



Heritage-Border Complexes

Parallels, Possibilities and Consequences of Border-Straddling Heritage

Ali Mozaffari and David C. Harvey

Introduction

Today we are living in a world that is more connected than ever before in human history. While access to, and exercise of, this connectivity has never been open or even, the premise of ever-increasing mobility, and a rising wave of globalization has been central in both rhetorical meaning and actual practice (Brumann 2021, 4). Indeed, Khanna (2016) refers to the present experience as one of ‘hyperglobalization’. This has had contradictory effects, resulting in dislodging formerly stable social relations and personal identities in some circumstances (Giddens 1991) and, in other cases, resulting in a time-space compression destabilizing both time and space (Harvey 2012). This phenomenon has at once displaced, challenged and intensified notions of sovereignty and boundedness – in broad terms, borders – often understood, delineated and justified through complex relationships between the past and the present. Within such dynamic and complex spatiotemporal contexts, it is imperative to shift the focus to how people *do* heritage and what heritage *does* in relation to boundaries and borders. In other words, we need to examine how people purposively engage with the past in relation to borders and boundaries (doing heritage) alongside an exploration of heritage as a realm of action, productive of boundaries and borders (what heritage does).

This volume explores some of the implications of this proposition for heritage studies. Following the introduction, which sets out the relevant scholarly terrain of the relationship between heritage and borders, the

rest of the volume responds to the above imperative, focusing on different aspects of the heritage-border relationship in a critically reflective manner and drawing from a range of distinct disciplinary backgrounds. Together, the chapters of this volume explore a response to the changing world that we live in. While inevitably partial, we hope that we might provide a pathway through which heritage scholarship might navigate these uncharted and choppy waters.

In this volume, we take a ‘soft’ approach to borders, understanding them in the broadest conceptual terms. We are cognisant of subtle but important differences between borders (commonly understood in more definitive, often geopolitical terms), frontiers (as a liminal space or zone, but with less definitive connotations, which may be used territorially or metaphorically) and boundaries (as symbolic or physical markers of entities across any scale) (see van Houtum 2005; Newman 2006). We also recognize that these terms have evolved historically and carry disciplinary baggage. Our ‘soft’ approach, which substitutes borders for all the above, is a deliberate strategy to encourage interdisciplinary conversation and to include questions of scale, epistemology and ontology of heritage and borders/frontiers/boundaries within the book. Therefore, while some of the chapters within this volume refer to borders in a formal sense, as delineating a nation state, others understand borders in a fluid and multifaceted manner. Hence, as well as *prima facie* territorial entities, the book illustrates that borders may be drawn around cultural practices, attitudes or disciplines as well, even though the majority of the chapters here focus on borders in territorial and sociocultural terms.

Under present conditions of increasing mobility, globalization and virtual connection, the negotiation of borders becomes ever more central to our daily lives. As borders seem to evaporate in some areas, in certain forms, and under specific circumstances, they are redrawn ever more firmly at other places and on different scales. Indeed, even in instances where certain types of borders have been declaratively removed (such as within much of mainland Europe), their everyday practice and experience seems to have intensified (Miggelbrink 2016), becoming more regulated, formalized and institutionalized, often in dynamic and inconsistent ways.¹ They can also appear to become opaque, with the subtleties of transgression or marginalization marked in novel ways.

In an increasingly connected and rapidly shifting world, we need to re-define both the concept of, and approach to, heritage. A dominant conception of heritage tends towards associating it with more-or-less exclusive pasts in spatially discrete entities.² In other words, it is understood and utilized in association with nation states, and in line with an assumed Westphalian world order (est. 1648).³ This association and the scope it imposes on

heritage limit its analytical value by failing to account for the various ways heritage may be deterritorialized, dynamically rescaled and mobilized transnationally in a connected world. For instance, heritage can advance a larger common good (e.g. in UNESCO rhetoric), or imperial and quasi-imperial designs (e.g. increasingly, in the case of rising hegemonic powers) at regional and global scales.

There are notable exceptions to this dominant conception, where heritage is propagated and understood in terms of movements and connectivities and in relation to diasporic communities, but they are not the rule.⁴ As Andersen and Prokkola (2021) point out, while institutionalized heritage is prominent in processes of bordering (alongside simultaneous practices of silencing other narratives), heritage also offers possibilities of reconciliation, through transnational and humanitarian narratives, even within highly unpromising terrain (e.g. see Silverman and Ruggles 2007; Vrdoljak 2009; Logan 2013; Brumann 2014). In other words, notwithstanding the problems and pitfalls that so many discrete expressions of heritage reveal, there is ample room for thinking through and developing alternative heritage possibilities.

While the Westphalian order remains in place, the existing conception of heritage, even within critical heritage studies, is struggling to cope within the dynamic spatial reordering that is currently unfolding at transnational and subnational scales (e.g. see Kazharski and Makarychev 2025). This necessary recasting of heritage, we argue, will have direct repercussions for the field of heritage practice and scholarship in general and critical heritage studies in particular. This is because, despite repeated declarations to rethink heritage at different scales and in different ways, with some notable exceptions (e.g. see Robertson 2008; Carter 2019; Lähdesmäki, Zhu and Thomas 2019), the existing field of critical heritage studies seems inevitably to be tied to the current spatial and scalar paradigm of the nation state (Smith 2006; Harvey 2015). Pursuing the promise of ‘rethinking heritage’, we propose to shift the focus from heritage itself to the dialectical relationship between heritage and borders. In so doing, we expand on a recent paper by Andersen and Prokkola (2021, 241), where they examine the role of heritage within bordering practices in war museums on both Croatian and Finnish borderlands, agreeing with their conclusion that ‘heritage making is [always about] bordering and re-bordering’ (see also, Whitehead et al. 2021). Indeed, we argue that the practice of imagining borders is impossible without heritage. This view of heritage recognizes its inextricable relation with the cultural logics of boundary-making. In broad terms, therefore, we propose that heritage and borders are co-constituted as a dynamic duo in multiple ways, depending on the scale at which they are deployed. This approach will open new horizons that bring together

questions of time, space, place, power, emotion and contextual experience (affect), and sharpen the analytical import of the concept of heritage. We therefore turn our gaze not only to the constitution of heritage borders but also to critical transgressions of borders thus established. It is in this sense that we refer to *heritage-border complexes*. Before unpacking some consequential lines of thinking and exploring analytical options for further work, we first need to explain what has prompted us to focus on heritage-border complexes.

How Did We Get Here? Unpicking the Love Affair of Heritage and Borders

The idea of seeing the world in terms of borders that separate essential entities is deeply ingrained.⁵ Furthermore, as we shall discuss below, ‘heritage’ – heritage narratives, assertions, laws, sites, landscapes and investments – has been central to these phenomena, in a mutually reinforcing manner. This is manifested in various forms of victimization and marginalization (for example, against refugees and migrants) and in resisting and responding to those victimizations (Herzfeld 2009; 2010; De Cesari 2010; Jasper, Jones and Mozaffari 2017; Meskell 2015). In other examples, material culture such as historic monuments and sacred sites – even carpets – are used to assert territorial claims (Emmett 2000; Mozaffari and Barry 2021; 2023). Increasingly, even forms of literary or intangible cultural heritage are (mis)appropriated to advance geostrategic goals cloaked in civilizational rhetoric (Mozaffari and Akbar 2023). While the stridently exclusive (and often exclusionary) styles of national singularity – whether in Italy, UK, USA or Azerbaijan – often take the headlines, we should note that the ideal of a supposed exclusive and singular sense of selfhood reaches beyond the realms of right-wing populism. For instance, while meta-regionalist projects such as those in Scotland, Catalonia or ‘greater’ Kurdistan tend to curry favour from many liberals, they can be just as susceptible to notions of exceptionalism and essentialism within their identity narratives.

Despite valuable contributions from heritage scholarship, we contend that the field has fallen short of crafting alternative narratives that intricately and compellingly explore the multifaceted and dynamic interplay between heritage and borders. We contend that we need a more nuanced examination that can reveal practical possibilities, and that can reach beyond what can seem like a scholarly dualism between the incessant critique of entrenched power relations and a preoccupation with footloose global flows.

It appears self-evident that, despite a scholarly emphasis on inclusivity, prevailing notions of heritage predominantly reinforce essentialist

boundaries – such as here and there, us and them, superior and subaltern – across various spatial, categorical and scalar dimensions. While an increasing number of heritage scholars have been critical of such essentialist framings, some forms of heritage are an effect and expression of essentialist nationalist politics, providing the cement and rhetorical power for affective border creation, legitimation and curation. Critical heritage studies as an intellectual project has resulted in a growing body of literature that addresses and analyses the making and function of heritage across temporal boundaries. However, it is unclear how many transcend nation-bound critique or sidestep assumptions of bounded national essentialisms while avoiding simplistic dualisms between nationalism and internationalism. This has left a gap that needs to be bridged by other approaches that go deeper than, and beyond, the essentialist foundations of national containers (however the ‘nation’ is defined), both from ‘above’ and from ‘below’. While the growing scholarship in heritage diplomacy (broadly understood) is an important step in this direction, critical heritage studies is yet to address itself fully to such ‘transgressive’ perspectives.⁶

To build this bridge, we begin by reappraising and expanding two of the major concepts that underlie the current understanding of heritage: *processualism* and *relationality*. Processualism recognizes heritage as an emergent entity, emphasizing the dynamic, performative and discursive aspects of heritage beyond the materiality of the object. This processual viewpoint draws from the broader field of relational thinking, which resolutely situates heritage within a web of relations between things, both human and nonhuman.⁷ A processual understanding of heritage shifts the locus of critique away from something inherent within heritage resources, such as sites and artefacts, to an analysis of what is done with these resources, and thus provides a powerful impetus for exposing power disparities, the politics of exclusion and victimization, while remaining distinct from activism.⁸ Processual understandings of heritage have gradually been influential in the framing of heritage as representation since the millennium, and should be recognized as part of an increasingly apparent theme in recent scholarship that has engaged with a *relational* understanding of the world. As we discuss in the next section, the existing body of scholarship has made considerable contributions using these concepts, while at the same time (and, perhaps, inevitably) promoting their own essentialisms.

Learning from these advancements and building on a *relational* view of heritage as an immanent and open-ended *process*, our intellectual project explores how heritage might have purposive and future-oriented attributes with a transformative potential (Harvey and Perry 2015). The key intellectual component in this exercise (explained in the following section) is the conceptualization of heritage-border complexes, and how they add nuance

and augment our understandings of the differentiations between *here* and *there* (Nelson 2019). Consequently, we consider what these differentiations do to the workings of heritage. To a certain extent, this requires building on the existing scholarship that seeks to extricate heritage from exclusive and exclusionary heritage narratives, and rethinking heritage-border relations is a step in this direction. This can be done by refocusing on different conceptualizations of ‘heritage-bordering’ practices that may, perhaps, even create a space of hope.

Following an elaboration of the heritage-border relationship, we explore how the state of the field has progressed through notions of processualism and relationality, paying attention to the consequences of these conceptualizations. A critical reading of the state of the field is a necessary foundation for this work. Thus, in the final section we turn to different conceptualizations of heritage-border relations and the implications thereof. As well as adding nuance to our understanding of heritage-border relations, we reflect on the possibilities of different avenues available to take the debates forward and how we can make an intervention within these debates.

State of the Field: In Search of Border-Heritage Relations

Heritage is not only a central (and often banal) means through which imagined communities (Anderson 2006) are recognized; it is also an increasingly central conduit for the exercise of sovereignty within discrete, territorialized entities.⁹ Heritage, therefore, supports practices of containerization, while, at the same time, practical containerization cements essentialized notions of heritage. We shall examine the state of the field by developing processualism and relationality as fundamental attributes of heritage, reflecting on how they have *worked* within critical heritage studies, and what their implications might be for our rethinking of heritage-border complexes.

As noted earlier, a definition of heritage as a *process* has long promoted a concern for what heritage *does*, and the connected critical appreciation of authorized heritage discourse (AHD) has underlined the politics at its heart (Harvey 2001; Smith 2006). Although there may be some conceptual problems about the intentions and relations of power that notions of AHD assume, energizing questions are, at least, being promoted and developed through the critical language of AHD. This stated ambition certainly suggests that (something called) critical heritage studies ought to have traction – or intellectual bite – that would undermine exclusionary visions of heritage. Furthermore, a greater appreciation of the affective dimensions of heritage and its dynamic and variegated emotional hue has tended to promote

a more nuanced, subtle and complex appreciation of the term (Waterton and Watson 2015; Tolia-Kelly, Waterton and Watson 2016; Jones 2024). Notwithstanding the quality and quantity of this scholarship, however, essentialist narratives still seem to have a warm glow, with heritage providing the ammunition for numerous ongoing conflicts (see, among others, Dolff-Bonekämper 2010; Constantinou, Demetriou and Hatay 2012; Viejo Rose and Sørensen 2015; Whitehead et al. 2020).

Has the critical heritage studies movement failed? Or is it a case that *criticality* has not been enough – or that its scope is limited by ideology? Why does heritage so often come – and keeps on coming – ready-packaged, as a long-nurtured nostalgia, already achieved? Why does heritage seem to answer questions, rather than act as a lens through which questions can be asked? Looking specifically towards ideas of purpose into the future, is it enough just to point to these problems of AHD, without trying to invoke something better? In other words, within a world of border essentialisms, what room remains through which an alternative conception of heritage can provide a more hopeful space?¹⁰

While heritage assertions are often central to essentialized understandings of the world, there is no inherent reason why this should be so. Put simply, if heritage is seen as the *process* of using the past (real or imagined), deployed in the present, with a purpose for the future, then it really ought to be part of the solution, rather than central to the problem. This position is also implied within Laurajane Smith's (2006, 11) suggestion that there is no such 'thing' as heritage. We have always felt that there is a liberating quality to this phrase, which dispenses with essentialized assumptions of heritage being rooted in stable singularities and instead embeds it within an ecology of relations. Consequently, rather than satisfying ourselves with nodding to this phrase to support a frustrated critical assertion about how heritage is used to fix the meaning of objects and sites (often in a politicized boundary-marking exercise), we should use Smith's stimulating statement as a provocation or prompt to find something better. 'Heritage as process' cannot refer to a static boundary or be inexorably connected to a fixed terrain and identity narrative – a 'where' that supposedly guides us, that answers questions and that needs to be preserved.¹¹

In a similar manner to which the universalist outlook of UNESCO reflects an enlightenment project that assumes the pre-eminence of nations, much of the critique that invokes an examination of AHD can also fall into the same trap. Just as a 'Europe of the regions',¹² ends up inadvertently enhancing the power of the essential border even as it seeks to celebrate efforts of reaching across borders, then powerful and critical renditions of AHD tacitly provide legitimacy to those who seek to profit from the existence of impermeable borders.¹³ This basic argument is implied by, among others,

Lähdesmäki, Zhu and Thomas (2019) and Harvey (2021), in their analysis of the contradictions at the heart of European heritage schemes, and was highlighted by Harvey (2015, 579) in his call to trace the ‘power geometries’ (drawing on Massey 1996; 2005) that are connected to AHD as a means to steer between the warm glow of localism and platitudes of universalism. Such an endeavour would be faithful to a broader intimation towards a *pluriversalist* perspective, which would allow for multiple epistemological standpoints rather than a ‘universalism-or-alternative’ dualism (Escobar 2020). We shall return to this later.

The idea that heritage might provide a creative answer to this conundrum of how one might celebrate distinctiveness without falling back on essentialist rhetoric, has been implicitly and explicitly made clear for many years. As a direct answer to critics that lampooned and despaired of the ‘heritage industry’ in the 1980s, for instance, Samuel (1996) pointed to the capacity for heritage to act as a champion of marginalized groups, being both authentically democratic and laden with promises of progressive and emergent hope (Carter et al. 2020, 7).¹⁴ In many ways, this mantle was taken up and further developed through notions of ‘heritage from below’ (Robertson 2008) or ‘heritage movements’ (Jones, Mozaffari and Jasper 2017; Mozaffari and Jones 2020; Jones 2024), which sought to examine the power and potential of heritages operating outside of the AHD. These (often informal) expressions of heritage, challenge taken for granted and constricted narratives, at times empowering communities to transcend the limitations of containerization. In other words, rather than always being connected (often unthinkingly) to reactionary and powerful (national) voices, there is always a possibility – an implication, hinted at through situated relationality – that heritage might be at the heart of more subversive and perhaps even liberating efforts (Chatterton and Pusey 2020).

As a central implication of *processual* viewpoints around heritage, the idea of ‘potentiality’ has been noted for many years and often allied with such invocations towards activism and to provide a voice for those who are not usually heard (e.g. see Smith, Shackel and Campbell 2011). More broadly, a range of alternative heritage visions have been developed, often around the idea that *nostalgia* need not always be seen as a reactionary emotion, but rather should be recognized as a subversive challenge that can transcend critical debates about AHDs (Harvey 2017, 110). Such ideas include notions of *mobile nostalgia*, *productive nostalgia*, *counter-memory* and *heritage arrival* (Blunt 2003; Legg 2005; Bonnett 2010; Hoskins 2012; Bonnett and Alexander 2013), which can be characterized as celebrating relational and processual understandings of heritage, and which tend to eschew national (and other) containers. In other words, rather than be content with a critique of what exists operating within established (bounded)

framings, there is a profound sense of hope and potential embedded within them.

Scholars have begun to expand the scope of heritage, as apparent in the more recent works by Rodney Harrison and Tim Winter, to name but two examples. While Harrison (2012) is concerned with the dialogical, more-than-human ontologies and the Anthropocene, Winter's (2019; 2022; 2023) most recent works are strongly underpinned by notions of connectivity and cultural manifestations in vast geopolitical expanses (geoculture and advocating a turn to maritime heritage) and Jones (2024) interprets it under the rubric of movement broadly understood. However, while invaluable, this scholarship may risk a different kind of theoretical essentialism by potentially discounting the significance of the nation state or ignoring the fact that, for most of the world, everyday identities and heritage are not experienced through notions of connectivity and mobility, at least not in any immediate or concrete fashion (Jones's 2024 book is a useful corrective).¹⁵ How do we address such essentialisms in our quest for nuances in the conception of heritage?

It is evident that within relational parameters there are multiple approaches to conceptualizing heritage. Furthermore, allied with the potential of *processual*-based heritage understandings, as we noted, recent years have also seen greater recognition of affect (Jones and Garde-Hansen 2012; Waterton and Dittmer 2014; Waterton and Watson 2015; Tolia-Kelly, Waterton and Watson 2016). This attention to *non-* or *more-than-representational* approaches provides an impetus for looking beyond (or otherwise sidestepping) circumscribing heritage within fixed borders. Thus far, however, these developments have rarely (or at least not explicitly) been brought into a conversation with broader geopolitical efforts to rethink (national and other) borders.

A contrasting angle to AHD but drawing on the *more-than-representational* has been presented through notions of *heritage diplomacy*, where statecraft, international relations and soft power intersect.¹⁶ While archaeologists, cartographers and others have been in the service of foreign policy since the nineteenth century, heritage diplomacy is a much later development,¹⁷ attributed to the post-Second World War formation of a bipolar world.¹⁸ In the new millennium, Luke and Kersel (2013, 2) note that international conflicts, such as the invasion of Iraq in 2003, propelled heritage into the centre stage of propaganda and public relations, leading them to assert that 'U.S. archaeology abroad is an integral part of past and current U.S. foreign policy'. Elsewhere, Winter (2015) argues that the 'state' is but one player in heritage diplomacy. He invites us to move beyond the common frameworks of the colonial and postcolonial and to balance critical readings of conflict and dissonance with analyses of the diplomacy of cooperation in

international arenas. Thus, through heritage diplomacy, hidden and opaque forms of sovereignty may be understood. Rather than mutually exclusive categories, therefore, we are faced with a dialectics of cooperation and contestation that must be settled through long negotiations.¹⁹

Thus far, we have explored the contours of the big debates that pertain to the field and some of their possible shortcomings. Much of these shortcomings revolve around simplified assumptions over the nature of heritage and the nature of (national) territories and borders. This suggests the need to assume a fresh approach to the nexus of cultural sovereignty, political sovereignty and heritage, which implies a rethinking of regions, nations and heritage through the lens of heritage-border complexes. Following developments within cultural studies, therefore, our ambition can perhaps be encapsulated by a desire to develop a sort of *more-than-critical-and-relational-heritage-theory*.²⁰ This would be a mammoth task that cannot be addressed in a single chapter but our aim here is to raise complex questions and hope that we can provide some pointers to further discussions throughout the rest of this book and in future work.

Heritage Borders: Some Observations

There is an inextricable link between heritage and borders. Whether physically articulated, or whether defined by legal arrangements, in the form of de facto barriers or differentiations through other means, heritage plays a significant role in naturalizing, justifying and grounding borders as taken-for-granted entities.²¹ In a somewhat circular fashion, borders also underwrite, explain and authenticate heritage.²² In other words, heritage is narrated and deployed as a resource in support of a world composed of distinctive social groups that appear to coincide (more or less) with, or declare connection-in-severalty to, corresponding territorial units. Indeed, one can identify a continuing nostalgia for an era when ‘lines on a map’ were supposedly more straightforward and seemingly more ‘naturally’ cast as a common-sense fact.²³ Strongly connected to the role of *territorial awareness* within Paasi’s (2009; 2012) thesis of how regions become institutionalized, an entrenchment of containerized heritage dreams is encouraged. While heritages legitimize solid lines on a map and the territories they represent, therefore, these maps, in turn, consolidate and substantiate heritage claims (Anderson 2006). Indeed, the actual line on a map becomes a powerful resource through which identity politics is performed and power is articulated.²⁴ Despite a scholarly recognition of the many complicated ways that borders are made and contested, an imagined – if not invented – mosaic of exclusive identities has become naturalized and enhanced

through the careful preservation of certain tangible and intangible cultural heritage narratives.²⁵

Of course, a powerful critique of such simplistic dualisms – of *us and them*, *somewhere and anywhere*, and *here and there* – can be found within both postcolonial theory and relational thinking. However, it is difficult to develop such non-dualistic and critical lines of thinking where, as is invariably the case in official formulations, heritage is understood, validated and managed based on taken-for-granted territorial conceptions (e.g. Waterton, Smith and Campbell 2006; Stovel 2008; Horský & Ovčáčková 2024). Such conceptions are ingrained in both resolutely national frameworks of governance, and larger-scale entities (such as the European Union (EU) or UN/UNESCO).²⁶ Thus, transnational and intergovernmental organizations such as UN (United Nations) and UNESCO profoundly reinforce the singularity and sovereignty of the territorial nation state as the fundamental unit for the organization of political authority (Reus-Smit 2020). This is the result of multiple factors, including the historical and geopolitical conditions under which these organizations were conceived (see Harvey 2024). Drawing on Meskell (2009; 2013), this has two consequences for UNESCO's framing of heritage. Firstly, it underlines a preference for the singularity of the nation state. Notwithstanding the existence of some multinational nominations being accepted, the lack of a 'national committee' for nonrecognized entities has been identified as a central factor in the skewing and stunting of heritage representation (Donnachie 2016; Brumann 2021). Secondly, and concurrently, the UNESCO imagination and conceptualization of the world imposes an avowedly *universalist* outlook that stems from the Enlightenment idea of humanity and its values.

However much one might agree with UNESCO dreaming of universalism in principle, it seems inescapable that, in practice, it has resulted in a Eurocentric and perhaps even dated rendering of how the world should be understood, an epistemic marshalling of what this universalist dream means and *does* (Harvey 2024). Drawing on Shepherd's (2015) notion of *epistemic violence*, therefore, we recognize many elements of *epistemic* management – or *curation* – taking place. While not necessarily 'violent' and colonial in nature, such practices impel us to examine more critically the connected issues of power, justice and human rights when such epistemic categorizations are drawn.²⁷ Central to these notions of universalism are ideas of essentialist categorizations – a separation of 'culture' and 'nature' and an assumption that the world is naturally divided into a mosaic of stable 'nation states'. Just as UNESCO continues to struggle with more nuanced conceptions of culture and nature, so its continued assumptions over the physical presence of heritage, and its perceived need for certain kinds of expertise and an institutional culture that works through top-down management and

has financial dependencies on member states, lies at the heart of its shortcomings (see Brumann 2014; Meskell and Liuzza 2022). This universalism, however, has the potential to marginalize and even essentialize other ways of being. As some of our chapters show, notwithstanding an increasing rhetorical commitment to ideas of intangible heritage, indigenous knowledge and civil society, therefore, UNESCO has an inherent ontological problem residing within its institutional structure (e.g. see Andersen 2021).

Drawing on Barthel-Bouchier's (2015) interpretation of Bourdieu's notion of the organizational field, entities such as UNESCO are condemned to repeat and reproduce the categories that lie at the heart of their foundation; categories that may have a propensity for essentialism.²⁸ This essentialism, as we discuss later, pertains above all to ontological categories, but while the organization may have moved on from its past Eurocentric attributes, the organizational viewpoint will always struggle to articulate a more open, relational or processual understanding of heritage-border relationships. Critical heritage studies seems to pursue an intellectual intervention in this space by critiquing the institutionalization of heritage within national boundaries and in the international system of management (UNESCO), but its interventions are also limited by its own ideological underpinnings – after all, the essential existence of 'nations' is bound up in the very existence (and naming) of the 'United Nations'.

In an increasingly connected world where ideas, values and practices are in a state of flux and mutual (albeit uneven) influence, notions of radical relativism can impose their own kinds of borders. In some contexts, these ideas may result in exoticism and fall short of describing world relations, let alone articulating alternative attractive approaches. However, recognizing institutional shortcomings is not to set up a strawman of universal dominance and cultural uniformity under late capitalism. On the contrary, it is to recognize that these relationships unfold over various scales.

Rather than just dispense with the very idea and possibility of universalisms, we need to explore the spaces that are available for rethinking the assumptions that such universalist discourses make. In other words, while much emphasis on non-Western perspectives (i.e. Indigenous knowledges, Asian perspectives, subaltern voices, southern urbanisms, or other forms of knowledge of a non-European origin) have often been cast as 'alternative perspectives' – a phrase that tends to support a hierarchy of value – perhaps a more realistic pathway would be to perceive a possibility of several perspectives of merit.²⁹ Rather than either perceiving the world through a singular lens of *universalism* (as a synonym to Eurocentrism), or totally rejecting such 'Eurocentric' tendencies, therefore, other approaches may be useful.

One such proposition is conveyed in *pluriversalism*, which broadly interpreted, refuses to frame epistemologies from 'the South' as *alternatives*

to Western viewpoints by recognizing a diversity of ethical and cosmological worlding practices (Mukhopadhyay 2021, iii) without falling into the trap of cultural relativism and the ontological borders that it would impose. As Rico (2016, 103) points out, such a *pluriversalist* perspective can actually ‘rescue’ a Western hegemonic mainstream from being cast in homogenous singularity, thereby allowing a more nuanced appreciation of hidden and marginalized voices even within a apparently ‘universal’ mainstream.³⁰ On the other hand, allowing space for multiple epistemologies can perhaps counter a seeming bland flatness that is sometimes invoked by the phrase ‘alternative knowledge’. As Mukhopadhyay (2021, 313) notes, a pluriversal perspective can, on the one hand, give voice to ‘multiplicity of worlds and ways of worlding life’ (Escobar 2020, 131). On the other hand, it also ‘opens up the possibility to have a dialogue between and within diverse ethical and cosmological worlds’. An example, perhaps, of where such an expanded conceptual frame for heritage is developed can be seen in the work of Whitehead, Schofield and Bozoğlu (2021). By invoking what they refer to as a ‘momentary ontology of heritage’ and focusing on the *when* of heritage rather than the *what*, they make space for a fleeting, mundane, relational and plural heritage that is rooted in everyday ubiquity. As a momentary co-presence of then and now, valorization is focused on the experience (rather than the edifice), and while Whitehead sees this experience as ‘universal’, we feel that this also resonates with *pluriversal* viewpoints. Indeed, perhaps one can make a case for ‘universality’, as opposed to the UNESCO endorsed idea of (uppercase ‘U’) ‘Universality’.

While a *pluriversal* viewpoint provides a space of possibility to refuse the value hierarchy that is embedded within a ‘universalist-or-alternative’ dualism, it further impels us to ask: what purposes might this nuanced understanding of universalism serve? As we alluded to earlier and will expand on below, there are fundamental complexities and contradictions inherent both within the institutional management of heritage as well as in critical heritage studies as a field of enquiry. We shall now reflect on the state of the field with a specific focus on ways of conceptualizing heritage-border relations and their mutual constitution in a more productive light.

From Critical Reflection to Possibilities for Intervention

Thus far we have argued for the need to address the heritage-border relationship within heritage studies in general and critical heritage studies in particular, for two connected reasons. Firstly, as we have shown, essentialist assumptions about heritage and borders continue to hide around

every corner, even within many avowedly ‘critical’ conceptions, due to the enlightenment-inspired notions of discourse and knowledge construction that lie at their heart. In effect, as Waterton, Saul and Tolia-Kelly (2023, 146) point out with regards to critical heritage studies, thus far ‘we have [merely] dressed ourselves up as the solution, rather than the problem’. Secondly, we feel that rethinking ‘heritage’ and ‘borders’ in a situated, relational, processual and mutually supporting manner as ‘heritage-border complexes’ can be productive in the search for a more-than-critical heritage practice. Thus, we build on scholarship in border studies to ask how borders (as ‘emergent time-places’) can be conceptualized: how are they conceived, and how are they engaged in practice? Probing these questions and building on the notions of *processualism* and *relationality*, we tackle heritage-border complexes provisionally in three steps: (1) conceptualizing heritage-border complexes; (2) patterns of engagement with heritage-border complexes; and (3) reflecting on the broader implications of heritage-border complexes for heritage studies. Each step contains several conceptual propositions that may be considered in responding to properties of heritage-border sensibilities. Our objective here is not to *resolve*, but to raise issues for further questioning and exploration. For each of these conceptual propositions, we suggest some possibilities for understanding and analysis, but our list is not exhaustive.

Conceptualizing Heritage-Border Complexes

The first question is: *how do we understand heritage-border complexes*? What are the conceptual apparatuses that contain analytical and explanatory values for the designation of borders and their ontological qualities? On the face of it, any border presupposes its crossing (e.g. see Herrschel 2016, 6), but we need to recognize this as a multifaceted and emergent phenomenon at the meeting point of time and space. Borders are polysemic (Golunov 2014, 66, after Balibar) with multiple processes involved in their production and experience. Here, spatial borders are emergent events (Badiou 2006, 174; in Demetriou and Dimova 2019, 6); a zone ‘on the cusp’. They are always contingent and confirm symbolic boundaries, as ‘conceptual distinctions made by social actors to categorize objects, people, practices, and even time and space’ (Lamont and Molnar 2002, 168). Thus, through borders, identities and realities are formed and contested (Epstein 1992, 232) and understanding them requires a multifaceted approach that can accommodate multiple scales and perspectives. To this end, we adapt some of the theoretical propositions established in border studies to heritage-border complexes and highlight ontological aspects of: (1) borders as

liminal zones; (2) bordering practices; and (3) processes involved in drawing borders, or delineations.

Heritage Borders: Liminality and Movement

Both heritage and borders have liminal qualities and analogous functions. As liminal zones and cultural interfaces, borders bring together the tangible (material) and intangible (symbolic and nonmaterial) worlds (Demetriou and Dimova 2019, 5). Whatever crosses a border, blurs boundaries between categories and places. Similarly, heritage is always entangled with notions of the liminal as it collapses boundaries of place and temporality by reimagining the past in the present. It is born of the consciousness of, and direct engagement with, historical change. This recognition also pertains to structural changes within a given society and signals the desire to manage ambiguities that emanate from it, at times with reference to heritage. Whether metaphoric or actual, borders serve a comparable purpose, meaning that both borders and heritage are means of imposing a measure of stability, control and thus a perceived sense of safety. The presence of complementary and analogous qualities in heritage and borders is at the heart of heritage-border complexes. Analytically, liminality draws our attention to conditions of heightened ambiguity, relationality and instability that give rise to heritage. Liminality also allows the appraisal and experience of marginality and difference (Shields 2013), debates that have currency in heritage studies.

One way of conceiving heritage-border complexes is in relation to the specific case of transborder heritage – heritages that straddle borders. Resting on notions of movement and liminality and their related practices, transborder heritage (border-straddling) conjoins the material and the nonmaterial in an intrinsically political connection.

Heritage and Bordering Practices

Heritage-border complexes establish an inextricable link between territoriality and temporality, underscoring a shift of emphasis from the notion of essential discreteness to a dialectic interplay among discreteness, connectivity and circulation. These complexes do not reject the institution of the territorial nation state; rather, they acknowledge its presence, while critically engaging with heritages that, by transcending national boundaries, are shaped by and influence global flows (Duara 2021, 5).³¹ This speaks to supranational scales, where by design (e.g. EU), or due to antecedent pasts (e.g. Imperial legacies), heritages are reimagined and boundaries (re)drawn.³²

The analytical focus, therefore, shifts to the processes of heritage encompassing artefacts, sites, experiences or practices. From a philosophical

standpoint, endeavours to maintain the integrity of each component within the nation states' mosaic serve to uphold boundaries – witness the EU's ongoing efforts towards celebrating a strictly territorialized sense of internal diversity. Concurrently, the celebration of a resilient sense of 'self' often culminates in a diminished capacity to accommodate the 'other' (Nelson 2019). Employing heritage as an analytical vehicle, therefore, includes challenging its use as an exclusionary, boundary-marking activity and recognizing its capacity to cross boundaries. Furthermore, even in the absence of hard conflict, the use of heritage to support or refute exclusionary claims over shared pasts offers valuable insights into heritage-border relationships.

Delineations

Thus far, there are three major factors involved in drawing borders: *where* a border should be delineated, at what *scale* a border is delineated (its reach and extent) and on what common categories a border is based (commonalities). A demonstrative example of these factors and how they affect heritage-bordering practices, can be seen in the discourses around civilizations and the boundaries between them.³³ Current scholarship depicts civilizations as a relational process that, among other things, are fuzzy, lack internal cohesion, are created through exchange and are historically specific. In short, they are not discrete entities neatly juxtaposed (e.g. see Elias 1984; Arnason 2003; 2010; Smith 2017; Arnason and Hann 2018; Linklater 2020).³⁴ The idea of civilization(s) thus encompasses delineation of borders at an alternative scale as, evidently, the world of cultural-historical units does not map on to nation states, and it never has. Mações (2020) asserts, with reference to powers such as China, which promotes an idea of a 'civilization state', that while nation states are a Western invention, 'civilizations are an alternative to the West', meaning that they sustain a different imagination of world relations.³⁵

At present, these two conceptual bases for delineating boundaries (nations and civilizations) coexist and are activated at different scales, by different actors and for different purposes. It is at the seams of the two – where the world of 'nation states' and the world of 'civilizations' meet – that notions of heritage may be loaded with critical potential (e.g. see Kristensen, Nørskov and Bozoğlu 2024). Moreover, while civilizational understandings underline the importance of other conceptions of world history, they also highlight the importance of being able to critically appraise the use of heritage for civilizational claims. This has consequences not only for understanding heritage and borders, but also for the place of heritage in conceiving a world that is built around them.

Patterns of Engagement with Heritage-Border Complexes

What are the patterns of engagement with heritage-border complexes? Drawing on Zolberg and Woon (1999), we suggest there are three patterns that may be identified when engaging with borders, each of which has a heritage corollary. The first is *boundary crossing* as a direct critique to making strict distinctions or delineations between insiders and outsiders. Heritage is central to such practices of distinction and often enforced by political and discursive forces, thus producing a direct effect on the heritage repertoires recognized by groups on either side of a border. The second pattern is *boundary blurring*, which occurs where there are significant overlaps between groups on either side of a border. After all, the past is rarely contained within bounded entities, and cross-border heritages are increasingly common as an experienced reality around borders, even if state (or related) funding and institutional interest tend to regard borders as sacrosanct. Zolberg and Woon's (1999) third pattern involves *boundary shifting*, referring to the redefinition of categories or a change to the definition of what constitutes the boundary. This involves efforts to redefine heritage repertoires by emphasizing commonalities and de-emphasizing or eradicating distinctions. This is particularly pertinent for heritage diplomacy, with civilizational approaches to heritage or projects that incorporate pasts across national boundaries being an obvious example of this kind.

The Broader Implications for Heritage Studies

So far in this chapter, we have attempted to establish the basis for shifting the focus from heritage to the mutual relationship between heritage and borders, which we have tried to capture as heritage-border complexes. We believe that this shift in focus is useful in two ways. Firstly, it recognizes the inextricable link between heritage and bordering practices and their complementary, analogous function. Secondly, it complicates existing notions of, and approaches to, the study of heritage vis-à-vis practices of bordering in productive ways. This approach opens the space for critical questions about how the past is deployed, territorially or otherwise, to promote and contest group identities. Individual chapters in this collection probe heritage-border complexes in specific contexts and together address some, but not all, pertinent questions in that regard. In the following, we will outline the sets of questions that have motivated this volume and situate the chapters in relation to them. The reader will find that, in most instances, chapters tackle multiple questions from different angles.

Our Questions

Firstly, we asked: *What useful cases demonstrate the relationship between heritage and borders? How can we make space for creativity, and progressive possibility?*

All the contributions to this volume have addressed these initial questions. While some have focused on common national borders (McGuire; Kashani-Sabet; Steele; Vainikka; Andersen, Opilowska and Prokkola; Ledinek and Pisk) others have focused on subnational scales (Vainikka; Shahab and Toma), and yet others (e.g. Lahdesmaki; Robertson) have examined the implied borders of selfhood and senses of community as we deploy notions of affect in heritage sites and landscapes. All the chapters demonstrate that heritage-border complexes are entangled not only with historical events and traumas, but they are also embedded in other political, economic and strategic milieu of their contexts.

Secondly, we asked: *How do heritage-border complexes take shape, what gives rise to them and what do they look like?*

This relationship is often tangibly manifested in relation to conflict, specifically war heritage. For instance, Vainikka shows the complex history of a tense border between present-day Russia and Finland, reflecting the relationship between heritage, borders, regional and national imaginaries. Andersen, Opilowska and Prokkola demonstrate that, at a regional scale and with reference to war memorials, a constantly evolving relationship is shaped by internal dynamics and narratives of national identities as much as institutional dynamics at a regional scale. It is also shaped by an array of actors on the ground. On a different scale, Robertson shows that even the trace of an apparently mundane heritage (i.e. property fences), reflects important historical, economic and social developments in Scotland, thus reflecting the workings of heritage-border complexes. These chapters demonstrate the perpetually evolving nature of heritage-border complexes. The entanglement between colonial legacies, nation-state formations and practices of archaeology give rise to various heritage-border complexes. McGuire demonstrates how multiple heritage-border complexes coalesce upon the same sites and peoples, between Mexico and the United States. Within a different geography, Steele shows how borders instated by past colonial powers forever shape the trajectory of heritage and, through them, narratives of identity in former African colonies.

Thirdly, we wondered: *How are assumptions of discreteness changing or upsetting long-term historical flows as well as our capacity to trace them? Are there concrete examples that demonstrate heritage-border complexes at work and the analytical value of the concept?*

It is evident that the advent of the nation state as the dominant mode of political authority has prioritized certain forms of discreteness that have, in turn, changed or even upset pre-existing flows of peoples and cultures. This is well observable and studied at transnational scales, where, for example, new national borders have inserted a cleavage between otherwise close, if not identical, productions of, for example, carpets, architecture and music. As already noted, Lahdesmaki and Steele address this scale in two different contexts and with reference to monuments and affective import of heritage sites. Indeed, Lahdesmaki posits empathy as the key to understanding and experiencing transnational heritages. Here, empathy becomes the vehicle for constituting new heritage-border complexes at a macro scale, one that provides an opportunity for individuals to recognize a sense of global cohabitation in which questions of power, ethics and emotions converge.

Heritage studies, however, have not been as attentive to the effects of bordering at a subnational level. The chapter by Shahab and Toma serves this objective by looking into the muted but intense contestation of identity, cultural sovereignty and indigeneity through heritage in northern Iraq. Here, a Kurdish nationalist narrative seeks to subsume Assyrian heritage, resulting in a heightened recognition of heritage-bordering processes by the Assyrian community.

Fourthly, cutting across various scales and in conceptual terms, we wanted to know: *How do concepts such as agonism, liminality, transnationalism or hybridity offer certain challenges and opportunities with which to think through social-historical conditions of heritage at any given scale? What work can be done through different types of managed heritage-border activities? And in what ways are situated heritage processes bound up with how pasts are interpreted and invented to suit a current agenda in regional and global power dynamics?*

All contributions have addressed this set of questions. McGuire, for example, illustrates the challenges of liminality as well as the complex and contradictory heritage-border activities that have arisen as a result of different heritage processes, regimes of survey and land division, and national ideologies in Mexico and the United States. In a different way, Steele's chapter shows how two different colonial legacies have resulted in a new reality on the ground, and the delineation of borders has resulted in significantly different heritage narratives and regimes at the national scale.

But perhaps the strongest expression of liminality is the Demilitarized Zone between North and South Korea. Viejo Rose and Lee demonstrate in their chapter how international power relations, legacies of ideological wars and the ghosts of a bygone bipolar world that continue to haunt the two nations and beyond, coalesce in this zone, giving rise to a difficult heritage-border complex.

Finally, we were also interested in the interface between international relations and heritage-border complexes, thus wondering: *How do heritage-border complexes lend themselves to different modes of soft power and cultural influence beyond the borders of the nation state? Where might we be able to make an intervention?*

Kashani-Sabet's chapter indicates the use of an exhibition of art and culture as a means of creating a cross-border empathy between citizens of Iran and the Republic of Azerbaijan. On one level, this may be seen as a public diplomacy project by Azerbaijan that serves Azeri national interest. On another level, it may be seen as a means of dealing with nostalgia and the trauma of annexation of the Republic of Azerbaijan (at the time known as Arran) by the Russian Empire, and the desire to create links based on culture. Other chapters: Steele; McGuire; Andersen, Opiłowska and Prokkola; and Vainikka contain implicit ideas about the intersection of soft-power and transborder influences shaping and in turn being shaped by heritage-border complexes. While many of these chapters invoke implicit warnings and/or correctives, Ledinek and Pisk are explicit in their ambition for such transborder heritage phenomena to contain the seeds of progressive possibilities.

In the Epilogue, we reflect on the totality of the book and outline an agenda for future works on heritage-border complexes.

In conclusion, a word on the organization of the chapters. From our description, it is apparent that certain themes and concepts run across the chapters in this volume. In our view, this transgression and straddling of chapter 'boundaries' resonates with the phenomenon of heritage-border complexes, complicating conventional organization of chapters. Working with this, we have attempted to strike a balance between conceptual continuity and thematic consistency. Relative to these, we have discounted geographical continuity of chapters. Readers can read the chapters in any sequence, and we leave it to them to decide whether we have made the right choice.

Ali Mozaffari is Honorary Senior Fellow with the Asia Institute at the University of Melbourne, a former Australian Research Council DECRA Fellow, and serves as Vice President (Communications) of the Association for Critical Heritage Studies. He researches 'the geopolitics of the past', 'heritage-border complexes' and 'heritage and civilisational analysis'. His publications include *Heritage Movements in Asia* (Berghahn Books, 2020), *Development, Architecture and the Formation of Heritage in Late-Twentieth Century Iran* (Manchester University Press, 2020) and *World Heritage in Iran* (Routledge, 2016). He coedits Berghahn's *Explorations in Heritage Studies* and cofounded the *Heritage and Transnationalism Network* (ACHS).

David C. Harvey is Associate Professor in Critical Heritage Studies at Aarhus University, Denmark. He focuses on the geographies of heritage, including processual conceptions, heritage-landscape relations, climate change, remembrance, oral history and farming practice. He is currently researching ‘heritage-border complexes’, ‘peaceful/pacific heritage’, and ‘heritage, walking and everyday landscapes’. His recent publications include *The Future of Heritage as Climates Change: Loss, Adaptation and Creativity* (Routledge, 2015), *Commemorative Spaces of the First World War* (Routledge, 2018), *Creating Heritage: Unrecognised Pasts and Rejected Futures* (Routledge, 2020) and *The Real Agricultural Revolution: The Transformation of English Farming (1939–1985)* (Boydell, 2023).

NOTES

1. For instance, one of the authors’ experiences of travelling regularly by train between Denmark, Sweden and Germany has seen regular shifts in border practices and procedures, applied inconsistently with regards to both which crossing points are used and who is crossing, despite each border being officially free from hard surveillance.
2. Despite the avowedly ‘internationalist’ outlook of bodies such as UNESCO, stated ambitions towards, or pretention of a ‘cosmopolitan’ worldview that is critical of a containerized understanding should be situated in the context of a global politics that rests on an assumption of discrete territories (mostly in the form of nation states). See Mattez (2023), Sluga (2010) for critical reflections on the internationalist ethos of UNESCO.
3. The Treaty of Westphalia (1648) is often considered a key moment in the foundation of the present state system, both intellectually speaking and in terms of political and diplomatic discourse. For further reading see Croxton (1999).
4. Rodney Harrison, Tim Winter, Stuart Hall, Tod Jones and Jennifer Brinkerhoff are among the growing number of writers approaching heritage from such perspectives.
5. Indeed, in the present moment of populist and nativist politics, the continued maintenance and experience of borders, of border conflicts, border transgression and border politics has rarely been more central. While unfolding crises of anthropogenic climate change and forced migration on a global scale have tended to underscore the high profile of ‘border management’ activities, the Covid-19 crisis has further heightened these tensions, with increasingly authoritarian regimes and assertive nationalism. This can be witnessed in the clichéd desires to ‘MAKE [insert name of country] GREAT AGAIN’, or ‘Take Back Control’, which insist upon the prior existence of an essential sovereign entity founded upon a singular and hegemonic heritage narrative.
6. This also augmented by the wealth of scholarship prompted by the Belt and Road Initiative, which includes multiple disciplines and authors.
7. Notwithstanding several discipline-specific uses of the word processualism – in archaeology, for instance – within this paper, processualism refers to its established use within the field of heritage studies.

8. Examples along this line of thinking include Harvey (2001); Smith (2006); Harrison (2012); Jones, Mozaffari and Jasper (2017); Mozaffari and Jones (2020); Hammami et al. (2022); Jones (2024).
9. For cultural sovereignty, see Luke (2013).
10. Scholars are engaging with Smith's idea of AHD in productive ways. For example, see Skrede and Hølleland (2018) and Gentry and Smith (2019).
11. While we argue that heritage cannot be affixed to a terrain, in the sense of a physical site, we believe the link between heritage and place is inextricable. Here we understand place in relational terms, as emergent and heavily entangled in forms of imagining (e.g. see Cresswell 1992; Massey 1996; Mozaffari 2014).
12. For a useful reference to regionalisms in UNESCO, see Meskell, Liuzza and Brown (2015).
13. In many ways, the sheer scale of scholarly investment and financial weight of the EU has, perhaps inadvertently, hardened many of the borders of this fuzzy continent.
14. See Hewison (1987) and Samuel (1996) for differing views on the potential and meaning of heritage more than thirty years ago. For commentaries, see Gentry (2015), Murphy et al. (2017), and Carter et al. (2020).
15. As Khosravi (2007, 321) makes clear: whatever ideals or privileges we might have, for the vast majority of people in the world the '[b]orders of nation-states have come to be a natural order in human lives'.
16. Winter (2015, 1007) defines heritage diplomacy as 'a set of processes whereby cultural and natural pasts shared between and across nations become subject to exchanges, collaborations and forms of cooperative governance', which incorporates both soft and hard power components.
17. Since the nineteenth century, archaeologists have been involved in developing narratives of legitimacy on an international arena. For example, see Margareta Diaz-Andreu's writings including Diaz-Andreu (1996); Diaz-Andreu and Champion (1996); also see Nikolaou (2017).
18. Archaeological practice has been at the centre of international bodies', such as UNESCO's, diplomatic efforts to save various monuments (e.g. Aswan Dam) or to raise alarm about others being endangered or destroyed (e.g. Bamyán) (see Hassan 2007; Harrison 2012; 2015).
19. A parallel line of enquiry has emerged on heritage and security, exploring the intersection of the two fields of enquiry with the premise that heritage is increasingly securitized and is employed in direct conflict. Securitization of heritage supplies the imperative for transborder interventions, especially in violent theatres. See, for example, Foradori, Giusti and Lamonica (2018); Russo and Giusti (2019); Christensen and Berg (2022).
20. For work on more-than-representational theory, see Lorimer (2005).
21. Some useful readings for this may include: Daniels et al. (2011). A reference for maps and nationalism in Germany during war: Herb (2002). For a Russian-focused example: Hirsch (2000, n.d.). For the use of maps, the classic Benedict (1987). See also Källén (2019) and several chapters in Timothy and Gelbman (2022).
22. See Brumann (2021, chap. 5, 98–154), where he highlights (p 101) how the entire UNESCO decision-making and management framework 'presupposes that it is the normal and natural thing to root for one's country even when humanity's heirloom is at stake'.

23. We would argue that it is common for populist, antiglobalism and anti-immigration rhetoric to nod towards a sanctity of clearly defined borders as definite lines: a fence, a wall or a line on a map.
24. See, however, the arguments of Rossetto and Lo Presti (2021), together with critical responses by Craib (2021), Rankin (2021) and others. Contrary to standard narratives, Rossetto and Lo Presti (2021, 1) argue that lines on a map have a critical-progressive potential 'in an era marked by new, rampant rhetoric regarding nationalism, maps are surprisingly among the few spaces left to cultivate progressive imaginaries of cultural diversity and migration as intrinsic, positive features of national experiences'.
25. See Hobsbawm (1983) for work on 'invented traditions'. While critical scholarship in the fields of border studies and group identity formation recognizes complexity in border-making processes, the idea that the world is divided according to nation state territorial competence is largely taken for granted. The detail of the 'lines on a map' might change, but the idea of there being lines on the map is rarely reflected upon; see Billig (1995), Bruckner (1999) and many others.
26. On a European scale, one can argue that even as the Faro Convention or the European Landscape Convention might attempt to highlight the importance of more local and community-focused understandings of heritage, the process of their development and practical implementation have inevitably ended up investing further in an avowedly national scale of governance. At a global scale, the increasing politicization of decision-making within UNESCO, for instance, has acted to underline the power and centrality of (nation) states parties, even as policy-makers seek to do the opposite (see Brumann 2014; Meskell and Liuzza 2022).
27. We believe these same issues must also be examined in relation to discourses that, in the name of rejecting universalism and Eurocentrism, seek to legitimize alternative hegemonic or oppressive systems. For instance, the heritage and border imaginaries at work in Hungary provide a compelling example (see Kremmler 2023; Kazharski 2025).
28. Arguably, the EU's Horizon Programme of academic funding operates in a similar manner.
29. On this, the reader may wish to also see Wallerstein (2006), where he discusses the idea of European universalism versus Universal universalism.
30. See also, Gao and Jones (2021).
31. This manoeuvre can perhaps be seen in parallel to Doreen Massey's (2005) notion of a 'global sense of place', which is a cornerstone of how many cultural geographers have come to understand relational notions of place identities.
32. Even within the bounds of the Westphalian order, the historical underpinnings of the nation can be seen to influence the cultural ethos of the state, a topic also covered in literature on state identity. This is encapsulated in what Anthony Smith called *ethnies* (Smith 2005; see also Yun 1990). For state identity see Alexandrov (2003), Lebow (2008; 2009a; 2009b) and Berenskoetter (2010).
33. Within this chapter, we use civilization in ethnographical terms, referring to 'all the features that can be observed in collective life of one human group, embracing their material, intellectual, moral and political life and, there is unfortunately no other word for it, their social life' (Bowden 2009, loc. 582–86).

34. See also, the work of Navaro-Yashin (2002), who examines boundaries of secularism and Islamism in her exploration of the relations between ‘Turkish culture’ and the Turkish state.
35. Michael Schuman (2020) highlights another effect of Eurocentrism in understanding the world, in that the dominant conceptions of international relations are shaped by a Eurocentric understanding of history that inevitably emphasizes a biased view, not only of those relations, but also of the machinations of global power.

References

- Alexandrov, Maxym. 2003. ‘The Concept of State Identity in International Relations: A Theoretical Analysis’, *Journal of International Development and Cooperation* 10(1): 33–46. <https://doi.org/10.15027/14409>.
- Andersen, Casper. 2021. ‘Science and Decolonisation in UNESCO’, in Andrew Goss (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Science and Empire*. London: Routledge, pp. 286–99.
- Anderson, Benedict. 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. ACLS Humanities E-Book. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14725843.2011.556797>.
- Arnason, Johann P. 2003. *Civilizations in Dispute: Historical Questions and Theoretical Traditions*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2010. ‘Domains and Perspectives of Civilizational Analysis Introduction’, *European Journal of Social Theory* 13(1): 5–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431009355757>.
- Arnason, Johann P., and Chris Hann. 2018. *Anthropology and Civilizational Analysis: Eurasian Explorations*. New York: SUNY Press.
- Badiou, Allan. 2006. *Being and Event*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Barthel-Bouchier, Diane. 2015. ‘Heritage and Climate Change: Organizational Conflicts and Conundrums’, in David C. Harvey and Jim A. Perry (eds), *The Future of Heritage as Climates Change*. London: Routledge, pp. 151–66.
- Benedict, Anderson. 1987. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.
- Berenskoetter, Felix. 2010. ‘Identity in International Relations’, in *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Billig, Michael. 1995. *Banal Nationalism*. London: SAGE.
- Blunt, Alison. 2003. ‘Collective Memory and Productive Nostalgia: Anglo-Indian Homemaking at McCluskieganj’, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 21(6): 717–38.
- Bonnett, Alastair. 2010. *Left in the Past: Radicalism and the Politics of Nostalgia*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing USA.
- Bonnett, Alastair, and Catherine Alexander. 2013. ‘Mobile Nostalgias: Connecting Visions of the Urban Past, Present and Future amongst Ex-Residents’, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 38(3): 391–402.
- Bowden, Brett. 2009. *The Empire of Civilization: The Evolution of an Imperial Idea*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

- Brückner, Martin. 1999. 'Lessons in Geography: Maps, Spellers, and Other Grammars of Nationalism in the Early Republic', *American Quarterly* 51(2): 311–43.
- Brumann, Christoph. 2014. 'Shifting Tides of World-Making in the UNESCO World Heritage Convention: Cosmopolitanisms Colliding', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37(12): 2176–92.
- . 2021. *The Best We Share: Nation, Culture and World-Making in the UNESCO World Heritage Arena*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Carter, Thomas. 2019. 'Bygones, Survivals and "All the Old Rubbish": Curatorial Discernment and the Failure to Create an English National Folk Museum', in Thomas Carter et al. (eds), *Creating Heritage: Unrecognized Pasts and Rejected Futures*. London: Routledge, pp. 16–31.
- Carter, Thomas, et al. 2020. 'Introduction', in Thomas Carter et al. (eds), *Creating Heritage: Unrecognized Pasts and Rejected Futures*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–15.
- Chatterton, Paul, and Andre Pusey. 2020. 'Beyond Capitalist Enclosure, Commodification and Alienation: Postcapitalist Praxis as Commons, Social Production and Useful Doing', *Progress in Human Geography* 44(1): 27–48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132518821173>.
- Christensen, Marie, and Elisabeth Berg. 2022. 'The Cross-Sectoral Linkage between Cultural Heritage and Security: How Cultural Heritage Has Developed as a Security Issue?', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 28(5), 651–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2022.2054845>.
- Constantinou, Costas M., Olga Demetriou and Mete Hatay. 2012. 'Conflicts and Uses of Cultural Heritage in Cyprus', *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies* 14(2): 177–98. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19448953.2012.681923>.
- Craib, Raymond. 2021. 'Rescuing the Map from the Nation', *Dialogues in Human Geography* 12(1), 45–48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20438206211059279>.
- Cresswell, Tim. 1992. *In Place-out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression*. Vol. 2. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Croxton, Derek. 1999. 'The Peace of Westphalia of 1648 and the Origins of Sovereignty', *International History Review* 21(3): 569–91. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1080/07075332.1999.9640869>.
- Daniels, Stephen, et al. (eds). 2011. *Envisioning Landscapes, Making Worlds: Geography and the Humanities* (1st ed.). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203839287>.
- De Cesari, Chiara. 2010. 'Creative Heritage: Palestinian Heritage NGOs and Defiant Arts of Government', *American Anthropologist* 112(4): 625–37. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1433.2010.01280.x>.
- Demetriou, Olga, and Rozita Dimova (eds). 2019. *The Political Materialities of Borders: New Theoretical Directions*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. <https://doi.org/10.5422/fordham/9780823288519.003.0011>.
- Diaz-Andreu, Margarita. 1996. 'Constructing Identities Through Culture: The Past in the Forging of Europe', in Clive Gamble et al. (eds), *Cultural Identity and Archaeology: The Construction of European Communities*. London: Routledge, pp. 48–61.
- Diaz-Andreu, Margarita, and Timothy Champion. 1996. 'Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe: An Introduction', in Margarita Diaz-Andreu and Timothy Champion (eds), *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*. London: University College London Press, pp. 1–23.

- Dolff-Bonekämper, Gabi. 2010. 'Cultural Heritage and Conflict: The View from Europe', *Museum International* 62(1–2): 14–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0033.2010.01713.x>.
- Donnachie, Ian. 2016. "‘Anything You Want It to Mean’? Scotland’s Changing Heritage Landscape", in *Heritage and Tourism in Britain and Ireland*. New York: Springer, pp. 145–60.
- Duara, Prasanjit. 2021. 'Circulatory Histories of the Nation-State', *Verge: Studies in Global Asia* 7(1): 5. <https://doi.org/10.5749/vergstudglobasia.7.1.0005>.
- Elias, Norbert. 1984. 'State Formation and Civilization: The Civilizing Process, Vol 2'. London: Blackwell Publishers.
- Emmett, Chad F. 2000. 'Sharing Sacred Space in the Holy Land', in Alexander B. Murphy, Douglas L. Johnson, and Viola Haarmann (eds), *Cultural Encounters with the Environment: Enduring and Evolving Geographic Themes*. Maryland, PA: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 261–82.
- Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs. 1992. 'Tinkerbells and Pinups: The Construction and Reconstruction of Gender Boundaries at Work', in Michele Lamont and Marcel Fournier (eds), *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. 232–38.
- Escobar, Arturo. 2020. *Pluriversal Politics: The Real and the Possible*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Foradori, Paolo, Serena Giusti and Alessandro Giovanni Lamonica. 2018. 'Reshaping Cultural Heritage Protection Policies at a Time of Securitisation: France, Italy, and the United Kingdom', *The International Spectator* 53(3): 86–101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03932729.2018.1467161>.
- Gao, Qian, and Siân Jones. 2021. 'Authenticity and Heritage Conservation: Seeking Common Complexities Beyond the “Eastern” and “Western” Dichotomy', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 27(1): 90–106.
- Gentry, Kynan. 2015. "‘The Pathos of Conservation’: Raphael Samuel and the Politics of Heritage", *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21(6): 561–76.
- Gentry, Kynan, and Laurajane Smith. 2019. 'Critical Heritage Studies and the Legacies of the Late-Twentieth Century Heritage Canon', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 25(11): 1148–68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2019.1570964>.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Golunov, Sergei. 2014. 'Practical Relevance as an Issue for Contemporary Border Studies', *Sotsiologicheskoe Obozrenie [Russian Sociological Review]* 13(4): 60–79. <https://doi.org/10.17323/1728-192x-2014-4-60-79>.
- Hammami, Feras, et al. 2022. 'Heritage and Peace-Building: Challenges, Possibilities and Sustainable Practices', in Kalliopi Fouseki et al. (eds), *Routledge Handbook of Sustainable Heritage*. London: Routledge, pp. 241–60.
- Harrison, Rodney. 2012. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. London: Routledge.
- . 2015. 'World Heritage Listing and the Globalization of the Endangerment Sensibility', in Fernando Vidal and Nélia Dias (eds), *Endangerment, Biodiversity and Culture*. London: Routledge, pp. 195–217.
- Harvey, David. 2012. 'From Space to Place and Back Again: Reflections on the Condition of Postmodernity', in Barry Curtis et al. (eds), *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change*. London: Routledge, pp. 2–29.

- Harvey, David C. 2001. 'Heritage Pasts and Heritage Presents: Temporality, Meaning and the Scope of Heritage Studies', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 7(4): 319–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13581650120105534>.
- . 2015. 'Heritage and Scale: Settings, Boundaries and Relations', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21(6): 577–93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2014.955812>.
- . 2017. 'Critical Heritage Debates and the Commemoration of the First World War: Productive Nostalgia and Discourses of Respectful Reverence During the Centenary', in Helaine Silverman, Emma Waterton and Steve Watson (eds), *Heritage in Action*. Cham: Springer, pp. 107–20.
- . 2021. 'Kulturarvens Geografier: Museer Som Rum for Dialog', in Lisa Skytte Jakobsen, Ane Hejlskov Larsen and Vinnie Nørskov (eds), *Museologi i Fagene*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, pp. 131–58.
- . 2024. 'Heritage in Conflict: Still Searching for Pacific Practices', in Lucas Lixinski and Yujie Zhu (eds), *Heritage, Conflict and Peace-Building*. London: Routledge, pp. 224–39.
- Harvey, David C., and Jim A. Perry. 2015. *The Future of Heritage as Climate Change*. London: Routledge.
- Hassan, Fekri A. 2007. 'The Aswan High Dam and the International Rescue Nubia Campaign', *African Archaeological Review* 24(3): 73–94.
- Herb, Guntram Henrik. 2002. *Under the Map of Germany: Nationalism and Propaganda 1918–1945*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203433720>.
- Herrschel, Tassilo. 2016. *Borders in Post-Socialist Europe: Territory, Scale, Society*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315569741>.
- Herzfeld, Michael. 2009. *Evicted from Eternity: The Restructuring of Modern Rome*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- . 2010. 'Engagement, Gentrification, and the Neoliberal Hijacking of History', *Current Anthropology* 51(S2): S259–67. <https://doi.org/10.1086/653420>.
- Hewison, Robert. 1987. *The Heritage Industry: Britain in a Climate of Decline*. London: Methuen.
- Hirsch, Francine. 2000. 'Toward an Empire of Nations: Border-Making and the Formation of Soviet National Identities', *The Russian Review* 59(2), 201–26. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2679753>.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1983. 'Introduction: Inventing Traditions', in Erik J. Hobsbawm and Terence O. Ranger (eds), *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1–14.
- Horský, Jan, and Lenka Ovčáčková. 2024. 'Symbolic Centres: Cultural Transfer in the Forcibly Abandoned Czech Borderlands', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*: 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2024.2443923>.
- Hoskins, Gareth. 2012. 'On Arrival: Memory and Temporality at Ellis Island, New York', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 30(6): 1011–27.
- Jasper, James M., Tod Jones and Ali Mozaffari. 2017. 'Heritage Contests: What Can We Learn from Social Movements?', *Heritage and Society* 10(1): 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159032X.2018.1428445>.
- Jones, Owain, and Joanne Garde-Hansen. 2012. *Geography and Memory: Explorations in Identity, Place and Becoming*. London: Springer.

- Jones, Tod. 2024. *Heritage Is Movement: Heritage Management and Research in a Diverse and Plural World*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003374008>.
- Jones, Tod, Ali Mozaffari and James M. Jasper. 2017. 'Heritage Contests: What Can We Learn from Social Movements?' *Heritage and Society* 10(1): 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159032X.2018.1428445>.
- Kazharski, Aliaksei. 2025. 'History Meets the "Mafia State"? Hungary and the (De) Securitisation of Built Cultural Heritage in Slovakia', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 31(1): 36–51.
- Kazharski, Aliaksei, and Andrey Makarychev. 2025. 'Critical Heritage Studies and Post-Imperial Insecurities in Central and Baltic Europe', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 31(1): 1–3.
- Khanna, Parag. 2016. *Connectography: Mapping the Future of Global Civilization*. New York: Random House.
- Khoshravi, Shahram. 2007. 'The "Illegal" Traveller: An Auto-Ethnography of Borders', *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale* 15(3): 321–34.
- Kremmler, Katrin. 2023. "'Eurasian Magyars": The Making of a New Hegemonic National Prehistory in Illiberal Hungary', in James Koranyi and Emily Hanscam (eds), *The Ancient Past and Contested Present in East-Central Europe*. Oldenbourg: De Gruyter, pp. 181–216.
- Kristensen, Troels Myrup, Vinnie Nørskov and Gonul Bozoğlu. 2024. 'Karian Cosmopolitanism: Archaeology, Heritage, and Identity in Southwestern Turkey', in Lennart Wouter Kruijjer, Miguel John Versluys and Ian Lilley (eds), *Rooted Cosmopolitanism, Heritage and the Question of Belonging: Archaeological and Anthropological Perspectives*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 158–78.
- Källén, Anna (ed.). 2019. *Heritage and Borders*. Konferenser / Kungl. Vitterhets Historie Och Antikvitets Akademien 100. Stockholm: Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien.
- Lähdesmäki, Tuuli, Yujie Zhu and Suzie Thomas. 2019. 'Introduction: Heritage and Scale', in Tuuli Lähdesmäki, Suzie. Thomas, and Yujie Zhu (eds), *Politics of Scale: New Directions in Critical Heritage Studies*. New York: Berghahn Books, pp. 1–20.
- Lamont, Michele, and Virag Molnar. 2002. 'The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences', *Annual Review of Sociology* 28(1): 167–95.
- Lebow, Richard Ned. 2008. 'Identity and International Relations', *International Relations* 22(4): 473–92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117808097312>.
- . 2009a. 'Culture and International Relations: The Culture of International Relations', *Millennium – Journal of International Studies* 38(1): 153–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305829809336258>.
- . 2009b. *A Cultural Theory of International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Legg, Stephen. 2005. 'Contesting and Surviving Memory: Space, Nation, and Nostalgia in Les Lieux de Mémoire', *Environment and Planning d: Society and Space* 23(4): 481–504.
- Linklater, Andrew. 2020. *The Idea of Civilization and the Making of the Global Order*. Bristol: Bristol University Press.

- Logan, William. 2013. 'Learning to Engage with Human Rights in Heritage', in Marie-Theres Albert, Roland Bernecker and Britta Rudolff (eds), *Understanding Heritage: Perspectives in Heritage Studies*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 35–48.
- Lorimer, Hayden. 2005. 'Cultural Geography: The Busyness of Being "More-Than-Representational"', *Progress in Human Geography* 29(1): 83–94. <https://doi.org/10.1191/0309132505ph531pr>.
- Luke, Christina. 2013. 'Cultural Sovereignty in the Balkans and Turkey: The Politics of Preservation and Rehabilitation', *Journal of Social Archaeology* 13(3): 350–70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469605313487622>.
- Luke, Christina, and Morag M. Kersel. 2013. *US Cultural Diplomacy and Archaeology: Soft Power, Hard Heritage*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Mações, Bruno. 2020. 'The Attack of the Civilization-State', *Noema Magazine*, 15 June 2020. <https://www.noemamag.com/the-attack-of-the-civilization-state/>.
- Massey, Doreen. 1996. 'A Global Sense of Place', in Stephen Daniels and Roger Lee (eds), *Exploring Human Geography: A Reader*. London: Arnold, pp. 237–45.
- . 2005. *For Space*. New York: Sage.
- Mattez, Anaïs. 2023. 'Restitution of Cultural Property: The Rise and Fall of a Cosmopolitan Ideal', *International Journal of Heritage Studies, International Journal of Heritage Studies* 30(2), 165–80. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2023.2284715>.
- Meskill, Lynn. 2009. *Cosmopolitan Archaeologies*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- . 2013. 'Challenging the Economic and Political Order of International Heritage Conservation', *Current Anthropology* 54(4): 483. <https://doi.org/10.1086/671136>.
- . 2015. 'Heritage and Cosmopolitanism', in William Logan, Máiréad Nic Craith and Ullrich Kockel (eds), *A Companion to Heritage Studies*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 479–90. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118486634.ch32>.
- Meskill, Lynn, and Claudia Liuzza. 2022. 'The World is Not Enough: New Diplomacy and Dilemmas for the World Heritage Convention at 50', *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 29: 391–407.
- Meskill, Lynn, Claudia Liuzza and Nicholas Brown. 2015. 'World Heritage Regionalism: UNESCO from Europe to Asia', *International Journal of Cultural Property* 22(4): 437–70.
- Miggelbrink, Judith. 2016. 'Crossing Lines, Crossed by Lines: Everyday Practices and Local Border Traffic in Schengen Regulated Borderlands', in Reece Jones and Corey Johnson (eds), *Placing the Border in Everyday Life*. London: Routledge, pp. 137–64.
- Mozaffari, Ali. 2014. *Forming National Identity in Iran: The Idea of Homeland Derived from Ancient Persian and Islamic Imaginations of Place*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Mozaffari, Ali, and Ali Akbar. 2023. 'Heritage Diplomacy and Soft Power Competition Between Iran and Turkey: Competing Claims over Rumi and Nowruz', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, August: 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2023.2241872>.
- Mozaffari, Ali, and James Barry. 2021. 'Heritage and Territorial Disputes in the Armenia–Azerbaijan Conflict: A Comparative Analysis of the Carpet Museums of Baku and Shusha', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 28(3), 318–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2021.1993965>.

- . 2023. ‘Heritage Destruction in the Caucasus with a Specific Focus on the Armenia-Azerbaijan Conflict’, in José Antonio et al., *The Routledge Handbook of Heritage Destruction*. New York: Routledge, pp. 333–42.
- Mozaffari, Ali, and Tod Jones (eds). 2020. *Heritage Movements in Asia: Cultural Heritage Activism, Politics, and Identity*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Mukhopadhyay, Rishika. 2021. ‘Heritagising Urban Craft Economy: Thinking with Chitpur Road, Kolkata’, Doctoral Dissertation. Exeter: University of Exeter.
- Murphy, Alexander B. et al. 2017. ‘The Past Is a Foreign Country – Revisited’, *The AAG Review of Books* 5(3): 201–14.
- Navaro-Yashin, Yael. 2002. *Faces of the State: Secularism and Public Life in Turkey*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Nelson, Garrett Dash. 2019. ‘Mosaic and Tapestry: Metaphors as Geographical Concept Generators’, *Progress in Human Geography* 43(5): 853–70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132518788951>.
- Newman, David. 2006. ‘Borders and Bordering: Towards an Interdisciplinary Dialogue’, *European Journal of Social Theory* 9(2): 171–86. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431006063331>.
- Nikolaou, Polina. 2017. ‘Authoring the Ancient Sites of Cyprus in the Late Nineteenth Century: The British Museum Excavation Notebooks, 1893–1896’, *Journal of Historical Geography* 56: 83–100.
- Paasi, Anssi. 2009. ‘The Resurgence of the “Region” and “Regional Identity”’: Theoretical Perspectives and Empirical Observations on Regional Dynamics in Europe’, *Review of International Studies* 35(S1): 121–46.
- . 2012. ‘Border Studies Reanimated: Going beyond the Territorial/Relational Divide’, *Environment and Planning* 44(10): 2303–9. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a45282>.
- Rankin, William. 2021. ‘What is a Nation?’ *Dialogues in Human Geography* 12(1): 41–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20438206211046852>.
- Reus-Smit, Christian. 2020. *International Relations: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rico, Trinidad. 2016. *Constructing Destruction: Heritage Narratives in the Tsunami City*. New York: Routledge.
- Robertson, Iain. 2008. ‘Heritage from Below: Class, Social Protest and Resistance’, in *Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*. Abingdon: Ashgate Publishing Group, pp. 143–58.
- Rossetto, Tania, and Laura Lo Presti. 2021. ‘Reimagining the National Map’, *Dialogues in Human Geography* 12(1): 5–27.
- Russo, Alessandra, and Serena Giusti. 2019. ‘The Securitisation of Cultural Heritage’, *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 25(7): 843–57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2018.1518979>.
- Samuel, Raphael. 1996. *Theatres of Memory: Past and Present in Contemporary Culture*. 12th ed. London: Verso Books.
- Schuman, Michael. 2020. *Superpower Interrupted: The Chinese History of the World*. London: Hachette UK.
- Shepherd, Nick. 2015. *The Mirror in the Ground: Archaeology Photography and the Making of a Disciplinary Archive*. Cape Town: Centre for Curating the Archive.

- Shields, Rob. 2013. *Places on the Margin: Alternative Geographies of Modernity*. London: Routledge.
- Silverman, Helaine, and D. Fairchild Ruggles. 2007. *Cultural Heritage and Human Rights*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Skrede, Joar, and Herdis Hølleland. 2018. 'Uses of Heritage and Beyond: Heritage Studies Viewed Through the Lens of Critical Discourse Analysis and Critical Realism', *Journal of Social Archaeology* 18(1): 77–96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469605317749290>.
- Sluga, Glenda. 2010. 'UNESCO and the (One) World of Julian Huxley', *Journal of World History* 21(3): 393–418.
- Smith, Anthony D. 2005. 'Civic and Ethnic Nationalism', in *Nations and Nationalism: A Reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 177–83.
- Smith, Jeremy C. A. 2017. *Debating Civilisations: Interrogating Civilisational Analysis in a Global Age*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Smith, Laurajane. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. Hoboken: Taylor & Francis.
- Smith, Laurajane, Paul A. Shackel and Gary Campbell. 2011. *Heritage, Labour, and the Working Classes*. London: Routledge.
- Stovel, Herb. 2008. 'Origins and Influence of the Nara Document on Authenticity', *APT Bulletin* 39(2/3): 9–17.
- Timothy, Dallen J., and Alon Gelbman. 2022. *Routledge Handbook of Borders and Tourism*. Milton: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Tolia-Kelly, Divya P., Emma Waterton and Steve Watson. 2016. 'Introduction: Heritage, Affect and Emotion', in *Heritage, Affect and Emotion*. New York: Routledge, pp. 19–29.
- van Houtum, Henk. 2005. 'The Geopolitics of Borders and Boundaries', *Geopolitics* 10(4): 672–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650040500318522>.
- Viejo Rose, Dacia, and Marie Louise Stig Sørensen. 2015. 'Cultural Heritage and Armed Conflict: New Questions for an Old Relationship', in Emma Waterton and Steve Watson (eds), *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 281–96.
- Vrdoljak, Ana Filipa. 2009. 'Cultural Heritage in Human Rights and Humanitarian Law', *International Human Rights and Humanitarian Law*: 250–302.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2006. *European Universalism: the Rhetoric of Power*. New York: The New Press.
- Waterton, Emma, and Jason Dittmer. 2014. 'The Museum as Assemblage: Bringing Forth Affect at the Australian War Memorial', *Museum Management and Curatorship* 29(2): 122–39.
- Waterton, Emma, Hayley Saul and Divya P. Tolia-Kelly. 2023. 'Reckoning with Extractivism: Towards an Anti-Colonial Heritage', in Nick Shepherd (ed.), *Rethinking Heritage in Precarious Times*. London: Routledge, pp. 143–66.
- Waterton, Emma, Laurajane Smith and Gary Campbell. 2006. 'The Utility of Discourse Analysis to Heritage Studies: The Burra Charter and Social Inclusion', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 12(4): 339–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527250600727000>.
- Waterton, Emma, and Steve Watson (eds). 2015. *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Whitehead, Christopher, et al. 2020. *Dimensions and Heritage and Memory: Multiple Europes and the Politics of Crisis*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Whitehead, Christopher, Tom Schofield and Gönül Bozoğlu. 2021. *Plural Heritages and Community Co-Production: Designing, Walking, and Remembering*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Winter, Tim. 2015. 'Heritage Diplomacy', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. 21(10): 997–1015. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2015.1041412>.
- . 2019. *Geocultural Power: China's Quest to Revive the Silk Roads for the Twenty-First Century*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
- . 2022. 'Civilisations in Dialogue? UNESCO and the Politics of Building East and West Relations', *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 28(3): 259–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2021.1941913>.
- . 2023. 'A Maritime Turn and Ocean Ontologies in Critical Heritage Studies', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* November, 30(6): 623–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2023.2284736>.
- Yun, Ma Shu. 1990. 'Ethnonationalism, Ethnic Nationalism, and Mini-Nationalism: A Comparison of Connor, Smith and Snyder', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 13(4): 527–41.
- Zolberg, Aristide R., and Long Litt Woon. 1999. 'Why Islam Is Like Spanish: Cultural Incorporation in Europe and the United States', *Politics & Society* 27(1): 5–38.