

INTRODUCTION

Yudhishtir Raj Isar, Dacia Viejo-Rose and
Helmut K. Anheier



The concepts of identity and heritage long antedate the conjoined usage of these terms today. In the past, identity referred not to self-consciousness but to likeness, and heritage was mainly a matter of family legacies. In the present, these terms swim in a self-congratulatory swamp of collective memory. Heritage is now that with which we all individually or collectively identify. It is considered the rightful (though sometimes unwelcome) legacy of every distinct people. (Lowenthal 1994: 41)

Rationale

The relationships between cultures, cultural change and globalization remain inadequately understood. Often reduced to the seemingly one-way impact of globalization processes on the world's cultures, these relationships, and the changes they involve, are in reality reciprocal and far more complex and multifaceted: cultures do shape globalization processes and patterns, and vice versa; what is more, the relationships in turn involve many further interactions with social, economic and political forces. Addressing the richness of these relationships is the main purpose of *The Cultures and Globalization Series* (see Box 1.1 for further details).

Various readings of the multiplexity of 'culture' have informed all the preceding volumes in the *Series* and each one has privileged a particular interpretation. Our common denominator and point of departure was an understanding broad enough to reconcile several such readings, in any case embracing both the 'arts and heritage' sense of the term and a more capacious social science interpretation of culture as the social construction, articulation and reception of meaning.¹ As for the notion of globalization, we should underline that we mean contemporary *accelerated* globalization, for the process as such has a long history, that long predates our epoch. For this we borrowed from Held et al. (1999) a straightforward definition, namely the intense and instantaneous time-space compression created by the movement of objects (goods, services, finance and other resources, etc.), meanings (language, symbols, knowledge, identities, etc.) and people across regions and intercontinental space.

Box I.1 Cultures and globalization – the knowledge gap

While a substantial evidence base has been developed on the economic, political and social aspects of globalization, the cultural dimension continues to be the object of many unsubstantiated generalizations

and *unquestioned* assumptions. This is the key knowledge gap the *Series* is designed to fill. The complex, two-way relationships between cultural change and globalization have remained largely uncharted empirically and under-analyzed conceptually.

One reason for this dual neglect at the global level is that conventional understandings of culture are still connected principally to the sovereign nation-state. However, today, this nexus of culture and nation no longer dominates: the cultural dimension has become constitutive of collective identity at narrower as well as broader levels. What is more, cultural processes take place in increasingly ‘deteritorialized’ and transnational contexts, many of which are beyond the reach of national policies. Mapping and analyzing this shifting terrain, in all regions of the world, as well as the factors, patterns, processes, and outcomes associated with the ‘complex connectivity’ (Tomlinson 1999) of globalization, is therefore a main purpose of this *Series*.

In so doing, the *Series* aims to meet three further goals: to highlight key contemporary cultural changes and their policy implications; to channel and encourage cutting-edge research; and to contribute to the development of information systems in the field of culture. In this way, it will seek to build bridges between the social sciences, the arts and the humanities, and policy studies. Indeed, our approach is based on our awareness that the social sciences and the humanities have become too compartmentalized – a state of affairs that we seek to overcome by the kind of inter and cross-disciplinary thinking required for a project of the kind proposed here that seeks to explore the nexus of cultures and globalization. We therefore encourage ‘out of the box’ thinking and approaches that cut across established disciplines and methods.

Each volume is more than a compilation of separate conceptual chapters. An analytical framework and a set of over-arching questions spell out organizing principles and substantive priorities to authors in advance. Each volume is also more than a compendium of country or ‘area’ studies. While such aspects are important, they take second place in this project to a pronounced transnational, comparative and evidence-based perspective that is our key signature.

The knowledge gap in the field of cultures and globalization stems from the paucity of comparative information. It is for this reason that, alongside the ‘narrative’ chapters, all of which rely upon freshly-observed empirical phenomena, each volume includes a significant data section. Departing from conventional approaches, we have developed a new way compiling, analyzing and presenting quantitative data on specific aspects of the cultures and globalization relationship. These ‘indicator suites’ make up Part II of the volume and are based on the premise that much information on many facets of the cultures and globalization nexus is already ‘out there’, but is not being processed in appropriate ways. Another point of departure is that for most readers interpretative information graphics are far easier to understand than ‘raw’ data in tabular form.

Initiated in 2007, the indicator approach has been refined with each successive volume. More details will be provided in Part II, which, among other topics, presents indicator suites on topics such as contested memories; museums, memory and heritage; territorial identities; internet identities; work-related identities; World Heritage Sites and Intangible Heritage.

Heritage, memory, identity: what do we mean?

This fourth volume in the *Series* is devoted to a triad of contemporary keywords, namely ‘Heritage’, ‘Memory’ and ‘Identity’. These notions are articulated principally around the notion of culture as ‘ways of life’.² As different human groups

define certain objects and practices as ‘heritage’; as they envision heritage to reflect some form of collective memory, either lived or imagined; and as they combine both to construct composite cultural identities, the potency of the triad becomes evident. Today, the three terms raise conjoined issues of practice, policy and politics. Together they have come to constitute ‘global scripts’, to

borrow a term deployed by Lily Kong in volume 3 (Kong 2010).

Heritage, memory and identity have each been abundantly discussed from the perspective of different disciplines. The vast majority of these treatments have concerned the local, the sub-national and the national levels. Our purpose here is not to rehearse or augment these existing debates (the bibliography alone would be interminable!), but to shed light on the ways in which the tropes of heritage, memory and identity intertwine at *the transnational and global levels*. This interface is at the core of our project. Some of the issues germane to it were taken up in previous volumes of the *Series*, but neither centrally nor explicitly.³ So in conceiving this volume, we asked contributors to focus on the following sorts of questions:

- Is contemporary accelerated globalization challenging the ways in which heritage, memory and identity hitherto functioned in and for nation-states in a Westphalian world?
- Is globalization driving and shaping the triad in new directions?
- How are the terms of the triad interacting in response to increased mobilities, flows and space–time compression?
- Specifically, how are heritage, memory and identity affecting, and how are they, in turn, impacted by, the dynamics of globalization?

These broad questions were, in turn, broken down in more specific interrogations. However, before taking these up, it would be useful to present the general conceptual framework in which we placed the notions of heritage, memory and identity.

Among the three terms, the one that is recognized across the world as a domain of public *cultural policy* (in the sense of the remit assigned to ministries or departments of culture) is *heritage*, or, more precisely, *heritage preservation*. This consists of the valorization and preservation by individuals and groups of traces of the past that are thought to embody their cultural identities.⁴ At the societal level, heritage preservation has become a quasi-habitus; as Stuart Hall reminds us, ‘we should think of The Heritage as a discursive practice’ (Hall 2005: 25). The field has grown much in recent years, testifying to the cultural self-consciousness of our time, as a result of which the concept of ‘culture’ itself has become ever more protean, its forms,

usages and repertoires increasingly complex and diverse. Some of the expansion was metaphorical (Samuel 1994), but in real terms the idea of heritage has also been doubly expansive: extending both to the entirety of what anthropologists call ‘material culture’ – structures, sites, artefacts – and to immaterial cultural manifestations now celebrated as ‘intangible heritage’ (see also Smith 2006).

The values and practices of heritage preservation – and revitalization – are prominent in contemporary cultural life, demanding major economic and political trade-offs in determining what sites and properties are to be preserved, restored, rebuilt, documented or not. The narrative that binds these societal decisions together also shapes the social meanings and symbols that are central to the construction of collective memories and identities. The latter, in turn, shape collective perceptions of ‘selves’ and ‘others’ and, therefore, also influence the ways in which societies perceive and interact with one another. Paradoxically, when rhetorically invoking these notions of heritage, as they do today with increasing vigour and remarkable unanimity, nation-states lay claim to ‘patrimony’ that was very often created long before they themselves came into being and/or by members of societies that no longer exist. What is more, this patrimony is valorized because it is taken to be universal, ‘the shared heritage of humanity’. But instead of becoming a true global public good, it becomes the ‘cultural property’ of a national (or sub-national) unit (Appiah 2006). Archaeological sites, monuments, etc., all become instruments for territorial self-fashioning, providing a symbolic terrain on which imaginaries compete and battles for the future are fought, e.g., the ‘facts on the ground’ revealed by the study of archaeological practice in Israel (Abu El-Haj 2001).

In this context, the fraught issue of conceptualizing ‘culture’ as the fixed property of particular groups also arises (cf. Moore’s concluding commentary in this volume). For example, anthropologists working in Eastern Europe have observed the ambivalent branding role played by representations of ‘heritage’ in tourism agendas (Urry 1990). In the Balkans, a region with highly diverse cultures and histories, and where the past has recently been drawn upon to justify present violence and war, heritage tourism employs the (ancient) past as a restructuring element for the future. The emphasis on heritage seeks both to selectively rewrite histories and to reshape an image for tourists, as when

the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia focuses on its 'Alexander the Great' period in order to be perceived as a locus of key historical events... Indeed the very fact that Greece refuses to allow that country to call itself Macedonia *tout court* is a wry illustration of the manner in which Alexander's Macedonia has become a memorial stake in national identity-building today...

The contemporary cult of heritage has produced the 'inflation' of which Françoise Choay has written (1992, 2009) and that David Lowenthal has described as follows:

Like identity, heritage is today a realm of well-nigh universal concern. It betokens interest in manifold pasts – family history, buildings and landmarks, prehistory and antiques, music and paintings, plants and animals, language and folklore – ranging from remote to recent times. So widespread and fast-growing is such interest that heritage defies definition. Indeed, the term celebrates every conceivable thing and theme: anchorites and anoraks, Berlin and Bengal, conkers and castles, dog breeds and dental fillings, finials and fax machines, gorgonzola and goalposts are topics typical of a thousand recent books entitled Heritage of _____. Pervading life and thought as never before, heritage suffuses attitudes toward everything. (Lowenthal 1998: 42)

These attitudes have generated various practices of identification, classification, preservation, exhibition and *mise en valeur*. Once taken at their face value, these practices are now recognized as constituting a new mode of cultural production in the present that simply has recourse (principally but not exclusively) to the resources of the past. As Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1998) has argued, the discourses and practices of preservation, restoration, reclamation recovery, re-creation, recuperation, revitalization and regeneration need to be seen against the reality that there is really 'no there, there' prior to what somebody has to do to identify, evaluate, conserve and celebrate. This applies most aptly perhaps to the notion of 'intangible heritage', as defined by the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, adopted in 2003 by UNESCO: 'the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills ... as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals,

recognize as part of their cultural heritage.' Unlike the preservation of the tangible heritage, which is conserved in its extant materiality, the preservation of the intangible heritage consists of recording and documentation, in other words, a sort of materialization of the immaterial. The 2003 Convention requires each State Party to 'identify and define the various elements of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory' and to 'draw up, in a manner geared to its own situation, one or more inventories of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory'. Identifying, inventorying: what kind of 'safeguarding' is taking place here? In the oral history perspective, for example, safeguarding would mean maintaining such traditional forms alive by adding items to the repertoire today, not just ensuring the survival of existing histories. In the case of traditional music, it would be to ensure the continuation of these forms and their use – and the list could be extended considerably.

But real practice does not and indeed cannot keep all these forms 'alive'. What is being engaged upon, rather, is a 'metacultural' process (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2004), one that does not, indeed cannot, actually ensure that the knowledge embodied in those who possess and 'are' the intangible heritage may actively enact or perform itself. The library metaphor frequently cited in this context actually gives the game away: the reasoning behind the famous statement attributed to Amadou Hampâté Ba – 'Africa loses a library when an old man dies' – actually confuses an archive for an active repertoire. Yet the intangible heritage is essentially repertoire embodied, manifested and transmitted in performance; it is not documentation in an archive. Any repertoire is based on embodied knowledge and requires active social relations for its creation, enactment, transmission and reproduction. When compared with the objects typically displayed in the museum showcase, intangible cultural forms can be less easily detached from the persons who embody them (Isar 2005a).

Yet this kind of 'museal sensibility' in Andreas Huyssen's words, 'seems to be occupying ever larger chunks of everyday culture and experience', including 'the electronic totalization of the world on data banks', making the museum far more than a mere cultural institution but 'a key paradigm of contemporary cultural activities' (Huyssen 1995: 14). As collective pasts are increasingly mobilized in a museum complex, as it were, heritage has necessarily

become an arena for conscious choice, justification and representation. This has led to a form of fetishization, as dramatizations and ritual enactments of cultural traditions are celebrated in the form of dress, music, dance, handicrafts. The process, however, is not new. What is happening across the global South today already occurred in Europe and North America decades ago, as industrialization gradually eliminated entire peasant cultures. Today, such 'museumization' is part and parcel of heritage politics. Thus dominant national populations often impose their idea of heritage on minority groups, whose cultures are then in turn preserved like specimens in jars. In this process, the 'cultures' ostensibly valorized in their fetishized forms may be the site of a double violence. In Ecuador, for example, in festivals where indigenous culture is celebrated, Spanish-speaking *mestizos* don Indian costumes, perform pre-Columbian dances, and play 'Indian' music, while the very people whose 'cultures' are being performed are not allowed to participate (Isar 2005b). Phenomena such as these challenge the process of heritage valorization. What is the point of preserving in the museum, or as performance for the tourist, what has been wiped out in the community? As Richard Kurin warns (2004: 74–75), this is to miss the

intricate and complex web of meaningful social actions undertaken by individuals, groups and institutions. ... Whether they survive or flourish depends upon so many things – the freedom and desire of culture bearers, an adequate environment, a sustaining economic system, a political context within which their very existence is at least tolerated. Actions to safeguard 'tangibilized' inventoried items of cultural production are unlikely to safeguard adequately the larger, deeper, more diffuse cultural patterns and contexts.

Clearly also 'The Heritage' is neither inherently nor exclusively positive. It can be a receptacle of meanings whose content can be positive or negative, constructive or destructive. Indeed, it is often accompanied by a complex and often discordant array of identifications and potential conflicts, not least when heritage places and objects are involved in legitimating power structures. The invention or creation of any heritage potentially disinherits or excludes those who do not subscribe to, or are not

embraced within, the terms of meaning attending that heritage; this quality is exacerbated when it is implicated in the same zero-sum definitions of power and territoriality that attend the modernist notion of the nation-state and its allegories of exclusive membership. That landscapes of tourism consumption are simultaneously other people's sacred places is another cause of heritage contestation on a global scale – the processes of sacralization and sacralizing also involve the exercise of profane forces (Ashworth, Graham and Tunbridge 2007). Hence the increasing salience of concepts such as 'heritage that hurts', 'negative heritage', or 'dissonant heritage' (Ashworth, et al. 2000).

In the 2007 volume of this *Series*, Viejo-Rose argued that heritage both tangible and intangible 'has become central to contemporary perceptions of collective memory' and that 'an increasing number of cultural groups now articulate their struggles for rights and recognition around the ownership and representation of their cultural heritage. ... And these representations – or negations of them – have often become conflictual, yoking history and culture to the purposes and acts of war' (Viejo-Rose 2007: 102). Spatial or temporal disruptions – war, conflict or crisis – have an impact on a collective's sense of continuity, and are remembered differently by different groups, who might uphold divergent accounts of the 'historical truth' or 'authentic memory' of the event. The idea of 'dissonant heritage' relates to the conflicts that arise from divergent interpretations of heritage or from opposing memories or visions of identity. These, in turn, bring up questions of authenticity, ownership and representation. Whose heritage is it? Whose voice is more authentic, or more legitimate in claiming the right to 'interpret' a site? Who has the right to publicly remember and be remembered?

For with the 'cult of heritage' comes the 'memory boom'. The notion of *collective memory*, our second term, not yet institutionalized as a public policy field,⁵ but almost equally prevalent as heritage, was first theorized by the French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs in the 1930s and has been refracted since then in many different ways (Wertsch 2002; also Wertsch and Billingsley in this volume). For Halbwachs, collective memory is always selective; different human groups elaborate different collective memories, which in turn give rise to different modes of behaviour. He explored, for example, how pilgrims to the Holy Land over the centuries had

evoked very different images of the life of Jesus Christ; how wealthy old families in France had a memory of the past that diverged sharply from that of the *nouveaux riches*; and how working-class constructions of past reality differed from those of their middle-class counterparts. A particularly influential recent addition to this tradition was made by the historian Pierre Nora and the colleagues, with whom he conceived the massive collaborative work entitled *Les lieux de mémoire* (1994). In relation to the memorializing function of cultural heritage (in its original meaning, derived from the Latin verb *monere*, a monument was something designed to remind, as an anamnestic device, a deliberate memorial), the collective memory of a nation or ethnic group can be represented in part by the memorials it chooses to erect. Forgetting is closely linked to anamnesis. As pointed out by the historian Ernest Renan as long ago as 1882, forgetting is not just a negation or absence of memory; it is a means of remembering otherwise (1990). Both what a collectivity chooses to memorialize, physically or otherwise, and what it chooses *not* to memorialize are significant. Such choices are integral to the way collectives deploy memory ‘in the service of providing a usable past’ (Wertsch 2002: 37) and can therefore be conceptualized as mnemonic communities that forge mnemonic traditions and often engage in mnemonic battles with one another (Zerubavel 2003).

In recent years, many different readings of memory have been articulated alongside the ‘memory boom’ that has emerged most strongly in Euro-American discursive space. The term has enjoyed considerable purchase in French academic thought

for some decades and is in fact commonly used in that country by more people than just the intelligentsia.⁶ In other European settings as well, the notion of memory seems to have been pressed into service as a form of collective Freudian ‘work’ on atrocious historical events such as massacres and genocides, notably the Holocaust (Todorov 2004). It has considerable currency in Germany, where memories of the Nazi era are prominent in public debates.⁷ Post-Communist memory work abounds in Central and Eastern Europe, documented in archives of repression built up in certain countries.⁸ Other regions have seen horrific events as well, but in India and Pakistan, for example, the massacres of the 1947 Partition and the mass-scale ethnic cleansings that took place are rarely evoked as issues of memory as such. Yet, as the notion of collective memory has been appropriated by diverse streams of socio-cultural research and commentary, it has perhaps become the most protean of the three terms, often used in rather muddled ways. Andreas Huyssen, a literary scholar, uses the term ‘cultural memory as it is articulated in institutions, in public debates, in theory, in art, and in literature’ (1995: 4). He observes that its broad use, ‘the newest obsession with memory’, also poses the ‘paradox that novelty in our culture is ever more associated with memory and the past rather than with future expectations’.⁹ He also notes that ‘memory as a concept rather than merely material for the historian seems increasingly to draw literary critics, historians and social scientists together’ (1995: 5–6). The textbox below is about the work of EUSTORY, a pan-European initiative on ‘historical images and patterns of remembrance’.

Box I.2 EUSTORY – the History Network for Young Europeans

The early twenty-first century winds of change that swept across Europe confronted Europeans with major challenges. One of these is the issue of European identity and how this is shaped by our common, but conflicted, European past. How much history still matters in Europe has become visible in many recent debates, disputes and even conflicts at the highest political level. For example, the Polish–German confrontation about the commemoration of forced migration and expulsion, the heated debate about the North-Stream gas pipeline and the different perceptions of the year 1989 as a major European turning point, to mention just a few. ‘Peace and freedom in Europe are still put to the test today by hatred and violence. If we Europeans want to establish a peaceful common future, we have to talk openly about our past’ said Nobel Peace Prize Winner and former Finnish President

Martti Ahtisaari when asked about his reason for supporting EUSTORY, the History Network for Young Europeans (www.eustory.eu). This international association of non-governmental organizations from 22 European countries is based on the common aim of understanding differences and overcoming divisions in Europe by enabling young Europeans to look critically at their past in order to understand the present. Instead of using history as an ideological weapon against others, EUSTORY emphasizes a European perspective on history that recognizes the vast diversity of historical experience and promotes understanding instead of exclusion. All EUSTORY member organizations share the same basic tool: they promote self-regulated work among young Europeans (school students) with national historical research competitions. In these competitions, the young people learn to view history from the grassroots by doing research in their own villages, communities and families. This research makes them understand how history has affected their surroundings, how it has shaped the lives of people in their community and in their family. With this approach, EUSTORY aims at the democratization and social reintegration of history, which is very important especially (but not only) in societies where memories have long been manipulated and suppressed. The topics of the EUSTORY competitions are usually very broad, i.e. 'Migration in History', 'The History of my Family', 'Borders' or 'Labour'. These broad topics allow the participants to find their own relevant sub-topics in their surroundings. Despite the fact that some of the topics do not seem to be political at all, the results of the competitions reveal a variety of different aspects of political European history. Twentieth-century family history in Russia cannot be dealt with without tackling the legacy of Stalinism. And looking at Spanish young people in the 1950s means asking questions about the Franco era as well. Since the Körber Foundation initiated EUSTORY in 2001, more than 115,000 students from Wales to the Eastern border of Russia, between the North Sea and Sicily have participated in its competitions.

But there is more to EUSTORY than national historical research competitions. It also enables its laureates to work together with their peers from other countries on topics of the European past and present by organizing regular international youth seminars. These seminars create space for encounters and facilitate dialogue on issues that are difficult and disputed within European societies today. These seminars deal with topics such as exclusion, discrimination and persecution in Europe, e.g. in Berlin on the sixtieth anniversary of the 1938 'Kristallnacht' pogrom that took place Germany and Austria, on stereotypes and prejudices within and towards the Balkans (Belgrade) and the legacy of the Soviet past in the Baltic States (in Tallinn and Tartu/Estonia).

The seminars give participants the opportunity to see history from different angles and understand that different perspectives and interpretations have to be taken into account before drawing any conclusions about the past and its relevance for the present. The seminars are the first steps the young prize winners actually take at the pan-European level. As a second step, EUSTORY has developed international e-learning projects for alumni (i.e. prize winners who took part in at least one international seminar) on topics of European remembrance, memory and identity. Using the internet as a tool and lasting between four and six months each, these projects provide the opportunity both for the participants as well as for EUSTORY as an organization to work in more depth on challenging themes of European relevance. Usually, these projects are linked to anniversaries and commemorations of major European historical events in order to provide a bottom-up perspective to the official discourses of remembrance.

For example, in 2005, when Europe celebrated the sixtieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War, EUSTORY asked 40 young Europeans, most of them prize winners of national history competitions, to research the legacy of the conflict in Europe and develop ideas for the future of remembrance. What will be the future of memories about the Second World War once there are no more eyewitnesses left who can keep the memories alive? How is the story of the War told in the different European countries, in families, in history textbooks at school and, last but not least, in the media? The project proved to be a practical lesson in multiple perspectives. One element was a comparative analysis of history textbooks from different countries: Bulgaria, Germany, France, Great Britain, Latvia, Poland, Russia and Sweden. Each of these countries were affected

by the Second World War in very different ways, and looking at these ways made the participants aware of how strongly images of history are formed by the narrative that is taught and learned at school. And it also made them understand how much the official narrative is still dominated by the national outlook. It was astonishing to see how united the participants were in their evaluation of the 'history culture' in their countries. They gave low marks to history teaching at school and were all in favour of an active form of dealing with history and strengthening of cross-border discussions about it. In summary, they all agreed that working on memory can only be successful if it does not end with the passive receipt of information, but allows each generation to enjoy the freedom of asking their own questions of history and of connecting the answers to their own reality.

In 2006 and 2007, when Europe officially celebrated the anniversaries of the Hungarian Uprising and the adoption of the Treaties of Rome, EUSTORY again used the opportunity to question the official politics of memory. Young Europeans from 12 different countries researched and debated the different ways in which protest, resistance and civil disobedience are remembered in Europe today. They compared definitions of these three terms in their respective national contexts, looked at the perceptions of the Hungarian Uprising of 1956 and presented events of protest, resistance and civil disobedience that are important for the remembrance in their countries. As a result, they questioned the official perception of the 1956 events as a precursor to European unification (as stated during the jubilee celebrations in spring 2007), but underlined instead how much this interpretation is a component of the European self-image in the twenty-first century. These two examples show that although Europe is struggling with global challenges, it is still vitally important for us Europeans to learn about our respective historical images and patterns of remembrance, to continually scrutinize them and to discuss them together. Above all, young people in particular must play an active role in this dialogue, never losing an opportunity to grapple critically with the Europe of yesterday and today. To do so would demonstrate responsible European citizenship in the best sense of the word.

Gabriele Woidelko

Yet the very idea of collective memory is also contested – and not only by psychologists like Schiff, who in this volume observes that the concept is as metaphorically potent as it is empirically inaccurate. The influential German historian Reinhard Koselleck had long been highly critical of the concept, and the late Susan Sontag was even more dismissive:

all memory is individual, unreproducible – it dies with each person. What is called collective memory is not a remembering but a stipulating: that this is important, that this is the story about how it happened, with the pictures that lock the story in our minds. Ideologies create substantiating archives of images, representative images, which encapsulate common ideas of significance and trigger predictable thoughts, feelings. (Sontag, 2003: 85–86)

Yet Assmann herself, although she cites this severe judgment does not believe that the idea of collective memory is spurious, but that 'it is much too vague to serve as a critical term' (2008: 55). She stresses the need to disaggregate this abstract, umbrella notion, to distinguish – as indeed do the contributors to this volume – among the different formats in which memory processes operate 'such as family memory, interactive group memory, and social, political, national and cultural memory' (2008: 55). While the first three are grounded in lived experience and will vanish with their carriers (like 'intangible heritage'), political and cultural memory must be 'grounded on the more durable carriers of external symbols and representations'. Designed for long-term use, these vehicles include libraries, museums, archives, monuments – all repositories of the discursive formation termed 'The Heritage' – as well as educational and artistic

institutions, ceremonies and commemorative dates and practices. But it is important to heed Assmann's call to 'the memory discourse to develop its own stance of critical vigilance and to develop criteria for probing the quality of memory constructions, distinguishing more 'malign' from more 'benign' memories – that is, memories that perpetuate resentment, hatred and violence from those that have a therapeutic or ethical value' (Assmann, 2008: 54).

In global mediascapes, processes of transmission of such cultural memory generate flows of, and productions of, memories in which particular narratives and images are reproduced and reframed, yet also questioned and contested through new images. Mediated memories are central in the creation of both individual and collective identities. Van Dijck has explored the shifts in new media technologies as they influence how we remember the past, and argues that 'media and memory, as cultural concepts, form the metaphors we live by: present technologies invariably and inherently shape our memories of past and present life' (2004: 272). Also, today, people are called upon to construct new memories better suited to increasingly 'post-national' cultural complexities. In many cases, the 'nation' is no longer the principal site or frame of memory. As compulsive consumers of the past, people now shop for what best suits their own sense of self at a given moment, and construct multiple identities out of a great variety of materials, times and places. The old *lieux de mémoire* seem to have lost much of their power to forge and sustain a single vision of the past, but they remain useful as sites where people with very different memories of the same events can communicate, appreciate and negotiate their respective differences. As Nora reminded us (1989: 13), after tracing the pre-national, national and post-national phases in the history of memory, 'modern memory is, above all, archival (cf. earlier remarks on the intangible heritage concept). It relies entirely on the materiality of the trace, the immediacy of the recording, the visibility of the image.' Or, as Huyssen suggests, for whom 'the media are the hidden veil through which I am looking at the problem of cultural memory', 'our mnemonic culture rejects the idea of the archive while depending on the archive's contents for its own sustenance' (1995: 6).

Whatever forms they take, collective memories are now yoked to the pervasive notion of *identity*, a

central keyword of our time. There is a vast and multi-faceted literature on the topic. Identity understood as a set of distinctive features inherited, assumed and asserted by different social formations – nations, ethnic groups, professions, age-sets or groups with shared sexual orientation – has been discussed in a great variety of ways. In previous volumes of this *Series*, we too have analyzed the contemporary avatars of identity in their relationships to the forces of globalization. We have foregrounded the play of identity politics, in both its beneficent and malevolent aspects, the latter being particularly toxic in the form of what Appadurai (2006: 51) has called 'predatory identities', whose 'social construction and mobilization require the extinction of other, proximate social categories', or when wars are waged in their name (Maalouf 2003), or when they are reduced to what Amartya Sen (2006) calls their single, 'solitarist' understandings. For this reason, instead of discussing the term in some depth, as we have done with the preceding two, suffice it to say here that the focus in this volume will be placed on the particular ways in which, driven by the forces of globalization and their responses to them, social groups deploy the resources of heritage and memory to identify themselves and cope with the 'uncertainties' about 'us' and 'them' that, as Appadurai also argues (2006: 6), globalization so often exacerbates. Although the myriad social constructions of identity in and by today's nation-states are rarely recognized as major questions of public policy, references to the notion of identity are on all politicians' lips. France, for example, was for several years endowed with a Ministry of Immigration and National Identity (*Ministère de l'Immigration, de l'Intégration, de l'Identité nationale et du Développement solidaire*). The concatenation of terms tells its own eloquent story. It represents anxieties that are encountered in other countries as well, significant aspects of which will be explored by the contributors to this volume.

Globalization and the triad of terms

Today, having a heritage is indispensable to having an identity and cultural memory; losing a heritage is like losing a key bit of both. Heritage has come to be used as 'proof' of past, tradition, belonging, and therefore proof also of rights to place, representation and political voice. To what extent does globalization

modify these interactions? As people become more mobile, and connect more frequently and widely, has there been a shift in trends towards valuing forms of heritage that are equally moveable and with higher connectivity? Could it be that the identities of both individual subjects and their collective cultural worlds may now be shifting and fragmented rather than unified and stable; composed, not of a single, but of several, sometimes contradictory or unresolved, strands? Do the migratory flows of our time, when churning up the relatively 'settled' character of many populations and cultures, also construct multiple identities across different, often intersecting and antagonistic, discourses, practices and positions? Is Hall correct to think that

although they appear to invoke an origin in a historical past with which they continue to correspond, actually identities are about questions of using the resources of history, language and culture in the process of becoming rather than being: not 'who we are' or 'where we came from', so much as what we might become, how we have been represented and how that bears on how we might represent ourselves. Identities are therefore constituted within, not outside representation. They relate to the invention of tradition as much as to tradition itself, which they oblige us to read not as an endless reiteration but as 'the changing same': not the so-called return to roots but a coming-to-terms-with our 'routes'. (Hall 1996: 3–4)

Against this backdrop, the terms heritage-memory-identity form a conceptual troika, in which both the concepts and the practices lead parallel as well as contrapuntal lives. They have become performative in their very utterance, 'doing things' (Austin 1962) rhetorically and concretely in the public sphere. They form composite discursive practice, as heritage serves as one of the ways in which 'the nation slowly constructs for itself a sort of collective social memory' as well as an identity 'by selectively binding its chosen high points and memorable achievements into an unfolding "national story"' (Hall 2005: 25). They are ever-changing as well. They deploy processes of domination and suppression, inclusion and exclusion: as these unfold, people tend to reify both identity and memory, referring to both as if they were material objects – memory as something to be retrieved; identity as something that can be lost or found. But neither identities nor memories

are *things*. Rather, they are *constructions* or *representations*, and as such, they are embedded in power and class relations that determine what is remembered (or forgotten), what is valued or deemed valueless – what is defined as heritage and what isn't – by whom and for what end. Just as history is written by the 'winners,' so too are the definitions and boundaries of heritage. Is globalization intensifying these multiple interpenetrations of heritage-memory-identity? These intersections are sometimes potentially explosive, as a result of both internal fissures and imaginings, but also under the impact of global pressures, e.g. *Hindutva's* claims on 'authentic Indian Hindu heritage', the kinds of memories that it constructs and the schizophrenic identities it is forced to assume. Along with this scenario, as Rustom Bharucha observes, there are counter-identity formations, with different memory restructurings, as in secular activism, which is not without its own violence and sanitization of pain.¹⁰ In taking up these sorts of issues in different settings, this volume would also echo earlier explorations in the 2007 volume of the *Series*, entitled *Conflicts and Tensions*.

There is a politics of heritage and a politics of memory just as there is a politics of identity. Heritage, memory and identity are central to 'invented tradition'.¹¹ They are not just constructs that individuals and groups think *about*; they are also constructs they think *with*. Every assertion of identity/heritage represents not only difference but also the elimination of difference. So too with any kind of commemorative activity that involves the deployment of individual and group memories together (Connerton 1989). Commemoration is often the product of intense contest and struggle. There are cases too of outright annihilation, as the persisting destruction of heritage in armed conflict sadly indicates, or instances of manipulation and suppression, of deliberate erasures of memory which lead to the construction of counter-memories, of 'memory-as-struggle', 'memory-as-resistance', counter-memories, and the re-emergence of submerged memories. Indeed, many different struggles for group rights – 'cultural rights' – are now organized as issues of memory as much as of identity, targeting the taboos and the exclusions. As Huyssen observes, 'monolithic notions of identity, often shaped by defensiveness or victimology, clash with the conviction that identities, national or otherwise, are always heterogeneous and in need

of such heterogeneity to remain viable politically and existentially' (1995: 5).

There is much social science investigation of the processes of cultural invention whereby peoples across the world 'are creating pasts, myths of ancestral ways of life that serve as powerful political symbols. In the rhetoric of postcolonial nationalism (and sometimes separatism) and the struggles of indigenous Fourth World peoples, now minorities in their own homelands, visions of the past are being created and evoked' (Keesing 1989: 19). Indeed, as Keesing puts it, anybody, whether scholar or activist, who is sympathetic to these political struggles and quests for identity, would be in a contradiction-ridden position in relation to these processes, for the ancestral ways of life evoked rhetorically may bear little relation to those documented historically, recorded ethnographically, and reconstructed archaeologically. Yet their symbolic power and political force are undeniable. To distance ourselves from them 'is a politically delicate task', as Richard Handler (1994: 38) observes, for the protagonists may well be peoples whose struggles we *want* to support. Deconstructing such notions 'at precisely the moment when the disempowered turn to them may aid the reactionary social forces who seek to reassert the validity of homogeneous 'mainstream' collective identities against proponents of 'multicultural' diversity'.

A decalogue of questions ... and a range of answers

In summary, the global cultural landscape is marked by a triple and conjoined proliferation: of heritages, of memories, of identities. This proliferation is highly fluid; it is sometimes irenic, sometimes conflictual; and it is highly diverse and ever-changing. Yet there are also shared trends in the ways the three elements interact with one another in the context of globalization. How are the forces of globalization inflecting the discourses and practices of heritage, memory and identity? In what new directions is globalization taking these discourses and practices? Are globalization processes facilitating them, or are their impacts rather more constraining? What happens to these knowledges and practices in an age of transnational migrations and networks (Ashworth et al. 2007)? What happens to boundaries and continuities as the smooth equivalence between

national identity, national memory and national heritage is challenged? Guided by this conceptual envelope, we initially set out ten sets of questions to articulate the content and structure of the volume:

- 1 *Heritage conservation as a global doctrine and practice*: What forces have been in play as preserving heritage has been made global doctrine by international standard-setting by organizations such as UNESCO? What local, national and regional discrepancies have arisen? Are these discrepancies accentuated by globalization or not?
- 2 *Deliberate destruction of heritage, memory and identity and their reconstruction*: As the reverse of the preservation medal, or counter-script, what transnational factors encourage or discourage deliberate defacement and destruction of heritage, memory and identity? What ideas are woven into the post-conflict reconstruction rhetoric? How, by whom, and with what intentions are certain elements and forms selected and others ignored? How do rewriting, revisioning, and reinterpreting heritage, memory and identity become explicit in policy and discourse?
- 3 *From the national to the sub-national*: How is heritage becoming an allegory for memories and identities at regional, sub-cultural and class levels? In other words, how is the concept becoming untied from the nation-state? What is the role of globalization in such processes? What role do the media play?
- 4 *Contemporary creativity and cultural heritage*: Following up on some of the questions explored in the 2009 volume, what are the interdependencies between artistic creation and heritage? How does artistic practice 'de-freeze', uncover or recover memories and identities? How does it shape or alter them?
- 5 *The cultural economy and heritage*: Heritage and commemoration are tied increasingly to the tourism industry. How is globalization accentuating the commodification of heritage and memory in different settings? How does the tourism industry impact upon the notions of authenticity and identity – of objects, performances and experiences?
- 6 *Diasporic heritage*: Are there manifestations of collective memory, identity and heritage among diasporic communities that are detached or different from nation-state-based manifestations?

- 7 *Multiple identities and multiple heritages*: How are multiple identities leading to the construction of mixed or hybrid heritage? Are 'intercultural' forms emerging? What are the implications?
- 8 *Memorializing practice and its sites*: What forms is memorializing practice taking in diverse socio-cultural settings? What deliberate or other forms of forgetting are taking place? What borrowings or transfers are being facilitated by globalization?
- 9 *Manipulated, erased and suppressed memories*: What forms of manipulation and suppression of historical memories are taking place today, e.g. as in Communist and post-Communist regimes, and the resulting 'counter-memories', 'memories of struggle' and 'memory wars'?
- 10 *Policy implication*: Finally, what are the policy implications that follow from the questions above, and what policy recommendations can be made?

Global approaches

As in previous volumes of this series, the first section explores cross-cutting themes that are global in scope or at least generic enough to manifest themselves in a very wide range of geo-cultural settings. We have chosen to open this section with a stage-setting essay by a leading scholar in the field of memory studies, James Wertsch, whose intellectual groundings span several disciplines. This chapter, written jointly with anthropologist Doc Billingsley, provides a framework for grasping the term 'collective memory'. Rather than review diverse theories, the authors suggest that a fruitful method of engaging memory and of establishing its connections with heritage and identity in an era of globalization is to focus on *remembering* as an active process. So the authors present an understanding of collective remembering based on mediation, particularly on narrative frameworks that mediate our understanding of the past, and their effects on our present identities. They argue that attention to the cultural mediation allows for a more coherent exploration of the relationship between identity projects that call upon the notion of memory and globalization. The latter may encourage the perpetuation of old mnemonic nationalisms and the emergence of new forms. In this perspective, we should see commemorative practices and

artefacts as examples of intangible and tangible heritage being used as resources to construct and legitimate representations of the past. In their most effective form, these representations take on characteristics of collective remembering, influencing people's understandings of their personal and group identities. It is also important to explore the impacts that national narratives and schematic narrative templates have on how people relate to the past and draw on memory for understanding the present. This is what the authors set out to do as they analyze the links between globalization and memory-related identity projects. Their case study is an ethnographic analysis of contemporary cultural revitalization movements among Maya communities in Guatemala.

'The Heritage' as a discursive practice has been central to cultural revitalization everywhere and the role played by international organizations, principally UNESCO, in propelling an intergovernmental discursive process is well known. Two major global scripts have emerged: 'World Heritage' and 'Intangible Heritage'. Isar's chapter, entitled 'UNESCO and Heritage: Global Doctrine, Global Practice' (see Chapter 2), explores the ways in which the UNESCO-led expansion of the heritage concept (appeals to *national* memories and identities are its ever-accompanying tropes) has evolved. Nation-states are the stakeholders here, as the owners of the symbolic capital they aptly term 'cultural property', and their ambitions in the heritage arena feed into a global political economy of prestige. Hence the need to deconstruct the identitarian stakes that lie behind the proliferation of World Heritage Sites. The discursive paradigm to which 'World Heritage' belongs was elaborated originally in Europe and North America. It may have been thoroughly globalized, but in the process, it has been contested in other geo-cultural settings, leading at once to ever-broader definitions of what is heritage, notably in the form of 'intangible heritage', but also to different notions of how all kinds of heritage should be preserved.

But what about more malevolent ways of affirming difference, such as the deliberate destruction of heritage, especially during war-time? What impacts does such destruction have in turn on notions of memory and identity? Dacia Viejo-Rose's chapter, entitled 'Destruction and Reconstruction of Heritage: Impacts on Memory and identity' (see Chapter 3), explores these questions. She also takes up the positive and negative consequences of reconstruction or

neglect. She discusses the more salient of these consequences, including those that we are only now beginning to appreciate, including the ways in which war creates new heritage even as it destroys. Memory and memorials are also put to diverse uses in the aftermath of war; their ever-changing nature makes it easy to deploy them for political ends. Mediated and transformed into global icons, destructive acts also acquire formidable symbolic dimensions. Part of this impact, as discussed in this chapter, is visible in ways the 'international community' has responded through reconstruction programmes and policies and in the creation of Truth and Reconciliation Commissions around the world that seek to acknowledge the firm grip in which the long arm of memory can hold societies. As these programmes are salient in cultural policies today, the author highlights some of the key policy implications of her findings and arguments.

The 'heritage industry' that accompanies contemporary tourism has been widely analyzed in many publications. Tim Winter's essay, 'The Political Economies of Heritage', places it within the global economic frameworks that condition the interplays among heritage, memory, identity and capital. These are not always recognized or adequately understood. Commodification (as discussed in Throsby 2008) is certainly involved, but there is more. Supposed losses of 'authenticity' are bemoaned, as the global dollar destroys, pollutes or erases, but Winter argues that the casual use of that term as a generic way of understanding the cultural-economic dyad masks the real complexities of the interaction. While the many instances in which heritage resources have been either endangered or lost give validity to such accounts, more nuanced, multi-vector understandings of this relationship are needed. In recent years much attention has been paid to how heritage, memory and identity are socially actualized in both material and non-material ways in the light of globalization. Winter considers how heritage and memory are being produced and shaped in particular contexts through a series of global political and economic processes, and highlights how such processes involve the privileging of certain forms of expertise and cultural knowledge. More specifically, he explores how heritage, memory and identity can come to be constituted and reconstituted through a highly complex, highly interconnected set of political economies.

The pulls and pressures of today's migratory

flows complexify notions of heritage, memory and identity in different ways. Some of these are explored in Ien Ang's 'Unsettling the National: Heritage and Diaspora' (see Chapter 5). The relationships between heritage and diaspora are complex and problematic. Bringing them together in a cultural studies perspective therefore opens up a range of tensions which trouble the intimate interrelationship that presumably exists among (national) identity, memory and heritage. A diasporic perspective cracks open the nationalist narrative of seamless national unity, highlighting the fact that nations today inevitably harbour populations with multiple pasts, bringing memories and identities into circulation that often transcend or undercut the homogenizing image of nationhood and national heritage. At the same time, the heritage lens reveals some of the internal tensions and contradictions in the very idea of diaspora, which exemplify the multifaceted complexities of identity formation in the contemporary globalized world. These complexities cannot be contained within the cultural and geographical confines of the nation-state. Ang focuses on new institutions of memorial culture in the diasporic space, in particular museums, a concern that is echoed further on in the volume by Julie Thomas's ethnographic exploration of museums of immigration.

But primordially rooted peoples relate to territory in rather different ways, invoking the resources of heritage, memory and identity in reference to a *single* place to which they claim privileged belongingness. This perspective is addressed by anthropologist Jean-Pierre Warnier's chapter, entitled 'Territorialization and the Politics of Autochthony' (see Chapter 6). This politics has emerged around the claims of 'autochthonous' (or 'Indigenous') peoples who claim to be born on a territory occupied by their ancestors from time immemorial and with which they maintain a specific economic and spiritual relationship. Their territorial rootedness was recognized in the 'Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples', adopted by the United Nations in 2007. Elaborated in the wake of fifty years of activism on the part of non-governmental organizations and Indigenous movements, this international standard-setting treaty was designed to protect *inter alia* the heritage, memory and identity of the latter. Indigenous Peoples justify their activism on the grounds of their autochthony. They claim fundamental and special rights to territories. Yet a closer examination of their movements around the world

shows that they can have diverse and sometimes conflicting agendas. This has not prevented them from converging on a global scale and confronting the top-down policies of states, which all have a key stake in territorializing their populations and controlling migratory flows. As a result, Indigenous People's politics of heritage, memory and identity are intertwined with complex global issues.

The passion for memorialization has also created a specific contemporary and global expression in the ritual forms that include mourning and protest that have emerged recently in public spaces where particular deaths are considered unjust and traumatic, either because a famous person or because anonymous citizens the victims of a massacre. These improvised memorials have been dubbed 'grassroots memorials' in order to highlight both their political dimension and their non-institutionalized character. There appears also to be a global pattern in the ways these memorials are formed and organized. In their chapter, entitled 'Grassroots Memorials as Sites of Heritage Creation' (see Chapter 7), Cristina Sánchez-Carretero and Carmen Ortiz explore this phenomenon with particular reference to the *Archivo del Duelo* (Archive of Mourning) research project created by the Spanish National Research Council (CSIC) in response to the terrorist attacks of 11 March 2004 in Madrid.

Yet in the global memory culture, formal institutions have long existed as well, e.g. as museums and heritage sites. In 1999, the directors of nine historic sites across the world came together to explore a common question: how could their sites promote human rights? They imagined a new type of space, a 'Site of Conscience'. These entities work at the intersection of historic preservation, human rights, citizen engagement, education, and the arts. To achieve their vision, they wrestle with a variety of critical issues. What does a heritage practice for human rights look like? What is required to promote a lasting culture of human rights and civic participation in a society? And what role can heritage play in that process? These are some of the difficult questions raised by Liz Ševčenko, who is the founding Director of the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, in her chapter, entitled 'Sites of Conscience: Heritage for Human Rights' (see Chapter 8).

It has become inconceivable today to use any of the three cultural notions we are discussing in this volume – particularly heritage – independently of the concept of 'nature'. A passionate advocate of

environmental conservation, writer and researcher Benjamin Morris, takes us through the many diverse relationships between cultural heritage and the natural environment. Beginning with the premise that conventional divisions between nature and culture can no longer be maintained, Morris explores the multiple forms of heritage that the natural world has occasioned, such as protected spaces and conservation movements. How have natural events, such as disasters, been memorialized into heritage? How has the natural world been invoked in the construction and/or representation of local and national identities? Looking to the future, Morris also allows us to round off this first section of the volume on a future-oriented note of interrogation. Will anthropogenic global warming serve as a context in which changes in natural processes that simultaneously impact cultural heritage sites and traditions provide an opportunity to reconnect societies fragmented by the forces of globalization?

Regional realities

This section, as its title indicates, brings together essays that explore issues specific to or characteristic of different world regions. It is not designed to be an exhaustive 'state of the art' for each region, but merely to provide a selection of regionally-specific perspectives or problem areas. We are aware of the potential risk of essentialization in reverse, as if such abstractions as 'Africa' or 'Asia' are ever effective platforms for commonalities rather than internal difference. Yet we still recognize the value of treatments that bring to the fore families of cultural and societal realities distinctly different from those of the 'West'. Under the conditions of globalization, it surely behooves us to contribute to the latter's 'provincialization', to borrow Chakrabarty's provocative term (2000). The contestation of Western ideas of universalism has characterized the expanding heritage discourse, as Isar's chapter has argued. Jagath Weerasinghe's 'Living Sacred Heritage and "Authenticity" in South Asia' (see Chapter 10) explores how different forces in South Asia – states, civil societies and the corporate world – articulate ideas and practices in opposition to norms originating in the erstwhile 'central' countries. His focus is on South Asian understandings of the notion of 'authenticity' and the way these influence heritage preservation practice.

The lens remains focused on Asian conditions as sociologists Aurel Croissant and Paul Wesley Chambers analyze the acrimonious dispute between Cambodia and Thailand over an eleventh-century Hindu temple situated along the Thai–Cambodian border. Their focus is on the way Thais perceive and talk about this contested site of collective memory. As in many other local cases, the inter-state heritage and memory-based conflict has taken on special salience in the context of globalization, as it is linked to the spread of new concepts of identity, boundary, and territory and their links to distinguished architectural heritage. The contested temple site and the surrounding area are registered in recent Thai memory as land wrested away from them by Westerners.

The viewpoint then shifts to the African continent, focusing on Southern Africa. Heritage tourism is developing here at a rapid pace. As archaeologists Susan Keitumetse, Laura McAtackney, and Gobopaone Senata argue, these developments heighten the need for the communities concerned to clarify the ways in which local cultural identities can be positively expressed thereby. Archaeological remains, monuments and cultural landscapes are readily available for heritage marketing and consumption. But intangible and/or invisible aspects of heritage also exist, as storehouses of memory that can provide significant resources. Formulating identities on the basis of the latter is necessarily varied and often will not conform to conventional heritage management methods. The authors explore the potential for alternative approaches in Botswana and South Africa. While their concerns echo and amplify those expressed earlier by Winter with regard to the hegemonic political economies within which heritage tends to be exploited for tourism purposes, their judgement of heritage tourism itself is more positive (however, Box 12.1 by Michael Francis on the San people that accompanies the chapter is less sanguine about its benefits (see page 163)).

Such concerns are also tied to the ways in which *multiple* and shifting notions of heritage and identities are being elaborated. Anthropologist Rosabelle Boswell explores these dynamics in the three island nations of southern Africa: Mauritius, Zanzibar and Madagascar. In these countries, heritage, memory and identity are categories of practice. In other words, they are constructed by the actors themselves for their own purposes. However, the deployment of

heritage for tourism, nation-building and ethnic memorialization is turning heritage into a category of analysis. Moreover, the formalizing of heritage risks homogenizing identity and recasting heritage and memory as uncomplicated reflections on the past. Globalization is complicating the process of abstraction: identity and memory are becoming more deterritorialized, ordinary people are actively engaged in the casting of their own identities and new spaces are challenging the continued salience to identity of heritage and memory-making.

We alluded earlier in this Introduction to the many debates about history and memory taking place in post-Communist Europe. As these societies turn their backs on the 1945–89 years, is the material and immaterial culture left behind from that period condemned to total destruction? Is there an historical responsibility to preserve the cultural production of the discredited ‘socialist’ order? And what of the principles that characterized its cultural policies, apparently so beneficial and benevolent – at least to those who trod the ideological line? Arguing that the cultural production of that era was much more diverse and multifaceted than is commonly assumed, Dragan Klaić sets out his case by examining the uses of heritage policy – under Communism and after it. In the latter case, heritage and memory have been appropriated by governments for national representation and promotion. They have also been swept into the maw of the global neo-liberal political economy. In fact, Klaić argues, there is an ongoing tension between nationalist and neo-liberal motivations, and the case studies of some ‘radical interventions’, as he calls them, are there to prove it. Nostalgia is part of the ‘structure of feeling’ here. Many groups experience forms of ‘aesthetic nostalgia’ that lead them to venerate an ‘authentic’ collective past. A particularly salient form of the latter is the ‘Yugo-nostalgia’ that Zala Volčić analyzes in her chapter entitled ‘Post-socialist Recollections: Identity and Memory in Former Yugoslavia’ (see Chapter 15). This collective phenomenon harks back to a shared cultural history yet also provides the raw material for new forms of distinct national identities for each of the former Yugoslav republics. Symbolic spaces and ‘flows’ of people, capital and products form particular routes of memorizing, determining the ways in which discourses of memory and nostalgia circulate. Memories of the Yugoslav past come together with nationalist affirmations of identity to create a

distinctive cultural arena. As in many settings across the world, the combination also provides content for the global commercial communication order.

Whereas in an earlier age heritage was the artist's principal source of inspiration, the grounding for the continuity of cultural identity, twentieth-century modernism held that contemporary art must oppose or negate tradition. Postmodern sensibility has led us to challenge this dichotomy. Indeed, contemporary attempts to build continuity between heritage and creativity were among the topics taken up in the previous volume, entitled *Cultural Expression, Creativity and Innovation*. Globalization bears upon these attempted syntheses between past and present in many different ways. Analyzing the recent experience of Latin America, where public policies have tended to privilege 'high culture' forms, Lucina Jiménez López explores both Latin American popular culture and contemporary artistic practice marked by blurred boundaries and new genres. She analyzes how globalization has impacted these different repertoires and draws some strong conclusion for policy-making in the countries of the region.

Fields and issues

This section brings together chapters covering particular issues that arise with regard to heritage, memory, identity or relevant phenomena. Complementing Ien Ang's treatment of conceptual issues pertaining to museums as public sites, Julie Thomas provides an ethnographic analysis of the permanent exhibitions of two national museums of immigration in France and the United Kingdom. This museography structures the interplay between diasporic heritage and identity and nation-state heritage and identity. In response to the pressures of globalization, 'memory' and 'identity' have been manipulated in the display in ways that allows the 'heritage' in these two countries to be subtly redefined not in terms of plural content but in terms of civic 'process'.

The city of Istanbul has two chapters devoted to it. This is not because it was declared a 'European Capital of Culture' for the year 2010, but because it is an exceptionally germane laboratory for the heritage/memory/identity problematic, as well as embodying such an evocative palimpsest of heritage and memory for artists and writers. In 'Heritage,

Memory, Debris: Sulukule, Don't Forget' (see Chapter 18), Asu Aksoy and Kevin Robins explore the sociological interactions between political economy and ethnic discrimination, as they relate the recent destruction of Sulukule, a predominantly Roma district located in the historical peninsula of Istanbul. They describe the process by which the local municipality initiated a programme of radical urban 'redevelopment' in the cause of gentrification in the historic, central zone of the city. They situate the developments in Sulukule in the context of the longer-term cultural imaginary through which the city's historical trajectory has come to be conceived, as elaborated in the literary texts of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar and, later, Orhan Pamuk. Finally, they explore the evolving new conceptual and ideological frame that is serving as a rationale for the reinvention, in the name of development, of Istanbul's cultural heritage and identity. In her essay, 'Knowing the City: Migrants Negotiating Materialities in Istanbul', Yael Navaro-Yashin deploys the ethnographer's gaze on the ways in which migrants into two districts of Istanbul come to know and interpret the built environment which they inhabit. Weaving through migrants' ways of negotiating the materialities around them, the author discovers that the city is known to its contemporary inhabitants in fragmentary and partial terms. As if collecting pieces of a puzzle or assembling units of debris, migrants attempt to understand the past and the future of the built environment left behind by Greek and Jewish exiles or emigrés. Their stories form another distant layer of memory by removal in the record of Istanbul's history.

A very specific type of memory work is connected with the remembering (or not) of traumatic or shameful collective experiences. Sociologist Akiko Hashimoto's chapter, 'Divided Memories, Contested Histories: The Shifting Landscape in Japan' (see Chapter 20), examines the way Japanese society treats traumatic memories of the Second World War and includes comparisons with the German approach in her discussion. Her essay adds to the broad sweep of Ian Buruma's classic treatment of the topic (2009). As she observes, winners and losers remember wars differently. For every victor who remembers a good, honourable war, there is a vanquished counterpart who remembers a humiliating failure. If winners accept victory as a mostly uncomplicated affair, losers, by contrast, face a predicament of living with a discredited past

that stains national history. Hashimoto's exploration illuminates the impact of this quandary in post-Second World War Japan, and its search for a renewed identity in the global world at the turn of the century. The last years of the twentieth century proved to be a critical time for Japan to revise its national goals, yet at this pivotal time of social transition, Japanese citizens remain deeply divided in their vision of the future between progressive and conservative directions.

Ananda Breed looks at a very specific genre of memory work in her treatment of the use of theatre in relation to the Rwandan mass killings of 1994. The use of theatre to memorialize and commemorate that terrible genocide is illustrated by a case study of *Rwanda My Hope*, a production written and performed by survivors of the genocide. While initially recognizing the usefulness of theatre to embody survivor testimonies and human rights discourses, the author actually questions its performative dimension and considers some of the ethical implications of 'genocide theatre' when presented to international audiences and donor agencies in the context of globalization.

Given the metaphoric nature of the very notion of memory itself, the stipulated or fictive aspect we alluded to earlier, we thought it would be appropriate to include a contribution from psychologists or social psychologists whose work is grounded in empirically observable *individual* memories. Schiff, Porto de Andrade and Toulemonde have analyzed the narrations of Arab–Jewish couples living in France. On this basis, they argue that collective memories can be understood as individual narratives that are negotiated in concrete social relationships. Here, in the context of globalization, the task of establishing a coherent and sustaining couple identity has become more problematic. On the basis of life-story conversations with Arab–Jewish mixed couples, they discover how couples create, or fail to create, a coherent story of their identity.

It also seemed indispensable to hear from a contemporary artist who directly addresses memory in her work. Paris-based Esther Shalev-Gerz develops photographs and installations in public space through active dialogue, consultation and negotiation with people whose participation places the emphasis on their individual and collective memories. In her essay, entitled 'Listening Voices: On Actualizing Memories', she comments on how

globalization brings together people who have very different modes of both conceiving and communicating what memory, identity and heritage mean for them. Some of these modes are not even thinkable for others. Language/s become elements of identification and translation through voice and listening (the person's body and image). Yet many meanings remain wordless. How can art create a place that does not depend only on concepts and words, but acts as a platform that opens up new encounters and thus unlocks new openings into memories and heritage, she asks?

To close Part I, we invited two eminent scholars to contribute commentaries on the heritage-memory-identity triad and globalization in the light of perspectives brought to bear by other contributors to the volume. In her commentary, anthropologist Henrietta L. Moore interrogates the notion of 'intangible heritage' in the context of the broader claims of identity and culture that are abroad in the world today. What are the links between the notion of intangibility and ideas of culture as assets? To address such questions it is necessary to deconstruct the value assigned to cultural distinctiveness and/or diversity, to revisit the taken-for-granted dichotomy between the traditional and the modern and thence to analyze, as does Moore, the entanglements between the 'modernities' that have emerged in different parts of the world. Here the argument is based on the entanglements between Western and Japanese modernity. Finally, Moore explores how globally shared technologies abet the elaboration of new worlds of meaning that engage in new ways with notions of heritage, memory and identity. The closing essay, entitled 'From the Tower of Babel to the Ivory Tower', by the doyen of heritage scholars David Lowenthal, echoes the axiological note struck in the Foreword by Pierre Nora. The 'Tower of Babel' is a metaphor for the ways in which, as demonstrated by various contributions to the volume, obsessive emphasis on exclusive, unique and fiercely acquisitive identities suffuses the heritage debate with tension and conflict; the 'Ivory Tower' for the utopian vision of a truly cosmopolitan heritage, hence for a truly global trust in heritage stewardship that might curb 'the reckless present with the elevated lessons of the past'.

These observations bring us back to the abiding purpose of this *Series*, which is to shed light on the ways in which issues of culture, together with the

complex and often loose understandings characteristic of contemporary 'culture talk', have generated such a range of expectations, anxieties and illusions across the world. As with ideas of the 'cultural conflict', 'cultural economy' or 'creativity and innovation', the expectations with regard to heritage, memory and identity are tied to their paradigmatic usage in our societies today. The anxieties arise from their frequent overuse and abuse, while the illusions are the result of overblown visions, of simplifications that are reductive, and readings that are instrumental. We can only reiterate our conviction that the expectations can be justified, the anxieties allayed and the illusions dispelled by the patient and methodical marshalling of evidence in informed and conceptually sensitive ways. It is our hope that this volume too, like its predecessors, will contribute meaningfully to that task.

Notes

- 1 For the purposes of the Series, we take 'culture' to be both the lived and creative experience for individuals and a body of artifacts, symbols, texts and objects; in other words, both heritage and contemporary creation, involving both enactment and representation. In this broad yet bounded vision, culture embraces art and art discourse, the symbolic world of meanings, the commodified output of the cultural industries as well as the spontaneous or enacted, organized or unorganized meaning-linked expressions of everyday life, including social relations. It is constitutive of both collective and individual identity.
- 2 As was the 'conflicts and tensions' dyad of the first volume, which explored the ways in the exponential growth in affirmations of, or claims to, cultural difference in the face of the forces of globalization have given rise to multiple conflicts and tensions in recent years. As we put it, 'behind the concern for "culture" that is increasingly evoked in contemporary public debate lurks the specter of conflict: the cultural dimensions of conflict on the one hand, and the conflictual dimensions of culture on the other' (Anheier and Isar 2007: 19). By contrast, the 'cultural economy', our theme in 2008, related rather more to the 'arts and heritage' understanding of culture or, more precisely, to the ways in which a global political economy of goods and services based on cultural content, commonly referred to as the 'cultural' or the 'creative' industries, was fraught by global imbalances and/or divides. This we followed up with the third volume, entitled *Cultural Expression, Creativity and Innovation*, a theme chosen precisely because the reigning 'creative economy' discourse tends to ignore the core resources of individual or collective creativity and innovation in artistic practice. It appeared necessary to redress the balance.
- 3 For example, in the inaugural *Conflicts and Tensions* volume, the politics of identity was linked to 'memory wars' and the deliberate destruction of historic monuments was also discussed. The role of cultural industries as vectors of group identity was highlighted in *The Cultural Economy*, the second volume, while attention was paid to heritage conservation as a form of meta-cultural production and as an 'industry'. The third volume, *Cultural Expression, Creativity and Innovation*, explored the dialectics of twenty-first century cultural expression based on both inherited and emerging forms and traditions.
- 4 While *valuing* means simply appreciating existing value, *valorizing* is the process of adding value through intervention and interpretation, a process that 'begins when individuals, institutions or communities decide that some object or place is worth preserving, that it represents some worth remembering, something about themselves and their past that should be transmitted to future generations' (Avrami, Mason and de la Torre 2000: 8).
- 5 Only a few countries, for example, have official institutes devoted to questions of national memory. Spain is rare in having adopted in 2007 a Historic Memory Law (see chapter by Sánchez-Carretero and Ortiz, page 106). Its full official title is the following: *Ley por la que se reconocen y amplían derechos y se establecen medidas en favor de quienes padecieron persecución o violencia durante la Guerra Civil y la Dictadura*.
- 6 As these lines are being written, the 2010 *Monumenta* exhibit in the historic *Grand Palais* exhibition hall in Paris is a massive audiovisual commemoration mounted by the French artist Christian Boltanski. In a parallel project he calls *The Heart Archives*, Boltanski is recording millions of heartbeats. An explanatory panel that 'the sound of a beating heart, a symbol of life to oppose time's passage to oblivion, becomes one part of a vast living memory, in which each may find his or her place, concretely and individually, while also participating in creating a modern myth...'
- 7 For example, on 13 February 2010, two memory scholars contributed an Op-Ed piece to the *New York Times* linking historical memory and built form. The piece, entitled 'A Damnation of Memory', was about the construction by the Bavarian Monument Protection Agency of a roadside chapel near the town of Berchtesgaden using stones from Adolf Hitler's nearby alpine retreat on the Obersalzberg (Ryback and Beierl 2010).
- 8 See István Rév's masterful treatment in *Retroactive Justice: Prehistory of Post-Communism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005). Also Richard S. Ebenshade, 'Remembering to Forget: Memory, History, National Identity in Postwar East-Central Europe' in *Representations*, Special Issue 49, Winter 1995.
- 9 He speaks of the West.

- 10 In email comments made to the co-editors about the initial *Brief* sent to contributors.
- 11 See the classic definition in E.J. Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition* (1983: 1): “Invented tradition” is taken to mean a set of practices, normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules

and of a ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past ... However, insofar as there is such reference to a historic past, the peculiarity of ‘invented’ traditions is that the continuity with it is largely factitious.’

REFERENCES

- Abu El-Haj, N. (2001) *Facts on the Ground: Archaeological Practice and Territorial Self-Fashioning in Israeli Society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Appadurai, A. (2006) *Fear of Small Numbers. An Essay on the Geography of Anger*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Appiah, K.A. (2006) *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co.
- Ashworth, G.J., Graham, B. and Tunbridge, J.E. (2000) *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- (2007) *Pluralising Pasts: Heritage, Identity and Place in Multicultural Societies*. London: Pluto Press.
- Assmann, A. (2008) ‘Transformations between History and Memory’, *Social Research*, Vol. 75, No. 1, Spring, pp. 49–72.
- Austin, J.L. (1962) *How To Do Things with Words: The William James Lectures Delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Avrami, E., Mason, R. and de la Torre, M. (2000) ‘Report on Research’ in E. Avrami and Mason (eds) *Values and Heritage Preservation*. Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Trust.
- Buruma, I. (2009) *The Wages of Guilt: Memories of War in Germany and Japan*. London: Grove Atlantic (revised edition).
- Chakrabarty, D. (2000) *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Choay, F. (1992) *L'allegorie du patrimoine*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- (2009) *Le patrimoine en questions: Anthologie pour un combat*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- Connerton, P. (1989) *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halbwachs, M. (1980) *The Collective Memory*. New York: Harper & Row/Colophon Books.
- Hall, S. (1996) ‘Introduction: Who Needs Identity?’, in S. Hall and P. du Gay (eds), *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage.
- (2005) ‘Whose Heritage’, in J. Littler and R. Naidoo (eds), *The Politics of Heritage: The Legacies of ‘Race’*. London: Routledge.
- Handler, R. (1994) ‘Is “Identity” a Useful Concept?’, in J.R. Gillis (ed.), *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D. and Perraton, J. (1999) *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics, and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. and Ranger, T. (1983) *The Invention of Tradition*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huysen, A. (1995) *Twilight Memories: Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia*. New York: Routledge.
- Isar, Y.R. (2005a) ‘Tangible and Intangible Heritage: Are They Really Castor and Pollux?’, in *INTACH Vision 2020* (Proceedings of the conference INTACH 2020, organized by the Indian National Trust for Art and Cultural Heritage, INTACH, November 2004). New Delhi: INTACH.
- Isar, Y.R. (2005b) ‘The Mobilization of Cultural Identity and Difference: Some Conceptual Perspectives’, paper presented at the Sixth Mediterranean Social and Political Research Meeting, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, European University Institute (March).
- Keesing, R. (1989) ‘Creating the Past: Custom and Identity in the Contemporary Pacific’, *The Contemporary Pacific*, Vol. 1, Nos. 1 and 2, Spring and Fall, pp. 19–42. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (1998) *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums and Heritage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (2004) ‘Intangible Heritage as Metacultural Production’, *Museum International*, Nos 221–222 (May): 52–65. Paris: UNESCO/Blackwell Publishing.
- Kong, L. (2010) ‘Creative Economy, Global City: Globalizing Discourses and the implications for Local Arts’, *Cultural Expression, Creativity and Innovation. The Cultures and Globalization Series*, 3. London: Sage, pp. 166–175.
- Kurin, R. (2004) ‘Intangible Cultural Heritage in the 2003 UNESCO Convention’, *Museum International*, Nos 221–222 (May): 66–76. Paris: UNESCO/Blackwell Publishing.
- Lowenthal, D. (1985) *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1998) *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (first paperback edition).

- (1994) 'Identity, Heritage and History', in J.R. Gillis (ed.), *Commemorations. The Politics of National Identity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Maalouf, A. (2003) *In the Name of Identity: Violence and the Need to Belong*. London: Penguin Book.
- Nora, P. (1989) 'Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*', *Representations*, No. 26 (Spring), pp. 7–25.
- (1994) *Les lieux de mémoire*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Renan, E. (1990) 'What is a Nation?', in H. Bhabha (ed.), *Nation and Narration*. New York: Routledge (English translation of lecture delivered in 1882).
- Ryback, T.W. and Beierl, F.M. (2010) 'A Damnation of Memory', *The New York Times*, 13 February, 2010.
- Samuel, R. (1994) *Theatres of Memory*. London: Verso.
- Smith, L. (2006) *Uses of Heritage*. New York: Routledge.
- Sontag, S. (2003) *Regarding the Pain of Others*. New York: Picador.
- Throsby, D. (2008) 'Globalization and the Cultural Economy: a Crisis of Value', in H.K. Anheier and Y.R. Isar (eds), *The Cultural Economy: The Cultures and Globalization Series*, 2. London: Sage.
- Todorov, T. (2004) *Les abus de la mémoire*. Paris: Arléa.
- Tomlinson, J. (1999) *Globalization and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Urry, J. (1990) *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.
- van Dijck, J. (2004) 'Mediated Memories: Personal Cultural Memory as an Object of Cultural Analysis', *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*, Vol. 18, pp. 261–277.
- Viejo-Rose, D. (2007) 'Conflict and the Deliberate Destruction of Cultural Heritage', *Conflicts and Tensions: The Cultures and Globalization Series*, 1. London: Sage, pp. 102–118.
- Wertsch, J.V. (2002) *Voices of Collective Remembering*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Young, J.E. (1993) *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Zerubavel, E. (2003) *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.