CHAPTER 1

The New Heritage Studies: Origins and Evolution, Problems and Prospects

William Logan, Ullrich Kockel, and Máiréad Nic Craith

COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

Heritage and heritage studies have evolved in quite astounding ways over the last sixty years. Nobody could have imagined when the Venice Charter (ICASHB 1964) jump-started the heritage profession in the aftermath of World War II that there would be a veritable heritage boom in the 1990s, and continuing into the twenty-first century. Who would have predicted that so much attention would now be paid to protecting environmental features, material culture, and living traditions from the past, or the vast numbers of community members, policy-makers, practitioners, and scholars engaged in caring for, managing, and studying heritage? Who would have foreseen the explosion of heritage-based cultural tourism, the reconfiguration of heritage as an economic asset, and a World Heritage List comprising of more than a thousand properties spread around the globe?

This volume seeks to investigate the story of expansion in heritage and heritage studies. Containing 37 chapters commissioned from 44 scholars and practitioners from 5 continents, it is designed to provide an up-to-date, international analysis of the field, the steady broadening of the concept of heritage and its social, economic, and political uses, the difficulties that often arise from such uses, and current trends in heritage scholarship. Starting from a position of seeing "heritage" as a mental construct that attributes "significance" to certain places, artifacts, and forms of behavior from the past through processes that are essentially political, we see heritage conservation not merely as a technical or managerial matter but as cultural practice, a form of cultural politics.

A Companion to Heritage Studies, First Edition. Edited by William Logan, Máiréad Nic Craith, and Ullrich Kockel.
© 2015 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Published 2015 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

We are interested in the different extent to which various groups within global, national, and local communities are able to participate in heritage identification, interpretation, and management. Moreover, we want to address the extent to which communities have access to and enjoy heritage once it has been officially recognized, conserved, or safeguarded. This interest inevitably leads to human rights considerations, to developing closer intellectual links with international lawyers and others in the human rights field, and to strengthening both the multidisciplinary nature of heritage studies and what we sees as the critical relationship between theory and practice.

Whether this new vision of heritage studies represents a "paradigm shift" or only the culmination of changes already occurring in the heritage studies field since the late 1980s is an issue we will discuss later. For now, let us go back to the field's origins and interpret its evolution.

Expanding Heritage

When ideas of "heritage" were initially formalized, their focus was on monuments and sites. This was especially the case in Europe, from where these ideas spread across the British, French, and other European empires and the anglophone United States (Nic Craith 2007). Writer-practitioners such as John Ruskin and Nikolaus Pevsner in England, and Eugène Viollet-le-Duc in France, were enormously influential in the early days of heritage identification and protection. From these beginnings, heritage planners around the world have sought to protect broad areas of historic, aesthetic, architectural, or scientific interest. Although there is considerable variation across the world, most countries now attempt to protect, as official policy and through professional practice, a much wider range of features than they did 60 years ago.

It was gradually realized, for instance, that the protection of a monument or building was not in itself enough, and that good conservation work was often being rendered ineffective by unsympathetic developments allowed to occur in front of, beside, behind, or even over heritage buildings. Attention therefore extended to the precincts around major monuments and buildings. A further extension of interest took place in 1962, when André Malraux, then the French minister for culture, first established planning regulations (known as the *loi Malraux*) designed to protect and enhance the historic features of the Marais district of Paris. The English were also expanding their focus at about this time, to take in conservation areas, the first of which were designated in 1967. England now has over 8000 protected areas, including the centers of historic towns and cities, fishing and mining villages, eighteenth- and nineteenth-century suburbs, model housing estates, and historic transport links and their environs, such as stretches of canal (English Heritage n.d.).

At the international level, the World Heritage List established under UNESCO's Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972), or as it is commonly known, the World Heritage Convention, now contains a large number of cities inscribed for what the convention calls their Outstanding Universal Value. An Organization of World Heritage Cities, founded in 1993 with headquarters in Quebec City, today brings together 250 cities that are either inscribed or have inscribed sites within them (OWHC 2014). In 1992, the World Heritage Committee added the new category of "cultural landscapes" to the World Heritage system to allow recognition of places presenting a blend of cultural and natural elements. Twenty years

later, the landscape concept was translated into urban areas as the "historic urban landscape," blending modern and historic architectural and urban design forms rather than natural and cultural elements, but nevertheless emphasizing, like cultural landscapes, the need for a holistic view of the environment and a sensitive, balanced approach to new human interventions.

Vernacular structures are now seen as being of cultural heritage interest; that is, structures that are not architect-designed but owner- or community-built, using available resources and traditional techniques. So, too, are industrial structures. Publications by Miles Lewis (1977), Paul Oliver (1997), and William Siew Wai Lim and Tan Hock Beng (1998) began to fill in major gaps in the tangible heritage literature. More recently there has been considerable heritage interest internationally in "cultural routes." The Council of Europe in 1987 established a program of European cultural routes that is managed from a specialized institute located in Luxembourg. The program's first initiative is the Santiago de Compostela Route, the famous Christian pilgrimage route of the Middle Ages. In the United States and Canada, efforts have been made to commemorate the Underground Railroad – the route taken by slaves trying to reach freedom before the Civil War – by protecting a series of key sites along its length. In Asia, UNESCO is supporting the Silk Road Project for developing cultural heritage and cultural tourism along the traditional routes of the silk trade between south-eastern Europe and China.

In the international development field, there was a marked shift in the 1990s in the attitude of key agencies such as the World Bank towards cultural heritage. Rather than seeing cultural heritage protection as an obstacle to development, it is now recognized that the two can go hand in hand to bring about more effective programs to raise standards of living in developing countries and elsewhere (Logan 2003: xxi).

Neil Silberman (Chapter 2) explores the evolving heritage conception, and the changing forms and functions of heritage places from their initial validation as national institutions in the early nineteenth century to their multicultural context in the early twenty-first century. He shows that the meanings and values of heritage places are neither static nor inherent, but ascribed by particular social groups choosing to emphasize or ignore particular items or aspects for social and political purposes. Romantic nationalism led to a first "heritage boom" during the emergence of nation-states in nineteenth-century Europe, as commemorative sites and structures were created to serve as tangible evidence of a nation's pedigree, harmonizing the diverse populations of nations into singularly national peoples, or sometimes re-fragmenting them, laying the foundations for new identity claims in the future. Already by the late nineteenth century, accelerating domestic and international tourism engendered a second "heritage boom," albeit differently motivated: the new "heritage tourists," on their quest for historical authenticity and exotic landscapes as means of (however temporary) escape from modern industrial life dominated by economic calculus, contradictorily created the demand that allowed for the commoditization of built heritage as a "cultural resource."

A focus on the built environment is arguably based on a European concept of cultural heritage, which is entirely appropriate for an environment dealing largely with the conservation of buildings made of stone, brick, and other durable materials (Logan 2006). This view of heritage has been frequently criticized. Walled cities, cathedrals, and eye-catching landscape formations like the Giant's Causeway in Northern Ireland heavily dominate the list of European World Heritage sites. This contrasts starkly with the concept of permanency found on other continents. An example of this is the

imperial shrine at Ise, Japan. From a Western perspective, this shrine hardly qualifies as "old" since it is rebuilt every twenty years. However, from a Japanese perspective, it is old because it is rebuilt "in exactly the same way – using the same ancient instruments, materials – with each step of the process marked by appropriate ancient rituals" (Sahlins 2002: 9).

Although heritage has for a long time been defined primarily in terms of material objects, as "tangible heritage," there has been a parallel interest in what is nowadays called "intangible heritage," which for most of the past two centuries, however, remained in the shadow of the more prominent heritage of material objects and the built environment. To some extent and in some parts of the world, particularly Europe, North America, and Australia, this reflects the different social and political status of the signified: whereas monuments, works of fine art, castles, and cathedrals materially and visually project and transmit the heritage of the hegemony, folk songs and wisdom, as with many other traditional skills, tend to project and transmit heritage of the lower classes non-materially and orally.

Kristin Kuutma (Chapter 3) traces the emergence of folklore as an academic discipline and its subsequent involvement in cultural policy-making, including the contemporary transition from "folklore" to "intangible cultural heritage," and the discipline's contribution to the international management of heritage regimes. Originating during the period of nation-building, when they formed part of the creation of national cultural heritages, collections of folklore represent past repertoires and practices of mostly pre-industrial (peasant) lifestyles that nowadays often feed various linguistic, ethnic, or other local revival movements. As global power relationships at the turn of the twenty-first century are creating ever-shifting discourses of inclusion and exclusion, rootedness, and rights for possession, a need to identify and safeguard intangible cultural heritage was postulated, leading to the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, adopted in 2003, and commonly known as the Intangible Heritage Convention. Although intangible elements had always been included in understanding the significance of heritage places under the World Heritage Convention (1972), this new convention focused on and led to a system for evaluating and safeguarding intangible heritage in its own right.

Heritage in the post-war years was conceived as and called "cultural property," an understanding and terminology that is still found today in relation to some disciplines (e.g. anthropology) and some forms of heritage (e.g. intellectual property). Pertti Anttonen has observed that "the cultural representations that are selected for making heritage-political claims are commonly called traditions, with a special emphasis on their character as cultural properties; that is, representations with an ownership label" (Anttonen 2005: 39). Ownership, lying at the heart of the notion of cultural property, has become a major and growing concern since the second half of the twentieth century. Folarin Shyllon (Chapter 4) considers these concerns, especially in the context of human rights. Access to and enjoyment of cultural heritage is considered to be a fundamental cultural right, a sub-category of human rights (Shaheed 2011). It might be argued that a similar right to intellectual property also exists, but some intellectual property rights do not fit human rights easily because they are economic and commercial rather than social or cultural. Considering cultural heritage as a fundamental human right can raise difficult ethical issues, as different cultures tend to regard their own values as universal and those of others, where they conflict, as culturally contingent. The debate on intellectual and, by extension, cultural property is rather more focused

on economic value. As Shyllon points out, some cultural heritage, such as the sites inscribed on UNESCO's World Heritage List, may be regarded as universal property in the wider sense, while intellectual property rights tend to be held as monopolies.

Except from a natural law perspective, values can be seen as being in the mind; this goes even for economic, monetary values, which are the result of negotiations between actors. In contrast, artistic, linguistic, and technical skills can be seen as embodied. As an example of a non-Western approach to intangible heritage, Natsuko Akagawa (Chapter 5) examines the philosophy behind Japanese legislation for safeguarding cultural property. Her analysis highlights the significance of embodiment as a concept for understanding, and dealing with, heritage.

Landscapes of Memory

Recent decades have seen a growing interest across different contexts in how heritage has been embodied in the land (see Gilbert 2010). Perspectives on this vary, from geographical analyses of how hegemonic powers have shaped symbolic landscapes (e.g. Cosgrove 1984) to accounts of indigenous relationships with the land as an animate being and keeper of memory (e.g. Blue Spruce and Thrasher 2008). Associative landscapes now serve as the foundation for official designations of heritage origins, such as the French *terroir* discussed by Marion Demossier (Chapter 6). Involving communities in identifying and managing heritage landscapes and individual sites has become a key concern, moving traditional knowledge systems, their contribution to heritage management, and the need to support them into the spotlight.

However, this concern has not necessarily been recognized in the practice of international heritage programs. With reference to the Pacific islands, Anita Smith (Chapter 7) explores differences in the recognition of traditional knowledge systems in two UNESCO conventions – the World Heritage Convention (1972) and the Intangible Heritage Convention (2003) – and underlines long-standing critiques of the World Heritage system as Eurocentric in its determination of Outstanding Universal Value. In the late 1990s there was an attempt to establish an indigenous body to advise the World Heritage Committee in accordance with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (United Nations 2007). While this initiative failed (see Logan 2013; Meskell 2013a), the call has been renewed in recent years (see Disko, this volume).

Although in public perception issues of land and landscape are particularly associated with indigenous peoples, they also play a major role in other contexts. The application by parts of Burgundy in eastern France for World Heritage status is a case in point. Using an "ethnographic gaze," Marion Demossier (Chapter 6) examines different conceptions of Burgundy as a re-territorialized site, and the construction of its micro-regional *climats* with their historical depth of place as "God-given," naturalized artifacts in the context of global competition, where UNESCO designation is prized for conveying an elite status.

The embodiment of heritage in landscapes of memory also raises issues of the relationships between natural and cultural heritage, and their frequent separation in the practice of heritage management, where different government and non-government bodies are in charge of different types of heritage, and conflicts of interest arise not least from budget constraints and varying lines of responsibility. This can be exacerbated where a designated site stretches across one or more political or administrative boundary.

The Curonian Spit, shared by Lithuania and Russia, is one of only 31 such transnational World Heritage sites where different approaches by the two administrations to environmental issues have been problematic (Armaitienė *et al.* 2007). Moreover, multiple layers of cultural memory affect the site and its contemporary meaning as heritage for different constituencies (Kockel 2012a). Appropriately contextualizing cultural heritages in relation to place and memory has been made difficult by a widespread tendency to treat cultural differences as mere constructs (Kockel and Nic Craith 2015). This is particularly apparent where we are dealing with places of pain and shame.

Not all heritage serves as a reminder of a glorious past (Logan and Reeves 2009). In the Lithuanian national open air museum at Rumšiškės near Kaunas, the extensive display of farm buildings and machinery, as well as the central small town, invoke nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Lithuania, but close to the center there is a clearing in the woods where the time frame is different. Several items, including an earthen yurt and a cattle wagon, commemorate the deportations of thousands of Lithuanians between 1941 and 1953, when they were sent to the Soviet Gulags (Kockel 2015). Jonathan Webber (Chapter 8) seeks to make sense of Auschwitz, designated a UNESCO World Heritage site in 1979, as a heritage site and landscape of memory. Auschwitz means different things to different victim groups in terms of their own histories, but also to other visitors. Emblematic of "undesirable heritage," it is at the same time a powerful symbol, a theatre where multiple memorial events are performed, and a destination for "dark" tourism attracting large numbers of spectators.

Collecting Heritage

Ever since interest in heritage began to develop, the collection of material items and oral testimony has been a central activity aimed at facilitating their preservation. This remains so despite a growing critique of museum and archiving practices. UNESCO's Memory of the World Programme (MoW) is a major initiative for the protection of documentary heritage. However, with the exception of Charlesworth (2010), it has been largely overlooked in academic research, even within the field of heritage studies. Against this background, Anca Claudia Prodan (Chapter 9) attempts to clarify the main features of the program, and to identify points for research. MoW is part of UNESCO's policies aimed at building inclusive knowledge societies. While acknowledging the contribution of MoW in that regard, Prodan argues that in the process of this, the program is reduced to being merely a source of information, and that it needs to be strengthened by being recontextualized within UNESCO's international system of heritage protection.

Artifact collections and the practices employed in accumulating them have come under scrutiny in the context of postcolonial critiques of intercultural relations. In 2002, the British Museum and the Louvre, together with an international group of major museums, issued the Declaration on the Importance and Value of Universal Museums (ICOM 2004) Most of these museums date back to the late eighteenth century, before the period of European imperial expansion, and the declaration has been widely interpreted as an attempt to guard against claims for the repatriation of much of their collections to the countries of origin. Such claims are made not only with regard to indigenous peoples, but extend to Western countries such as Greece, as the case of the Elgin Marbles illustrates. Maurice Mugabowagahunde (Chapter 10)

discusses the politics of possession with regard to indigenous heritage in colonial and postcolonial museums, drawing on examples from sub-Saharan Africa, where indigenous peoples find much of their heritage conserved in European museums.

Using and Abusing Heritage

Consistent with the new rhetoric that came into fashion in the 1980s when neoliberal politics gained ground and governments set out to more clearly prioritize support for business organizations and, in Western Europe, to dismantle the welfare state that had emerged after World War II, local culture and heritage have increasingly been harnessed as foundations for social and economic growth. In most instances, this has involved the promotion of some form of "heritage" as a resource, especially for tourism. Consequent reappraisals of local resources created conditions under which the ailing primary sector, especially agriculture and fishing, was seen as something that could be revived as a supplier of raw materials for the production of culinary specialties (Tschofen 2008; see also Demossier, this volume) and other "cultural goods." Increasing emphasis on sustainability has led to the expectation that the utilization of culture will enhance rather than diminish the cultural resource base of a region or sociocultural group, which raises questions about the nature of the heritage "product" and its relation to traditional knowledge and practices (Kockel 2007a).

Socioeconomic Development

Heritage sites are increasingly ascribed with additional purposes beyond their original *raison d'être*, to the extent that they have become an integral part of the "memory industry" (Klein 2000). Connecting past and present, such sites also serve political functions. Brenda Trofanenko (Chapter 11) considers the case of the Grand-Pré National Historic Site, a recently designated UNESCO site in Canada, in the light of these developments. Grand-Pré tells the local story of the Acadian expulsion from Canada in the eighteenth century. With the recent World Heritage site designation, remembrance of the expulsion and interpreted historical narratives are placed alongside claims of Outstanding Universal Value for cultural traditions in the area, while the site is considered a key engine for economic development in a peripheral Canadian province with limited and declining natural resources and a disadvantageous demographic profile. This creates tensions between different expectations, but also raises a critical issue. From a policy-maker's perspective, heritage has several advantages over other resources: it is an omnipresent resource, in the sense that anyone anywhere, regardless of social, political, or economic position, can claim some kind of cultural heritage; and as a postmodern product, heritage is highly flexible and can be readily adapted to changing market conditions (Kockel 2007b). However, developers regarding "culture" and "heritage" as unlimited resources fail to appreciate the limited carrying capacity of any ecological system, including that of local cultures cast as heritage: there comes a point when further exploitation of the resource will destroy its very base. The heritage industry uses "visitor footfall" to measure the danger of overexploitation, mainly with regard to tangible heritage, but this is only one side of the issue. Traditional knowledge and practices also have limits beyond which any further exploitation can become destructive.

Considering a major recent initiative to brand Peru for the tourism market, Helaine Silverman and Richard Hallett (Chapter 12) offer a critical discourse analysis of promotional materials that reveal both a reification of iconic Peruvian material culture into intangible cultural heritage and a shift in the focus of the tourism industry from objects to emotions. The latter have recently come under the spotlight in tourism studies more generally (e.g. Picard and Robinson 2012). The new Peru "brand" exemplifies a tourism product that is about the sensory experience of immersion, which at least appears more immediate than the classic "sightseeing" version of cultural tourism.

Beyond tourism, heritage plays a crucial role in city image-making, and is increasingly being recognized for its potential to contribute to good design in urban areas (Logan 2005; Bristol 2010). Neil Silberman's review of the evolving social role of heritage places (this volume) shows how the categories and constellations of heritage places selected for protection and official commemoration facilitate a unique articulation of a spectrum of (often contradictory) collective memories. This creation of symbolic urban landscapes very much represents hegemonic discourses embodied in the built environment. At a different level, heritage designation often creates problems for those living in the vicinity of listed sites, raising issues of sustainability for both the sites and the communities living at and with them. Tim Winter (Chapter 13) takes the fortieth anniversary of the World Heritage Convention in 2012 as his starting point for an analysis of these challenges. The anniversary was celebrated under the theme of "sustainable development and the role of communities," reflecting recognition of significant problems in this area of governance, as well as the ties between cultural preservation and economic welfare.

Heritage is arguably central to social needs and to the preservation of communities in the face of developments that can compromise, and sometimes destroy, social fabric and community cohesion. Keir Reeves and Gertjan Plets (Chapter 14), examining this wider context of heritage, argue that considering tangible and intangible heritage together offers a valuable way of understanding the relevance of heritage to social needs, and especially to social cohesion.

Digital Heritage

In conventional museums, the focus has been on actual cultural objects from the past, whereas in contemporary exhibitions, the dynamics of the display, facilitated by modern technology and know-how, often take center stage. When visitors later remember the stunning special effects rather than the story behind these, the purpose of the display becomes questionable (Kockel 2007b). And when, as in the Bannockburn Heritage Centre near Stirling, Scotland, which opened to coincide with and celebrate the seven-hundredth anniversary of the famous battle between the English and Scots armies, the visitors are able to change the outcome of the battle in an animated role play, one is left to wonder about the merits of virtual heritage. To what extent is a full-size glass-fiber model of Stonehenge, or a printable 3D scan of a precious metal object, still heritage? And whose heritage is it? In the post-postmodern free-for-all virtual world, any heritage is anybody's. Or is it?

Encounters with heritage sites are increasingly mediated through digital resources, and people use digital means not only to buy and sell heritage items in internet auctions (Hewitt 2007) but to learn about the history of places and objects. The younger generation in particular often experiences heritage in the first instance through digital surrogates.

Maria Economou (Chapter 15) looks at how social interaction around heritage is increasingly transferred to the digital sphere, and how heritage institutions are using digital tools in an effort to open up to diverse communities.

With the advent of technologies like smartphones with integrated high-resolution cameras, the question of ownership, which has been raised in relation to cultural property (see Mugabowagahunde, this volume), is extended to copyright, covering not only the original artifact, but also any copies made of it, or audiovisual recordings of intangible heritage. Folarin Shyllon (this volume) explores the far-reaching implications of treating cultural rights and intellectual property rights as commensurable human rights, an area of growing concern, especially but not only in relation to the commercial exploitation of traditional ecological knowledge through pharmaceutical companies and other economic interests.

The use of heritage can be malign as well as benign (Logan 2007: 42). The concept of heritage was inextricably associated with that of the nation-state as nineteenth-century elites composed interpretations of the past that generated a national consciousness of historical destiny (Nic Craith 2008). Many emerging European nation-states, from Italy to Germany and from Ireland to Finland, drew legitimacy from the formation and transmission of a largely "national" heritage (Crooke 2000). Folklorists, as nation-builders, "mapped" the territory and its people (see Kuutma, this volume). Folklore, seen as expressing the authentic voice of the people, was frequently a tool of resistance through which a colonized or subjugated people reasserted its spiritual heritage and status (Ó Giolláin 2000).

Following the transfer of imperial hegemony from Sweden to Russia in 1809, one of the slogans of the emerging Finnish nationalist movement was, "Swedes we are no longer, Russians we can never become, so let us be Finns!" Probably coined by Johan Snellman, a Stockholm-born philosopher and later a Finnish statesman, the slogan encapsulates the need for a legitimizing discourse of the nation. In the twentieth century, Douglas Hyde (of Anglo-Irish rather than Gaelic Irish background) famously called for the "de-Anglicization" of Ireland. Folklorists rediscovered the nation's voice, and frequently anchored it to a particular territory or cultural landscape (Nic Craith 2008).

In the twentieth century, the geopolitical constellation changed several times. The collapse of the great empires – cataclysmic in the case of Austria-Hungary and Turkey, slower but painful for the British, Dutch, French, and Japanese – enabled small separatist nationalisms to replace integrative imperial projects. In the second half of the twentieth century, this was superseded by the rise of new global powers, first in the binary configuration of the Cold War. The collapse of communism sparked another wave of small separatist nationalisms in former Soviet and allied territories. At the same time, the focus of geopolitics finally shifted away from Europe, except for a recent footnote, where grassroots movements for independence in Scotland and Catalonia signal a shift in political culture that perhaps indicates a new direction for nationalism in the twenty-first century.

Against this background of waxing and waning nationalisms, UNESCO introduced the idea of a global heritage that belongs to all peoples of the world, an idea adopted at least rhetorically by the states that have signed up to its various conventions. However, in practice, designations such as World Heritage or Outstanding Universal Value are abused in much the same way as heritage was in the process of nation-building. China, for example, has framed the concept of World Heritage with national characteristics,

transforming it into a nationalistic discursive device, as Haiming Yan (Chapter 16) demonstrates. By creating a set of narratives of World Heritage, the Chinese state has sought to invent a vast nation of China characterized by ethnic cohesion, stability, and solidarity. But China is not alone in this. To some extent, nation-states utilize rather than simply abide by UNESCO discourses (Logan 2001, 2014b).

War and Civil Unrest

In times of war and civil unrest, leading to the often large-scale displacement of people through ethnic cleansing, heritage is often damaged or destroyed, targeted deliberately or becoming collateral damage. Where the tangible heritage of artifacts is displaced along with a people, or historic monuments and sites are preserved amid the surrounding destruction, they can be revalidated, adapted, and repossessed through processes of place-making (Kockel 2012b). It is more difficult to resurrect the intangible heritage that was embodied in those who are killed or uprooted from their cultural context.

Looking at the debates over plans for the Gdańsk Museum of World War II, Julie Fedor (Chapter 17) examines the struggle to define and preserve the heritage of the war in Poland and Russia. Originally conceived partly as a counterweight to the memory projects of the German Centre against Expulsions (see Kockel 2012b), the museum constitutes an ambitious and large-scale memory project aiming to be the first museum in Europe to cover the experiences of both Nazi and Soviet occupations in depth, and help incorporate the East European experience into a broader European memory.

Accommodating a multidimensional wartime past within a museum context has proved difficult (see Webber, this volume). After the collapse of communism, museums in Eastern Europe have often been used for narrating revised "national" stories. In these narratives, a national society locates itself on a trajectory extended as far back in time as possible, thus establishing continuity with a pre-communist past. In some instances, an attempt has been made to tell the "national" story in different ways that try to come to terms with the reality of different cultures coexisting in a particular place.

In spring 2012, the Silesian Museum at Katowice launched a temporary exhibition entitled *Koledzy z platzu* ("Colleagues from the Platz: Parallel Life Stories of Upper Silesians"), employing the life stories of neighbors sharing the same backyard in an Upper Silesian town (Kockel 2015). These neighbors were represented as ordinary people who "did not stand out from the crowd, who – in spite of numerous differences – had a common denominator: their native land" (Muzeum Śląskie 2012). The people represented, born at the turn of the twentieth century, had to contend with consecutive enforced changes of place names, official language, and even citizenship. However, the heritage narrative of the museum claims that they did not develop roots in the cultural traditions of any of the neighboring countries to Upper Silesia. Their story represents an example of a growing discourse of indigeneity that scholars of European culture and heritage find rather disconcerting (Kockel 2010, Straczuk 2012; Kiiskinen 2013).

During conflicts, heritage is often deliberately destroyed for its symbolic value. This became particularly clear during the 1990s in southeastern Europe. Focusing on the iconic Old Bridge in Mostar, Bosnia Herzegovina, destroyed in 1993, Andrea Connor (Chapter 18) considers the politics of heritage destruction and reconstruction. A site of real and imagined "gathering," this 400-year-old footbridge was not only an emblem of the city but a metaphorical conduit for meanings of place and a site of

embodied encounter. Reopened 11 years after its destruction as a monument to reconciliation, the "new Old Bridge" gained World Heritage status in 2005. However, cultural expressions once held in common have been recast as "ethnic heritage," making the reconstruction of heritage a contentious and potentially divisive act.

The Middle East has been a major theater of war for some decades, and increasingly so since the invasion of Iraq in 2003, which brought unprecedented destruction to some of the world's most sensitive heritage sites. Drawing lessons for cultural property protection from this experience, Benjamin Isakhan (Chapter 19) details the policies and protocols of the US-dominated coalition toward Iraq's important monuments and museums, and discusses the obstacles and challenges that face the Iraqi government. Updating Isakhan's analysis, it has to be said that the renewed air strikes on Iraq in late 2014 do not bode well for civilian populations ("collateral damage"), their embodied, once living intangible heritage, or their tangible places and artifacts.

The deliberate targeting of heritage for military or non-military destruction can go beyond the material, and involve the destruction of a people's embodied intangible heritage and their cultural identity for the sake of ideology. Christian Manhart (Chapter 20) examines these processes in Afghanistan and Mali, explaining UNESCO's dual mandate to build peace and protect heritage, and the contradictory situations that can arise in the context of war and destruction. While the rebuilt Mostar bridge has been awarded World Heritage status, UNESCO is, for complex reasons, currently not in favor of reconstructing the Bamiyan Buddhas. Whereas the obliteration of the Buddhas was driven by religious fanaticism, the destruction of the Mostar bridge was, on the face of it, ethnically motivated. However, it has been observed that in reporting on the conflict in former Yugoslavia, journalists often referred to "Serbs, Croats, and Muslims," juxtaposing two rival Christian denominations described in ethnic terms with an ethnic group described in religious terms. At the end of the twentieth century, one might have hoped it would be unthinkable – or politically incorrect – to describe a European war in terms of religion.

Cultural obliteration through war and violent unrest may be more spectacular than other forms of the same process, but the long-term consequences of these other forms may arguably run as deep. Centuries of colonization have, for example, left their mark on the cultures of the Andes. Nevertheless, as Hugo Benavides (Chapter 21) argues, the legacies of genocide and ethnocide on the region's native population can be contrasted with creative resistance to such cultural obliteration. Benavides examines how heritage has both supported and subverted hegemonic control and ethnic decimation as native communities and their descendants continue to reinvent and reassess their identities in the face of hegemonic pressures.

Recasting Heritage

When the production and protection of heritage attracts public resources, this works as an incentive to invent and sustain, to produce and reproduce "heritages" that may have little or no basis in tradition. Their legitimacy then derives not from their historicity but from financial calculus (Kockel 2007a). This applies equally to tangible and intangible heritage, although each has its own specific problems in this regard: tangible heritage may require much larger financial outlays for its maintenance and protection; the cost of safeguarding intangible heritage is more difficult to verify. In either case, scarce

public resources determine the fact that not every single item deemed worth preserving can actually be supported. At the onset of industrial decline in the North Atlantic sphere, heritage – as part of the service and information sectors – was perceived as a renewable resource ready to be exploited, requiring a small initial investment for good long-term returns. Since then, it has become clear that even heritage has its carrying capacity beyond which maintenance costs are likely to exceed revenue. And searching questions are being asked: What are the costs of heritage protection? Is it economically sustainable? Is heritage a luxury, appropriate in advanced Western postindustrial societies but not in poorer societies? We seem to live in an age in which heritage is ubiquitous (Harrison 2013: 3). Is there too much heritage? Have we gone too far? Is it time to start limiting heritage preservation programs, even the concept itself? And if so, in what ways?

Limiting Heritage

With more than 1000 sites inscribed on UNESCO's World Heritage List at the close of 2014, is there a case for the list to be capped in the light of limited and – in real terms – diminishing funds to sustain them? Is there an unlimited number of places of Outstanding Universal Value, and could we list them all, or are we now listing places of national rather than universal significance? Many sites are running into difficulties for various reasons, not necessarily connected with the sites themselves. The World Heritage Committee at its 2014 meeting studied reports on 150 such properties, and there are 45 properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger (UNESCO 2014a, 2014b). As we are seeing a decline in resources available for heritage preservation, most notably in Western Europe, where funding used to be comparatively generous, Ron van Oers (Chapter 22) contends that the system of cultural heritage conservation and its management is simply not robust enough, having too narrow a base in the educated elite while lacking a sustainable mechanism of financing independent of government funding. One response might be to cut back on heritage protection programs. Van Oers, however, argues that the problem can be addressed by involving a broader range of stakeholders, including policy-makers, local councils, the private sector, and local communities.

Stakeholders need to be open to innovative approaches in order to achieve economic sustainability, which may require the redefinition of what is meant by "heritage." Brenda Trofanenko (this volume) argues that sites seek to achieve various, often conflicting purposes, all for the sake of attracting people by their "universal value," and wonders about the limitations such sites hold with regard to the very purposes they are expected to support – not just in terms of their physical carrying capacity, but as sites of cultural reproduction or distortion. In North Karelia, Finland, for example, there is considerable pride in the musical heritage of the region. The repertoire of events, however, is not based on a celebration of past Karelian music itself, but on the idea of music-making as a heritage characterized by a distinct creativity and originality of the musical material performed; that is, a "tradition of invention" emphasizing continued development rather than the conservation of some unadulterated heritage (Kockel 2007b).

The international cultural discourse underlying UNESCO's heritage initiatives has its roots in the 1920s and 1930s, when the League of Nations fostered ideas of common global heritage and international collaboration. Following its establishment in 1945,

UNESCO led significant progress in these areas, with the founding of several international organizations like the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), and the creation of policy instruments for cultural property, excavations, landscape, and the built environment, among others. Christina Cameron (Chapter 23) argues that, with the benefit of hindsight, those initiatives and the philosophy underpinning them may seem naive. The continuing destruction of historic urban centers and monuments by planners or warlords, and the ongoing dispute over the concept of Outstanding Universal Value, certainly cast doubts on the future viability of the current system. As more countries joined the World Heritage Convention (1972), received notions were challenged. With the Intangible Heritage Convention (2003), a Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity was introduced, which is no longer limited by notions of Outstanding Universal Value. The initial objectives with which UNESCO set out in 1945 may not be attainable, and alternatives may be radical and unpalatable in a global cultural and financial climate marked by geopolitical rivalries.

Perhaps we expect too much of UNESCO and the other global heritage bodies. The emphasis on cultural heritage as a resource for development has been questioned by scholars critical of the new governmentalities engendered by heritage regimes (Coombe 2012) and their depoliticizing impacts on communities and other so-called stakeholders. Drawing on anthropological research in indigenous contexts and addressing the role of corporate actors, Rosemary Coombe and Melissa Baird (Chapter 24) argue international heritage institutions face new challenges that will limit any emancipatory expectations we might have as heritage governance is certain to become re-politicized in rights-based struggles on "resource frontiers" (Tsing 2003).

In a situation of limited resources and other opportunities, what kinds of heritage should be protected, and how should we decide what not to protect? The independent expert Farida Shaheed (2011) addressed the issue of limitations to cultural rights in her first report to the UN Human Rights Council. Cultural rights may be limited in certain circumstances, following the principles enshrined in international human rights law. This also applies to the right of access to and practice of cultural heritage, for example where an element of cultural heritage infringes on human rights. Practices that are contrary to human rights cannot be justified by reference to the safeguarding of cultural heritage, diversity, or rights.

There are clearly some dimensions of our own and other people's cultures that we prefer to see disappear, indeed that we might actively seek to wipe out (Logan 2007: 37, 2009: 15). Some have been eradicated in the past, such as social forms like Chinese foot-binding, and economic forms like New World slavery. But what of contemporary heritage elements? Heritage professionals generally baulk at the idea of destroying heritage. Colin Long and Keir Reeves (2009), however, do not walk away from this dilemma in a discussion that has bearing on Auschwitz and Rwanda. Investigating Anlong Veng, Pol Pot's home village in Cambodia, which is becoming a cult site, they argue that the removal of reminders of Pol Pot would have the justifiable effect of "emphasizing above all else the voices of the victims and silencing the perpetrators once and for all" (Long and Reeves 2009: 81).

Human rights are then an obvious starting point for the consideration of limitations that should be imposed on cultural heritage, regardless of resource issues. Human rights treaties are formulated as catalogues of "rights" or claims that individuals or persons belonging to groups such as ethnic minorities and indigenous peoples hold against the state within whose territory they live (Ekern *et al.* 2012: 216). They may be fine on

paper, but getting governments to implement those rights is very often extremely difficult. A case in point is the struggle of indigenous peoples to bring implementation of the World Heritage Convention (1972) in line with international standards concerning their rights. Adopted before most other international human rights treaties came in to force – including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966) – the World Heritage Convention finds itself at odds with international human rights standards as well as other standards and principles developed since the early 1970s. Stefan Disko (Chapter 25) discusses some of the major shortcomings of the convention from an indigenous rights perspective, such as the lack of provisions ensuring that the free, prior, and informed consent of indigenous peoples is obtained before parts of their territories are designated as World Heritage sites.

Another limitation on the effectiveness of heritage programs is raised by George Abungu (Chapter 26) and Webber Ndoro (Chapter 27). Examining the challenges that must be faced by sub-Saharan African heritage practitioners and actors now and in the future, they see the key issue being how to achieve best conservation practice when surrounded by a sea of poverty. Both see the failure of the supposed trickledown effect, in which the benefits of World Heritage inscription and consequent global tourism are meant to flow down to those Africans whose heritage is on show. Ndoro notes that while World Heritage sites can help in supporting job creation, the development of infrastructure and small-scale business ventures, and provide general economic benefits to the national economy, the record is disappointing. Most of the investors at World Heritage sites are foreign tour operators, hotel chains, and airlines, and resentment is growing among local communities that they are missing out on the economic benefits of World Heritage listing. It is understandable that communities and sometimes representative governments turn their backs on heritage in favor of more effective ways of increasing material well-being.

Holistic and Inclusive Heritage

One of the lessons that should have been learnt by government, policy-makers, and heritage practitioners alike over the last 60 years is the need to listen to the voices of local communities. Some governments have been reluctant to take this approach, as have heritage professionals in some countries. In relation to World Heritage places, UNESCO has moved strongly in recent years to engage local and especially indigenous communities in heritage identification and management. It used the Linking Universal and Local Values conference held in Amsterdam in 2003 (de Merode, Smeets, and Westrik 2004) to promote the view that heritage protection does not solely depend on top-down interventions by governments or the expert actions of heritage industry professionals, but must involve local communities (Logan, Langfield, and Nic Craith 2010: 9). UNESCO recognizes that the notion of Outstanding Universal Value at the heart of World Heritage may not always coincide with local ideas about what is significant heritage, and that a reconciliation of the views of locals and UNESCO must be achieved if local communities are to feel a sense of ownership of World Heritage sites, which is a pre-requisite for the sustainability of Outstanding Universal Value.

In other words, respect for and inclusion of traditional knowledge and management practices are fundamental elements of the new, fairer, and more inclusive approach to heritage conservation and heritage studies. Indigenous peoples have learned to use the

language of rights effectively, a useful part of their battery of political tactics. We will have to wait longer to see if and how the heritage rights of other ethnic and racial minorities, as well as minorities defined by gender, sexuality, and class, are affected. With good fortune and a lot of effort by these groups and their supporters, there may also be beneficial consequences for these groups (Logan 2014a: 13).

Another important step toward inclusivity lies in reducing the Eurocentric character of the World Heritage system and, more generally, heritage discourse, and acknowledging variations in concepts and practice in other world regions. This has been a long struggle, involving UNESCO and World Heritage Committee initiatives such as the Global Strategy for a Representative, Balanced and Credible World Heritage List (UNESCO 2015), which has been discussed by scholars such as Sophia Labadi (2005, 2013) and Lynn Meskell (2013b). It is taken up in this volume by practitioner-scholars Britta Rudolff and Kristal Buckley (Chapter 35). In their analysis of the World Heritage system and the common perception that it is at a "crossroads," they identify Eurocentrism as one of six key challenges that need to be met.

From Africa, the focus next turns to Asia. Zeynep Aygen and William Logan (Chapter 28) argue that the economic and geopolitical shift towards Asia that is currently being witnessed will inevitably lead to a stronger Asian voice being heard in the heritage field. It follows, they maintain, that more needs to be learnt about Asia's heritage and Asian heritage safeguarding projects. They note that the so-called "Asian century" really started in the late 1980s, and they warn against the danger of overstating the differences between "Asian" and "Western" heritage approaches. In a world of the continuing culture-based conflict, even wars, the need today is to strengthen cross-cultural dialogue, building on the commonalities rather than differences between people.

One of the fundamental ways that Asian heritage practice has influenced the West is in the prominence given to intangible heritage. The tradition of Western heritage practice, starting with Ruskin and Viollet-le-Duc and enshrined in the Venice Charter (ICASHB 1964), focused largely on the tangible until the Japanese opened the way for the Nara Document on Authenticity (ICOMOS 1994), UNESCO following suit with the Intangible Heritage Convention (2003). This is not to say that the intangible was and is not vitally important in the cultural life of the West or other non-Asian parts of the world. Indeed, while it may be true that "Asian heritage is valued for its spiritual significance rather than historical or material significance" (Chapagain 2013: 12), Western people have always placed great store in the "living" and "embodied" heritage of religion and spiritualism, festivals and markets, and associated cultural contexts – even if Western heritage practice did not.

There remains much room for Western heritage practice to embrace the intangible, both as a feature giving value to the tangible heritage of places and artifacts, and as a form of heritage in its own right. Máiréad Nic Craith and Ullrich Kockel (Chapter 29) explore the ways in which Westerners think about places. They see a greater complexity developing in the understanding of the built environment over the past two decades or so, and a rising concern to protect the "sense of place" or *genius loci*. This new emphasis on the cultural significance of place partly emanated from the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter (1979, with subsequent revisions; see Australia ICOMOS 2013) and was accompanied by a values-driven approach to conservation and management, the purpose of which was not to preserve the physical fabric of a place for its own sake but to maintain the values embodied in a place (Avrami, Mason, and de la Torre 2000: 7). Such values are intrinsically intangible, and this being so, Nic Craith and Kockel

conclude that UNESCO and other governmental heritage agencies would do well to consider bringing their separate tangible and intangible heritage systems together.

In Chapter 30 Laurajane Smith and Gary Campbell explore another intangible dimension of heritage, on this occasion within the context of museums. Starting with the assertion Smith made in her important book *Uses of Heritage* (2006), that heritage was an embodied cultural performance of meaning-making, they seek to remedy the lack of recognition of affect and emotion as "essential constitutive elements of heritage-making." This had been noted earlier by Laurajane Smith and Emma Waterton (2009: 49), likening this failure as "an elephant in the room" of heritage studies and its museum studies sub-branch. The chapter concludes that heritage and museum visitors' experiences, rather than being merely learning experiences, can only be explained if the emotional aspects of their visit are taken into account, and that it is therefore essential to understand how emotions work if the staging and experience of heritage and museums are to be more effective.

As Smith and Campbell note, there has been a growing interest in emotion and affect in recent heritage studies literature. One scholar contributing to this is Andrea Witcomb (Chapter 31), who provides a case study of memories and memorialization of the Thai–Burma Railway, built during World War II. This is heritage as performance, focusing on remembering and forgetting, story-telling, religion, and festivals. But it is more than a descriptive case study: it seeks to move beyond the conventional discussion of heritage as a site of ideological productions reflecting hegemonic interests to recognize that heritage also "embodies far more localized, personal, emotional, and affective relationships." Witcomb argues that emotion plays a fundamental role in expressions of heritage, and in impacting on people's understanding of their sense of self in relation to others. In other forums such an argument can provide the basis for strengthening communities that are suffering from macro-economic restructuring, unemployment, and demographic change. In this chapter, however, Witcomb focuses on the moments of encounter between various individual and sets of actors from different cultures involved in remembering and memorializing – performative practices that she sees as producing a form of heritage practice in its own right.

The Ethics of Heritage

Andrea Witcomb is right in arguing that it is time to move on from case studies of contestation over heritage and of heritage's links with the ideology of regimes in power. Heritage is, of course, never apolitical or in any way neutral, and, as has been earlier discussed, it has all too often been used as a means of welding populations together to prop up regimes, to support ethnic cleansing, and to justify hostilities against neighboring states. But heritage is no longer seen as just something actually or allegedly inherited from the past and used for a narrow political purpose. It is increasingly recognized as a dynamic evolving interplay of multiple factors touching all aspects of contemporary human life.

Our understanding of heritage and interventions to safeguard it require the establishment of an ethical basis. Witcomb's analysis of cross-cultural encounters in the Thai–Burma Railway case draws upon theories about the politics of identity, but it also emphasizes the importance of taking a cosmopolitan ethical stance. This is argued further by Lynn Meskell (Chapter 32), who explores the notions of rights and responsibilities that are central to cosmopolitanism as a set of ethical and philosophical beliefs.

Meskell explains that cosmopolitanism holds that we are all citizens of the world and have responsibilities to others. As heritage is acquiring a role in global movements of conservation, post-conflict restoration, indigenous rights, and sustainable development, Meskell asks how cosmopolitanism might prepare us for the challenge of the past being drawn into contemporary struggles for recognition and self-determination. As heritage experts, these obligations may entail addressing the political and economic damage wrought by past regimes, improving community livelihoods, or confronting transnational corporations.

Kwame Appiah (2006) focuses on the key issue of reciprocity – that is, of showing how and why human rights should continue to be supported, but also of articulating the view that there is a reciprocal set of duties that humans have toward each other and their physical and cultural environment. He challenges heritage practitioners and scholars to shift our focus away from nations and peoples and to focus instead on the individuals who create (and pay for) the things that are valued today and who will benefit from experiencing them (Appiah 2006: 122). His cosmopolitan perspective is "to ask what system of international rules about objects of this sort will respect the many legitimate human interests at stake" (Appiah 2006: 126–27). A cosmopolitan approach to heritage practice and scholarship also requires that respect is given to the heritage of others as you would have your own heritage respected. This applies to the heritage of indigenous peoples, other minority groups, and national neighbors. Heritage as a cultural process might thus be re-envisioned as a path to mutual understanding and respect, peace and security (Logan 2010, 2012a).

It may not be so simple, however, as Patrick Daly and Benjamin Chan (Chapter 33) show. They turn our attention to the role of heritage in post-conflict situations, drawing on their research into post-Khmer Rouge Cambodia and post-World War II Japan. They warn that while there is considerable potential for heritage to be a useful tool for supporting political reconciliation and stability, it seems that the achievement of stability and peace may be facilitated at the expense of the victims of conflict who are denied both justice and healing. They see post-conflict situations as "complicated, messy, and unique, with conflicting narratives, agendas, and various levels of empowered stakeholders," making it extraordinarily difficult to construct a consensus around what is needed and how to do it. Denis Byrne also sees great potential for heritage studies to foster empathy with the past experiences of others, but notes that this requires a "sophisticated understanding of how objects become imbued with affect and how they transmit it" (Byrne 2013: 596).

Perhaps heritage can be used to build cross-cultural and transnational dialogue so that conflicts are minimized or avoided in the first place. In some cases, breaking down nationalist narratives might help, as might giving fuller recognition to the hybridity of diasporic heritages (Eng 2011). Strengthening cross-cultural dialogue underlies the creation of UNESCO, and its World Heritage program could give a stronger priority to activities focused on dialogue creation (Logan 2010). These might include, for example, transnational inscriptions and developing new strategies for interpreting sites in more cross-culturally sensitive ways. Ona Vileikis (Chapter 34) takes up this notion, using her experience in the Central Asian Silk Roads World Heritage nomination process as a case study. She finds that transparent collaboration and sharing information, practices, and expertise has proven to be a valuable step towards strengthening transnational dialogue. The five countries involved so far – Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan – used consultation workshops and meetings in preparation of the

nomination strategy, as well as established networks at institutional and governmental levels, that have an ongoing role in capacity-building, raising necessary funds and awareness, as well as providing technical assistance.

The New Heritage Studies: Paradigms and Challenges

The story outlined above portrays heritage practice and heritage studies as vastly transfigured over the last sixty years, most of the difference in conceptions, philosophies, and approaches occurring since the late 1980s and early 1990s. Senior members of the profession such as Gustavo Araoz, currently ICOMOS president, and many academics have referred to this transfiguration as "a new paradigm" (e.g. Araoz 2011; Silberman 2013). Gregory Ashworth (1997) proposed two paradigms: conservation as preservation, and conservation as heritage. Even one of the current authors, William Logan (2012b: 10), has used the term paradigm, although referring to a future when heritage conservation develops into a human rights-based cultural practice.

Paradigm Change

Has there been a paradigm change? In the strict sense of the word, as coined by Thomas Kuhn (1962), probably not, although the term has come to be used in common parlance whenever we want to describe a pronounced change in direction of the way we see the world around us. Certainly massive change has occurred over the decades, but it has been evolutionary rather than revolutionary, the latter marking paradigm shifts according to Kuhn; it has thus built on the past rather than swept it all aside. Technical and managerial research and publications continue to make their valuable contribution to the field alongside the new heritage studies.

Indeed, some scholars are calling for even more change, and use revolutionary language to do so. An Association of Critical Heritage Studies (ACHS) was formed in 2012, with a preliminary manifesto calling for heritage studies to be changed "from the ground up" (ACHS 2011). Designed as a "provocation," the ACHS's manifesto seeks much that in this volume has been envisaged under the name "new heritage studies," as the following extract shows:

> Heritage is, as much as anything, a political act and we need to ask serious questions about the power relations that "heritage" has all too often been invoked to sustain. Nationalism, imperialism, colonialism, cultural elitism, Western triumphalism, social exclusion based on class and ethnicity, and the fetishising of expert knowledge have all exerted strong influences on how heritage is used, defined and managed. We argue that a truly critical heritage studies will ask many uncomfortable questions of traditional ways of thinking about and doing heritage, and that the interests of the marginalised and excluded will be brought to the forefront when posing these questions. (ACHS 2011)

Other heritage scholars have reacted to the ACHS manifesto, with some debate emerging in a special issue of the *International Journal of Heritage Studies* in September 2013. One of the concerns raised there by Witcomb and Buckley (2013) is that the ACHS, if it adheres to its manifesto, is likely to deepen the already existing gulf between theory and practice, scholars and practitioners.

Practical Implementation Challenges

We should not underestimate the difficulty of achieving effective change, and we need closer collaboration between scholars and practitioners so that the "new heritage studies" can better influence practice while keeping its feet on the ground where practitioners operate. William Logan (2012b: 241) has previously described the difficulties in relation to the World Heritage system, noting that while it may be possible to tweak the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, this may not be enough.[1] UNESCO is an international governmental organization relying on its Member States – or those that have become States Parties to the World Heritage Convention (1972) – to cooperate on their own accord in the World Heritage mission. States Parties will always make World Heritage decisions that suit their national interests. Even the United States, one of the instigators of the World Heritage Convention, and, as Diane Barthel-Bouchier (2013: 38) observes, usually an upholder of the values of universalism, human progress, and rationality, is causing difficulties. Its current refusal to pay its financial contribution to UNESCO is causing the organization to scale back its activities rather than embark upon new initiatives (Erlanger 2011). The heritage profession can also be resistant to change with its entrenched attitudes in many countries, its tight networks, and its gate-keeping actions.

In this difficult context, and mindful of the criticism, overload, and pessimism facing UNESCO, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, perhaps ICOMOS in particular, Britta Rudolff and Kristal Buckley (Chapter 35) ask what it might mean to consider "alternative" futures for the World Heritage system. They want to go beyond the small incremental changes to the Operational Guidelines and changes to inscription and other processes through "upstreaming" that are already contemplated, and they note that revising the World Heritage Convention (1972) is extremely unlikely. It seems to them that the best approach is to focus on possible future enhancements in relation to the intended purposes of the convention, and to push for a further evolution in heritage concepts and mechanisms. This leads Rudolff and Buckley to identify six interrelated problems where focused reform could deliver significant, "alternative," and better futures for the World Heritage system: (1) the problem of Eurocentrism; (2) the problem of inflation and overload; (3) the reduction of credibility; (4) the problem of inclusion; (5) the nature/culture divide; and (6) the problem of conservation. Cautiously optimistic, they conclude that the most significant potential outcome that explorations of "alternative" futures can achieve is to give direction and stimulus to those presently active to carry on working towards their common goals as established by the World Heritage Convention while striving to improve and innovate.

Ana Filipa Vrdoljak (Chapter 36) and William Logan and Gamini Wijesuriya (Chapter 37) deal with two other challenging areas for implementing change: the legal field on the one hand, and education, training, and capacity-building on the other. Vrdoljak outlines the multilateral instruments that make up the contemporary international legal framework for the protection of cultural heritage, noting that more than half were adopted in the decades after the end of the Cold War. She observes that these recent treaties have profoundly broadened the definition of what is being protected and the range of stakeholders attracting rights and obligations. The inclusion of intangible heritage complicates matters, as do the extension of rights holders beyond states and the redefinition of the role of states. Existing legal concerns have been exacerbated and new challenges opened up. She warns against UNESCO adding yet more specialist legal instruments, and argues instead for the development of a framework instrument

that would provide an overarching set of principles inspired by developments in human rights and environmental law, and by which all of UNESCO's existing heritage instruments must be interpreted. The Council of Europe's Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (2005), commonly known as the Faro Convention, offers UNESCO a model to follow. Such an approach, Vrdoljak concludes, would help promote a more holistic approach to cultural heritage, facilitating effective involvement of a broad range of stakeholders at all levels in its protection.

Something similar was needed, and in fact has been established, in the case of education, training, and capacity-building. A World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Building (UNESCO 2011) was adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its thirty-fifth session in 2011, and a program to achieve its objectives is being undertaken by its developers – UNESCO, through the World Heritage Centre, and the three Advisory Bodies (ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN). In line with the holistic approach taken by the World Heritage Convention (1972), the capacity-building strategy covers both cultural and natural heritage. It focuses on capacity-building, a concept that subsumes the education and training of individual practitioners, but extends beyond practitioners to cover the wider audience that is, or should be, engaged in the heritage conservation process. The capacity-building strategy recognizes that capacity in fact resides in practitioners, institutions, communities, and their networks, that these are effectively different audiences, and that capacity-building activities are needed involving different learning areas and a diverse range of pedagogical approaches.

Logan and Wijesuriya particularly focus on how the capacity-building strategy reflects the broader and more critical conception of heritage that has emerged. They pick up some of the concerns outlined in Ekern *et al.* (2012: 221), regarding the limitations faced by practitioners in dealing with the political character of their interventions, particularly in relation to minority and marginalized peoples. It is critically important to understand the broader economic, political, and social context in which they are operating. Practitioners need to recognize that there can be many motives behind official heritage interventions, that such action is sometimes made primarily to achieve political goals, and that this can undermine rather than strengthen cultural diversity, cultural identity, and human rights. The shift towards a more critical approach to both heritage practice and heritage studies encourages educators, scholars, and practitioners to consider the human rights implications of conservation interventions, and to devise ways in which local people, especially indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities, can be empowered to play a meaningful role in determining how their heritage is identified and managed. Practitioners in the field thus need new skills in facilitating small group discussions, conflict resolution, and in listening patiently and respectfully rather than assuming their specialist training gives them ready-made answers.

Much of the discussion in Logan and Wijesuriya's chapter – as indeed in the volume as a whole – is focused on World Heritage and the global heritage agencies. This is not unreasonable, given the richness of discourse at the global level and the way in which ideas developed at the global level flow down to influence heritage practice and scholarship at national and local levels. There is also profitable interaction between these levels, the flow of ideas often originating at the national or local level – the "periphery" (Logan 2001) – and moving out to affect and sometimes become incorporated by the global. Heritage thinking, like heritage management, cannot be solely top-down; we need to listen to local voices expressing "heritage from below" (Robertson 2012) and their claim to heritage rights. Denis Byrne argues in relation to Southeast Asian

Buddhist societies that, without taking into consideration popular beliefs and associated practices, we are "poorly positioned to enact conservation policies and programs at the local level" (Byrne 2011: 3). George Abungu sums up the matter in his chapter on African heritage issues in this volume, when he concludes: "Practitioners who care about the future of heritage have an obligation to change the fundamentals of the practice to fit into the current world of high expectations and compelling rights." The obligation, we should add, applies equally to new heritage studies scholars, educators, and capacity-builders.

Logan and Wijesuriya end their chapter with the admonition that efforts should not be directed exclusively towards World Heritage. The needs of nationally and locally significant heritage, or, indeed, intangible heritage as well as heritage places and artifact collections in museums and galleries, must not be neglected. The World Heritage Convention puts the overall aim of heritage conservation clearly as "to give the cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community."[2]

We agree that this applies to heritage at all levels – to enable people to better understand, have access to, and enjoy their heritage in ways they choose. This is probably the greatest challenge for policy-makers, practitioners, scholars, educators, trainers, capacity-builders, and communities themselves – globally, nationally, and locally.

Notes

1 The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention is a document first adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 1977 and contains precise criteria for the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List and for the provision of international assistance under the World Heritage Fund. The document has been revised by the committee numerous times to reflect new concepts, knowledge or experiences, the most recent revision dating from July 2013 (see UNESCO 2013).

2 World Heritage Convention (1972), art. 5.

References

Legislation

Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (World Heritage Convention) (UNESCO, 1972). Available at: http://whc.unesco.org/archive/convention-en.pdf (accessed March 19, 2015).

Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (Intangible Heritage Convention) (UNESCO, 2003). Available at: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001325/132540e.pdf (accessed March 19, 2015).

Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro Convention) (Council of Europe, 2005). Available at: http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/199.htm (accessed March 19, 2015).

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (United Nations, 1966). Available at: http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/ProfessionalInterest/ccpr.pdf (accessed March 19, 2015).

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (United Nations, 1966). Available at: http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/ProfessionalInterest/cescr.pdf (accessed March 19, 2015).

Other Works

ACHS (Association of Critical Heritage Studies) (2011) Manifesto. Available at: http://archanth.anu.edu.au/heritage-museum-studies/association-critical-heritage-studies (accessed October 1, 2014).

Anttonen, P. (2005) *Tradition through Modernity: Postmodernism and the Nation-State in Folklore Scholarship*. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Appiah, K.A. (2006) *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: Norton.

Araoz, G. (2011) Preserving Heritage Places under a New Paradigm. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 1 (1), 55–60.

Armaitienė, A., Boldyrev, V., Povilanskas, R., and Taminskas, J. (2007) Integrated Shoreline Management and Tourism Development on the Cross-Border World Heritage Site: A Case Study from the Curonian Spit (Lithuania/Russia). *Journal of Coastal Conservation*, 11 (1), 13–22.

Ashworth, G.J. (1997) Conservation as Preservation or Conservation as Heritage: Two Paradigms and Two Answers. *Built Environment*, 23 (2), 92–102.

Australia ICOMOS (2013) Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (Burra Charter), revised version. Available at: http://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/The-Burra-Charter-2013-Adopted-31.10.2013.pdf (accessed June 29, 2014).

Avrami, E., Mason, R., and de la Torre, M. (2000) Report on Research. In *Values and Heritage Conservation*. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute, pp. 3–11.

Barthel-Bouchier, D. (2013) *Cultural Heritage and the Challenge of Sustainability*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Blue Spruce, D., and Thrasher, T. (eds) (2008) *The Land Has Memory: Indigenous Knowledge, Native Landscapes, and the National Museum of the American Indian*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press/Museum of the American Indian/Smithsonian Institution.

Bristol, G. (2010) Rendered Invisible: Urban Planning. In M. Langfield, W. Logan, and M. Nic Craith (eds), *Cultural Diversity, Heritage and Human Rights: Intersections in Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge, pp. 117–134.

Byrne, D. (2011) Thinking About Popular Religion and Heritage. In J.N. Miksic, G.Y. Goh, and S. O'Connor (eds), *Rethinking Cultural Resource Management in Southeast Asia: Preservation, Development, and Neglect*. London: Anthem, pp. 3–14.

Byrne, D. (2013) Love and Loss in the 1960s. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 19 (6), 596–609.

Chapagain, N.K. (2013) Introduction: Contexts and Concerns in Asian Heritage Management. In K.D. Silva and N.K. Chapagain (eds), *Asian Heritage Management: Contexts, Concerns, and Prospects*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–29.

Charlesworth, H. (2010) Human Rights and the Unesco Memory of the World Programme. In M. Langfield, W. Logan, and M. Nic Craith (eds), *Cultural Diversity, Heritage and Human Rights: Intersections in Theory and Practice*, London: Routledge, pp. 21–30.

Coombe, R. (2012) Managing Cultural Heritage as Neoliberal Governmentality. In R. Bendix, A. Eggert, and A. Peselmann (eds), *Heritage Regimes and the State*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen, pp. 375–387.

Cosgrove, D. (1984) *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Crooke, E. (2000) *Politics, Archaeology and the Creation of a National Museum in Ireland: An Expression of National Life*. Dublin: Irish Academic Press.

De Merode, E., Smeets, R, and Westrik, C (eds) (2004) *Linking Universal and Local Values: Managing a Sustainable Future for World Heritage*. World Heritage Papers 13. Paris: UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Available at: http://whc.unesco.org/documents/publi_wh_papers_13_en.pdf (accessed February 15, 2015).

Ekern, S., Logan, W., Sauge, B., and Sinding-Larsen, A. (2012) Human Rights and World Heritage: Preserving Our Common Dignity through Rights-Based Approaches to Site Management. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 18 (3), 213–225.

Eng, I. (2011) Unsettling the National: Heritage and Diaspora. In H. Anheier and Y.R. Isar (eds), *Heritage, Memory and Identity*. London: Sage, pp. 82–94.

English Heritage (n.d.) Conservation Areas. Available at: https://www.english-heritage.org.uk/caring/listing/local/conservation-areas/ (accessed October 5, 2014).

Erlanger, S. (2011) Cutting off Unesco, US May Endanger Programs in Iraq. *New York Times*, November 16. Available at: http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/17/world/middleeast/cutting-off-unesco-us-may-put-iraq-programs-at-risk.html?_r=0 (accessed September 30, 2014).

Gilbert, J. (2010) Custodians of the Land: Indigenous Peoples, Human Rights and Cultural Integrity. In M. Langfield, W. Logan, and M. Nic Craith (eds), *Cultural Diversity, Heritage and Human Rights: Intersections in Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge, pp. 31–44.

Harrison, R. (2013) *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. London: Routledge.

Hewitt, B. (2007) Heritage as a Commodity: Are We Devaluing Our Heritage by Making It Available to The Highest Bidder via the Internet? In U. Kockel and M. Nic Craith (eds), *Cultural Heritages as Reflexive Traditions*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp. 194–208.

ICASHB (International Congress of Architects and Specialists of Historic Buildings) (1964) International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (Venice Charter). Available at: http://www.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.pdf (accessed March 9, 2015).

ICOM (2004) Declaration on the Importance and Value of Universal Museums. *ICOM News*, 1, 5.

ICOMOS (1994) The Nara Document on Authenticity. Available at: www.icomos.org/charters/nara-e.pdf (accessed September 25, 2014).

Kiiskinen, K. (2013) *Bordering with Culture(s): Europeanization and Cultural Agency at the External Borders of the European Union*. Turku: University of Turku.

Klein, K. (2000) On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse. *Representations*, special issue 69, 127–150.

Kockel, U. (2007a) Reflexive Traditions and Heritage Production. In U. Kockel and M. Nic Craith (eds), *Cultural Heritages as Reflexive Traditions*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp. 19–33.

Kockel, U. (2007b) Heritage versus Tradition: Cultural Resources for a New Europe? In M. Demossier (ed.), *The European Puzzle: The Political Structuring of Cultural Identities at a Time of Transition*. Oxford: Berghahn, pp. 85–101.

Kockel, U. (2010) *Re-Visioning Europe: Frontiers, Place Identities and Journeys in Debetable Lands*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Kockel, U. (2012a) Borders, European Integration and UNESCO World Heritage: A Case Study of the Curonian Spit. In A. Peselmann, A. Eggert, and R. Bendix (eds), *Heritage Regimes and the State*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen, pp. 227–246.

Kockel, U. (2012b) Toward an Ethnoecology of Place and Displacement. In U. Kockel, M. Nic Craith, and J. Frykman (eds), *Blackwell Companion to the Anthropology of Europe*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 551–571.

Kockel, U. (2015) Re-placing Europe: An Ethnological Perspective on Frontiers and Migrants. In C. Whitehead, R. Mason, and S. Eckersley (eds), *Museums, Migration and Identity in Europe: Peoples, Places, Identities*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 81–100.

Kockel, U., and Nic Craith, M. (2015) Hybride Ethnologien des Eigenen, Anderen und Dritten: Toposophische Erkundungen am Beispiel der Pfälzer in Irland. In F. Jacobs and I. Keller (eds), *Das Reine und das Vermischte: Festschrift for Elka Tschernokoshewa*. Münster: Waxmann, pp. 73–95.

Kuhn, T. (1962) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Labadi, S. (2005) A Review of the Global Strategy for a Balanced, Representative and Credible World Heritage List, 1994–2004. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites*, 7, 89–102.

Labadi, S. (2013) *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage and Outstanding Universal Value*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Lewis, M. (1977) *Victorian Primitive*. Melbourne: Greenhouse.

Lim, W.S.W. and Beng, T.H. (1998) *Contemporary Vernacular: Evoking Traditions in Asian Architecture*. Singapore: Select Books.

Logan, W. (2001) Globalizing Heritage: World Heritage as a Manifestation of Modernism and Challenges from the Periphery. In D. Jones (ed.), *Twentieth Century Heritage – Our Recent Cultural Legacy: 2001 Australian ICOMOS National Conference*. Adelaide: School of Architecture, University of Adelaide, pp. 51–57.

Logan, W. (2003) *The Disappearing "Asian" City: Protecting Asia's Urban Heritage in a Globalizing World*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Logan, W. (2005) The Cultural Role of Capital Cities: Hanoi and Hue, Vietnam. *Pacific Affairs*, 78 (4), 559–575.

Logan, W. (2006) Needs for Heritage Education at Universities. Paper presented at an international symposium on "Heritage Education – Capacity Building in Heritage Management," Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany, June 14–18.

Logan, W. (2007) Closing Pandora's Box: Human Rights Conundrums in Cultural Heritage Practice. In H. Silverman and D. Fairchild Ruggles (eds), *Cultural Heritage and Human Rights*. New York: Springer, pp. 33–52.

Logan, W. (2009) Playing the Devil's Advocate: Protecting Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Infringement of Human Rights, *Historic Environment*, 22 (3), 14–18.

Logan, W. (2010) Heritage and Dialogue: Using Heritage Conservation to Strengthen the Defences of Peace. In *Proceedings of the World Universities Congress, Canakkale 18 Mart University, Canakkale, Turkey, 20–24 October 2010*, Vol. 2. Canakkale: Canakkale 18 Mart University:, pp. 1440–1448.

Logan, W. (2012a) States, Governance and the Politics of Culture: World Heritage Places in Asia. In P. Daly and T. Winter (eds), *The Routledge Handbook of Heritage in Asia*. London: Routledge; pp. 113–128.

Logan, W. (2012b) Cultural Diversity, Cultural Heritage and Human Rights: Towards Heritage Management as Human Rights-Based Cultural Practice. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 18 (3), 231–244.

Logan, W. (2013) Australia, Indigenous Peoples and World Heritage from Kakadu to Cape York: State Party Behaviour under the World Heritage Convention. *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 13 (2), 153–176.

Logan, W. (2014a) Heritage Rights: Avoidance and Reinforcement. *Heritage and Society*, 7 (2), 1–15.

Logan, W. (2014b) Making the Most of Heritage in Hanoi, Vietnam. *Historic Environment*, 26 (3), 62–72.

Logan, W., Langfield, M., and Nic Craith, M. (2010) Intersecting Concepts and Practices. In M. Langfield, W. Logan, and M. Nic Craith (eds), *Cultural Diversity, Heritage and Human Rights: Intersections in Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge, pp. 3–20.

Logan, W., and Reeves. K. (eds) (2009) *Places of Pain and Shame: Dealing with "Difficult" Heritage*. London: Routledge.

Long, C., and Reeves, K. (2009) "Dig a Hole and Bury the Past in It": Reconciliation and the Heritage of Genocide in Cambodia. In W. Logan and K. Reeves (eds), *Places of Pain and Shame: Dealing with "Difficult" Heritage*. London: Routledge, pp. 68–81.

Meskell, L.M. (2013a) UNESCO and the Fate of the World Heritage Indigenous Peoples Council of Experts (WHIPCOE). *International Journal of Cultural Property*, 20 (2), 155–174.

Meskell, L.M. (2013b) UNESCO's World Heritage Convention at 40: Challenging the Economic and Political Order of International Heritage Conservation. *Current Anthropology*, 54 (4), 483–494.

Muzeum Śląskie (2012) Colleagues from the Platz: Parallel Life Stories of Upper Silesians. Available at: http://www.muzeumslaskie.pl/en/colleagues-from-the-platz-parallel-life-stories-of-upper-silesians.php> (accessed July 29, 2012).

Nic Craith, M. (2007) Cultural Heritages: Process, Power, Commodification. In U. Kockel and M. Nic Craith (eds), *Cultural Heritages as Reflexive Traditions*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp. 1–19.

Nic Craith, M. (2008) Intangible Cultural Heritages: The Challenges for Europe. *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures*, 17 (1), 54–73.

Ó Giolláin, D. (2000) *Locating Irish Folklore: Tradition, Modernity, Identity*. Cork: Cork University Press.

Oliver, P. (ed.) (1997) *Encyclopedia of Vernacular Architecture of the World*, 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

OWHC (Organization of World Heritage Cities) (2014) Introduction to the OWHC. Available at: http://www.ovpm.org/en/presentation (accessed October 5, 2014).

Picard, D., and Robinson, M. (eds) (2012) *Emotion in Motion: Tourism, Affect and Transformation*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Robertson, I.J.M. (2012) *Heritage from Below*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Sahlins, M. (2002) *Waiting for Foucault, Still*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.

Shaheed, F (2011) Report of the Independent Expert in the Field of Cultural Rights, Farida Shaheed. Human Rights Council Seventeenth Session Agenda Item 3. UNHRC document A/HRC/17/38. Available at: http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/images/Report%20of%20Farida%20Shaheed.pdf (accessed February 14, 2015).

Silberman, N. (2013) Heritage Interpretation as Public Discourse: Towards a New Paradigm. In M.-T. Albert, R. Bernecker, and B. Rudolff (eds), *Understanding Heritage*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 21–33.

Smith, L. (2006) *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge.

Smith, L., and Waterton, E. (2009) *Heritage, Communities and Archaeology*. London: Duckworth.

Straczuk, J. (2012) Local Practices of European Identity on the New Eastern Borders of the EU. In U. Kockel, M. Nic Craith, and J. Frykman (eds), *Blackwell Companion to the Anthropology of Europe*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 199–211.

Tschofen, B. (2008) Of the Taste of Regions: Culinary Practice, European Policy and Spatial Culture – A Research Outline. *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures*, 17 (1), 24–53.

Tsing, A. (2003) Natural Resources and Capitalist Frontiers. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 38 (48), 5100–5106.

UNESCO (2011) World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Building. Document WHC-11/35.COM/9B. Available at: http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2011/whc11-35com-9Be.pdf (accessed August 27, 2014).

UNESCO (2013) Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. Available at: http://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/ (accessed February 15, 2015).

UNESCO (2014a) List of World Heritage in Danger. Available at: http://whc.unesco.org/en/danger/ (accessed September 30, 2014).

UNESCO (2014b) State of Conservation (SOC). Available at: http://whc.unesco.org/pg.cfm?cid=171&l=en&&action=list&soc_start=2014&soc_end=2014&&maxrows=150 (accessed September 30, 2014).

UNESCO (2015) Global Strategy. Available at: http://whc.unesco.org/en/globalstrategy/ (accessed February 15, 2015).

United Nations (2007) Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). Document A/RES/61/295. Available at: http://www.un-documents.net/a61r295.htm (accessed March 19, 2015).

Witcomb, A., and Buckley, K. (2013) Engaging in the Future of "Critical Heritage Studies": Looking Back in Order to Look Forward. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 19 (6), 562–578.