2015

Heritage places: Evolving conceptions and changing forms

Neil A. Silberman, *University of Massachusetts - Amherst*

Heritage places: Evolving conceptions and changing forms

Neil A. Silberman
International Scientific Committee on Interpretation and Presentation
ICOMOS

To be published in <u>A Companion to Heritage Studies (Wiley Blackwell Companions to Anthropology)</u>, William Logan, Máiréad Nic Craith, and Ullrich Kockel (eds.). London: Wiley-Blackwell, 2015.

The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance, better known as the Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS 2013), has long been recognized as an international standard for the management of heritage places (e.g. Zancheti et al. 2009). Yet its text offers clear evidence of just how difficult an exact definition of "heritage places" can be. Equating "cultural heritage places" with "places of cultural significance" (Australia ICOMOS 2013: 1), the Burra Charter defines "place" as "a geographically defined area" that "may include elements, objects, spaces and views" (Article 1.1). Further noting that "place may have tangible and intangible dimensions," Burra conflates divergent notions of space and place, referring both to an objectively measurable, bounded area of the earth's surface and to subjective, qualitative perceptions such as "sacred mountain," "busy street," or "home." These subjective perceptions are of an entirely different character than either measurement or typological categories (Manzo 2005) and it is not quite clear if, or even how, the two categories mesh. Furthermore, Burra's definition of "cultural significance," is equally expansive, encompassing "aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations" that is "embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects" (Article 1.2). As an additional complicating factor, the Charter adds that "[p]laces may have a range of values for different individuals or groups."

How can such sweeping, all-inclusive definitions—attempting to cover all material, immaterial, objective, and subjective aspects of heritage places—possibly capture their irreducible essence? How can we identify the distinctive characteristic of heritage places without endlessly extending the list of specific material forms and subjective associations a heritage place <u>may</u> possess? At a time when officially recognized heritage types are splintering into distinct regional, ethnic, and religious variants (Ashworth, Graham, and Tunbridge 2007); when the UNESCO World Heritage List has exceeded a thousand inscribed properties all said to possess Outstanding Universal Value (UNESCO World Heritage Centre 2014); when the possession and control of cultural heritage resources have become symbols of political legitimacy (for a description and critique, Nilsson Stutz 2013), no single physical definition of a heritage place seems capable of capturing the thoroughly fragmented reality of cultural heritage in the 21st century. Thus focusing on process, rather than object, may be a more useful approach. I will argue in the following pages that a heritage place can be best understood as any physical structure, archaeological feature, or landscape that serves as a stimulus for collective and individual memory and historical associations. Indeed, ascriptions of heritage significance can be fixed on almost any place or locus of past human activity—from the Athenian acropolis (e.g. Loukaki 1997), to a Brazilian fishing village (Correia, Carlos, and Rocha 2013: 59-63), to the residence of the King of Rock 'n' Roll (Marling 1996). It is the evocative relationship of present to past that makes a heritage place significant, not anything inherent to the type or date of the site itself. Thus there are countless inaccessible and unpromoted medieval structures, archaeological ruins, and celebrity homes that offer no emotional connection in the public psyche, and, despite their typological potential to be considered worthy of commemoration, are accordingly not considered heritage places except in the most general and most abstract sense (Baillie, Chatzoglou and Taha 2010).

At the same time, it is important to recognize that heritage places, once officially or informally identified as such, do not necessarily last forever. Quite apart from physical deterioration, the changing tastes, values, and shifting generational affinities and attachments can result in the neglect or abandonment of once-venerated or respected places (e.g. Wiener 2012, for the case of Cold War sites in the Untited States) and can likewise give rise to the sudden "heritagization" of places that possessed no such significance before (Franck and Paxson 2013). This chapter will trace the evolving social role of heritage places from their initial roles as sites

for pilgrimage and ritual to their formalization as national institutions the early 19th century to their multicultural context in the early 21st century. The chapter will argue that the significance of heritage places is neither static nor inherent in their physical components and their definition and classification should focus on their roles in confirming or contesting the values attributed to them by particular social groups. Indeed, the categories and constellations of heritage places chosen for official commemoration offer a unique articulation of each era's spectrum of (often contradictory) collective memories. Heritages places can thus be defined—without reference to their specific components—as focal points of reflection, commemoration, and debate about the values of the past in contemporary society.

Touching Eternity: Heritage Places as Tokens of Faith

More than a century ago, Alois Riegl, the great fin de siècle Austrian art historian, famously recognized what had become by his time "a modern cult of monuments" (Riegl 1903; English trans: Riegl 1996) Noting that in former times, monuments primarily served "for the specific purpose of keeping particular human deeds and destinies… alive and present in the consciousness of future generations," he asserted that the "erection and maintenance of such 'deliberate' monuments has all but come to a halt" (Riegl 1996: 69) Writing just a few years before thousands of "deliberate" monuments to the dead of the Great War would once again spring up to express the grief of villages, towns, and city squares across Europe, Riegl was nonetheless correct in noting that at the turn of the twentieth century an epoch making shift in public commemoration had occurred. For in marked contrast to earlier times when heritage was a shared concern of the community, professionals (like Riegl himself) were now entrusted as members of government-appointed national commissions to designate official monuments that, according to their expert opinion, bore outstanding historical or artistic significance. It might even be fair to say that in earlier ages, the whole world was a heritage site.

For many ancient, rural, and indigenous peoples, wisdom indeed "sat in places," with significant features of the landscape bearing visual witness to ancestors' exploits, ancient battles and boundaries, and the earthly traces of cosmic creation myths (Basso 1996). The entire landscape was an evocative historical record. Scattered allusions in the Hebrew Bible to such geographical curiosities as a pillar of salt in the southern Dead Sea region (Genesis 19:26), the

twelve large stones rising above the surface of the Jordan River near Jericho (Joshua 4:9), and the "great heap of stones" in the hill country near Ai (Joshua 7:26), were each associated with famous events of the Israelite tradition. Yet the identification of these places was not motivated by haphazard antiquarian curiosity; similar to the famous landmarks of Egypt mentioned by Herodotus in the 5th century BC (Baragwanath and de Bakker 2012) and those in Greece described by Pausanias in the 2nd century AD (Alcock, Cherry, and Elsner 2001), these ancient "heritage places" were symbolic verifications of much wider religio-historical narratives, in which the each physical landmark was used to substantiate the whole. This attempt at the validation of historical-theological belief systems through the selective description of heritage places continued for centuries, and indeed endures until the present day (Lewis 2012).

Another important element of veneration was added to religiously inspired heritage places when cults of relics arose in most major world religions (Tambiah 2013). Significant sites and features of the landscape not only provided tangible evidence of sacred events and personalities, they also offered a medium for physical contact with the divine. Peter Brown's vivid description of the logic of the early Christian cult of saints (Brown 2009) also applied to other religions: the places where holy men and women had walked, the scenes of their martyrdom or spiritual triumphs, even the reliquaries and shrines that contained their earthly remains and possessions, offered a means of direct communication with the grace-giving sources of their faith. That eternal realm of communion was not necessarily otherworldly, but, as the humanists of the Renaissance would show, could also exist in a remote golden age of beauty, prosperity, and wisdom: the classical epoch of Greece and Rome.

And so heritage as we know it was born as a new kind of spiritual veneration, in reaction to the reaction to the increasingly rigid medieval theological and earthly regimes. Cyriac of Ancona, among of the first of the Renaissance antiquarians, traveled widely throughout the eastern Mediterranean in the 15th century, studying, drawing, and describing long ignored and neglected classical remains. Yet his was not merely a search for information, but a quest for communion: when asked by a priest why he so tirelessly sought out areas of half-buried ruins, sarcophagi, and ancient Latin inscriptions—which we would today unhesitatingly call heritage places—Cyriac replied that he had a higher calling: to bring the dead back to life (Belozerskaya 2009: 42). That belief that somehow material relics from the past could reveal transcendent truths about human existence would remain a central motivation of archaeology and the study of

cultural heritage. Whether it was Winckelmann's theory of aesthetic development, through its endless cycles of rise, flowering, and decay (Potts 2000) or Christian Thomson's neat scheme of universal technological development across the millennia through raw materials of stone bronze, and iron (Eskildsen 2012), heritage places were becoming sites of ideological or spiritual reflection about transcendent patterns of human destiny. As will be described below, the cult of the nation would become the most widespread observances at heritage places all over the world. Yet the element of personal communion with archaeological remains, architectural ruins, and natural landmarks still endures at heritage places with both ancient and modern spiritual associations like Stonehenge, the Pyramids, the Old City of Jerusalem, Uluru, Machu Picchu, and even the UFO cultists' Area 51 (Timothy and Olsen 2006; Battaglia 2006). Thus one social process that can characterize a heritage place is the quest for tangible contact with a transcendent metaphysical belief. Such feelings still resonate in even local settings where a powerful need for ruins (Jackson 1980) offers a sense of psychic intimacy with distant eras and vast expanses of human history, bolstering our own sense of mortality with at least a fleeting encounter with timelessness.

Belonging to a Nation: Heritage Places as Objects of State Power

One of the primary rationales for a more precise definition of "heritage places" is legal rather theoretical; in modern nation-states, the official designation of heritage places brings with it a variety of benefits, tax incentives, responsibilities, and legal restrictions that affect its status as a special class of property (cf. Phelan 1993; Bendix, Eggert and Peselmann 2012; Pickard 2012). Whether owned by the state, or protected by the state against destruction or undesirable changes by their private owners, legally recognized monuments, archaeological sites, historic districts, and cultural landscapes have become the objects of international conventions, protracted bi-national legal battles, and criminal prosecutions within individual states (Forrest 2010). Oversight of material and intangible elements of collective memory-- at least those officially recognized as having national significance-- is a recognized prerogative of sovereignty in the modern system of nation-states (Pavoni 2012). Like the regulation of the exploitation or conservation of natural resources deemed vital to a nation's security, the development or protection of heritage places is seen as an unalienable national right. Although the properties on

the ever-expanding UNESCO World Heritage List are recognized as possessing outstanding universal value as the patrimony of all humanity, the individual state-parties to the 1972 World Heritage Convention still retain full legal sovereignty over their listed World Heritage sites (Atherton and Atherton 1995).

How did the state come to be the legal custodian of a certain class of designated heritage places? Here too the social process, rather than the material fabric, provided the underlying rationale. As mentioned above, the cult of relic-bearing heritage places gradually expanded; the 18th century classical antiquarians and the three-age archaeologists who succeeded the earlier pilgrims thought in terms of grand, universalist schemata, in which particular miraculous events, aesthetic developments, and technological advances were arranged as grand narratives of human history. Yet as the Age of Kings and the Age of Reason gave way to an era of competing nation-states, a new kind of heritage narrative arose. Simultaneously universal and particular, it recognized the nation as the culmination of a succession of earlier forms of communal organization, in which each people's unique character could be expressed. Each emerging nation saw itself as unique and eternal; the qualities most prized in the present were perceived in the monuments and heritage places of the past (cf. Silberman 1989, 1996). The civic narrative taught in government schools and displayed in the galleries of national museums were also enacted in public pageants that re-enacted the evolving embodiments of national genius-- from Prehistory, through the Bronze and Iron ages, through increasingly complex social organization and artistic achievements, to their ultimate fulfillment in the form of a nation-state. Gradually, individual heritage places that were informally identified by antiquarians and romantic nationalists as national symbols (e.g. Dietler 1994; Hutchinson 2012, Silberman 2013) were regularly incorporated into national heritage registers and bureaucratically administered by national monuments services or culture ministries (e.g. Munasinghe 2005). The official lists of protected heritage cumulatively represented the national narrative—and thus public visits to government-protected heritage places and historic landmarks essentially became civic rituals, with each site reaffirming, pars pro toto, the validity of the entire national narrative (illustrated effectively by Bodnar 1991).

As long as the nation-state defined itself through its homogeneity of language, culture, cuisine, national costume, the network of official heritage places had resonance with the vast majority of citizens. "Heritage place" had a distinct connotation as a site of ethno-national

commemoration, a place where loyalty to the nation-state was literally or symbolically mobilized (among countless case studies: Azaryahu and Kellerman-Barrett 1999; Ranger 2004; Yan and Bramwell 2008; Hamilakis 2009). However, this close association between a sequence of distinctive heritage places with perceived ethnic characteristics often led to the twin evils of extending territorial claims to encompass adjoining areas containing "national" heritage places (e.g. Silverman 2011)-- and ignoring or neglecting heritage places within the national boundaries that do not illustrate the accepted national narrative (Waterton 2009). The civic significance of commemorative heritage places is thus exclusionary by nature, even, as we will see below, when formerly marginalized indigenous or minority ethnic groups begin to officialize their own set of heritage places as symbols of communal identity.

Escaping from everyday routines: Heritage Places as entertainment venues

From the time of Pausanias's <u>Description of Greece</u>, to the Baedeckers, Blue Guides, and Lonely Planet of more modern times, public visitation to heritage places has been conditioned by an implicit quality quite distinct from the sites' spiritual significance or their relevance to national epics. The aesthetic quality of the remains, the ease with which they can be reached, and-- not least important-- the quality of the local cuisine and nearby accommodations have always been important components of the character of a heritage place. Yet until the rise of mass tourism in Europe and the Mediterranean in the 19th century with the advent of railroads and, perhaps even more important, steamships (Armstrong and Williams 2005) and with the further individualization of family tourism in the US, with the construction of long-distance highways and the spread of auto ownership (Rugh 2008), a large class of heritage places were transformed from sober places of reflection and awe to entertainment venues.

There had always been informal commercial activity surrounding famous heritage places, but it was only with the rise of the great World Expositions that the practice of antiquities-gawking as became a holiday pursuit. From the display of the massive Nineveh reliefs and sculptures at the 1851 Crystal Palace Exhibition (Malley 2012), to the traditional Japanese village at the 1893 Columbian Exposition (Stone 2011), to the full scale reproduction of Jerusalem's Old City at the St. Louis World's Fair in 1904, reproductions of cultural heritage sites (Çelik 1992) became highly visible symbols of the western imperial conquest of time as

well as resources and space. Gradually the heritage places themselves were remade. At first a perimeter fence, a simple ticket booth, and a few identifying signposts were all the infrastructure needed. But as the guided coach tours and family auto vacations encountered a greater variety of roadside diversions, the design of heritage places gradually grew more complex, adding a standard set of amenities: parking lots, visitor centers, cafeterias, rest rooms, and souvenir shops. A new architectural form gradually crystallized, transforming at least one possible definition of a heritage place. Borrowing design principles from the world's fairs and the theme parks that were by the 1950s becoming so successful, heritage places became tourist attractions offering a standardized narrative read by the feet—from the parking lot, through the ticket booth, along carefully demarcated interpretive paths, through the cafeteria and gift shop, and out to the parking lot again (Silberman 2007). The experience of visiting a heritage place, rather than the knowledge and particular facts and figures presented there, became its primary value.

Indeed, as public budgets for monuments services and culture ministries steadily declined with the worldwide rise of neoliberal austerity policies, independent income generation or privatization became a crucial factor in the management of many heritage places, despite their sometimes adverse effects (Palumbo 2006). Especially with the added attractions of multimedia visitor centers, immersive virtual environments, and interactive interpretive installations eagerly supplied by a growing industry of IT heritage designers and funded by government agencies and international development agencies, heritage places and revitalized historic centers were reconceptualized as productive centers that would stimulate local economies (cf. Bandarin, Hosagrahar and Albernaz 2011).

In the cases where visitation soars, physical conservation usually suffers-- leading to extraordinary measures to limit visitor traffic or substantially raise admission fees (Russo 2002). Likewise, the necessity to generate revenue from heritage places imposes a practical constraint on interpretation-- only sanitized, museumized representations of the past's unpleasantness and horror can be permitted lest potential visitors be driven away (Waitt 2000). In this sense, heritage places can be seen as holiday venues whose most threatening competitors are not other heritage places, but other entertainment attractions that provide welcome weekend or vacation relief from the daily grind. And for the members of local communities whose economic underdevelopment often serves as the main reason for investment in the often costly design and management of such heritage places, the heritage place often loses its distinctly local significance or historical

value, becoming just another workplace in a service industry designed to appeal to consumers from the outside.

Asserting Independence: Heritage Places as Symbolic Resistance

Post-colonial independence and civil rights movements have given rise to yet another meaning to the term "heritage place." As mentioned above, the creation of "officialized" heritage places by national governments gave voice to homogenized mainstream heritage narratives while marginalizing or ignoring the heritage perspectives of indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities (as illustrated in Graham and Howard 2008: chaps. 5, 6, 8, 9). Yet the eventual recognition of indigenous rights and the legitimation of the cultural (if not always fully political) autonomy of regional communities and ethnic minorities led to the identification of certain heritage places as proud symbols of independence from the long-dominant majority elites (Silberman 2010). Yet the primary difference with what I have called "neo-nationalist heritage" from its predecessors was that it was aimed in the first place to separate rather than unite. Heritage self-definition was a declaration of independence from a formally united (however unjust and unequal) society. And therein lies the cruel irony of this stage of the evolution of heritage places-- a neologism that had its origins, as noted in the earlier discussion of the Burra Charter, in the notion that all heritage perspectives and values should be recognized. In encouraging acceptance and respect for the historical assertions and authenticity standards of all polities and peoples (cf. Larsen 1995), the inevitability of direct ideological conflict over twice- or thrice-claimed heritage places—most recently Ayohda, Bamiyan, Preah Vihear, and Timbuktu, for example (Ratnagar 2004; Flood 2002; Williams 2011; O'Dell 2013)-- produced yet more bloodshed and conflict as new oppositions arose to claim their place on the heritage landscape, shattering the usefulness of heritage as a community-building tool.

In such situations of conflicting claims defended by violence and destruction, heritage places took on yet another meaning, symbolizing the fragmentation of preexisting memory communities rather than the congealing of new collectivities. The irony is, however, that the new heritage activists followed the same pattern as earlier imperial and colonial elites. The power to declare unilateral significance, to craft self-justifying historical narratives, and to exclude rivals and despised subordinates from "true" membership in the community became prerogatives of

new post-colonial political elites.

I cannot conclude this survey of 21st century heritage fragmentation without also mentioning the use of heritage places as sites of conscience and foci of diasporic identity, in which traditional geographical and national commemorative understandings of heritage places simply do not apply. The transformation of places of mass murder, enslavement, exploitation, and inhumanity to formal heritage sites (with the infrastructure of modern heritage interpretation, but designed to encourage moral reflection) offers a sobering counterpoint to the use of heritage places as platforms for partisanship or as simple entertainment venues (Sevcenko 2010). And in an era of massive demographic shifts through rural-to-urban migration, undocumented workers from poorer nations seeking employment in developed economies, or the forced displacement of ethnic minorities, we can often see nativist reactions that decry the perceived disintegration of formerly homogenous nations (e.g. Vogelaar and Hale 2013)—and the inward turn of diasporic communities themselves (e.g. Agnew 2005). These 21st century variations in the significance and social role of heritage places make it clear that a better understanding of the dynamic process of heritage placemaking—rather than a single comprehensive definition—must be sought.

Grasping for Meaning: Heritage Places as reactions to change

Heritage places can variously or even simultaneously be sites of conflict, identity, entertainment, patriotism, ideology, and reflection. None is necessarily more important or constitutive than the rest. The new social networks being created through indigenous and "bottom-up" approaches to the establishment of heritage places stand alongside and almost always intertwine with the web of relationships that earlier concepts of heritage places inspired. The concepts of authenticity and significance that underlie the range of meanings reflect the self-perceptions of communities and individuals and are oriented at least as much toward the present and the future as the past. Heritage places should therefore be seen as stages for a kind of performative action, in the expression of a value or a sense of identity, whose subjectivity and ephemerality contradicts the very notion of the "timelessness" of cultural heritage. Gustavo Araoz has redefined the heritage place, not as a material relic with a single unchanging meaning, but rather as a "vessel of value" (Araoz 2011). Araoz rightly asserts that over the past two centuries,

the modern heritage conservation movement developed under the assumption that values rested mostly, if not entirely on … material form. The philosophy of conservation and its resulting doctrinal foundation, the protective legislation, the identification and official registration processes, and the methodological framework and professional protocols for intervening in heritage places are all fixated on the protection of the material vessels that carry the value (58)

It is now time to recognize the centrality of values in establishing that this or that landscape feature is a heritage place. Indeed, the heritage place of the 21st century potentially contains all the values that have been associated with sites of memory and commemoration over the centuries, yet it is also the stage on which or imaginings of the future are born. As David Lowenthal has eloquently noted, our appreciation of the past through heritage places requires a creative sense of imagination that is uncannily parallel to our visions of the distant future (Lowenthal 2006). To have no vision of the past beyond a static conception of a particular material form of a historic structure is to have no sense of the trajectory of time. The significance of heritage places is neither static nor inherent in their material components; authenticity and significance are ascribed to them by social groups, whose composition and self-perceptions change with time. These groups selectively highlight or ignore various elements of material and intangible heritage, to defend their social rank, express their hopes for the future, or historicize their political goals.

As we have seen, the categories and constellations of heritage places chosen for protection and commemoration throughout the centuries embody each era's spectrum of (often contradictory) collective memories. We should thus begin to see heritage places as cultural phenomena rather than things. Though the conservation of the physical vessels that contain the values is an essential responsibility, we must not lose sight of the values themselves. Good or bad, noble or immoral, they are projections of the society's ever-changing collective psyche, foci of nostalgic reflection that are always stimulated and decisively shaped by present hopes and fears. In that sense, our primary task in understanding the nature of heritage places is to distinguish the various projections of collective memory from the inherited landscapes, monuments, and landmarks that serve as the "screens" on which they are shown.

Neil A. Silberman is an author, historian, and managing partner of Coherit Associates, an international heritage consulting firm. He is an adjunct lecturer in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Massachusetts and also serves as president of the ICOMOS International Committee on Interpretation and Presentation (ICIP). His research interests include interpretation theory, the history of heritage practice, and the politics of commemoration.

References

Agnew, V. (2005). *Diaspora, Memory and Identity: A Search for Home*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Alcock, S.E, Cherry, J.F., and Elsner, J. (2001). *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Armstrong, J., and Williams, D. (2005). The Steamboat and Popular Tourism. *The Journal of Transport History,* 26 (1), pp. 61–77.

Ashworth, G. J, B. J Graham, and J. E Tunbridge. (2007). *Pluralising Pasts: Heritage, Identity and Place in Multicultural Societies.* London; Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press.

Atherton, T.-A., and Atherton, T.C. (1995). The Power and the Glory: National Sovereignty and the World Heritage Convention. *Australian Law Journal,* 69, pp. 631–649.

Australia ICOMOS. (2013). The Burra Charter 2013. Australia ICOMOS, http://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/The-Burra-Charter-2013-Adopted-31.10.2013.pdf Accessed June 29, 2014.

Azaryahu, M., and KellermanBarrett, A. (1999). Symbolic Places of National History and Revival: A Study in Zionist Mythical Geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* 24 (1), pp. 109–123.

Baillie, B., Chatzoglou, A., and Taha, S. (2010). Packaging the Past. *Heritage & Society,* 3 (1), pp. 51–71.

Bandarin, F., Hosagrahar, J., and Albernaz, F.S. (2011). Why Development Needs Culture. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development,* 1 (1), pp. 15–25.

Baragwanath, E., and de Bakker, M. (2012). *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Basso, K.H. (1996). *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language among the Western Apache*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Battaglia, D. (2006). *E.T. Culture: Anthropology in Outerspaces*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Belozerskaya, M. (2009). *To Wake the Dead: A Renaissance Merchant and the Birth of Archaeology*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Bendix, R., Eggert, A., and Peselmann, A. (2012). *Heritage Regimes and the State*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.

Bodnar, J.E. (1991). *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century*. Princeton.: Princeton University Press.

Brown, P. (2009). *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Çelik, Z. (1992). *Displaying the Orient: Architecture of Islam at Nineteenth-Century World's Fairs*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Correia, M., Carlos, G., and Rocha, S. (2013). *Vernacular Heritage and Earthen Architecture*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.

Dietler, M. (1994). "Our Ancestors the Gauls": Archaeology, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Manipulation of Celtic Identity in Modern Europe. *American Anthropologist,* 96 (3), pp. 58.

Eskildsen, K.R. (2012). The Language of Objects: Christian Jürgensen Thomsen's Science of the Past. *Isis,* 103 (1), pp. 24–53.

Flood, F.B. (2002). Between Cult and Culture: Bamiyan, Islamic Iconoclasm, and the Museum. *The Art Bulletin,* 84 (4), pp. 641.

Forrest, C. (2010). *International Law and the Protection of Cultural Heritage*. London: Routledge.

Franck, K., and Paxson, L. (2013) Transforming Public Space into Sites for Mourning or Free Expression. In K. Franck, and Q. Stevens (eds), *Loose Space: Possibility and Diversity in Urban Life*. London: Routledge, pp. 132–153.

Graham, B.J., and Howard, P. (2008). *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and*

Identity. Burlington: Ashgate Pub. Co.

Hamilakis, Y. (2009). *The Nation and Its Ruins: Antiquity, Archaeology, and National Imagination in Greece*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hutchinson, J. (2012). *Dynamics of Cultural Nationalism: The Gaelic Revival and the Creation of the Irish Nation State*. London: Routledge.

Jackson, J.B. (1980). *The Necessity for Ruins: And Other Topics*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts.

Larsen, K.E. (1995). *Nara Conference on Authenticity in Relation to the World Heritage Convention*. UNESCO, ICOMOS, ICCROM.

Lewis, J.R. (2012). Excavating Tradition: Alternative Archaeologies as Legitimation Strategies. *Numen* 59, (2-3), pp. 202–221.

Loukaki, A. (1997). Whose Genius Loci?: Contrasting Interpretations of the "Sacred Rock of the Athenian Acropolis." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers,* 87 (2), pp. 306–329.

Lowenthal, D. (2006). Stewarding the Future. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift - Norwegian Journal of Geography,* 60 (1), pp. 15–23.

Malley, S. (2012). Nineveh 1851: An Archaeography. *Journal of Literature and Science,* 5 (1), http://www.literatureandscience.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/JLS-5.1-Malley-rev.pdf Accessed June 29, 2014.

Manzo, L.C. (2005). For Better or Worse: Exploring Multiple Dimensions of Place Meaning. *Journal of Environmental Psychology,* 25 (1), pp. 67–86.

Marling, K.A. (1996). *Graceland: Going Home with Elvis*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Munasinghe, H. (2005). The Politics of the Past: Constructing a National Identity through Heritage Conservation. *International Journal of Heritage Studies,* 11 (3), pp. 251–60.

Nilsson Stutz, Liv. (2013). Claims to the Past. A Critical View of the Arguments Driving Repatriation of Cultural Heritage and Their Role in Contemporary Identity Politics. *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* 7 (2): 170–95.

O'Dell, E.J. (2013). Waging War on the Dead: The Necropolitics of Sufi Shrine Destruction in Mali. *Archaeologies,* 9 (3), pp. 506–525.

Palumbo, G. (2006) Privatization of State-Owned Cultural Heritage. In *Of the Past, for the*

Future: Integrating Archaeology and Conservation, Proceedings of the Conservation Theme at the 5th World Archaeological Congress, Washington, DC, 22–26 June 2003, 35. Los Angeles: Getty Publications.

Pavoni, R. (2012) Sovereign Immunity and the Enforcement of International Cultural Property Law, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2244798 Accessed June 29, 2014.

Phelan, M. (1993). Synopsis of the Laws Protecting Our Cultural Heritage, A. *New England Law Review,* 28, pp. 63.

Pickard, R. (2012). *Policy and Law in Heritage Conservation*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Potts, A. (2000). *Flesh and the Ideal: Winckelmann and the Origins of Art History*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Ranger, T. (2004). Nationalist Historiography, Patriotic History and the History of the Nation: The Struggle over the Past in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Southern African Studies,* 30 (2), pp. 215–234.

Ratnagar, S. (2004). Archaeology at the Heart of a Political Confrontation: The Case of Ayodhya. *Current Anthropology,* 45 (2), pp. 239–259.

Riegl, A. (1903). *Moderne Denkmalkultus: sein Wesen und seine Entstehung*. Vienna: W. Braumüller.

Riegl, A. (1996) The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Essence and Development. In N.S. Price, K.M. Talley, and A.M. Vaccaro (eds), *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*. Malibu: Getty Publications, pp. 69–93.

Rugh, S.S. (2008). *Are We There yet?: The Golden Age of American Family Vacations*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Russo, A.P. (2002). The "Vicious Circle" of Tourism Development in Heritage Cities. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 29 (1), pp. 165–182.

Sevcenko, L. (2010). Sites of Conscience: New Approaches to Conflicted Memory. *Museum International,* 62 (1-2), pp. 20–25.

Silberman, N.A. (1989). *Between Past and Present: Archaeology, Ideology, and Nationalism in the Modern Middle East*. New York: H. Holt.

Silberman, N.A. (1996) Promised Lands and Chosen Peoples: The Politics and Poetics of Archaeological Narrative. In P. Kohl and C. Fawcett (eds) *Nationalism, Politics, and the*

Practice of Archaeology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 249-262.

Silberman, N.A. (2007). Sustainable Heritage? Public Archaeological Interpretation and the Marketed Past. In Y. Hamilakis, and P. Duke (eds), *Archaeology and Capitalism: From Ethics to Politics*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, pp. 179–193.

Silberman, N.A. (2010) Validation, Resistance, and Exclusion: Neo-Nationalist Cultural Heritage in a Globalized World, http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1033&context=neil_silberman.

Silberman, N.A. (2013). The Tyranny of Narrative History, Heritage, and Hatred in the Modern Middle East. *Journal of Eastern Mediterranean Archaeology and Heritage Studies,* 1 (2), pp. 175–184.

Silverman, H. (2011). Border Wars: The Ongoing Temple Dispute between Thailand and Cambodia and UNESCO's World Heritage List. *International Journal of Heritage Studies,* 17 (1), pp. 01–21.

Stone, L.A. (2011). The Japanese Village and Deer Park. *Studies in the History of Gardens & Designed Landscapes,* 31 (3), pp. 216–227.

Tambiah, S.J. (2013) The Charisma of Saints, Amulets, and Tomb Shrines. In F. Aulino, M. Goheen, and S.J. Tambiah (eds.), *Radical Egalitarianism: Local Realities, Global Relations*. New York: Fordham Univ Press, pp. 15–50.

Timothy, D., and Olsen, D. (2006). *Tourism, Religion and Spiritual Journeys*. London: Routledge.

UNESCO World Heritage Centre. (2014). "Twenty Six New Properties Added to World Heritage List at Doha Meeting." http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/1162 Accessed June 29, 2014.

Vogelaar, A.E., and Hale, B.W. (2013). Constituting Swiss Heritage: Discourse and the Management of "Invasive Species". *International Journal of Tourism Anthropology,* 3 (2), pp. 130–149.

Waitt, G. (2000). Consuming Heritage: Perceived Historical Authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 27 (4), pp. 835–862.

Waterton, E. (2009). Sights of Sites: Picturing Heritage, Power and Exclusion. *Journal of Heritage Tourism,* 4 (1), pp. 37–56.

Wiener, J. (2012). *How We Forgot the Cold War: A Historical Journey across America*.

Berkeley: University of California Press.

Williams, T. (2011). The Curious Tale of Preah Vihear: The Process and Value of World Heritage Nomination. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites,* 13 (1), pp. 01–07.

Yan, H., and Bramwell, B. (2008). Cultural Tourism, Ceremony and the State in China. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 35 (4), pp. 969–989.

Zancheti, S.M., Hidaka, L.T.F., Ribeiro, C., and Aguiar, B. (2009). Judgement and Validation in the Burra Charter Process: Introducing Feedback in Assessing the Cultural Significance of Heritage Sites. *City & Time,* 4 (2), pp. 47–53.