Heritage Studies

Heritage Studies:
Stories in the Making

Edited by

Meghan Bowe, Bianca Carpeneti,
Ian Dull and Jessie Lipkowitz

CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS
PUBLISHING

Heritage Studies: Stories in the Making,
Edited by Meghan Bowe, Bianca Carpeneti, Ian Dull and Jessie Lipkowitz

This book first published 2013

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-4865-4, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-4865-7

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

13th CHS	The 13th Annual Cambridge Heritage Research Seminar
AHM	Archaeological Heritage Management
AHD	Authorised Heritage Discourse
CA	Conventional Approach
CHS	Cambridge Heritage Research Seminar
CHSS	Cambridge Heritage Seminar Series
CRM	Cultural Resource Management
HRG	Heritage Research Group Cambridge
IAA	Israeli Antiquities Authority
NAGPRA	Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act
NCAM	National Corporation for Antiquities and Museums
NCMG	Nottingham City Museums & Galleries
NMB	National Museum of Bermuda
PA	Palestinian Authority
RARI	Rock Art Research Institute
SGA	Society of Greek Archaeologists
UCH	Underwater Cultural Heritage
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
VBA	Values-Based Approach

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The editors would like to thank the conference committee responsible for organising the 13th Annual Cambridge Heritage Research Seminar: Lorena Bushell, Sofia Cecchi, Catherine Dent, Ana Escobedo, Laura Kraak, Andrea Koenker, Alice Rose, Calum Robertson, Cydney Stasiulis, Valerie Teh and Yingwen Tao.

We are indebted to the guidance and supervision of the following people: Britt Baillie, Gilly Carr and Dacia Viejo-Rose. We would also like to thank the contributors of this volume and the conference participants for their enriching conversation and thought.

And finally thank you to Marie Louise Stig Sørensen for not only contributing to this volume but for the entire study of Heritage at Cambridge.

PREFACE

MARIE LOUISE STIG SØRENSEN

Reflecting on the routes that have brought us to a particular intellectual (and social) place is always interesting, challenging and at times also sobering. It provokes introspection, and also probing; questions about "why" and "how" become genuine, and if not exactly answerable they can at least be mused over. When we organised the 13th Cambridge Heritage Research Seminar the aim was exactly this, to inspire such reflection—where are we in terms of Heritage Studies and what routes have we travelled to arrive at this stage? Looking back over the years to the beginning of graduate teaching of heritage, trends appear, both obvious ones and some that are more subtle or intricate. Below, I consider some of these using the University of Cambridge as my case. Although this is a single case, and the particular constellations of people and opportunities are therefore distinct to the place, we were amongst the first departments teaching heritage and the changing trajectories and experiences gained may therefore reflect also on the development of this new field of studies more generally.

The Beginning

At Cambridge, the graduate degree course in Archaeological Heritage and Museums began in 1990 (with John Carman, who later became a central figure in the field, being one of the three students testing a precursor to the course in 1988, before he began his PhD research). During my interview in 1987, for the position as an Assistant Lecturer in European Bronze Age, I was asked whether I wanted to contribute to other avenues of teaching. I explained that I would be interested in developing a course on heritage. The background to this was that I had developed a strong interest in the political dimensions of archaeology, from both contemporary and historiographic perspectives. Until that point John Alexander, who otherwise lectured on the European Iron Age and African archaeology, each year gave one or two undergraduate lectures about the organisation of heritage in the UK, but otherwise the area had no presence

in the curriculum, nor was heritage offered as a course at other universities. So I was very free—and alone—to develop my ideas about what heritage teaching should and could entail. One of the concerns was what to call the course. CRM (Cultural Resource Management) or AHM (Archaeological Heritage Management) had by then become common acronyms for heritage-related management, especially as it related to the rapidly expanding scene of rescue archaeology. Henry Cleere advised me to select the name carefully, as the word "resource" would not translate well into French; hence we called our degree "Archaeological Heritage and Museums." Combining heritage teaching with museology, which had already developed as a distinct field, was seen as a way of giving the course a broadly based profile, both in terms of its attractiveness and its relevance to the labour market. The Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology therefore became involved with the teaching from early on, offering one of the three papers that made up the degree, with the museum paper variously coordinated by Robin Boast or Chris Chippendale, with Anita Herle and Mark Elliot adding to the museum-based teaching staff. From the beginning the aim was, as it continues to be, to offer an academic degree that provides students with a thinking space where the condition of heritage has to be questioned, challenged and debated rather than taken for granted. It was not exclusively theoretical, but aimed to go beyond a practical perspective so that students leaving the course would be able to approach any kind of task, including practical ones, with a discursive understanding of the wider field rather than simply trusting existing solutions and procedures.

Studying Heritage: a Widening Field

Around the same time a few other UK universities as well as some abroad began to offer similar courses. Our MPhil course in Archaeological Heritage and Museums can, with hindsight, be seen as part of a more general trend of an emerging and quickly expanding field that saw heritage as its remit. In the early 1990s it was, however, a small, marginal and in every sense truly an emerging sub-field. For the first few years it was realistic to aim at producing comprehensive reading lists that covered the whole field; now we all have to settle for carefully selected recommendations amongst a vastly expanded resource. Nonetheless, the field has not yet become disciplined in a strict sense. I believe this is because it, while no longer marginal, continues to exist within an inter-disciplinary space. This is an interesting place to occupy and Heritage Studies may now be recognised not merely as a cross-disciplinary research

field but rather as a trans-disciplinary project that explores and brings together methods as well as intellectual arguments and concerns from within a range of disciplines and increasingly making them its own.

One way of looking for trends within this development is to consider the composition of the MPhil student cohorts: who studies heritage and how has this changed or not changed over the years. Some 160 students have taken the Cambridge MPhil course in Archaeological Heritage and Museums since 1990, with more than 25 PhD students having completed dissertations relating to heritage and museums. In terms of variables such as gender, age, nationality and academic background, there are only a few discernible trends in their composition. This seems surprising; but the students were from the beginning mixed in terms of nationality, the age profile shows no distinct long-term trends with the majority of candidates coming immediately after their undergraduate degree or within one or two years after and the group has always been dominated by women. As the size of the cohort has gradually increased (with 7–13 students a year over the last five years) these trends have become easier to see.

What has changed, however, as already indicated, is the size of the group and the nations represented among the students. Some of the earlier years had large numbers of students (10+), but over recent years such numbers have become the expectation, rather than unusual, and the heritage MPhil students commonly make up to a third of the department's MPhil students. This is likely due to the increased visibility of this specialism and its importance as an emerging area of study and employment. In addition, the number of PhD students working on heritage related topics has vastly increased. It seems that young researchers are willing to take out loans to study heritage; it must be perceived as a good investment. The research students have produced very important works and many have gone on to reach great accomplishments having been able to pursue research at the highest level or to be involved with the practical aspects of heritage through their careers.[1] The number of Post-Doctoral fellowships and staff members and researchers involved with heritage research has also increased, and the Heritage Research Group Cambridge (HRG) is now a substantial community that draws in people from a number of disciplines, such as anthropology, architecture, history and even engineering.

The composition of the student cohort has, nonetheless, also changed; but this is in terms of what countries are involved rather than the degree of

[1] See the Heritage Research Group's webpage (http://www.arch.cam.ac.uk/heritage/) for a list of students.

international mixture. In contrast to the late 1990s, when we had several students from Africa this continent has not been represented amongst the students in recent years. Similarly, although we continue to have students from Asia, the applicants have largely shifted from India, Pakistan and Bangladesh to East Asia, with the first students from mainland China arriving in 2004; since then we regularly have Chinese and Korean students among us. There have also been changes in the individual nations that the students come from. Greek students have, for instance, recently become scarce amongst our applicants. These changes reflect, I assume, larger political and especially economic variants and changes over the time period considered, as well as greater competition for students as more universities are offering heritage-related degree courses. Nonetheless, the economic and political hindrances that applicants from some areas face are extremely worrying, and suggest that heritage research may be yet another victim of political unrest and financial crisis.

The wider range of courses now offered by different institutions and within different contexts is, however, an enrichment of the field, especially if the degree courses help to ensure a widening of the field of study and critical engagement. The range of courses, whether by design or coincidence, has ensured that heritage is taught within contexts that represent and are embedded within varied local knowledge systems, traditions, understandings, and ways of practicing heritage. The HRG while cognisant of such diversity has taken seriously the challenge of appreciating and acknowledging one's own context: we are wary of adopting or mimicking distinct ways of thinking about heritage(s) that belong to particular cultural contexts and traditions. We aim at critical analysis and encourage continuous self-reflection, however hard that is.

In terms of the academic background and prior experiences that students arrive with, there are some changes. From the beginning our students came from a number of different academic backgrounds, although there was always a major component of archaeologists. That diversity has remained. What has changed, however, is that students are now more knowledgeable about the field before they begin their graduate studies. They have clearly been exposed to some discussions and often done some reading before they come, and many have acquired practical experience working in museums, in the field, or with some kind of heritage institution. There is a sense that heritage and its various debates have become part of general knowledge in a way one could not have assumed some twenty years ago. The teaching now has to start at a different level, as it can take basic concepts and issues (such as NAGPRA or World Heritage Sites) for granted. This allows us to add more research-led

lectures to the course, and thus to benefit from the local heritage research community in more effective ways. These are challenging but very satisfying changes.

The Content of Heritage Studies

The content of the field has also, of course, shifted, and this has affected our sense of disciplinary identity. Firstly, as the field has expanded vastly, especially over the last ten years, it is being worked on from ever more angles and introducing different disciplinary approaches. This is both extremely exciting and at times frustrating, as the field can seem to be reinvented rather than expanded. It also causes some tensions and infighting between disciplinary perspectives, which at times leads to a preoccupation with delineating heritage as a field. In that process tendencies towards prioritisation of certain disciplinary approaches can be noted. The recent development of "Critical Heritage Studies," while in many ways welcomed, can arguably be seen as part of such processes. Similarly, the attempt at developing Memory Studies as a distinct disciplinary field may be seen by some as a division of Heritage Studies. But one may, of course, similarly critique the labelling of Heritage Studies itself as a result of a comparable *carving out* of a particular field. So the disciplinary identity of the field of study is one where we have seen enormous changes, some tension and also very exciting discussions and diversification.

At a different level, the topics and themes have also expanded and shifted. I do not think any of the earlier themes have become irrelevant or exhausted, but we have certainly seen a number of new ones emerging. Some of the most central themes in the early years included value, selection and signification criteria, with John Carman[2] writing a very early PhD on the relationship between law and value. These are still important areas. The concern with the public was also present from early on, in the UK this was partly influenced by Nick Merriman's PhD; but there has, of course, been a very substantial change in the format of this concern with later trends opening up issues of empowerment, inclusion, source communities and other themes. Darrin Lee Long's PhD was a very early

[2] It is not realistic to refer to all the heritage-related PhDs produced by Cambridge students, I have selected to mention some that can be seen to indicate trends. This should not be interpreted as a statement of their relative quality or importance compared to those not mentioned. I only refer to PhDs already submitted and should here point out that a number of important heritage topics are being investigated by current students.

exploration of the complexity of community, a topic later taken up by both Carol McDavid and Charlotte Andrews in their PhDs as they, in very different ways, explored ideas of communities and the production of heritage outside authorised heritage discourses. Shadia Taha's[3] recent PhD further argued for the complexity of the link between heritage and people by investigating attachment to heritage. Within the museum there has similarly been increased attention towards ways of developing, indeed creating, new forms of relationships with source communities, as seen in the works of both Robin Boast and Anita Herle. The meanings and roles of heritage as it becomes institutionalised in museums and/or in national narratives were also recognised early on. Lina Tahan studied the National Museum in Lebanon and engaged with the complex debate about post-colonial heritage. Naomi Farrington investigated nationalistic use of heritage in Israel and Donna Yates recently analysed the ideological overlap between nationalistic and indigenous heritage rhetoric in Bolivia. The question of illicit trade in antiquities was another early concern, with Colin Renfrew and Neil Brodie being core figures in this debate, affecting international legal instructions and disseminating case studies and arguments widely. Morag Kersel's PhD exemplified the development towards critical problematisation of this field, and the trend towards broadening the research to include the views of the "other," including subsistence diggers.

Amongst the topics only emerging recently, we have in particular worked with conflict and post-conflict Heritage Studies, with both Britt Baillie[4] and Dacia Viejo Rose investigating the role of heritage within conflict zones in Europe for their PhDs, and Gillian Carr, Paola Filippucci and myself working on related themes through various projects, including the CRIC project which, importantly, gained EU funding. I say importantly because such grants demonstrate that there is now consensus about the importance of heritage research. Such recognition should stimulate heritage research as it places it on an even footing with other parts of academia. Other important themes—such as the nature/culture dynamic, as explored in Ben Morris' PhD on the recovery of New Orleans, or Susan Keitumetse and Antony Pace's PhDs on sustainable development—are cutting edge and indicative of areas that are likely to gain increased importance over coming years.

[3] In Chapter 2, this volume, Shadia Taha revisits community and attachment to heritage by engaging with the difficulties of applying sustainable conservation practices in the ancient port of Suakin/Sudan.

[4] See Chapter 1, this volume, for Britt Baillie's discussion of approaches to heritage management in the contested city of Jerusalem.

Building Communities: The Heritage Research Group Cambridge

In the beginning studying or researching heritage seemed an isolated and marginal task. Students clearly felt like step-children within the department, so we needed to make them feel like a community. That was why the Heritage Research Group was founded in the mid 1990s. The HRG, then and now, is a community in the sense of like-minded people—students, staff, researchers—who seek each other out to share their interests, comments on ideas, engage in debates and learn together. In the beginning all its members were from within the Department of Archaeology, but over the years the group has evolved organically expanding its reach and including a wider range of people. A few years ago we began to produce the Bulletin, a newsletter for sharing information about events and news amongst those interested in heritage; it is currently being sent to some 600 people. The Annual Cambridge Heritage Research Seminar (CHS), run by the HRG, was another means of strengthening the sense of presence and purpose. The idea for CHS was born by John Carman and myself: we needed a forum for debating and exploring cutting-edge issues within heritage that the students would benefit from, and we wanted to create a shared task to foster their sense of being a community. Over the years some of our founding principles have changed, such as not publishing the proceedings in order to keep the discussions open, free and unrestrained, whereas the core aims, to explore emerging topics and facilitate interactions between young and senior researchers, have remained the same.

The Future of Heritage Studies: Reflections

With the financial crisis and consequential change of priorities it is clear that heritage for its own sake is not supportable at a public level, as evidenced, for example, in the dramatic cuts in public funding for the Arts and Heritage sectors. In itself this is neither surprising nor challenging; but the reasons why we have come to this position are significant and how we respond to them will affect perception of the value of heritage at different levels over the next decade. Our responses are also of significance for how heritage will be re-thought and re-imagined in order to integrate with other social, political, economic as well as psychological strategies. We can neither afford to nor should we ignore this change in the valorisation of heritage.

One of the things we have learned from our studies is that heritage is changeable; it is adaptable and malleable, it can serve a number of needs, but it can also be used as a scapegoat and seen as preventing progress—and I am here referring to both tangible and intangible heritage. What we have also learned, however, is that the meanings and values of heritage are complex and that people can be deeply connected to heritage or, alternatively, feel detached from it. Such observations teach us that heritage cannot simply be approached as a resource—the relationships drawn are far more complex. Clearly, we must continue to learn about this fascinating, complex aspect of how we use references to and remains from the past to construct meaning in the present. Heritage is part of the present, including the economic crises, fractions and tensions within our societies and amongst communities and ingrained in political rhetoric. We can also see new potential roles for heritage, such as in sustainable development, or as a means of alleviating poverty; but in all such engagements a critical understanding of heritage is needed. In debates about heritage, or plans for its use, its complex character always needs to be recognised and reckoned with—heritage must never be thought of as just another set of opportunities. There is therefore not just a marginal place for Heritage Studies within universities, on the contrary Heritage Studies have become a vibrant, complex field because it is so closely related to ongoing issues and processes that we need to comprehend.

Reflecting and tracing some of the routes that brought us here make me feel as if we are close to some kind of crossroad in terms of the society-heritage constellation. I think the field of study and practices we are engaged with are, and will be, confronting very important intellectual and political challenges over the next few years, and we need to be armed—theoretically and methodologically—to participate in these necessary debates, and if we can do so then Heritage Studies will be a much needed area of education.

Dr Marie Louise Stig Sørensen
University Reader
Department of Archaeology and Anthropology
University of Cambridge

INTRODUCTION

SKETCHING HERITAGE STUDIES

IAN DULL

Twenty-five years ago, the Department of Archaeology, University of Cambridge, first introduced the study of heritage to its curriculum. The introduction coincided with a moment of confrontation between various approaches to the study of the material past. Many saw the study of heritage as a post-modern baby, a result of government pressure to make the study and preservation of the past pay for itself. With a boom in the building of museums, the declaration of heritage sites and the increased visibility of English Heritage and the National Trust in the UK, Heritage Studies were, often disparagingly, represented as the management of the past, dealing with counting "bums on seats"[1] and generally commercialising the past.

Understandings of heritage have come a long way since then. Heritage has expanded to include the realm of the intangible, practices and traditions, know-how and beliefs and diverse forms of expressions. As a discipline, Heritage Studies has delved into the terrains of war and politics, of memory and identity, of the construction of meaning and value and of sustainable forward-looking uses of heritage. It has questioned power structures and critically tackled outdated frameworks of thought and analysis. Above all it has been reflective, questioning itself, and the repercussions of decisions and definitions made in the past, and today. But these transformations of heritage as a discipline should not be seen as final; heritage—and the way we try to define it—is always in flux.

---

[1] For this turn of phrase, the editors are indebted to the convenors of the conference, "Heritage Studies: Stories in the Making," from which this volume derives its name, as well as the members of the Heritage Research Group Cambridge for their valuable input and context. This idea in particular was important in the early formulation and framing of the conference.

This book has grown out of the latter vein of Heritage Studies, its reflective nature. What began as a conference that addressed past and present developments in the study of heritage, with a concern for its future, has grown into the present volume. The conference, "Heritage Studies: Stories in the Making," held at the McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, University of Cambridge on the 28th of April 2012, initially focussed on heritage at Cambridge. As four of the convenors of the conference, we, as editors, and graduate students in Heritage Studies at Cambridge,[2] sought to follow up on the issues raised last April, inviting conference participants to further reflect on the discussions sparked by the conference and the future challenges it recognised for the state of heritage.

The Heritage Research Group Cambridge (HRG)—an interdisciplinary network of Cambridge researchers whose work touches heritage from a variety of different angles—provided the framework for the conference. Considering the longevity of the HRG and the study of heritage at Cambridge, the conference offered an opportunity to take stock of the changes in the study of heritage—both at Cambridge and elsewhere—through the lens of its alumni, now spread around the world and through the ranks of academia, museums and heritage management. Two principle aims of the conference were to build upon and strengthen the reach and network of the HRG and to thoughtfully consider the past, present and future concerns of heritage.

In choosing the conference's title, "Heritage Studies: Stories in the Making," we and the other convenors intended to highlight heritage as a process of making and re-making narratives from the scope of the individual to the national: indeed the only constant in the study of heritage is society's fascination with it. Yet we hoped to bring the fluxous shape of heritage scholarship into this metaphor as well, suggesting how our understanding of heritage—and our shaping of it—is equally evolving, non-static. The conference itself explored this nature of heritage and heritage scholarship: three sessions focussed on recent areas of heritage practice (conflict heritage, post-colonial heritage and developments in the curation of museums and monuments). More than just an opportunity to present research, each alumnus brought a different piece of the history of Heritage Studies at Cambridge, and Heritage Studies more broadly, charting its path and offering the opportunity to consider its future themes. The final event of the conference—a panel discussion placing current students alongside alumni—sought to expand this line of inquiry: what

[2] Please see the biographies (in the List of Contributors) for Meghan Bowe, Bianca Carpeneti, Ian Dull and Jessie Lipkowitz for further information about the editors.

problems does heritage face at the moment? And how can heritage (in practice and in scholarship) respond to the challenges of the future?

Though this volume takes its name from the conference, we envision it as more than a collection of papers presented. Rather, in extending the metaphor of heritage as an ever-developing narrative to this volume, we see this process of re-writing heritage—and ideas about it—as continuing. Thus, in shaping this book, we asked contributors to reconsider their experiences within the context of issues which arose at the conference. To these concerns we added some of our own as graduate students, and relative neophytes in the heritage realm: as a fundamentally trans-disciplinary field of study, where does heritage belong and what should its relationship be with other, related disciplines, including architecture, archaeology and anthropology? Such a question relates not only to an evolving sense of disciplinary identity, but also to anxieties about practical issues like funding for Heritage Studies. Indeed, in the wake of neoliberal shifts in heritage management, and the global financial crisis of 2008's effect on the availability of funding, the situation—departmentally and financially—of heritage is no moot point. With these issues comes another set of questions: in an era where heritage has come to be *used* for social and economic outcomes—heritage is a "business" in the realms of tourism, sustainable development, poverty alleviation and reconciliation—how does this change conceptions of heritage, what it should do and whom it should be for? And how should heritage academics and practitioners work with and respond to new understandings of heritage? It is our firm conviction that understanding these phenomena comes through reflection on the development of heritage and the critical study of it.

As a result, contributors' responses for this volume were introspective in nature: the consideration of shifts seen across careers in heritage, meditations on what works and what doesn't and ruminations on what should be considered for the future. Each contribution tells a story of not only individual research and a field within heritage, but also a tale of wider shifts in how heritage has come to be conceived—at a policy level and within the broader public—and clues for envisioning the future(s) of heritage and Heritage Studies. Rather than the final word on the development of the field, this volume should be seen as a snapshot: a moment of reflection in order to better understand the present. As we see it, each of the contributions in this volume is one "story in the making," an evolving experience which offers us ideas on the trajectories of heritage.

Although this volume is not a comprehensive vision of heritage fields today—heritage has grown beyond the reach of a single volume—each "story" responds to, and, hopefully, expands on, persistent trends in

heritage today. As editors and convenors of the conference, we have attempted to offer a variety of perspectives and give current students the opportunity to speak and engage with professionals and academics. It is in dialogue with these often contrasting views that we can best reflect on the history of Heritage Studies today. Understanding the present state(s) of heritage is undeniably significant in terms of managing it for the future. As Kate Clark writes in revisiting ideas of the value of heritage, "We will hand on to future generations a historic environment which is poorer if, despite talking about value [or heritage, generally, I would add], we fail to understand 'what' it was that we were valuing" (Clark 2005, 328). In a time where definitions of, scholarship on and public views about heritage cover broad spectra, the need to reassess its direction(s) is essential.

Understanding the Present

When in 1985, David Lowenthal titled his book *The Past is a Foreign Country*, he responded to a notion that heritage, the past, was distant and distinct from everyday lives. It was a "foreign country" in that it was so different as to be exotic, in need of recapture. But, nearly thirty years later, heritage—though it remains distant, a break from the past—has become a commonplace topic, a word used widely, and in ever-broadening contexts. Culture is often linked to heritage and *vice versa*, as are sustainable development and urban regeneration; "heritage," indeed, has become a catch-all term, used in different contexts, and across borders, rarely with the same meaning. Today, heritage remains distinct from contemporary experience: it is demarcated from the quotidian by an array of symbols, signage, advertising and spaces, but has itself become a quotidian encounter nonetheless. Heritage is no longer a foreign country, but instead has come to be the very essence of our own (country, city, neighbourhood, person).

Thinking on heritage and its practice has followed a similar trajectory, moving from national to local, from monumental architecture to traditions and intangible practices. Beginning in the 1980s, authors like David Lowenthal and Robert Hewison challenged what they saw as a nostalgic current in the institutionalisation of heritage, which had begun in the nineteenth-century, but became widespread by the 1960s (see Lowenthal 1985, Hewison 1987). In the United Kingdom, at least, institutions like the National Trust and English Heritage were, it was said, entrenching an aristocratic, manor-oriented vision of a national "heritage"—a heritage out of sync with a nation with industrial roots, and increasingly international, and non-white, populations. Such early heritage scholarship sought to

recognise this sanitised—and often commodified—vision of heritage, the creation of a national myth through the cleaning up of monumental objects. "Saviors of the past," Lowenthal would go on to say, "change it no less than iconoclasts bent on its destruction" (1985, 410). Indeed, the beginnings of Heritage Studies turned a sceptical eye to the project of conservation generally, finding its ventures to often be as fraught as the destruction of archaeology itself. In the "heritage of Heritage Studies,"[3] as we are apt to call it, this critical trend has aimed to distinguish the scholarship of Heritage Studies—the examination of the processes and thinking surrounding the concept and practice of heritage—from practice, material conservation research, or grey literature.[4] But aside from a critical stance, what traditions make up this "heritage of heritage"?

One of the earliest points of departure for Heritage Studies was in viewing heritage through its role in the crystallisation of the nation-state. As Benedict Anderson writes in his seminal anthropological work, *Imagined Communities*, "[c]ommunities [and, here, he means nations] are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined" (2006, 6). Heritage scholarship has focussed on the objects, spaces or places—the heritages—that contribute to these national imaginations. In this, there can be no greater example, and hot-button issue, than the Parthenon Marbles or Elgin Marbles (depending on one's point of view), Greece's symbolic rallying cry against British imperialist tendencies. Impassioned individuals have spoken out on both sides, equating a room of sculptures to national grandeur. Greece has even left space in the New Acropolis Museum for the Marbles—invoking national heritage and identity, through absence, rather than presence. In returning to this debate, heritage scholarship, and the public more generally, engages in an analysis of the roles which heritage plays in ongoing national constructions and international disputes.

---

[3] The idea of a "heritage of heritage" or "heritage of Heritage Studies" emerged from among the editors of the volume throughout its development. In applying the concept of "heritage" to heritage itself, we seek to call attention to the importance of origins and traditions (in academia and conservation), which persist in the scholarship on and practice of heritage. Such traditions may be distinct at the national level, or a tradition of thought, as it has been suggested of the Eurocentric conservation traditions enshrined in the conventions of international organisations, like UNESCO (see Smith 2006, Chapters 2 and 3). We equally take the opportunity to suggest that within Heritage Studies, such traditions exist, largely emanating from the work of eminent thinkers like David Lowenthal in the 1980s.

[4] "Grey literature" here is used to refer to research and technical reports created by agencies, businesses, organisations, or individuals for reasons other than academic publication.

But this is only one example among many: scholars in architecture, archaeology and anthropology (heritage's early disciplines) have taken to exploring how each discipline has "created" heritage and national identity around the world. In recent years, national "heritage" has been strongly implicated in regional conflicts in the Balkans, and Middle East, where sites or buildings become firebrands of national or ethnic status.[5] Perhaps when heritage is at its most conspicuous—celebrated in national museums or at nationally-renowned sites, or used to draw lines between peoples—we find it easiest, and most effective, to understand how it is constructed, imagined and put to negative use. Scholars have progressively harped on this note enough to make clear that heritage is not simply a set of objects or imaginaries but a process of making claims about one's past and present. Indeed, Laurajane Smith's influential book, *The Uses of Heritage*, which later contends that heritage is a process, rather than a thing itself, distils this vein of thought when it defiantly opens with the claim that "There is, really, no such thing as heritage" (2006, 11).

Heritage Studies, thus, has tried to show that heritage, despite its innocuous cover, is *not*, to use Laurajane Smith and Emma Waterton's terms, "inherently good, safe, and conflict-free" (2009, 31). Though heritage has often been construed as innately benevolent for communities, nations and the human race, its uses have inevitably also been nefarious. This critical lens has thus left no stone unturned, taking aim at the politics beneath every process in heritage: from its valuation to its conservation to its management and reuse. That such academic efforts have often been divorced from practice *per se* does not, however, mean they have no effect on it: in each case, the goal has been to better understand how such processes shape the possibilities that heritage practice presents.

And in recent years, the scope of such possibilities has been broadened. While national heritages remain prominent in the heritage imagination—enshrined in national law and international conventions like those of UNESCO—much scholarship has turned to different heritages, identities and communities. Part of this reflects a wider shift in politics: from the politics of assimilation, a vision of the homogenous nineteenth-century nation-state, to a politics of representation or even inclusion (Fraser 2000). The other part, however, reflects a turn towards localism. For one, UNESCO, and other standard-setting organisations, in recent years have recognised a need to include local communities in management

[5] For extensive discussions of nationalist politics and conflict related to heritage in the Balkans and Middle East, see Meskell 1998, Abu El-Haj 2001. For a wider study of the relationship of heritage and nationalism, see Díaz-Andreu and Champion 1996.

plans for heritage sites, speaking to concerns about their representation and livelihoods. Such steps reflect a values based conservation model (see Baillie, this volume, Chapter 1), which seeks to consider the value of a site, and the effects of its conservation, on stakeholders. But it is not just large-scale, international organisations recognising this shift. More broadly, where heritage was recognised as maintaining national or civic identity, it has come to be viewed as integral to the identity of different communities within these larger bodies. Heritage has come to be seen, not as nomenclature for monumental sites, but as a process of valuing social and cultural knowledge. A small town can now celebrate its various histories in a local museum, designed for none but its residents (Smith 2006, Chapter 7; Smith and Waterton 2009, Chapters 5 and 6). An immigrant population in London can identify and celebrate places which are relevant to its cultural and social life (Gardner 2004). The extension of heritage into the realm of the intangible has further broadened our thinking—venerating traditions and cultural practices which lie beyond the material—while opening our eyes to the importance of absence, even in tangible contexts. We have come to see that the power of heritage is often its ability to convey value.

The recognition of such value is an attractive prospect. Heritage is now invoked far afield: it plays key roles in urban regeneration, economic development and is an ever-alluring sign for tourists; heritage is incorporated into strategies for post-conflict peace-building and reconciliation; and, where ownership and control of sites is in question, it can provide a catalyst for post-colonial identity. As we think of it now, heritage can be a vision for the development of a place, a method of claiming space, an engine for economics and a place of universal value to the human race—all at once. It is not hard to imagine how these aims can quickly find themselves in competition. Can heritage tourism not be deemed neo-colonial subjugation? [6] How does the recognition and autonomy of an ethnic minority mesh with national developmental and economic aims? And the most loaded question of all: when such aims are in conflict, how do we balance them? Many scholars today advocate a conflict-driven understanding of heritage: viewing the question of value as inherently political, and thus always in contest, we *mitigate* rather than *solve* these quagmires (see Clifford 1997, especially Chapters 5 and 7; Smith and Waterton 2009; also Hampson, this volume, Chapter 6). In shifting our presumptions of what to expect from heritage—away from its

[6] Meskell (2005) suggests that the construction of "global heritage" and heritage tourism—which presents the ancient and the other for consumption, often by wealthy foreigners—are two forms of the continuation of colonialism.

"good, safe, and conflict-free" (Smith and Waterton 2009, 31) beginnings—there is the potential to better manage conflicts where they inevitably occur.

As heritage is expected to *do* more and more in our society, such conflicts will become more, rather than less, pervasive. Indeed, in an increasingly globalised world, scholars have noted how ethno-national divides are regularly reinforced (see Tomlinson 1999, Labadi and Long 2010, Pullan and Baillie 2013); heritage often plays a significant role in this process. While today a politics of recognition and diversity is central, solidarity at the ethnic and national level, as achieved through heritage, is by no means obsolete. With each recognition of a heritage's value comes new terrain for its politicisation and conflict. In many ways, the visions for, treatment of and agendas concerning—in short, the uses of—heritage are splintering in different directions.

The ways in which Heritage Studies is practiced in academia are shifting as well. Earlier scholars followed the critical traditions of social and cultural history, often looking at heritage from the outside in. Yet, they have more recently been joined by a lively community of scholar-practitioners, who speak from their experiences in practicing heritage through related disciplines. With each of these voices comes a new and different set of traditions, methods and interests. Some academics have even made heritage into an experimental practice. Stephanie Moser, for example, put ideas about working with heritage and communities to the test by transforming an Egyptian archaeological site into a laboratory for collaborative archaeology (see Moser 2002).[7] These experiments with heritage issues lend new approaches to understandings, and complexities, of how heritage can be made and interpreted. While many such practitioners rely on the epistemological subjectivity of their disciplines, and a relativist approach to heritage, inquiry into heritage is nonetheless now the subject of scientific experimentation, not only inference.

As these shifts in academic practice go to show, while the trajectory of heritage can be painted in broad strokes, traditions in heritage management have always been diverse, and grow more diverse by the day. Such trends now present a new challenge: where does Heritage Studies belong? With heritage becoming an element of a number of disciplines—geography, development, tourism, museum studies, adding to the traditional triumvirate of archaeology, anthropology and architecture—does it also stand as a discipline on its own? And if so, which traditions and methods

[7] The works of Field et al. (2000) and McDavid (1997, 2009) have used experimental collaborative archaeology as well, in Australia and the United States respectively.