

What does heritage change?
Le patrimoine, ça change quoi?



CHAIRE
de recherche du Canada
en patrimoine urbain
ESG UQAM

Association of Critical
Heritage Studies
Third Biennial Conference
MONTREAL, CANADA | 6-10th June

Sessions
open to proposals

To submit a paper or a poster:
achs2016.uqam.ca



What does heritage change? Le patrimoine, ça change quoi?

Between the global and the local I: heritage policies (heritage changes the policies)	1
At the UNESCO feast: Foodways across global heritage governance	1
Subversion and heritage in contemporary Africa	2
Heritage as contributor to policy making (paper and poster session)	3
Between the global and the local II: post-colonial heritage, heritage and mobility (heritage changes the local societies)	4
Cultural heritage and the working class	4
Patrimonialisation des savoirs médicaux: vers une reconfiguration des ressources thérapeutiques	5
Reshuffling of knowledge and the making of autochthonous cultural heritage: ethnographical perspectives <i>Mise en patrimoine et recomposition de régimes de savoir. Ethnographie d'expériences autochtones.</i>	6
Challenging narratives: Exhibition and production of Arab-Jewish heritage	8
Changing places, changing people? Critical heritage(s) of diaspora, migration and belonging	9
Indigenous heritage in the making of new collective identities in Latin America	11
Borders of heritage/ Frontières du patrimoine	13
Reflecting on the mobile contact zone: Cultural diplomacy, touring exhibitions and intercultural heritage experiences	14
Ephemeral sites of critical anti-modernism: Exploring the tangible and intangible cultural heritage of experimental 1970s eco-social communities	15
Are contemporary processes of migration changing the authorized heritage discourse?	17
Labour, mobility and heritage	18
Epistemologies, ontologies, teaching (how do we study and teach heritage as an agent of change)	19
Maverick heritages. Ugliness, discomfort and illegality in the political and social construction of heritage	19
Connecting to the Critical Heritage Studies Movement in the Americas: Theoretical and practical considerations, case studies, and dialogue	21
Urban heritage: Critical theoretical and methodological perspectives	22
What does photography preserve? Reification and ruin in the photographic heritage of a place called Montréal	23
Critical heritage theory: Foundational cores and innovative edges	25
L'imaginaire paradoxal des villes occidentales: patrimoine, gentrification et résistances	26
Sustainable urban heritage conservation in questions	27
The Artistry of Heritage	28
Heritage makers II: co-construction and community-based heritage (heritage changes people)	29
Co-production in heritage: Toward new imaginaries	29
Heritage and the new fate of sacred places	30
"Heritage" constructions and indigeneity: Considering indigenous cultural centre design in Canada	31
Empathy and indifference – emotional/affective routes to and away from compassion	32
What does heritage change? Case studies in archaeology	33
Envisioning the dialogic museum through digital interventions	34
Heritage values: the tangible effects (heritage changes the environment)	35
The cultural politics of new built heritage in emerging economies	35
Re-writing history in the time of late capitalism: Uses and abuses of built heritage	36
Industrial heritage: Toward comparative perspectives	37
[S']inventer par le patrimoine: des usages d'une ressource pour ordonner les liens du passé, du présent et de l'avenir	38

What does heritage change? Le patrimoine, ça change quoi?

Heritage-makers I: the activist vs the expert, their changing roles (heritage changes people)	39
“For people then and for people now”: Approaches to heritage and shared authority	39
Activism, Civil Society and Heritage	40
La conservation des quartiers anciens et le problème de la gentrification	42
What does the Heritage Citizens Movement change?	43
L’expertise au temps de la dérégulation patrimoniale	44
Justice, law and right to heritage (heritage changes rights)	45
How do rights change heritage?	45
Rights-based approaches to heritage management: Possibilities and limitations	46
Heritage (as) justice: Negotiating rights, contesting properties	47
Notions of heritage I: geographical and linguistic processes of transformation (heritage changes itself)	48
Flexible scales and relational territoriality in the meaning-making of cultural heritage	48
Devant l’arrêt de monde(s), derrière les ruines, sous les déchets: explorations, traces, fuites	49
Heritage and liminality: Cross-cultural and inter-disciplinary perspectives on liminality and cultural heritage	50
Les mécanismes en œuvre dans la construction de narrations patrimoniales	52
Challenging a discourse of difference – heritage in Asia and Europe	54
Heritage shifts in East Asia: Communication between global policies and local practices	55
Qu’est-ce que l’art contemporain fait au patrimoine ?	56
Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)	57
Le patrimoine, et après ?	57
«Alter-heritagization» / «alter-metropolization»? Objects, players and forms of alternative heritage production in contemporary metropolises	58
Beyond re-uses: The future of church monuments in a secular society	61
Mobilizing the heritage environment	62
“Le patrimoine immatériel, ça change quoi ? Culture, économie, société”	63
Héritage religieux et patrimoine culturel religieux. Différences et affordances	64
Les patrimoines de la santé aujourd’hui et demain: Quelle ressource pour quels acteurs ?	66
Memory and heritage: Oral narratives and cultural representations of industry, work and deindustrialization in Scotland	67
Intersecting discourses: Inflecting craft and heritage	68
HeritageFutures / Utopian currents	69
Religion as heritage – Heritage as religion?	70
Representing intangible heritage of post-industrial waterfront zones: Politics of seeing, ways of noticing	71
Fashioning heritage	72
Reflection, selection, deflection: Rhetoric in the global pursuit of heritage	73
Temporalité, narrativité et performativité des patrimoines sensibles: Enjeux pour la citoyenneté culturelle et l’espace public	74
Leisure as heritage: Reconceptualize heritage and leisure	77
Uses of heritage and conflicts I: political uses (heritage changes politics)	78
Heritage and the late modern state	78
Cultural contestation: Politics and governance of heritage	79
Politics of scale: A new approach to heritage studies	80
Contested pasts: Urban heritage in divided cities	81
The critical turn in perspectives on public housing as heritage	83
Heritage and War (20 th -21 st centuries). From mass destruction to deliberate demolition of monuments	84
Le patrimoine et la guerre (XX ^e -XXI ^e siècles). De la disparition massive à la destruction intentionnelle des monuments	84

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Between the global and the local I: heritage policies (heritage changes the policies)

At the UNESCO feast: Foodways across global heritage governance

Chiara Bortolotto, Benedetta Ubertazzi

With sustainable development gaining momentum as a priority of UNESCO heritage policies, an increasing number of food-related nominations are being submitted for inscription on the lists of the Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage. The Mediterranean diet, traditional Mexican cuisine and the Japanese dietary culture of washoku are just some examples of this booming phenomenon.

Since food and foodways are powerful references for self-representation and identity-making, the heritage vocabulary has long been associated with the promotion of local products and culinary preparations. Festivals and tourism contribute to establishing culinary districts and boosting local economies. As food consumption is intrinsically associated with market principles, economic considerations are interlinked with the food-related heritage project more than with other heritage domains. The particular stakes underpinning this field have led to the establishment of international and interregional norms governing intellectual property rights. The coordination of these instruments with international and regional norms protecting intangible cultural heritage is shaping new heritage regimes for agro-biological diversity and foodways.

In exploring the recent heritage legitimacy afforded to food-related cultural expressions by the UNESCO Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage, and in analysing the challenges and controversies shaping this field at the international level, this session will contribute to debate over the main theme of the conference, namely “What does heritage change?” The ultimate aim of this session, however, is to investigate how the international heritage apparatus changes existing categories, principles and objectives in national heritage policies and local heritage agendas.

We invite contributions that will closely analyse how the interaction of different levels of regulations as well as of institutional and sociocultural priorities shape global heritage policies with outcomes often unforeseen by international policy-makers. Presentations focusing on Europe, Asia and Latin America are particularly welcome. What is at stake in foodways heritage promotion in these regions? What are the different priorities in terms of sustainable development, commercial interests and protection of intellectual property rights? And what is the role of minorities and indigenous people in the establishment of measures of protection of traditional knowledge and agro-food resources in these regions?

Based on a resolute interdisciplinary approach, this session brings together legal scholars and anthropologists to investigate the “creative frictions” emerging from the encounter between the international governmentality apparatus, existing juridical regulations and social uses of heritage. The combination of ethnographic and legal exploration of complex world governance aims at shedding light on the interactions of particular actor networks across multiple scales, thus allowing our analysis to go beyond the simplistic opposition between “global norm” and “local reactions.”

We invite in particular contributions on the effects of UNESCO listing of food-related elements or on the preparation of food-related nominations.

chiara.bortolotto@ehess.fr

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Between the global and the local I: heritage policies (heritage changes the policies)

Subversion and heritage in contemporary Africa

Zoe Cormack, Lotte Hughes

This session will address the potential and limitations of heritage as a tool for leverage, empowerment and dissent in Africa.

It is widely acknowledged that heritage—the selective valuation and use of the past in the present—can be an oppressive. Heritage work in Africa has even been characterized as “an instrument for dictatorship” (Peterson et al. 2015:28) because it is often implicated in upholding particular narratives and political orders, imposing a singular vision onto a heterogeneous past. In contrast, this session will explore other possible appropriations of heritage, as it is constructed and deployed in the margins, or outside of formal heritage institutions. Can heritage also be a space from which to undermine established orders, make claims for representation and inscribe different visions for the future—or is this impossible given the inherently conservative characteristics of the authorized heritage agenda?

It is particularly vital to ask these questions of post-colonial and post-conflict African countries, often characterized by continuities in top-down state heritage management that serve a narrow patriotic nationalist project from which many citizens (such as youth and minorities) feel excluded. This model is being increasingly destabilized by moves toward federalism (in Ethiopia, South Africa and Nigeria), devolution and new legislation. In Kenya, for example, constitutional reform has enshrined new rights to cultural, indigenous and minority heritage.

Papers will challenge the myth of a unitary state as the primary mover in the use of heritage, while at the same time providing new insights into the role of individuals and autonomous groups in promoting what is a potentially subversive expression of heritage. As the apparatus of heritage expands across the continent, marginalized groups are appropriating its language and symbolism, imbuing it with new and different meanings and redeploing it to serve their own agendas. Thus heritage can be translated in novel ways. Examples include the uses of heritage and heritage narratives in indigenous or cultural rights claims, often casting heritage in profoundly different ways to state or international bodies. Or the use of heritage as a lobbying tool by civil society and in advocacy, such as recent attempts invoke the protection of heritage in opposition to infrastructural development projects and land grabbing in Sudan and Kenya.

The session cuts across several of the conference themes; in particular it addresses the call to rethink heritage policies and practices beyond elite cultural narratives. We welcome empirically grounded papers, from a range of disciplines that interrogate how and under what circumstances heritage may become a device for articulating and enacting alternative narratives and aspirations, while recognizing the complexities and dark sides of apparently emancipatory processes.

zoe.cormack@open.ac.uk

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Between the global and the local I: heritage policies (heritage changes the policies)

Heritage as contributor to policy making (paper and poster session)

Veronica Bullock, Peter Bridgewater, Amanda Morley

The Manifesto of the Association for Critical Heritage Studies (2011) argues for a more critical approach to heritage: heritage from below, writ large, in service of society. The integration of heritage and museum studies with those of community, development, memory, planning, public history and tourism is urged in the Manifesto, as is opening up to other disciplinary traditions such as anthropology, political science and sociology, for dialogue and collaboration on external research and policy projects. To this we would add the disciplines of science. The many issues facing the world today echo through the papers published in the International Journal for Heritage Studies in 2012 and 2013. This leads also to a call for broader issues-based research and, by extension, practice, within a more apposite and reflective heritage studies.

This session's objective is to discover heritage skill and knowledge sets which can or do contribute in the broader policy environment to improved policy-making, implementation and outcomes. A non-exhaustive list of policy areas is cultural, economic, environmental, Indigenous, social and sustainable.

To achieve this objective we invite papers that demonstrate the use of:

- negotiation skills, gained through heritage practice,
- heritage understanding of place and time,
- heritage understanding of connections between people, things, places and values,
- heritage understanding of balancing conflicting values,
- heritage analytical and language skills e.g. in effectively framing policy problems.

This paper session will be complemented by an identically themed poster session.

The outcome of both the paper and poster sessions will feed into the development of a strategy to assist heritage professionals contribute to broader public policy-making. This will be achieved in two workshops. The first two-hour workshop aims to assimilate the information presented and subsequent discussion from the paper and poster sessions. The aim of the second two-hour workshop is to draft the strategy. We will prioritize particular policy areas for coordinated efforts, including recommending ways and means to engage with public policy generally.

While the sessions will be “stand-alone,” participants in the paper and poster sessions are strongly encouraged to contribute to the strategy development workshops; equally, if clashes prevent participants' attendance at the paper and poster sessions, even though they are interested, we encourage them to participate in the strategy development workshops.

veronica.bullock@anu.edu.au

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

**Between the global and
the local II: post-colonial heritage,
heritage and mobility
(heritage changes the local societies)**

Cultural heritage and the working class

Gary Campbell, Laurajane Smith, Steven High

Many people are actively using working class heritage as a resource to reflect on the past and the present, and there is a growing tendency for the heritage of working class people to be interpreted and presented to the public in museums and heritage sites—see for example the Worklab network of museums. Working class communities and organizations also play active roles in creating a memory of their own past, and mobilizing this to sustain political action in the present.

Drawing on scholarship in heritage studies, social memory, the public history of labour and new working class studies, this session will highlight the heritage of working people, communities and organizations. We particularly urge community and labour movement activists, as well as scholars committed to civic engagement who are working closely with working class communities or organizations, to submit abstracts.

Papers for this session might include:

- Interpretation of working class communities, working life, oral history, industrial heritage or working class culture.
- Museums and other forms of formal and informal presentation of the working class, as well as places to remember and celebrate the labour movement.
- Papers dealing with intangible forms of labour heritage including music, art, skills, workplace experiences, oral histories, celebrations and festivals are encouraged.

We particularly welcome contributions from those—be they academics, trade unionists or working class community activists—who explicitly mount challenges to the received wisdom of the representation of “heritage” as belonging to the elite, and who foreground working class experience and self-representation.

gary.campbell2105@sky.com

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Between the global and the local II: post-colonial heritage, heritage and mobility (heritage changes the local societies)

Patrimonialisation des savoirs médicaux: vers une reconfiguration des ressources thérapeutiques

Lucia Candelise, Serena Bindi

La circulation continue des personnes, des savoirs et des savoir-faire nous place devant des interactions multiples entre le «local», le «transnational» et le «global»; en même temps les démarches de patrimonialisation de «pratiques culturelles» se multiplient, dans un contexte de reconfiguration incessante des rapports sociaux et politiques. D'une façon générale, les connaissances et les pratiques médicales sont touchées par ces phénomènes. C'est sur cette recomposition dynamique que nous proposons de réfléchir, avec un groupe de chercheurs travaillant sur différentes aires culturelles.

En cela, l'idée de cette session se situerait autour du débat lié aux processus de patrimonialisation, dans la perspective des savoirs et des ressources médicales. Ainsi, il s'agira d'interroger et de problématiser les notions, de plus en plus diffusées, de «patrimoine» et de «patrimonialisation», ainsi que celles de «local», de «global», de «globalisation» et de «traditionnel».

L'apparition institutionnelle, au début des années 2000, d'un certain nombre de questionnements et de projets en rapport avec la notion de patrimoine culturel immatériel, sous l'égide de l'UNESCO, est symbolique d'une situation plus large: aujourd'hui la patrimonialisation des pratiques culturelles est un sujet central dans toute réflexion politique, culturelle et sociale, quel que soit le niveau où l'on se situe. Pour ce qui est du domaine médical, le devenir et la recomposition des médecines qui revendiquent la qualification de «traditionnelles» rencontrent et utilisent cette notion de patrimoine.

A l'échelle mondiale, les démarches de patrimonialisation mises en place par des instances gouvernementales, mais aussi par des volontés de sauvegarde des pratiques ou des savoirs médicaux au niveau local, sont souvent en relation avec l'ouverture des frontières nationales et les récents mouvements de connaissances, de ressources, des savoirs et des acteurs de ces savoirs. La confrontation entre différentes approches du corps et de la maladie crée des situations d'échanges, de synergie, d'hybridation qui ont comme conséquence la construction de nouveaux savoirs ou de nouvelles techniques, mais aussi de nouvelles représentations qui leurs sont liées. Ces diverses situations rencontrent également la question de la patrimonialisation.

En apportant une réflexion à différentes échelles, les interventions de cette séance traiteront des formes de patrimonialisation et de transfert de savoirs médicaux en différents continents et en différents contextes nationaux. Le but de cette séance sera d'ouvrir à de nouveaux échanges et de nouvelles contributions notre travail qui avait donné lieu à la publication commune du dossier thématique de la revue *Anthropologie & Santé* en juin 2013 (<https://anthropologiesante.revues.org/1043>) et de réfléchir à comment différents enjeux autour des savoirs médicaux révèlent la complexité et parfois les dynamiques conflictuelles des démarches de patrimonialisation autant d'un point de vue institutionnel que social et culturel.

lucia.candelise@unige.ch

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Between the global and the local II: post-colonial heritage, heritage and mobility (heritage changes the local societies)

Reshuffling of knowledge and the making of autochthonous cultural heritage: ethnographical perspectives

Mise en patrimoine et recomposition de régimes de savoir.

Ethnographie d'expériences autochtones.

Anath Ariel De Vidas, Valentina Vapnarsky

Heritagization (the various means by which cultural features—either material or immaterial—are turned into a people's heritage) has recently become, for Amerindian groups, a major means to gain visibility and recognition in the new Latin American social and political landscapes where cultural diversity is endowed with an increasingly critical role. Different forms of cultural heritagization have largely been studied elsewhere, particularly in North America. However, they are far less known in Meso- and South America, especially among Amerindian peoples. For them, the notions of what ought to be preserved or forgotten, the ways knowledge and assets are transmitted, and the regimes of historicity often seem to go against the very grain of heritagization as delineated according to Western views. Besides this issue, due to outside mediation, teachings and influence, Amerindian peoples are now transforming some of their practices into items, which are more objectifiable for the Others, implying new modes of transmission for the younger generation.

The specific forms of remembrance among Amerindian minorities, therefore, display a twofold dimension. On the one hand, they are fostered within their very own localized cultural and social mould. On the other hand, they are now also, quite often, used within a globalized world as a means of reinforcing collective identities, or even new forms of indigenusness. Analyzing the patrimonial patterns that can be found during fieldwork consequently requires solving how all this is forced upon and adopted by people, but also understanding how Native actors manage, in response, to reclaim the right to handle their own cultural narratives and establish them as a source for the statement of their very own identity.

These topics were at the core of the project FABRIQ'AM (<http://fabriqam.hypotheses.org>). This session will be an opportunity to share the results of some analyses carried out in this project as well as to develop a comparative approach by including works from other cultural contexts. Based on a fine-grained ethnography of case studies, the contributions should analyze the processes of transformation triggered by the heritagization of cultural items in socially and culturally minorized societies across the world. The main focus will be on changes concerning the local conceptions of knowledge and transmission, of time and historicity, and of the life of cultural objects and artefacts (from the most intimate spheres to the tourist handicraft market, from the private/secret to the public domain...).

Through the study of cultural heritagization, which reveals individual options, strategies of self-definition and political agendas, the ambition of this session is to help decipher how Native peoples strive to fit into modernized society and how they negotiate with different patterns of knowledge and historicity.

La «mise en patrimoine» d'éléments culturels, matériels et immatériels, devient depuis plusieurs années l'un des moyens par lesquels les groupes amérindiens recherchent une visibilité et une reconnaissance dans un paysage social et politique marqué aujourd'hui dans la plupart des pays américains par une valorisation affichée de la diversité culturelle.

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change quoi?

Between the global and the local II: post-colonial heritage, heritage and mobility (heritage changes the local societies)

Les phénomènes de patrimonialisation culturelle, amplement étudiés ailleurs (surtout en Amérique du Nord) sont moins connus dans les espaces méso et sud-américains et encore moins chez les sociétés amérindiennes. Au sein de ces groupes, les conceptions de ce qui doit être conservé ou oublié, les manières de transmettre les connaissances et les savoirs, les modes d'historicité semblent bien souvent aller à l'encontre de l'idée même de la patrimonialisation telle qu'on l'entend dans le monde eurocentré. Par ailleurs, à la suite des médiations et des formes d'inculcation de schèmes formulées en dehors des sociétés amérindiennes, celles-ci transforment aujourd'hui certaines de leurs pratiques en nouvelles formes plus objectivables pour l'extérieur et qui participent de modalités inédites de transmission aux nouvelles générations.

Les formes de transmission mémorielle des sociétés amérindiennes ont alors une double dimension. D'une part, elles se construisent dans une matrice culturelle et sociale locale qui leur est propre. D'autre part, elles sont aussi, pour beaucoup, désormais investies au sein d'un monde globalisé en tant que ressources mobilisables pour conforter une identité collective, voire de nouvelles formes d'indianité. L'analyse des configurations patrimoniales que l'on peut observer sur le terrain demande alors une élucidation de ces formes d'adaptation mais aussi la compréhension de la manière dont les acteurs indigènes ont su, en retour, se réapproprier un droit à construire un discours propre sur leur culture.

Ces thématiques ont été étudiées au sein du projet FABRIQ'AM (<http://fabriqam.hypotheses.org>). Cette session, qui se veut ouverte à d'autres contextes, sera l'occasion de présenter dans une visée comparative certaines recherches issues de ce projet ainsi que d'autres travaux réalisés sous cet angle concernant d'autres aires culturelles. Les communications s'attacheront à élucider, à partir d'études de cas finement ethnographiés, les processus de transformation suscités par «la mise en patrimoine» dans des sociétés culturellement et socialement minorisées à travers le monde. On s'intéressera notamment aux changements affectant les régimes de savoir, les régimes de temporalité et d'historicité ainsi que ceux concernant le devenir d'objets/artéfacts (de la sphère intime à l'artisanat touristique, du privé/secret au public...). À travers l'étude de la patrimonialisation culturelle, prise comme révélatrice de jeux d'acteurs, de stratégies de définition de soi et de construction du politique, l'enjeu est d'aborder les modalités de l'insertion dans la modernisation des sociétés étudiées et leur capacité à l'investir, en mettant au jour les formes de cohabitation et de composition de régimes de savoirs et d'historicité.

anathari@ehess.fr

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

**Between the global and
the local II: post-colonial heritage,
heritage and mobility
(heritage changes the local societies)**

Challenging narratives: Exhibition and production of Arab-Jewish heritage

Jessica Roda, Stephanie Tara Schwartz

Among other event from the 20th century, decolonization and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has significantly impacted relationships between Jewish and Arabic cultures around the world. As a consequence of this conflict, Arabness and Jewishness are nowadays seen as opposite identities experiencing two different narratives. However, besides this mainstream narrative, Jewish individuals and groups with Arabic origin are claiming the recognition and the enhancement of their cultural specificities, histories and heritage. Alongside this internal identity claiming, national policies have encouraged the cultural sector to facilitate intercultural dialogue and decrease tensions among communities. Several cultural spaces such as exhibition and festivals are now considered spaces for the deconstruction of social, religious and ethnic tensions. In these spaces, Sephardic and Mizrahi identities/cultures are often used as calling cards to promote and produce the discourse of “living together.”

Questions might then be asked about the tools used by organizers and artists that are participating in the exhibition, the production of Arab-Jewish heritage and more broadly the issues of staging Arab-Jewish expressions beyond its initial social dimension. In other words, how is the staging of Arab-Jewish constructed and negotiated through museums and performance, in the past and the present? What does the staging of Arab-Jewish heritage in public spaces reveal and how does such exhibition challenge mainstream narratives of both Jewish and Arabic communities?

rodajessica@yahoo.com

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Between the global and the local II: post-colonial heritage, heritage and mobility (heritage changes the local societies)

Changing places, changing people? Critical heritage(s) of diaspora, migration and belonging

Ullrich Kockel, Katherine Lloyd, Susannah Eckersley

Much is being made of the perceived breakdown of the nation-state, which was historically configured as a “container” of heritage formations, adopting and perusing local traditions where possible but oppressing them where deemed unsuitable. Migration is seen as eroding the rigid boundaries of this configuration, potentially liberating identities and heritages in the process. This session addresses the relationship between critical heritage and redefinitions of self, other, community and place within the contemporary global reality of movement and flux. Diversity and hybridization are usually regarded positively, displacement, alienation, conflict and normative repression negatively; yet is that necessarily so? Heritage can be seen as a tool for discursively drawing boundaries of inclusion and exclusion, but who is doing the drawing, for what purpose, and what difference does that make? Challenging conventional heritage discourses projecting heritage as sited in place(s), and/or attached to specific groups and communities, we invite contributions exploring the various, sometimes conflicting “imagined communities” of heritage by raising critical issues, such as:

- How do ideas of place and place attachment shape or limit the positions individuals and groups may adopt? What roles do autobiography, memory and history play in shaping such ideas?
- How are scales of identity, place and belonging exhibited or influenced differently by both heritage and politics? What transitional identities and redefinitions of self, community, other and place develop in relation to the heritage practices, mediated memories and “past-presencing” of migrants?
- How do displaced people negotiate community and place in tension between the “here and now” and the “there and then” that shapes their heritage discourse as much as the elite discourse they are confronted with in everyday life?
- How are contested heritage practices, discourses and associations of “authenticity” negotiated between communities, and what role do official discourses and practices play in alleviating or aggravating these contestations?
- As displacement is becoming a common experience, what significance do “memorates” of “roots and routes” have in various socio-historical or geo-political contexts for shaping journeys of return, (re)discovery, pilgrimage or “closure” that figure in heritage tourism?
- How compatible are notions of cultural citizenship based on parity of esteem with the coexistence of perhaps conflicting heritage discourses? Why is conceptualizing conflict as heritage so difficult?

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Between the global and the local II: post-colonial heritage, heritage and mobility (heritage changes the local societies)

- Given the continued reality of multi-faceted place attachment, how may migration and displacement be turned into opportunities for re-placing communities and heritages while avoiding the trap of a shallow essentialism, and sanitization of uncomfortable heritages?
- What is needed to make critical heritage sustainable in a social, political and economic environment in radical flux (migration, climate change, financial crisis, political upheaval and conflict)? How do we decide which heritages should be sustained, who legitimizes these decisions, and to what extent are such questions about merely replacing one elite with the power of definition by another?

We are keen to examine issues such as these from multi- and interdisciplinary perspectives combining theoretical explorations with applied concerns. Along with papers we encourage creative engagement using other formats with a capacity to capture our subject matter, such as artwork, poetry or performance.

u.kockel@hw.ac.uk

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Between the global and the local II: post-colonial heritage, heritage and mobility (heritage changes the local societies)

Indigenous heritage in the making of new collective identities in Latin America

Anne Ebert, Katharina Farys

Indigenous heritage fundamentally characterizes Latin America: Materialized and stereotyped understandings dominated heritage conceptions since the early 20th century, when state officials, intellectuals, and artists conceived precolonial archaeological monuments (e.g., Teotihuacan/Mexico, Cuzco/Peru, Tiwanaku/Bolivia) as sites for the imagination and rooting of their national identities in a unique precolonial past. Their inscription on the UNESCO world heritage list further underlines this outstanding importance. Since the 1970s, indigenous movements reinterpreted archaeological sites and contested existing definitions in their struggles for the recognition of their perspectives. In doing so, these new political actors used indigenous heritage for new collective identifications as indigenous nationalities and thereby rejected nationalist appropriations. In the 1990s, states recognized these different collectivities, thus also accepting the new plural meanings of archaeological heritage.

This pluralization of actors and meanings of archaeological heritage is paralleled by the heterogenization of the concept of indigenous heritage and now includes cultural expressions like indigenous languages, knowledge, and cultural practices branded as *usos y costumbres*. Most recently, indigenous heritage establishes new connections between culture and nature: *Buen Vivir* (Good Living), a sustainability discourse, proposes an understanding of natural environment shaped by human and non-human actors whose reciprocal relationship is guided by indigenous practices and knowledge.

Indigenous heritage is thus a complex concept constituted by and subjected to dynamic negotiation and meaning-making processes shaped between the interplay of different actors. Today these include, beyond state officials, scientists, artists, local peoples, indigenous activists and international institutions, also NGOs and their employees as well as tourist agencies and travelers. While on the one hand their social practices and interactions have cultural, social, political and economic impacts on indigenous heritage spaces and practices, on the other, these make indigenous heritage crucial for the emergence and reproduction of collectivities. Based on this conceptualization of indigenous heritage this session addresses the following questions:

- Who are the different actors that refer to, define, contest and challenge established ideas of indigenous heritage? How are these heritage practices influenced by the personal and institutional background of these actors?
- Which practices and knowledge are selected and reconceptualized as indigenous heritage? Which ones are considered appropriate, which ones are ignored?
- What are the material and social consequences of these interactions between different actors and indigenous heritage?
- Which new meanings of indigenous heritage emerge within these negotiation processes? To what extent do new actors reify dominant definitions of indigenous heritage?
- What are the effects of the reinterpretation of indigenous heritage on the formation of new collective identities?

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Between the global and the local II: post-colonial heritage, heritage and mobility (heritage changes the local societies)

We particularly invite actor-oriented and empirical contributions from scholars working in anthropology and its neighbouring disciplines oriented on the study of sociocultural and historical dynamics to discuss these questions. Topics might include case studies on specific indigenous heritage spaces and practices, analysis of the politics of indigenous heritage as well as investigations on the entanglements of indigenous heritage between local practices and global configurations.

In bringing these aspects together, the aim of the session is to shed light on the role of actors in the making and remaking of indigenous heritage. By systemizing these dynamics in relation to the constitution of new collective identities, the session seeks to acknowledge the heterogeneous and complex nature of sociocultural transformation processes and the creation of new cultural realities.

a.ebert@fu-berlin.de

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Between the global and
the local II: post-colonial heritage,
heritage and mobility
(heritage changes the local societies)

Borders of heritage/ Frontières du patrimoine

Astrid Swenson

How do borders shape heritage and its potential for change? Despite the growth of international connections in heritage studies, national, linguistic and disciplinary borders continue to structure scholarly and practical approaches to heritage. The aim of this session is therefore threefold. First we will address which borders limit our understanding of heritage today. What are the roles of linguistic, disciplinary, religious and national borders? Which methodologies are best suited to overcome them? Or is the critical turn in heritage studies better served by not overcoming differences but simply making them more transparent: is it actually the multiplicity of approaches created by borders which offers a heuristic tool in itself? Hence, secondly we will investigate the fluidity of borders in a longer trajectory, by looking at the history of transfers of ideas, people and objects across national and cultural borders historically in different contexts. What factors helped increase flow at particular moments? How did these transfers change and transform ideas about heritage lastingly? Yet, while the growing transnational research has helped us over the last years to better understand the cross-border dimension of heritage, this has sometimes led to overlooking the physical and mental barriers to flows. Therefore the session will thirdly look at the solidity of borders, by focusing on borderlands in different geographical, linguistic and historical contexts. How have physical borders, and the performativity of the border in conflict and peace, been affecting ideas of heritage not only in borderlands, but in the centre of nations and transnationally? Is each border unique, or can commonalities be discerned in different context and times? To answer these questions, this session invites scholarly contributions from different disciplines, national academic traditions and linguistic contexts to approach borders as an object of study and as a heuristic tool for a better understanding of the role of cultural particularization versus globalization and other transnational processes relating to heritage.

astrid.swenson@brunel.ac.uk

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Between the global and the local II: post-colonial heritage, heritage and mobility (heritage changes the local societies)

Reflecting on the mobile contact zone: Cultural diplomacy, touring exhibitions and intercultural heritage experiences

Lee Davidson

International exhibitions have long been promoted for their potential to connect people, objects and stories across political, cultural and geographical divides. Recent commentators have linked touring exhibitions to cultural globalization, diplomacy and the advancement of intercultural understanding, while others have critiqued them as revenue generators driven by public appeal or as “politically-safe” forms of national branding. Very few studies, however, have attempted to empirically investigate the complex processes and contexts through which international exhibitions are produced, and thereby substantiate what they might change, and how.

This session explores international touring exhibitions as mobile “contact zones” which undergo processes of transformation and reconstruction as they traverse contested museological, cultural and political terrains. This approach highlights their nature as dynamic sites of encounter, performance and interpretation. We also examine how the mobile contact zone is experienced by the actors involved, both heritage professionals and visitors. Responding to the main conference theme, an overall question that the session addresses is: what do international touring exhibitions, and the intercultural heritage experiences they facilitate, change? Do they help in developing intercultural understanding, facilitating dialogue and building bridges between cultures?

We invite papers that explore these questions, with a particular emphasis on gathering in-depth empirical evidence from multiple sources and perspectives of exactly what touring exhibitions do change, and how. Our interest is in building a theoretical understanding of international touring exhibitions, as well as critiquing the role of museums in cultural diplomacy and the development of a transnational, intercultural museum practice.

Related conference sub-themes include: the role of heritage in globalization and transnational processes, particularly its circulation and mobility through touring exhibitions; the “uses” of heritage in terms of tourism (the international blockbuster as tourist attraction), national identity-making and “imagined communities” as constructed through such exhibitions and utilized for cultural diplomacy. Through detailed investigation of these processes and possibilities, this session will attempt to gain a deeper understanding of their implications for intercultural heritage experiences and for the creation of touring exhibitions that fulfil their potential as spaces in which power, identity and notions of civility are performed and explored in open-minded, reflexive and constructive ways.

Lee.Davidson@vuw.ac.nz

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Between the global and the local II: post-colonial heritage, heritage and mobility (heritage changes the local societies)

Ephemeral sites of critical anti-modernism: Exploring the tangible and intangible cultural heritage of experimental 1970s eco-social communities

Steven Mannell

The 1970s witnessed a flourishing of living experiments in space, place and community sharing broad ambitions to bring about transformed human social and interpersonal conditions, to re-envision relationships between people and the environment and ecology of their habitats, and to reject a growing mainstream vision of people as passive consumers in favour of a role as creative and adventurous agents of their own destinies. While some expressions of these experiments were non-spatial or intended as temporary events, a significant number were manifest as buildings and communities. Spatial settings include places that can be loosely described as back to the land settlements (e.g. Drop City in Colorado), urban squatter sites and districts (Christiania in Denmark), intentional experimental communities (Centre for Environmental Technology, Wales), incremental community change clinics (Farallones Institute, California), and experimental and demonstration sites (Ark for Prince Edward Island, Canada; Granada TV House for the Future, UK). These projects arose in milieux ranging from the outer fringes of the counterculture, through the Alternative Technology Movement, to government research institutes and commercial television network, and their intentions ranged from inwardly-oriented efforts at personal or small group enlightenment, through living experiments intended to demonstrate viability of alternative approaches, to public demonstrations seeking to transform societal expectations and norms. All share a critical spirit of “liberal anti-modernism,” defined by Ian McKay (1994) as “an intensely individualistic thirst for an existence released from the iron cage of modernity into a world re-encharmed by history, nature and the mysterious.”

Some of these experiments remain in operation today (often in a transformed state), but many were transitory, and now abandoned. These sites offer potent challenges in the documentation, conservation and representation of cultural heritage, tangible and intangible. Heritage elements include the sites themselves, and the remnants of buildings, devices and equipment. Other artefacts and primary documents may remain on site, or may have been removed to official and informal archives. Important evidence is also available in the form of contemporary media coverage, self-publications and other public accounts. Because of the transient nature of these sites, important ephemeral heritage dimensions include personal journals, letters, photographs and films, along with oral history and lore. The conscious social experimentation means that the practices of governance, decision-making and daily life are often as significant as the artefacts and documents in the heritage value and legacy. These intangible cultural heritage dimensions extend to the vision, ethics and politics that informed and challenged the communities, along with the variations, inversions and refinements of their cultural practices over time. Many of these sites also have a body of local or international received tradition and myth—people know “of” these places, but know little for certain “about” these places. Often this received tradition is rooted in significant events or celebrations at the sites, or moments of interaction between the eco-social experimenters and the neighbouring communities; the events themselves, and the cultural memories associated with them, are another important heritage element.

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Between the global and the local II: post-colonial heritage, heritage and mobility (heritage changes the local societies)

For the present day, these sites offer important lessons worth retrieving and considering; lessons that might inform our efforts to move toward a sustainable future. This session invites presentations of case studies, theoretical considerations, and artistic and community projects that witness, document, assess, or carry forward the spirit and cultural heritage of such sites of eco-social experimentation. Presentations might address the challenge of documenting and representing the complex of tangible and intangible elements making up the legacy of such sites; track the life of these communities over time; explore the effects of the fluidity of both communities and their physical settings; recount the shifting outside perceptions of these eco-social experiments; or assess the rippling after-effects of these experiments on the world outside the closed community.

steven.mannell@dal.ca

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Between the global and the local II: post-colonial heritage, heritage and mobility (heritage changes the local societies)

Are contemporary processes of migration changing the authorized heritage discourse?

Sophia Labadi, Laia Colomer, Cornelius Holtorf

There are many different kinds of migrants in the contemporary world. They include the familiar figures of refugees or undocumented migrants, associated with and suffering from exclusionary practices, poverty, silencing or repressions; skilled migrants with economic resources but lacking the tools for cultural and social integration; migrants or second generation migrants returning to their homelands and becoming “strangers” there; people moving to several countries as global nomads, etc. An increasing number of people are thus living “transit lives,” between different cultures.

In the past decades museums and heritage places all over the world have begun to adapt to this challenging situation. From enlightened and exclusive institutions, promoting one version of the past and national identity, museums have had to transform themselves to remain relevant in our fast changing and diverse world. Equally, some countries are increasingly identifying and protecting heritage places, routes or landscapes that are significant to people affected by mobility such as migrants/diaspora, ex-colony citizens, modern and contemporary slaves, etc. These changes include giving greater access to collections and exhibition spaces, promoting multi-vocality in the interpretation of collections, encouraging migrants’ involvement in exhibitions through co-curation, or developing participatory methodologies among local and/or excluded communities for the definition of the significance of heritage places.

This session invites papers that discuss, analyze and evaluate approaches, methodologies and the impact of programmes of museums and heritage places involving people in cultural transitions (including migrants, refugees, cross-cultural people). Basically, we are interested in investigating what happens to heritage when people’s identities are in transition due to mobility. Issues which the session will explore include:

- Specific museum programmes developed for migrant communities, such as language learning programmes, well-being sessions, employment schemes for migrants, etc.
- Migrants’ critical views of museum’s programmes and collections.
- Definition of new heritage places and museums from a migrant perspective and approach (i.e. multi-vocality and participatory policies).
- Redefining the diverse significance and uses of mainstream heritage places in the context of globalized, dynamic and fluid cultures (i.e., the heritage of emotions applied to migration).

s.labadi@kent.ac.uk

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Between the global and the local II: post-colonial heritage, heritage and mobility (heritage changes the local societies)

Labour, mobility and heritage

Lachlan Barber

Recent writing in heritage studies and related disciplines has highlighted the stories and histories of working class people as an overlooked and, at times, marginalized element of the collective heritage imaginary and authorized heritage discourses (Klubock and Fontes 2009; Shackel, Smith and Campbell 2011). The heritage of work has the potential to generate powerful and at times difficult engagements with places where the nature of employment, industry and life have changed as a result of development and economic restructuring. An element of these dynamics that has not received much attention from scholars of heritage, however, is the need for people to move to earn a living. Unequal economic opportunities across scales—from the global and transnational, to the regional, to the local—incite and implicate a range of mobilities, from temporary and circular migration, to periodic absences from the home and extended daily commutes. Approaching this reality through a heritage lens may entail the destabilization of places and sites as the locus of heritage-making, opening the possibility of approaches that privilege the lived experience of workers with simultaneous and at times contradictory place attachments. As the literature on “new mobilities” has shown, mobility is an increasingly pervasive feature of economic and social life in the 21st century, but it has a history that is at times forgotten, diminished or misrepresented. Individual and community stories of the uprooting of lives, relationships and attachments to place and home that inevitably accompany work-related mobility are often held in private, as are the challenges associated with living and working in uncertain, precarious and at times unwelcoming arrangements and conditions.

The principal aim of this session is to provide a basis for the generation of understandings of the heritage of mobility related to labour, work and employment. The focus will be to engage with the lived experiences of workers by sharing the stories of individuals and communities affected by mobile work. Moreover, the inclusion of papers treating various forms of work-related mobility will permit a broader discussion on how heritage could be conceptualized in research that privileges mobility (although not a privileged mobility). The session will also encourage participants to consider creative and inclusive methods for representing and rendering visible the intersection of mobility and heritage. Both empirical and theoretical papers are welcome.

lbarber@mun.ca

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change quoi?

Epistemologies, ontologies, teaching (how do we study and teach heritage as an agent of change)

Maverick heritages. Ugliness, discomfort and illegality in the political and social construction of heritage

Cristiana Panella, Walter Little

With regard to the main question of the 3rd ACHS Biennial Conference, “What does heritage change?” the convenors of this session propose ethnographic evidence of contradictory spheres of value by showing how encounters between official rhetorics of heritage and borderline/illegal ethics and objects produce social change. In particular, they explore, through an inclusive approach, the social and political constructions of heritage by questioning the aesthetic dichotomies of beauty/ugliness, properness (goodness)/moral pollution, formality/informality, order/disorder, and cleanliness/dirtiness, among others, as part of the representations of heritage. They include in the discussion, those places of social memory that are outside of official local, national and international naming organizations’ considerations of heritage. Imbricated in these processes are layers of opacity and transparency, rooted in official regulations and customary and common practices, that allow for the heritagization of places and concurrent aesthetic and political negotiations of those places by the heterogeneous categories of actors at stake (tourists, vendors, local officials, residents).

The first section of the session focuses on relationships between regulated places and “alien” actors. Despite most heritage sites being strictly regulated through juridical, deontological or moral norms, “unauthorized” actors (for instance, street vendors, beggars or “clandestine” migrants), if not invading and occupying the sites per se, place themselves in the public places around “heritized” places. While such actors tend to be negatively characterized by politicians, city planners and formal-sector business owners as a blight on the aesthetics of heritage sites, it is far from clear that those who visit heritage sites and those vendors sell in and near the sites conceive of such a dichotomous relationship. Such frictions generated by the co-habitation of different spheres of value configure the aesthetics of heritage spaces as complexes of social, political and economic processes.

In the second section of the session, we extend our reflections on the structural contradictions imbricated in the rhetorics of beauty with regard to “heritized” objects (antiquities and ethnographic items circulating through the international market and “heritage” logos). We investigate the interrelations between opacity and transparency—the situations establishing ethical and aesthetic taken-for-granted intrinsic values in order to show that the sentiment of “beauty” and “goodness” of a given final product (objects, practices, individuals or categories) is directly proportional to the degree of opacity of production stages of products.

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Epistemologies, ontologies, teaching (how do we study and teach heritage as an agent of change)

Convenors will be pleased to receive papers fitting the parts below:

Part I - The politics of aesthetical authenticity in relation to the anti-aesthetics of pollution

Throughout the world there are numerous examples of the proper order and organization of places and people being inverted. In heritage sites, despite the dominant discourses of the state, UNESCO and tourism industry, the sense of objects, places and words can take on counter aesthetics and alternative meanings for political and economic reasons. Here, we explore how political and aesthetical authenticity is constructed in different heritage domains through a selective concept of aesthetical pollution.

Part II - Ontologies of beauty and illegality within the clandestine art trade

The construction of heritage and clandestine art trade are often mutually constituted in heritage sites. This slot focuses on the organic relationship between beauty and Illegality in art trade. Here, we question how places are affected by the aesthetics and ethics that serve to brand a place/object, leading to new negotiations of value through alternative concepts of beauty that emerge from the ways that places and objects are “heritized” and used within logics of tourism and market.

cristiana.panella@africamuseum.be

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Epistemologies, ontologies, teaching
(how do we study and teach
heritage as an agent of change)

Connecting to the Critical Heritage Studies Movement in the Americas: Theoretical and practical considerations, case studies, and dialogue

Michelle Stefano, Felix Burgos

Among other aims, the Critical Heritage Studies (CHS) Movement, most exemplified by the promotional efforts of the Association of Critical Heritage Studies (ACHS), seeks to push heritage studies beyond its more traditional, longstanding “borders” of investigating the progress, as well as shortcomings, of the museum and heritage enterprise. Indeed, in the manifesto for ACHS, it is noted that heritage studies ought to expand to include a broader range of disciplinary (and interdisciplinary) theories and methodological toolkits as a means of achieving deeper critical engagement with the practices and implications of museum and heritage work. In this light, CHS can be argued to be a movement that strives to promote more holistic understandings of heritage that include related political, economic, environmental and sociocultural issues.

Using the momentum built by the session—Critical Heritage Studies in North America: Issues, Ideas and Forward Thinking—held during the 2nd International Conference of ACHS (Canberra 2014), this session has been expanded to further articulate the connections that can be made with respect to CHS and the variety of related theories and practices utilized in the contexts of North, Central, and South America. As CHS is beginning to gain a foothold in these regions, there are, however, traditions of heritage-related work that can contribute to enhancing and widening the scope of the CHS discourse, such as with respect to anthropology and visual anthropology, folklore/public folklore, intercultural and American studies, to name only a few.

The session remains broad in scope so as to incorporate, as well as offer, a wide range of scholarly and professional perspectives from these geographical contexts that can strengthen CHS. Moreover, articulating these connections can also illuminate ways in which the CHS discourse can be more strongly grounded as a tool for enhancing the theoretical frameworks and methods of other, yet related, disciplines common to these research contexts, as mentioned earlier. It also serves to examine a wide range of case studies from the Americas, such as from Colombia, Peru and the US, in order to illuminate the applicability of CHS in diverse contexts, as well as to offer alternative models for heritage work, particularly those with a focus on co-collaborative community-based projects, perspectives and issues.

michelle.stefano@maryland.gov

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Epistemologies, ontologies, teaching (how do we study and teach heritage as an agent of change)

Urban heritage: Critical theoretical and methodological perspectives

Kalliopi Fouseki, Torgrim Sneve Guttormsen, Grete Swensen

Cities are growingly being faced by social, economic, cultural and environmental challenges imposing health and social risks. Rapid urbanization, population growth, climate change are only some of the major global challenges that a 21st century city needs to respond to. The current challenging global environment has led to the development of new approaches to the concept of “sustainable city” a city that caters for current and future generation. For instance, the idea of smart city (a city that is technological, digital and interactive) and the idea of green city (a city that is environmentally friendly) has emerged to address economic, social and environmental global challenges. However, the temporal focus of such models of “sustainable cities” is narrowed down on the present and the future.

Although the role of heritage, and culture in general, in forming sustainable cities is growingly emphasized, heritage still stands in the periphery. Heritage is often viewed as “something” that can benefit from wider sustainable models and projects rather than as an agent of change.

In this session, we would like to introduce the concept of deep cities, a concept which refers to a city’s long-term history and heritage. The session will explore how this concept can offer new ways of thinking about sustainable cities. The underlying idea of the session is that heritage is not just “something that is subject to change,” but a driver of change. However, for heritage to hold such an active role, we contend that participatory approaches in developing deep cities need to be adopted.

The introduction of the novel concept of deep cities will open new research avenues for the field of critical heritage studies. By bringing together architecture, archaeology, ethnology and conservation, this session invites contributions from a wide range of geographical regions that illustrate examples where sustainable cities have been the result of the adoption of deep cities. The session would welcome papers that discuss theoretical and methodological issues related to one of the following (or related) themes:

- Urban environments and planning;
- “Imagined communities” of heritage;
- Critical sustainability perspectives on heritage and the Anthropocene;
- Diaspora, diversity and cultural citizenships;
- The future of heritage;
- Participatory approaches to urban heritage.

Selected papers will form the basis of the edition of a special volume on “Urban Heritage.”

kalliopi.fouseki@ucl.ac.uk

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Epistemologies, ontologies, teaching
(how do we study and teach
heritage as an agent of change)

What does photography preserve? Reification and ruin in the photographic heritage of a place called Montréal

Martha Langford

Photography was recognized as an instrument of heritage preservation from the moment of its inception in the early 19th century, when projects such as Les Excursions Daguerriennes (1841-1843), a set of Romantic engravings of monuments based on photographic documents, established the links between sight and science, memory and history, hortatory reification and “ruin lust” (Dillon 2014) that this session seeks to address. This proposal is crafted in the certain knowledge that almost every session at this conference will use photographic technology as a window onto the past, present and even the future, with very little comment on the lens itself. Our session envisions a reflexive approach to the relationship between photography and heritage practices, as manifest in architectural history and theory, urbanist, environmental and photographic studies, and as practised by documentary photographers and conceptual artists—actors from cognate disciplines unified by their interest in the built environment and its created communities, but divergent in their emphases and confidence in the various forms of photographic representation. A focus on Montréal strengthens the dialogical structure of the session and allows for more sustained critical analyses of objectives and outcomes in the uses of photography.

Our investigation begins in the archives where neither institutional record-keeping nor the redeployment of documents at the point of restoration can be considered neutral. Returning to the 1960s and the Quiet Revolution, architectural historian Nicola Pezolet (Concordia University) offers a reading of photographic documents in the Jean-Paul Mousseau archives at the Musée d'art contemporain de (MACM) and Hydro-Québec to tease out the program of nation-building in Mousseau's mural for Hydro-Québec's corporate lobby and the recent renewal of both the object and its embedded claims. This oscillation between then and now—ideation and outcome—animates the entire session.

In the 1970s, targeted campaigns under the banner of Save Montréal were supported by the foundation of Héritage, with activist photographs emerging at every stage. Visual artist and architect Melvin Charney (1935-2012) can now be recognized as the genius loci of this moment, with lessons for the future in his thinking about the “industrial vernacular” and incorporation of “users' participation” (Martin 2014) in his projects. Complementary papers by architectural theorist Louis Martin (UQAM) and art historian Johanne Sloan (Concordia University) will critically examine the photographic legacies of Charney's visionary architecture and conceptual art.

Still at this mid-20th-century turning-point of heritage consciousness, “What Does Photography Preserve?” will consider the use of documentary photography as a tool of heritage activism. A critical backward look is offered by two sometimes collaborating practitioners, Clara Gutsche and David Miller, who will reflect on the making of the Milton Park Series (1970-1973) and the Lachine Canal Series (1985-1986; 1990)—Miller photographing exteriors; Gutsche photographing the residents of Milton Park in their homes, as well as the ghostly interiors of Lachine Canal's industrial buildings. Gutsche and Miller have staunchly kept faith with the documentary tradition, evoking Walker Evans's idea of a “documentary style... photographs which are highly structured, constructed to have the 'look' of neutrality, everydayness, and 'stylelessness'” (Gutsche and Miller 2011). Perpetuating a style of photographic knowledge tied through Evans and his inspiration, Eugène Atget, to threatened disappearance—to the elegiac image of the ruin—complicates the debate staged by this session with issues of photographic singularity and aesthetics that are by no means exhausted (Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism 2012). Is there slippage between activism and nostalgia, and if so, should it be considered strategic?

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change quoi?

Epistemologies, ontologies, teaching (how do we study and teach heritage as an agent of change)

Crucial to this level of analysis, and pressing on issues of gender, is the cycle of installations in disused industrial and cultural spaces by the Montréal-based partnership of Martha Fleming and Lyne Lapointe—projects documented in the publication *Studiolo* (Musée d'art contemporain de , Artexes Editions and Art Gallery of Windsor 1997-1998). The presence and absence of human and non-human actors on these urban stages raise the question of photographic social performance, as a participatory form of urban activism, and bring us to the most recent project to be discussed, *Pouf!* Art+Architecture's (Cynthia Hammond and Thomas Strickland) Dog Park Gallery (2010-2011). Focusing on a durational art work that led directly to the preservation of a much-loved green space and dog park in post-industrial Montréal, Thomas Strickland (Azrieli School of Architecture and Urbanism, Carleton University) will examine the various ways that photography was used to capture, represent and make visible working-class heritage. His paper will reflect on the strengths and challenges of photography as a medium for engaging with the animal in this highly contested, post-industrial “wilderness.”

Ranging from architectural records, through photo-conceptualism, documentary style and appropriation to the apparently de-skilled snapshot, this session will maintain its focus on photographic mediations of heritage objects and actions, grappling with their codified expressions of values imposed and opposed in words and images.

marthalangford@sympatico.ca

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Epistemologies, ontologies, teaching (how do we study and teach heritage as an agent of change)

Critical heritage theory: Foundational cores and innovative edges

Kathryn Lafrenz Samuels, Melissa F. Baird

The field of heritage has emerged as a key site of reflection. Influenced by shifts in the academy (e.g., post-colonial, post-structural and feminist theories), heritage scholars are bringing increased attention to the deployment of heritage as both a conceptual category and a contested field of power and discourse. Nevertheless, significant challenges remain in communicating what comprises the theoretical and methodological toolkit of heritage studies. Scholars are still mapping out the nuances and contexts of critical heritage as a distinct theory, and grappling with what exactly heritage is and why it constitutes a valid area of investigation. This changing vision of heritage as a (quasi-) independent field of study is promising, as it brings increased attention to the political and social contexts of heritage, and how heritage engages theories of development, post-colonial theory, rights and justice, and ecology.

Reflecting on “What does heritage change?” and the current state of the field—its theorists, its practices, and its promises—one critique could be that heritage studies lack a rigorous theoretical or methodological approach. It is something of an irony that so little discussion has been devoted to the intellectual heritage of heritage studies. What theoretical foundations hold the field of heritage studies together and compose its core? What intellectual roots stabilize the field into a coherent endeavour? At the same time, what are the edges of its innovation? As a multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary arena of collaboration and intellectual “poaching,” heritage studies have thrived at the edges of innovation vis-à-vis well-established disciplines. However, as with most interdisciplinary fields, this could be a strength as well as a weakness, and heritage studies stand vulnerable to criticisms of having a weak or even “vacuous” core, or engaging in intellectual dilettantism. In this session we propose it is only by mapping its core theoretical strengths, embedded in a critical intellectual tradition, that we can assertively push forward in innovating along its edges.

Moreover, locating heritage studies in the critical tradition articulates with important debates on how the identity and expertise of the professional heritage scholar is being reconstituted and reimagined. This session continues those debates, and argues that such discussion is most productive when engaging heritage professionals both inside and outside the academy. After all, a major premise of critical heritage theory is to include voices from inside and outside academia, and to provide more interactive models, with mechanisms to identify theoretical and substantive insights and intervene in contemporary debates.

lafrenzs@umd.edu

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Epistemologies, ontologies, teaching (how do we study and teach heritage as an agent of change)

L'imaginaire paradoxal des villes occidentales: patrimoine, gentrification et résistances

Michel Rautenberg, Sandra Trigano, Marie Hocquet

Si la ville moderne occidentale se transforme, sous l'action des aménageurs, en écho à des utopies, des programmes de développement et des intérêts économiques, on néglige trop souvent l'action quotidienne d'habitants et d'acteurs sociaux qui s'approprient les lieux et contribuent à les transformer. Dans cette mutation de la ville, le patrimoine se trouve à la croisée d'enjeux économiques et sociaux singuliers: d'une part il est convoqué par les aménageurs et les acteurs de la gentrification et du tourisme; d'autre part il est utilisé dans de multiples formes de résistances plus ou moins actives qui s'opposent à ces politiques d'aménagement. On pourrait croire que ces tensions qui s'exercent sur les transformations urbaines opposent deux modes patrimoniaux différents. Pourtant, dans un cas comme dans l'autre, ce sont souvent des récits assez voisins qui sont mobilisés, évoquant un imaginaire de la ville européenne largement partagé, au-delà des oppositions politiques et des stratifications sociales: nostalgie de la sociabilité populaire et ouvrière, vitalité de la rue qu'on cherche à retrouver, authenticité des paysages urbains ou industriels passés, etc. C'est ce paradoxe que nous souhaitons interroger dans cet atelier, à partir de présentations fondées sur des travaux ethnographiques ou historiques.

Contemporary towns are changing through the action of urban planners and engineers, responding to certain utopias, to urban development policies and economic interests, yet everyday commitment of inhabitants and various social actors who know the places and contribute to transform the towns are often neglected. In the deep mutations of urban landscapes and urbanity that we are witnessing, heritage plays a peculiar partition: on the one hand it is convoked by planners, architects and actors of the gentrification and of tourism, on the other hand it is used in the various forms of resistance for arguing against those policies. One might think that those issues on urban transformations would oppose two different ways of heritagization. However, in each case, rather close tales of heritage are mobilized. They evoke an imagination of the European town that is largely shared, beyond political oppositions and social stratifications: nostalgia for the popular and the working class sociability, streets supposedly more lively, authenticity of former urban and industrial landscapes, etc. In this session, we aim to examine this paradox, working from ethnographic or historic presentations.

michel.rautenberg@univ-st-etienne.fr

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Epistemologies, ontologies, teaching
(how do we study and teach
heritage as an agent of change)

Sustainable urban heritage conservation in questions

Etienne Berthold, Laurent Aubin

This session proposes a critical and epistemological reflection on sustainable urban heritage conservation. Recent research on the management of urban heritage following its conservation process is characterized by a growing number of studies that aim to provide an overview of how to assess the sustainability of existing practices. This dominant focus of the research has contributed to the development of indicators and approaches to sustainable development in this field. In addition, it has assisted with the implementation of policies and development strategies based on the assessment of the indicators. However, the epistemological foundations of this type of research do not achieve unanimity since its purpose is shared among various uses, both political and scientific. Increasingly numerous studies seeking to measure an aspect of sustainable urban heritage conservation—perhaps especially problems related to the quality of life in historic districts—rely on the perceptions that the various actors (including citizens) have of urban spaces and heritage policies that frame them. In doing so, researchers significantly underestimate the study of discourses, which are nevertheless constituents of patrimonialization processes and dynamics. This session will explore various aspects of the relations between heritage and sustainability. Contributors are particularly invited to highlight and address epistemological as well as ideological issues of research in the fieldwork of sustainable urban heritage conservation.

etienne.berthold@ggr.ulaval.ca

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Epistemologies, ontologies, teaching (how do we study and teach heritage as an agent of change)

The Artistry of Heritage

Andrea Terry, Carla Taunton

This session explores artist-history exchanges in the context of heritage sites, venues and spaces, and considers recent curatorial and artistic interventions and performative strategies, such as decolonial methodologies. Drawing on disciplinary art history, this session approaches heritage sites as strategically re-deployed historic structures that function as representational signs – artifactual objects furnished with other objects that cumulatively and, by virtue of their provenance, preservation, conservation and subsequent institutionalization, validate the interpretation by reconceiving authority as so-called “historical authenticity.” Historians, curators and interpreters use the objects at hand, conducting extensive research, to offer interpretations that position the site’s representation as legitimate, credible and ultimately authoritative. While historical venues can provide visitors with experiential moments of different times and places, present-day circumstances often require recognizing, acknowledging, eradicating, reconceptualising or decolonizing perceptions and representations of the past.

Over the past three decades in North America, artists, curators and heritage practitioners have collaborated to develop contemporary art exhibitions installed within historical sites, projects referred to in related scholarship either as “museum interventions” or, more pointedly, “artist-history interventions.” As art historians, curators and practicing artists Jim Drobnick and Jennifer Fisher explain, the term “museum intervention” describes “the collaboration between artists and institutions to transform the museum from a container of cultural artifacts to a medium of contemporary work. In this practice, the museum context becomes the raw material or ‘cultural readymade’ for artistic analysis, commentary and reconfiguration” (2002, 15). Artist-history exchanges thus provide innovative ways to satisfy cravings for uniquely novel and authentic experiences and so, with the advent of Web 2.0 and social media, they foster opportunities for dynamic interaction and thus function as a strategy to entice new audiences, as identified in the 2010 American Art Museums’ report on diversity. Significantly, they also frequently implicate viewers in their own subjectivities by “tweaking” the expected conventions of installations (Stokes Sims, 12-16). While some interventions aim to reconfigure these places as destinations appealing to a global (or international) audience, others critique the policies, practices and power structures governing heritage sites. In terms of the latter, such endeavours oftentimes seek to disrupt authoritative experiences of the past, thereby re-activating heritage sites as tools to foster communal and critical reflection; these projects require deliberately strategic and calculated considerations of the degree to which the conventional representation(s) might be challenged. Accordingly, this session invites individuals engaged in the fields of visual and material culture – emerging, midcareer, and established artists and cultural workers alike – to consider, describe, and analyze how practicing artists contribute to heritage site development, programming and policies and reveal new ways to think about local, regional, national, and global histories. We invite papers that consider the following, but not limited to, artists interventions and critical engagement with historic sites (monuments, museums, and public spaces) in relation to decolonizing strategies, the living archive, artistic collaboration, and community engaged art/curatorial practice. Finally, we encourage the consideration of how projects presented draw on practices, concepts, and techniques explored decades earlier, be they “soft” (invited/commissioned) or “hard” (uninvited).

andrea.terry1@gmail.com

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Heritage makers II: co-construction and community-based heritage (heritage changes people)

Co-production in heritage: Toward new imaginaries

Bethany Rex, Katherine Lloyd, Nuala Morse

Involving communities, visitors or the public is frequently presented as one of the major tasks of museums and heritage sites in current global movements toward new collaborative paradigms (Golding and Modest 2013; Watson and Waterton 2011). Co-production is a highly current issue, and a proposed emancipatory solution to the authorized heritage discourse, which seemingly has reached a critical juncture. Scholarship has echoed calls from communities for more direct involvement in the presentation and management of heritage and material culture. However there is also a strong critique within the literature and a sense of dissatisfaction from professionals around the gap between the well-meaning rhetoric and practical realities—its effects have more often been tokenistic than transformative. This important critique has brought to the fore the issues of power and inequality in co-production, often drawing on the imagery of the ladder or spectrum of participation (Arnstein 1969; Simon 2010). It has also tended to optimistically re-employ these same critical modes to reimagine co-production practice.

This session invites new perspectives and new approaches to co-production that go beyond these strictly critical modes. The session aims to push the debate beyond the current focus of co-production debates which view co-production as something that takes place at various levels; the recognition of co-production as inevitably messy; and as meaning very different things to policy-makers, practitioners and almost nothing to the “public.” We encourage papers to get up close to the recognized issues of power, hegemony and domination, but also beyond, in a “post-critical” vein. This might include new languages, metaphors and imaginaries to address the roles, relations and stakes involved in the co-production of heritage, as well as approaches taken from a variety of disciplinary traditions. We therefore invite contributions drawing from diverse theoretical perspectives such as actor-network theory (Latour 2005; Bennett 2007), assemblage (Deleuze and Guatarri 1987; Macdonald 2009) and non-representational theory and affect (Thrift 2010; Waterton 2014).

We invite theoretical and/or empirical contributions that explore the processes and practice of co-production along different terms, to generate a richer understanding of the politics of co-production and its progressive possibilities for change. We particularly invite contributions focusing on professionals’ experiences of co-production and their shifting understanding of expertise, knowledge practices and professional identities. With these issues in mind, we invite papers along (but not limited to) the following themes:

- how alternative framings of co-production change understandings of heritage;
- the merging of local knowledge/professional expertise;
- how knowledge and knowledge practices are constructed in empirical examples of co-production;
- how professional values/subjectivities are being challenged or altered in response to the imperative to co-produce;
- how emotion and feelings of belonging encourage co-production and/or co-management to flourish.

b.rex@ncl.ac.uk

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Heritage makers II: co-construction and community-based heritage (heritage changes people)

Heritage and the new fate of sacred places

Luc Noppen

While historical churches are being abandoned all over the Christian West, more and more places are growing the opposite way: pilgrimage sites are being enlarged and enhanced, whole urban districts are being developed with churches and temples boasting diverse, and often unorthodox, religious practices. Epistemologically linked to heritage, the sacred now seems to follow a path of its own, staging itself in new settings where the “religious heritage” refers mostly to common practices, however recent they may be. This new heritage-making through both spectacle and commonality, which leans heavily on the intercultural as an intangible matter, seems to leave aside the tangible side of heritage. But it has to be observed that, however intangible the practices and the communities may be, all these new or renewed sacred places are thought and made of very tangible landscapes, buildings, artefacts, and are set with urban planning rules, by-laws, legal status and tax systems.

If, as it has been demonstrated elsewhere, neither the cult nor the religion can be seen as solutions to the safeguard of historical churches, is there nonetheless something to be learned for redundant churches in this new fate of sacred places? How does the legal status of these pilgrimage sites and other “Highway to heaven” in our secular society can be compared to that of former church monuments? Can the transcultural way to produce the meaning of these sacred places hold any lessons for the interpretation of old churches now deprived of meaning?

This session would like to focus on Canadian examples of new or enhanced sacred places, looking at their materiality to understand how their community-making process can (or cannot) bear examples for the engendering of heritage communities that could revive the meaning of redundant historical churches.

noppen.luc@icloud.com

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Heritage makers II: co-construction and community-based heritage (heritage changes people)

“Heritage” constructions and indigeneity: Considering indigenous cultural centre design in Canada

Rebecca Lemire

In November 2014, artists and thinkers including Jimmie Durham, Michael Taussig, Rebecca Belmore and Paul Chaat Smith convened in Calgary and Saskatoon for “Stronger than stone: (Re)Inventing the Indigenous Monument,” an international symposium which served to foreground the most critical issues facing Indigenous memory-making and cultural preservation today. Propositions for new types of monuments (or anti-monuments in many cases) were made that were specific to the Indigenous worldview and served to honour Indigenous people on their own terms, often emphasizing the importance of landscape, language and oral storytelling in providing a “moral and practical guide to the culture.” Building off the proceedings of this symposium, this session seeks to expand the dialogue into the architectural arena and the role that Indigenous cultural centres play in the presentation of heritage. As Luke Willis Thompson points out, it is important to remember that “The word ‘heritage’ refers to something that cannot be recovered.” Furthermore, Indigenous cultural centres are necessary precisely because of the colonial dismantling of Indigenous culture in this country. More positively, Canada has recently seen a surge in the construction of these centres as part of nation-wide Indigenous cultural revival. In many cases, such as with the Nk'Mip Desert Cultural Centre, they are outward-facing and tied to important economic rejuvenation plans. However, what does it mean when a Western form of building or institution is employed to represent an Indigenous culture? What happens when a non-Indigenous architect is chosen to construct a centre, and characterize a cultural ethos? What is most salient about the existence of these centres? This session invites papers which assess the successes and/or failures of these centres as keepers and presenters of cultural heritage (papers may focus on individual examples and not necessarily the field as a whole) as well as projects which present alternatives to this mode of cultural preservation. Artists and architects are also encouraged to apply.

lemire.rebecca@gmail.com

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Heritage makers II: co-construction and community-based heritage (heritage changes people)

Empathy and indifference – emotional/affective routes to and away from compassion

Gary Campbell, Laurajane Smith

We would like to propose a session, building on the one we ran at the 2014 CHS conference in Canberra, on how emotion and affect feature in the fields of heritage and museums studies, memory studies, public history, heritage tourism, studies of the built and urban environment, conservation, archives and any field of study that deals with the emotional impact and use of the past in the present.

There is an increasing interest in how emotion is a form of judgement on things that affect our lives, identity and wellbeing. This session focuses on the issue of empathy, the emotional and imaginative skill to place oneself in the subjective position of another. Significant debate has occurred within the wider social sciences that has dismissed empathy as simply a feel-good way of belittling or dismissing social justice issues and thus maintain an individual and societal indifference to the marginalized. Conversely, others have argued that empathy is key to overturning indifference and effecting political and social changes. Overall, this session asks what role(s) can and does heritage, in its various forms, play in engendering empathy, and what might an examination of the ways in which heritage and empathy interact reveal about the utility or otherwise about forms and experiences of empathy? Equally, what may the study of the emotional content of heritage practices and performances tell us about the maintenance of indifference?

This session calls for papers, that explicitly address not just the emotional content of heritage practices, but clearly explore the ways in which heritage is used in a range of contexts to elicit or withhold empathy, and the consequences this has for social debates and individual and collective well-being.

Papers may explore such things as:

- the idea of empathy and its role in the expression of different forms of heritage;
- the way empathy, or its withholding, can be used to either facilitate or closedown the extension of social recognition in heritage and museum contexts;
- how forms of commemoration can re-assert or challenge dominant historical or heritage narratives;
- how people using heritage sites or museums, or debating issues of historical importance, mobilize particular suites of emotional and affective responses to the past;
- how communities or other groups who propose non-authorized versions of heritage/history utilize emotional and affective responses to challenge received narratives about the past;
- research which critically investigates the empathetic responses of “visitors” to heritage sites, museums and other forms of heritage;
- research which investigates the role of empathy in the expression and transference of intangible heritage.

gary.campbell2105@sky.com

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Heritage makers II: co-construction and community-based heritage (heritage changes people)

What does heritage change? Case studies in archaeology

Allison Bain, Réginald Auger

In addressing the theme of this conference, we argue that archaeology, above and beyond the traditional goals of research and post-excavation analyses, may contribute to economic development, education and the creation of identities and communities. Our session “What does Heritage Change? Case Studies in Archaeology,” is divided into two themes starting with archaeological practice through its legislation and management. Contract or commercial archaeology increasingly comprises the vast majority of archaeological practice in North America and Western Europe, and the legislation and management of buried heritage is a key part of the archaeological process, regardless of planned outcomes. Heritage sites are managed by multiple forms and branches of legislation at the local, regional, provincial/state and national levels. Competing and at times conflicting interests, poor funding and weak legislation may hinder the proper integration of archaeological heritage in the planning and management of cities, First Nations lands, outlying regions slated for development and parklands. Case studies from a variety of regions will examine and discuss some of these shared challenges while also highlighting archaeological success stories.

The second part of this session addresses potential outcomes in archaeology above and beyond the tourist sector. Archaeology can be an important and, at times, contested method used in the interpretation of past communities and identities. Furthermore, as a vehicle to encourage dialogue, archaeology can be used to address disputed notions about the past, and as a powerful means of its appropriation. The diverse and multidisciplinary nature of current archaeological practices also creates opportunities to encourage education in communities facing socio-economic challenges. Examples presented in the second part of this session explore archaeology and its role in education, community building and identity.

Allison.Bain@hst.ulaval.ca

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Heritage makers II: co-construction and community-based heritage (heritage changes people)

Envisioning the dialogic museum through digital interventions

Areti Galani, Rhiannon Mason

Digital installations and interventions have been seen as a promising ways to support and foster dialogue in museum exhibitions. How does this potential translate into practice and does it enable reflexive and critical approaches towards heritage-making?

This session aims to explore how digital installations and interventions in the context of museum exhibitions envision the notion of the 'dialogic museum'. It particularly aims to articulate and problematize the role of digital installations and interventions that allow the capture and presentation of multiple stories and voices in the museum exhibition space as enablers of different forms of dialogue. The session position this debate in the context of exhibition-based dialogue[s] around 'sensitive' topics, for example, by focusing on how narratives of place, identity, belonging and migration are constructed, de-constructed and re-constructed through digital installations and interventions. However, we would equally welcome papers that deal with digitally enabled dialogue in the museum in relation to other sensitive, controversial or difficult topics.

The sessions asks:

What are the forms of dialogue that are afforded by digital installations and interventions in the museum context? Do the methods of production of digital installations and interventions (e.g. digital interpretive practice vs. digital creative practice) embody and enable different forms of dialogue? For instance, do digital installations afford a greater variety of self-reflexive and/or situated dialogic behaviours by visitors? How do digitally mediated asynchronous museum dialogues change visitors' understanding of and relation to heritage and how? Does the digitally mediated dialogic approach suit some topics more than others? How does digital interpretation fit with the museum's traditional institutional or curatorial voice? How might it help museums deal with 'sensitive' topics and controversy? What are the limits and the ethical and design challenges of digital installations in supporting museum dialogues around sensitive topics?

As the session approaches these questions through the lens of digital practice, it also encourages a critical perspective on (a) the role of the fast evolving field of digital museology/digital cultural heritage in heritage-making; and (b) the discourse around the capacity of digital interactive installations and interventions to resonate with visitors in ways that are not easily achievable through other museum media. It particularly welcomes reflections and insights around the notion of socially engaged digital heritage.

areti.galani@ncl.ac.uk

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Heritage values: the tangible effects (heritage changes the environment)

The cultural politics of new built heritage in emerging economies

Sarah Moser, Ipek Türeli

In many emerging economies of the Global South, new urban mega-projects are strategically reviving heritage into simulacra, copies without originals, intended to sell places. We refer to these projects collectively as “New Built Heritage.” This type differs from earlier constructions of heritage by canonical state institutions such as museums and ministries of culture in the way its main goal is to differentiate and market places rather than solely to shape collective identities. This session brings together papers that study the particular ways new built heritage occurs, and that analyze the purposes behind such allusions to built artefacts of the past, and also probe the effects on various users and audiences of these projects.

The desire to attract foreign investment and join the global economy has led on the one hand to the adoption of placeless corporate styles, and on the other hand to the manufacturing of new built heritage. The ongoing revival of heritage is curious considering it was the relatively austere idiom of Architectural Modernism that was widely adopted by newly independent states in the decades following colonialism. Architectural Modernism signified a break with the past, and therefore, demonstrated aspirations of “modernity.” It was disassociated from “empire” and colonial architecture with its appropriation of the vernacular (e.g., Saracenic in India), but still, its key ideas had emerged from European and American metropolises to be tested abroad. In the case of new built heritage projects, however, scholars are increasingly observing South-South flows of ideas, urban policies and aesthetics.

Builders of new urban projects are increasingly prioritizing “local” culture and “authentic” architectural idioms, and even opting for curated simulacrum in secular projects ranging in scale from kiosks to government buildings, resorts, royal palaces, housing developments, shopping centres, and the planning of new urban areas. There has been a surge in the revival of historic styles, often from non-local sources, in high-profile public and private projects. What often results is a carefully edited version of the past that serves the agendas of the ruling elite.

In this session, we aim to explore the cultural politics of this new heritage revival trend in all of its facets, scales and flows, the forces driving it, and the ways in which hegemonic narratives are being challenged or resisted. Some of the questions our session explores are:

- Whose heritage is being revived, by whom, and for what purpose?
- What narratives are included in new-built “heritage” and who is excluded?
- To what extent is the phenomenon of new-built heritage revival a strategy for empowerment? To what extent is it a strategy for domination?
- What role does economic competitiveness play? To what extent are cities and urban projects using heritage as a branding technique to attract investment and compete in the global or regional marketplace?
- How are nation-building efforts entangled in state-driven newly built heritage projects?
- What role do interpretations of Islam currently play in inspiring new-built heritage in Muslim-dominated countries?

Our session examines case studies in the United Arab Emirates, Turkey, Morocco, Vietnam and Indonesia, and draws on theoretical developments in several disciplines, including geography, architecture and cultural studies.

sarah.moser@mcgill.ca

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Heritage values: the tangible effects (heritage changes the environment)

Re-writing history in the time of late capitalism: Uses and abuses of built heritage

Claudine Houbart, Stéphane Dawans

With his expression “ceci tuera cela,” Hugo established almost two centuries ago a strong link between words and stones as transmission vehicles of human memory. We heritage experts would be inclined to consider stones as more reliable than words, what semiology seems to confirm: stones are clues, and clues are, according to Roland Barthes, tangible proofs of “what has been.” But the inspector Columbo has often shown how we can play with these clues, and Umberto Eco would easily forgive us this incursion into mass culture to agree on the idea that we can rewrite history using false justified clues, that is also, tangible heritage.

Since the emergence of the restoration discipline, experts have been aware of the danger of falsification: Ruskin’s texts, Boito’s philological restoration, Brandi’s historical instance or the Venice Charter are so many illustrations of this concern. But since the 1990’s in Europe, a growing number of restoration and reconstruction projects very clearly depart from this fundamental idea. Of course, the collapse of the Soviet bloc has created a particular political context in which (re-)emerging nations attempted to (re-)build their identity through architectural symbols (leading to the writing of the Riga Charter). But more generally, this phenomenon is closely linked to the cultural context: on the one hand, the postmodern movement has deeply questioned the idea of “sincerity,” with a tendency to blur the limits between true and false and, as a consequence, between original and copy. And on the other hand, in the heritage sphere, the globalization of the debate progressively rattled European certitudes about concepts as essential as authenticity, leading to the replacement of the self-confidence expressed by the Venice Charter by a careful relativism, illustrated by the Nara document thirty years later.

These contemporary phenomena have important side effects. In the context of late capitalism, heritage has become a major economic issue, especially as many cities have well understood its potentialities in terms of city branding. This could of course be seen as a positive opportunity for heritage conservation; nevertheless, a rich scientific literature has shown that tourism can deeply transform our representation of the past. The tourist is a client rather than an amateur, and his quest of authenticity is often satisfied by what the French philosopher Yves Michaud has called “adulterated authenticity,” the one from over-restored monuments, reconstructed city centres, eco-museums, and, why not, theme parks. More than authentic built remains, the “tourist gaze” shapes more and more our representation of “what has been,” and the arguments developed by heritage experts in response to globalization and identity issues are seized upon by city marketing specialists willing to meet a mostly commercial demand, sometimes tinged with dubious political motivations.

What we intend to question in this session is the limit between uses and abuses of heritage and heritage discourse and more particularly whether, as suggested by Theodore Scaltsas’s inspiring paper “Identity, origin and spatiotemporal continuity” (1981), the intentions underpinning restoration and reconstruction projects affect the very essence of restored or reconstructed objects. Besides architectural history and conservation theory, we welcome contributions in the fields of sociology, anthropology, philosophy, history, political sciences, geography, tourism economy and even psychology.

c.houbart@ulg.ac.be

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

**Heritage values: the tangible effects
(heritage changes the environment)**

Industrial heritage: Toward comparative perspectives

Stefan Berger

In many parts of Europe and North America, but also in Australia, Japan and parts of China, regions of heavy industry, in particular regions of coal and steel industries, have been in decline since the 1960s. In many of these regions, the transition to post-industrial landscapes has provoked discussions surrounding industrial heritage, what to do with it and for which purposes. One of the most ambitious industrial heritage projects was initiated in the Ruhr region of Germany from the 1960s onward. In this session these efforts in the Ruhr will be compared with other efforts in similar regions, such as Nord-Pas de Calais in France, Asturias in Spain, Upper Silesia in Poland, South Wales in Britain, Pittsburgh in the US, Kyushu in Japan, and Newcastle in Australia. In particular the session will focus on the nexus between the attempted structural economic transformation of those regions and identity constructions. Three factors seem vital in explaining the success of industrial heritage initiatives: a) strong state traditions, b) a positive identification with the industrial past, and c) an absence of other historical identity constructions onto which to hang regional identity.

stefan.berger@rub.de

What does heritage change?

Le patrimoine, ça change quoi?

Heritage values: the tangible effects (heritage changes the environment)

[S']inventer par le patrimoine: des usages d'une ressource pour ordonner les liens du passé, du présent et de l'avenir

Daniel Le Couédic, Patrick Dieudonné, Lionel Prigent

Essentiellement construite sur des questions d'aménagement et d'environnement, urbain ou non, cette session est envisagée à la croisée de plusieurs thématiques: les «communautés imaginaires», les usages du patrimoine dans le tourisme, le rapport à l'expertise. Nous proposons de décrire et d'organiser un faisceau de situations et d'exemples, qui ressortissent à une même hypothèse sur le caractère social, la nature de bien collectif et le rôle de catalyseur des transformations joué par le patrimoine. Nous posons comme hypothèse que le patrimoine sert à inventer ou s'inventer, en suivant trois parcours:

- s'inventer un passé, une histoire (par une référence commune qui est partagée même si elle diffère sensiblement d'une «réalité historique»);
- s'inventer un présent (par un marketing territorial qui écrit une image, une réputation, mais aussi par la mise en œuvre);
- s'inventer un avenir (par l'affirmation de l'identité d'un territoire, ou un projet de développement économique adossé au patrimoine).

Trois sites peuvent illustrer notre propos :

À Brest, détruite il y a plus de cinquante ans, nombre d'habitants, d'experts et d'élus continuent d'exprimer un «déficit de patrimoine», en dépit des efforts engagés pour renouer le fil de l'histoire, de l'espoir de restituer une légitimité en instaurant des mesures de protection. La perspective de la requalification d'ateliers industriels du 19^e siècle a pourtant induit un renouveau de la préoccupation patrimoniale, matérielle et immatérielle, fondée sur une histoire maritime et des objets pourtant déconnectés de la ville d'aujourd'hui. Comment un passé peut-il en chasser un autre? Comment se joue la relation entre la sélection des patrimoines (s'inventer un passé) et les cadres institutionnels ou sociaux de protection et de transformation de l'espace urbain?

Liverpool, atteinte par une crise économique sévère, avait perdu nombre de ses activités. Les quais, lieux emblématiques de sa prospérité passée, étaient abandonnés et les bassins envasés. Ce sont pourtant ces lieux en déprise que la ville est parvenue à transformer en nouveaux espaces d'activités qui ravivent le passé mais projettent aussi une image renouvelée du territoire. Quels effets l'actualisation du patrimoine, les changements fonciers ou matériels induits par les formes contemporaines de sa protection, de sa réappropriation ou de sa reconversion, sont-ils à même de produire pour s'inventer un présent?

L'estuaire de la Loire, entre Nantes et Saint-Nazaire, est une zone naturelle inondable, pièce remarquable du patrimoine naturel. La protection est rendue difficile par les pressions anthropiques (notamment industrielles) qui s'exercent sur le site. Organiser des activités culturelles et ouvrir cet espace à l'art contemporain a sans doute permis de catalyser une identité, en créant un lien entre les deux villes principales de l'agglomération nantaise. Au-delà des mesures de protection à portée universelle, l'activité artistique ou culturelle a-t-elle la capacité de condenser une lecture du patrimoine qui pourra soutenir les projets du territoire et susciter des objectifs suffisamment partagés pour permettre à ses acteurs de s'inventer un avenir?

daniel.lecouedic@univ-brest.fr

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Heritage-makers I: the activist vs the expert, their changing roles (heritage changes people)

“For people then and for people now”: Approaches to heritage and shared authority

Elizabeth Kryder-Reid

In exploring the broader question “What does heritage change?” this session presents work that is extending heritage policies and practices beyond elite cultural narratives. Using diverse disciplinary perspectives and drawing from case studies around the world, the presenters explore contexts in which stakeholders’ perspectives and choices have been catalysts for change, democratized knowledge, or exposed gaps in contemporary heritage practices. The case studies reveal complex and often contested paradigms of value that different groups bring to public heritage and memory practices, and at the same time they point to new approaches, strategies and methodologies that have been tools for empowering a more inclusive, shared authority approach to heritage sites and collections. These studies humanize the concept of heritage to assert the agency of diverse stakeholders in creatively and intentionally negotiating the politics of the heritage industry and profession to reframe narratives, alter knowledge production and reconfigure social relations.

The presentations trace the political and phenomenological concerns of diverse stakeholders in a wide range of contexts. For example, presenters explore repatriation claims between tribes and government-owned heritage sites in the US Midwest; contested narratives in the planned National Museum of Romanian Communism and the site of Jilava Penitentiary, a former Communist prison, near Bucharest; Native American art objects in a museum collection reinterpreted by Native artists and elders; the entanglements of nationalist politics and grassroots development of projects for cultural preservation in Kyrgyzstan; divergent and convergent meanings of a family-curated museum in Maine, and the findings of an analysis of stakeholder-defined value of cultural heritage at two contested sites in Indiana.

The goal of the session is to highlight innovative strategies for a shared authority approach to cultural heritage. Such an approach acknowledges the agency of diverse stakeholders in navigating structures of power embedded in the mainstream heritage practices and values the counter narratives they produce both with and without the support of dominant institutions.

ekryderr@iupui.edu

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Heritage-makers I: the activist vs the expert, their changing roles (heritage changes people)

Activism, Civil Society and Heritage

Ali Mozaffari, Tod Jones

Heritage processes vary according to cultural, national, geographical and historical contexts. Since the late 1980s, the phenomenon of contestation in heritage has been increasingly recognized. However, there is still little detailed and situated knowledge about the range of actors present in contestations, the variety of strategies they pursue, the reasoning behind their choices, the networks they develop, and how, from all this, heritage has been and is constructed. More often than not, contestation appears to be essentialized as occurring between the “state” (often treated as a monolith) and the people or the community (such as certain uses of the idea of authorized heritage discourse in uses of heritage). Following this trend, much of the growing body of scholarship on heritage has tended to assume universalising theoretical positions based on limited, specific contexts, thus somewhat compromising the ability to draw nuanced and theoretical positions that take into account the diversity of contexts within which heritage is produced.

This session acknowledges the emerging trends in heritage studies which take into account what may be described as relational aspects of heritage construction, such as those inspired by Deleuze, which examine heritage in terms of assemblages (Harrison 2013), Latour’s actor-network theory (Krauss 2008), or other approaches that are increasingly considering heritage as part of human, material and social flows. The premise of this session is that heritage is constructed, contested and negotiated through actions of players or actors and within traceable places and spaces (arenas) through the course of time. Of interest here are the mechanisms of heritage construction and contestation as well as the conceptual and theoretical perspectives that may drive interpretation of realities on the ground.

What does heritage change?

Le patrimoine, ça change quoi?

Heritage-makers I: the activist vs the expert, their changing roles (heritage changes people)

The session is open to scholars from any field of enquiry. We invite contributors to focus on different aspects of heritage in diverse areas to examine questions including but not limited to the following:

- Activism is not limited to individuals. A player in heritage may be an individual, a compound player such as an NGO, or even a state entity such as a heritage organization with divergent internal perspectives. Who is a heritage activist? How do activists identify themselves?
- How does the material turn in social sciences, with its recognition of the role of non-human actors and distributed agency, transform our understanding of contentious heritage?
- What is the micro-politics of heritage in social movements, including preservationist movements?
- What is the relationship between heritage and individual or collective activism?
- How does activism change heritage and how does heritage change activism?
- How does engagement with media transform heritage? What are the preferred modes of communication and media for heritage and why? What does the preference tell us about the relationship between civil society, public sphere and heritage?
- How and why is heritage transformed into a cause?
- How does advocacy for heritage manifest itself?
- Where does contestation take place? And why?
- What is the role of space and place in forms of contesting heritage? Does contestation lead to new definitions and experiences of place and space? At what scales?
- Other questions that may explore the relationship between agency, materiality, affect and heritage will also be considered.

a.mozaffari@curtin.edu.au

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Heritage-makers I: the activist vs the expert, their changing roles (heritage changes people)

La conservation des quartiers anciens et le problème de la gentrification

Marc Grignon

La conservation des quartiers anciens ne se réalise probablement jamais sans être accompagnée de tensions sociales de différentes sortes. Si, dans les années 1960 et 1970, de nombreux projets ont pu être motivés par la résistance citoyenne aux formes les plus néfastes de la rénovation urbaine, aujourd'hui, on a l'impression que la volonté de conserver le patrimoine urbain aboutit presque systématiquement à la «gentrification – un terme qui ne renvoie pas uniquement à l'embourgeoisement d'un quartier, mais qui suggère en outre une forme d'appropriation de l'espace au détriment de la population en place et des commerces existants. Ainsi, au nom de la «revitalisation», du «sentiment de sécurité» ou même de la «mixité sociale» – des notions qui deviennent de plus polysémiques, appropriées par des acteurs aux perspectives différentes–, des projets de sauvegarde du patrimoine aux effets ambigus se multiplient.

Plus largement, les projets de conservation des quartiers et des rues à caractère patrimonial ne se font jamais sans affecter en profondeur la vie de la population locale. Il est donc nécessaire de se questionner sur les tenants et les aboutissants de ces pratiques de conservation à partir d'exemples récents, afin de voir concrètement leurs effets positifs ou négatifs sur la vie locale et mieux comprendre leur évolution au cours des dernières décennies.

Cette séance vise donc à examiner quelques cas révélateurs de projets et de programmes de conservation de quartiers anciens mis en œuvre au cours des deux ou trois dernières décennies en tenant compte des transformations sociales qui ont pu les accompagner. Est-ce que, dans le contexte d'aujourd'hui, les projets de conservation de quartiers anciens conduisent inévitablement à un processus de gentrification? Quelles sont les conditions pouvant faire en sorte que les projets soient davantage bénéfiques aux résidents et aux commerçants déjà établis dans un quartier? Quels sont les bons exemples, ceux qui devraient nous inspirer et nous guider? Quel(s) rôle(s) peuvent jouer les décideurs, les organismes de sauvegarde, les mouvements citoyens dans ce processus aujourd'hui?

marc.grignon@hst.ulaval.ca

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Heritage-makers I: the activist vs the expert, their changing roles (heritage changes people)

What does the Heritage Citizens Movement change?

Martin Drouin

There is no doubt that the involvement of civil society is a key element in the history of heritage. Working upstream, in line with or against the tide of state recognition, enlightened amateurs or ordinary citizens have invested time and energy in the safeguarding and enhancement of a good, a place or a practice, judged, from their point of view, as irreplaceable or remarkable. It is easy for each country or each region to find an example of a precursor, working alone or in a group, who has managed to preserve one treasure or another. Similarly, a heroic battle, whether lost or won, has often marked the local consciousness and has henceforth been referred to as the highlight of a new era or a different way of understanding heritage. The citizens movement has also helped to engage a wider audience in the heritage project. Recognition is no longer the purview of a small group of specialists; with the values-based approach, the opinion of a wider audience is eagerly sought; public consultations have broadened the debate on the local and media scenes; and heritage communities demonstrate that it is possible to give meaning and a different life to heritage. In short, the state no longer has the monopoly on heritage discourse, even if the powers conferred by national laws mean that it is still a major player.

What does the Citizens' Heritage Movement change? In view of what has been mentioned above, the answer may seem easy. Yet on the ground, the same recriminations are being tirelessly expressed. Stakeholders still summon the troops to new battles and highlight the many pitfalls to safeguarding. Tinkering, a need for urgent action, and/or volunteer fatigue doubtlessly undermine many projects. Will the movement end up running out of gas? Is it the only safeguard against indifference? If it has enabled great things and raised the awareness of a wider audience, can it also be looked at critically? Are there different trends within the movement? Can we compare the work of scholarly associations with the various friends of heritage? Behind the legitimate objectives, can there be other interests? Has the professionalization of certain groups transformed the civic roots of heritage activism? The proposed session intends, from a historic or contemporary perspective, to invoke various real-world experiences in order to overcome naive optimism about citizen involvement and explore some possible ways to understand a phenomenon which, despite its essential nature, remains little studied.

We understand Citizens' Heritage Movement in a very large extent which could include an individual trying to alert his neighbourhood to a more organized group with regular members and paid staff. In between, the movement could take a large variety of expressions. Its action is also plural reaching from activism of every sort to public education and technical assistance, and from management for the local community to touristic enhancement.

As part of the session, we invite researchers to provide a critical reflection on the proposed general theme: "What does the Citizens' Heritage Movement change?" They could refer to studies in order to document or broaden the issue of citizen involvement, focusing more specifically on the following aspects:

- The historical or contemporary role of the citizens movement;
- The response and behaviour of authorities toward citizen requests;
- The evaluation of actions taken and their sustainability;
- The pitfalls and challenges of the citizens movement;
- The future of the citizens movement.

Beyond the avenues mentioned, this call for contributions aims to better understand and define the citizens movement by way of a critical approach. Any other suggestion will be considered with great attention.

drouin.martin@uqam.ca

To submit a paper or a poster: achs2016.uqam.ca

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Heritage-makers I: the activist vs the expert, their changing roles (heritage changes people)

L'expertise au temps de la dérégulation patrimoniale

Dominique Poulot

Dans la seconde moitié du XX^e siècle, on a vu fonctionner une bureaucratie spécialisée d'experts nationaux et internationaux, dont les savoirs et les conclusions étaient validés par leurs pairs. L'émergence de nouveaux patrimoines, de nouvelles collections, de nouveaux réseaux internationaux - de musées et de dispositifs patrimoniaux plus ou moins étroitement définis - a semblé décliner le champ des expertises ad hoc en autant de spécialités inédites ou reconfigurées. Mais depuis le début de ce siècle l'idéal de patrimoines liés des communautés d'interprétation, et à des émotions localisées, s'est fait jour. Parmi d'autres résolutions, la convention de Faro sur la valeur du patrimoine culturel pour la société (2005, entrée en vigueur en 2011), a porté en Europe l'idée d'une expertise propre à un espace et à une population. Ainsi l'ancien cadre savant qui garantissait naguère les formes de patrimoine semble se désagréger au profit de revendications d'autochtonie, de réclamations de droits au patrimoine, d'affirmations identitaires et mémorielles particulières.

Certains déplorent le déclin des anciens modèles d'expertise « objective » tandis que d'autres se réjouissent, à l'inverse, de l'émergence d'expertises inédites, et en particulier collaboratives. Pour autant, l'opposition d'une expertise d'en haut à une expertise d'en bas est trompeuse car il existe maintes collaborations et négociations entre les deux. D'une part, les expertises publiques, pour scientifiques qu'elles se réclament, sont aussi marquées par des considérations éthiques, politiques, sinon tactiques, bref circonstanciées et « impures ». D'autre part, les expertises « localisées » et engagées les moins susceptibles a priori d'illustrer un – connoisseurship – bureaucratique-savant sont souvent le fruit de politiques officielles destinées à les faire advenir. Les recherches critiques menées par diverses disciplines au sein des commissions, des administrations ou des associations en charge de valider des choix et des protections ont montré depuis quelques années toute les variétés de la relation de/à l'expertise et ses enjeux dans les processus de patrimonialisation.

Les institutions confrontées à des demandes de restitutions de collections ont dû réviser les anciennes expertises et répondre à la nécessité de nouvelles. Assiste-t-on à une dérégulation des expertises patrimoniales ? Y-a-t-il des expertises des pays de départ et des expertises des pays d'accueil ? Le patrimoine est-il susceptible de folksonomies ? Comment se règlent leurs éventuelles concurrences ? Que pèse une expertise « désintéressée » face aux expertises économique-touristiques ? Inversement, que pèsent les expertises locales, bien ou mal fondées, face à une norme internationale ? Y-a-t-il une traduction possible des expertises, ou s'agit-il au contraire d'expertises intraduisibles ?

Dominique.Poulot@univ-paris1.fr

What does heritage change?

Le patrimoine, ça change quoi?

Justice, law and right to heritage (heritage changes rights)

How do rights change heritage?

Anne Laura Kraak

Questions about the repatriation of cultural property, issues of access and exclusion in the World Heritage system, intangible heritage practices in conflict with human rights norms, or the ways in which the international human rights regime is interpreted as a form of cultural heritage itself: rights are now considered relevant in a broad variety of heritage situations.

This is reflected in the incorporation of references to human rights in a series of key international heritage-related conventions, including the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003), the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005) and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007). Moreover, the advisory bodies to the World Heritage Convention are undertaking efforts to improve the understanding of the rights dimension in World Heritage work and a wider set of debates about the role of rights in heritage practice is taking place among scholars, as witnessed by a growing amount of academic publications on the topic. These debates emerged in the context of the rise of the human rights discourse globally as well as an increased concern in the heritage sector with the ethical implications of its work.

Despite this increased interest in the links between heritage and rights, it remains a highly contested area. Views vary with regard to whether the link is useful or harmful, effective or inhibiting. This is partly due to the diverse cultural contexts in which this relationship is considered. Moreover, both rights and heritage can be understood in widely different ways. For example, there are different consequences when rights are interpreted from a strictly legal perspective or when the discursive capacity to initiate debates about ideas of justice is foregrounded.

In the context of this contestation, critical reflection is necessary on the appropriateness of the adoption of a global or universal framework to address issues of social justice in culturally diverse situations. This session aims to bring together researchers from different disciplinary backgrounds to critically discuss the extent to which engagement with “rights” (whether in a legal or more discursive sense) could provide a means to address issues of social justice in heritage contexts, contributes to existing tensions or perhaps does not make much difference. Contributors are encouraged to consider enabling conditions for respecting rights in heritage contexts, the pitfalls or limitations of the link between heritage and rights, and how rights are used in heritage situations “on the ground.”

With the overarching question—How do rights change heritage?—the session contributes to the broader theme of the conference by considering the following: when rights are linked to heritage, what does heritage change?

akraak@deakin.edu.au

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change quoi?

Justice, law and right to heritage
(heritage changes rights)

Rights-based approaches to heritage management: Possibilities and limitations

Bahar Aykan

State dominance in heritage management has been a key area of attention in critical heritage studies. There is now a large body of work discussing how this dominance may result in the prioritization of national perspectives and interests over local ones and contribute to the marginalization of alternative interpretations of heritage by ethnic and religious minorities, immigrants and Indigenous peoples. Conflicts often arise between these groups and state authorities over how to manage heritage, by whom, and for what reasons. Heritage practice was rarely concerned with local participation to decision-making processes in the past. This has begun to change recently, as the rights of local people in controlling and maintaining their heritage have been increasingly recognized in the area of heritage conservation. A number of key global heritage organizations such as ICOMOS, IUCN and UNESCO are moving toward adopting rights-based approaches for a more democratic, bottom-up and conflict-free heritage management. Indigenous peoples across the globe are now effectively using the language of rights as a political tactic to manage their heritage (Logan 2013:40). This session aims to bring together research that explores the possibilities and limitations of rights-based approaches in democratizing heritage management. It invites contributions that draw on a wide range of empirical cases from across disciplines and welcomes discussions on questions such as:

- What do heritage rights involve? How are they translated into conservation policy and practice at a local, national and/or international level?
- In what ways do heritage rights complement or collide with other socio-economic, cultural and political rights (property rights, freedom of religion and expression, women's and minority rights, and so forth)?
- (How) do rights-based approaches contribute toward a bottom-up heritage identification, protection and management? In what ways could they be put into work in overcoming state dominance in heritage management and in resolving heritage conflicts?

aykanbahar@gmail.com

What does heritage change?

Le patrimoine, ça change quoi?

Justice, law and right to heritage (heritage changes rights)

Heritage (as) justice: Negotiating rights, contesting properties

Olivier Givre, Cyril Isnart

Who owns the heritage? Although not a new one, this question challenges the taken-for-granted assumption that heritage “belongs” to its owners or beneficiaries, be they states, museums, social groups, communities, private persons, inhabitants or even humanity, for example in UNESCO’s World Heritage and its several declinations. Technically, making heritage means also to design and apply juridical rules concerning the status of selected elements, including their property rights: museums, art historians, experts, lawyers may contribute to it. Nonetheless, heritage property is a huge matter of contest. From the Parthenon Marbles claimed by Greece to human remains symbolically reburied as a symbol of past oppression and slavery, examples abound of disputes about the ways heritage “goods” were established as such, by means deemed as unfair and illegal or illegitimate.

Post-colonial statements may include heritage policies from former colonial states in a continuous process of “predation.” The suspicion of “cultural theft” is still an issue between countries claiming heritage as their own, against a former ruler or a conflicting neighbour: “minorities’ heritages” (national, religious, ethnic, linguistic...) appear here as a case in point. Apart from the classical nation-state issues, heritage disputes can also emerge in more fuzzy situations of claiming heritage property (if not ownership), for example in the case of intangible heritages lacking specific legal status but possibly triggering conflicts in the “community” around their proper use, or in the case of local and private collections becoming public ones, blurring the boundary between personal and collective property.

This session aims then at exploring the various ways of understanding heritage (as) justice or injustice, a potentially developing issue in a context of extensive (and globalized) use of the notion of heritage. It will welcome papers (in English or French) focusing on heritage elements submitted to claims, disputes, discontent or contradiction, and on the way claimers, stakeholders or heritage institutions deal, cope, fight or negotiate around contested heritages. A specific attention will be devoted to papers tracking back the concrete history of contested heritages, and focusing on issues such as legal/legitimate, possession/dispossession, justice/injustice.

Such notions as “restitution,” “restoration” or “repair” will be of significant help, as they imply a voluntary (if not desired) returning of heritage to its presumed real owners, for ethical, juridical, political or even economical reasons. To “give back” an artefact may be a political act, by acknowledging its sometimes “suspicious” origin, but it also means to make clear the whole process of constructing (and possibly deconstructing) heritage, the multiple circulations, exchanges, negotiations, appropriations or exclusions through which it was/is made as such. It questions the blurred boundaries of heritages, in the case of multisited or plural claims, as well as the common meanings of cultural “goods,” “property” or “possession.”

olivier.givre1@univ-lyon2.fr

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change quoi?

Notions of heritage I: geographical and linguistic processes of transformation (heritage changes itself)

Flexible scales and relational territoriality in the meaning-making of cultural heritage

Tuuli Lähdesmäki, Satu Kähkönen, Kristin Kuutma

Space plays a crucial role in the production and meaning-making of cultural heritage. Although space has often been discussed in heritage studies, further critical analysis of the constructive and performative nature of space, in particular that of scale and territoriality, is needed in order to understand the power hierarchies and mechanisms of power in cultural heritage and in various conflicts related to its meanings, ownership, preservation and management.

The idea of cultural heritage is commonly fixed to territories: heritage is often perceived and narrated as reflecting not only locally, regionally and nationally framed territorial meanings, but also those of supranational territorial entities such as cross-border or transnational regions and continents. The territorial meanings of cultural heritage are, however, situational and fluid: the territorial meanings of sites, objects and traditions recognized and labelled as cultural heritage vary in different discourses and contexts. For example, the same site, object or tradition can be defined as representing cultural heritage of different nations, depending on one's point of view. Similarly, the same cultural heritage can be regarded as local, regional, national or supranational in different heritage discourses. Territorial definitions of cultural heritage are often intertwined with political agendas. Indeed, spatiality, scale and territoriality have a crucial role in producing, interpreting and governing cultural heritage. Usually, heritage administration, heritage politics and policies have a territorial focus and operational context. Although the geographies of heritage have raised increasing scholarly interest in the field of heritage studies, the difference that scale creates to the meanings of heritage has nevertheless been rarely investigated, as David Harvey has argued.

This session aims to promote the objectives of ACHS, an interdisciplinary approach and critical exploration of power relations involved in the production and meaning-making of cultural heritage. It addresses the main topic of the ACHS 2016 conference by discussing cultural heritage as a domain of power and politics—such as identity politics—and explores how imagined or real spaces, scales, territories and territorial borders are constructed, defined and managed in the processes of heritagization, and with what effects. The session tackles the following questions:

- How do space, scales and territoriality influence the meanings of cultural heritage?
- What kinds of power hierarchies, politics and conflicts of interpretation are implicated by the territorialisation of cultural heritage?
- What kinds of territorial top-down and bottom-up dimensions influence governing and meaning-making of cultural heritage?

tuuli.lahdesmaki@jyu.fi

What does heritage change?

Le patrimoine, ça change quoi?

Notions of heritage I: geographical and linguistic processes of transformation (heritage changes itself)

Devant l'arrêt de monde(s), derrière les ruines, sous les déchets: explorations, traces, fuites

Octave Debary, Jean-Louis Tornatore

Dans un texte majeur, « L'arrêt de monde », D. Danowski et E. Viveiros de Castro explorent le thème de la fin du monde tel qu'il se déploie aujourd'hui « dans l'imaginaire de la culture mondialisée ». Entre fiction, philosophie et anthropologie, ils déroulent la scène sombre de nos futurs d'espèce humaine devenue force géologique et autodestructrice vivant non plus sur mais dans une planète considérée comme un être vivant et une puissance menaçante (Gaïa). Si le spectre de la catastrophe est partout agité, diffère l'imagination de ce que sera le monde d'après la catastrophe : un univers terrifiant qui n'en finit pas de se consumer ne laissant qu'une fuite sans espoir aux spécimens d'humanité restante (La Route de C. MacCarthy, 2008) ; la lente mais sûre reprise ou reconquête du monde par la « nature » débarrassée de nous (Homo disparitus d'A. Weisman, 2007). La ruine absolue pour l'un, l'arrêt de la ruine ou sa transfiguration pour l'autre.

Le déchet, reste d'objet, reste d'homme, voire déchet social, est dans l'errance, le mouvement. Il n'est pas à sa place, parfois n'a pas de place. Il constitue une limite incertaine entre l'être et le non-être, entre ce monde et un autre. Cette limite trace celle de la culture ; la culture se sépare de ses déchets, de ses « déchets culturels ». En ce sens, la saleté ouvre à la culture (M. Douglas). Le nettoyage et l'exclusion des déchets est une (re)mise en ordre de la culture, comme affirmation de son système et de son classement (M. Thompson). La culture maintient en vie ses productions, ses objets, et au seuil de leur non recyclabilité, les congédie comme déchets (ultimes). L'impureté est le privilège de la culture. Il s'agit de dire sa propre finitude, son risque de perte. Et de cette perte, la culture souhaite se défaire. Au centre de cette logique, le déchet permet de dire le temps qui passe et l'horizon d'une fin ; la pourriture ou la salissure est déperdition de la vie. L'eschatologie contemporaine liée au risque écologique trouve ici sa place. A force de vivre, de produire des déchets, on pollue le monde, le risque environnemental dit le risque de la culture. La ruine, elle, se tient au seuil, celui de la fin de la culture, du retour de la nature ou de la promesse d'un futur. Comment faire usages de la ruine ? Lire dans les entrailles d'une ville détruite son destin possible (Jouannais).

Nous voudrions placer notre session sous le signe du mouvement radical, celui qui suppose l'arrêt de mondes, et mettre en regard la pluralité des approches qu'il suscite. La ruine est un motif contemporain associé à la ville (D. Scott). Si l'humanité est devenue majoritairement urbaine, c'est donc de la ville que viennent les images fortes de son anéantissement. Voire, la ville a commencé à se désagréger de l'intérieur, à l'occasion de petites fins de monde, arrêts d'usines par exemple, suscitant le parcours de leurs abandons et de leurs décombres, générant des pratiques, artistiques et/ou déambulatoire, l'urbex, un voyeurisme de la décrépitude, le ruin porn... Nous voudrions mettre en balance, en confrontation la perspective attendue ou redoutée de la ruine de notre monde avec ces petites ruines qui parsèment nos vies quotidiennes, sur lesquelles ces pratiques veulent attirer nos attentions. Dans quelle mesure celles-ci préfigurent-elles, exorcisent-elles celle-là ? Et puis, dans quelle mesure la ruine et le déchet n'entrent-ils pas en concurrence avec nos patrimoines, le patrimoine urbain, le patrimoine industriel ?

Cet atelier est ouvert aux interventions qui interrogent le reste, ruine ou déchet, dans la construction du rapport au temps et à l'histoire. De la poubelle au musée ou à l'espace sanctuarisé, en passant par la ruine, le reste, par la manifestation de ce qu'il n'est plus et de ses diverses occurrences, permet non seulement de dire le temps qui passe mais constitue un indice de nos conceptions du futur. Sa valeur mémorielle, patrimoniale, testimoniale se construit sur les ruines de son histoire, comme sur les perspectives des catastrophes à venir.

octave.debary@free.fr

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change quoi?

Notions of heritage I: geographical and linguistic processes of transformation (heritage changes itself)

Heritage and liminality: Cross-cultural and inter-disciplinary perspectives on liminality and cultural heritage

Ali Mozaffari, Nigel Westbrook

Heritage has multiple, concurrent origins. It is performed and produced by individuals, groups and organizations, or institutions on various scales. It is a transformative process and thus closely connected to the transitional. In heritage, transitionality may be usefully conceptualized under the rubric of the liminal, which at its core anticipates change and transformation, structure-agency relationships, affect, and human experience—all significant issues in recent theoretical debates in the field.

Various individuals, groups, institutions and even countries can create, attempt to control or contest liminality. Examining heritage in light of liminality can pertain to interrogating notions of transition, boundary and border zones and their manifestations and constructions as well as the actors who construct them and their possible intentions in both quotidian and exceptional times. Additionally, new insights may be drawn about understanding spatial and temporal transitions between heritage sites and landscapes and spaces of everyday life or the structure of experiencing a heritage place. In coupling liminality and heritage, the session ultimately pursues a two-fold objective: to develop a better or different understanding of heritage through the use of liminality, and to explore the potential contribution of heritage to understandings of liminality in the present.

Authors are invited to analyze the relationships between heritage and liminality in their multiple forms. The session cuts through a number of conference themes and welcomes papers from multiple disciplines including geography, architecture, anthropology, sociology, tourism studies and politics. Both theoretical and case-based studies with theoretical implications will be considered.

Possible topics of investigation include but are not limited to the following interrelated aspects:

1. Time and temporality – how thresholds and liminal zones change over time and how is the transition experienced by various groups and/or individuals?

- What are the temporal qualities of thresholds in relation to places?
- What are the temporal differences between liminal zones and their immediate surroundings?
- How, when and by whom are they constructed as thresholds?
- How do thresholds and transitions transform in time and what are the causes for their transformation?
- How is the question of time related to other tangible or intangible aspects of experiencing heritage?

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Notions of heritage I: geographical and linguistic processes of transformation (heritage changes itself)

2. Narrative

- What are the narratives of entering/transitioning for various groups of people?
- How are experiences narrated on a quotidian basis and how does that narrative differ in other times?
- At a more local scale, what are the various narratives of entering, border zones and thresholds and how do they interact?

Performance

- How, when and why are transitions performed?
- What kind of performances and actions create, keep or dissolve a liminal state at various scales: in relation to a locale (as in entering and exiting) or in a set of intangible institutional structures that operate at multiple scales?

3. Place

- How is liminality created, controlled or contested in place?
- Who are the actors (individuals, collectives or institutions) who create or resist liminality?

4. Embodiment and concretization

- What are the symbolic (visual, structural and other forms) markers of such zones?
- How do they appear and how are they constructed in their settings (urban, architectural, landscape)?
- How does historical transformation of the setting influence the construction of a liminal zone and vice versa?

A selection of papers will be considered for inclusion in an academic publication.

a.mozaffari@curtin.edu.au

What does heritage change?

Le patrimoine, ça change quoi?

Notions of heritage I: geographical and linguistic processes of transformation (heritage changes itself)

Les mécanismes en œuvre dans la construction de narrations patrimoniales

Denis Martouzet, Carabelli Romeo

Le patrimoine n'est pas un donné, c'est un construit culturel et social, dynamique et itératif (Maria Gravari-Barbas). La construction patrimoniale est la construction d'une croyance à partager/imposer. Le statut d'objet patrimonial que l'« on » (experts, élites, décideurs...) donne à un objet suppose de le saisir comme spécifique. C'est aussi l'occasion d'une saisie de la dynamique qui amène la spécificité patrimoniale, cette même dynamique qui est le terrain d'action des politiques, des prises en charge émotionnelles et culturelles de ces entités patrimoniales qui sont, en quelque sorte, spécifiques sinon spéciales.

Cela est toujours à la fois vrai et faux, selon le regard que l'on y porte et selon les intentions (Vincent Veschambre) qui président au processus de patrimonialisation.

Cette croyance porte sur l'entité visée mais, l'objet seul ne suffisant pas, il est nécessaire de construire cette croyance, ce qui amène l'analyse des processus et leur prise en compte comme des actes patrimoniaux, comme des entités patrimoniales. Plus concrètement, il apparaît nécessaire d'inventer une narration (Paul Ricœur) capable de mettre en place un système de récits constitutifs de cette croyance.

Une croyance est une certitude plus ou moins grande par laquelle l'esprit admet la vérité ou la réalité de quelque chose. Non seulement, il y a plusieurs degrés de croyance – ce n'est pas binaire (Gérald Bronner) – mais, de plus, entrent en jeu différents types de connaissance : ce qui relève de l'opinion (Aristote), ce qui est foi (Saint-Augustin) et ce qui s'inscrit dans la démarche scientifique (Karl Popper).

Notre questionnement porte :

- sur la manière dont s'interpénètrent et se combinent science, foi et opinion dans la construction de la narration utile à la patrimonialisation. Comment s'organisent les processus en œuvre ? Comment se rencontrent, dans les processus cognitifs et relationnels, idéologie, raison, et dimension psycho-affective et émotionnelle ? Comment se conjuguent enrôlement et engagement ? Quelles sont les évolutions récentes et en cours, voire à prévoir ou anticiper, concernant ces processus ?
- sur la manière dont la narration ainsi construite échappe à ceux qui l'ont construite, s'autonomise et est appropriée par ceux qui n'ont pas participé à sa construction, renforçant les aspects « foi » et « opinion » au détriment de l'objectivation scientifique, comment, faisant passer un objet du statut de banal au statut de patrimonial, elle le transforme de « normal » à « exceptionnel » par la transformation – par imposition – des regards et des représentations que portent la société sur cet objet.
- sur l'entité même de la narration en tant que telle, en tant que besoin de points de repères idéels, symboliques et culturels dans un espace matériel.
- sur les motivations, les besoins matériels et immatériels, individuels comme sociaux, à l'origine de la construction de ces narrations : en quoi leur nature oriente le contenu des narrations ?

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change quoi?

Notions of heritage I: geographical and linguistic processes of transformation (heritage changes itself)

Les propositions de communication peuvent venir de chercheurs, quelle que soit leur discipline de référence, de spécialistes et experts, d'acteurs du patrimoine. Il peut tout autant y avoir des cas d'études spécifiques, exemplaires, de parcours de patrimonialisation révélateurs de narrations (types, structures, invariances) comme des approches théoriques, comparatives et/ou méthodologiques. On imagine comme pertinentes des communications portant sur des objets qui catalysent les activités patrimonialisantes, mais aussi sur ces processus qui rendent actif le rapport idéal, symbolique et culturel à l'espace matériel. Ce sont les processus en œuvre qui sont au cœur de nos questionnements. Aussi, les entités concernées peuvent tout autant être matérielles localisées ou multilocalisées qu'immatérielles (par exemple les conteurs de la place Jemaa el-Fna, la cuisine méditerranéenne...).

denis.martouzet@univ-tours.fr

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Notions of heritage I: geographical and linguistic processes of transformation (heritage changes itself)

Challenging a discourse of difference – heritage in Asia and Europe

Anna Källen, Anna Karlström

As the interface between past and present, heritage is deeply involved in articulations of personal and group identity, working to unite and harmonize group relations and, simultaneously causing frictions, fractions and violence. Critical heritage theory reveals that values and approaches to heritage are articulated both within and across regions (such as Asia, or Europe). A vital, and as yet unanswered, question centres on the degree to which heritage in Asia fundamentally differs from those conservation regulations and practices based on European notions of time, materiality and aesthetics, which have been internationalized as a set of “standards.” Attempts to challenge the European hegemony in global heritage practice has led to an overly simplistic dichotomization between “Asian” and “Western,” where Europe is reduced to linearity, rigidity and permanence, and Asia spirituality and impermanence. With little serious, long-term humanistic and social science research undertaken on the complexities of Asian approaches to heritage in relation to European ones, policy-makers and international heritage programmes too often resort to this East-West dichotomy and re-establish these socially constructed (or imagined) communities in attempts to express multicultural sensitivity. Critically, a paradigm of difference and opposition undermines more robust understandings of shared approaches and inter-regional dialogue, and risks contributing to situations of conflict or violence. Securing grounded, nuanced understandings of the complex entanglements and inter-connections between heritage, its care, and its governance in Asia and Europe is therefore an urgent task. The widespread politicization of heritage today, both at the local and national levels, means a more open, intra-regional, cross-cultural dialogue around the cultural past, and its links to identity is of global concern.

This session invites papers that challenge this discourse of difference. We are interested in research and debates that move beyond statements of essential difference, transcend nationalism, flesh out the complexities of regional heritage, and unpack ideas of Asian-European dichotomy. We also welcome contributions that examine, through a comparative lens, the actual foundations for valuing and approaching heritage in Asia and Europe.

anna.kallen@ark.su.se

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Notions of heritage I: geographical and linguistic processes of transformation (heritage changes itself)

Heritage shifts in East Asia: Communication between global policies and local practices

William Nitzky, Yujie Zhu

To date, there has been much scholarly discussion and critique about how ideas and policies of “heritage” may be operating globally. There have also been ethnographic studies providing “on the ground” perspectives. In this session, we aim to establish a bridge between local-level empirical study and global heritage discourse. By addressing “heritage” in relation to processes of modernization and globalization in East Asia, we seek to investigate the dynamic communication between global heritage policies and local practices in that region. Rather than assuming that a Euro-centric discourse necessarily operates, we intend to explore the dialectical shifts of heritage discourse between international regimes and national and local presentations. We also wish to examine the tensions and opportunities in the process of interpreting, imagining and practicing heritage in the East Asian context of shifting economic and cultural values.

With these issues in mind, we invite papers looking into the following themes:

- What are the routes and modes of transport by which notions such as heritage, preservation, museum or authenticity—that originally emerged from Europe—travel to East Asian countries such as China, Korea or Japan?
- What concepts and practices do such notions meet when they arrive and how do populations interact with them? How are they professionally translated and interpreted and popularly imagined and practised on the ground?
- Through what kinds of processes and practices is the global heritage system variously put into operation and transformed at national and local levels?
- What roles do international professional groups, including heritage experts and nature conservationists, play in shaping the activities of Asian heritage practitioners and managers—and vice versa?
- How are documents and decisions concerning heritage conservation made at international levels (e.g. World Heritage) transmitted to East Asia and how do local actors variously take up, negotiate, resist or ignore these in whole or part?
- In what ways may local heritage decision-makers enlist national and international agents in order to meet their own economic and political agendas?
- How do international tourists and global tour operators imagine and influence heritage tourism in East Asia, and how do those variously respond?

Instead of focusing on single-site case-studies from diverse national contexts, this session engages with East Asia as an important ground for testing the global dynamics of heritage discourse in relation to the intensified mobility of concepts, objects, media and human beings.

We welcome projects with inter-disciplinary approaches to deepen the insight of the complex picture of the heritage system in the era of cultural and economic globalization. By investigating the proposition that cultures are an attribute of human societies formed by transcultural relationships, our session will collectively strive to cast new light on heritage politics, memory, governance, and the complex and often contradictory association of power and culture.

wnitzky@gmail.com

To submit a paper or a poster: achs2016.uqam.ca

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change quoi?

Notions of heritage I: geographical and linguistic processes of transformation (heritage changes itself)

Qu'est-ce que l'art contemporain fait au patrimoine ?

Bernard Haumont

L'art contemporain, lorsqu'il est en relation avec le patrimoine culturel, que ce dernier soit bâti ou qu'il mobilise d'autres matériaux ou supports, tend à reconfigurer les rapports de la société à ses patrimoines et à son histoire. Il est ainsi à même d'ajouter, de modifier, de détourner ou même de transformer les valeurs historiennes ou esthétiques communément associées au patrimoine culturel d'une nation, d'une région ou d'un groupe social ou ethnique; y compris d'ailleurs en ce qui concerne les valeurs universelles prêtées au Patrimoine mondial de l'Humanité (UNESCO).

Une première dimension des reconfigurations de ces rapports se tient dans les façons de voir et d'appréhender ces patrimoines, puisque le regard sur ceux-ci et la perception qu'on en a sont susceptibles d'être modifiés par les interventions artistiques qui s'en emparent ou y trouvent place. Dans ce sens, les manières de traiter et d'utiliser des matériaux historiques ou patrimoniaux pour développer un travail artistique contemporain paraissent tout aussi importantes que les résultats obtenus, puisqu'elles entraînent de facto une rencontre singulière entre une subjectivité à l'œuvre et des matériaux historiquement situés.

Une seconde dimension de ces reconfigurations se rapporte à la mise en crise des identités culturelles et sociales attachées à des patrimoines, pour en souligner et renforcer les caractères ou à l'inverse leur opposer d'autres façons d'envisager leurs rapports au temps et à l'histoire, ainsi qu'à la société ou à l'un de ses groupes. Les révélations ou les ruptures prendraient ainsi place dans des processus d'artialisation, symétriques en quelque sorte des mouvements d'anthropologisation de l'art observables par ailleurs.

Une troisième dimension, enfin, réside dans l'accélération des processus de patrimonialisation que des œuvres artistiques contemporaines illustrent pleinement en passant rapidement du statut d'objet culturel ou artistique à celui d'objet muséal et patrimonial, y compris pour des réalisations éphémères ou périssables qu'il s'agit alors de restaurer ou de reconstituer. Dès lors, la création contemporaine semble inverser le processus classique du choix des objets à patrimonialiser et pose de façon radicale la question : quels objets ou quels lieux ne sont pas potentiellement du patrimoine?

La séance abordera principalement ces différentes dimensions, sans se priver d'élargir les questionnements qu'elles recèlent.

bernard.haumont@paris-valdeseine.archi.fr

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

Le patrimoine, et après ?

Olivier Lazzarotti

Le 19^e siècle aura été celui de l'invention européenne des monuments, historiques et de nature. Le 20^e, plus spécifiquement sans sa seconde moitié, aura été celui du patrimoine, en particulier dans sa version mondiale, telle que soutenue par les États-Unis des années 1970. Or, en ce début de 21^e siècle, de nouvelles formes de mobilisations mémorielles émergent: de la rue Champlain de Québec au quartier Xintiandi de Shanghai, de Bercy-Village à Paris à South Bank de Londres, ou bien encore aux «parcs mémoriels» des campagnes chinoises du Fujian, les notions de monuments ou de patrimoine ne rendent plus exactement compte de ce qui prend forme. Et pourtant, tous ces lieux sont bien mémoriels.

Le projet de cette communication sera d'analyser ces nouvelles manifestations mémorielles, dérivant de nouveaux processus et portées par de nouveaux acteurs pour conclure à l'émergence nécessaire d'une nouvelle notion: les «mémoires-Monde».

Que changent-elles? Qu'est-ce qui a changé? Pourquoi?

olivier.lazzarotti@u-picardie.fr

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

«Alter-heritagization» / «alter-metropolization»? Objects, players and forms of alternative heritage production in contemporary metropolises

Geraldine Djament, Maria Gravari-Barbas, Sébastien Jacquot

The contemporary movement of heritagization, characterized by a multiple expansion (typological, chronological, spatial) of heritage and of heritage producers (local actors, inhabitants, social groups, national states, international players), nourishes also the production of alternative heritage. By this expression, we wish to focus on non-institutional, dissonant, under-recognized heritage, located on the “pioneer front” of contemporary heritage production. Alter-heritage represents, therefore, an alternative to the heritage institutional “production chain,” controlled by the national state (Heinich 2009), by metropolitan leaders or corporate private groups. It also represents an alternative to the hyper-spectacular heritage sites encompassing the capital resources, the global attention and the international tourist flows (Gravari-Barbas 2012; 2014). These questions become important in a context in which heritagization is quasi-systematically associated with gentrification (Semmoud 2005) and used by the late aesthetic capitalism (Lipovetsky and Serroy 2013). Are other, “alternative” ways for heritage and heritagization possible?

Alter-heritage can represent different types of alternatives:

- A geographical alternative: by its location in the suburbs, away from the historic centres and the central tourist districts (Duhamel and Knafou 2007).
- A typological alternative: by the nature of “heritagized” objects which may hold a controversial value, such as the heritage of the housing projects of the post-Second World War years (Pouvreau 2011; Veschambre 2010; 2014).
- A social alternative: by their reference to imagined communities and to minorities, as in the case of the heritage of immigration (Rautenberg 2007), or by the role played by non-favoured social groups in its construction.
- A tourist alternative: by their marginal location compared to the dominant fluxes and practices.
- A political alternative: by their own intention of being alternative; for example militant heritages (Aguilar 1982) or cultural activism (Prévoit and Douay 2012), or protest practices of heritage (Bondaz, Isnard and Leblon 2012).

Alter-heritages can belong to one or more categories. They can be altogether geographic, social, typology and tourist alternatives (Jacquot, Fagnoni and Gravari-Barbas 2012). For example, heritage located at the suburbs of contemporary metropolitan regions may become, through the action of popular social categories or political groups, an activism locus, aimed at reversing the dominant stigma of the suburb.

The choice of examining the metropolitan regions comes from the trend toward metropolization of culture and heritage (Djament-Tran and San Marco 2014), and from the concentration of initiatives of alter-heritagization in metropolitan areas as well as from the growing role that metropolises play in the construction of a political alternative (Harvey 2012).

What does heritage change?

Le patrimoine, ça change quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

This proposed session on “alter-heritagization in the contemporary metropolitan regions” aims at:

- Identifying alternative heritages, their categorizations and their promoters (social, ethnic, cultural groups; inhabitants...).
- Analyzing the alternative terms of heritage (What does make the heritage alternative? Does the alter-heritagization imply a change in the notion of heritage itself?).
- Analyzing the eventual relationships between alter-heritage and institutional heritage (alter-heritage can break with the institutional heritage or on the contrary, it can become an institutional one).
- Analyzing the relationships between alter-heritage and tourism (does alter-heritage imply an alter-tourism?).
- Identifying heritage conflicts in which they are involved, the issues of power at stake and their relationships with metropolitan conflicts in general.
- Analyzing the contribution of alter-heritage to the construction of a metropolitan alternative (Beal and Rousseau 2014): Is alter-heritagization a tool allowing an alter-metropolization (in what meaning)? What does alter-heritagization change in the metropolization process?

Le processus contemporain de patrimonialisation, caractérisé par une extension multiple (typologique, chronologique, spatiale) de la notion de patrimoine et des entrepreneurs de patrimoine (acteurs locaux, habitants, groupes sociaux, États-nations, acteurs internationaux), nourrit aussi la production d'un patrimoine alternatif. Par cette expression, nous voudrions attirer l'attention sur les patrimoines non institutionnels et/ou non totalement reconnus, situés sur le «front pionnier» de la patrimonialisation contemporaine. Le patrimoine alternatif représente une alternative à la «chaîne de production» institutionnelle du patrimoine, contrôlée par l'État-nation (Heinich 2009), par les dirigeants métropolitains ou par de grands groupes privés. Il représente également une alternative aux sites patrimoniaux hyper-spectacularisés attirant les ressources en capitaux, l'attention globale et les flux touristiques internationaux (Gravari-Barbas 2012; 2014). Ces questions deviennent importantes dans un contexte dans lequel la patrimonialisation est presque systématiquement associée à la gentrification (Semmoud 2005) et utilisée par le capitalisme tardif, esthétique (Lipovetsky et Serroy 2013). D'autres voies, «alternatives», pour le patrimoine et la patrimonialisation sont-elles possibles?

What does heritage change?

Le patrimoine, ça change quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

Ces patrimoines peuvent prétendre à une alternative :

- D'un point de vue géographique, par leur localisation hors des centres historiques et des central tourist districts (Duhamel et Knafou 2007).
- D'un point de vue typologique, par leur patrimonialisation d'objets à la valeur controversée, comme c'est le cas du patrimoine des grands ensembles (Pouvreau 2011; Veschambre 2010; 2014).
- D'un point de vue social, par leur référence à des communautés imaginées minoritaires, comme dans le cas du patrimoine de l'immigration (Rautenberg 2007), ou le rôle joué par des groupes sociaux non favorisés dans leur construction.
- D'un point de vue touristique, par leur situation en marge des flux et des pratiques touristiques dominants.
- D'un point de vue politique, par la patrimonialisation et/ou leur revendication d'une alternative: il s'agit alors de patrimoines militants, à l'inverse du «classement de classe» auquel l'inscription aux Monuments Historiques a pu être identifiée (Aguilar 1982), d'«activisme culturel» (Prévot et Douay 2012), d'usages contestataires du patrimoine (Bondaz, Isnard et Leblon 2012).

Les patrimoines alternatifs peuvent ressortir de l'une ou de plusieurs de ces catégories, comme l'illustre le patrimoine de banlieue, à la fois situé en banlieue, en marge du tourisme métropolitain, patrimoine ordinaire de catégories sociales souvent populaires et porteur d'un militantisme visant à inverser la stigmatisation dominante de la banlieue (Jacquot, Fagnoni et Gravari-Barbas 2012).

Le choix d'examiner les régions métropolitaines vient de la tendance à la métropolisation de la culture et du patrimoine (Djament-Tran et San Marco 2014), et de la concentration des initiatives de patrimonialisation alternatives dans les aires métropolitaines, comme du rôle croissant que jouent les métropoles dans la construction d'une alternative politique (Harvey 2012).

Cette session consacrée à «la patrimonialisation alternative dans les régions métropolitaines contemporaines» vise à:

- Identifier les patrimoines alternatifs, leurs catégorisations et leurs promoteurs (groupes sociaux, ethniques, culturels; habitants...).
- Analyser la dimension alternative du patrimoine (qu'est-ce qui rend le patrimoine alternatif? La patrimonialisation alternative implique-t-elle un changement dans la notion de patrimoine elle-même?).
- Analyser les éventuelles relations entre patrimoine alternatif et patrimoine institutionnel (le patrimoine alternatif peut rompre avec le patrimoine institutionnel ou au contraire devenir un patrimoine institutionnel).
- Analyser les relations entre patrimoine alternatif et tourisme (le patrimoine alternatif implique-t-il un tourisme alternatif?).
- Identifier les conflits patrimoniaux dans lesquels ils sont impliqués, les enjeux de pouvoir associés et leurs relations avec les conflits métropolitains en général.
- Analyser la contribution du patrimoine alternatif à la construction d'une alternative métropolitaine (Beal et Rousseau 2014). La patrimonialisation alternative constitue-t-elle un outil permettant une métropolisation alternative (en quel sens)? Que change la patrimonialisation alternative dans le processus de métropolisation?

geraldine.djament@wanadoo.fr

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

Beyond re-uses: The future of church monuments in a secular society

Édith Prigent, Liliian Grootswagers-Theuns, Luc Noppen

All through the Christian West, increasingly more churches are closed to worship, and recycling, or converting to new uses has become commonplace. What has not been seen yet is a church renowned for its artistic value, a “monument” in the straight sense of the word, being totally abandoned by the cult and its religious references, fundamental for the understanding of the artistic value itself. While it is now well known that the increased social and global mobility threatens our traditional views on heritage in general, interpretation and education schemes are often put in place to overcome the lack of public memory and common backgrounds on which usually relies the common recognition of heritage: everybody can learn milling at the mill, or farming at the farm, even though they have no previous knowledge or family experience of these practices. But what about the religion, that bears the meaning of the most renowned religious works of art? What is the importance of the Sistine Chapel ceiling if somebody has no knowledge of the Last Judgement, less of Michelangelo, not to say of the so Europe-centred 16th century?

While we can admit that the traditional religious practices and knowledge that produced these Gesamtkunstwerk—one could name the “total work of art” that describes some unique monuments left by Christianity—will soon be long gone, we have to question the means and the very reasons of their survival as a heritage that less and less would share. Much more than those church buildings that can be re-used for community or other purposes, of course at the cost of some of their décor or artefacts, these Gesamtkunstwerk call for major public investments that will have to be justified, if not only through some kind of renewed interpretation and public understanding of their heritage values. If everybody agrees that they have to stay “untouched,” used only as monuments of themselves, should the public authorities engage into liturgy to sustain that mission? If not, who should own them and care for them? How can their integrity be preserved? How can their meaning be conveyed?

This session will provide the opportunity to discuss experiments conducted through the Western World and bring together different viewpoints on the economy, the interpretation and the in-situ preservation of works of art, notably to grasp the legal, financial and societal implications and means of heritage-making when it puts into question the consistency of monuments previously thought to be “untouchable.”

collection2@mrvs.qc.ca

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

Mobilizing the heritage environment

Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe

The classic car industry—and phenomenon of popular culture—relate directly to the investigation and promotion of architectural and urban heritage. The Classic Car fraternities (they range right across financial and ethno-cultural divides) have achieved a high level of material and media success: they offer a kinship of interest and enterprise to respect the philosophical, technical and subjective (authenticity of historical record, knowledge acquisition, personal memory, aesthetic appeal and nostalgia). Besides common cause of historic preservation are common aims of inquiry and dissemination.

The focus of professional and popular heritage and conservation activity remains on architecture and artefact, plus particular separable built environments. A broader alliance between all aspects and elements of the social fabric has yet to be achieved. A core element are, literally, the engines of later modern development, and especially the automobile/motor car. This machine has both enabled large scale tourism of heritage architecture and sites but also wrought havoc on historic patterns of settlement and urbanism. Furthermore, historic automobiles have stimulated the expansion of technology museums as well as a thriving classic car industry. The industry confronts long-standing debate about restoration versus conservation together with considerable variation in the social economy of its adherents—between elitist and highly expensive restoration such as exemplified by the annual Pebble Beach event in California and the many classic car “Meets” most often organized by enthusiasts of national or manufacturer car production. Around the history of automobile ownership, impact and collection lies a diversity of critical discourse worth aligning with the investigation of patrimony.

Papers are invited that address issues of classic car ownership, restoration, display and relationship with heritage conservation practice and policy. The conflicted impact of the automobile upon urban development and social culture, including its place in the wider dynamics of mobility, tourism and environmental sustainability are also welcomed.

rhodri.windsor@ubc.ca

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

“Le patrimoine immatériel, ça change quoi ? Culture, économie, société”

Julia Csergo, Antoine Gauthier, Chiara Bortolotto

Le concept de patrimoine culturel immatériel (PCI) a fait l'objet de nombreux colloques et publications depuis la promulgation de la Convention pour la sauvegarde du patrimoine culturel immatériel de l'UNESCO en 2003, voire même avant. Toutefois, peu d'entre eux se sont attardés à la question de l'impact réel des systèmes et politiques mis en place pour favoriser le développement des pratiques culturelles transmises de génération en génération comme les arts et l'artisanat traditionnels, les fêtes locales, les connaissances sur la nature, l'alimentation ou d'autres formes de traditions régionales.

Dix ans après l'entrée en vigueur de la Convention de l'UNESCO en 2006, il devient incontournable d'interroger, dans une perspective critique et pragmatique, l'atteinte de ses objectifs et d'analyser ses effets directs et indirects à l'échelle locale, régionale et internationale. Le Québec par exemple, où se tient le congrès, représente un terrain d'analyse porteur à travers les actions menées en vertu de la Loi sur le patrimoine culturel qui a inséré le patrimoine immatériel dans la législation interne d'un État fédéral n'ayant pas ratifié la Convention de 2003.

Cette session s'adresse aux chercheurs, aux responsables d'organismes culturels, aux chargés de projets en culture, aux décideurs politiques et à tous ceux que la question du PCI intéresse. Elle vise à répondre à la question: «Le patrimoine immatériel, ça change quoi?»

julia.csergo@wanadoo.fr

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

Héritage religieux et patrimoine culturel religieux. Différences et affordances

Cyril Isnart, Nathalie Cerezales

Dans la tradition occidentale, le patrimoine culturel trouverait ses fondements «dans le concept chrétien de l'héritage sacré de la foi» (Babelon et Chastel 1994), dont la conservation des objets religieux sous l'Antiquité et le culte des reliques seraient les prémices. Posant alors le principe du «transfert de sacralité», on emprunta le vocabulaire et les techniques du premier pour construire le second, qualifiant ainsi le fait patrimonial comme le culte laïc des productions humaines. Le sacré religieux et le sacré patrimonial seraient ainsi deux modes de relation de l'homme à la transcendance (Dormaels et Berthold 2009).

Mais ces analyses, porteuses d'une charge symbolique puissante, voire aveuglante, ont peut-être effacé l'autre dimension de toute religion en action: les liens, les hiérarchies, les oppositions et les coopérations que le culte établit entre les hommes sous la forme de l'héritage collectif. Les croyants forment une lignée (Hervieu-Léger 1999), se remémorent un passé (Halbwachs 1950; Assmann 2003) et se transmettent des valeurs et des objets (Grabnir 2001; Godelier 2006). Que le patrimoine culturel reprenne les logiques de l'héritage religieux est difficilement contestable, mais que sait-on au juste de l'étrange superposition qui naît lorsque advient la catégorie de «patrimoine culturel religieux»?

Face à l'extension du champ patrimonial du religieux (Paine 2013), cet atelier permettra de s'interroger sur ce que la prise au sérieux de l'héritage religieux change dans notre analyse du fait patrimonial. Il voudrait ainsi analyser la spécificité et la pertinence de la catégorie «patrimoine culturel religieux» et, partant, renouveler son étude, en dépassant le paradigme du «transfert de sacralité».

On pourrait distinguer trois domaines d'interrogation, qui ne sont ni exclusifs ni restrictifs.

1. Le rôle identitaire du patrimoine religieux. Qu'il soit matériel ou immatériel, le patrimoine religieux a joué un rôle primordial dans l'identification du patrimoine culturel national et dans la construction de la nation, en Occident comme dans les territoires et les contextes post-coloniaux. Il joue également un rôle particulier dans les mouvements de résurgence communautaire et de reconnaissance ethnique. Il constitue l'un des moyens de s'identifier et de se définir, non plus seulement en tant que groupe, mais aussi par rapport aux autres. Comment la triade patrimoine/religion/identité, restée souvent impensée, se configure-t-elle?
2. La patrimoine comme pratique pieuse. Il sera question d'interroger la patrimonialisation comme nouvelle pratique religieuse. En effet, parallèlement à la baisse de la pratique en Occident, on assiste à la naissance d'institutions confessionnelles dédiées au patrimoine religieux, à un renouvellement des usages touristiques des rites et des édifices sacrés, et à un remploi du patrimoine ancien par de nouveaux mouvements religieux. Comment évaluer ces dynamiques entre une standardisation, une déspiritualisation ou une multiplication créative des rapports au religieux contemporain?

What does heritage change?

Le patrimoine, ça change quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

3. Les dispositifs du patrimoine religieux. Le patrimoine culturel religieux englobe une série de manifestations matérielles, dont l'existence est parfois indexée sur les usages touristiques, patrimoniaux, économiques ou spirituels qu'elles contribuent à créer. Il s'inscrit, comme par le passé, dans un circuit de consommation qui dépasse le cadre étroit du pèlerinage et de la dévotion. Sa spectacularisation semble être un moyen de rassembler ou d'intéresser bien au-delà du groupe de fidèles. Qu'est-ce que la présence d'un édifice, d'un rituel ou d'un objet dans un contexte non religieux produit sur ses dimensions proprement religieuses?

À l'aide d'exemples précis et de contributions (en français et/ou en anglais) issues de diverses disciplines (histoire, histoire de l'art, sociologie, géographie, anthropologie), périodes et cadres géographiques, cette session souhaiterait ainsi analyser les pratiques de patrimonialisation, de muséification, ainsi que les négociations et les (re)qualifications du fait religieux, et interroger les limites, parfois poreuses, entre religion et patrimoine culturel.

isnartc@gmail.com

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

Les patrimoines de la santé aujourd'hui et demain: Quelle ressource pour quels acteurs ?

Jacques Poisat, Denis Robitaille

La question du futur de la patrimonialisation et de son influence sur les sociétés et les acteurs sociaux est au cœur des interrogations actuelles sur les patrimoines liés aux hôpitaux et à la santé.

Certes l'avenir des patrimoines des hôpitaux et de la médecine paraît aujourd'hui fort incertain. Cependant, en France comme au Québec, la sauvegarde des patrimoines liés à la santé a suscité un réel intérêt dans les trente dernières années. Les recherches que nous conduisons depuis 1989 montrent qu'aujourd'hui, dans un nombre significatif d'expériences de valorisation, le patrimoine hospitalier n'est plus considéré seulement comme collections d'objets, mais tend à être utilisé par les acteurs sociaux comme une «ressource»: ressource culturelle et scientifique, pour les historiens et les chercheurs; ressource symbolique, pour les soignants; ressource communicationnelle et managériale, pour des directeurs d'hôpitaux; mais aussi ressource citoyenne pour la société civile.

La session proposée s'attachera à rendre compte d'actions culturelles qui démontrent que l'histoire et le patrimoine des hôpitaux, et plus largement de la santé, peuvent être utilisés pour faciliter la création «d'espaces de controverses» (Herreros 2004) entre professionnels (de la santé, de la culture, de la recherche), citoyens et usagers.

En particulier sera analysé le projet des Augustines du Québec de rassembler le patrimoine culturel de leurs douze monastères-hôpitaux dans le monastère fondateur de l'Hôtel-Dieu de Québec et d'y créer «un lieu de mémoire habité» (Robitaille 2008), qui contribue aux enjeux actuels des soins, en prolongement de leur héritage immatériel. Ce projet colossal a nécessité la rencontre, féconde et perturbante, d'univers culturels, institutionnels et organisationnels différents, qui n'ont pas toujours l'habitude de travailler ensemble, pour en arriver à une proposition mixte et diversifiée, qui associe l'histoire, l'architecture, la muséologie, l'entreprise touristique, l'hôtellerie, les causes sociales, la santé globale, etc. En lien avec le thème du congrès, ce projet illustre un changement de paradigme lorsque des continents souvent séparés se mettent au service de la sauvegarde et de la mise en valeur d'un des patrimoines fondateurs du Nouveau Monde. Fondamentalement, les Augustines souhaitent que le lieu dédié à leur mémoire soit un lieu d'accueil et de soutien pour les soignants d'aujourd'hui: un patrimoine qui prend soin des soignants. Mais comment transmettre un patrimoine hospitalier et religieux immatériel du «prendre soin» en tenant compte des contingences modernes?

Cependant, les usages sociaux du patrimoine requièrent à l'évidence qu'il soit conservé et transmis. Or, les difficultés actuelles de conservation conduisent à s'interroger sur la médiation numérique proposée dans le processus de patrimonialisation hospitalière. À partir d'une étude empirique avec analyse de bases de données, un panorama des formes et des limites actuelles de la mise en ligne des patrimoines de la santé en France sera donc dressé.

Dans l'immédiat, quatre communications (de six intervenants) sont prévues dans cette session. L'objectif étant d'échanger entre chercheurs et professionnels de la culture ou de la santé autour de recherches empiriques ou théoriques sur les usages sociaux du patrimoine, toute intervention en lien avec le thème du patrimoine ressource sera la bienvenue. Seront particulièrement appréciées les communications qui s'interrogeront sur l'avenir de la patrimonialisation des hôpitaux et de la santé.

jacques.poisat@univ-st-etienne.fr

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

Memory and heritage: Oral narratives and cultural representations of industry, work and deindustrialization in Scotland

Arthur McIvor, Steven High

Industrial heritage in Britain has tended to be romanticised in museum ‘cathedrals’ and ‘theme parks’ (like Beamish), with workers’ lived experience subordinated to the machines, buildings and physical artefacts that dominate these spaces. Here workers’ lives are more often than not celebrated rather than critically reconstructed and interpreted. The politics, class relations and struggle, violence, poverty and murkier side of working life is increasingly being neglected as the past is sanitised for public consumption in the name of positive image-building. Examples in Scotland would be the UNESCO site of New Lanark (textile mill), the Scottish Mining Museum near Edinburgh and the recently opened Transport Museum in Glasgow. This links to wider debates around deindustrialization and ‘smokestack nostalgia’ (including the seminal work of Steven High) which have identified a tendency to uncritically sentimentalise the industrial workplace. In this selective remembering, the lived and

embodied experience of the people who worked in these spaces and were directly affected by deindustrialization is being airbrushed out whilst the industrial workplace sometimes appears benign, shorn of the class, gender and power relations in which it is embedded.

This session proposal pivots around oral heritage, bringing together four papers based on original unpublished research and all incorporating oral history methodology to critically interrogate narratives of work, job loss and deindustrialization. In terms of place, they focus on the port city of Glasgow and the Clydeside industrial conurbation in the second half of the twentieth century. Memory studies provide an opportunity for a refocused narrative based around the testimonies of marginalised working class, women and ethnic minority groups. Sharing authority in oral history projects can be empowering and play a role in community building. We are interested in lived experience and how the people directly affected represented, framed, interpreted and shaped their past in community movements, campaigns, protests, regeneration struggles and their emotional connection to physical heritage. This approach enables a more complex picture of the multi-layered impact of deindustrialization and

its social and cultural legacy to emerge. An oral history approach has the capacity to challenge existing interpretations of the past and how it has been represented in academic discourse and public history.

a.mcivor@strath.ac.uk

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

Intersecting discourses: Inflecting craft and heritage

Elaine Cheasley Paterson, Susan Surette

Russell Staiff argues that heritage discourse and practice are tightly interwoven with the theoretical legacy of the visual arts, specifically citing the shared concerns of formalism, iconography, aesthetics and modernism (“Heritage and the Visual Arts” 2015). Yet craft, as a field of knowledge, is often subsumed under the visual arts, when in fact its materialities, functionality, concerns about skill and preoccupation with the local (whether understood as geographically or politically constituted) invite an examination of its own intersections with current heritage concerns. Furthermore, craft has been associated with nationalist agendas since the inception of late-19th-century craft and heritage discourses, both linked by the writings and practices of William Morris. Diasporic, indigenous and post-colonial communities have well often turned to the preservation of tangible craft objects and intangible craft practices to define their political, social and cultural heritages. Susan Pearce has speculated that the designation and accumulation of community and national heritage objects mirror how the family constructs its own heritage through gathering and displaying valued objects, many of them crafted (“The construction of heritage” 1998). In the context of the “post-industrial” West, concerns for the futures of fine and traditional craft practices have recently been expressed in craft council policy statements in Canada and the United Kingdom and are seen in the development of eomuseums in France, contexts in which craft heritages are tied to economic interests.

This session proposes an examination and discussion of possible intersections of the narratives of craft and heritage with the goal of exploring the economic, social and cultural sustainability of craft practices. Questions that might be addressed include:

- How do heritage narratives inflect the production, marketing and consumption of craft objects?
- Are heritage narratives that privilege traditional craft skills and the idea of functionality incommensurable with contemporary craft practices and objects?
- Can North American and Western European professional craft practices along with their attendant narratives find a relevant place within heritage studies?

elaine.paterson@concordia.ca

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

Heritage Futures / Utopian currents

Helen Graham, Liz Stainforth

The notion of heritage is closely linked to processes of change. In the Western context, the definition of heritage as “a contemporary product shaped from history” (Harvey 2010) highlights the extent to which our relationship with the past is being continually re-configured. However, there is a future dimension implied in this relationship that is often neglected; to paraphrase William Morris, the sense in which heritage testifies to the hopes and aspirations of those now passed away. Making the future-oriented aspect explicit is both an acknowledgement of the inevitability of change and an opening for thinking about the changes envisaged by former generations. In other words, heritage is not only a record of the past but also a history of what people imagined the future might be.

These logics of the future speak directly—as utopianism always does—to different social and political imaginaries.

- How do such temporal logics relate to alternative heritage scenarios?
- What kind of politics is implied by ideas of “forever, for everyone” (UK National Trust slogan)?
- What sort of imaginaries might open up political potentials for heritage and have implications for decision-making processes?
- How might we diagnose utopian tendencies in heritage practices?

This session invites contributions on utopian currents in the field of critical heritage studies. The perspective of historical futures will be used to shed light on a range of case-based topics, as well as raising the question of our own present, and how contemporary heritage practices might hold open or foreclose possible futures.

The session encourages proposals on themes including, but not limited to:

- Heritage futures based on current practices.
- The social and political imaginaries involved in heritage practices and writing about heritage.
- Logics of time and the negotiation of the past and the future within heritage studies (through, for example, conservation, interpretation, participation).
- Critical heritage approaches to the temporal politics of heritage.
- Diagnoses of utopian currents in heritage case studies.
- Discussions of heritage in relation to the hopes/fears of particular groups or communities of people.
- Examples of utopian interventions oriented toward change, or alternative heritage decision-making processes.”

h.graham@leeds.ac.uk

What does heritage change?

Le patrimoine, ça change quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

Religion as heritage – Heritage as religion?

Ola Wetterberg, Magdalena Hillström, Eva Löfgren

Since the beginning of the 19th century religious buildings and artefacts of the West have been involved in a continuous process of musealization. In the time-period subsequent to the Second World War, the general forces of secularisation increasingly turned religious buildings, most of them churches, into heritage and substantial parts of Christian practices into history. On a global scale (Western), conservation and heritage practices have been applied on tangible and intangible expressions of religion in a great variety of cultural contexts, sometimes in a narrow-minded authoritarian way. The fact that a large number of churches in Western Europe and North America are closing has created a situation where material religious heritage awaits some form of care, publicly or privately financed. The situation also accentuates problems connected to the relationship between pastoral needs and heritage values. In the long perspective, modern history has witnessed a “migration of the holy” from religion to the nation-state, including a nationalized cultural heritage. Today, one may argue that secular conservation values are increasingly invested in religious buildings and artefacts. The principle theme of this session concerns the link between the religious/pastoral values of churches and its historical/heritage values.

The fact that the Western world of today recognizes, politically defines and legally formalizes material religious heritage as a secular cultural heritage, more or less emancipated from its religious meaning and context, is a result of complex cultural and political processes.

- In what contexts have these processes of musealization been expressed?
- Which social interests and agents have promoted the changes?
- How does it affect religious practice and what are the material outcomes?
- What are the social and political consequences of what may be described as the churches’ gradual loss of religious sanctity and their re-sacralization as national heritage, historical testimony, aesthetic monuments and symbols of local community and identity?

The exploration of the interaction of different value spheres in church maintenance relate to a number of research fields, such as museum and cultural heritage studies, including both the intertwining of religion and material culture and cases of heritage conservation practice, secularization theory, which is now strongly affected by the debate on the validity of classical secularization thesis of Weber, Durkheim and Parsons, memory and identity studies and the broad research field tied to the concept of intangible heritage, and research on the history and theory of professions within the heritage conservation field in which church renovation and restoration ideology have always played a crucial role. Most obviously the tension between pastoral and historical value poses a burning theological problem concerning the meaning and function of late modern religious practices.

Theoretical reflections related to ACHS could, among others, include the relationship between conservation/history and religious practices; heritage and religion as different forms of memory practices producing sacredness; the migration of holiness from religion to heritage and the nation; dissonances between religious and secular claims on heritage and religious heritage sites interpreted on different geographical scales.

ola.wetterberg@conservation.gu.se

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

Representing intangible heritage of post-industrial waterfront zones: Politics of seeing, ways of noticing

Katarzyna Kosmala, Graham Jeffery

While intangible cultural heritage is an important factor in maintaining cultural diversity in the face of growing globalization, there is still little appreciation of its value. UNESCO endorsed the importance of intangible cultural heritage not only as a cultural manifestation but also, and more importantly, as a wealth of knowledge and skills that are transmitted through generations.

We invite paper contributions that address multiple ways of understanding, recognizing, valuing, and preserving intangible heritage and challenges associated with these processes, including the politics of development, representation of multiple stakeholders and their interests, land ownership patterns and finance capital. The session will be contextualized in particular by linking to regeneration discourse of post-industrial waterfront zones—addressing questions of how to rethink post-industrial spaces where the previous logics of their use and occupation have broken down, attending to alternative urban imaginaries that are played out through language, ways of doing and working, as well as through their actual manifestations in the built environment.

The session aims to critically explore various emerging methodological approaches to regeneration, focusing on explorations and representations of intangible heritage and its value, utilizing multiple forms of engagement, through digital and other forms of mapping, oral history, archival research and testimony, interventions in public space, performance, lens-based art, and the use of social media platforms. The objective is to discuss and debate innovative ways of effective knowledge exchange across disciplinary boundaries of arts, humanities and social sciences in relation to arts-led regeneration strategies, concerning ways of valuing the intangible heritage and public engagement in the process, in particular in the context of waterfront heritage zones and port cities. We are additionally interested in questions as to how grand narratives of development and entrepreneurial cultures can influence the ways public space may be perceived, certain narratives remain invisible and inequalities perpetuated.

We invite papers that focus on case studies, theoretical contributions as well as artistic interventions that address multiple ways of understanding, representing and valuing intangible heritage of post-industrial waterfront zones. We invite papers and other forms of submissions from different parts of the world to share the experiences on ways of representing intangible heritage and its value in the context of waterfront heritage zones in past industrial areas and port cities—from different expert fields, including academics, architects, artists and urbanists who are seeking to challenge and extend understandings in this area. Intangible heritage brings important questions for contemporary cities. We also invite papers that address intangible cultural heritage as a tool for re-imagining urban environment or as a lens for re-envisioning the city's futures, in particular concerning waterfront heritage zones.

katarzyna.kosmala@uws.ac.uk

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

Fashioning heritage

Sharon Peoples

In endeavouring to answer the question “What does heritage change?” this proposed session, “Fashioning Heritage,” will call for papers that critically examine the way in which one of the main functions of dress is to locate or position individuals and communities in space and time. The temporal realm can be conceived as personally transitioning from and through certain life stages, being culturally defined as well as conceiving gender differently by dress and textiles. Transitions are visually marked by a change in bodily representation. Christenings, circumcision rites, communion, bar mitzvahs, graduations and weddings are some of those shifts clearly associated with dress. Using the definition of dress by Mary Ellen Roach-Higgins and Joanne B. Eicher (1992), we might also include explicit body-art markings, such as scarification, as also indicating transition through rites of passage at a permanent level on the body.

Space is also marked by clothes and cloth as people literally move from one space to another. From private to public, from profane to sacred spaces or undergoing diasporic processes, all can be expressed through fashioning the body in a way that articulates the fluidity of identity. While these transition markers require different levels of literacy—a reading of patterns, motifs and colours, they nonetheless are representations and performances that can be for both insider and outsider audiences.

Dress is portable, as are the skills that are required to craft bodies. As communities indeed move around the globe, it raises the questions of how does a community imagine itself. What does it require to construct its identity, both tangible and intangible, through dress practices?

The aim of the session is to promote the discussion of the politics of dress and the role of the fashioned body in heritage. Thinking about heritage through fashion has been the domain of folkloric studies. However, since Jennifer Craik's ground-breaking book *The Face of Fashion* (1994), there has been a steep rise in critical studies in fashion theory and interest in the politics of dress. When we write about fashion we tend to discuss individuality, as a personal act, here the intention is to discuss identity, community and relationships through clothing. This clothing may often be considered as cultural heritage items hence often locating the wearer in a particular political framework. Categorization is deeply political. In teasing out these issues, which may seem like boundaries, no doubt papers will find that there are ambiguous boundaries which unravel between the body and the cloth.

Topics to be considered are:

- Transitional dress as narratives of change;
- Crafting heritage and community development;
- Inclusion and exclusion in dress practices;
- Fragmented communities brought together through dress;
- Social cohesion and civic engagement through dress;
- Gender and dress.

sharon.peoples@anu.edu.au

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

Reflection, selection, deflection: Rhetoric in the global pursuit of heritage

Felix Girke

The constructed and political nature of heritage claims is now acknowledged across the disciplines, and increasingly even among heritage professionals. But already Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, in their seminal *The invention of tradition*, had proclaimed that “all invented traditions, so far as possible, use history as a legitimator of action and cement of group cohesion” (1983:12). So rather than simply diagnosing heritage as being constructed, as such (ab-)use of history, their challenge rests in the “how” rather than in the “that”: how are actions legitimized by reference to the past, and how is group cohesion sustained by heritage claims? How do we decide what is worthy of conservation, and how do we frame our decisions? One answer is rhetoric, in the sense of persuasive interaction, or, in Francis Bacon’s words, “applying reason to the imagination for the better moving of the will.”

The rhetorician Kenneth Burke has coined the trifecta of “reflection, selection, and deflection” as terministic screens that govern our words (1969:59). These three processes are equally active in the dynamics of heritage: out of the boundless reservoir of an imaginable past, certain items are selected to be reflections (or: representations) of a bounded identity, but are at the same time deflections from other historical items that are not made to matter (or: made not to matter) in given heritage discourses. Thus, “reflection, selection, deflection” are the guiding notions for the discussions in this session as they embody the intentionality, the creativity, and the strategy that drive heritage efforts, and point to the critical role of power.

Increasingly, this relation between heritage and rhetoric is addressed by academic work (Lafrenz Samuels and Rico forthc.), and a broad “discursive turn” has been diagnosed (Harrison 2013:95-113, see esp. Smith 2006). Still, there has been no systematic attempt to articulate the position that rhetoric is not just a contingent aspect of heritage, but that there is no pursuit of heritage without persuasive and figurative interaction. There is no authenticity that has not come about through persuasive processes of authentication. What, then, is the role of rhetoric in the performance of the fundamental practices of heritage—categorizing, curating, conserving, and communicating (Harrison)?

Papers are invited on any arena in which reflection, selection and deflection take place, such as heritage tourism, public debates or political agendas. Further fitting topics include the role of metaphors and other tropes, persuasive genres such as certification and authentication practices, and specific idioms of heritage such as AHD.

felix.girke@uni-konstanz.de

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

Temporalité, narrativité et performativité des patrimoines sensibles: Enjeux pour la citoyenneté culturelle et l'espace public

Marie-Blanche Fourcade, Jennifer Carter

Dans le cadre de cette session, nous souhaitons faire, dans une perspective multidisciplinaire et critique, un état des lieux qui interroge doublement, à la lumière de trois axes que sont la narrativité, la temporalité et la performativité, la patrimonialisation des sujets sensibles tant sur ses rôles, ses formes et ses effets sur les sociétés qui les entreprennent, que sur sa fonction révélatrice d'un monde en changement.

L'espace public laisse une place grandissante aux objets, aux lieux et aux témoignages qui incarnent des mémoires «difficiles» par rapport aux luttes sociales ou aux événements traumatisants tels que les génocides, l'esclavage, les droits autochtones et la décolonisation, ou qui font eux-mêmes les sujets de tensions et de controverses dans leur conservation, leur valorisation et leur transmission. Qu'il s'agisse de récits de vie publiés, d'expositions immersives, de documentaires historiques et sociaux, ou des banques de témoignages en ligne, les formes que prennent la patrimonialisation des sujets sensibles, ainsi que leurs effets sur les individus impliqués par ces sujets (victimes, survivants, activistes), témoignent d'une grande diversité.

Plus qu'une autre déclinaison ou approche patrimoniale, les objets et les médiations de sujets sensibles bouleversent les représentations, les pratiques et les savoir-faire des acteurs culturels et sociaux en raison, d'une part, des émotions et des enjeux dont ils sont les réceptacles et, d'autre part, des visées symboliques et politiques dont ils sont porteurs.

La patrimonialisation du sensible ne cesse de se transformer dans ses modalités et ses aspirations, influencée par des conditions géopolitiques, des régimes de valeurs ainsi que des usages politiques et identitaires toujours en évolution. Elle est également mue, dans une démarche portée par la notion de citoyenneté culturelle, par une conscience de plus en plus forte qu'un devoir de mémoire, de justice et d'éducation doit être accompli et traduit de manière permanente dans l'espace public, et notamment dans les institutions culturelles. La patrimonialisation englobe ainsi non seulement des visées de connaissance et de reconnaissance pour les communautés héritières des traumatismes, mais répond également à des impératifs sociaux qui sous-tendent le vivre-ensemble et les pratiques interculturelles, dont la prévention, la réconciliation, la réparation sociale, la responsabilisation et la solidarité sociale.

Dans cette perspective, nous tenterons de répondre au fil de la session à la question suivante: quelle est la contribution sociale, culturelle et politique, en termes de connaissances et de pratiques, de la patrimonialisation du sensible aux sociétés qui en sont les actrices?

Nous invitons, en ce sens, les participants à présenter des études de cas qui pourront alimenter la compréhension des enjeux, des mécanismes et des effets de cette forme de patrimonialisation, en portant une attention particulière aux dispositifs culturels employés, aux stratégies mobilisées et aux discours convoqués. Plusieurs points pourront orienter la discussion:

- Les formes de narrativité et de performativité associées au patrimoine sensible;
- La temporalité et ses enjeux dans la médiation des patrimoines sensibles;
- Les stratégies de mobilisation et les pratiques de valorisation des patrimoines sensibles;
- La diversité et les caractéristiques de la patrimonialisation;

What does heritage change?

Le patrimoine, ça change quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

- Le rôle des institutions culturelles et sociales dans la patrimonialisation de mémoires traumatisantes;
- Les collaborations entre institutions, experts, communautés, citoyens;
- Les conflits et les controverses générés par le processus et leurs effets;
- La place des émotions et de l'affect.

Papers in this session will consider from a multidisciplinary and critical perspective a range of theories and practices surrounding difficult heritage, including its roles, forms and effects on society. Three thematic axes—narrative, temporality and performativity—will structure the session and ensuing discussions in relation to heritage-making and sensitive subject matter. We ask what the evolving forms, and forms of address, in relation to difficult heritage, reveal to us about our changing world and cultural practices.

Objects, sites and testimony recalling painful memories and difficult heritage have proliferated in the public space. Whether this heritage arises from ongoing social struggles or traumatic pasts such as genocide, slavery, or (de) colonization, or is itself the subject of controversy in its musealization or conservation, its increasing presence in the public sphere belies an ongoing and evolving fascination with the spaces and forms of difficult memory. Life stories, immersive exhibitions, historical and social documentaries, and online testimonials are but some of the forms that the heritage-making of difficult subjects can take, while the impact on the communities associated with this heritage (victims, survivors, activists) is equally diverse.

Perhaps more so than for any other form of heritage, both the objects associated with, and interpretation of difficult subjects pose great challenges to the practices and savoir-faire of cultural practitioners. On the one hand, this form of heritage often bears highly evocative associations with difficult memories, and on the other, it harbours significant symbolic and political meaning.

The modalities of difficult heritage and its making, and the intentions underlying its curation and exhibition continue to transform in light of different geopolitical factors, value regimes, and its association with identity politics or other forms of political use. While theorizing these modalities is one of the aims of this session, it is also productive to reflect deeply, and in light of prevailing concepts of cultural citizenship, on the need for, and nature of, a spectrum of modes of memory work, justice and education in the public sphere and notably in cultural institutions. In this sense, the work of heritage-making aims not only to increase knowledge and acknowledgement of those communities affected by trauma, but responds equally to the very social imperatives that constitute the basis for vivre-ensemble and the practices of interculturality, be these prevention, reconciliation, social reparation, accountability or social solidarity.

From this perspective, a unifying question of this session relates to the roles and functions of difficult heritage, and asks: What are the social, cultural and political contributions, both to knowledge and practice, of difficult heritage to society?

What does heritage change?

Le patrimoine, ça change quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

We invite a range of contributions, from case studies to theoretical investigations, that will further a critical investigation of the many facets of difficult heritage, ranging from its modes and modalities, to the issues associated with its curation and public reception. What narrative devices or temporalities does it deploy? What engagements or performances does it invite? The following are possible points of discussion:

- The forms of narrative and performativity associated with difficult heritage
- Temporality and the mediation/interpretation of difficult heritage;
- Strategies for the valorisation of difficult heritage;
- Diversity and the characteristics of heritage-making;
- The role of cultural and social institutions in heritage practices and traumatic memory;
- Collaborations amongst institutions, experts, communities and citizens;
- Conflicts and controversies surrounding difficult heritage;
- The place of emotions and affect in difficult heritage.

fourcade.marie-blanche@uqam.ca

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Notions of heritage II: new manifestations, new implications (changes in heritage)

Leisure as heritage: Reconceptualize heritage and leisure

Huimei Liu, Dallen Timothy

Extant scholarly literature has been documented on heritage and tourism. However, the strong links between heritage and leisure, a broader concept than tourism, have long been neglected. The notion of heritage has pervaded in a variety of humanities-related fields, among them is leisure, which demonstrates the lived experience of locals, and provides indispensable meanings and identity for communities and individuals. And both heritage and leisure root themselves into cultural fabrics of social lives.

The engagement with heritage becomes a potential site for the exploration, creation and re-creation of identity, and is central to an understanding of cultural and leisure practices. As manifestations of culture, forms of heritage and leisure forge and articulate identities of individuals and communities, as well as regions. In the time of globalization and multiculturalism, leisure, as a cultural manifestation, provides a way to a better understanding of societies and brings together communities. More studies lay the attention on the social and political reasons behind the conservation of a traditional leisure in certain communities and the learning or exchange of leisure in migrated communities. As observed, some forms of leisure have become intangible heritage, which are conserved as a tradition, either in communities with a long history or migration communities with a divergence of cultures.

However, gaps still exist between heritage and leisure studies academia. In this session, we aim to bridge the gaps and generate dialogue opportunities between these two sections. Therefore, following issues will be explored:

- How leisure can be viewed as heritage?
- How history and culture shape leisure and heritage?
- How traditional leisure is kept and transformed in modern society?
- What are the meanings of leisure to locals and how they contribute to their well-being?
- How leisure becomes heritage and how they jointly build communities and shape cultural and ethnic identities?
- How does a local leisure tradition articulate a local notion of heritage?
- What are the role of heritage in the leisure experience and benefits to the wider society?
- Also how immigrants maintain their leisure at home countries and acquire new leisure, thus build a more diverse heritage in the host countries?

In addition, being a critical element of leisure, tourism and its connection with heritage are worthwhile to be explored. Topics interpreting the relations between heritage and tourism are also very welcomed.

- What are the motivations, experiences, benefits and satisfactions that heritage visitors have?
- How interpretations affect heritage visitors' experience?
- How does pilgrimage tourism shape visitor's identity? How heritage tourism helps sustainable development?

This session not only continues the important discussions on heritage and tourism, but also extends to heritage and leisure.

huimeiliu@zju.edu.cn

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Uses of heritage and conflicts I: political uses (heritage changes politics)

Heritage and the late modern state

Richard Hutchings, Joshua Dent

This session explores the different ways late modern states control and translate heritage, both their own and that of others. While modern governments have always played a role in the production and authorization of heritage, late modern states have unprecedented command over the heritage landscape. Coinciding with the postwar economic boom, globalization, and most recently neoliberalism, the state has come to dominate the most vital aspects of heritage, ranging from research (heritage production) to education (heritage reproduction) and governance (heritage stewardship). As such, the late modern state (1950-present) constitutes an important framework for exploring contemporary heritage environments. Aspects of the late modern heritage landscape given primacy in this session include state institutions and their bureaucracies (e.g., schools, libraries, museums, biology/natural resource management, archaeology/cultural resource management), and heritage under capitalism, colonialism, imperialism, nationalism, globalization, and neoliberalism. Contributors to this timely session are asked to speak to the following themes, in part or in whole:

- imagined communities,
- heritage in conflict and cooperation,
- critical sustainability perspectives,
- the rise and fall of expert knowledge,
- rethinking heritage policies beyond elite cultural narratives,
- the future of heritage.

richard.hutchings@viu.ca

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Uses of heritage and conflicts I: political uses (heritage changes politics)

Cultural contestation: Politics and governance of heritage

Jeroen Rodenberg, Pieter Wagenaar

Heritage practices often lead to social exclusion. As an “Authorized Heritage Discourse” (AHD) (Smith 2006) may define what is considered to be heritage, a certain set of social values can come to exclude other values. By formulating heritage policies which reproduce the existing AHD government may further such exclusion.

Every now and then AHDs are challenged, leading to what political scientists like Ross (2007; 2009) call “cultural contestations” between groups. These are surrounded by strong emotions, and can take the form of veritable “representational battles.” According to various political scientists (e.g. Ross 2007; 2009), government often tries to stay out of cultural contestation, for it has little legitimacy in resolving such matters. Yet, as the available literature shows, government policy is often the root cause of such contestation. And even when it is not, government, whether it likes it or not, may find itself compelled to try and mitigate it. This necessity of government intervention is frequently fuelled by the use of heritage by marginalized groups.

In our view, political science pays ample attention to the ways in which cultural heritage leads to conflict, especially when heritage is used as a resource for identity formation. Yet, surprisingly enough, it has a tendency to downplay government’s role (Ross 2007; 2009). Heritage studies often do acknowledge the role government plays when analyzing politics of heritage (Harrison 2010; Laurence 2010; Waterton 2010). Yet, many case-studies have a tendency to focus on cultural contestation foremost, without analyzing what goes on inside the state apparatus.

In this session we focus on the role government plays in cultural contestation, trying to truly get inside the world of policy-makers. We especially welcome papers which use decision-making theories and policy analysis tools from political science and governance studies to try and understand how government deals with it, and why it prefers certain solutions to others. The papers should therefore be expressly aimed at contributing to further development of theories explaining the various roles governments play in cultural contestation.

j.rodenberg@vu.nl

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Uses of heritage and conflicts I: political uses (heritage changes politics)

Politics of scale: A new approach to heritage studies

Yujie Zhu

In recent decades, the growth of the World Heritage industry has necessitated the reconsideration of scale. Formerly dominated by nation-states, some influential international organizations such as UNESCO and its advisory bodies (ICOMOS and IUCN) are now taking a strong role in decision-making through policy-making and implementation. Despite the power of the transnational organization and its relation with states parties, there is a growth of regionalism and “localism” in the heritage industry. The 2003 Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention has strong support from several Asian countries and, to some extent, reflects their wills and interests. Regional organizations have sprung up in South Asia, Africa and Caribbean, promoting regional heritage identities against the hegemonic value stemming from European heritage discourse. These phenomena indicate that the power structure of the heritage industry is not fixed; rather, it refers to a process of reconfiguration and contestation along different scales.

We believe the concept of “politics of scale” is crucial in critical heritage studies by tracing the “power geometries” (Massey 1996) of how heritage works. We also criticize how the European-dominant language of heritage affects local traditions, cultural practices and daily life in the form of authorized heritage discourse (Smith 2006). Although the seminal work “A Geography of Heritage” (Graham, Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000) brings the concept of “scale” to heritage studies, the concept of “politics of scale” is not yet well developed to analyze the social construction of heritage scales through socio-political contestation. Recently, David Harvey encouraged heritage studies to take the understanding of scale into account for further theorization of heritage. As he stated, “to understand how heritage works, we must examine what scale does, and how heritage and scale interact” (2015:3).

In this session we echo Harvey’s call, and seek to investigate the interrelation between the re-theorization of scale and heritage. This session will not only examine scale as a fixed unit and exiting category with certain spatial boundary such as “local, regional, national and international,” but also explore how scale works as a process of “hierarchization and re-hierarchization.” We will also deploy the pluralistic meanings of “politics of scale” (Brenner 2001) to analyze the power struggle during the process of production, reconfiguration and contestation within and among heritage scales.

With these issues in mind, we invite papers looking into the following themes:

- How scale is used by heritage institutions to legitimate their authority and produce hierarchies among scales;
- How heritage discourse is reinforced and affects other scales based on the power structure and uneven development between scales;
- How local struggles emerge to negotiate with the discourse through moving between and along scales.

We encourage papers from different approaches or disciplines, since we believe the plural form of “heritage studies” makes it a multi- inter-disciplinary area that benefits from communication, collaboration or even contestation. Each discipline is embedded in one scale or many (such as individual, local, regional, national and global), and we hope the critical interaction of these approaches will generate new insights into heritage studies.

yujie.zhu@anu.edu.au

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Uses of heritage and conflicts I: political uses (heritage changes politics)

Contested pasts: Urban heritage in divided cities

Mirjana Ristic, Sybille Frank

This session seeks to explore the role of urban heritage in mediating and contesting political conflict in the context of divided cities. We take urban heritage in a broad sense to include places left, scarred or transformed by geo-political dispute, national and ethnic division, violence and war. The case studies can include tangible spaces such as elements of border architecture, historic sites, ruins and urban traces of the conflict, and memorials; as well as intangible elements of city, including urban voids, everyday rituals, place names and other forms of spatial discourse. These can be both designated and undesignated urban heritage sites. We seek for empirical and theoretic papers that will cover one of the following themes:

1. Heritage at war

Recent political events show that urban heritage in divided cities plays a role in the war not merely as the site of violence and terror, but the very tool through which they are mediated. The Old Bridge in Mostar was bombed out in 1993, the Nablus old town was bulldozed and demolished by tank fire in 2002, while Syrian ancient sites are still being pulverized by ISIS.

We ask: Why is urban heritage so often rendered a target of the war? What is the political role of its destruction? How can urban heritage be used as a tool for political resistance?

2. Divided heritage

Urban heritage is often re-designed, re-invented and employed as an instrument of political division in the cityscape. Discrete religious heritage dominates the Greek and Turkish sides of Nicosia, urban parades invested with separate sectarian traditions are held in Belfast, streets in Sarajevo and East Sarajevo acquired different commemorative names after the war.

We ask: What role do spatial remnants, practices and discourses of the past play in the demarcation of urban territories? What happens when heritage of one social group becomes “displaced” on the side of the other? How does urban heritage mediate and contest socio-spatial marginalization, discrimination and exclusion?

3. Dealing with contested heritage

The political division of the city itself often leaves contested urban heritage in the cityscape. The legacy of ethnic clashes is still visible in the cityscape of Beirut, while traces and memories of the Berlin Wall still haunt the city.

We ask: What should be done with remnants of the city’s division in the post-conflict scenario? What influence do preservation and commemoration of these places have on transformation of the city’s spatial morphology, flows of urban life and place identity? In what ways can transformation of such heritage contribute to reunification and reconciliation?

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change quoi?

Uses of heritage and conflicts I: political uses (heritage changes politics)

4. The everyday life of urban heritage in divided cities

Common research on urban heritage often focuses on representational capacities and the symbolic role of heritage sites.

We ask: How are the official discourses of history and memory embedded in these sites accepted, contested and/or transformed through their use? In which ways are new popular and unintended meanings inscribed in these sites through spatial practices around them?

risticm@unimelb.edu.au

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Uses of heritage and conflicts I: political uses (heritage changes politics)

The critical turn in perspectives on public housing as heritage

Imran bin Tajudeen

This session discusses the ways in which early public housing from the 1950s to 1960s in Hong Kong, China, and Singapore have emerged recently as an arena for the critique of national, elite or dominant notions of heritage and history. The contexts of the development of public housing in the early post-Second World War era and the background to their recent reappraisal as significant sites for the edification of cultural identity or socio-political struggle provide grounds for exploration of a number of issues concerning emerging perspectives on what heritage can “do.”

Thus for instance, the socio-political contexts and affiliations behind the initiation or production of public housing may be narrated or rewritten today with differing emphases or silences. Alternatively, the differing opinions and narratives may also stem from differences of sentiment or opinion regarding the location of significance or value in examples of public housing—whether this is deemed to reside in architectural form or planning and physical fabric, in community and activities, or simply in the everyday. These differences have the power to frame popular understandings of the history of the interplay between civic groups and the state in the creation, regulation or reproduction of public housing and its “lifeworld,” while simultaneously reflecting the prevailing assumptions in the society in question about the notion of “public housing heritage”—whose heritage is this deemed to be? Has it been discussed as belonging to the residents who shape what is at stake—that is, as a form of community heritage that is embodied—or instead as heritage that is shared across the citizens of a city in an abstract sense? Or do the discussions revolve around an even more rarefied notion of the role of state agencies behind their creation, or even specific ruling regimes?

The concern of this session is thus not with any lack of acknowledgement of the category of “public housing” as heritage. Rather, the focus is upon the variability or contradictions in the articulation of their historical significance or heritage value. These inconsistencies or paradoxes may be observed in both explicit ideological contentions and in more insidious means of exclusion based on some purportedly “objective” criteria or forms of “expert knowledge” such as aesthetics, technical considerations, or significance within the nationalist narrative.

The debates revolving around the significance of early post-war public housing highlight the potential of a critical inquiry into the heritage-making discourses on an ubiquitous product of architectural modernism, the apartment block and estate, to raise questions on what the very notion of “heritage” has come to signify when it is applied to a kind of mass-produced vernacular, albeit an avowedly “non-traditional” one. Does this signify a critical turn in popular (and academic) discourse/discussions about “heritage” that is no longer restricted to conventional or privileged categories of cultural patrimony, and has become the means of re-positioning the definition of identity away from elite or state constructs? How is this complicated by the very nature of the genesis of public housing?

imran.tjdn@gmail.com

What does
heritage change?
Le patrimoine,
ça change
quoi?

Uses of heritage and conflicts I: political uses (heritage changes politics)

Heritage and War (20th-21st centuries). From mass destruction to deliberate demolition of monuments

Le patrimoine et la guerre (XX^e-XXI^e siècles). De la disparition massive à la destruction intentionnelle des monuments

Jean-Yves Andrieux

Since 1914-1918, the dominant image of heritage destruction by acts of war is associated with the exponential expansion of mass violence, most often practised remotely, using weapons of extreme force. From 1939 to 1945, sophisticated weaponry boosted the scale of the industrial war until the total eradication of towns. This resulted in two phenomena that have occupied the affected countries for decades: first, complex restorations on thousands of monuments; secondly, extensive reconstruction projects, that applied various doctrines and created another built heritage, recognized by international bodies as new markers of human resilience half a century after their completion. Many studies have investigated this process of destruction, these revivals and the political as well as social and sensitive consequences that ensued for the people.

Observing the most recent conflicts forces one to reconsider the place of built heritage: it does no longer appear as a collateral victim, but, first, as a strategic part of war operations and, secondly, as a symbol of political messages delivered by the belligerents to the world. The Lebanese civil war (1975-1990) represented an unparalleled example to date the militarization of urban space. When the former Yugoslavia broke up, nationalistic tensions rose in the region, during the third Balkan war (1991-1999). The ethnic cleansing that moved and persecuted populations corresponded to the purification of monuments in a sort of “urbicide.”

These demolitions and symbolic amputations then continued, in different places around the world, coming to a recent crescendo in the Middle East. One must acknowledge that, on the territories of Iraq and Syria, these latest developments reached another dimension. Were they only part of a religious act recalling the iconoclastic crises of the past, or losses directly attributable to fighting in case of enemy attack, or a cruel provocation against the West? Contrariwise, does the whole damage result from an act of political purification whose historical meaning was revealed, for the first time, by the “vandalism” practised by the French Revolution? In all cases, for about four decades, heritage has become unwillingly one of the great symbolic stakes of the on-going conflicts over the planet.

We welcome papers that will try to understand how the modern world has returned to such radicalism, and explore the causes, forms, terms and consequences of this profound change. We will specially appreciate the documented case studies, historical perspectives, philosophical reflections, or other sociological approach, geographic, etc., which will make comparisons, take stock and provide reasoned explanations.

L'image dominante des destructions patrimoniales par faits de guerre est associée, depuis 1914-1918, à l'extension exponentielle d'une violence de masse, pratiquée le plus souvent à distance, à l'aide d'armes d'une force extrême. De 1939 à 1945, la puissance de feu a amplifié l'échelle de la guerre industrielle jusqu'à l'éradication totale. Il en a résulté deux phénomènes qui ont occupé les pays touchés pendant plusieurs décennies: des restaurations complexes portant sur des milliers de monuments, d'une part; de vastes chantiers de reconstruction, aux doctrines diverses,

What does heritage change?

Le patrimoine, ça change quoi?

Uses of heritage and conflicts I: political uses (heritage changes politics)

d'autre part, qui ont créé d'autres patrimoines bâtis, reconnus un demi-siècle après leur achèvement par les instances internationales comme de nouveaux marqueurs de la résilience humaine. On a largement étudié ces destructions, ces renaissances et les conséquences aussi bien politiques ou sociales que sensibles qui en ont découlé pour les populations.

L'observation des conflits plus récents force à reconsidérer la place que le patrimoine bâti y occupe non plus comme victime collatérale, mais comme cadre stratégique des opérations de guerre et comme symbole des messages politiques livrés par les belligérants au reste du monde. La militarisation de l'espace urbain fut un des traits de la guerre civile du Liban (1975-1990). La troisième guerre des Balkans (1991-1999), consécutive à l'éclatement de l'ex-Yougoslavie et à l'affirmation des tensions nationalistes dans cette région, a donné lieu à une «purification» monumentale et «urbicide», parallèle à la purification ethnique qui déplaçait et persécutait les populations.

Ces démolitions et amputations symboliques ont ensuite continué, dans divers lieux de la planète, atteignant un récent paroxysme au Moyen-Orient. Avec ces derniers développements, sur les territoires de l'Irak et de la Syrie, on touche à une autre dimension. S'agit-il seulement d'actes religieux rappelant les crises iconoclastes du passé? Ou bien de pertes directement imputables aux combats, en cas d'offensive ennemie? Ou encore de provocations cruelles contre l'Occident? Ou enfin d'actes de purification politique, dans la lignée du «vandalisme» pratiqué par la Révolution française? Dans tous les cas, depuis environ quatre décennies, le patrimoine est devenu un des grands enjeux symboliques des conflits en cours sur la planète.

Nous accueillerons des communications qui tenteront de comprendre comment le monde actuel est revenu à un tel radicalisme et qui exploreront les causes, les formes, les modalités, les conséquences de cette profonde mutation. Seront en particulier appréciées les études de cas documentées, les perspectives historiques, les réflexions philosophiques ou toute autre approche sociologique, géographique, etc., qui permettront d'établir des comparaisons, de dresser un premier bilan et de proposer des explications raisonnées.

jean-yves.andrieux@paris-sorbonne.fr

What does heritage change?

Le patrimoine, ça change quoi?

Index

A

Andrieux, Jean-Yves 84
Aubin, Laurent 27
Auger, Réginald 33
Aykan, Bahar 46

B

Bain, Allison 33
Baird, Melissa F. 25
Barber, Lachlan 18
Berger, Stefan 37
Berthold, Etienne 27
Bindi, Serena 5
bin Tajudeen, Imran 83
Bortolotto, Chiara 1, 63
Bridgewater, Peter 3
Bullock, Veronica 3
Burgos, Felix 21

C

Campbell, Gary 4, 32
Candelise, Lucia 5
Carter, Jennifer 74
Cerezales, Nathalie 64
Cheasley Paterson, Elaine 68
Colomer, Laia 17
Cormack, Zoe 2
Csargo, Julia 63

D

Davidson, Lee 14
Dawans, Stéphane 36
Debary, Octave 49
Dent, Joshua 78
De Vidas, Anath Ariel 6
Dieudonné, Patrick 38
Djament, Geraldine 58
Drouin, Martin 43

E

Ebert, Anne 11
Eckersley, Susannah 9

F

Farys, Katharina 11
Fourcade, Marie-Blanche 74
Fouseki, Kalliopi 22
Frank, Sybille 81

G

Galani, Areti 34
Gauthier, Antoine 63
Girke, Felix 73
Givre, Olivier 47
Graham, Helen 69
Gravari-Barbas, Maria 58
Grignon, Marc 42
Grootswagers-Theuns, Lillian 61

H

Haumont, Bernard 56
High, Steven 4, 67
Hillström, Magdalena 70
Hocquet, Marie 26
Holtorf, Cornelius 17
Houbart, Claudine 36
Hughes, Lotte 2
Hutchings, Richard 78

I

Isnart, Cyril 47, 64

J

Jacquot, Sébastien 58
Jeffery, Graham 71
Jones, Tod 40

What does heritage change?

Le patrimoine, ça change quoi?

K

Kähkönen, Satu 48
Källen, Anna 54
Karlström, Anna 54
Kockel, Ullrich 9
Kosmala, Katarzyna 71
Kraak, Anne Laura 45
Kryder-Reid, Elizabeth 39
Kuutma, Kristin 48

L

Labadi, Sophia 17
Lafrenz Samuels, Kathryn 25
Lähdesmäki, Tuuli 48
Langford, Martha 23
Lazzarotti, Olivier 57
Le Couédic, Daniel 38
Lemire, Rebecca 31
Little, Walter 19
Liu, Huimei 77
Lloyd, Katherine 9, 29
Löfgren, Eva 70

M

Mannell, Steven 15
Martouzet, Denis 52
Mason, Rhiannon 34
McIvor, Arthur 67
Morley, Amanda 3
Morse, Nuala 29
Moser, Sarah 35
Mozaffari, Ali 40, 50

N

Nitzky, William 55
Noppen, Luc 30, 61

P

Panella, Cristiana 19
Peoples, Sharon 72
Poisat, Jacques 66
Poulot, Dominique 44
Prégent, Édith 61
Prigent, Lionel 38

R

Rautenberg, Michel 26
Rex, Bethany 29
Ristic, Mirjana 81
Robitaille, Denis 66
Roda, Jessica 8
Rodenberg, Jeroen 79
Romeo, Carabelli 52

S

Smith, Laurajane 4, 32
Sneve Guttormsen, Torgrim 22
Stainforth, Liz 69
Stefano, Michelle 21
Surette, Susan 68
Swensen, Grete 22
Swenson, Astrid 13

T

Tara Schwartz, Stephanie 8
Taunton, Carla 28
Terry, Andrea 28
Timothy, Dallen 77
Tornatore, Jean-Louis 49
Trigano, Sandra 26
Türeli, Ipek 35

U

Ubertazzi, Benedetta 1

V

Vapnarsky, Valentina 6

W

Wagenaar, Pieter 79
Westbrook, Nigel 50
Wetterberg, Ola 70
Windsor-Liscombe, Rhodri 62

Z

Zhu, Yujie 55, 80