Chapter 1
Contested Cultural Heritage: A Selective Historiography

Helaine Silverman

Although "contested cultural heritage" has not always been specified in these words, the concept has been cogently present for at least 25 years in anthropology, archaeology, history, geography, architecture, urbanism, and tourism (to name the most obvious disciplines) and is now a framework driving much applied research in these fields internationally. This is because we live in an increasingly fraught world where religious, ethnic, national, political, and other groups manipulate (appropriate, use, misuse, exclude, erase) markers and manifestations of their own and others' cultural heritage as a means for asserting, defending, or denying critical claims to power, land, legitimacy, and so forth. This introductory essay presents a selective historiography of contested cultural heritage as I perceive its development, illustrated by some of the better known cases of its instantiation and augmented by the contributions to this volume. I emphasize the more tangible aspects of cultural heritage (a bias from my training as an archaeologist) [Note 1] and draw heavily from anthropological/archaeological literature where academic attention to the issues has been greatest and whose practitioners dominate the roster of authors herein.

Shifting the Paradigm

Attention to contested cultural heritage is, fundamentally, awareness of the construction of identity and its strategic situationality and oppositional deployment—the knowledge that "self and society are not ... given, as fully formed, fixed, and timeless, as either integrated selves or functionally consistent structures. Rather, self and society are always in production, in process..." (Bruner 1983a:2–3). This statement was revolutionary at the time it was made and came from the heart of cultural anthropology in a volume entitled *Text, Play and Story: The Construction and Reconstruction of Self and Society* (Bruner 1983b). Its most compelling exemplification was Bruner and Gorfain's (1983) analysis of the dialogic narration and paradoxes of Masada, Israel's physically dramatic and ideologically sanctified site

H. Silverman (✉)
Department of Anthropology, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801, USA
e-mail: helaine@illinois.edu

of Jewish heroism and resistance. Bruner and Gorfain recognized the multivocality of the Masada epic, identifying its competing political, moral, authoritative, and religious aspects. In so doing their study transcended a contribution to anthropological theory: in retrospect it can be seen as a pioneering recognition of heritage sites as sites of contestation [Note 2].

"Masada" (Bruner and Gorfain 1983) was virtually contemporaneous with two full-scale ethnographies of contested cultural heritage, one about Greece and the other about Quebec. These are the earliest such studies I am able to identify. Like "Masada," Herzfeld's (1982) study of Greek national identity was explicit about the role of contested cultural heritage in the push and pull of nation building and its larger geopolitical context:

> In 1821 the Greeks arose in revolt against the rule of Turkey and declared themselves an independent nation. . . they proclaimed the resurrection of an ancient vision. . . That vision was Hellas. . . This unique nation-state would represent the ultimate achievement of the Hellenic ideal and, as such, would lead all Europe to the highest levels of culture yet known.
>
> Europeans in other lands. . . were not uniformly impressed by the modern Greeks' claim to represent [Classic Greek culture]. By what token could the latter-day Greeks portray themselves as the true descendants of the ancient Hellenes. . . Were they still . . . the same as the Greeks of old? . . . they were not . . .
>
> Greek scholars constructed cultural continuity in defense of their national identity. . . .
>
> . . . the *idea* of Greece—like any symbol—could carry a wide range of possible meanings. . . Such is the malleable material of which ideologies are made.
>
> . . . paradox. . . difficulties threatened the coherence of the national ideology . . . . (Herzfeld 1982:3–4, 6; emphasis in original)

Handler (1985, 1988) studied Quebécois interest in their own French-origin cultural patrimony as opposed to the central discourse of Canadian *national* culture. In Quebec, cultural patrimony became a matter of *provincial*, which is to say *local*, concern and was deeply imbricated in new understandings and practices that challenged historic, mainstream patterns.

At the same time, Lowenthal (1985) published his more sweeping, influential, and transdisciplinary meditation on how the (Western) past has been understood, fashioned, and altered so as to become a usable, albeit "weighty" heritage. In *The Past Is A Foreign Country* Lowenthal illuminated how history, memory, and the physical remains of the past are employed to reveal the past and also how they enable *creation* of a past of our own liking—thus, a malleable past. He introduced concepts such as selective erosion, invention, and oblivion—the practice of which, on the ground, subsequently became demonstrated in almost countless studies including various in the present volume. Obviously, Lowenthal was not writing in a vacuum (as his extensive bibliography confirms), and here it is important to observe that he cited Hobsbawn's (1983) renowned essay on invented traditions, a concept that has become tremendously significant in heritage studies, particularly concerning intangible practices and debates over authenticity (see especially Bruner 1994; see e.g., Churchill 2006).

Archaeology participated in anthropology's "cultural turn" [Note 3], and in 1986 a veritable tsunami in archaeology was unleashed at a major international conference held in Southampton, UK—the first World Archaeological Congress

(WAC)—whose agenda focused on critical awareness of the treatment of the past in the present, concern with stakeholder empowerment and social justice, and related political and theoretically linked matters (see Campion 1989; Cleere 1989; Gathercole and Lowenthal 1990; Layton 1989; Miller et al. 1989; Shennan 1989).

> [WAC] insisted on recognizing that science, far from being politically neutral, constitutes a value system linked to dominant social interests, and the idea of science "being open to all" is ultimately a belief about the way the world should be, rather than how it is. WAC made clear statements that archaeology had long served state interests in shoring up nationalist identities and asserting territorial domains. At the same time, WAC put itself forward as a forum not merely for professional archaeologists and allied scientists, but for everyone interested in the past, with native people from underdeveloped countries specifically encouraged ... Since 1986, WAC has constituted itself as a uniquely representative non-profit organization of worldwide archaeology that recognizes the historical and social role, and the political context, of archaeology, and the need to make archaeological studies relevant to the wider community. It especially seeks to debate and refute institutionalized views that serve the interests of a privileged few to the detriment of disenfranchised others. WAC explicitly values diversity against institutionalized mechanisms that marginalize the cultural heritage of indigenous peoples, minorities and the poor. ... attention to local archaeological communities trying to protect archaeological sites, or indigenous groups protecting sacred sites from industrial encroachment or tourism development.... "value-committed archaeologies" ... or "engaged archaeology." ... archaeology carries in it a source of empowerment, not only in the generalized sense, as a means of knowledge production about the past, but more specifically as a means to grant time-depth and legitimation to individuals, groups or nations. ... political commitment and ethical judgement COUNT in archaeology and constitute an important FOCUS of inquiry ... interaction is taking place, accords are being struck and native voices are empowered to be involved in archaeological research. Community-based archaeology projects not only incorporate local knowledge, history, education and work schedules into research agendas, but the very objectives of archaeological research are now being set by local communities, as "value committed" archaeologists put themselves at the service of endangered ethnic minorities. In fact, this is the archaeology of the future. The discipline of archaeology is no longer the exclusive province of white European upper-class men, and there is no going back to a pre-WAC era of exclusionary, hierarchical and scientized knowledge that marginalizes the multivocal archaeology from the peripheries. The question of "who controls the past?" is no longer a conundrum because it must be generally conceded that there are many pasts and they will be known differently from many views. (Gero 2009, emphasis in original)

WAC consolidated its philosophy and membership in 1990 at its second meeting, held in Venezuela (see especially Stone and Molyneaux 1994; Bond and Gilliam 1994a). Here archaeologists explicitly took on the issues of power inherent in professional archaeological practice, societal norms, and governmental political policy, arguing that "social constructions of the past are crucial elements in the process of domination, subjugation, resistance and collusion. Representing the past and the way of life of populations is an expression and a source of power. These representations may frame relationships of social inequality, and can be intimately related to structures of power and wealth. They contain ideological and hegemonic properties that represent historical and sectional interests" (Bond and Gilliam 1994b:1).

Although the United States Congress surely was not reading academic literature, it is not coincidental that NAGPRA (Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act) was passed in the same year as the WAC-2 conference. The civil

rights concerns that were mobilizing Native American communities and their non-indigenous allies were consilient with the kinds of issues motivating WAC activism worldwide (e.g., Hammil and Cruz 1989). Indigenous peoples of Canada, Australia, and elsewhere around the world were now vociferously insisting on physical and ideological control of—or least participation in decision-making about—their cultural heritage, from sequestered human remains to sites to exhibited artifacts (e.g., Mamani Condori 1989; Rakotoarisoa 1989; Richardson 1989)—indeed, to the representation of themselves in the everyday (see e.g., Michaels 1987). And they were questioning the exclusive validity of Western science itself (e.g., Echo-Hawk 2000).

This assertion extended to the landscape itself whose occupation and use came to the fore as a prime battleground for contested claims between original inhabitants and more recent settlers, visitors, and overseers (e.g., Bender 1993; Bender and Winer 2001; Flood 1989; McNiven and Russell 2005; Smith 2001). In response to events on the ground, scholars were recognizing the landscape as socially constructed and engaged (e.g., Ashmore and Knapp 1999; Corner 1999; Cosgrove 1984; David and Wilson 2002; Duncan and Ley 1993; Hirsch and O'Hanlon 1995; Rotenberg 1995; Silverman 1990)—including landscape contestations in art (e.g., Cosgrove and Daniels 1988; McGill 1990) and as mapped (e.g., Bassett 1998; Cosgrove 1999; Edney 1990; Jackson 1989; Silverman 2002a; Wood 1992). Indeed, in 1992 "cultural landscape" became clearly acknowledged as heritage by UNESCO in the World Heritage Convention (http://whc.unesco.org/en/culturallandscape/), and in 2000 the European Landscape Convention was signed, recognizing cultural and historical landscapes in Europe (Scazzosi 2004).

Museums—as the premier sites of representation—were drawn into the paradigm shift as well. Their watershed was the Smithsonian's co-publication of *Exhibiting Cultures. The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display* (Karp and Lavine 1991) and *Museums and Communities. The Politics of Public Culture* (Karp et al. 1992). The book titles are self-explanatory. No longer were museums to be uncontested, authoritative spaces for the presentation and interpretation of dominant versions of history and culture. A new self-awareness among curators (certainly those trained in the social sciences) was leading to a new museology, informed by the same discourses rocking anthropology, archaeology, and allied fields. The changes can be seen in an extraordinarily prolific sequence of publications that cumulatively constitute the intellectual foundations of the contemporary field of museum studies [Note 4]. Within this arena, issues of contested cultural heritage have figured prominently, whether concerning the representation of African prehistory and the "ethnographic present" in white-dominated museums on and off the "Dark Continent" (e.g., Coombes 1994; Hart and Winter 2001; Schildkrout 1991; Kreamer 2006; see also Hall 1994; Spiegel 1994) or how Americans view the West of lore (see Dubin 1999a; Wallach 1994)—to cite just two dramatic examples [Note 5].

There was, then, in the 1980s an explosion of new ideas about cultural heritage [Note 6]. Contestation of cultural heritage lay evident before the academic eye, ripe for intervention and interpretation.

The Paradigm Realized

A continuous stream of publications in the 1990s consolidated the Kuhnian paradigm shift toward a socially engaged, politically aware study of the past that regards heritage as contested, recognizes the role of power in the construction of history, focuses on the production of identity, emphasizes representation and performance, and preferentially analyzes formerly colonial states and societies and their subaltern populations. The 1990s also witnessed the creation of new journals dedicated in significant part to expositions within the paradigm, notably *International Journal of Cultural Property* (founded in 1992) and *International Journal of Heritage Studies* (founded in 1994).

The shift in the heritage paradigm was particularly evident in Americanist scholarship for the USA has seen its share of contestation as previously disenfranchised groups have pushed to have their voices heard in the story of America. Two dramatic cases rocked the American archaeological world in the 1990s. They involved the serendipitous discovery of human remains and the resultant claims made by the descendant communities of historically abused minority groups to own and interpret the cultural heritage they argued belonged to them. Another example is Colonial Williamsburg, where the disenfranchised population was historically eliminated from the historical script.

The first case was the conflict over the discovery of an African burial ground in lower Manhattan in 1991, located where a new federal office building was being constructed (see, e.g., Harrington 1993; McCarthy 1996). The African American community of New York City was galvanized by the discovery (as were many others since slavery was not widely known to have been practiced in northern cities). Both the United States Government Services Administration (GSA) and the original contract archaeology team showed insensitivity to the academic let alone immense emotional and cultural significance of the find. Indeed, excavation to remove the burials began without a research design, without communication with the vibrant African American community, and with no African American expert participation in the project. At the time the mayor of New York City was himself African American and he became officially involved. Eventually, the rapid extraction of burials was halted, the contract firm was fired, a new contract firm was hired, and careful excavation of the burials under a sound research program was begun in consultation with African American scholars from Howard University, the premier historically black educational institution of the USA. Notwithstanding the loss of data and ethical tribulations, important information about the African Burial Ground was recovered, the slave remains were reburied, and today a beautiful National Historic Landmark stands as a memorial on this sacred ground.

The problem of contested heritage surrounding the African Burial Ground was serious. The GSA simply did not recognize the site as cultural heritage; the original contract archaeology firm was similarly driven by economics and efficiency. But legitimate stakeholder claims to their cultural heritage triumphed when not just the field project but also the analysis and interpretation were conducted by qualified scholars of the descendant community (see, e.g., Blakey 1998).

The second case concerned the find now known as Kennewick Man. Discovered in 1996 along the Columbia River in Washington state, controversy over the cultural affiliation of the skull ("Caucasian" or Native American Indian but without specific tribal origin; see Owsley and Jantz 2002) led to more than a decade of legal wrangling between archaeologists wanting to study it for its scientific information and Native American groups (supported by many other archaeologists) arguing that in their worldview no issue of ancestral migration into the continent was involved since their cosmology stated they had always been on the land (for a precise summary of the case, see Burke et al. 2008). Whose cultural heritage Kennewick Man was, and who had the moral and legal right to interpret and dispose of the "Ancient One," became enveloped in the recently passed NAGPRA law (see, e.g., Mihesuah 2000), the burst of dialogue between Native American peoples and archaeologists (a handful of whom were themselves Native American) (Bray 2001; Swidler et al. 1997; Watkins 2000; and the 1990s-dominated bibliographies in the previous references; the "Working Together" column in the 1990s *SAA Bulletin*, published by the Society for American Archaeology), and the development of a professional code of ethics by the Society for American Archaeology (Lynott and Wylie 1995).

We can also consider the ramifications of the paradigm at Colonial Williamsburg, one of the country's most visited historic places, where the sanitized white representation of pre-Revolutionary War- and Revolutionary War-era Virginia was challenged because the narrative and performance excluded the African slaves who had serviced the fine Georgian homes 200 years earlier. Colonial Williamsburg, a private, (self-professed) patriotic organization administering America's premier remaining colonial town, had to come to grips with the nation's shameful past. The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation implemented, with difficulty, new historical scripts acknowledging class distinctions and, especially, the existence of slavery (Handler and Gable 1997). But the "Other Half" optional tour through Colonial Williamsburg was not without its own contestation as tourists (black and white) accepted and rejected the facts and enactments put before them (Handler and Gable 1997). Most notorious was the controversy that arose in 1999 when Colonial Williamsburg innovated a slave auction, as would have happened in its era.

> Enslaving Virginia weaves the shameful history of human bondage into the fabric of storytelling at Williamsburg, underscoring a Revolution fought for the liberty of some, but not all. This edgy new representation of Colonial life casts costumed actors as slave leaders and slave owners while paying tourists find themselves in the roles of slaves.
>
> The reenactments are so realistic that some audience members have attacked the white actors in the slave patrol, who have had to fight to keep their decorative muskets. And when some early performances drove young children to tears, Williamsburg added "debriefing" sessions afterward to help calm them.
>
> One visitor even attempted to lead his own revolt against the slave handlers. "There are only three of them and a hundred of us!," he yelled. The actors had to step out of character to restrain him.
>
> At an attraction that historically has appealed almost exclusively to whites, the skits have stoked particularly strong emotions among African Americans, some of whom welcome frank discussion of a topic often given short shrift, even as they and others are discomfited by repeated images of subjugation. Several black actors have refused to portray slaves because they find it demeaning and emotionally wrenching. (Eggen 1999: A1)

Writing before Handler and Gable (1997) published their study of Colonial Williamsburg, Mondale (1994:17) generalized that "the intentionally preserved past (under the sponsorship of private and public agencies) is much more likely to conserve history as an amenity and an objet d'art, as quaintspace, than as an elemental, almost desperate struggle for shared meaning." His statement was prescient in its correct characterization of Colonial Williamsburg. And it anticipated current debates about the impacts of inscribing sites on UNESCO's World Heritage List, a topic requiring separate treatment.

Recovering an excluded past may be as difficult as including it. This is what we saw above concerning the controversy over representing slavery (and see Dann and Seaton 2002). Tunbridge and Ashworth addressed this issue by introducing the important concept of "dissonant heritage": "the heritage creation process is controversial in a number of respects. ...The idea of dissonance ... keeps at the forefront the ideas of discrepancy and incongruity. Dissonance in heritage involves a discordance or lack of agreement and consistency... [Also, the concept implies] a state of psychic tension caused by the simultaneous holding of mutually inconsistent attitudes or the existence of a lack of consonance between attitudes and behaviour... [Dissonance] is intrinsic to the nature of heritage... At its simplest, all heritage is someone's heritage and therefore logically not someone else's" (1996:20–21) (see also Meskell 2002:566).

Mondale (1994) takes a broad view on the issue of the "problematic past" and its conservation in the sense of remembrance, inclusion, and commemoration. He indicates the conundrums of "what to remember and what to forget. Selecting particular pasts to conserve is necessarily a matter of continuous negotiations among all interested parties" (Mondale 1994:15). Bruner (1996) provides us with a particularly compelling example from Ghana where the expectations of African American tourists concerning slave history at its source differ from Ghanaians' interest in the larger sweep of their history in which the dungeons of Elmina Castle (where slaves were held prior to their forced embarkation to the New World) played just one part. African American cultural heritage necessarily is different from Ghanaian and what emerges from the engagement are conflicting interpretations, contested claims of narrative ownership, and administratively enforced differentiation of patterns of site usage. Elmina Castle has multiple stakeholders and the process of history building is ongoing.

Indeed, cultural heritage may be very painful or troublesome, depending on the group you belong to, resulting in contestation of history and heritage. Lennon and Foley's (2000:46–65) treatment of the Nazi death camps in Poland exemplifies this: Jewish pain, enduring Polish anti-semitism. We could readily consider the struggle between multiple parties over Ground Zero in New York City as another example. Sather-Wagstaff (2009) cogently presents its transformation into a tourist attraction, while Meskell (2002) anticipates its transformation into a heritage site; these processes are occurring as economic developers and various municipal, state, and national authorities seek to impose their differing visions on this sacralized terrain.

In their introduction to *The Excluded Past*, MacKenzie and Stone (1994:1) are concerned with "the struggles that take place between subordinated groups who

seek access to, and a re-evaluation of, their past, and those who wish to deny them this goal" and why exclusion and omission happen. Forces of discriminatory ideology, power, social fabric, custom, and religious dogma may be responsible, among other factors. Typically, exclusion is directed at minority groups in a society. But an indigenous majority may be similarly dispossessed as was the case, for instance, in Zimbabwe (Pwiti and Ndoro 1999; see chapter by Larkin).

At its worst the exclusion of heritage leads to violence—violence toward cultural heritage that in the act of destruction of inanimate objects implicates loss of human life. Sadly, too many examples can be given, for example, the 1992 destruction of the Babri Masjid (mosque) in Ayodhya, India, by Hindu militants, which provoked riots across the subcontinent in which more than 2,000 people were killed. Hindus claimed that the mosque (built in 1528) was constructed over the temple site where Lord Rama was born. The Muslim destruction of the Hindu shrine (real or conceived) in 1528 assumed extraordinary significance four and half centuries later when fueled by particular contingencies (see discussion in Johnson-Roehr 2008; see also Dalrymple 2005; compare to the current struggle over Spain's Great Mosque of Cordoba: see Ruggles in this volume). Within the literature Bernbeck and Pollock's 1996 paper on the Ayodhya tragedy particularly interests me because their argument is phrased very much in terms of the archaeological literature of the time, with an emphasis on the linkages between archaeology, ethnicity, nationalism, and identity (see, e.g., Arnold 1990; Chapman 1994; Kohl and Fawcett 1995; Rowlands 1994; Schmidt and Patterson 1995; Shennan 1989; Smith 1989; also see Jones 1997, which was published the next year, and Meskell 1998, which was published the year after).

In addition to Ayodhya (Lal 2001; Sharma 2001), mention can be made of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974 (Jansen 2005 and Knapp; Antoniadou 1998) and the Balkans War in 1991–1995 (Barakat et al. 2001; Chapman 1994; Sulc 2001), each replete with massive destruction of the cultural monuments and materials as well as human lives. It is small wonder that archaeologists remain engaged with contested heritage (see especially Golden 2004).

A different kind of violence in the contestation of cultural heritage has occurred in Britain, leading to a novel proposal by archaeologist Barbara Bender (1998) that is intellectually grounded in the paradigm shift I have been discussing. In 1985 (see Chippendale 1986) and again in 1988, there were violent clashes at Stonehenge (England's premier World Heritage Site) between New Age Druid cultists (accompanied by assorted others) and the site-protecting police. Since the mid-1970s "wierdos" (*sic*: Bender 1998:127) had been holding a Free Festival at Stonehenge, eventually attracting as many as 50,000 people. When police acted to evict these appropriators so as to protect the site from damage and, in Bender's opinion, acting on behalf of "English Heritage and the parts of the Establishment to promote a socially empty view of the past in line with modern conservative sensibilities" (1998:131), world heritage came into conflict—not just contestation over meaning—with a new group of stakeholders holding their own, non-archaeological, non-scientific interpretation of the great monument. Bender's remarkable mitigation of the struggle over use of the site was to create a "Stonehenge Belongs To You And Me" mobile exhibition in consultation with a group of free festivalers and

travelers (1998:149). Her goal was to legitimize the different voices in English heritage, rather than conceding all authority to English Heritage itself. Today there is negotiated access to the site (Darvill 2007; Stone 2008).

Amidst the many archaeological case studies of contested cultural heritage being produced in the 1990s, there were also important contributions from cultural anthropology (including the study by Handler and Gable discussed above). Several of Edward Bruner's studies are particularly noteworthy. In addition to Elmina Castle discussed above (Bruner 1996), Bruner (1993) studied New Salem, Illinois, where Abraham Lincoln lived for 6 years (1831–1837) as a young man, long before the apotheosis of the Civil War. Illinoisans claim New Salem as the place that transformed Lincoln into the figure he became as an adult—apocryphal New Salem is folded into the "Lincoln legend." Scholars argue that the tourist-impelled interpretation of Lincoln in the town is greatly exaggerated and inaccurate. Thus, New Salem is a contested site where history and popular interpretation of Abraham Lincoln clash.

Bruner's (Bruner and Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1994) study of Maasai tourism in Kenya interrogates another kind of contested heritage—that desired by tourists who come to Mayers Ranch to see the enactment of "a colonial drama of the savage pastoral Maasai and the genteel British" and participate in a simulacrum of former colonial privilege. The Maasai performers who participate in the show manipulate social relationships with their white patrons and tourists so as to use their traditions to their own advantage, notably to earn money with which to live and propagate a Maasai way of life out of the view of tourists and their handlers.

Michael Herzfeld's (1991) influential study of the contest for ownership and interpretation of the past on Crete is fascinating because the actors in the conflict are all Cretan, consisting of local people in a formerly Venetian town (Rethemnos) pitted against the bureaucracy in charge of historic preservation. At issue is local, lived heritage ("social time") versus the officially privileged architectural heritage of the thirteenth through seventeenth centuries ("monumental time"), and the disputed ownership of history.

Michel-Rolph Trouillot has provided another holistic theoretical framework for understanding how power operates in the production and documentation of history. In so doing he explained the dynamics of heritage contestation:

> ... historical production occurs in many sites. But the relative weight of these sites varies with context... History is always produced in a specific historical context. (1995:22) ... History as a social process involves people in three distinct capacities: 1) as *agents* or occupants of structural positions; 2) as *actors* in constant interface with a context; and 3) as *subjects*, that is, as voices aware of their vocality (1995:23) ... differential exercise of power ...makes some narratives possible and silences others (1995:25) ... Power is constitutive of the story ... power itself works together with history (1995:28) ... facts are not created equal: the[ir] production ... is always also the creation of silences. (1995:29) (emphasis in the original)

We clearly see these factors at work in the contributions to this volume (see below).

Apprehending Contested Heritage in the New Millennium

The new millennium is seeing an ever growing and diversifying interest in the field of heritage studies. This is readily apparent in a rich crop of authored and edited volumes and in the need of the field for more topical publication venues, thus generating *Public Archaeology* (founded in 2000), *Journal of Social Archaeology* (founded in 2001), *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship* (founded in 2003), *Archaeologies. Journal of the World Archaeological Congress* (founded in 2005), and *Heritage Management* (founded in 2008).

Several principal focuses have emerged dominant amidst the suite of issues I have identified above in my survey of the literature from the previous decades. There is significant overlap and cross-cutting in my categories below, which certainly can be reconfigured differently, but all instantiate contestation of heritage—inevitable because of heritage's intimate association with identity in its multiple domains of performance. Indeed, virtually the entire contents of the journal *Archaeologies* (see above) are devoted to critical contestations. As Ashworth et al. (2007:2, 3) recognize, "The inevitable outcome is that conflicts of interest are an inseparable accompaniment to heritage as practice and process... open to constant revision and change and [heritage] is also both a source and a repercussion of social conflict."

Based on the larger field of heritage scholarship concerning or invoking contestation, I would suggest the following as some of the major arenas of investigation evident in the new literature: (1) manufacture, marketing and consumption of heritage; (2) foreign ownership of trafficked illegal antiquities from source countries; (3) public outreach by heritage personnel (archaeologists, historians, museums, etc.) to previously disenfranchised stakeholder groups; (4) the concept of "value" including questions about UNESCO's actions in the work of cultural heritage; (5) local and national deployments of cultural heritage in a global world; (6) heritage and politics; (7) intangible heritage; (8) intersections of heritage with human and cultural rights (this issue is expressly addressed in Silverman and Ruggles 2007a [see also Ruggles and Silverman 2009b] and will not be further considered here, being a topic exceeding the scope of the volume at hand; this particular field is likely going to explode in importance in coming years [Note 7]).

Manufacture, Marketing, and Consumption of Heritage

Significantly increased world tourism has led to the outright marketing of major historic and archaeological sites by their national and international promoters, bringing more issues of consumption and contestation of heritage into play. Rowan and Baram's (2004) edited volume focuses on marketing heritage and consuming the past. I note two chapters in particular concerning the outright promotion of archaeological sites for the purpose of attracting tourist revenue. Ardren (2004) observes that the so-called Maya Riviera is crowded with Maya-themed hotels but the Maya people staffing the mass tourism industry receive poor wages and work in less than ideal conditions. And insofar as actual native Maya communities are concerned,

there is little economic benefit from the massive ancient heritage industry. Addison (2004) demonstrates that road signage in Jordan, a Moslem country rich in Islamic monuments, effaces that heritage from the tourist landscape by directing travelers almost exclusively to Christian sites. "It is not that the [Islamic] sites are unsigned. Every one of the Islamic holy sites, even in the most remote villages, is signed, but the signs are never visible from the heavily traveled tourist roads" (Addison 2004:238). Not only does the Jordanian heritage bureaucracy invest most heavily in Christian sites, favoring them over Islamic sites in terms of preservation, but also "Islamic heritage—history, religion, pilgrimage and Muslims themselves— are deliberately obscured from Western visitors" (Addison 2004:245). Addison believes that this Jordanian policy was influenced by the "eagerly awaited influx of millennium-minded Christian tourists" expected to appear in the year 2000. For this reason (among others), Jordan deliberately effaced its own national identity "and in particular its Islamic heritage" (Addison 2004:246). Of course, as Addison points out, the year 2000 was immediately followed by the September 11 attack and the second Palestinian intifada in 2001. Tourism to Jordan plunged. In response, "tourists must be courted into a landscape as free as possible of any hint of threat or discomfort. . . the Hashemite regime in particular has worked overtime to configure itself as a secular, Western-identified state" (Addison 2004:246).

AlSayyad's (2001) *Consuming Tradition, Manufacturing Heritage. Global Norms and Urban Forms in the Age of Tourism* is an important contribution identifying the commodification of traditional and historic environments for the purpose of tourism under the global regime. "[N]ations, regions and cities have utilized and exploited vernacular built heritage to attract international investors at a time of ever-tightening global economic competition. . . the tourist industry has introduced new paradigms of the vernacular and/or traditional, based on the production of entire communities and social spaces that cater almost exclusively to the 'other' " (AlSayyad 2001:vii).

Additional studies substantiate AlSayyad's statement. Shepherd (2009), for instance, gives multiple examples from China—for instance the newly renamed town of Shangri-La in northern Yunnan Province, which directly alludes to James Hilton's utopia. Meskell (2005) critiques the performance of ancient Egypt at the Pharaonic Village in Cairo. I have noted the Mochica Village that has been created on the grounds of the Royal Tombs of Sipán Museum in Lambayeque, Peru (Silverman 2005). Magnoni et al. (2007) demonstrate the enfolding of the ancient Maya landscape with the contemporary heterogeneous Maya in the production— by indigenous peoples as well as national tourism offices and the economic forces of globalization—of *El Mundo Maya* for the *Ruta Maya* tourist circuit (discussed below) (see also Ford, this volume) [Note 8]. Mortensen (2009) uses the phrase "creating Copán" to express the effort of the tourism "industry" (*sensu strictu*) to manufacture a tourist product in the context of a global commodity chain linking "the flows of people, technology, goods, capital and services between countries and regions" (Mortensen 2009:180).

Kelli Ann Costa (2004) has dealt with the organization of tourism and presentation of historic sites in Ireland. Her follow-up book, *Coach Fellas* (Costa 2009),

specifically considers Irish tour bus drivers who simultaneously perform as guides and are the crucial element in branding "people and place" as distinctively and authentically Irish. However, as she demonstrates, that vision of heritage contrasts with realities of contemporary Irish economic development.

Philip Duke's (2007) monographic study of tourism on Crete is especially interesting for its detailed observations of which archaeological sites are visited, what their condition is, if they are managed, and how foreign tourists encounter the Minoan past. As with Herzfeld's (1991) study of the more recent Venetian period Cretan past, locals are not sufficiently consulted in issues pertaining to the cultural heritage. Duke laments that "locals must continuously contest their access to the past of their own island, a past that is largely defined by academics, government bureaucrats, and the tourist industry" (2007:62). As interesting is Duke's observation that the larger—in terms of tourist numbers—draw of Crete is not its prehistory but its magnificent beaches. Duke cites a study by two tourism specialists who conducted an economic analysis in 2005 in which they analyzed what would make Crete's two most important archaeological attractions—Knossos and the Iraklio Museum—more appealing to tourists, since archaeological sites were not being sufficiently exploited as a resource. Their study advocated provision of amenities at the sites, "such as restaurants and audiovisual equipment." Duke criticizes their study for emphasizing "the means of delivery rather than the contents of the message itself," in other words, "the past has been coopted by the tourist industry" (2007:64).

Kreutzer's (2006) analysis of the economics of archaeological heritage management brings into focus the contest between archaeologists and developers working with income-seeking national governments. This is an issue familiar to Andeanists, for at various times in the past decade or so plans have been floated in Peru to privatize the more spectacular components of this country's remarkable precolumbian landscape. In Cuzco such plans have sometimes prompted mass protests. I have written about the resentment in Cuzco concerning entrance fees at particular monuments of the official tourist circuit, which inhibit or dissuade locals from enjoying their own cultural heritage, and the problem of "museumification," which generates an ongoing struggle between residents, municipal authorities, the private sector, and the global tourism industry (Silverman 2006a). Kreutzer recognizes the key issue: "The economics of privatisation policies threaten to disenfranchise the public from its own past" (2006:53). Appadurai takes a more general approach to the economics of the past: "The past is a scarce resource because its construction is subject to cultural as well as material constraints" (2007:48). He suggests that the economy governing the production of the past be examined.

A promising strategy for the future relationship between economics and cultural heritage was presented by Jeff Morgan, founder of the Global Heritage Fund (GHF), in his interview with Brian Williams on Fox News on September 28, 2009 as part of the channel's G20 meeting coverage [Note 9]. GHF works through partnerships with foreign governments and private entities (such as businesses, individual entrepreneurs, NGOs). Over the past 7 years that GHF has been in existence (it was founded by Mr. Morgan in 2002), it has invested $15 million in projects; my understanding is that these monies have been matched in the destination countries. In the

interview Mr. Morgan addressed the potential for cultural tourism to help developing countries, since making sites accessible necessarily involves development such as road building and other infrastructural improvements of the kind governments are expected to provide. Mr. Morgan argued that investment in showcase archaeological sites can help people living in poor countries (where individual income is "$2/day") by boosting those countries' economies through cultural tourism to the sites. For instance, he noted that Guatemala receives $400 million/year from Tikal. (It would be interesting to know what Guatemala does with that money.) Mr. Morgan advocates capacity building of governments and local communities. He is hopeful that GHF "can elevate the global crisis of our endangered heritage, and offer positive solutions for preservation and community development." The former goal is obvious: stop looting, stop uncontrolled development that destroys archaeological sites, stop destruction of the environment in which the targeted site is located. The latter goal is the one with which archaeologists, especially, have been concerned within the framework of "public outreach" as I discuss below. Most striking is the inclusion of cultural heritage preservation, as promoted by GHF, in the framework of the G20's global economic concerns and policies. This is dramatic testimony not just to the extraordinary power-brokering ability of Mr. Morgan and GHF's already impressive track record, but to the truly global significance of the marketing and consumption of cultural heritage—i.e., tourism—ideally with concomitant positive social, economic, and political development. But therein lies the proverbial rub for it is not a given that all domains will perceive widely shared positive results. Such outcomes must be specifically programmed.

Illegal Antiquities, Ownership, and Nationalism

Archaeologists have been concerned with looting and its resultant trafficking in illegal antiquities for quite some time. Following passage of UNESCO's 1970 "Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property," the *Journal of Field Archaeology* pioneered, in its very first issue in 1974, a regular feature column called "The Antiquities Market. News and Commentary on the Illicit Traffic in Antiquities." The goal of this section was stated to be "the proper recovery and the protection of antiquities." But at this time concern with looting and trafficking was largely academic and abstract: for archaeologists the pathology was the loss of context with which to reconstruct ancient civilizations; for UNESCO the issue was glibly glossed as "universally recognized" "respect" for the cultural heritage of "all nations" as well as nations respecting their own cultural heritage as a "basic element [of] national culture." Deeper analysis was missing on the role of certain material culture in the performance and reproduction of identity within societies and in the construction of nationalism.

Particularly with the Native American Indian empowerment movement in the USA, ultimately culminating in NAGPRA in 1990, interest in illegal antiquities expanded to encompass the role of ethnographic as well as ancient material culture

in the societies from which it was being removed. *The Ethics of Collecting Cultural Property* (Messenger 1989) was a state-on-the-art volume reflecting the broadened concerns of the time: Whose culture? Whose property? In a more recent volume, Brown (2003) has been explicit about the contestation of cultural heritage inherent in too many dealings between indigenous peoples/communities and the empowered establishment, across the realms of intellectual property rights, intangible heritage, and land. Hollowell (2009) presents a highly nuanced discussion of legal looting for in her case study there is a contestation of cultural heritage in the mind of every Native person on St. Lawrence Island who chooses to dig on community land so as to recover artifacts that can be sold to art dealers. "Diggers often felt emotionally torn between selling a unique object and wanting it to stay on the island. … In spite of their alienability, artifacts remained important cultural symbols for St. Lawrence Islanders" (Hollowell 2009:225).

It is not just "peoples" who seek the return of and/or control over their own cultural heritage. Countries—understood as those entities seated at the United Nations—increasingly in this decade are seeking the repatriation of particular objects. These countries are usually in the developing world, but not always (for instance Greece—see below—is a member of the European Union). We should be interested in *why* countries want to exercise their "right to those cultural properties which form an integral part of their cultural heritage and identity (i.e., their 'national patrimony')" (Warren 1989:8) and *how* those objects or cultural properties are manipulated in discourse and actuality.

Greece's dispute is only one of various involving source countries in the context of nationalism, tourism, and a coveted stake on the world stage (Greenfield 2007). Egypt seeks the return of the Bust of Nefertiti from the Berlin Museum and the Rosetta Stone from the British Museum, iconic objects that are huge tourist draws to their respective museums (see discussion in chapter by Ikram); indeed, in October 2009 Egypt announced it had cut all cooperation with France's Louvre Museum until it secures the return of its Pharaonic materials housed there. Nigeria wants to repatriate the Bénin bronzes from the British Museum (Greenfield 2007:124–128; see also Coombes 1994). Of particular interest are the series of Web articles by Dr. Kwame-Opoku (e.g., 2008) in which he argues, "How do a people remember their history when the records have been stolen by another State? The human rights of the African peoples… are being violated by this persistent and defiant refusal to return cultural objects [that] were not produced by the Europeans and Americans and were not meant for their use. Such a refusal also violates the freedom of religion in so far as many of the stolen African objects, for instance … the Benin altars … are necessary for the traditional practice of beliefs… Most of these objects should have been returned when the African countries gained Independence in the 1960s. The refusal to return the objects relating to power and culture is a denial of the right to self-determination." Peru is still embroiled in legal wrangling with Yale University over the repatriation of Hiram Bingham's collections from Machu Picchu, Peru's most famous archaeological site (Lubow 2007 *inter alia*). Eliane Karp-Toledo (2008), wife of Peru's former president, Alejandro Toledo, wrote in an Op-Ed piece for *The New York Times*, "I fail to understand the rationale for Yale to have any historical

claim to the artifacts. . . .The agreement reflects a colonial way of thinking . . . I won-
der if it is pure coincidence that Yale delayed negotiations with Toledo, Peru's first
elected indigenous president, until Peru had a new leader [Alan García, the current
president] who is frankly hostile to indigenous matters. Why is it so hard for Yale
to let go of these collections. . . Yale must finally return the artifacts that symbolize
Peru's great heritage." Inca heritage and the precolumbian past have been funda-
mental in the construction of the imagined community called the Peruvian nation
(e.g., Silverman 1999, 2002b). And the list goes on.

The massive looting of the Iraq National Museum in April 2003 is widely
acknowledged to have been undertaken for profit rather than symbolic cultural era-
sure (Brodie 2006; Polk and Schuster 2005; Rothfield 2009; Stone and Bajjaly 2008
inter alia; see the more complex argument by Starzmann 2008), nor was looting
restricted to the museum (see Rothfield 2008). Nationalism, however, came into play
with the (quasi) reopening of the museum in Baghdad in 2009, a tangible effort to
reforge the nation in this country with a long history of implication of archaeology in
nation building (see Bernhardsson 2005 for an excellent survey). As reported widely
in the international press, the reopening was controversial within Iraq with various
factions (politicians, Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Tourism, Shia and Sunni fun-
damentalists) differing on whether the move was premature, whether the museum
had enough security, and if pre-Islamic materials should be exhibited. Nuri al-Maliki
and senior officials were widely quoted as saying that they wished to demonstrate
that the capital was secure and normal life was returning.

Indeed, antiquities need not be mobile for them to be removed from context—
what looting and trafficking do. Violence to the archaeological record reached a
culmination with the complete destruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas by the Taliban
in Afghanistan in 2001, which was televised and condemned globally. As a warring
party and de facto government, the Taliban contravened the 1954 Hague Convention,
which seeks to protect monuments in times of violent conflict. This tangible and
symbolic act was the most dramatic contestation of cultural heritage yet seen, for
it simply denied and erased a block of time (everything pre-Islamic) as heritage at
all. The Taliban asserted ownership over that cultural heritage, which it denied as
heritage, and the right to dispose of it. Taking place in a country without a descen-
dant community (there are no Buddhists in Afghanistan), the destruction also was a
contestation of the right of the international community—including UNESCO—to
intervene in foreign soil and to assert humankind's ownership of the world's cul-
tural heritage, defined universally, but, of course, from a Western perspective (see
Meskell 2002:564).

Public Outreach

One of the most dramatic changes in the heritage field has been in the area of public
outreach, a catch-all term I will use here to encompass a range of practices such as
interpretation, educational dissemination, civic engagement, community develop-
ment projects—basically, everything that would fall within the purview of applied

anthropology. The clearest evidence of the change can be seen in a story told by Paul Shackel about an old, mud-coated sign, dating to the mid-1970s, that he found on the grounds of Harpers Ferry National Park: "Yes—we are archaeologists. Yes—we are doing archaeology. Please do not disturb us." (Shackel 2002:157). No longer does that attitude obtain.

Public outreach is manifested in sensitivity to stakeholders, whether they are a descendant community or non-related neighbors living in proximity to something that has been identified as "heritage" (on the latter, see Atalay 2007 for an especially interesting study). That label of "heritage" may spring from what Smith (2006) has called "authorized heritage discourse" (top-down), or the assertion of heritage may be locally generated (bottom-up). Public outreach is a decision by authorities (be they archaeologists or others) to relinquish exclusive control of the past and to transcend the purely academic or self-serving results of research.

Although still not widely enough accepted let alone enacted (see, e.g., McManamon 2000), this new model of *présent-ing* the past surged into the mainstream of heritage practice over the course of the 1990s and into the current century (see, e.g., Lynott and Wylie 1994; Watkins et al. 2000; Little 2002; Derry and Malloy 2003; Shackel and Chambers 2004; Silverman 2006b; Little and Shackel 2007). Smith and Wobst (2005:6) write, "Traditionally, archaeology has been done 'on' not 'by,' 'for,' or 'with' Indigenous peoples. . . . these groups are in disadvantaged positions in comparison to the dominant populations. Especially in developing countries, they are those people whose voices are the least likely to be heard."

A significant amount of applied research has been conducted by Australians "on" and more recently "with" the Aboriginal people of this continent. The scholars involved are deeply committed to assisting and enabling the Aboriginals to defend their land rights and customs in what has been a centuries-long contestation of indigenous culture versus a hostile dominant Anglo society. Flood (1989) provides a succinct summary of the development of cultural heritage legislation through the beginning of meaningful collaborations between white scholars and Aboriginal stakeholders. Yet the secondary title of her paper—"the development of cultural resource management in Australia"—is markedly different in its abstraction (one might say "objectification") from the wording chosen in more recent works. Lilley and Williams (2005) are open about the skepticism and open hostility of Aboriginal peoples toward archaeology and anthropology. They recognize that Aboriginals may perceive complicity in the study of their past in perpetuating colonial subjugation and that the "fight by non-Indigenous people against racism and human rights abuses is a form of paternalism" (Lilley and Williams 2005:228). They advocate "mutuality in a difficult postcolonial milieu" (2005:230): "equitable and mutually beneficial working relationships between archaeologists and Indigenous people, and on that basis help . . . advance the development of a tolerant, just, and open society. . .recognize . . . the need of all parties (. . . 'stakeholders') to come to grips with the past so they can make sense of the present and head more confidently into the future" (2005:234).

McNiven and Russell take the stakeholder argument one step further in a position that bores deepest into the uncomfortable contestation of cultural heritage between its cultural affiliates and ("good guy") non-affiliate researchers. They write,

> We fundamentally disagree with the stakeholder paradigm and interest-group model. Indigenous peoples are not mere stakeholders in their heritage—they own that heritage and have the right to fully control *if* and how research is undertaken on that heritage. . . . As such, they may wish (or not wish, as the case may be) to have non-Aboriginal guests research their cultural sites on their own terms and conditions. . . . The stakeholder model has appeal among many archaeologists and cultural heritage managers because it facilitates management of archaeological sites and associated conflicts over how such sites should be treated. Under the guise of democratization of the management process, the entire ownership issue is sidestepped and Indigenous peoples are reduced to mere participants in the management of Indigenous sites. (2005:236, emphasis added)

It is not just Indigenous/Aboriginal people who have been disenfranchised. In the USA, African Americans and other minorities have been poorly served in the national interpretation of the past, until recently. Recent examples of empowering outreach toward contested cultural heritage in the context of disenfranchised people include Mullins' (2004, 2007) applied archaeology project in Indianapolis, undertaken at the behest of the stakeholders themselves, that has reclaimed a rich but invisible African American history in a blighted neighborhood (see also Jackson 2009). James Wescoat (2007), a geographer and landscape scholar, describes a major project that has been mitigating Hindu–Muslim tension in a contested shrine at Champaner-Pavagadh in Gujarat, India—ground zero in 2002 of violent conflict—through a clever cultural heritage conservation and ethnic conciliation project.

Activist or to some degree socially engaged scholars are attempting to "do good." But we must recognize that public outreach is rife with tension or its potential. Almost universally, for one group to claim its heritage and desire to manipulate it in some manner to its own benefit will bring it into contestation, even conflict with another group—let alone when some group wishes to act upon a heritage that is not culturally its own. These problematic issues are developed in the case studies presented in the edited volume I have cited above.

Anne Pyburn (2006, 2007) has been sanguine in her assessment of the potential for the scholar himself/herself to be drawn into local/local–national disputes once the Pandora's Box of engagement is opened.

> It is nice [for the archaeologist] to bring wages into a poor village. It may not be nice to undermine the local political order by paying wages and giving power to village factions who oppose the local majority. . . It is also not really nice to tell local people who have been in mortal conflict with their government for generations over their land rights that you have come to take away the ancient altar their ancestors put on the land, so that the government can protect it for them. . . .. Heritage can affect people's life chances in the modern world, and consequently archaeologists cannot be the only arbiters of the past that we hope to reclaim. (2006:264)

Value and UNESCO

With promulgation of the World Heritage Convention (*Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*) in 1972, UNESCO became the foremost heritage authorizer, establishing the ground rules for the 185 signatories (as of June 2008) to this international document. Since its inception, however, scholars have recognized inherent problems in key principles of the document, in addition to obstacles concerning its implementation.

Byrne criticized the western hegemonic aspect of archaeological heritage management, which has been imposed as well as spread by an ideology that takes "universal value" as inherent and that privileges those sites which are "intelligible to the Occidental mind and ... the Western way of experiencing the past" (1991:276). This would explain why 132 states-parties generated World Heritage Sites in only 82 countries as of 1992 (20 years after the Convention was signed) with the disparity largely coming from the non-Western world. Pressouyre worried that the Convention "condemns to oblivion the forms which have not been accepted into the history of civilization and the history of art" (1996:47). The disparity between, especially, European sites on the World Heritage List and sites in non-Western countries continues although UNESCO is striving to diminish the imbalance (see related discussion in Labadi 2007).

Pressouyre identified three types of fundamental contradiction in the World Heritage Convention: "impingement of [national] sovereignty, transfer of sovereignty [as when Germany was unified], properties endangered due to internal conflict [as when Yugoslavia broke up]" (1996:9). He also went on to indicate a contradiction between the Convention's requirement of uniqueness and representativeness (1996:16). For instance, "no absolute masterpiece (neither a Greek temple, nor a Maya pyramid, nor a Hindu pagoda) can pretend to be universally recognized" (1996:18).

Smith has analyzed heritage as a social and cultural practice and process (2006:13) that legitimates particular spokespersons and managers of "the past" (2006:29); "alternative and subaltern ideas about 'heritage' [are undermined]... as a result of the naturalizing effects of ... the 'authorized heritage discourse' " (2006:11). That "authorized heritage discourse" makes heritage innately valuable (2006:29). It is the basic criterion of "outstanding universal value" in the Convention that many find most objectionable because it is both elusive and Western-biased (see, e.g., Cleere 2001; Pomeroy 2005; Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996:21).

Because World Heritage Sites are more prone to attract tourism than other sites (indeed, this may be the key reason why countries compete to have their sites placed on the UNESCO list), another issue of value is implicated in the listing beyond alleged "universal value." It is the value of these sites to stakeholders below the level of UNESCO, the global tourism industry, and the nation-state. What is their value and who decides? We can see this issue played out in microcosm—outside the sphere of World Heritage Sites—in Gordillo's (2009) study of architecturally modest historical sites in northern Argentina. Stakeholder attitudes there ranged from disinterest, to mild curiosity, to antagonism toward the ruins—the latter in terms of

a conflict over preservation versus use of the land for an industry that would provide badly needed jobs versus perceived tourism potential. Four case studies in a recent Getty volume (de la Torre 2005) explore "heritage values" as these impact site management. The Getty studies emphasize preservation of the significance and values of a place/site—to be elicited from various stakeholders replete with the conflicts and contestations that may emerge, such as no value being attached, or symbolic value at odds with potential economic value (on cultural heritage from the point of view of a team of economists, see Hutter and Rizzo 1997).

In an article in a recent issue of *The Economist* ("The Limits of Soft Cultural Power," September 12, 2009, p. 65), the director of the World Heritage Centre says that UNESCO should be protecting not buildings but human values (undefined). But, he continues, "the process breaks down in countries where governance hardly exists. And places where tourism and other economic activities are expanding uncontrollably may also trample on UNESCO's high principles, which seek to preserve the integrity of sites and their surroundings." Responding to the worldviews, politics, economic constraints, and pressures of 185 countries, UNESCO is itself conflicted over its own cultural heritage policies.

A country's nominations to the UNESCO World Heritage List can reflect conflicts over cultural heritage at home. Mexico is a case in point. In a fascinating study Bart van der Aa (2005) has analyzed Mexico's 22 World Heritage Sites in terms of their antiquity (precolumbian, colonial, post-colonial) and nature. He is able to demonstrate a careful, deliberate balance practiced by Mexico in nominating, almost in tandem, one archaeological site and one historic site each year beginning with the first nomination in 1987. Such a pattern cannot be coincidental and van der Aa relates it to the particularities of Mexico's official construction of national identity which overtly privileges "mestizo," the combination of indigenous and Spanish. He sees each of the identities comprising Mexico's official national identity as contested. Indigenous people are still at the bottom of the social ladder notwithstanding the nation's appropriation of the greatest of their centers (he does not develop the argument further, but it would be in government and private architecture, marketing for tourism, and so on). Those people descended from the Spanish conquistadores are tainted by the brutality of the conquest and conversion to Catholicism. Since the Mexican Revolution that which is "pure Spanish" has been officially de-emphasized or denied in favor of the hybrid culture. Inasmuch as under conditions of globalization, in which UNESCO participates, it is important for all countries to be represented on the World Heritage List for the marketing of national identity, Mexico has chosen to value sites representing the diverse components of its history. Furthermore, Mexico has now added a group of post-colonial sites to the Tentative List submitted to UNESCO. While one may certainly question the "outstanding universal value" of the Rivera and Kahlo Museum or the railway station at Aguascalientes (among other Tentative List sites), it is very interesting that Mexico, unlike the vast majority of states-party to the World Heritage Convention, is moving its concept of cultural heritage into the present era, seeing it as dynamic and in process. Van der Aa (2005:140) makes the important observation that heritage selection has a temporal character (i.e., nominations are a product of their

contemporary times). Mexico is undertaking "an orientation *towards* new kinds of heritage that might represent 'real' Mexicanness. It is, at the same time, a movement *away from* the former, one-sided, stress on pre-colonial and colonial heritage" (van der Aa 2005:141, emphasis in original).

Finally, UNESCO faces contestation of its own "universal" authority and the value of its product. Two high-profile, efficient, private, heritage-protecting organizations with politically unencumbered budgets and personnel—World Monuments Fund and GHF—conduct surgically effective interventions around the world (see GHF discussion above). And, in 2009, the Cotsen Institute of Archaeology at University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) launched a "Sustainable Preservation Initiative," directed by Lawrence Coben, which seeks to move heritage work further into the field of social responsibility through its explicit attention to stakeholder communities under the slogan "Saving Sites By Transforming Lives."

Local, National, International, and Global Intersections

Smith and Wobst (2005:6) have argued, "More and more decisions that affect Indigenous peoples and their communities are made at the global level, far away from local realities….often Indigenous peoples have neither voice nor representation in the global decision-making that affects their lives. Archaeologists have a responsibility to facilitate Indigenous voices [and] enable the voices of Indigenous peoples to be heard and inform decision-making at the global level." Silberman (1995:257) has incisively argued that "the archaeology of every new nation addresses *both* a domestic and an international audience." Today, tensions in the local, national, international, and global interface lie at the heart of contested cultural heritage. This fact is precisely apprehended by Lisa Breglia:

> For regional and national institutions charged with preserving and promoting culture, heritage comprises material spaces of intervention, such as archaeological ruins, used to produce symbolic meanings that forge identity, belonging, and community at regional and national levels…. Cultural heritage sites are key accoutrements of the … state as an 'imagined community'… But their material and symbolic significance does not stop at the nation's territorial borders. Cultural heritage sites are sites of international interest for tourism and conservation/preservation interests, as well as for academic researchers. (2009:61)

One of the most stunning cases of the intersection of local, national, international, and global interests in cultural heritage occurred in 1997 when 58 foreign tourists were massacred at the Temple of Hatshepsut, just outside the Valley of the Kings, in Luxor, Egypt. This was not purely a barbarism of fundamentalist Islam. The pathologies leading to the massacre had begun decades before with the Egyptian government's attempt to remove and resettle the local population in Gourna, whose homes sat over ancient tombs, which the Gournis had been looting for generations if not centuries (Fathy 1969; Mitchell 2001). Architect Hassan Fathy's plan to provide the Gournis with better housing in New Gourna, a town of his own creation, was resisted by the populace ("Even the peasant is slow to take an interest in proposals

for bettering his condition. He is apathetic and dumb, he has no education, no conception of national affairs, no status. He does not believe that he can help himself or make himself heard." [Fathy 1969]) and delayed by officialdom ("cooperating with the bureaucracy is like wading through a bog. . . we are all at the mercy of a system of official procedure that everybody hates" [Fathy 1969]) (see Mitchell 2001).

Meskell (2005) and Mitchell (2001, 2002) brought Fathy's tale of the two towns up to date, beginning in 1991 when Egypt began to aggressively pursue tourism in the context of liberalization and privatization. The same conflict between tradition and modernity that Fathy railed against came into play once more, with tourism being "a means to modernization, transforming its heritage into a tourist product and profit-making capital" (Meskell 2005:131; Mitchell 2002:250, n.14:362–363). Most Gournis have not wanted to leave their homes and move to New Gourna, not in Fathy's era and not since then (Mitchell 2001:217–218). The Egyptian government (backed by ICOMOS, the World Bank, USAID, see Meskell 2005:133–134; Mitchell 2001:222) has not wanted them to loot or intrude on the "past perfect" image of the west bank of the Nile River. In the 1990s the effort to evict the Gournis was "linked not just to arguments about archaeological preservation, but to demands to create a proper tourist experience. National heritage is now to be shaped by the forces and demands of a worldwide tourist industry" (Mitchell 2001:228). Gournis have made money, in varying degrees, from the tourism industry (directed at a pre-Islamic past that they do not necessarily claim as their own; see discussion in Meskell 2003) while being captive to its fluctuations. The attack was as much a protest against Cairo as it was against the West. The ancient Egyptian temple was the ideal vehicle for the murderers to assert their claims.

Recent studies of contemporary Maya populations in Central America also have emphasized multi-scalar antagonisms. Mortensen (2007) has written about the disparate treatment of the idolized ancient Maya and their downtrodden descendants in Copán, Honduras. The "ancient Maya have been transformed through archaeology and tourism into a valuable worldwide commodity" (Mortensen 2007:135), whereas the history of the larger number of non-Maya indigenous people and those populations themselves are officially marginalized. Nor is the situation of the contemporary Maya much better. Frühsorge (2007) considers pan-Maya activism in Guatemala with regard to particular Maya groups and with regard to the state. Since the end of the civil war in Guatemala in 1996, heritage claims to spectacular Maya sites and sacred landscapes are contested by the lowland indigenous Maya and highland Ladino elite (who assert Maya and indigenous descent). As Frühsorge recognizes, there are tensions between local and national histories, which are exacerbated by the privileging of the Classic Period Maya.

The living Maya of Mexico also are center stage in recent considerations of local, national, international, and global interconnections. Breglia has analyzed a particular situation on the Yucatán Peninsula, where the local Maya group is so feisty that "they do not even consider themselves to be descendants of the ancient Maya" whose Chunchucmil ruins partially overlap the community's federal land grant (2009:55). Notwithstanding the income earned by community members through participations in six seasons of excavation conducted by Breglia, "few embraced

the archaeological significance of the site [and they had their own] construction of a competing notion of heritage that challenged the nascent archaeological discourse" (Breglia 2009:56). These Maya were concerned with protecting their rights under the national land grant system (*ejido*). Breglia's analysis is exemplary in cautioning archaeologists, state, and international heritage management policy: "While cultural patrimony is linked with the state, national, and international discourses of universal cultural value and 'good' . . . the concept of patrimonio ejidal is a locally constructed and historically embedded concept tied to experiences of . . . debt peonage . . . and the socioeconomic transformations of the rural landscape" (Breglia 2009:57–58). Local people may feel much more inclined, based on experience and knowledge, to stake their future on the land rather than the promises held out to them by tourism development in the global context. The issue is further informed by the Mexican constitution, which gives the nation inalienable rights over archaeological remains rather than individuals or local communities. Thus, Breglia concludes that "distinct regional and even local (site-specific) understandings of Maya cultural heritage exist both in tandem and in tension with the Mexican nationalist discourse on cultural heritage, as well as with the criteria of universal cultural value defined by UNESCO" (2009:60).

The issue of land rights and cultural heritage manifested in archaeological sites (see Breglia above), particularly World Heritage Sites, necessarily creates linkages at all levels of administration, from the local community to UNESCO. Gillespie's (2009) treatment of Angkor provides the maximal case in point. Here, in a region decimated by the murderous Khmer Rouge regime (as occurred throughout Cambodia), some one hundred villages occupy the Archaeological Park. Land is vitally important to these impoverished farmers and is recognized as such by the government "so much so that the concept of security of tenure has become securely ensconced in the country's development rhetoric" (Gillespie 2009:339). The Archaeological Park has been zoned with decreasing degrees of protection emanating out from the high-profile core encompassing 208 sq km in which residential use and commercial development are prohibited. Moreover, Gillespie notes an "apparent lack of community consultation on issues, particularly that of security of tenure for residents within the Park" (2009:345). Although management of Angkor is a work in progress, the pressure of tourism must be gaining. I can envision a future situation in which Cambodia is de-mined, new archaeological sites are opened for tourism to relieve pressure on Angkor's monumental core, and farmers under new conditions of political freedom begin to protest for land rights that will earn them immediate tangible benefits rather than the often elusive and inequitably distributed income from tourism. Indeed, Gillespie observes that compensation provisions have been overlooked in the 2001 Land Law, whose Article 5 is basically an eminent domain argument: "No person may be deprived of his ownership [of land] unless it is in the public interest" (cited in Gillespie 2009:347)—and, indeed, UNESCO's concept of "outstanding universal value" is interwoven with the codified idea that World Heritage Sites "*belong* to all peoples of the world, *irrespective* of the territory on which they are located" (http://whc.unesco.org/en/about/, emphasis added). The tangible benefit of World Heritage Sites in developing countries readily

accrues to the national government through tourism income and economic development, usually to regional governments, and certainly to private enterprise. At the local level these benefits may be far less or even missing.

This issue of disparity was a key point of departure for my own project in Cuzco, former capital of the Inca Empire and today Peru's premier tourist destination. Among my goals was to assess local opinion about the benefits of tourism in this World Heritage Site (see, especially, Silverman 2002b, 2006a). I was surprised to find a significant range of public opinion, for where I saw exploitation the local population often saw opportunity—some work is better than no work, basically—notwithstanding an almost uniformly sanguine realization about economic inequities and the loss of social space in the historic center. Indeed, a fundamental theme throughout manifold studies of cultural heritage is the social construction of space and its obligatory counterpart, the contestation of space.

Several fascinating studies about local–national conflict over cultural heritage rights in Bolivia have recently been published. They concern disputes over the transfer of archaeological materials from their point of origin (local, indigenous) to a new place of display (national capital, hispanic, mestizo) and the repatriation of these materials. The most salient case concerns Aymara political mobilization which finally (and recently) culminated in this historically disenfranchised ethnic group gaining control over their ancestral site of Tiwanaku (a World Heritage Site) with tangible and intangible benefits accruing, including the return of the renowned Bennett Monolith of Tiwanaku from a traffic roundabout in La Paz to a new site museum on the altiplano under Aymara control (Scarborough 2008; see also Hastorf 2006:87). At the time (early 1930s), the removal of the Monolith from Tiwanaku, following its discovery, was framed as an act of rescue (protection from the local Aymara inhabitants, regarded as ignorant and destructive), but clearly it also was an appropriation of the indigenous past by a dominant society that had utter disdain for the civilization's descendants (indeed, it was disputed whether the ancestral Aymara had even created Tiwanaku). When the Monolith was finally returned to Tiwanaku and the Aymara, the context of the cultural restitution was one of rising political power for indigenous peoples.

A comparable story is told by Benavides (2004:164–178) concerning a precolumbian Ecuadorian carved monolith, known as San Biritute, which a local community claiming descent from the ancient culture wanted repatriated. It had been removed by force in 1952 and taken to the coastal city of Guayaquil. Now, in 1994, the *comuna* wanted it back and said they'd been trying to get it for decades. For the comuneros the monolith had ritual power, particularly to produce rain. In Guayaquil the archbishop wanted it put in a museum, not returned to the community where it could generate cultism. The conservative mayor of Guayaquil agreed and the monolith is exhibited in the museum where it can be seen but not worshiped. This struggle between a rural community and a major city over a precolumbian icon revealed a contest that "has very little to do with historical reasoning per se and much more to do with history's relationship with political authority and power" (Benavides 2004:174–175). Benavides provides other material supporting his overall argument that in Ecuador (as elsewhere) historical representation

plays a fundamental role "in the maintenance and functioning of national political domination" (Benavides 2004:179).

Especially with Gupta and Ferguson's (1992) attention to interconnectedness of space under conditions of human mobility and transnational cultural flows and Appadurai's (1996) discussion of the production of locality, the situation of heritage is yet more complicated. With the realization that we live under conditions of globalization, claims to cultural heritage now involve, among other important aspects, the role of diasporic populations. Hodder writes, "With globalisation 'others' have become less strange and have been imported into all societies as a result of human mobility, migration and tourism" (1998:127). Orser (2007) identified this issue clearly when he wrote about contestations between Irish Americans and the Irish living in Ballykilcline, Ireland over the rights of heritage. Diaspora is at the heart of Bruner's (1996) discussion of African American pilgrimage to slave sites in Ghana (see also Landry, this volume). Moreover, in this age of multiculturalism and in keeping with UNESCO's mantra of world heritage and universal value, all groups can claim what otherwise would be the heritage of others, supported, when necessary, by differing degrees of argumentation and historical legitimacy.

In the Political Arena

Cultural heritage policies and practices are inherently political, lending themselves to manipulation: What is considered heritage? Why? By whom? Why? What is not? Why? What is well managed? Why? What is ignored or erased? Why? What is included in the discourse of nationhood? Why? What is excluded? Why? Who benefits from repatriation or cultural restitution? Why? Earlier and recent literature bear directly on these questions.

In an oft-cited article Appadurai wrote that the past is "collectively held, publicly expressed and ideologically charged. . . versions of the past . . . are likely to vary within the groups that form a society. . . discourse concerning the past between social groups is an aspect of politics, involving competition, opposition and debate" (1981:202). Rafael Samuel, the famous Marxist historian of British urban life, was also concerned with the politics of heritage, writing, "Politically, heritage. . . draws on a nexus of different interests. It is intimately bound up with competition for land use, and struggle for urban space. Whether by attraction or repulsion it is shaped by changes in technology. It takes on quite different meanings in different national cultures, depending on the relationship of the state and civil society, the openness or otherwise of the public arena to initiatives which come from below or from the periphery" (2008:287).

Istanbul is an excellent example of the political aspects of heritage. The city has been a microcosm of Turkey's ethnic mixing for centuries. Bartu (2001) recounts the intersection of heritage politics and urban development through consideration of debates over historic preservation and revitalization of the Pera/Beyoglu district, which was established in the thirteenth century by Genoese traders and functioned as an independent enclave in an otherwise Byzantine context. Under the Ottomans

in the fifteenth century it still maintained its independence and trading preeminence. In the nineteenth century it welcomed native minorities: Jews, Armenians, Greeks. Basically it was the non-Muslim district of the city and it became the most prosperous, progressive, and cosmopolitan. It was the European face of Istanbul and Turkey. When a mayor of Istanbul proposed massive urban renewal plans for Istanbul in the 1980s, to transform it into a global city, debate raged about Pera/Beyoglu. Couldn't it just be demolished since it wasn't *Turkish*? Bartu says, "Such a view demonstrated both the power of the Turkish nationalist project and its ambivalent relationship with Europe" (2001:138). Others defended the district with nostalgia for its glorious past, now run down. Was the district "heritage" and was it worth preserving? The questions surrounding the district became more complicated with the ascendancy of an Islamist municipal government in 1994 for whom Pera/Beyoglu represented cosmopolitan degeneration. Remarkably, though, the new party embraced architectural historic preservation and tolerance. Bartu's study demonstrates how fragile the politics of heritage are, and how amenable to political exploitation cultural heritage is.

Egypt exemplifies similarly entangled plural pasts. "Egypt's effective past is materially that of its Islamic heritage and the more recent European inlay. The Pharaonic past is a political card. It can arouse passionate responses... but it has not effectively become an integral or a predominant element of the materiality of Egyptian life" (Hassan 1998:212). I reached a similar conclusion in my study of the appropriation of the past in the coastal city of Nazca, Peru, famous for its World Heritage Site of giant geoglyphs traced on a vast plain. Although the iconography of the geoglyphs and memorabilia of them are abundantly visible in town, virtually no one draws a cultural connection to the precolumbian past (Silveman 2002b). And in Cuzco, where Inca ancestry is far more tangibly obvious in the built environment, cultural practices, and racial descent of the population, it is the Catholic present that is the material stuff of daily practice; "playing Inca" is basically restricted to those earning a direct income from such performances and to civically prescribed events—notwithstanding the frequent prideful statement among the populace at large of "I am descended from the Incas" (Silverman 2002b).

Dictators, in particular, as strong political actors, have the wherewithal, if so desired, to intervene in cultural heritage programmatically and rapidly. In this volume Higueras discusses Mussolini's actions on the Roman landscape. Gilkes also considers fascist Italy noting that "the fascists in Italy could draw inspiration directly from the everyday environment of the classical remains that littered Italian towns and cities... By overstepping the middle ages and other 'ages of decadence,' the fascists linked themselves to the Romans, whose imperial might and penchant for territorial aggrandizement were exemplars of what could be achieved by the fascist 'new men'" (2006:35).

Italian territorial reach extended to Albania, across the Adriatic Sea, where series of archaeological projects were commissioned to support Mussolini's interpretation of history (Gilkes 2006). Fascist archaeology also crossed the Mediterranean Sea into Libya, where "based on [an] extremely simple view of history, the fascists postulated that in antiquity there would have been large numbers of Latin

immigrants who came to the Tripolitanian part of the Roman province of *Africa Proconsularis*" (Altekamp 2006:63). "As a consequence, the presentation of Roman Tripolitania demanded monumental restoration and reconstruction" (Altekamp 2006:64). Today, cultural heritage in Libya is under the control of a different dictator, Muammar Gaddafi, during whose rule five archaeological sites have been inscribed on UNESCO's World Heritage List: a Roman city (Leptis Magna in 1982), a Phoenician trading post (Sabratha in 1982), a Greek colonial city (Cyrene in 1982), an oasis town (Ghadames in 1988), and a rock art site (Tadrart Acacus in 1985). In the week-long celebration of Ghaddafi's 40-year reign, events were held at the four World Heritage List (WHL) built sites as well as in Tripoli. This use of ancient sites for political reinforcement, of course, is not uncommon—the Shah of Iran held a blowout party at Persepolis; Evo Morales of Bolivia and Alejandro Toledo of Peru both took presidential oaths of office at their countries' signature sites, Tiwanaku and Machu Picchu, respectively. Although Ghaddafi does not appear to invest significantly in cultural heritage projects, he is not ideologically adverse to these pre-Islamic sites and draws on them when convenient. To have sites on the World Heritage List is to be a member of the world community. This reality seems not to be lost on dictators worldwide.

Politics and heritage are deeply entwined right now in a high-stakes game for legal international recognition, tourism, and investment in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), today the self-named Republic of Macedonia, versus Greece. On its "Permanent Mission to the United Nations" webpage, Macedonia has coined the slogan "...Cradle of Culture, Land of Nature..." and in Spring 2009 Macedonia launched an exceptionally appealing TV promotional ad, "Macedonia—Timeless" (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fP_bSxRIz-I), immediately contested by an unofficial YouTube response, "Macedonia is Greece" (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fP_bSxRIz-I). Macedonia's appropriation of Alexander the Great as the name of its international airport in Skopje, the capital, is so significant on the international stage that President Obama has been pressured by three hundred academic classicists to urge FYROM "to forego its hero-based focus, since they believe that the inhabitants, who are primarily Slavic-speaking, have no legitimate claim to the heritage of Alexander" (Rose 2009).

Multi-ethnic states face particular challenges (internal and external) in the adjudication and management of their cultural heritage, including that which is extraterritorial. Just as Greece claims that the Republic of Macedonia/FYROM is Greek, with its Slavic population dating to 1,000 years after Alexander the Great, so UNESCO's "efforts to preserve Tibetan cultural sites as examples of tangible world heritage [coincide with] Chinese state policies to strengthen political claims to Tibet through the promotion of cultural and heritage ties between China and Tibet" (Shepherd 2009:57). In 1994 three major sites in Lhasa (Potala Palace, Jokhang Temple, Norbulingka) were listed by UNESCO as a single World Heritage Site ensemble on the World Heritage List, along with China's other World Heritage Sites (cultural, natural, mixed), thus internationally affirming China's control of Tibet while promoting tourism to this already appealing destination and justifying modernization and economic development while reiteratively facilitating

Chinese authority and also the disappearance of authentic Tibetan culture. Shepherd argues convincingly that "UNESCO plays into the ongoing Chinese state project of creating an 'imagined community' across space and through time" (2009:64). UNESCO, which vociferously proclaims itself to be apolitical, is content to attempt to encourage physical preservation of the monuments it has listed as universal world heritage. What China does with that designation, short of actions that would require UNESCO putting Lhasa on the notorious List of World Heritage in Danger, is China's business.

Of particular interest in terms of multi-ethnic states is the agreement between five countries to participate in a mutually beneficial transnational tourist circuit called "La Ruta Maya." The idea was proposed by officials of the National Geographic Society (!) to the governments of Mexico, Guatemala, Belize, Honduras, and El Salvador, each of which accepted. It has been a success most especially for the Central American signatories. Belize, in particular, has benefitted as an English-speaking country now with a significant independent tourism that combines ruins with spectacular beaches (compare with Crete, discussed above). Non-specialized travel agencies offer "Route of the Maya" tours, most typically covering the four smaller countries (Mexico is usually its own trip). Travel brochures emphasize the Maya past and living Maya communities. And here is where a paper by Rosemary Joyce becomes most interesting. In addition to questioning what makes one Maya site worthy of the UNESCO World Heritage designation but not others, and recognizing the intersection of archaeological authority with the global space of tourism and global cultural capital, Joyce (2003) worries that "mayaness" is being used for nation building in countries with multiple ethnic groups. Mayanization deprivileges other ethnic groups, such as the Lenca of western Honduras. Indeed, it is an accident of political borders that Copán is in Honduras rather than Guatemala as it is so near that border, just south of Quirigua, and so unlike the rest of Honduras' archaeological record. Cooperative international politics among countries that in the past have sometimes fought wars with each other have produced, in association with the global tourism industry and global capital, a strong Maya–non-Maya dichotomy in Central America. Interestingly, however, Honduras is starting to establish a pluralistic discourse about its national identity, recognizing its multiple ethnic groups while still privileging Copán. Guatemala and El Salvador similarly are starting to produce a multicultural ideology. Yet it is Maya sites that hold national attention as when Copán was chosen as the venue for an indigenous protest. "[T]he tactic drew on the rhetoric of mayanization and the conflation of Honduras with Copán that was part of long-established nationalist discourse. Pan-Indian activism had come to Honduras and when it did, it used the international visibility of the classic Maya site, and the indigenous authenticity of the contemporary Chorti Maya, to advance a uniquely modern cause" (Joyce 2003:93).

Politics of a different kind are implicated in the Musée du Quai Branly, the brainchild of former French president Jacques Chirac, which opened in 2006. The museum houses collections formerly in the Musée de l'Homme and Musée des Arts d'Afrique et d'Océanie, both created to showcase France's colonial holdings. Although the Musée du Quai Branly (a neutral, geographically based name chosen

to avoid controversy) is new, its exhibition script is traditional notwithstanding dramatic (though severely underlit) presentation and marketing as "arts premiers"— world class art—rather than being relegated to the status of anthropological or natural history curiosity.

Internecine museum politics intervened in the birth of the Musée de Quai Branly for it faced challenges from other museums in Paris over which had the right to maintain and exhibit certain categories of material (Price 2007). International politics are in evidence in that this material culture had been obtained from non-Western peoples who were in no position to resist relinquishing it and who ultimately had no role in its re-presentation in the Musée de Quai Branly. By maintaining possession rather than repatriating various items (notably those which are ethnographic with known ceremonial uses or religious connotation), Chirac and his museum were sustaining a colonial stance as much as non-Western peoples were being "honored." Rather, Musée du Quai Branly has not "confront[ed] the full story of France's past as a colonial power, . . . invite[d] meaningful participation by members of the fourth-world cultures represented in its collections, and . . . acknowledge[d] the continuing dynamism of those cultures in the twenty-first century" (Price 2007:178).

Finally, for as much as UNESCO can be decried as Western in orientation (see above and see below), nevertheless one is tempted to think that there are times when action should be taken concerning cultural heritage. Meskell (2002:565) raises this point concerning various erasures being perpetrated in one country against the heritage originating from another country or culture or group. In these cases, such as Saudi Arabia demolishing an Ottoman fort in Mecca, "neither the U.S. or UNESCO has intervened for a number of reasons: politics, timing, and cultural value" (Meskell 2002:565). There is, then, a "political dimensionality of heritage and what constitutes *worth* saving" (Meskell 2002:565, emphasis in original).

Intangible Heritage

Interest in intangible heritage as a major locus of manifold contestation has surged to the fore coincident with UNESCO's promulgation of the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity in 2001 and the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Heritage in 2003 (see Ruggles and Silverman 2009a; Smith and Akagawa 2009; note the founding of the *International Journal of Intangible Heritage* in 2006). But even before these documents were promulgated, scholars were recognizing fundamental problems in the doctrine of universality and linking of "heritage" to economic development through tourism. Ucko, for instance, noted an "inherent assumption by archaeologists and national legislators that 'the past' is a national asset whose rights and interests must take precedence over the more particularized rights of groups which are often called ethnic" (1989:xii).

Since 2003 there has been particular concern with the potential for state abuse contained within the UNESCO documents. Pyburn writes, "Also common are situations in which preservation itself is a means of oppression, as when descendant groups have their cultural identity enforced and economic disadvantages naturalized

by constant official and public rhetoric about cultural continuity, authentic heritage, and characterization of the poor as 'traditional' and 'living in the past' " (2007:172). Pyburn's point is reiterated by Cojti Ren (2006:12), who writes of the situation of the Maya of Guatemala, "to be considered 'authentic Maya,' we must conserve the cultural practices and traits of our great past, such as the rituals, the cosmovision, the art, and the agriculture. Even dress and physical traits must be maintained as the traits of 'the real Mayas of the past.' Otherwise our identity is questioned." Smith has argued that the rhetoric of heritage disempowers "the present from actively rewriting the meaning of the past [and] the use of the past to challenge and rewrite cultural and social meaning in the present becomes more difficult" (2006:29).

These apparently unanticipated conundrums of the UNESCO convention are also highlighted by Silverman and Ruggles (2007b:3): "while heritage can unite, it can also divide... it can be a tool for oppression"; they speak of the "uneasy place" of heritage in the UNESCO convention. Logan (2007:37) worries that while it is implicit in the convention that all cultures should be preserved and protected equally, there are some aspects of various peoples' cultures that other societies might wish to see abandoned as being objectionable. The convention, then, is mired in the "clash between universalism and cultural relativism" (Logan 2007:39). Logan recognizes three types of conflict surrounding the cultural rights the convention is supposed to mitigate: (1) governments of multi-ethnic countries may find it convenient to abrogate the rights of their minorities so as to force assimilation and compliance with the regime; (2) selective interpretations of cultural heritage are used to influence mainstream cultural identity and opinion to the detriment of human rights; (3) there are "inherent contradictions in the human rights framework of concepts and instruments themselves [because] cultural rights can be in direct conflict with other human rights, particularly the rights of individuals and children and women as groups." Elazar Barkan (2007) raises similar problems with the convention, using as his examples the bioprospecting of National Geographic Society's Genographic Project and the plight (or not) of Muslim women encumbered (or not) by dress codes and behavioral restrictions (or not).

This Volume

In the context of the preceding pages I now briefly present the contributions to this volume. As with the discussion above, the papers can be organized in a number of cogent ways. The framework I present below is not intended to hinder the linkages among the papers but to highlight particular arguments made in terms of the venues of contestation of cultural heritage. The papers are very rich and I only touch on some of their dimensions.

Contested Spaces of Religion and Nationalism

Ruggles deals with the contestation for space (social, religious, political, cultural) in Spain between the Catholic majority and the Moslem minority that once—long

ago and for centuries—was the controlling force in Spain. Although Moslems were expelled in 1492, today a new kind of Moslem *reconquista* is taking place, with globalization being the context and facilitator of the immigration of a new wave of Moslem migrants into Spain. Moslems have reentered Spain. They claim their former Great Mosque in Cordoba for worship and assert social, political, cultural, and physical space for the performance of identity. They are in conflict with the dominant, majority Catholic population, which has historicized the pre-1492 past and uses the mosque as the Cathedral it has been for the past centuries (indeed, archaeological remains of a church underlie the mosque as well as being superimposed). At issue is Spain's Moslem community's demand to publicly perform their "differentness" from Spanish Catholic culture. The Great Mosque of Cordoba is the vehicle for a larger debate over the legitimacy of this "other" population in Spain. This debate is significantly informed by Spanish fear of Islamic terrorism, given attacks suffered by Spain. Yet, since the demise of Franco's regime, Spanish law guarantees religious freedom.

Religion and politics form the theme of Hartnett's paper as well. The centuries-long fight between Catholics and Protestants in Ireland has many manifestations, one of which is the painting of wall murals in Belfast, Northern Ireland. Republicans and Loyalists contest their right for space in the city, on the land. They assert contesting claims for political and cultural power and autonomy. Here the issue of Catholic versus Protestant strife in Northern Ireland is informed by centuries of dispute and violence, much as dispute and violence characterized first the Moslem *conquista* of Spain and then the Catholic *reconquista*. Space is the terrain of contestation in Belfast. As with Cordoba, there is contestation over space of performance of identity, identity being based on a number of cultural features such as religion.

Landry's paper also considers regime change, in this case from Communist to post-Communist in Benin, west Africa. Today various supra-national forces influence decisions being made in Benin that concern the country's economy. One of these—and by no means insignificant—is UNESCO's promotion of the Slave Route, which engenders tourism that brings in foreign currency. This tourism is transnational with links being forged between Benin and Afro-American communities across the Atlantic: African American tourists from the USA and the descendant communities of Haiti and Brazil. In addition to slave heritage, Vodun religion is significant in the engagement of Haiti, Brazil, and Benin, most notoriously Haiti. Landry is concerned with contests over history and the space of Vodun, with the right to interpret and profit from it, indeed to share it.

Owning and Displaying the National Past

Ikram and Kynourgioupoulou focus on the role of iconic elements of the ancient past in countries that have been conquered and colonized. In both cases—Egypt and Greece—we are drawn back to the UK, for the Rosetta Stone is in the British Museum, as are the more hotly contested Parthenon Marbles (see Fitz Gibbon 2005; Hitchens 1997). Even more so than the Rosetta Stone, the Bust of Nefertiti in

Berlin is Egypt's focus for repatriation. Both authors raise issues that transcend legal arguments over legitimate ownership. At issue is the role of the visible past in the construction of national identity. Today this is further enhanced by the global phenomenon of tourism: Greece and Egypt both have massive tourism industries. The new Acropolis Museum in Athens and the new museum being built on the Giza Plateau can both expect to see even greater attendance if they are able to display these two great icons of their respective pasts.

Zobler's paper is a fascinating discussion about forces of nationalism and regionalism in a country having a brilliant, long ancient past and a recent history of colonialism, the latter within the context of frequent European domination of an Islamic country. The museum, as an institution, is well known as a venue for the attempted creation of national identity as well as contestation or rewriting of history. The three museums analyzed by Zobler constitute a superb illustration of *intra*-national contests of history and identity.

Higueras considers nationalism and its relationship to a country's archaeological/historical past. His paper has two major thrusts, one of which is concerned with the visions of history that were inscribed on the Roman urban landscape by political actors in successive regimes—the Roman Empire, the liberal period, the Fascist State. Higueras, like Ikram, Kynourgiopoulou, and Landry, is concerned with the "value" of cultural heritage in its respective nation-states. When Italy came into being Rome immediately inherited a landscape of monuments to former greatness and development of the city led to new archaeological discoveries. These were put at the service of creating a new national sentiment overriding local identities. Then, when Mussolini came to power, he exalted the classical Roman heritage.

Erasing the Past

The second theme of Higueras' paper concerns the erasure of heritage in Rome: past negation in favor of future creation. Mussolini selectively appropriated the past; a past that was not considered useful was a disposable past. Mussolini self-glorified through remodeling of the urban landscape—at grave consequence for the residents of Rome's gutted vernacular landscape dating to the thirteenth through eighteenth centuries.

Larkin's paper deals with Zimbabwe, which is notorious for the erasure of its precolonial history by the brutal colonial regime that controlled the indigenous Shona people for generations. The almost achieved erasure of the site of Great Zimbabwe, so as to rewrite history and thereby claim territory, has few equals in the annals of the destruction of cultural heritage (see, e.g., Fagan 1981:44–46; Ndoro 1999).

Complicated Identities

The larger focus of Larkin's paper is the complicated identities of Zimbabwe's stone carving artists, who are encumbered by the historical trauma, contradictions of colonialism, and prejudices and stereotyped expectations of the international art world.

Some of the Zimbabwean artists seek to participate in the international art world as named fine artists, without reference to their national or ethnic identity at all; they eschew Shona cultural heritage in their work. Other artists explicitly draw on traditional themes of indigenous identity in the production of ethnographic art. Official authentification, gallery owners nationally and internationally, and the tourist industry all intervene in the scripting and success of artists' work, not always to the satisfaction of the artists themselves.

Galaty deals with a region where inter-ethnic strife has been so pervasive that it gave the world a word to describe its pathology: balkanization. The Balkans have long been the terrain of social, political, cultural, and religious contestation. In the Balkans new national borders complicate ancient and deeply held identities. Both in ancient times and recently, central powers have used heritage in creative ways to undercut rival claims to territory and move boundaries. The tensions inherent in the Balkans—and which erupted into multi-party war following the collapse of Yugoslavia—have presented special challenges to the government officials charged with managing heritage resources and developing them for tourism. Cultural heritage management in the Balkans is a highly politically-charged process, and it may be some time before we see a "Balkan Route" promoting inter-nation tourism like the Maya Route through Central America, nor is there a "mega-ethnic" identity—such as "Maya"—with which people can self-servingly identify.

Fantasy and Nation

The intersection of identity and scientific versus pseudoscientific knowledge is the basis of Hanks' very original contribution. She interrogates belief in ghosts and the hunt for them in historical buildings in England. Her sensitively attuned ethnography interprets ghost hunting as reflecting a national anxiety in Britain about "Englishness," which she relates to England's bloody historical disputes over religious legitimacy (Catholic vs. Protestant/Church of England) and to today's waves of immigrants who culturally, racially, and religiously do not conform to "Englishness" yet who are part of the national body politic in this multicultural country.

As is well known, new nations seek master narratives on which to create a sense of nationhood, an imagined community. Of particular interest is the case of the "Pyramids of Bosnia," related by Galaty and well publicized (see, e.g., Bohannon 2006, 2008), whose promotion by their "discoverer" is an attempt to generate a prideful and potentially profitable past on which to build a new nationalism. Archaeologists around the world, and many in the official Bosnian archaeological community, have condemned the interpretation of natural hills as the world's largest and oldest pyramids. But for the town of Visoko, in which they are located, this notoriety is fueling cottage industries servicing curious tourists.

Hanks' and Galaty's contributions also share attention to "bottom-up" constructions of heritage and how these may challenge official versions of history. In Hanks' case, ghost tours "democratize" history, opening it up to alternate interpretations

produced by non-credentialed members of the public who nevertheless are fully integrated into the nation. Galaty considers "how people on the margins of states negotiate, and help produce, history and heritage"—in this case tribal peoples largely isolated from the capital center of power yet, as he shows, "anything but passive participants in heritage creation and management."

Environmental Heritage

The Maya of El Pilar are the specific focus of Anabel Ford in her pithy contribution concerning archaeology's discovery of a new Maya center in the "romantic" or "foreboding" jungle. She is concerned with the purpose this placement on the world map of knowledge will serve to the local people of the community who are, and should be, the primary stakeholders in the future of that past. She criticizes the homogenization of "Maya" by the tourism industry and by the stratosphere of political power (i.e., NAFTA leaders) and argues that we should be focusing on the long-term success of the Maya forest adaptation rather than putting yet another temple site in the public domain of mass tourism whose script of "lost" or "perished" civilizations runs counter to historical fact. Ford emphasizes that the Maya at El Pilar, as elsewhere, are concerned with very present issues of a disputative nature: land tenure, social space in their respective nations, their representational appropriation in museums and other institutions, etc. Archaeologists can (judiciously) play a positive role in these contemporary matters through promotion and involvement in development projects, commitment to environmental issues in which the Maya figure prominently, and specifically with regard to the cross-border Maya, advocacy of a Peace Park serving to improve relations between Belize and Guatemala through adherence to sustainable agricultural and shared tourism policies, among other undertakings.

A Future Without Contestation?

As the scores of case studies presented in this introduction sadly illustrate, cultural heritage is an ever-present venue for contestation, ranging in scale from competitively asserted to violently claimed/destroyed. Can cultural heritage be well managed and beneficially promoted while simultaneously being kept within essentially benign parameters so as to efface or diminish contestation? This is difficult to achieve since heritage belongs to particular groups intra-nationally and notwithstanding UNESCO's attempt to generate a feel-good, international ethos of world cultural heritage and universal value. On the other hand, projects such as those undertaken by GHF offer some cause for optimism, though bear in mind that GHF is targeting unique sites, not entire national scenarios.

Let's play a mind game using Fekri Hassan's (1998:212–213) imagining of an idealistic future for cultural heritage in Egypt. The multiple dimensions encompassed in his prescription could well be contemplated by many of the states-party

signatories of the World Heritage Convention and certainly merit critical discus-
sion in forums around the world. Here I remove Hassan's specific references to
Egypt and Pharaonic, Hellenistic, and Islamic heritage, substituting A, B, C to
enable the reader to insert the names of any country's particular history of cultural
development, whether Western or non-Western:

> A stable political future of [name of country] depends upon an ability to integrate its pasts
> and recognize its ["A", "B" and "C"] heritage, and to place that variegated heritage within
> the course of a global civilization. [The country]'s links with the West are not limited to
> the recent history of confrontation, colonization, and decolonization. An active cultural and
> educational program to engage the public and schoolchildren in archaeological activities
> that show [the country]'s long multicultural and rich past is essential to combat . . . a loss
> of affiliation, which is exploited by subversive extreme religious parties [substitute name of
> any negative group].

Hassan's recommendation linking knowledge and tolerance—if combined with
equitable economic and development policies, enfranchising politics, and thoughtful
social planning—might begin to establish the basis for a better present and future in
societies around the world. In this scenario, cultural heritage could not only achieve
the debatable and nebulous universal value dictated by UNESCO but also promote
manifold benefits in local and national communities.

Notes

1. While tangible and intangible heritage are intimately linked, intangible heritage per se has
   received much recent attention with passage of UNESCO's *Convention for the Safeguarding of
   the Intangible Heritage* in 2003 (see discussion of the development of this concept in Ruggles
   and Silverman 2009a; see also Ruggles and Silverman 2009b; Smith and Akagawa 2009).
2. This may explain, furthermore, why Masada was not inscribed on the World
   Heritage List until 2001. And it is manifest in the careful wording of Jerusalem's
   inscription on the World Heritage List (1981, 2000): see http://whc.unesco.org/
   en/tentativelists/1483/ and http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/148 (accessed September 14,
   2009), including the fact that the first inscription was proposed by Jordan, not Israel.
3. The cultural turn invokes contingency, agency, practice, social construction, attention to inter-
   pretive strategies, cultural contexts, and singular stories and places or micro history, etc. (see
   Bonnell and Hunt 1999). For instance, Sewell understands culture as "contradictory . . . loosely
   integrated . . . contested . . . subject to constant change . . . [and] weakly bounded" (Sewell
   1999:53–54). Raymond Williams (1958) anticipated the cultural turn a generation before,
   stressing that society, history, ideology, art, class, and democracy are sites of ideological
   struggle.
4. The development of the literature, as I see it selectively, includes—chronologically—these
   highlights: Cameron 1971; Hudson 1977; Haraway 1984–1985; Lumley 1988; Vergo 1989;
   Weil 1990; Ames 1992; Hooper-Greenhill 1992, 2000; Findlen 1994; Kaplan 1994; McClellan
   1994; Sherman and Rogoff 1994; Bennett 1995; Duncan 1995; MacDonald and Fyfe 1996;
   Barringer and Flynn 1998; Conn 1998; Yanni 1999; Black 2000; Asma 2001; Kreps 2003;
   Peers and Brown 2003; Anderson 2004a; Bennett 2004; Karp et al. 2006; Levin 2007; Ostow
   2008. And see references in Note 5 below. I also note the numerous museum journals with
   critical (rather than practical) contributions, including: *Museum Anthropology* (founded in
   1976 and in sync with changes in anthropology overall), *Journal of the History of Collections*
   (founded in 1989), *Museum International* (founded in 1997), *Museum and Society* (founded
   in 2003), *Collections* (founded in 2004), *Museums and Social Issues* (founded in 2006), and

Museum History Journal (founded in 2008). Although my literature list is culled, I think it fairly represents the explosion of critical museum inquiry beginning in the mid-1980s and increasing dramatically in the 1990s until the present—i.e., the paradigm shift discussed by Harrison (1993) and Anderson (2004b). The literature on museums is by now so vast (including publications by ICOM and UNESCO) that it exceeds the purview and possibilities of this chapter.

5. Other prominent examples of contested heritage in the museum include: Anderson and Reeves 1994; Clifford 1997; Crooke 2001; Dubin 1999b; Henderson and Kaeppler 1997; Holo 1999; Luke 2002; Price 2007; Simpson 1996; Stanworth 1994; Zolberg 1996.

6. I would add Henri Lefebvre's (1989) *The Production of Space*, whose unifying spatial theory—conjoining ideological, social, relational, political, performative, physical, and temporal aspects—was consilient with the social constructivism of contemporary anthropology. Clear antecedents to Lefebvre are Norberg-Schulz (1971) and Relph (1976).

7. At the time this volume goes to press, Langfield et al. (2009) has not yet been released. See also the brief essay on this topic by George Nicholas and Julie Hollowell on the WAC website: http://www.worldarchaeologicalcongress.org/site/nicholas_hollowell.php (accessed September 1, 2009).

8. Any treatment of Maya archaeological tourism must acknowledge an earlier, comprehensive, pathbreaking work: Quetzil Castañeda's (1996) *In the Museum of Maya Culture. Touring Chichén Itzá*, in which he argued that "the invention of the Maya as a culture derives from the historical complicities between Maya peoples, anthropological practices, tourist businesses, regional politics, nation building, New Age spiritualists, and international relations between Mexico and the United States."

9. The whole interview can be watched at this url: http://cts.vresp.com/c/?GlobalHeritageFund/e90eb825cd/be52bcbf00/3457febab4

References

Addison, Erin
  2004. The roads to ruins: Accessing Islamic heritage in Jordan. In *Marketing heritage: Archaeology and the consumption of the past*, ed. Yorke Rowan and Uzi Baram, 229–247. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.
Altekamp, Stefan
  2006. Italian colonial archaeology in Libya 1913–1942. In *Archaeology under dictatorship*, ed. Michael L. Galaty and Charles Watkinson, 55–71. New York, NY: Springer.
Ames, Michael M.
  1992. *Cannibal tours and glass boxes. The anthropology of museums*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
Anderson, Gail
  2004a. *Reinventing the museum. Historical and contemporary perspectives on the paradigm shift*, ed. Gail Anderson. Walnut Creek, CA: Rowan & Littlefield.
  2004b. Introduction: Reinventing the museum. In *Reinventing the museum. Historical and contemporary perspectives on the paradigm shift*, ed. Gail Anderson, 1–7. Walnut Creek, CA: Rowan & Littlefield.
Anderson, Margaret, and Andrew Reeves
  1994. Contested identities: Museums and the nation in Australia. In *Museums and the making of 'ourselves.' The role of objects in national identity*, ed. Flora E. S. Kaplan, 79–124. London: Leicester University Press.
Appadurai, Arjun
  1981. The past as a scarce resource. *Man* (N.S.) 16: 201–219.
  1996. *Modernity at large*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
  2007. The globalization of archaeology and heritage. A discussion with Arjun Appadurai. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 1(1): 35–49.

Ardren, Traci
  2004. Where are the ancient Maya in ancient Maya archaeological tourism? Advertising and the appropriation of culture. In *Marketing heritage. Archaeology and the consumption of the past*, ed. Yorke Rowan and Uzi Baram, 103–113. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.
Arnold, Bettina
  1990. The past as propaganda. Totalitarian archaeology in nazi Germany. *Antiquity* 64: 464–478.
Ashmore, Wendy, and A. Bernard Knapp, eds.
  1999. *Archaeologies of landscape. Contemporary perspectives*. Oxford, MA: Blackwell.
Ashworth, G. J., Brian Graham, and J. E. Tunbridge.
  2007. *Pluralising pasts. Heritage, identity and place in multicultural societies*. London: Pluto Press.
Asma, Stephen T.
  2001. *Stuffed animals and pickled heads. The culture and evolution of natural history museums*. Oxford, MA: Oxford University Press.
Atalay, Sonya L.
  2007. Global application of indigenous archaeology: Community based participatory research in Turkey. *Archaeologies* 3(3): 249–270.
Barakat, Sultan, Craig Wilson, Vjekoslava Sankovic Simcic, and Marija Kojakovic
  2001. Challenges and dilemmas facing the reconstruction of war-damaged cultural heritage: The case study of Pocitelj, Bosnia-Herzegovina. In *Destruction and conservation of cultural property*, ed. Robert Layton, Peter G. Stone, and Julian Thomas, 168–181. London: Routledge.
Barkan, Elazar
  2007. Genes and burkas: Predicaments of human rights and cultural property. In *Cultural heritage and human rights*, ed. Helaine Silverman and D. Fairchild Ruggles, 184–200. New York, NY: Springer.
Barringer, Tim, and Tom Flynn, eds.
  1998. *Colonialism and the object. Empire, material culture, and the museum*. London: Routledge.
Bartu, Ayfer
  2001. Rethinking heritage politics in a global context: A view from Istanbul. In *Hybrid urbanism. On the identity discourse and the built environment*, ed. Nezar AlSayyad, 131–155. Westport, CT: Praeger.
Bassett, Thomas
  1998. Indigenous mapmaking in intertropical Africa. In *Cartography in the traditional African, American, Arctic, Australian, and Pacific societies* (The history of cartography, volume two, book three), eds. David Woodward and G. Malcolm Lewis, 24–48. Chicago, IL University of Chicago Press.
Benavides, O. Hugo
  2004. *Making Ecuadorian histories. Four centuries of defining power*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
Bender, Barbara
  1993. Stonehenge—Contested landscapes (Medieval to present-day). In *Landscape. Politics and perspectives*, ed. Barbara Bender, 245–279. Oxford, MA: Berg.
  1998. *Stonehenge. Making space*. Oxford, MA: Berg.
Bender, Barbara, and Margot Winer, eds.
  2001. *Contested landscapes: Movement, exile and place*. Oxford, MA: Berg.
Bennett, Tony
  1995. *The birth of the museum. History, theory, politics*. London: Routledge.
  2004. *Pasts beyond memory. Evolution, museums, colonialism*. London: Routledge. Bernbeck, Reinhard, and Susan Pollock
  1996. Ayodhya, archaeology and identity. *Current Anthropology* 37(Supplement):S138–S142.

Bernhardsson, Magnus T.
  2005. *Reclaiming a plundered past. Archaeology and nation building in modern Iraq*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
Black, Barbara J.
  2000. *On exhibit. Victorians and their museums*. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.
Blakey, Michael.
  1998. The New York African burial ground project: An examination of enslaved lives, a construction of ancestral ties. *Transforming Anthropology* 7(1): 53–58.
Bohannon, John.
  2006. Mad about pyramids. *Science* 313(5794): 1718–1720.
  2008. The man who went up a hill and came down a pyramid. *Discover* 29(11): 64–69.
Bond, George C., and Angela Gilliam.
  1994a. *Social construction of the past: Representation as power*, ed. George Clement Bond and Angela Gilliam. London: Routledge.
  1994b. Introduction. In *Social construction of the past: Representation as power*, ed. George Clement Bond and Angela Gilliam, 1–22. London: Routledge.
Bonnell, Victoria E., and Lynn Hunt.
  1999. Introduction. In *Beyond the cultural turn: New directions in the study of society and culture*, ed. Victoria E. Bonnell and Lynn Hunt, 1–32. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Bray, Tamara ed.
  2001. *The future of the past. Archaeologists, native americans and repatriation*. New York, NY: Garland.
Breglia, Lisa.
  2009. When patrimonies collide. The case of Chunchumil, Yucatán. In *Ethnographies & archaeologies. Iterations of the past*, ed. Lena Mortensen and Julie Hollowell, 55–70. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
Brodie, Neil.
  2006. The plunder of Iraq's archaeological heritage, 1991–2005, and the London antiquities trade. In *Archaeology, cultural heritage, and the antiquities trade,* ed. Neil Brodie, Morag M. Kersel, Christina Luke, and Kathryn Walker Tubb, 206–226. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
Brown, Michael F.
  2003. *Who owns native culture?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Bruner, Edward M.
  1983a. Introduction. The opening up of anthropology. In *Text, play, and story: The construction and reconstruction of self and society*, ed. Edward M. Bruner, 1–16. Washington, DC: American Ethnological Society.
  1983b. *Text, play, and story: The construction and reconstruction of self and society*, ed. Edward M. Bruner. Washington, DC: American Ethnological Society.
  1993. Lincoln's new salem as a contested site. *Museum Anthropology* 17(3): 14–25.
  1994. Abraham Lincoln as authentic reproduction: A critique of postmodernism. *American Anthropologist* 96(2): 397–415.
  1996. Tourism in Ghana: The representation of slavery and the return of the black diaspora. *American Anthropologist* 98(2): 290–304.
Bruner, Edward M. and Phyllis Gorfain.
  1983. Dialogic narration and the paradoxes of Masada. In *Text, play, and story: The construction and reconstruction of self and society*, ed. Edward M. Bruner, 56–79. Washington, DC: American Ethnological Society.
Bruner, Edward M., and Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett.
  1994. Maasai on the lawn: Tourist realism in east Africa. *Cultural Anthropology* 9(2): 435–470.

Burke, Heather, Claire Smith, Dorothy Lippert, Joe Watkins, and Larry Zimmerman eds.
  2008. *Kennewick man. Perspectives on the ancient one*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
Byrne, Denis.
  1991. Western hegemony in archaeological heritage management. *History and Anthropology* 5:
    269–276.
Cameron, Duncan.
  1971. The museum, a temple or the forum? *Curator* 14(1): 11–24.
Campion, T.C. ed.
  1989. *Centre and periphery: Comparative studies in archaeology*. One World Archaeology.
    London: Unwin Hyman.
Castañeda, Quetzil.
  1996. *In the museum of Maya culture. Touring Chichén Itzá*. Minneapolis, MN: University of
    Minnesota Press.
Chapman, John.
  1994. The destruction of a common heritage: The archaeology of war in Croatia, Bosnia and
    Herzegovina. *Antiquity* 68(258): 120–126.
Chippendale, Christopher.
  1986. Stoned henge: Events and issues at the summer solstice, 1985. *World Archaeology* 18(1):
    38–58.
Churchill, Nancy.
  2006. Dignifying carnival: The politics of heritage recognition in Puebla, Mexico. *International
    Journal of Cultural Property* 13: 1–24.
Cleere, H. F. ed.
  1989. *Archaeological heritage management in the modern world*. One World Archaeology.
    London: Unwin Hyman.
Cleere, H. F.
  2001. The uneasy bedfellows: Universality and cultural heritage. In *Destruction and conserva-
    tion of cultural property*, ed. Robert Layton, Peter G. Stone, and JulianThomas, 22–29. One
    World Archaeology. London: Routledge.
Clifford, James.
  1997. Museums as contact zones. In *Routes: Travel and translation in the late twentieth century*,
    ed. James Clifford, 188–219. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Cojti Ren, Avexnim.
  2006. Maya archaeology and the political and cultural identity of contemporary Maya in
    Guatemala. *Archaeologies* 2(1): 8–19.
Conn, Steven.
  1998. *Museums and American intellectual life, 1876–1926*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago
    Press.
Coombes, Annie.
  1994. *Reinventing Africa. Museums, material culture and popular imagination*. New Haven, CT:
    Yale University Press.
Corner, James, ed.
  1999. *Recovering landscape*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Architectural Press.
Cosgrove, Denis.
  1984. *Social formation and symbolic landscape*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
  1999. *Mappings*, ed. Denis Cosgrove. London: Reaktion.
Cosgrove, Denis, and Stephen Daniels.
  1988. *The iconography of landscape*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Costa, Kelli Ann.
  2004. Conflating past and present: Marketing archaeological heritage sites in Ireland. In *Marketing heritage. Archaeology and the consumption of the past*, ed. Yorke Rowan and Uzi Baram, 69–91. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.
  2009. *Coach fellas. Heritage and tourism in Ireland*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
Crooke, Elizabeth.
  2001. Confronting a troubled history: Which past in northern Ireland's museums? *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 7(2): 119–136.
Dalrymple, William.
  2005. India: The war over history. *The New York Review of Books*, April 7, 62–65.
Dann, Graham, M.S., and A. V. Seaton, eds.
  2002. *Slavery, contested heritage and thanatourism*. London: Routledge.
Darvill, Timothy.
  2007. Research frameworks for world heritage sites and the conceptualization of archaeological knowledge. *World Archaeology* (39)3: 436–457.
David, Bruno, and Meredith Wilson, eds.
  2002. *Inscribed landscapes. Marking and making place*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
De La Torre, Marta, ed.
  2005. *Heritage values in site management. Four case studies*. Los Angeles, CA: Getty Conservation Institute.
Derry, Linda, and Maureen Malloy eds.
  2003. *Archaeologists and local communities: Partners in exploring the past*. Washington, DC: Society for American Archaeology.
Dubin, Steven C.
  1999a. A matter of perspective: Revisionist history and "the west as America." In *Displays of power. Controversy in the American museums from the 'enola gay' to 'sensation,'* ed. Steven C. Dubin, 152–185. New York, NY: New York University Press.
  1999b. *Displays of power. Controversy in the American museums from the 'Enola Gay' to 'sensation.'* New York, NY: New York University Press.
Duke, Philip.
  2007. *The tourists gaze, the cretans glance. Archaeology and tourism on a Greek island*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
Duncan, Carol.
  1995. *Civilizing rituals. Inside public art museums*. London: Routledge.
Duncan, James, and David Ley, eds.
  1993. *Place/Culture/Representation*. London: Routledge.
Echo-Hawk, Roger C.
  2000. Ancient history in the new world: Integrating oral traditions and the archaeological record in deep time. *American Antiquity* 65(2): 267–290.
Edney, Matthew.
  1990. *Mapping an empire. The geographical construction of British India, 1765–1843*. Chicago, IL University of Chicago Press.
Eggen, Dan.
  1999. In Williamsburg, the painful reality of slavery. *The Washington Post*, July 7, A1.
Fagan, Brian.
  1981. Two hundred and four years of African archaeology. In *Antiquity and man. Essays in honour of Glyn Daniel*, ed. John D. Evans, Barry Cunliffe, and Colin Renfrew, 42–51. London: Thames and Hudson.
Fathy, Hassan.
  1969. *Gourna: A tale of two villages*. Cairo: Ministry of Culture.
Findlen, Paula.
  1994. *Possessing nature. Museums, collecting and scientific culture in early modern Italy*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Fitz Gibbon, Kate.
  2005. The Elgin marbles. In *Who owns the past? Cultural policy, cultural property, and the law*, ed. Kate Fitz Gibbon, 109–119. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Flood, Josephine.
  1989. "Tread softly for you tread on my bones": The development of cultural resource management in Australia. In *Archaeological heritage management in the modern world*, ed. H. F. Cleere, 79–101. One World Archaeology. London: Unwin Hyman.

Frühsorge, Lars.
  2007. Archaeological heritage in Guatemala: Indigenous perspectives on the ruins of Iximche. *Archaeologies* 3(1): 39–58.

Gathercole, Peter, and David Lowenthal, eds.
  1990. *The politics of the past*. One World Archaeology. London: Unwin Hyman.

Gero, Joan.
  2009. The history of World Archaeological Congress. http://www.worldarchaeologicalcongress.org/about-wac/history/146-history-wac. Accessed 15 Sep 2009.

Gilkes, Oliver.
  2006. The Trojans in Epirus. Archaeology, myth, and identity in inter-war Albania. In *Archaeology under dictatorship*, ed. Michael L. Galaty and Charles Watkinson, 33–54. New York, NY: Springer.

Gillespie, Josephine.
  2009. Protecting world heritage: Regulating ownership and land use at Angkor archaeological park, Cambodia. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 15(4): 338–354.

Golden, Jonathan.
  2004. Targeting heritage: The abuse of symbolic sites in modern conflicts. In *Marketing heritage. archaeology and the consumption of the past*, ed. Yorke Rowan and Uzi Baram, 183–202. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.

Gordillo, Gastón.
  2009. The ruin of ruins. On the preservation and destruction of historical sites in northern Argentina. In *Ethnographies & archaeologies. Iterations of the past*, ed. Lena Mortensen and Julie Hollowell, 30–54. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.

Greenfield, Jeanette.
  2007. *The return of cultural treasures*. Third Edition. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Gupta, Akhil, and James Ferguson.
  1992. Beyond "culture": Space, identity, and the politics of difference. *Cultural Anthropology* 7(1): 6–23.

Hall, Martin.
  2004. Lifting the veil of popular history: Archaeology and politics in urban Cape Town. In *Social construction of past: Representation as power,* ed. George Clement Bond and Angela Gilliam, 167–184. London: Routledge.

Hammil, Jan, and Robert Cruz.
  1989. Statement of American Indians against desecration before the World Archaeological Congress. In *Conflict in the archaeology of living traditions*, ed. R. Layton, 195–200. One World Archaeology. London: Routledge.

Handler, Richard.
  1985. On having a culture. Nationalism and the preservation of Quebec's *Patrimoine*. In *Objects and others. Essays on museums and material culture,* ed. George W. Stocking, Jr., 192–217. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
  1988. *Nationalism and the politics of culture in Quebec*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Handler, Richard, and Eric Gable.
  1997. *The new history in an old museum. Creating the past at Colonial Williamsburg*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Haraway, Donna.

  1984–1985. Teddy bear patriarchy: Taxidermy in the garden of Eden, New York City, 1908–1936. *Social Text* 11:20–64.

Harrington, Spencer P. M.

  1993. New York's great cemetery imbroglio. *Archaeology*, March–April 1993, 30–38.

Hart, David, and Sarah Winter.

  2001. The politics of remembrance in the New South Africa. In *Archaeologies of the contemporary past*, ed. Victor Buchli and Gavin Lucas, 84–93. London: Routledge.

Harrison, Julia. 1993. Ideas of museums in the

  1990s. *Museum Management and Curatorship* 13: 160–176.

Hassan, Fekri.

  1998. Memorabilia. Archaeological materiality and national identity in Egypt. In *Archaeology under fire. Nationalism, politics and heritage in the eastern mediterranean and middle east*, ed. Lynn Meskell, 200–216. London: Routledge.

Henderson, Amy, and Adrienne L. Kaeppler eds.

  1997. *Exhibiting dilemmas. Issues of representation at the smithsonian*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Herzfeld, Michael.

  1982. *Ours once more. Folklore, ideology, and the making of modern Greece*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

  1991. *A place in history. Social and monumental time in a Cretan Town*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hirsch, Eric, and Michael O'Hanlon, eds.

  1995. *The anthropology of landscape. Perspectives on place and space*. Oxford, MA: Clarendon Press.

Hitchens, Christopher.

  1997. *The Elgin marbles. Should they be returned to Greece?* London: Verso.

Hobsbawm, Eric.

  1983. Introduction: Inventing traditions. In *The invention of tradition*, ed. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, 1–14. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Hodder, Ian.

  1998. The past as passion and play. Çatalhöyük as a site of conflict in the construction of multiple pasts. In *Archaeology under fire. Nationalism, politics and heritage in the eastern mediterranean and middle east*, ed. Lynn Meskell, 124–139. London: Routledge.

Holo, Selma Reuben.

  1999. *Beyond the Prado. Museums and identity in democratic Spain*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Hollowell, Julie.

  2009. Standpoints on stewardship in a global market for the material past. In *Ethnographies & archaeologies. iterations of the past*, ed. Lena Mortensen and Julie Hollowell, 218–239. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.

Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean.

  1992. *Museums and the shaping of knowledge*. London: Routledge.

  2000. *Museums and the interpretation of visual culture*. London: Routledge.

Hudson, Kenneth.

  1977. *Museums for the 1980s: A survey of world trends*. Paris: UNESCO/Macmillan.

Hutter, Michael, and Ilde Rizzo, eds.

  1997. *Economic perspectives on cultural heritage*. New York: St. Maarten's Press.

Jackson, Antoinette.

  2009. Conducting heritage research and practicing heritage resource management on a community level—Negotiating contested historicity. *Practicing Anthropology* 31(3): 5–10.

Jackson, Peter.
 1989. *Maps of meaning*. London: Unwin Hyman.
Jansen, Michael.
 2005. *War and cultural heritage. Cyprus after the 1974 Turkish invasion*. Minneapolis, MN:
    University of Minnesota Press.
Johnson-Roehr, Susan.
 2008. The archaeological survey of India and communal violence in post-independence India.
    International Journal of Heritage Studies 14(6): 506–523.
Jones, Sian.
 1997. *The archaeology of ethnicity. Constructing identities in the past and present*. London:
    Routledge.
Joyce, Rosemary.
 2003. Archaeology and nation building: A view from Central America. In *The politics of archae-
    ology and identity in a global context,* ed. Susan Kane, 79–100. Boston, MA: Archaeological
    Institute of America.
Kaplan, Flora E. S., ed.
 1994. *Museums and the making of 'ourselves.' The role of objects in national identity*, ed. Flora
    E. S. Kaplan, 79–124. London: Leicester University Press.
Karp, Ivan, and Steve D. Lavine, eds.
 1991. *Exhibiting cultures. The poetics and politics of museum display*. Washington, DC:
    Smithsonian Institution Press.
Karp, Ivan, Christine Mullen Kreamer, and Steven D. Lavine, eds.
 1992. *Museums and communities. The politics of public culture*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian
    Institution Press.
Karp, Ivan, Corinne A. Kratz, Lynn Szwaja, and Tomás Ybarra-Frausto, eds.
 2006. *Museum frictions. Public cultures/global transformations*. Durham, NC: Duke University
    Press.
Karp-Toledo, Eliane.
 2008. The lost treasure of Machu Picchu. Op-Ed. *The New York Times*, 8 Dec.
Knapp, Bernard, and Sophia Antoniadou.
 1998. Archaeology, politics and the cultural heritage of Cyprus. In *Archaeology under fire*, ed.
    Lynn Meskell, 13–43. London: Routledge.
Kohl, Philip L., and Clare Fawcett, eds.
 1995. *Nationalism, politics and the practice of archaeology*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge
    University Press.
Kreamer, Christine Mullen.
 2006. Shared heritage, contested terrain: Cultural negotiation and Ghana's Cape Coast Castle
    museum exhibition "crossroads of people, crossroads of trade." In *Museum frictions. Public
    cultures/global transformations*, ed. Ivan Karp, Corinne A. Kratz, Lynn Szwaja, and Tomás
    Ybarra-Frausto, 435–468. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Kreps, Christina.
 2003. *Liberating culture. Cross-cultural perspectives on museums, curation, and heritage
    preservation*. London: Routledge.
Kreutzer, Daniel D.
 2006. Privatising the public past: The economics of archaeological heritage management.
    Archaeologies 2(2): 52–66.
Kwame-Opoku, Dr.
 2008. Ten essential points on the continued detention of the Benin bronzes by European and
    American museums. http://www.modernghana.com/news/184756/50/ten-essential-points-on-
    the-continued-detention-of.html. Accessed 20 Sep 2009.
Labadi, Sophia.
 2007. Representations of the nation and cultural diversity in discourses on world heritage.
    Journal of Social Archaeology 7(2): 147–170.

Lal, B. B.
  2001. A note on the excavations at Ayodhya with reference to the Mandir-Masjid issue. In *Destruction and conservation of cultural property*, ed. Robert Layton, Peter G. Stone, and Julian Thomas, 117–126. London: Routledge.
Langfield, Michele, William S. Logan, and Mairead Nic Craith, eds.
  2009. *Cultural diversity, heritage and human rights: Intersections in theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
Layton, R., ed.
  1989. *Conflict in the archaeology of living traditions*. One World Archaeology. London: Routledge.
Lefebvre, Henri.
  1991. *The production of space*. Malden, MA: Blackwell (first English translation)
Lennon, John, and Malcolm Foley.
  2000. *Dark tourism. The attraction of death and disaster*. London: Continuum.
Levin, Amy K.
  2007. *Defining memory. Local museums and the construction of history in America's changing communities*. Plymouth, UK: AltaMira.
Lilley, Ian, and Michael Williams.
  2005. Archaeological and indigenous significance. A view from Australia. In *Heritage of value, archaeology of renown,* ed. Clay Mathers, Timothy Darvill, and Barbara J. Little, 227–247. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
Little, Barbara J., ed.
  2002. *Public benefits of archaeology*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
Little, Barbara J., and Paul A. Shackel, eds.
  2007. *Archaeology as a tool of civic engagement*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira.
Logan, William S.
  2007. Closing pandora's box: Human rights conundrums in cultural rights protection. In *Cultural heritage and human rights*, ed. Helaine Silverman and D. Fairchild Ruggles, 33–52. New York, NY: Springer.
Lowenthal, David.
  1985. *The past is a foreign country*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
Lubow, Arthur.
  2007. The possessed. *The New York Times Magazine*, 24 June.
Luke, Timothy W.
  2002. *Museum politics. Power plays at the exhibition*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
Lumley, Robert.
  1988. *The museum time-machine. Putting cultures on display*. London: Routledge.
Lynott, Mark J., and Alison Wylie, eds.
  1995. *Ethics in American archaeology. Challenges for the 1990s*. Washington, DC: Society for American Archaeology.
MacDonald, Sharon, and Gordon Fyfe.
  1996. *Theorizing museums. Representing identity and diversity in a changing world*. Oxford, MA: Blackwell.
MacKenzie, Robert, and Peter Stone.
  1990. Introduction: The concept of the excluded past. In *The excluded past. Archaeology in education*, ed. P. Stone and R. MacKenzie, 1–14. One World Archaeology. London: Unwin Hyman.
Magnoni Aline, Traci Ardren, and Scott Hutson.
  2007. Tourism in the Mundo Maya: Inventions and (mis)representations of Maya identities and heritage. *Archaeologies* 3(3): 353–383.
Mamani Condori, Carlos.
  1989. History and prehistory in Bolivia: What about the Indians? In *Conflict in the archaeology of living traditions*, ed. R. Layton, 46–59. One World Archaeology. London: Routledge.

McCarthy, John P.
  1996. Who owns these bones? *Public Archaeology Review* 4(2): 3–12.
McClellan, Andrew.
  1994. *Inventing the louvre. Art, politics, and the origins of the modern museum in eighteenth-century Paris*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
McGill, Douglas C.
  1990. *Michael Heizer. Effigy Tumuli. The reemergence of ancient mound building*. New York, NY: Harry N. Abrams.
McManamon, Francis P.
  2000. Archaeological messages and messenger. *Public Archaeology* 1(1): 5–20.
McNiven, Ian J., and Lynette Russell.
  2005. *Appropriated pasts. Indigenous peoples and the colonial culture of archaeology*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira.
Meskell, Lynn.
  1998. *Archaeology under fire. Nationalism, politics and heritage in the eastern mediterranean and middle east*, ed. Lynn Meskell. London: Routledge.
  2002. Negative heritage and past mastering in archaeology. *Anthropological Quarterly* 75(4): 557–574.
  2003. Pharaonic legacies: Postcolonialism, heritage and hyperreality. In *The politics of archaeology and identity in a global context*, ed. Susan Kane, 149–171. Boston, MA: Archaeological Institute of America.
  2005. Sites of violence: Terrorism, tourism, and heritage in the archaeological present. In *Embedding ethics*, ed. Lynn Meskell and Peter Pels, 123–146. Oxford, MA: Berg.
Messenger, Phyllis Mauch, ed.
  1989. *The ethics of collecting cultural property. Whose culture? Whose property?* Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
Michaels, Eric.
  1987. Aboriginal content: Who's got it—Who needs it? *Art & Text* 23–24: 58–78.
Mihesuah, Devon A., ed.
  2000. *Repatriation reader. Who owns American Indian remains?* Lincoln, NH: University of Nebraska Press.
Miller, Daniel, Michael Rowlands, and Christopher Tilley, eds.
  1989. *Domination and resistance*. One World Archaeology. London: Unwin Hyman.
Mitchell, Timothy.
  2001. Making the nation: The politics of heritage in Egypt. In *Consuming tradition, manufacturing heritage. Global norms and urban forms in the age of tourism*, ed. Nezar AlSayyad, 212–239. London: Routledge.
  2002. *Rule of experts. Egypt, techno-politics and modernity*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Mondale, Clarence.
  1994. Conserving a problematic past. In *Conserving culture. A new discourse on heritage*, ed. Mary Hufford, 15–23. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
Mortensen, Lena.
  2007. Working borders: The contexts of copán archaeology. *Archaeologies* 3(2): 132–152.
  2009 Producing copán in the archaeology industry. In *Ethnographies & archaeologies. Iterations of the past*, ed. Lena Mortensen and Julie Hollowell, 178–198. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
Mullins, Paul.
  2004. African-American heritage in a multicultural community. In *Places in mind: Public archaeology as applied anthropology*, ed. Paul A. Shackel and Erve Chambers, 57–69. London: Routledge.
  2007. Politics, inequality, and engaged archaeology: Community archaeology along the color line. In *Archaeology as a tool of civic engagement*, ed. Barbara J. Little and Paul A. Shackel, 89–108. Lanham, MD: AltaMira.

Ndoro, Webber.
  1999. Great Zimbabwe. In *Lessons from the past,* ed. Kenneth Feder, 31–35. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing.
Norberg-Schulz, Christian.
  1971. *Existence, space and architecture*. New York, NY: Praeger.
Orser, Charles.
  2007. Transnational diaspora and rights of heritage. In *Cultural heritage and human rights*, ed. Helaine Silverman and D. Fairchild Ruggles, 92–105. New York, NY: Springer.
Ostow, Robin, ed.
  2008. *(Re)visualizing national history: Museums and national identities in Europe in the new millennium*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Owsley, Douglas W., and Richard L. Jantz.
  2002. Kennewick man –A kin? Too distant. In *Claiming the stones. Naming the bones. Cultural property and the negotiation of national and ethnic identity*, ed. Elazar Barkan and Ronald Bush, 141–161. Los Angeles, CA: Getty Publications.
Peers, Laura, and Aliso K. Brown, eds.
  2003. *Museums and source communities: A Routledge reader*. London: Routledge.
Polk, Milbry, and Angela M. H. Schuster.
  2005. *The looting of the Iraq museum. The lost legacy of ancient Mesopotamia*. New York, NY: Harry N. Abrams.
Pomeroy, Melanie.
  2005. Assessing the cultural significance of world heritage sites. In *Heritage of value, archaeology of renown*, ed. Clay Mathers, Timothy Darvill, and Barbara J. Little, 301–316. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
Pressouyre, Léon.
  1996. *The world heritage convention twenty years later*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.
Price, Sally.
  2007. *Paris primitive. Jacques Chirac's museum on the Quai Branly*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Pwiti, Gilbert, and Webber Ndoro.
  1999. The legacy of colonialism: Perceptions of the cultural heritage in Southern Africa, with special reference to Zimbabwe. *African Archaeological Review* 16: 143–153.
Pyburn, K. Anne.
  2007. Archaeology as activism. In *Cultural heritage and human rights*, eds. Helaine Silverman and D. Fairchild Ruggles, 172–183. New York ,NY: Springer.
  2006. Exhibiting archaeology. Site museums and cultural resource management in Latin America. In *Archaeological site museums in Latin America*, ed. Helaine Silverman, 256–266. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
Rakotoarisoa, Jean-Aimé.
  1989. The burden of an encumbered inheritance upon the study of the past of Madagascar. In *Conflict in the archaeology of living traditions*, ed. R. Layton, 82–87. One World Archaeology. London: Routledge.
Relph, E.
  1976. *Place and placelessness*. London: Pion.
Richardson, Lori.
  1989. The acquisition, storage, and handling of aboriginal skeletal remains in museums: An indigenous perspective. In *Conflict in the archaeology of living traditions*, ed. R. Layton, 185–188. One World Archaeology. London: Routledge.
Rose, Brian.
  2009. Everyone's hero. Ancient models, modern identity. *Archaeology Magazine,* Sep/Oct:editorial.
Rotenberg, Robert.
  1995. *Landscape and power in Vienna*. Baltimore, MD Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rothfield, Lawrence.
  2008. *Antiquities under siege: Cultural heritage protection after the Iraq war*. Lanham, MD:
    AltaMira.
  2009. *The rape of Mesopotamia. Behind the looting of the Iraq museum*. Chicago, IL: University
    of Chicago Press.
Rowlands, Michael.
  1994. The politics of identity in archaeology. In *Social construction of the past: Representation
    as power*, ed. George Clement Bond and Angela Gilliam, 129–143. London: Routledge.
Ruggles, D. Fairchild, and Helaine Silverman.
  2009a. From tangible to intangible heritage. In *Intangible heritage embodied*, ed. D. Fairchild
    Ruggles and Helaine Silverman, 1–14. New York, NY: Springer.
Ruggles, D. Fairchild, and Helaine Silverman, eds.
  2009b. *Intangible heritage embodied*. New York, NY: Springer.
Samuel, Raphael.
  2008. Politics. In *The heritage reader*, ed. Graham Fairclough, Rodney Harrison, John H.
    Jameson, and John Schofield, 274–293. London: Routledge [originally 1994].
Sather-Wagstaff, Joy.
  2009. Folk epigraphy at the world trade center, Oklahoma city, and beyond. In *Intangible heritage
    embodied*, ed. D. Fairchild Ruggles and Helaine Silverman, 169–184. New York: Springer.
Scarborough, Isabel.
  2008. The Bennett monolith: Archaeological patrimony and cultural restitution in Bolivia. In
    Handbook of South American archaeology, ed. Helaine Silverman and William H. Isbell,
    1089–1101. New York, NY: Springer.
Scazzosi, Lionella.
  2004. Reading and assessing the landscape as cultural and historical heritage. *Landscape
    Research* 29(4): 335–355.
Schildkrout, Enid.
  1991. Ambiguous messages and ironic twists: "into the heart of Africa" and "the other museum."
    Museum Anthropology 15(2): 16–23.
Schmidt, Peter R., and Thomas C. Patterson, eds.
  1995. *Making alternative histories. The practice of archaeology and history in non-western
    Settings*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
Sewell, William H.
  1989. Concepts of culture. In *Beyond the cultural turn*, ed. Victoria E. Bonnell and Lynn Hunt,
    35–61. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Shackel, Paul A.
  2002. Broadening the interpretations of the past at Harpers Ferry National Historical Park. In
    Public benefits of archaeology, ed. Barbara J. Little, 157–166. Gainesville, FL: University
    Press of Florida.
Shackel, Paul A., and Erve Chambers, eds.
  2004. *Places in mind: Public archaeology as applied anthropology*. New York, NY: Routledge.
Sharma, Ram Sharan.
  2001. The Ayodhya issue. In *Destruction and conservation of cultural property*, ed. Robert
    Layton, Peter G. Stone, and Julian Thomas, 127–138. London: Routledge.
Shennan, S. J., ed.
  1989. *Archaeological approaches to cultural identity*. One World Archaeology. London: Unwin
    Hyman.
Shepherd, Robert.
  2009. Cultural heritage, UNESCO, and the Chinese State. *Heritage Management* 2(1): 55–80.
Sherman, Daniel J., and Irit Rogoff, eds.
  1994. *Museum culture. Histories, discourses, spectacles*. Minneapolis, MN: University of
    Minnesota Press.

Silberman, Neil Asher.
  1995. Promised lands and chosen peoples: The politics and poetics of archaeological narrative. In *Nationalism, politics, and the practice of archaeology*, ed. Philip L. Kohl and Clare Fawcett, 249–262. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
Silverman, Helaine.
  1990. Beyond the pampa: The geoglyphs in the valleys of Nazca. *National Geographic Research* 6(4): 435–456.
  1999. Archaeology and the 1997 Peruvian hostage crisis. *Anthropology Today* 15(1): 9–13.
  2002a. To be human is to dwell: Settlement patterns and social geographies. In *Ancient nasca settlement and society*, ed. Helaine Silverman, 1–20. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Press.
  2002b. Touring ancient times: The present and presented past in contemporary Peru. *American Anthropologist* 104(3): 881–902.
  2005. Embodied heritage, identity politics, and tourism. *Anthropology and Humanism* 30(2): 141–155.
  2006a. The historic district of Cusco as an open-air museum. In *Archaeological site museums in Latin America*, ed. Helaine Silverman, 159–183. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
  2006b. *Archaeological site museums in Latin America*, ed. Helaine Silverman. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
Silverman, Helaine, and D. Fairchild Ruggles.
  2007a. *Cultural heritage and human rights*, ed. Helaine Silverman and D. Fairchild Ruggles. New York, NY: Springer.
  2007b. Cultural heritage and human rights. In *Cultural heritage and human rights*, ed. Helaine Silverman and D. Fairchild Ruggles, 3–22. New York, NY: Springer.
Simpson, Moira G.
  1996. *Making representations. Museums in the post-colonial era*. London: Routledge.
Smith, Anthony D.
  1989. *The ethnic origin of nations*. Oxford, MA: Basil Blackwell.
Smith, Claire, and H. Martin Wobst.
  2005. Decolonizing archaeological theory and practice. In *Indigenous archaeologies: Decolonizing theory and practice*, ed. Claire Smith and H. Martin Wobst, 4–14. One World Archaeology. London: Routledge.
Smith, Laurajane.
  2006. *The uses of heritage*. London: Routledge.
Smith, Laurajane, and Natsuko Akagawa, eds.
  2009. *Intangible heritage*. New York, NY: Routledge.
Smith, Rhona K. M.
  2001. Traditional lands and cultural rights: The Australian experience. *International Journal of Human Rights* 5(3): 1–18.
Spiegel, Andrew D.
  1994. Struggling with tradition in South Africa: The multivocality of images of the past. In *Social construction of the past: Representation as power*, ed. George Clement Bond and Angela Gilliam, 185–202. London: Routledge.
Stanworth, Karen.
  1994. The politics of display: A "literary and historical" definition of Quebec in 1830s British North America. In *Art apart. Art institutions and ideology across England and North America*, ed. Marcia Pointon, 120–141. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Starzmann, Maria Theresia.
  2008. Cultural imperialism and heritage politics in the event of armed conflict: Prospects for an "activist archaeology." *Archaeologies* 4(3): 368–389.
Stone, Peter.
  2008. Stonehenge—A final solution? In *The heritage reader*, ed. Graham Fairclough, Rodney Harrison, John H. Jameson, and John Schofield, 524–535. London: Routledge.

Stone, Peter, and Joanne Farchakh Bajjaly, eds.
  2008. *The destruction of cultural heritage in Iraq*. Suffolk, UK: Boydell Press, Woodbridge.
Stone, Peter G., and Brian L. Molyneaux, eds.
  1994. *The presented past: Heritage, museums and education*. One World Archaeology. London:
    Routledge.
Sulc, Branka.
  2001. The protection of Croatia's cultural heritage during war, 1991–1995. In *Destruction and
    conservation of cultural property*, ed. Robert Layton, Peter G. Stone, and Julian Thomas,
    157–167. London: Routledge.
Swidler, Nina, Kurt E. Dongoske, Roger Anyon, and Alan S. Downer, eds.
  1997. *Native Americans and archaeologists. Stepping stones to common ground*. Walnut Creek,
    CA: AltaMira.
Trouillot, Michel-Rolph.
  1995. *Silencing the past. Power and the production of history*. Boston, MA: Beacon.
Ucko, Peter.
  1989. Foreword. In *Archaeological heritage management in the modern world*, ed. H. F. Cleere,
    ix–xiv. One World Archaeology. London: Unwin Hyman.
Van der Aa, Bart.
  2005. World heritage as a means of marking Mexican identity. In *Senses of place: Senses of time*,
    ed. G. J. Ashworth and Brian Graham, 133–148. London: Ashgate.
Vergo, Peter, ed.
  1989. *The new museology*. London: Reaktion.
Wallach, Alan.
  1994. The battle over "The west as America," 1991. In *Art apart. Art institutions and ideology
    across England and North America*, ed. Marcia Pointon, 89–101. Manchester: Manchester
    University Press.
Walsh, Kevin.
  1992. The museum as a facilitator. In *The representation of the past. Museums and heritage in
    the post-modern world*, ed. Kevin Walsh, 160–175. London: Routledge.
Warren, Karen J.
  1989. Introduction. A philosophical perspective on the ethics and resolution of cul-
    tural properties issues. In *The ethics of collecting cultural property. Whose culture?
    Whose property?*, ed. Phyllis Mauch Messenger, 1–25. Albuquerque, NM: University of
    New Mexico Press.
Watkins, Joe.
  2000. *Indigenous archaeology. American Indian values and scientific practice*. Walnut Creek,
    CA: AltaMira.
Watkins, Joe, K. Anne Pyburn, and Pam Cressey.
  2000. Community relations: What the practicing archaeologist needs to know to work effectively
    with local and/or descendant communities. In *Teaching archaeology in the twenty-first cen-
    tury*, ed. Susan Bender and George Smith, 730–781. Washington, DC: Society for American
    Archaeology.
Weil, Steven.
  1990. *Rethinking the museum*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
Wescoat, James L., Jr.
  2007. The Indo-Islamic garden: Conflict, conservation, and conciliation in Gujarat, India. In
    Cultural heritage and human rights, ed. Helaine Silverman and D. Fairchild Ruggles, 53–77.
    New York, NY: Springer.
Williams, Raymond.
  1958. *Culture and society, 1780–1950*. London: Chatto & Windus.
Wood, Denis.
  1992. *The power of maps*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Yanni, Carla.
   1999. *Nature's museums. Victorian science and the architecture of display*. Baltimore, MD: Johns
      Hopkins University Press.
Zolberg, Vera.
   1996. Museums as contested sites of remembrance: The Enola Gay affair. In *Theorizing muse-
      ums. Representing identity and diversity in a changing world*, ed. Sharon MacDonald and
      Gordon Fyfe, 69–82. Oxford: Blackwell.