indicates how identities are constructed within places (Vancay, 2008, pp.5, 8). However according to Hernandeza, Hidalgo, Laplacea, and Hesc, if you belong to a place you are “rooted” in this place and this in turn, brings feelings of wellbeing, security and connections to a this specific area, for many different reasons (Hernandeza, Hidalgo, Laplacea, Hesse, 2007, p.311) (Malpas, 2008, pp. 325-331). In fact I would imply that it’s via a phenomenological like “rooted” experience, or “Inche” of place, that its possible attain appreciation of place on many levels including aesthetic, cognitive, emotional, and social and making meanings. Consequently what this does, is that it enhances a “personal” belonging to place and thus creates a “settlement identity,” which is local focused (Lewicka, 2011, pp.209, 223-226) (Tigger –Ross, Uzzell, 1996,p.213). Indeed I would also suggest that an “Inche” concept of place, confirms how and why, many indigenous concepts of place, are embodied within an identity process (Knudtson, Suzuki, 1992, pp xxiv-xxv; 138-141) (Lehman, 2008, pp. 106-107) (Relph, 2008, pp.34-40). However it must also be noted, that parochialism and exclusion concepts can also impact upon place/identity process. For as indicated by Jacobs and Fincher, being obsessed by a specific place attachment, (belonging), can also create issues, in regards to Jingoism and identity insecurities, etc. (Fincher, Jacobs, 1998, pp. 2-3,8-12,18-19) (Metcalfe, 2013, pp.1-10).
In conclusion, I would once again suggest that it’s via the processes of memory and belonging / place attachments, that we attain an individual / social identity. In fact I would also propose, that over time, everything on earth has the intrinsic, or innate capacity, to form a sense of place, or “Inche,” place attachment, so that in turn, a unique identity can evolve. However I would also agree with Yi-Fu Tuan, when he mentions, “a place, may have spirit / personality, but it’s only human beings that can have “a sense of place. “p. 16 (DeMiglio, Williams, 2008, p.16).

Note: The term / concept “Inche” is my own term / concept. It’s a term / concept that I will use to explain, how and why a European, Asian and indigenous concepts of place, are embodied within identity processes. I will pursue this term / concept “Inche” with more investigation and research in the future. Thus the word that I - Peter Evans of unit 4 / 46 Morrison Street – Redcliffe – West Australia - Australia - have formulated to for sense of place dated this day 27/10/2104. For all innate (Human) and non-innate (non-human) things is called an “Inche” concept. Which is both philosophical and liminal / presence / being related, similar to a Heidegger “Dassin” concept, but encompassing a lot more:

“Inche” is: In = movement + e (or see) = moment + be = being:
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