

# Playing and displaying: Practices of Cultural Heritage as Cultural Production

Fri 13– Sat 14 December 2019  
Free University of Bozen–Bolzano  
Bolzano (BZ) / Italy



Neue Serie Handdruck/ Erna Hitzberger

In line with a constructive critical approach to heritage, the conference aims to develop an interdisciplinary theoretical discussion to look at practices of cultural heritage as practices of cultural production and to investigate how processes of valorisation create new cultural forms by displaying and “playing” with objects, places and performances.

“Playing” refers to the many practices, which activate and reactivate relationships between people, things and spaces, entailing conflicts and disputes too.

**Playing and displaying:  
Practices of Cultural Heritage  
as Cultural Production**

Program of the conference  
Bolzano Campus,  
Piazza Università, 1 – Bolzano  
Room C2.06

The conference is promoted  
by the Platform Cultural Heritage  
Cultural Production of the  
Faculty of Design and Art and  
organised by Stephan Schmidt-  
Wulffen, Waltraud Kofler Engl  
and Daniela Salvucci.

For further information  
[www.culturalheritage.unibz.it](http://www.culturalheritage.unibz.it)

**Friday, December 13th**

9:00–9:15  
Greetings and introduction,  
Platform Team

9:15–9:45  
Digital Participation in Cultural  
Heritage, Chiara Zuanni,  
University of Graz, Austria

9:45–10:15  
Cultural landscape and living  
heritage in the Vineyard Landscape  
of Langhe-Roero and Monferrato,  
Elena Settimini, University of  
Leicester, United Kingdom

10:15–10:45  
La Biagiola and the Area del Tufo:  
a networking project for cultural  
production, Giulia Sola, University  
of Bangor, United Kingdom

10:45–11:15 Discussion

11:15–11:35 Coffee Break

11:35–12:05  
Emotional Cartographies as  
an Allegory: Rethinking Mapping  
Process and Semantics, Nevena  
Marković, Institute of Heritage  
Sciences, Santiago de Compostela,  
Spain

12:05–12:35  
Cultural Heritage in Ethnohetero-  
geneous Societies – Critical  
Reflections on Becoming a Heritage-  
Maker, Deborah Sielert, Leibniz  
Universität, Hannover, Germany

12:35–13:05  
The progressive cultural production  
of Sufi heritage in the making  
of pluralist narrative in Pakistan,  
Rafique Wassan, University  
of Bern, Switzerland

13:05–13:35 Discussion

13:35–15:00 Lunch

15:00–16:00  
Keynote. Unwanted monuments.  
Berlin Voids and Found Objects,  
Gabi Dolf-Bonekämper, Technical  
University Berlin, Germany

16:00–16:30 Discussion

**Saturday, December 14th**

9:00–9:10  
Summary, Platform Team

9:10–10:00  
A practice turn in Heritage?  
Opportunities – Horizons – Politics,  
Stephan Schmidt-Wulffen, Free  
University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy

10:00–10:50  
Shifting Gaze: The (Im-)Materiality  
of Knowledge on Display, Regina  
Bendix, Göttingen University,  
Germany

10:50–11:10  
Coffee Break

11:10–12:00  
Place, People and Perception:  
Cultural Significance as a Social  
Construction, Leo Schmidt,  
Cottbus University, Germany

12:00–12:30  
Discussion

12:30–15:00  
Lunch Break

15:00–15:50  
Ordinary heritage and participation:  
fostering heritage as a common,  
Elizabeth Auclair, Cergy-Pontoise  
University, France

15:50–16:40  
Doing Archaeology. (Public)  
Participation and Archaeology  
as Intangible Cultural Heritage,  
Raimund Karl, Bangor University,  
United Kingdom

16:40–17:00  
Coffee Break

17:00–17:50  
The Museum as an heritage  
technique. Some Italian  
Experiences, Emanuela Rossi,  
Florence University, Italy

17:50–19:00  
Final discussion

## **Digital Participation in Cultural Heritage**

### **Abstract**

This paper will unpack the modes of cultural production prompted by representations of, and interaction with, cultural heritage in the digital sphere. This paper will discuss how researching the digital lives of museum collections and heritage sites, including user generated content, can reveal new data on the public understanding of museums and on the construction of heritage knowledge and values in the (digital) public sphere.

First, it will briefly discuss how digitisation has become central to heritage policies, and how digitised collections support the interpretation, educational, outreach, and marketing strategies of museums and heritage organisations. A mention of the rapidly expanding practice of sharing 3D models on portals such as Sketchfab will contribute to highlight how digitised artefacts can inspire new uses and, in turn, contribute to processes of revitalisation and transmission of memories.

Secondly, the focus will shift on visitor-generated content, during their visit to a museum or a heritage site or in online interactions with the museum website and social media channels. The case studies derives from the author's research in the UK (Manchester Museum) and Italy (#museumweek), as well as from the observation and analysis of other datasets (Notre-Dame fire; social media global campaigns and viral posts). Data mining and digital ethnography methods have been used to research participation in discussing heritage online. It will be discussed how it is possible to trace the emergence of previous memories, which become embedded within the online event, and how digitally-mediated encounters with cultural heritage can become part of performances of the selves, reinforcing discourses of cultural identity and belonging. The paper will draw on these analyses to explore new configurations for notions of heritage participation and expertise in the digital sphere.

In conclusion, the paper will question the materiality and tangibility of digital media and how different attitudes and methodological approaches to this media can affect, in turn, the understanding of heritage and the values attributed to participation.

### **Chiara Zuanni**

Chiara Zuanni is a tenure-track assistant professor in digital humanities, at the Centre for Information Modelling – Austrian Centre for Digital Humanities, University of Graz. Her research focuses on digital practices in museums and on digital engagement with cultural heritage. She is a member of the Getty Institute in Ancient Itineraries and local PI for the Erasmus+ project Digiculture. She has a BA in Classics and a MA in Archaeology (University of Bologna), and a PhD in Museology (University of Manchester); and she held postdoctoral positions at the University of Liverpool and at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

## **Cultural landscape and living heritage in the Vineyard Landscape of Langhe-Roero and Monferrato**

### **Abstract**

The aim of this research is to unpack and problematise the complex definition of 'participation' in the context of enlisted World Heritage cultural landscape by exploring how different groups articulate their understanding of heritage and identity values and meanings. The idea underpinning my thesis is that semantic differences exist between the heritage discourses used by heritage professionals and practitioners in formal and legal documents and the language used by local individuals and groups. Such semantic differences have implications for the development of participative preservation and management policies and practices within cultural landscapes, reflecting implicit – or explicit – power relationships between those who are attributed expertise and laypersons. The existence of an elitist, professional 'Authorised Heritage Discourse' (Smith 2006) risks inhibiting participation (Roe 2013; Schofield 2014) and generating disengagement in the identification, definition and preservation of a heritage site.

Through the analysis of a specific case-study, the World Heritage vineyard landscape of Langhe-Roero and Monferrato (Italy), I sought to establish where these semantic discrepancies lie and what they reflect for different stakeholders in terms of divergent understandings of heritage values and meanings. In particular, I explore whether international and national cultural frameworks consider how local people understand (or not) their cultural practices as 'heritage'. The data collection and generation have been divided into two main focuses: preliminary documentary research combined with interviews with different typologies of stakeholders (heritage professionals, local people and women wine producers). I suggest that the development of participatory methodologies based on consultation and negotiation – as the 'hybrid forum' model (Harrison 2013) – could generate a more inclusive identification of heritage values and meanings, attentive to different ways of articulating, preserving and managing landscape. Understanding heritage undercurrents means to distinguish between interests which are conflictual and those which in some sense are shared: this does not mean resolving all the conflicts or achieving a general consensus, rather providing people with capacity building tools and skills to enter the decisional processes, to facilitate the articulation of heritage values and also to rethink – and maybe redefine – heritage markers.

### **Elena Settimini**

Elena Settimini holds a PhD in Museum Studies from the University of Leicester (UK). Her research investigates the development of inclusive and participatory cultural policies within cultural landscape and living heritage, with a particular interest in women's representation within heritage sites. During her PhD, she has led seminars on heritage, cultural landscape and communities' engagement in museums at the School of Museum Studies, University of Leicester. In the last ten years she has been working with various Italian museums. She is also an active member of the International Committee of Museums (ICOM) and of the Association of Critical Heritage Studies (ACHS).

## **La Biagiola and the Area del Tufo: a networking project for cultural production**

### **Abstract**

The so-called “Area del Tufo”, in southern Tuscany, is a territory known mainly for its Etruscan necropolis and settlements. The whole cultural heritage it is home to, however, is rich and multi-layered, and deeply connected to the cultural identity of the area. At present this resource is only partially promoted and, in some cases, not even accessible to the public.

Entrusted in 2011 with the excavation of the Roman villa of La Biagiola (GR), “Associazione Cultura e Territorio” (ACT) has developed an enhancement project that has become a cultural product of excellence in Sovana. At the core of the project stands the partnership between the archaeologists and La Biagiola Winery, owner of the land where the site lies on.

This partnership has developed into a network of events; for instance, archaeologists offer guided visits during the summer “Wine not?” wine-tasting events, during which concerts and performances are usually offered. Furthermore, the winery’s production has been influenced by the history of the site, to the extent that the evidence of use of the *cocciopesto* technique in the roman villa has inspired the making of the *Cocciopesto* wine, fermented in *cocciopesto* anfora. The partnership thus creates a multifaceted cultural product involving different audiences and thereby guarantees mutual visibility to the winery and to the site, thus offering a fuller experience of the outstanding resources of the territory.

This successful experiment is now part of a new plan of integrated cultural networking in the Area del Tufo. The project, started in 2019, aims to elaborate a regional-scale model of cultural networking for extra-urban areas, exploiting – in this case – the spatial interconnections between the three main strong points of the area: cultural sites (archaeological parks, historical buildings, museums), natural sites, and local businesses and facilities. This network would promote a virtuous circle of mutual and exponential development and open more opportunities for creative actors to use the local cultural heritage in cultural production.

### **Giulia Sola**

Giulia Sola is an archaeologist and a PhD student in Archaeology at University of Bangor, Wales. She holds a BA in Classics and a MA in Archaeology and Ancient History at Università di Torino. Her current research focuses on the role of archaeological sites in their territories, taking the form of a multidisciplinary project aimed at turning heritage into a key development factor in extra-urban areas. Since 2017 she has been working with Turin-based ACT (“Associazione Cultura e Territorio”), which has been involved in several archaeological excavations and enhancement projects in Italy. She is also a tutor at “La Biagiola” archaeological site, in Sovana di Sorano (GR).

## **Emotional Cartographies as an Allegory: Rethinking Mapping Process and Semantics**

### **Abstract**

Further to the transition to more humanized geospatial technologies (Pickles, 1995), such as mapping feelings (Pocock, D. 1984) and emotional responses to space (Gartner, 2012), landscape inquiry has gone beyond “visible” landscape, introducing new conceptual models. The landscape is a way of seeing, discursive, enacted, embodied, characterized by deliberate narratives (Spirn, 2013). Emotions have been acknowledged as intersubjective – social and cultural. “Turned” by the spatiality and temporality of emotions – ‘Emotional Geographies’ (Davidson J, 2007), ‘Emotional Mapping’ goes beyond georeferencing emotional states in a certain geographic area. “Emotional Maps” are not only about emotions, but also about experiences, perceptions, memories and identities. Emotional Cartography is a way of imagination and production of territory by multiple individuals; hence collective views on territory – miradas territoriales (D. Wood 1992, 2010). This reflexive and participatory methodology links science, technology and art, theory and practice, and, as Nold argues, enables “Reflection-In-Action”. By quitting the topos, such cartography can achieve political and social goals. (Casti, 2013).

In such scholarship environment, the paper rethinks the emerging field of ‘Emotional Cartography’ in the era of “Turns” – Spatial, Affective, Participatory, Critical and Digital “Turns”. Have those “Turns” provided new research models? How “emotions” can be used to articulate and make places? What is the potential of “Emotional” data in decision making? The paper addresses these questions as it traces mapping approaches within the “Corpus of “Emotional (Heritage) Cartographies”, focusing on mapping processes and actors, techniques and tools, representation and interpretation of emotionalscapes. Furthermore, the semantics of the terms and conceptions, used by the projects, is explored through “The Glossary of Emotional cartographies”. Triggered by “invisible” or “silent” affective heritage, the paper, by testing this technique, argues for a mixed-methods approach, relying on sensory and participatory ethnographic techniques, such as walking methodologies, bringing together Non-Quantitative and “conventional” GIS. Such approach acknowledges local voices, the integration of subjective (“emotional”) spatial narratives, towards the negotiation of place. Ultimately, it draws on the potential of “Emotional Mapping” techniques as a tool for critical (spatial) thinking in (Critical) Heritage Studies, as a part of a deeper understanding of mapping as a practice, research method and a metaphor.

### **Nevena Marković**

Nevena Marković has a background in Classics, ecology and heritage. Based at the Institute of Heritage Sciences – Incipit, she is an Early Stage Researcher within the Marie Skłodowska-Curie ITN Project CHEurope – Critical Heritage Studies and the Future of Europe, and a PhD candidate at the Doctoral Program Scientific Cross-Disciplinary Approaches to Heritage and Landscape (The University of the Basque Country). Her thesis, supervised by César Parcerro-Oubiña and Cristina Sánchez-Carretero, draws on the potential of ‘Emotional Cartographies’ as a tool for reflexive (spatial) thinking in heritage, as a part of a deeper understanding of mapping as a practice, a research method and a metaphor.

## **Cultural Heritage in Ethnoheterogeneous Societies – Critical Reflections on Becoming a Heritage-Maker**

### **Abstract**

In my project presentation I will start from exemplary empirical analyses in order to critically reflect upon doing sociological heritage-research in a field of cultural productions, where the officialized notion of cultural heritage as a label plays only a minor, or no role at all. Instead, we understand Cultural Heritage (“CH”) as a cultural repertoire that evaluates cultural patterns,

which in many cases can be used for the propagation of membership among different groups. Processes of Heritage-Making are understood as highly contextual valuations, which co-produce those membership formations in various forms. The comparative research project which serves as a basis for these reflections studies the strategic production of ethnically marked cultural heritages in three different small cities in Germany. These heritage practices, places, narratives or objects are interwoven and partly produced by the more or less ethicized residents of these cities: As Dutch, Portuguese or East-Frisian.

Currently, we are in the process of developing a sociological model of cultural heritage which, among other things, identifies two different logics of valuation in heritage-making: one logic fosters internal group sociability, the other one external recognition. While the relation between heritage communities and questions of recognition is long on the tableau of critical heritage research, a perspective on sociability is rare. This might be because, rather than being a purposeful aim of action, heritage-making appears as an unintended consequence of action in these cases. I will show that by asking, “How do the logics of sociability and recognition structure the making of Cultural Heritage?”, we, on the one hand, develop analytical tools to call into question oversimplified models of the congruency of society and culture—in other words, of a Heritage belonging to a Community. This can i.e. be a potential grounds to disarray conservative and nationalist propagations of cultural heritage. On the other hand, I as a researcher -by naming ethnically marked cultural productions driven by a logic of sociability “cultural heritage”- turn into a heritage-maker myself. This raises the question: How to position oneself in between cultural heritage being a space of opportunity for claims to membership in society as well as a powerdriven process of exclusion and governmentality?

### **Deborah Sielert**

Deborah Sielert is a researcher and PhD student at the Institute of Sociology at Leibniz University Hannover. She holds an M.A. in “Gender & Ethnicity” from Utrecht University and is currently part of a collaborative research project on „Cultural Heritage as a Ressource?“. Herein, she studies ethnically marked (as Dutch, as Portuguese and as Frisian) cultural heritages in three small cities in northern Germany. Her research interests are heritage-making from a critical sociological perspective in the context of theories of ethnicity, as well as feminist research in the discursive field of “care”.

## **The progressive cultural production of Sufi heritage in the making of pluralist narrative in Pakistan**

### **Abstract**

Sufism, the ecstatic intellectual heritage of Islam, displays a powerful historical trajectory and influence in Muslim societies to envisage the alternative, dialogical, oppositional ideas and pluralist identity. The Sufis as radical lovers or martyrs of love in Islam tend to articulate a distinct discursive construction that contests the literal-legalist normative order. The non-conformist, higher and supra-formal consciousness of Sufis (Baldock 2012) Salafi-Sufi/popular Sufism-official Islam conflict (Bruinessen 2009) is a recurrent area of investigation to study Islam. Omid Safi's (2006) seminal essay *An Oppositional Sufi* informs the contested politics of knowledge in Islam. Sufism's alternative, creative cultural heritage has inspired many writers and intellectuals both in the West and East. The Indian cosmopolitan thinker Rabindranath Tagore's inspiration from Persian classical and Bengali folk Sufi tradition is a specific case in point (Lewisohn 2017). Informed by the interdisciplinary approach in the fields of anthropology, ethnomusicology, critical heritage and cultural studies, in this paper, I investigate the contemporary practice of Sufi creative cultural production i.e. the poetry, music, and dance in the making of progressive-modernist, inclusive identity constructions in Sindh region in Pakistan. Drawing on the concepts of the alternative and subaltern heritage (Smith 2006), argumentative tradition (Sen 2005), performance as politics (Taylor 2016) and politics of presence (Bayat 2011), my paper brings to the fore the practice of progressive Sufi heritage as cultural production by artists and writers that contributes to the visions of alternative and indigenous modernity and knowledge production within Islam. Most importantly, it exhibits the idea of progressive Islam (Safi 2003, Duderija 2018) contrary to the essentialist and static image of clerical Islam. The progressive intelligentsia actively engages with the cultural production of Sufi heritage as counter-narrative in the literary and musical space against religious hate and extremism in Pakistan. The practice of Sufi heritage as cultural production is performed in festivals, Sufi shrines, international Sufi festivals, conferences, and TV shows. Specifically, I will present the Sufi activist artistic practice by a feminist dance performer Sheema Kermani to conceptualize the progressive-secular Sufi subjectivity, critique, and formation of argumentative, plural Muslim public sphere in Pakistan. My paper contributes to the advancement of South Asian Sufi heritage in the global humanities discourse and practice.

### **Rafique Wassan**

Rafique Wassan is a Pakistani anthropologist and currently a PhD candidate at Walter Benjamin Kolleg, Graduate School of Humanities- Interdisciplinary Cultural Studies, University of Bern, Switzerland. His interdisciplinary PhD research project grounded in anthropology, ethnomusicology, cultural and critical heritage studies investigates the contemporary cultural production of progressive Sufi heritage discourse and performance in Sindh, Pakistan. Specifically informed by anthropology of Islam, his project brings to the fore the practice of heterodox, progressive-activist Sufi heritage as cultural production in the formation of alternative, inclusive and pluralist Muslim cultural sphere.



## **Unwanted monuments. Berlin Voids and Found Objects**

### **Gabi Dolff-Bonekämper**

Gabi Dolff-Bonekämper, professor at Technical University Berlin, is an Art historian, 1988- 2002 conservator at the Berlin Historic Buildings' Conservation Office. 2001 – 2002 guest-scholar at the Getty Conservation Institute in Los Angeles/Ca. 2003/2004 member of the UNESCO international experts group for the rebuilding of the Bridge of Mostar. 2000—2011 member of the Council of Europe expert group for cultural heritage. Since 2002 Professor for conservation studies at TU Berlin, specializing in urban conservation, history and theory of cultural heritage, contested sites of memory, contemporary art of commemoration, and post-war modernism in architecture and urbanism. Since 2016 speaker of the DFG-PhD Training group "Identität und Erbe – Heritage and Identity" in Berlin and Weimar. Holder of the 2017 prize of Riksbanken Jubileumsfond, Gothenburg, Sweden.

## **A practice turn in Heritage? Opportunities – Horizons – Politics**

### **Abstract**

Using an example from visual art the lecture elaborates a redefinition of crucial aspects of heritagization. Introducing a practice-based understanding of heritage, the producers come into view: the cultural producers of objects and buildings in past and present, the political or academic producers of heritage. Process creates a different access to 'time' and 'space' and enforces participation. The platform 'Cultural Heritage and Cultural Production', established by the province of South Tyrol and the Free University in 2017, tries to open its field of activity beyond traditional material heritage, integrating practices from other fields like art, anthropology, design. The symposium is meant to discuss the program of the platform and test its theoretical premises of 'critical heritage studies'.

### **Stephan Schmidt-Wulffen**

Stephan Schmidt-Wulffen is a German philosopher and art historian who works in the fields of epistemology, art and design. In the last 14 years he was Rector of the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna (2002-2011) and Director of the New Design University St. Pölten (2011-2016), where he has worked on the future development of universities with a focus on artistic education. He is honorary professor for aesthetics and artistic knowledge at the Zeppelin University Friedrichshafen. Schmidt-Wulffen studied philosophy, linguistics and communication design in Cologne, Constance and Wuppertal. In the last years, he worked as dean of the Faculty of Design and as scientific supervisor of the Platform for Cultural Heritage Cultural Production. His research includes 20th century art and art theory with a focus on conceptual and post-conceptual art, art in public space, and artistic practices.

## **Shifting Gaze: The (Im-)Materiality of Knowledge on Display**

### **Abstract**

The heritage regime is a means of bestowing ideational as well as, potentially, socio-economic and political value on all manner of phenomena, including immaterial practices. There are, however, also actors with plenty of immaterial heritage who have little interest and/or time to pursue a heritage listing, but who are not averse to cooperate in endeavors that might bolster their standing within society and contribute to a forward looking comprehension of their cultural resourcefulness. The paper will chronicle a four year interdisciplinary engagement with craftspeople focused on two divergent sectors: mud masonry and restoration and organ building. Focusing on innovation and craft potentials and geared to overcome the 'dying tradition' matrix rampant within and outside of many craft guilds, our team researched and produced a number of 'outputs' (films, exhibits, etc.). We sought to engage with the needs and interests of the actors whom we researched. In hindsight, the time invested in these formats appears to have brought forth more or at any rate differently effective results than a national or international UNESCO application (which, for organ building, occurred as well, carried by different actors). The presentation intends to motivate scholars and social actors alike toward an engagement that relativizes the heritage framework and instead engenders work that takes in account the social and economic needs and interests of those whose immaterial knowledge is at stake.

### **Regina F. Bendix**

Regina F. Bendix studied Folklore and Cultural Anthropology in Switzerland and the USA. Since 2001, she holds a professorship in Göttingen, Germany. She has published among other things on disciplinary history, lay theater, and narrative, and lead for nearly a decade a research group on heritage and cultural property.

## **Place, People and Perception: Cultural Significance as a Social Construction**

### **Abstract**

Cultural significance or Denkmalwert may be seen as the essential quality of objects and places around which the whole discipline of Heritage Conservation revolves. It is therefore useful to reflect how cultural significance comes into being and who is authorised to diagnose it. For a very long time people simply assumed that some objects possess this mysterious quality whilst many others do not, and that the experts would recognise it and compile helpful lists of these objects, the Monuments or Denkmale. This concept worked quite well for a very long time as long as there seemed to exist a joint or common idea of heritage values within individual societies and nations, with conservation officers working on behalf of, and authorised by, those societies. Over the last couple of decades or so we have however seen an erosion of this concept, and the Council of Europe's Faro Convention On the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (2005) is just one particularly striking proof of the sea change that is still in progress but is often ignored by Heritage bodies.

The paper will introduce and discuss examples of places where cultural significance has been and is being created, or in some cases dramatically enhanced, by people, in larger or smaller groups – created through their perception of the place and through their cultural practices. It will also attempt to lay some ground and provide some markers for a discussion about the future of Heritage Conservation as a public task.

### **Leo Schmidt**

Leo Schmidt has read History of Art, Classical Archaeology and History at the universities of Freiburg im Breisgau and Munich. He earned his doctorate in 1980 at Freiburg University with a thesis on the architectural history of Holkham Hall (UK). From 1980 to 1995, he worked as a historic buildings investigator for the Baden-Württemberg State Conservation Office, producing systematic catalogues of the historic buildings of the cities of Freiburg, Constance and Heidelberg. Since 1995 he has been teaching at the Brandenburg University of Technology (BTU) in Cottbus, as Professor for Architectural Conservation. He is Course Director of the Master Programme "Building and Conservation" and of the Joint Master Programme (with Helwan University Cairo) "Heritage Conservation and Site Management". He is also teaching in the International Master Programme „World Heritage Studies“. Leo has published on 18th-, 19th- and 20th-century architecture but also on difficult heritage such as the Berlin Wall and the Peenemünde rocket site. He has authored various conservation management and site management plans. He is vice president of ICOMOS' International Scientific Committee on Twentieth-Century Heritage (ISC20C) and a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London.

## **Ordinary heritage and participation: fostering heritage as a common**

### Abstract

The communication is embedded in the current theoretical work addressing heritage issues, marked by the broadening of the concept of heritage and the chronological and spatial extension of this notion, and also by the raise of participatory processes within public policies and urban planning projects.

#### *New “patrimonialisation” processes, focusing on people*

New definitions and representations of “patrimonialisation” processes stress the importance of “heritage communities” as much as objects themselves, and emphasise the relationship between the populations and their heritage. These approaches also underline the sensitive and affective dimension of heritage. These theoretical outcomes are linked to sustainability issues, and are currently experienced in urban projects, which foster sense of place and sense of belonging, and participate in bridging past and future. These changes are linked to a set of international Unesco and Council of Europe texts, that engage States to acknowledge and promote the diversity of culture and heritage. These texts encourage policies where the inhabitants themselves identify, define and participate in the preservation of the symbolic “resources” of their territory, that is to say what “counts” for them.

#### *(Re) considering heritage as a common, fostering emancipation and citizenship*

Heritage considered as a “common” can promote new models of governance and local initiatives for sustainable territories. In a context of hard competition between cities and between territories, a major challenge is notably to limit instrumentalizing heritage for mere territorial branding, tourism and economic matters. Defining heritage as a common, in this perspective, leads to a theoretical and practical shift since it supposes community based governance, collective decisions and inhabitant’s participation. This means reconsidering definitions of heritage and inventing management tools, where inhabitants alongside the “experts” decide what elements are considered as heritage, and define together local actions and policies.

#### *Co-producing heritage policies, involving artists in heritage preservation*

All these changes lead local actors to set up various methodologies in order to identify “what matters” for the population, acknowledging their representations, values and emotions, and including the inhabitants in the heritage preservation and valorisation actions. In order to analyse the rise of processes that involve artists in the urban projects, we will present the actors, methodologies and tools engaged in the preservation of the traditional squares of Porto Novo, in Benin.

### **Elizabeth Auclair**

Elizabeth Auclair has a PHD in geography; she is a senior lecturer in planning in the geography department at Cergy Pontoise University. In charge of the Master’s degree « Cultural development and heritage valorisation » for twenty years, she is since 2019 at the head of the geography research center MRTE. The general theme underlying her work concerns the articulation between artistic, cultural and heritage projects and alternative approaches for sustainable cities and territories. The main research questions concern situations of exclusion and inequalities, governance process and participation methods, evaluation of projects and policies and elaboration of new types of indicators.

## **Doing Archaeology. (Public) Participation and Archaeology as Intangible Cultural Heritage**

### **Abstract**

It is a common misconception that archaeology is mainly the material remains and traces of the past: things long dead, broken, abandoned or lost. Yet such things, one might argue, are not archaeology, but rubbish (Robinson & Aston 2003). Leaving aside the comparatively rare archaeological objects which have outstanding artistic and/or material value, the dead things themselves are utterly worthless: the vast majority of them, after all, are still buried, entirely unknown. And like any old rubbish, things nobody knows about, nobody can see, and nobody uses have no value at all.

Archaeology, thus, is much less the material remains of the past, than what we do with them: only by discovering, retrieving, and infusing them with significance by doing archaeology, the dead things become valuable cultural heritage. As Mortimer Wheeler famously put it: "...archaeology is a science that must be lived, must be 'seasoned with humanity'. Dead archaeology is the driest dust that blows." (Wheeler 1954, v). Archaeology is a mode of cultural production; its practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills, with artefacts (finds) and cultural spaces (sites) merely associated with them. Archaeology, thus, is at least as much, if not much more, intangible rather than tangible heritage.

For most of its history, doing archaeology was highly participatory: there simply were not enough professional archaeologists to engage in the production of archaeological heritage, nor even only its management. It is only in the last c. half century that the production and management of archaeological heritage has increasingly monopolised by a tiny heritage community: that of professional archaeologists and heritage managers. Using the authorised heritage discourse (Smith 2006, 29-34) to its own benefit, professional archaeology has tried to exclude virtually everyone else from the production and management of archaeological heritage; reducing all other heritage communities with an interest in doing archaeology to mere consumers of professionally prepared heritage products, and even painting some of them as 'enemies of archaeology'.

In this paper, I will examine the emergence of archaeology as a mode of cultural production, its increasing restriction to professionals, and discuss recent developments aimed at reversing the trend and returning archaeology to those to whom it truly belongs: everyone.

Robinson, T., Aston, M. 2003. *Archaeology is Rubbish. A Beginner's Guide*. London: Macmillan.

Smith, L. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. London & New York: Routledge.

Wheeler, R.E.M 1954. *Archaeology from the Earth*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

### **Raimund Karl**

Raimund Karl currently is Professor of Archaeology and Heritage at Bangor University in Wales (UK). Holding degrees in Pre- and Protohistory from and a Habilitation in Celtic Archaeology at the University of Vienna, Austria, he moved to the UK in 2001, where he first worked at the Centre for Advanced Welsh and Celtic Studies in Aberystwyth before moving to Bangor University in 2003. His main research interests include Archaeological Heritage Management, the role of archaeology in society, and Human and Civil Rights to participation in Cultural Heritage. His most recent monograph, 'Rechtswidrige Denkmalpflege?', is a critical analysis of how Austrian Heritage legislation and its application in practice inhibit public participation in Heritage.

## **The Museum as an heritage technique. Some Italian Experiences**

### **Abstract**

According to the introduction to the book *Museum Frictions. Public Cultures/Global Transformations* (2006) “museums became one of the institutions and practices associated with modernity, part of the checklist for being a nation, a means for disparate groups to present and claim their histories and values in the public sphere, and simultaneously an arena and means for constituting community identities. [...] They have become essential forms through which to make statements about history, identity, value, and place and to claim recognition. Reproduced, adapted and transformed globally, museums are not just a place or institution but have become a portable social technology, a set of museological processes through which such statements and claims are represented, embodied and debated. Whether they define their scope as national, regional, or community based, museums spaces can become global theaters of real consequence”.

Starting from this statement I will show, from different perspectives, how the museum could be seen a technology which, alongside other “heritage technologies” i.e. the 2003 UNESCO Convention on ICH, is used locally by communities in various ways. Different forms of museum – ecomuseums, community museums, territory museums and cultural centers- are encapsulated in the ideas of contemporary museology. Locally, people take responsibility for their own heritage, encouraging self-help and reacting to common issues within their neighborhood. Constituting self-awareness and local identity is a critical role played by community museums.

Finally I will propose to have a closer look at a community museum in Tuscany which I have been researching for around four years. In one of the most industrialized areas in Central Italy an informal group of people is struggling for the preservation of a small natural humid area from the aggressive development of factories. I examined what I define as “heritage technologies”: a collection of objects connected to the rural world, a community museum, a parish map, reenactments of old crafts and so forth. These technologies, which provide insights into gestures, actions and activities, were examined as the tools used by this group of people characterized by soft borders (a form of the Faro’s “heritage community”), to construct, reconstruct and negotiate a sense of place, identity and community, strongly connected to how they desire and imagine their future.

### **Emanuela Rossi**

Emanuela Rossi is associate professor of Cultural Anthropology at the University of Florence. She began to work on heritage from a museum perspective in her PhD thesis on the formation of the collection of the Museum of Anthropology in Vancouver (Canada), published in 2003 with the title of *Passione da museo*. In Canada she is part of the Great Lakes Research Alliance for the study of Aboriginal Arts and Cultures (GRASAC): an international group of researchers which has been working on a project of digital repatriation. Until the moment she has been doing research on the Indigenization process of the National museums in Canada and on some “heritage communities” in Italy using a critical approach to heritage studies.