This second issue of TRACES Journal has been designed as a dialogue among the scientific coordinators of some of the most recent European Union’s flagship research projects focusing on museums and heritage studies, including some recently concluded programmes as well as some newer researches launched under the H2020 umbrella.

Despite obvious differences, all of these projects share a common attention on contemporary social and economic issues, and a view to developing instrumental cultural policy, advancing museum and heritage practice and, ultimately, ameliorating key contemporary problems. Our time, however, is one of upsetting changes. Some years after the commencement of the first research programmes included here, European socio-cultural and political reality has undergone dramatical shifts, connected to phenomena that were not entirely predictable at the time they were funded. The heightened profile and nature of terrorist threats signalled by the escalation of attacks and their violence, the refugee crisis and EU countries’ different responses to it, the collapse of the Greek economy, BREXIT, the increasingly difficult relations with (and sometimes between) the historic ‘Europe makers’, Turkey and Russia, the entrenchment of nationalist movements and parties, the mobilization of exclusionary European identities, an entirely changed global situation connected to conflict in the Middle East... These are all factors that were (largely) beyond view in the first major tranche of EU-funded research into museums and heritage, and to which current projects must adapt.

Arguably the current economic and political crisis of Europe is also a crisis of values and identities; it is a cultural crisis. In such a context it is increasingly evident how social and political conflicts between and within European states are acted out also on the field of culture, including heritage institution and practices. We invited selected scholars who are currently or recently involved in major EU funded research programmes in the field to reflect on what this changed world means for our research and for museum and heritage practice. We asked them about the focus and the scope of their projects and their relevance in view of contemporary social, political and economic issues affecting Europe and its inhabitants; the expected impact of their research as well as the influence of EU political and funding agendas on the framing of their programme, its lines of enquiry and methods.

Their work stresses the potential relevance of research programmes in critically confronting the multifarious, inherently complex and often contentious European heritages. The contributors address the drives to develop new approaches to the effective study, use and transmission of heritage and to identify practice that can productively acknowledge diversity, dissent, and event frictions. What emerges clearly from their words is the critical place of heritage within the public sphere as well as the need for developing discourses on heritage that go beyond instrumental political stances. They also recognize the unavoidable challenge of thinking through heritage in relation to questions about identity and society, nation and nationalism, and historical and contemporary understandings of Europe and being European. They believe— as we do—that these are the present and future challenges for museum and heritage studies in Europe, that they might be truly relevant, within and beyond the academic sphere.

— Francesca Lanz and Christopher Whitehead
What roles can and should heritage play to address social division and crisis in Europe?

STEFAN BERGER / ANNA BULL / HANS LAUGE HANSEN

«Until recently the neoliberal consensus which dominated policy-making at national and at the EU level exacerbated social divisions but also appeared unchallengeable. Things have changed now that the revolt of the losers of globalisation and of austerity measures has reverberated onto politics and rewarded antagonistic populist and nationalist parties who often use the heritage of war and violent conflicts in ways that risk fueling tension both within and across Europe. [...]»

The EU has fostered the foundational myth of the union itself as a story of transnational reconciliation and peace and relies upon a consensual approach to the traumatic memories of the conflicts of the past (especially the two World Wars and the Holocaust) as the basis of social cohesion. But this story is no longer able to counter the rising of extreme nationalism. UNREST therefore, pursues a third memory way, which acknowledges and engages with widespread memory discontent without losing sight of fundamental European ideals. We call this third way agonistic memory.

Agonistic memory designates a new mode of remembrance, which embraces political conflict as an opportunity for emotional and ethical growth. It should 1. give voice to all the parties of a conflict in a multi-voiced manner; 2. contextualise conflicts and try to understand what makes perpetration possible, without excusing or legiti-
Antagonistic populist and nationalist parties often use contentious heritages in ways that risk fuelling tension both within and across Europe.

Peter Aronsson is professor of History at Linnaeus University. His recent work is on the role of historical narrative and consciousness in directing action, in regard both to historiography and the uses of the past in historical culture at large. Recently he has performed leading roles in three international projects exploring the uses of the past including the research project EuNaMus—European National Museums: Identity Politics, the Uses of the Past and the European Citizen (February 2010 – January 2013) which he coordinated.

Peter Aronsson

«Heritage usually emerges in response to threat and as hope for the future. This applies to the birth of national museums after the Napoleonic wars as well as to the making of new modern democratic nations in more recent history. Future investments in heritage need to claim to prove how sustainable European communities can grow out the current distress. Heritage that demonstrate earlier successful collaboration, sustainability and the creation of prosperity through problem resolution need to complement heritage that demonstrate the price of failure in terms of war and disaster. [...] The focus and scope of EuNaMus was to understand the cultural and political force of national museums in representing, negotiating, and handling change. National museums are thus ‘defined and explored as processes of institutionalised negotiations where material collections and displays make claims and are recognised as articulating and representing national values and realities.’ The results demonstrate the complexity of museums as institutions where logics and legitimacy from academia, politics, economics, and the public sphere meet. If skillfully performed the outcome of that negotiation can help overcoming past conflicts and find future perspectives to inspire communities. If they fail they will become irrelevant and even worse, enhance levels of conflict and distrust to the point of disintegrating a nation. This reveals the crucial role of cultural investments in museums as infrastructures with a potential importance beyond a restricted cultural political agenda. The existence of EU programmes helped to fund and create incitement for European collaboration that would otherwise not have been as large in scope and territorial extension and cross-disciplinary in approach. Eight universities and more then fifty researchers have collaborated in the project. The push from the funding programme to interact with stakeholders and to deliver policy briefs has been frustrating due to the lack of training, developed tools, and expertise to do so. However, it has also been stimulating as it has triggered a more intensive and necessary reflection on knowledge exchange. [...] Subsequent developments have proved cultural investment—in line with European values—to have been too late and weak to stand the test of economic crises. Unfortunately, the argument that challenges of our time needs more input from humanities and cultural sciences has not convinced funding bodies in Europe and elsewhere. Still technological inventions are searched for in a one-dimensional thrust to help us manage change. This is insufficient.»

Future investments in heritage need to claim to prove how sustainable European communities can grow out the current distress.

Klaus Schönberger

«The classic master narrative of European heritage was built from ‘the centre’: technical and architectural achievements found in large cities; language, knowledge and customs as signifiers of a nation; art and science as expression of the rise of the middle class. Multiple perspectives, languages, and identities have long been considered as the outcome of ‘exceptional’ migration and borderland experiences of marginal interest for the mainstream. Post-modernism, globalisation, the awareness of migration flows and economic crises have refocused attention to the margins for a better understanding of today’s dynamic European setting. Traces argues that contemporary Europeanisa-
Historical conflicts that appear insurmountable on a national and institutional level are often more negotiable on a micro-level.

Europe’s past and present is marked by conflict and difference as much as it is marked by rich and diverse cultural heritages. TRACES claims that Europe will be a combination (or concurrence) of many, sometimes contradictory voices, or it will not be at all. Its dynamic heritage holds the key to a reconfiguration of European imagination. Focussing on contentious aspects of heritage is expected to prepare the ground for solutions to the multiple crises we are facing today. Creative and practical, yet theoretically grounded heritage work is expected to open up new avenues in negotiating current conflicts.

“Heritage is an important vehicle in building European imagination. It is constantly being constructed and reconstructed, according to different current needs in different local and regional settings. Performativity relates to this productive character of heritage work. Besides examining and re-producing already existing understandings of difficult pasts, performative heritage crucially aims to re-configure existing systems of meaning by developing new, interactive, and creative practices. Crucially, this process must be collective, so that different stakeholders can insert their often conflicting positions into the debate. TRACES claims that acknowledging the contentious aspects of European heritage is crucial. TRACES envisages a new European imagination as an area where interaction between different, sometimes contradictory, perspectives and experiences of past and present learn to interact. By engaging with these proactively and collectively, heritage-work may become performative.”

GENNARO POSTIGLIONE

“Every conflict leaves its own legacy on the built environment. Ruins, rubbles, but also entire buildings and infrastructures mark the European landscapes, reminding us of a past that most people would rather forget. The Recall research project investigated possible forms of intervention on conflict heritage sites and territories, with the aim of overcoming the trauma connected with many painful places and stories. The strategies explored by the researchers were based on the aim of acknowledging the history of these sites, without reducing or limiting their potential to that of a commemorative space and overcoming the tendency of forgetting, abandoning, these places. The erasure from the collective memory of the image, presence and vitality of an urban space is a painful act. Reasons for such dissolutions are multiple: ideology, alteration, progress and, in general, change. Architects and designers have the mission to properly question this era-
sure. They can develop the capacity to turn this erasure into a powerful source of creativity. The project was thus based on the attempt to explore a possible shift from a ‘simply’ commemoration to a more active involvement and participation of people in/with the places and stories, through an act of ‘reappropriation.’”

PATRIZIA VIOLI

“I believe one cannot speak of a general single cultural and symbolic process that can be applied to all so-called ‘places of trauma’, which are often very different based on their shape, layout, memory transmission mode, as well as political and sometimes ideological intent. In very general terms, we can say that all of these places include a value which is, generally speaking, the transmission of memory. But memory may be functional to different symbolic logics and underlying policies. The huge memorial site built in Nanjing dedicated to the victims of the devastation of the city by Chinese troops in 1937 for ex-
ample, became a gigantic theme park in the 1990s following the complex ide-
ological revaluation sought by Deng Xiaoping in nationalistic and hegemonic
terms. During the Mao era, the image of China as a victim and a loser would
have been unthinkable. Hence, in the course of a few decades memory has
been first banned and removed, then restored and emphasised, as evidence of
how memory is not an absolute value in itself since it follows more complex
logic of power and domination.»

«I have long been interested in cultural communities and conflict, and trained
as a historian and anthropologist working on European class, politics and re-
ligion from the early modern period to the present. This confronted me with
the fact that there was little knowledge about the cultural dynamics, thus I
became fascinated by the possibility that societies were organised according
to deeper rules of order and authority. […]

Facing the enormous transformation of Western culture after 1989, the 1990s
Yugoslav Wars and the post-2001 War on Terror, I realised that the global
heritage crusade since the 1980s was strongly related to a new era of iden-
tity politics. In contrast to the competing ideologies of modernity, the post-
modern recognition of heritage communities and intangible heritage looked
peaceful and nostalgic, though what would happen if such signs of identity
would become politicised? This explains my interest in the paradoxes of European heritage pol-
itics since 2000.

The aim of the Terrorscape Networking Project was to investigate the dy-
namics of memory related to past violence from a transnational and trans-
disciplinary perspective, which includes forensics, semiotics, spatial and
cultural sciences, conflictual histories, contested heritage, and competing
memories of Europe’s twentieth century past in the context of its current fi-
nancial, political, and cultural crisis. Today, the continent still hosts traces
of terror (in particular camps and killing fields) as remnants of both World
Wars, the Holocaust, civil wars, and the Cold War. Nevertheless, we con-
sider terrorscape not only as places where terror, political or state-perpe-
trated violence happened, but also as sites where the ‘spacetimes’ of terror
are collectively remembered, or actively silenced. Traces of terror are from
this perspective closely related to signs of trauma, and as the official narra-

Dynamics of memory are far from linear and strongly related to
processes of appropriation of heritage, as well as the owning and disowning
of memory sites, in particular those linked to past traumatic events.

Rob van der Laarse is head of the Amsterdam School for Heritage, Memory and Material
Culture (AHM) at the UvA’s Faculty of Humanities. He was founding program director of heritage
studies at the University of Amsterdam from 2004-2010 and currently teaches at the art and
cultural sciences departments of the UvA as well as VU University Amsterdam. He is currently the
project coordinator for the research project iC-ACCESS Accessing Campscapes: Inclusive
tives of memory have become more and more a domain of struggle between competing ethnic and ideological communities, by understanding Europe’s topography of memory-making, which includes forgetting and the negotiation of contested memories between different (ethnic) groups and nations, we actually entered the dark side of the European project.”

LUCA BASSO PERESSUT

«Although walls, barriers and fences have been erected in Europe in recent years and several politicians are working to consolidate new nationalism and separatism, we are actually living in an increasingly globalised world, ‘an age of migrations’, in which the flows of people, goods, information, and ideas determine processes that seem unstoppable and go beyond any artificially imposed constraint. It is a scenario that offers us unexpected interchanging modes, whereby the comparison of cultures, ideas, memories, and identities coming from different backgrounds is undermining the social homogeneity that has long been a feature of geographical areas that are currently facing difficulties with the relationship between the ‘self’ and the ‘other’. [...] As Ackbar Abbas, former Co-Director of the Center for the Study of Globalization and Culture of the University of Manitoba, wrote: ‘migrancy means (...) not only changing places; it also means changing the nature of places.’ In this context, an innovative approach to the use of cultural heritage is required that goes beyond belonging to a single territory, to a specific language or an ‘imagined community’, and that, by contrast, is able to represent segments of social structures that are widely diversified by age, culture, gender and ethnicity, etc.

This means reorganising codified relations on a new basis among assets, cultural institutions, social, urban and architectural space. Museums as institutions aimed at favouring inclusive forms of cultural relations within communities (ie: ‘places where cultures meet’) are strongly committed to the task of representing these aspects of contemporary society and its complexity. It is increasingly necessary to develop a culture of complexity.

Adopting the notion of ‘migration’ as a paradigm of the contemporary global and multi-cultural world, MeLa investigated the role of museums in twenty-first century Europe. Despite recent events and their current awkwardness, these issues, which were the focus of MeLa research activities, continue to be a benchmark for an innovative vision of the role of museums today and in the close future.

CHRIS WITEHEAD

«In Horizon 2020, the European Commission posits the importance of cultural heritage for communitarian social relations, individual personal development and inclusive senses of belonging. These positions are reflected in the report of the Council of Europe’s Conclusions on Cultural Heritage as a Strategic Resource for a Sustainable Europe (2014) and the H2020 Expert Group on Cultural Heritage: Getting Cultural Heritage to Work for Europe (2015). In the latter heritage is presented not as a cost to society and a financial burden but as a boon to the European economy and a means of fostering ‘greater unity and cohesion of European citizens’, overcoming the challenges of demographic change, migration and political disengagement.

While we recognise and respond constructively to instrumental perspectives such as these, CoHERE also explores problematics relating to the notion of ‘European identity’ that are, as indicated, particularly visible now in some contexts.»
The CoHERE project does not shirk from an awareness of the contested nature of the political, and indeed moral and philosophical, terrain to be explored, where there is a commonplace attachment of ethics to heritage that often manifests in tacit or overt prescription. This leads inevitably to axiological discussions about exactly which human and social values, if any, constitute absolute goods. Following this, other questions emerge: why, and (sometimes) where and when did such values develop, or through which historical processes and memory practices—for example through reflection on ‘never-again’ iniquities such as genocides? [...]
TRACES is an independent four-monthly refereed journal that brings together original contributions to explore emerging issues in the field of heritage and museum studies.

Selected papers—collected into sixteen-pages thematic signatures, custom designed and printed offset in a limited edition—will investigate a common topic from different perspectives with a focus on practices, innovative approaches and experimental research actions.

Three issues per year: 'Snapshots', with graphic-based contributions raising questions and investigating practices; 'Dialogues', in which the topic will unfold through a semi-structured interview; and 'Insights', that will expand the field of inquiry by means of theoretical and empirical critical thoughts.
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