Chapter 1

Migratory Pasts and Heritage Making Presents: Theory and Practice

Alexandra Dellios and Eureka Henrich

Abstract

This chapter makes a case for an urgent reappraisal of migrant heritage in the context of recent global 'crises' – refugee, financial, and environmental. We define 'migrant heritage' as that which is made with, by, for, or in reaction to community groups and individuals who have, or whose ancestors have, moved across borders and/or cultures. We then outline the scholarly literatures which have shaped understandings of migrant heritage, zoning in on the overlaps between memory studies, migration studies and critical heritage studies. Themes including human rights, affect and activism emerge as key vectors of the volume, which presents case studies of migrant, multicultural and diasporic heritage making across the globe.

On 12 July 2019 hundreds of protestors occupied the Pantheon in Paris, the historic monument and mausoleum housing the remains of revered French citizens. The protestors were immigrants without papers or *sans papiers*, identifying themselves as 'Gilets Noirs' (black vests) in reference to the recent 'Gilets Jaune' movement. Their press release explained "we are not simply fighting for documentation, but against a system that makes us undocumented migrants" (Euronews 2019). The protestors' calls for the regularisation of their immigration status and the release of their fellow migrants in detention were rejected by French Prime Minister Edouard Phillipe. After police escorted the protestors from the Pantheon, and arrested 37 of them, Phillipe tweeted that "France is a state governed by the rule of law," which implies "respect for the rules that apply to the right of residence, respect for public monuments and for the memory they represent."[1]

These events are the latest in a history of migrant rights protest in France (Freedman 2008). They are also a vital reminder of the role heritage plays in political discourses about migration, citizenship, belonging, and human rights. The symbolic impact of some 700 black migrant protestors in the heart of the French capital was a shrewd choice – in their words, "We are occupying the graves of your great men to denounce your profanations… France is continuing slavery in a different way" (Euronews 2019). The Pantheon also featured in the Prime Minister's response, becoming almost a metonym of the French state and its laws. Yet the stated "respect for monuments" and the "memory they represent" begs the question: *whose* memories?

Human movement has become intrinsic to larger global political trends, chief among them the recent rise of right-wing populism across the world's democracies and its attendant anti-migrant and anti-refugee sentiment. From 2015, rising numbers of people seeking refuge in EU nations from across the Mediterranean Sea or overland through Southeast Europe—known as the 'refugee crisis'—precipitated many European countries to enact harsher border controls. Despite European Union and UNHCR relocation schemes, many individual nation-states have enforced increasingly draconian measures at their borders to deter or contain the movement of 'unauthorised' bodies—including a refusal to rescue those at risk of drowning at sea (Public Radio International 2017; Giuffrida 2019). Other 'crises' have emerged, including that which continues to occur on the United States-Mexico border, where thousands seeking asylum are apprehended by USA Border Protection officers each month (Hamilakis 2017). Whether 'migrant', 'immigrant' or 'refugee', mobile peoples are positioned in these 'crisis' discourses as aberrations – inconvenient and undesirable problems that demand swift solutions. Counter arguments can be correspondingly problematic, casting grateful newcomers as valuable contributors to their host nations, enriching core cultures with their colourful traditions. Rarely do we encounter these subjects as individuals, as creators and translators of their own heritages, cultures and politics, and as definers of their own positionality, which may or may not embrace the categories of 'migrant' and 'refugee' which the global immigration debate has fetishized (Crawley and Skleparis 2017).

The idea of a 'refugee crisis' is a challenge to intra-national and transnational mechanisms for receiving and settling mobile peoples. And while the fever-pitch coverage these 'crises' can be dismissed as misleading or politically-driven, the knock-on effect on everyday attitudes, beliefs and behaviours is harder to ignore. Some commentators have labelled the European crisis a 'turning point' in community attitudes towards human mobility and the rights of refugees, noting also a new backlash against the idea of multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism more broadly, although the latter two concepts often relate more explicitly to longer-settled cohorts of migrants and their descendants. For instance, while Australia did not see a massive increase in refugee arrivals in the twenty-first century, its public and political culture has displayed an intensified anti-immigration rhetoric including the mainstreaming of explicitly xenophobic and Islamophobic sentiments, which have come to target even long-settled communities, like descendants of Lebanese refugees who arrived in the 1970s (Anderson 2016). Some of the anti-immigrant narratives that circulate have a much longer lineage—particularly those that evoke the spectre of the boat or the wall to justify

ever-more punitive measures at the border (Walker 1999). The politics of race, and the politics of refugeehood, can play out differently in different national contexts (and according to the legacies of colonialism in respective nation-states). It is, however, possible to generalise that the spread of a rights-based and globalising rhetoric has been met by a reiteration of right-wing nationalist causes, and the legitimisation of cultural racism through the popularisation of previously marginal political parties, especially in the decade since the 'global financial crisis' from 2008. An embrace of nativism has lent sanction to attitudes which glorify ethnic homogeneity, and online platforms have enabled these views to spread unchecked, as the tragic events in Christchurch in 2019 demonstrated.

In response to the rhetoric of 'crisis' and claims of a 'turning point', historians have reiterated their called for a longer historical consideration of the limits of governmental and intergovernmental humanitarianism and border control—issues that feature in many histories of human mobility and forced migration (Guiraudon 2017; Holmes and Castañeda 2016; Lucassen 2017). That is, we need to historicise social and political responses to migration, and make more apparent the social structures that have historically constrained movement and settlement, rather than accept the inevitability inherent in a language of 'crisis' and its attendant moral panic. However, it's one thing to consider the situation facing refugees from, for example, Bosnia in the 1990s, or Southeast Asia in the late 1970s, and another to draw parallels. While we're asked to consider the long history of human mobility, and the long history of racism and xenophobia that states deploy to police their internal and external borders, it's also worth revisiting these histories and their current representations as a means to challenge stereotypes, conflations and misunderstandings; to assert that not all these historical experiences are the same; not all of these migrations are the same. This, in part, is the vital work of public historians, heritage practitioners, community actors, and all those interested in the use of the past in the present.

This book is a contribution to that body of work, within and beyond the academy, which demands a re-examination of our migratory past in order to better understand the politics of the present. In our case, an appreciation of the complexity of migration history is the precursor to interrogating the processes and practices at play in migrant heritage today. With this in mind, we ask the following questions: what is the life and impact of migrant heritage in these sometimes hostile and contradictory political and social contexts? How are migration histories (including those from newer and much older migrant communities, 'ethnic

minorities' and racialized 'non-Whites', as well as subsequent generations of citizens and noncitizens, forced and 'undocumented' migrants and asylum seekers) made public in the wake of rhetorical and physical violence against the cultural 'Other'? Where can we locate the memories and lived realities of migrants themselves—in what place and space are their collective and individual stories told? Or alternatively, how are these stories used to express ideas of belonging in and of place—for now and into the future? How do cultural institutions representing cities and towns with long histories of migration project, manage, or contain their multicultural histories or, conversely, their histories of emigration and their diasporic links? We contend that in the face of various global 'crises' (refugee, financial, environmental), the role of heritage is especially important: heritage is a stage for the negotiation of shifting identities and the legacies of race and racism; for the rewriting of traditions and historical narratives of belonging and becoming; and heritage is a tool for legitimising and contesting political visions for the future. The history and heritage of migration and migrants is obvious terrain for these battles over identity and questions of national and transnational communities.

What is the heritage of migration?

In this collection we focus on the creation, regulation and reception of what we broadly, in the first instance, call 'migrant heritage'—that which is made with, by, for, or in reaction to community groups and individuals who have, or whose ancestors have, moved across borders and/or cultures. Defining the heritage associated with migration and delineating it from other forms of heritage is no easy task. As historian Dan Stone recently wrote in relation to histories of refugees, "in writing the past, [historians] construct it, and thus… they have to be wary of taking as a given the phenomenon whose constitution they are seeking to describe and analyse" (2018: 103). As historians of migration and heritage scholars, we are keenly aware of our own roles in constructing 'migrant heritage' and wary of flattening the complexity of human mobility, and its experience and regulation past and present. Whether 'refugee', 'migrant', 'immigrant' or 'foreigner', or any other label given to those who are on the move, in this collection, all mobile peoples and their descendants are included as instigators and makers, as well as subjects of, the heritage processes under study. In its broadest sense, then, we see migration heritage as the political, cultural and social process of representing and preserving migratory experiences—the temporal and spatial dimensions of mobility and its emotional, familial and community aftermath, both tangible and intangible.

Efforts to represent these experiences can, and often do, involve cultural institutions, government bodies and non-government organisations, but they also occur in opposition to, and separate from, state structures.

'Migrant heritage' can stretch beyond borders and across generations, and people who may not identify as migrants themselves recognise migrant heritage in their own families, neighbourhoods or cities. Yet to evoke the ongoing connections between peoples in different locations and the shared sense of belonging and communal identity that can flourish from those connections, 'diasporic heritage' offers a different entry point. Cultural theorist Ien Ang has argued that heritage strategies that incorporate and validate migration heritage, such as immigration museums, 'tend to simplify the complex instabilities of the diasporic experience by reducing the diasporic subject to the frozen, one-dimensional identity of the 'immigrant'' (2011: 90). For studies of heritage, which are so often nation-bound, diaspora is a potentially disruptive concept to engage with—a subject position made possible not necessarily through the experience of a journey (as 'migrant' or 'refugee' may be) but through a shared history of migration and mobility and the active creation of hybrid identities that embrace transnational belonging. The process by which these histories become heritage is complex and contested, involving multiple actors including those living in diaspora 'homelands' and those who wish to remain connected to them. As a result, as Ann Reed reminds us, 'diasporic heritage is unstable and always part of a creative social process involving routes and roots' (2015: 394). People who define themselves as part of Chinese, Syrian, Latvian, African, Yugoslavian, Turkish, Moroccan and Vietnamese diaspora groups feature in the chapters that follow.

Finally, to capture a broad field of theory and practice, *Beyond and Between Borders* includes 'multicultural heritage' as a third category of analysis. 'Multicultural' is a messy term, used frequently by states to celebrate (or bemoan) cultural diversity and to characterise contemporary societies in contrast to an imagined monocultural past. It has been mobilised as the vanguard of progressive public policy (for instance, in Singapore following independence in 1965 or in Australia in the late 1970s), decried as an abject failure of immigration policy (in the UK and Europe in the early 2000s) and is still blamed for all manner of social ills, with 'culture' often standing in for 'race' as a more socially-acceptable definer of difference. Again, context is important here: while human mobility has always been a process that states have sought to contain and manage, only in the late twentieth century did immigrant-receiving nations devise 'multicultural' policies to manage and police this increasing internal

diversity. The twenty-first century retreat from multiculturalism and a resurgence of assimilationist discourses in many immigrant-receiving nations, along with a scapegoating of minority (and often racialized) communities by majority populations frustrated with austerity measures, has obvious implications for the framing and representation of migrant and migration heritage. As chapters within this collection demonstrate, some 'migrant heritage' practices have developed in response to multicultural policies and priorities, initiating a dynamic process by which value is ascribed to cultural diversity at a state level and taken up (and challenged) by groups wishing to gain cultural, economic or social benefit.

Heritage scholars have been alert to these discourses. While more than a decade has elapsed since the publication of Ashworth and Tunbridge's *Pluralising Pasts: Heritage, Identity and Place in Multicultural Societies* (2007), the tension identified by the authors between the state impulse to use heritage as a tool of social cohesion while pursuing the apparently contradictory trope of 'celebrating diversity' invites further analysis, especially in light of recent global political shifts. When does migrant heritage become 'multicultural'? Where states invoke this term, creating an 'us' who share in a 'multicultural heritage', whose interests are served? And, as Littler and Naidoo asked in their exploration of the legacies of race in the UK, 'what are the possibilities for radical heritage agendas that can imagine decentred, hybrid and culturally diverse narratives' of national histories and identities? (2007: 2).

These questions remain relevant, and recent developments demand a re-examination of the possibilities of heritage beyond official or imagined borders. This collection features case studies of migrant, multicultural and diasporic heritage existent in the nation-states of: Australia, Belgium, Britain, Canada, Greece, Germany, Indonesia, the United States of America, Mexico, Malaysia, the Netherlands, Norway, South Africa, and Bosnia, Kosovo and Croatia. They are presented by a host of passionate authors including historians, heritage scholars, heritage and museum professionals, activists, doctoral students and professors. The collection as a result is innovative and interdisciplinary, and draws on rich and overlapping fields of both theory and practice relating to heritage, memory and migration. Its urgency reflects the high stakes of the topic at hand in today's world.

Critical heritage studies, memory and migration

In order to locate our work and that of the authors in this volume, we first need to map the terrain of the fields of scholarship which have shaped our approaches and ideas. Of the works that address and examine the intersections between human mobility and its tangible and intangible manifestations in the present, three related clusters have been particularly important to us – memory studies, migration studies and heritage studies, broadly defined. With their interest in the connection between the production of memory and the construction of identity, memory studies scholars from the 1960s laid the groundwork for those writing in the fields of heritage and museum studies in subsequent decades. The umbilical connection between memory, heritage and identity was entwined in the field's theoretical underpinnings. Clarifying his oft-cited 'sites of memory' concept in the preface to the English language edition of *Realms of Memory* in 1996, Pierre Nora explained:

> a *lieu de memoire* is any significant entity, whether material or non-material in nature, which by dint of human will or the work of time has become a symbolic element of the memorial heritage of any community (xvii).

While imagined national communities were Nora's focus, his argument also accommodates communities constructed within, beyond and between borders. It is little wonder that scholars of migration have been interested in the memorial heritages of those whose journeys they study, whether they be represented in literature, passed down through families or etched into the memoryscapes of cities, online spaces and film. Edited volumes like Julia Creet and Andreas Kitzmann's *Multidisciplinary Approaches to Memory Studies: Memory and Migration* (2011) and Irial Glynn and J. Olaf Kleist's *History, Memory and Migration: Perceptions of the Past and the Politics of Incorporation* (2012) both make a strong case for the recognition and further exploration of migration as a key theme of memory studies literature. A thread in these works also taken up by authors in this collection is the question of the archive, broadly conceived. How are memories of migration recorded, preserved and accessed? What institutions govern these processes, and is it possible to transgress them in order to secure memories that do not conform to the confines of the nation-state and its regulatory apparatus?

Museums, acting as the material archives and memory repositories of modern societies, have provided the focus for one of the richest veins of scholarship on the intersections between memory, heritage and migration. Practitioners are often authors in the field, self-reflexively claiming and questioning their authority as curators, collectors and interpreters of migrant memories in the present. Edited collections including *Museums, Migration and Identity in Europe* (Whitehead et al. 2016) and *Changes in Museum Practice: New Media, Refugees and Participation* (Skartveit and Goodnow 2010) have brought together academics and practitioner scholars to consider the representation of human mobility in different frames—be it through place and belonging, or through social inclusion and participation. The first overview of the representation of migration in museums appeared in 2014. Laurence Gourévidis and a host of scholars (including contributors to this volume Susan Ashley and Andrew Witcomb) demonstrated the breadth and range of migration exhibitions across the world, a phenomenon which has flourished since the 1980s. Australia was at the forefront of this memory work, and recent scholarship indicates the ongoing impacts of these early initiatives (Darian-Smith and Hamilton 2019). Other studies have attempted to encourage institutional recognition of migration or ethnic-minority heritage in libraries and museums (Light 2017; Neumann 2019; Witcomb 2003). They generally assess institutional exhibitions or collections that attempt to include or 'speak' to racial and ethnic minorities within nation states.

Recent studies in this field have been shaped by significant supranational investment in museums as agents of social change, as the European Museums in the Age of Migration (MELA) project, funded by the European Union between 2011 and 2015, demonstrated (MELA Website). Perla Innocenti's concept of 'migrating heritage' is worth revisiting in this context, as it formed part of the MELA project. As she explained in 2014:

> Migrating heritage encompasses not only the migration and mobility of post-colonial artefacts, but also migration of people, technologies and disciplines, crossing boundaries and joining forces in cultural networks and partnerships to address new emerging challenges for social inclusion, cultural dialogue, and new models of cultural identity, citizenship and national belonging (p. 2).

As a result, older conceptions of nationally-bound or ethno-specific heritage were irrevocably changed. Innocenti asked how museums, primarily those in Europe, were evolving and

adapting in response. While adding to this growing literature on museums and migration, *Beyond and Between Borders* is also concerned with the heritage management sector and authorised heritage discourses, a sector governed by separate charters and conventions at the state, national and international level. This collection also reflects a discerned shift in the field from narratives of social inclusion and belonging to an assertion of migrant rights and the value of activism, co-curation and participation as strategies of heritage making. Accordingly, our authors include curators and heritage workers, activists and archivists, working within and without mainstream institutions.

Lastly, in the growing field of critical heritage studies intersections with the history of migration are less pronounced. Perhaps this is because the temporal, rather than the spatial, has been more familiar terrain for scholars of the migrant experience, whereas scholars in heritage studies, integrating expertise from archaeology and geography, often privilege spatial applications of concepts like identity and memory, locating material manifestations in a specific place and space (and often bound by case studies), and the tangible implications of 'managing' those manifestations. But this is nonetheless too simple a description of the critical heritage studies field, which is still developing.

From the early 2000s, critical heritage studies emerged to challenge and critique heritage-making practices defined by a dominant Western paradigm, and the power dynamics that determine what pasts become privileged in the present (Macdonald 2013; Urry 1995; Smith 2006; Harrison 2012; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998; Harvey 2001). Drawing on earlier pioneering works from Stuart Hall (1999) and Raphael Samuel (1994) and debates about the 'bogus history' offered by a national heritage industry (Lowenthal 1998; Hewison 1987; 2007)—scholars have produced a body of work that challenges ideas of 'expert' authority and the Western logic behind the intragovernmental bodies that codify and police 'best practice' and sites worthy of inscription. This is best encapsulated by UNESCO conceptions of heritage, and the impetus to categorise and register places according to a set of expert-devised definitions that often stress the monumental and a Eurocentric aesthetic. Working at the intersections between policy, practice and theory, heritage studies scholars have developed a dynamic consideration of 'heritage' and its preservation—one which rejects the notion of heritage as a static, unmediated and fabric-bound remnant of the past (Urry 1995; Smith 2006). Rather, heritage is conceived of and studied as a process and a practice (Harvey 2001), with 'value' increasingly understood as a contested concept that can be conferred

differently by individuals, communities and institutions (Clark 2014) In some ways, critical heritage studies is one offshoot of the wider multidisciplinary field of memory studies—with input from historical archaeology, cultural anthropology and landscape geography. The field has been able to offer close and detailed case studies of place and space, with an eye to community engagements with the past, identity formation, and the relationship between identity and the landscape.

More recently the field has been shaped by a turn to affect and emotion (Smith, Wetherell and Campbell 2018), and a consideration of the use of emotion in heritage making practices, in museums and commemorations, in political rhetoric and debates over social memory. As Smith asserts (2017: 69): "there is a complex interplay between processes of remembering, identity construction and emotional affirmation and investment that works to legitimize and justify particular historical and social narratives." Wetherell has been most useful in putting forward an "affective practice" as a basis for critical social research: approaching affect as a distributed phenomenon—not localised in the psychology of the individual or as "unmediated excess", but involving meaning-making that is situational and historically bound, "socially consequential and bound up with ongoing social relations" (2018: 5). A consideration of emotion has had great utility in critical heritage studies, encouraging scholars once again to move beyond the Eurocentric and materialist, beyond a tangible/intangible heritage divide, and towards a socially-mediated and historicised understanding of personal and collective engagements with and manifestations of heritage processes. This volume makes further inroads into the relationship between affect and heritage, encompassing the emotions of those who move across borders and those who work with them to represent or preserve their heritage including artists, aid workers, activists and museum staff (see Witcomb et al, Mason, Terraciano, Arauz and De Bock in this collection).

While historians demand that we consider chronology and context, other scholars in the humanities have also responded to the 'refugee crisis' by offering critiques of the role of public art, heritage and museums in fostering new ways to discuss human mobility. They have explored new concepts for engendering 'empathy' and global solidarity with those forced to migrate, and advocate for the creation of a more cosmopolitan and 'post-national' practice, politics and ethics towards those seeking safety and dignity (Mason 2013). These studies too draw on new ideas in the study of emotion, and how emotions may structure collective and individual encounters with the Other.

The chapters that follow contribute to the intersections between heritage, memory and migration in three main tranches – challenges to nation-based heritage discourses, explorations of place and the politics of race, and diasporic heritage practice with and by communities. Each section provides detailed 'snapshots' of heritage making today and the ways in which these practices are informed by or relate to theories of heritage which themselves continue to evolve and change. The dynamism and adaptation that characterise histories of migration are reflected in these case studies of migrant, diasporic and multicultural heritage from across the globe.

PART ONE: Challenging official heritage and national historiographies: expanding heritage making theories

Part One is presented as a challenge to nation-bound heritage discourses, reflecting on what Denis Byrne has critiqued as 'methodological nationalism' in heritage industry practice: "in its nation-building guise, heritage discourse promotes the idea of an abiding, quasi-cosmological affinity of citizens, heritage sites, and national terrain" (2016: 2363). The authors in Part One offer socially-engaged critiques of relational, widely networked, transversal and border-crossing heritages that move us beyond the territorialised nation-state and beyond state-sanctioned institutions. The contributions of these authors rest on their collaborations with and roles as diasporic community members and practitioners.

Susan Ashley's chapter looks to on-the-ground engagements, rather than mainstream institutional disseminations of cultural heritage. This work feeds into growing academic and practitioner debates about the need to engage communities of interest, to move beyond tried ideas of 'collaboration' and toward co-design and participation (see Crooke 2008; Waterton and Smith 2010; Flinn and Sexton 2018). Ashley also contributes to familiar critiques of English heritage (Hall 1999; Smith and Waterton 2012)—bound by structural, 'grand' and elitist definitions—by adding social detail through her ethnographic work with community groups. She provides evidence of heritage-making outside the 'National Trust' space, in which Black and minority ethnic groups in northern England strategically assert their voices in the public sphere and through networked relationships that necessarily cross borders.

Continuing this challenge, Christian Rossipal offers an 'unsettling' of state-centrism and methodological nationalism in academic practice, looking to contemporary cultural archiving undertaken by 'noncitizen' activists (refugees, asylum seekers, *sans-papiers* or the 'undocumented'); but he also moves beyond conventional understandings of *trans*nationalism in heritage studies, urging us to consider how cultural heritage is "entangled in the aporetic tension between the national, the transnational, and what I call the *transversal*". The study is an attempt to unpack the epistemological horizon of the nation-state that is also complicit in a transnational framework, bound as it is by a territorial and sovereign imperative. Balancing an understanding of the role of the state in shaping cultural boundaries (including transnational manifestations) with a critique of the transversal ("dwelling in movement and movement indwelling") Rossipal offers a robust new understanding of migration heritage and the cultural artefacts of radical statelessness.

Karen Schamberger, also engaging with radical identities and the formation of new relationships and entanglements between peoples and objects, explores the biographies of two museum objects. Both hold significance for the migration and settlement histories of different, and differently racialized, communities in Australia. From a curator's perspective, she explores the cognitive dissonance associated with these museum objects, objects that have mediated relationships between people of different cultural backgrounds throughout Australia's contentious history of race relations, identifying and tracing the shifting politics of belonging that plays out in this 'migrant nation'.

Robert Mason turns our attention to the violence that the border can inflict against the migrant body—looking to the Mexican-USA border and two heritage sites in order to unpack new approaches to museology and migration. The chapter locates the deeply political and ultimately vulnerable nature of the migrant body in these two interconnected examples of heritage sites. In these memory cultures, the migrant is rhetorically presented as an object of anger, terror and horror. Mason urges us to consider how emerging heritage practices can reconcile these rhetorical acts of emotional distancing and historically locate moments of violence and their impacts across borders.

PART TWO: Place, Placing Memories and the Politics of Race and Diversity

While issues associated with the shifting constructions of race feature throughout the collection, Part Two concentrates these concerns on the nexus between place, memory and politics—and thus refuses the de-politicisation of race that is often inherent in liberalist multiculturalism and the trope of 'celebrating diversity'.

Discourses of race are coded and historically contingent; the meanings and boundaries of race have changed over the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Gunew 2004). Gunew, in her exploration of the colonial dimensions of multiculturalisms in the UK, Canada and Australia, has questioned whether 'new racism' (or 'culturalism'), with its focus on 'culture' and its retreat from the older 'scientific racism' that developed from the late eighteenth century, serves to camouflage issues to do with unequal power relations (Gunew 2004: 20). Her response has been to centre minority perspectives, and to use minority perspectives to critique dominant discourses and practices (including heritage practices) associated with state multiculturalism.

Place and the amorphous notion of 'belonging' in place also speaks to these discourses of race—especially in populist rhetoric that conflates 'belonging' with a static notion of inherence and racial purity. This rhetoric stresses 'roots' of belonging, in contrast to critical heritage approaches to transnational heritage, which emphasise 'routes' as a source of collective identity. Alda Terracciano engages with these debates in a British context, drawing on her arts-based heritage practice with Moroccan communities in London. The chapter traces the intangible heritage of migrant communities, considering also the sensory experience of this heritage, augmented through technologies aimed at widening access and participation. Terracciano's work demonstrates how place-based identities are, nonetheless, rooted and routed—in the sense that they depend on evolving, dynamic and generational relations to the built environment, which can in turn have implicit and explicit links to other places, a temporal and spatial transnational relatedness that has long been the subject of diasporic studies.

Drawing on their close involvement with a public history project in the state of South Australia, Agutter, Ankeny and Lacey trace the project's genesis, construction and reception by implicated local community groups. The Pennington Gardens Reserve on the site of the

former Finsbury/Pennington migrant hostel was constructed with a 'diasporic history of the place' in mind—a culturally-aware space that nonetheless encountered difficulties over the inevitable dissonance of its migratory heritage.

These first two chapters in Part Two speak to on-the-ground community-engaged and place-based heritage practices that connect (or reconnect) community memories and identities with histories of place, and the built environment of local places. Alternatively, academics Justine Greenwood and Khanyile Mlotshwa conducted ethnographic work in order to unpack the lived realities of cosmopolitanism in two different urban landscapes. Greenwood turns our attention to the link between nation-building and cultural tourism—focussing on the two Australian cities of Canberra (the national capital) and Cabramatta (in Western Sydney). This analysis traces the efforts of various promoters and government bodies, in conjunction with ethnic minority groups, to publicise migrant heritage and multicultural arts as tourist attractions. Greenwood thus elucidates the evolving public politics of multiculturalism, and its operationalisation in urban landscapes and local environments. Khanyile Mlotshwa draws on concepts of embodied and intangible heritage to stress an alternative narrative about the multicultural communities of Johannesburg, South Africa. It's a narrative that recognises xenophobic conflicts among the African diaspora, but also, through Mlotshwa's focus on the Nigerian dish *kwasakwasa,* recognises too the double-meaning of postcoloniality in this context, the exploitation *and* resistance of diasporic subjectivities, which can be located in and around the practices of intangible heritage. Understanding these 'prolonged historical entanglements' between colony and metropole, too, is part of unravelling the heritage now consumed in the new 'global cities' (Hall 2017: 12) like Johannesburg.

Witcomb, Bounia and Papataxiarchis then take us to Lesbos, an island at the forefront of Europe's latest refugee crisis. Here, their field research considered the layered histories of refuge and reception contained in two small local history exhibitions. They unpack the histories of silence, the politics of memory and race in Greece, and the idea of a restorative museum in the context of humanitarian crises. This final chapter in Part Two draws attention to the influence of small local collecting institutions on the memory cultures of local communities.

PART THREE: Community participation and collaboration in diasporic heritage practice

As indicated, heritage scholars (Ashworth, Graham & Tunbridge 2007; Byrne, Brayshaw & Ireland 2003; Clark & Johnston 2003; Mydland & Grahn 2012; Smith 2006; Waterton & Smith 2010) have long challenged institutional heritage practices that devalue community knowledeges. Waterton and Smith (2010) argue that while the notion of 'community' has been adopted by dominant discourses about heritage, the deployment of 'community' in heritage management practice privileges restrictive assumptions about homogeneity and consensus, which can ignore and even actively mask the extent to which social systems like heritage regimes are tied up with issues of social justice, political recognition and subordinate status. The net result of this depoliticised use of "community" is the disappearance of dissonance and nuanced ways of understanding heritage. Despite intermittent and sometimes token efforts to address gaps, state-funded heritage projects, conservation efforts, and state and national heritage lists and grants continue to perpetuate the invisibility of migration and settlement histories, and the diverse backgrounds of 'Other' settlers. In the Western world, more 'traditional' bodies, such as the UK's National Trust and the National Trust of Australia, are purportedly loosing their cultural consensus and traction as their membership numbers drop.

While the rhetoric around community, especially in academic work, has been about challenging the role of heritage 'experts' and their privileged control over the public past (Byrne, Brayshaw & Ireland 2002), its practice in large state-funded initiatives (In Australia, the Australian Heritage Commission funded *Migration Heritage Kit* in the early 2000s, and the discontinued NSW government-funded digital archive Migration Heritage Centre comes to mind) ensures the continued *mis*recognition of community within the heritage management process—causing Waterton and Smith (2010: 5-6) to ask: how many projects are done *with* communities rather than *for* them?

Part Three brings together different approaches to these questions about community participation and collaboration in the practice of building and representing migrant, multicultural or diasporic heritage. Featured throughout this collection is an emphasis on community-initiated heritages or approaches that attempt to privilege/centre 'non-expert' voices. The ethnographic literature on reflexive practice is extensive. And the authors here

build on these approaches to 'shared authority' (Frisch 1990) by exploring case studies that attempt to close the 'participation gap' that can sometimes typify ethnographic research with migrant community groups. Like all sections in this collection, Part Three brings together the work of both practitioners and academics who draw on innovative and creative practices to either assess or foster a diasporic yet located sensibility.

Emily Arauz's chapter draws on interviews conducted with Syrian asylum seekers and refugees, participants in two community art projects in Berlin and Amsterdam. Both projects are offered as examples of cultural self-representation by members of migrant populations. Arauz urges us, as heritage practitioners, to go further than community negotiation and move toward collaboration, a practice that allows migrant participants agency in controlling their narratives. Similarly, Jozefien De Bock's discussion of her community-engaged practice as a public historian working in the Belgian city of Ghent focuses on participation and the barriers that inhibit it. De Bock unpacks the processes and outcomes of a city-wide migration heritage project, and the debates about the project conducted by members of the public and heritage practitioners. The chapter ultimately offers recommendations for future work that might more effectively mainstream migrant, diasporic and multicultural voices.

Torgrim Sneve Guttormsen examines the memorial practices surrounding the Vietnamese refugee diaspora in a number of national contexts. He too offers recommendations for heritage management moving forward, in addition to exploring more broadly the influence of the phenomenon of forced and undocumented migration on memorial cultures. Finally, Munro continues this focus on 'dissonant' and politically or diplomatically contentious heritage, by exploring the diasporic response to the violent break-up of the former Yugoslavia. Returning again to the UK, Gayle Munro offers a multiscalar examination of the heritage making practices of migrants from the former Yugoslavia—considering their response to heritage 'threat' in the home and in the diasporic community, and in relation to shared and highly contested cultural repositories originating across the region of the former Yugoslavia.

Conclusion

Contemporary migration, as Crawley and Skleparis have recently argued, belies the clear cut legal categories of 'refugee' and 'migrant' and instead requires us 'to engage with the

complex economic, social and political realities of the 'in between'' (2017: 49). It is this 'in between' in which the lived experience of people on the move, and those to whom they are connected, takes place. In *Beyond and Between Borders*, we have sought to reflect on, rather than elide, the messy, fluid and everchanging nature of migration and its legacies past and present, manifest in heritage. Our scope is broad, but not comprehensive, with Europe, Australia and the United States most prominent among the chapters. Nor can we claim any representativeness in terms of the selection of case studies and authors. The nature of academic scholarship necessarily invites contribution from those already within the system, and those in positions of institutional authority. We are however proud that early career scholars appear here alongside seasoned heritage theorists, and that many of the chapters reflect the collaborative and co-authored nature of heritage scholarship and practice in different institutional contexts.

Questions of integration and social inclusion or fostering diversity—terms favoured by the State and linked to many government-backed controls and across the world—are tried and tested topics in this field of migration and memory more broadly. However, as we've outlined in this chapter, new possibilities emerge if we shift our attention to the intersections between emerging critical heritage studies theories, and the history and heritage work of heritage professionals and institutions as well as migrant communities themselves. This collection is about the creation of new histories beyond and within the postcolonial nation-state— Australia, Belgium, Britain, Canada, Greece, Germany, Indonesia, the United States of America, Mexico, Malaysia, the Netherlands, Norway, South Africa, and Bosnia, Kosovo and Croatia. Accordingly, the authors engage with the diasporic, transnational, reterritorialized, hyper-diverse and cosmopolitan messiness of peoples' heritage making today. While the collection contains case studies primarily based in Europe, Australia and the USA, the content of these cases is also relevant to Asia and other parts of the world—not least because all the case studies speak to widely networked, transversal and transnational manifestations of heritage that have potential connections to other events and diasporas around the world.

We have attempted to offer locally-situated case studies of migration heritage together with an open and interdisciplinary approach that avoids universalising language and Eurocentric concepts and methods, or perpetuates a methodological hegemony. This is important if we are to present robust and nuanced studies of migration heritage, which we believe can have implications for heritage processes and expressions of professional practice and aide

historically-informed understandings of transnational and transcultural experiences of migration and settlement. We hope that the result is a collection which underlines what migrant heritage *does* in national, transnational and transversal spaces, and recognises the value of heritage work in today's world. Most importantly, it is our sincere wish that this book provokes and inspires future scholarship and practice in the fields of migrant, diasporic and multicultural heritage.

References

Anderson, S. 'Peter Dutton suggests Fraser government made mistake by resettling Lebanese refugees', *ABC News,* 22 November 2016, accessible at: https://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-11-21/peter-dutton-fraser-made-mistake-resettling-lebanese-refugees/8043624

Ang, I. (2011) 'Unsettling the National: Heritage and Diaspora' in Y. Raj Isar and H.K. Anheier, *Heritage, Memory & Identity*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 82-94.

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

Byrne, D. (2016). Heritage corridors: transnational flows and the built environment of migration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *42*(14), 2360-2378.

Byrne, D., Brayshaw, H., and Ireland, T. (2003). *Social significance: a discussion paper*, NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service.

Clark, K. (2014) 'Values-Based Heritage Management and the Heritage Lottery Fund in the UK', *APT Bulletin*, 45(2): 65-71.

Clarke, A. and Johnston, C. (2003). 'Time, memory, place and land: social meaning and heritage conservation in Australia', paper presented at the Scientific Symposium, ICOMOS 14th General Assembly, Zimbabwe.

Crawley, H. and Skleparis, D. (2017). Refugees, migrants, neither, both: categorical fetishism and the politics of bounding in Europe's 'migration crisis'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 44(1), pp.48-64.

Creet, J. and Kitzmann, A. (eds). (2014). *Memory and migration: Multidisciplinary approaches to memory studies*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Crooke, E. (2008). *Museums and community: ideas, issues and challenges*. Routledge.

Darian-Smith, K. and Hamilton, P. (2019) *Remembering Migration: Oral histories and heritage in Australia.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Euronews. (2019). *'Gilets Noirs' occupy Pantheon in Paris to protest migrant rights*. [online] Available at: https://www.euronews.com/2019/07/12/gilets-noirs-occupy-paris-monument-to-protest-migrants-rights-in-france [Accessed 14 Dec. 2019].

European Museums in the Age of Migration website https://ec.europa.eu/research/infocentre/article_en.cfm?id=/research/headlines/news/article_18_03_16_en.html?infocentre&item=Infocentre&artid=47818 [Accessed 28 Dec. 2019]

Flinn, A. and Sexton, A. 'Research on community heritage: Moving from collaborative research to participatory and co-designed research practice'. In *Heritage and Interpretation,* eds Sheila Watson, Amy Barnes, Katy Bunning, Leicester Readers in Museum Studies, Routledge 2018).

Freedman J. (2008). The French "Sans-Papiers" Movement: An Unfinished Struggle. In: Pojmann W. (eds) *Migration and Activism in Europe Since 1945*. Europe in Transition: The NYU European Studies Series. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Frisch, M. *A shared authority: Essays on the craft and meaning of oral and public history*. Suny Press, 1990.

Giuffrida, A. (2019). *Italy's Salvini refuses to back EU deal on rescue ship migrants*. [online] The Guardian. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/jan/09/malta-allow-49-people-stranded-mediterranean-rescue-ships-disembark-eight-european-nations [Accessed 14 Dec. 2019].

Gouriévidis, L. (ed) (2014). *Museums and migration: history, memory and politics.* London: Routledge.

Guiraudon, V. (2017). The 2015 refugee crisis was not a turning point: explaining policy inertia in EU border control. *European Political Science*, 17(1), pp.151-160.

Gunew, S. (2013). *Haunted nations: The colonial dimensions of multiculturalisms*. Routledge.

Hall, S. (1999/2007). 'Whose Heritage? Un-settling The Heritage, Re-imaging the post-nation'. In *Cultural Heritage: Critical Concepts in Media and Cultural Studie*s, ed. L. Smith. London: Routledge.

Hall, S. (2017). *Familiar Stranger: A Life Between Two Islands*. Penguin Books.

Hamilakis, *Journal of Contemporary Archeology* 2017, 'Archaeologies of Forced and Undocumented Migration', and the subsequent edited collection.

Hamilakis, Y. (2017). Archaeologies of Forced and Undocumented Migration. *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology*, 3(2), p.121.

Harrison, R. (2012). *Heritage: critical approaches*. Routledge.

Harvey, D. C. (2001). Heritage pasts and heritage presents: Temporality, meaning and the scope of heritage studies. *International journal of heritage studies*, 7(4), 319-338.

Hewison, R, 2007. Brideshead revisited. In L. Smith (ed) *Cultural Heritage: Critical Concepts in Media and Cultural Studies,* London: Routledge.

Hewison, R. (1987) The Heritage Industry in Britain in a Climate of Decline. London: Methuen.

Holmes, S. and Castañeda, H. (2016). Representing the "European refugee crisis" in Germany and beyond: Deservingness and difference, life and death. *American Ethnologist*, 43(1), pp.12-24.

InfoMigrants. (2019). *France: 'Black Vests' migrants detained after staging protest for right to remain*. [online] Available at: https://www.infomigrants.net/en/post/18177/france-black-vests-migrants-detained-after-staging-protest-for-right-to-remain [Accessed 14 Dec. 2019].

Innocenti, P., (Ed.) (2014) *Migrating Heritage: Experiences of Cultural Networks and Cultural Dialogue in Europe*. Ashgate, Farnham.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (1998). *Destination culture: Tourism, museums, and heritage*. University of California Press.

Light, H. 'Beyond museums: multicultural material heritage archives in Australia', in *Global mobilities: refugees, exiles and immigrants in museums and archives,* ed. A.K. Levin, pp. 329-347. New York: Taylor & Francis, 2017.

Littler, J. and R. Naidoo (eds) (2004). *The Politics of Heritage: The Legacies of Race.* London: Routledge.

Lowenthal, D. (1998). *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lucassen, L. (2017). Peeling an onion: the "refugee crisis" from a historical perspective. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 41(3), pp.383-410.

Macdonald, S. (2013). *Memorylands: Heritage and identity in Europe today*. Routledge.

Mason, R. (2013). "National Museums, Globalization, and Postnationalism: Imagining a Cosmopolitan Museology", *Museum Worlds: Advances in Research 1*. 40–64.

Mydland, L., and Grah, W. 2012, 'Identifying heritage values in local communities', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, vol. 18, no. 6, 564-587.

Neumann, K. "'In Search of 'Australia and the Australian People'": The National Library of Australia and the Representation of Cultural and Linguistic Diversity'. In *Remembering Migration: Oral Histories and Heritage*, eds. K. Darian-Smith and P. Hamilton, pp. 285-299.

Nora, P. "Preface to English Language Edition: From Lieux de memoire to Realms of Memory", in A. Golhammer (translator), (1996) *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past.* New York: Columbia University Press, xv-xxiv.

Public Radio International. (2019). *Italy's migrant crisis saw a huge turning point in 2017*. [online] Available at: https://www.pri.org/stories/2017-12-30/italys-migrant-crisis-saw-huge-turning-point-2017 [Accessed 14 Dec. 2019].

Reed A. (2015) 'Of Routes and Roots: Paths for Understanding Diasporic Heritage', in E. Waterton and S. Watson (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research.* Palgrave Macmillan, London

Skartveit, H. and K. Goodnow (eds.) (2010). *Changes in Museum Practice: New Media, Refugees and Participation.* New York and Oxford: Berhgahn Books.

Smith, L. (2006) *Uses of heritage*. London: Routledge.

Smith, L., & Waterton, E. (2012). Constrained by commonsense: The authorized heritage discourse in contemporary debates. *The Oxford handbook of public archaeology*, 153-171.

Smith, L. (2017). 'We are… we are everything': the politics of recognition and misrecognition at immigration museums. *Museum and Society*, *15*(1), 69-86.

Smith, L., Wetherell, M., & Campbell, G. (Eds.). (2018). *Emotion, Affective Practices, and the Past in the Present*. Routledge.

Stone, D. (2018). Refugees then and now: memory, history and politics in the long twentieth century: an introduction. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 52(2-3), pp.101-106.

Urry, J. (1995). 'How societies remember the past.' *The Sociological Review 43*(1), 45-65.

Walker, D. (1999). *Anxious nation: Australia and the rise of Asia, 1850-1939*. St. Lucia, Qld: University of Queensland Press.

Waterton, E and L. Smith. 'The recognition and misrecognition of community heritage.' *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16, no. 1-2 (2010): 4-15.

Whitehead, C., S. Eckersley, K. Lloyd, and R. Mason (eds) (2016). *Museums, Migration and Identity in Europe: Peoples, Places and Identities*. London: Routledge.

Witcomb, A. (2003) *Re-imagining the museum: Beyond the mausoleum*. London: Routledge.

---

[1] English translation provided by InfoMigrants website (2019).