

**This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.**

**Author(s):** Lähdesmäki, Tuuli; Zhu, Yujie; Thomas, Suzie

**Title:** Introduction: Heritage and Scale

**Year:** 2019

**Version:** Accepted version (Final draft)

**Copyright:** © Berghahn Books, 2019

**Rights:** In Copyright

**Rights url:** <http://rightsstatements.org/page/InC/1.0/?language=en>

**Please cite the original version:**

Lähdesmäki, T., Zhu, Y., & Thomas, S. (2019). Introduction: Heritage and Scale. In T. Lähdesmäki, S. Thomas, & Y. Zhu (Eds.), *Politics of Scale : New Directions in Critical Heritage Studies* (pp. 1-18). Explorations in Heritage Studies, 1. Berghahn Books.

Tuuli Lähdesmäki, Suzie Thomas, and Yujie Zhu (eds) 2019. *Politics of Scale. New Directions in Critical Heritage Studies*. New York: Berghahn.

<CT>**Introduction**

<CST>**Heritage and Scale**

<CA>Tuuli Lähdesmäki, Yujie Zhu and Suzie Thomas

<FL>Scholarly research of cultural heritage has faced paradigmatic changes during the past few decades. These changes have occurred in part as a reaction to diverse social, political, economic and cultural transformations of societies and traditional foundations of nation states. Today's world, characterized by networked agencies, global cultural flows, cultural hybridity and movement of people within and across borders, contextualizes the idea of heritage in new ways. It challenges its previous core function as a bedrock of monocultural nation-building projects, a continuation of elitist cultural canons, and as upholding Eurocentric cultural values. As a part of this transformation, consensual heritage narratives about the nation and national identity have been questioned and contested through various identity claims below and above the national narrative – and within it (e.g. Ashworth, Graham and Tunbridge 2007, Labadi 2007; Smith 2006). A range of communities, defined either geographically or by cultural, social, economic, ethnic, religious, or linguistic experiences, have increasingly asserted the legitimacy of their collective identities and of their heritage as this identity's manifestation (Smith 2006). These developments have brought heritage research into a new critical phase.

During the last decades of the twentieth century, academic fields within humanities and social sciences took increasing interest in uneven power relations, hierarchical power structures, explicit and implicit politics of dominance and oppression, silenced narratives and alternative, emancipatory and empowering identity projects. Critical research stemming from postmodernism, poststructuralism and Foucauldian perspectives on power gave ground to and strengthened new academic disciplines of Postcolonial, Racial, Gender, New Museology and Subaltern Studies. The theoretical frame of this critical research also renewed disciplines that more explicitly focus on the study of cultural heritage. In cultural heritage studies, the change from the previous emphasis of conservation and preservation of heritage (although these questions are also still debated) to complex questions of the power that heritage entails and produces has generated a field of study and a scholarly approach called Critical Heritage Studies. Rather than asking ‘what do we do to heritage’, scholars within this field, such as Smith (2006) and Harrison (2013), have posed the question ‘what does heritage do/how is heritage used?’ They perceive the ideas, practices and processes of heritage as inherently political, emerging within complex power relations and open to change and contest (Graham and Howard 2008; Harrison 2013; Smith 2006).

The exploration of power relations in Critical Heritage Studies focuses particularly on several ‘grand narratives’ that have dominated the meaning making and practices of heritage for centuries. Nationalism, imperialism, colonialism, Western triumphalism, social exclusion based on class and ethnicity, cultural elitism and the fetishizing of expert knowledge have all had a crucial impact on how cultural heritage is discussed, used and managed. These ideas and ideologies have arguably influenced what has been understood and defined as cultural heritage by privileging old, grand, prestigious, expert-approved sites, buildings and artefacts that sustain

Western narratives of nation, class and science (Smith 2012). Critical Heritage Studies seeks to question and unravel the previous and still existing hegemonic power structures in heritage and scrutinize the workings of power in heritage from a broad interdisciplinary perspective.

The recent studies on cultural heritage perceive the concept as a presentist process: it is not a passive act of preserving things from the past but ‘an active process of assembling a series of objects, places and practices that we choose to hold up as a mirror to the present, associated with a particular set of values that we wish to take with us into the future’ (Harrison 2013: 4). The concept of heritage itself is understood in this critical perspective as a complex and relational phenomenon that draws together and joins various social and cultural entities, such as material objects, places, values, ideas, emotions, memory and identity. Several scholars (e.g. Dicks 2000; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2004; Munjeri 2004; Smith and Akagawa 2009) have emphasized how these tangible and intangible dimensions of heritage are inevitably intertwined. Heritage is about the entanglement of these diverse dimensions and their ‘manufactured’ effect on people, a constant process of meaning making and cultural production that Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (2004) defines as a ‘metacultural’ operation. For her, fostering, preserving and producing heritage are processes that take place on a meta level, such as in diverse national and international heritage policy processes.

Although Critical Heritage Studies seeks to explore the mechanism of power in heritage and question the essentialist notions of stable meanings and Eurocentric values of heritage, the critical view of heritage scholars has rarely scrutinized a core issue that produces these mechanisms and notions: the issue of scale. When heritage sites are nominated to the UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) World Heritage List, for example, the world heritage status that is bestowed upon them gives a site significance at

different scales. The site's value locally may be transformed by the world heritage status, while it also gains a global 'outstanding universal value'. The relationship between this status and nation states – especially with sites that have contested histories or heritage – can also lead to experiences of transnational conflict and contestation (e.g. Liwanag 2016). Despite these recognizable issues of scale, most heritage research does not necessarily identify scale as a central issue.

Scale and scalar relations play a crucial role in the production and meaning making of heritage – thus scale can be seen as one of the core concerns of Critical Heritage Studies. Although scale has been broadly discussed in geography, a further critical analysis of its constructive and performative nature is needed in order to understand the power hierarchies in heritage and in various conflicts related to its meanings, ownership, preservation and management. What is scale? Does it relate only to issues of space, magnitude and level, or are there, as we suggest, also more nuanced ways of considering this term? The recent growth of concerns within heritage policy and practice, and the increasing attempts to preserve and govern heritage, necessitate reconsidering the scales of heritage.

Scalarly structured entities and their relationships are interconnected and constantly transforming, both historically and theoretically. Massey (2005) has conceptualized space as a relational construction that simultaneously includes diverse scalar dimensions and multiple meanings, both shared and personal. Similarly, heritage can be perceived as a multilayered and multi-scalar phenomenon. Certain layers of heritage meanings are activated in certain discourses, policies and practices at different scales. Thus, the same heritage practice, object or site can have several scalar meanings and be used to foster and promote several scalar identities or feelings of belonging to different scalarly organized communities. In diverse processes of heritage making,

the idea of heritage is commonly fixed to both real and imagined scalarly structured and defined territories: heritage is perceived and narrated as reflecting not only locally, regionally and nationally framed meanings but also those of supranational entities, such as cross-border or transnational regions or continents. However, scale does not only determine the relationships of territories and territorialized cultural features and identities. It also influences non-territorial social and cultural divisions; for example, public and personal, young and old, official and unofficial, minority and majority, and normative and unorthodox (see Ashworth and Graham 2005; Ashworth, Graham and Tunbridge 2007; Kean 2008).

In the volume, the heritage-scale relationship is perceived as a domain of power and politics. Instead of defining scale as a singular unit, such as local, national or global, the contributors emphasize a plural and dynamic understanding of scale and its relationship to heritage. The volume deploys the concept of ‘politics of scale’ to analyse the power struggles during the processes of production, reconfiguration and contestation within and among scales of heritage. The key questions that this volume addresses are:

<BL>

- What understandings of scale influence interpretation and meaning making of heritage?
- How is the idea of scale used by heritage institutions to govern heritage, legitimize authority and produce hierarchies in heritage?
- What kinds of workings of power, politics and policies are implicated through the scaled nature of heritage?
- How are heritage discourses reinforced through scale, and how do they affect other scaled divisions, such as political divisions, minority-majority relationships, citizenship or notions of ‘otherness’?

- How do conflicts and struggles within heritage discourses emerge, and how do they move between and along scales?

## <A>Definitions of Scale

<FL>In geography, the notion of scale has been discussed within diverse theoretical frameworks. The concept of geographical scale indicates socio-spatial organization within a bounded geographical area – usually labelled as size (such as province or continent) or level (such as global, national, regional, local and even household) (Marston 2000). Besides these ‘technical’ definitions, recent research also includes more nuanced elaborations. Below, we discuss four conceptualizations for understanding and utilizing the concept of scale that are critical in underscoring the power relations in heritage. These conceptualizations function as our point of departure in developing politics of scale as a theoretical and methodological approach.

## <B>*Scale as a Hierarchy*

<FL>In previous heritage studies, scale has been commonly discussed in relation, and as connected, to spatial entities that are hierarchically structured. In these views, the notion of scale is intertwined with the idea of hierarchy – whether the hierarchy itself is perceived as ‘natural’ or ‘constructed’. For example, Graham, Ashworth and Tunbridge (2000: 4) defined scale as follows: ‘Scale: an intrinsic attribute of places is that they exist within a hierarchy of spatial scales. Places therefore have a heritage at local, regional, national, continental and international scales, while, in turn, a particular heritage artefact can function at a variety of scales.’ Others have explained heritage as ‘exist[ing] within nested spatial-scale hierarchies’ (Ashworth 1994: 13). In this kind of scalar hierarchy, local, regional, national, continental and global levels form a

spatial system in which each ‘broader’ scope is understood as transcending the previous ‘narrower’ scope (Ashworth and Graham 1997: 382).

As Graham, Ashworth and Tunbridge (2000) note, the same heritage artefact can function simultaneously at different territorial levels. However, the structure of these territorial levels is stable in this conception. The notion of scale in this conceptualization follows a hierarchical order similar to a Russian ‘matryoshka’ nesting doll. Heritage is understood as being able to include ‘multi-scalar’ meanings, and yet the concept of scale is still seen as being structured along pre-given and fixed scalar units, such as village/town/city, a municipality, a region, a nation or a continent.

Approaching heritage through a nested spatial hierarchy relies on essentialist notions of spatial entities and their scaled ‘order’. Thus, various studies on spatial meanings of heritage seem commonly to entail a stiff and categorical notion of scale. This kind of approach to scale hinders perception of the complexity of a heritage-scale relationship and prevents viewing scale as a relational social construct and an instrument of power. Indeed, many of the previous studies on the spatial meanings of heritage have been excessively place-bound, ignoring the relational nature of spatial borders and the fluidity of ideas related to territorial entities, as Harvey (2015) claims. Harvey emphasizes how the relationship between the idea of heritage and scale can be perceived as an open, plural and relational process detached from physical distance, proximity or essentialist claims to territorial hierarchy. Thus, with this volume we aim to deconstruct the idea of a hierarchical order of scale, and scrutinize the power relations included in this idea, and the processes in which it is maintained.

*<B>Scale as an Instrument of Power*



<FL>The ‘Russian doll’ structure of scale discussed above has several implications. It creates uneven power relations among different scales, cements diverse social, political, economic and cultural hierarchies, and upholds the dominance and inequality included in these hierarchies. The Russian doll structure of scale also formats the power relations between social actors. Different social actors within this structure have different weights of influence. Some are more powerful than others. This uneven development is based on the structural relationship between institutions and the resources of power, capital and information that social actors use to produce the scale in which they act or seek to act (Smith 1990). This uneven development results in a process of hierarchization and re-hierarchization (Swyngedouw 1997). The process changes the geometry of social power by strengthening the control of some while disempowering others (Swyngedouw 1997).

Swyngedouw (1997: 148) points out that it is often capital (assets, financial or otherwise) that moves upward (upscaling) while the regulation moves downward (downscaling). Similar trajectories can be identified in heritage governance and administration from various parts of the globe. In these developments, top-down administrative systems have been established to reinforce heritage governance at ‘lower’ scales. As a result, the processes of heritage making are influenced and manipulated by discourses produced at the ‘higher’ scales of power, although the local heritage actors are those who in practice implement these processes.

### <B>*Scale as a Process*

<FL>The notion of scale as a process stems from studies exploring the social production of space. The idea of the relational and processual nature of space is the core concept in Lefebvre’s (1991) studies. For him, the same space contains various social spaces that all are present in a

multilayered way in our physical environment. The production of space(s) brings about a constant reshuffling and reworking of social spaces at different scales (Brenner 2001; Lefebvre 1991). Researchers have also emphasized the constructivist and social-constructionist understandings of the nature of scale. Scalar configurations are thus seen as the outcome of complex socio-spatial processes that regulate and organize social power relations (Swyngedouw 1997, 2000). Scaling the ‘material’ intertwines with scaling the ‘social’: scalar structure of material culture includes and produces scalar social structures. Embedded in geographical constructions, scales become arenas in which socio-spatial power choreographies are enacted and performed (Swyngedouw 2004). Thus, various scholars have focused their interest on scale as a social production, social relation and conflict (Marston 2000; Smith 1990). Here, scale is not a fixed force or existing resolution but a constant process of formation, transformation and rescaling (Brenner 2001; Swyngedouw 1997).

In Critical Heritage Studies, heritage is commonly understood as a process. Connecting the processual notions of heritage and scale enhances a deeper understanding of the politics of scale in heritage. In some studies, scale has functioned as an analytical tool to understand the connections and activities of international and transnational movements in these processes (e.g. Graham, Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000).

### *<B>Scale as a Network*

*<FL>*Latour (1996) and Castells (1996) suggest that the world’s complexity should not be thought of as levels, layers, territories or spheres but rather networked together. The conception of ‘network’ stimulates discussion about the flow of objects, people, ideas and technology as an interconnected complexity. Different from scales that address boundaries and hierarchies, the

conception of network helps us to view relations and connections between diverse units (Marston, Jones and Woodward 2005). In this view, the constant movement from local to global (and back to local) is based on the idea and politics of connectivity. This politics is actively utilized by various internationally acting organizations and institutions who engage in constructing transnational or interurban networks to enhance their power, authority and legitimacy related to other scales. This is particularly the case in Europe, where many transnational or trans-regional networks link together across the boundaries of local, regional and national state territories.

Following Brenner's (2001) views, we emphasize how the networks of connectivity and hierarchical scales of heritage governance are mutually constitutive. In each scale, heritage-related networks are established to develop common interests and knowledge across certain boundaries. Heritage actors active in these networks exchange information through formal meetings or informal contact. A well-known example of this kind of heritage network is the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS). Established in 1965, ICOMOS is an international network of heritage and conservation practitioners and specialists who also act as government officials and heritage consultants. At the regional level, several non-European heritage networks have been established to promote cultural uniqueness and regional identities, such as the Aga Khan Trust for Culture, the Islamic Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization in the Muslim World, and the Caribbean Community and Common Market in the Caribbean region (Salazar and Zhu 2015).

In following these views, scale can be perceived as a strategically constructed tool deployed to produce and reproduce power relations in various ways. Processes of scale formation/transformation are cut through by all manner of fragmenting and differentiating

processes of empowerment and disempowerment, such as nationalism, localism, class differentiation and competition (Swyngedouw 1997). Processes of scale formation are, thus, social practices that effectively ‘harness powers and instrumentalities at other scales’ (Jonas 1994: 258).

Although geographers have brought the concept of scale to heritage research, the idea and concept of ‘politics of scale’ has remained underdeveloped in this field and has thus hindered deeper analyses of the workings of scales of heritage and their production through continued sociopolitical contestation. In this volume we perceive politics of scale as a crucial concept and a theoretical and methodological approach to trace the ‘power geometries’ (Massey 1993) of how heritage works.

### <A>Heritage and Politics of Scale

<FL>In geography, Smith (1990) initiated the concept of politics of scale, which was later deployed by people such as Herod (1997) and Swyngedouw (1997), in social-spatial production research. Geographers use this concept to explain the transformation in political governance (such as global-local relations), the rise of supranational organizations and regulation, and the shifting importance of nation state.

Revisiting the definition of ‘politics of scale’ enables us to broaden our understanding of heritage and ‘what heritage does’. Brenner has suggested an important revisit to the concept. According to him, politics of scale can refer to ‘the production, reconfiguration or contestation’ both within one scale (the singular) and among different scales (the plural) (Brenner 2001: 599). The singular form indicates a struggle or contestation in a boundary setting, such as in producing a place, locality, region or nation. The plural form, as he rephrases it as a ‘process of scaling’,

does not focus on a production of a singular unit as such but rather on ‘hierarchization and re-hierarchization’ among multiple spatial units through interscalar transformation (Brenner 2001: 600). Indeed, a number of studies have examined how, for example, diverse social movements struggle to shift the scale of their political contests and how people use scale to take advantage of certain interscalar political conditions (Herod 1997; Smith 1990). Herod (1997) illustrates how labour unions have negotiated local, regional and national contracts to strengthen their bargaining positions. Similar ‘processes of scaling’ or ‘interscalar transformations’ take place in various contests and struggles related, for example, to gender, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transexual rights, and abortion.

In the field of heritage, the plural form of politics of scale (or as Brenner phrased it, process of scaling) is poorly recognized and examined. Notwithstanding this, politics of scale in heritage do exist. For example, there commonly exists more or less active resistance from ‘lower’ scales to negotiate with or among different scales for cultural or property rights. The idea of ownership – to whom does heritage truly belong – is one of the critical issues of politics of scale. The concept of politics of scale helps with theorizing heritage; the recognition of scale as an instrument of power and a tool of hierarchization and re-hierarchization brings to the fore the essentiality of scale to heritage.

One of the core concepts in Critical Heritage Studies is ‘Authorized Heritage Discourse’ (AHD), initiated by Smith (2006) a decade ago. With this concept, Smith refers to a heritage discourse that ‘takes its cue from the grand narratives of Western national and elite class experiences, and reinforces the idea of innate cultural value tied to time depth, monumentality, expert knowledge and aesthetics’ (Smith 2006: 299). For her, the authority of this discourse is heavily anchored within state-sanctioned agencies and international bodies such as UNESCO

and ICOMOS, who qualify objects, ideas and places as heritage and legitimize dominant narratives about them. Smith, however, also emphasizes how heritage discourse is disputed and mutable. Relations among different scales in the processes of heritage making are not always cooperative and harmonious but contested and competitive – in a sense of dissonance framed by Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996). Similar to the actions of various social movements, subordinate groups use the scale of ‘local’, ‘community’ or even ‘home’ to negotiate and resist control from the heritage discourse.

Critical Heritage Studies emphasizes that the values of heritage in the discourse of supranational organizations are deeply rooted in a European conservation tradition (Winter 2014). This tradition can be traced back to the eighteenth century, when the first modern ideologies of conservation – followed by efforts of preserving cityscapes of major European historical cities, such as Rome and Paris – took place (Glendinning 2013). The strategy of using heritage to develop ‘national consciousness’ emerged concurrently in some European countries, but it became a dominant heritage discourse during the nineteenth century alongside the rise and spread of nationalism and modernity (see Harrison 2013). Following the founding of broadly accepted and internationally operating heritage organizations from the mid twentieth century onwards, such as UNESCO and ICOMOS, heritage has entered into the scale of the global. This scalar dimension intersects with the discourse of universalism. UNESCO and its advisory board in particular have established the heritage discourse of a ‘universal value’ that is promoted in its conventions and policy texts. This discourse legitimates the significance of the global scale of heritage and disseminates UNESCO’s value system around the world. The World Heritage List and the rules of inclusion to and exclusion from it are UNESCO’s core mechanisms to gain and reinforce its global-scale authority.

In the twenty-first century, as Smith (2006) notes, heritage has, thus, become a ‘universalizing’ discourse. Although this discourse claims to be ‘universal’, it nonetheless relies on and recycles various Eurocentric values. The development and promotion of the notion of ‘authenticity’ as a core heritage value is an often-discussed example of this kind of legitimated Eurocentric conception. It became an important issue of heritage management and conservation after the launch of the 1964 Venice Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites. The application of authenticity was further universalized after the 1972 World Heritage Convention and further globally applied through other international policy documents, such as the 1994 Nara Document on Authenticity.

The construction of a heritage-scale relationship is, and has always been, a process of constant negotiation and contest. Dominant, dominated and *alternative* heritage discourses are not embedded in one or two scales but interacted with and negotiated among different scales. The universalizing discourse of UNESCO is also a transforming and negotiated process including actors at different scales. States parties, international pressure and soft power diplomacy have an increasing impact on the World Heritage Committee and its decision-making process of adding heritage sites to the World Heritage List (Luke and Kersel 2012). International heritage policies do not automatically transfer the power of heritage making over to the international heritage bodies. International heritage policies are finally enacted and put into practice by states and their national heritage actors, who implement the heritage policies on the national level (Bendix, Eggert and Peselmann 2012; Lähdesmäki 2014). Each state translates the key terms of the UNESCO Conventions in different ways, resulting in ‘domestication of global standards’, as Bortolotto (2012: 277) has noticed.

Recent studies on cultural heritage have sought to deconstruct heritage discourses by disclosing its political attempts and criticizing the power hierarchies included in it and produced by it. Particularly, studies have focused on a national frame of reference as the main arbiter of values and promoter of heritage discourses (Harvey 2015). The dominant heritage discourses and the management of heritage are predominantly arranged along a hierarchy of spatial scales in which a national framework has played – and still commonly plays – a central role. Heritage functions as a tool to create and rethink national consciousness and unity and to promote economic and social development. No countries can seemingly live without national museums, archives, monuments, historical narratives, or heritage-related agencies, laws and policies. The national frame functions as the most common scalar level in the promotion of a communal identity and the communal meanings of heritage (Graham, Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000: 259). The promotion of a national identity has a more established tradition compared with, for example, the supranational scale of community building (Ashworth 1994: 13).

Nation states, national-level actors and national meanings of heritage have a core role also in the international heritage discourses, policies and practices. Despite the development of international heritage networks, nation states remain important as facilitators and agents of structuring globalization. Nation states jostle for recognition, authority and control alongside new forms of political power in both transnational and regional networks. Nation states are interested in the stability of the national scale, as this scale facilitates heritage governance and can enable capital accumulation. Furthermore, tensions emerge and re-emerge between the global and the national.

In the global scale of the heritage industry, the dominance of the nation state as a scale of governance is little diminished (Leitner, Pavlik and Sheppard 2002). The World Heritage system



gives a licence to transform heritage into a soft power to carry out nationalism through legitimizing heritage conservation and commercialization activities. The World Heritage Centre is an international secretariat in need of both economic and political support from its states' parties. As Meskell et al. (2015) indicate, the World Heritage decision making adopted by the World Heritage Committee is less followed by its advisory bodies; instead, it is increasingly influenced by the political and economic interests of nation states in the Committee. An example of this is the success by some Asian countries in promoting the new category of Intangible Cultural Heritage, a UNESCO designation established in 2003.

In addition to the broadly discussed challenges of the national and global scales of heritage, various scholars have become interested in 'downscaling' their research focus. Recent heritage research has explored topics such as community, family or even personal heritage (Harvey 2015). However, in heritage discourses and practices, micro and macro scales of heritage commonly merge and affect each other. While the dominating heritage discourses seek to control the meanings and practices of heritage on the scale 'below' it, heritage is at the same time created by the actors representing these 'lower' scales – and their interests. Indeed, the actors on the 'lower' scale interpret and reinterpret the 'upper' scale heritage discourses from their own point of view and thus influence the form in which it is disseminated and transferred into heritage practices. The politics of scale functions as a crucial theoretical and methodological approach to scrutinize this multi-scalarity of heritage discourses, as the mechanisms through which heritage operates appear to be more elusive and less structural. Heritage often includes 'an attribute of dissonance, not only in a sense of identity and meaning, but also in terms of scale' (Harvey 2015: 579).

## <A>Concepts, Institutions, Policies and Practices – Politics of Scale in Action

<FL>In this volume, contributors apply the notion of scale to diverse processes of heritage making and the workings of power included within them. Politics of scale here means both a theoretical concept and a methodological approach to heritage-scale relationship and the effects that this relationship produces. This approach is founded on interwoven theoretical discussions that emphasize the constructed, processual, fluid and relational nature of heritage-scale relationship and the critical understanding of the hierarchical and uneven power structures in the production of this relationship.

The book is divided into three distinct parts to focus on particular aspects of scale and its politics, although the parts are also closely interrelated. The chapters interrogate multifaceted meanings of scale that are not only about levels such as global, national and local but also about spatialized social and cultural borders and border crossings and about scale in digital platforms. The examples of heritage discussed, theorized and problematized within this volume are diverse, from intangible cultural practices through to cultural and historic environments and digital heritage. The contributors are diverse in their disciplinary backgrounds, with perspectives grounded in art history, cultural studies, geography, heritage studies, linguistics, literature, museum studies, political science and sociology. Similarly, the examples and debates come from across the globe. The parts are divided roughly to focus on scaled conceptualization of heritage; scale in heritage institutions and policies; and scale in heritage practices. The book is not intended as a simply linear resource, however, and readers are invited to explore the chapters in relation to each other and in whatever ordering and grouping they wish.

The chapters in ‘Part I: Scaled Conceptualization of Heritage’ discuss diverse attempts to conceptualize heritage and the use of different concepts in varying heritage discourses, analysing

the politics that the scaled nature of these concepts entail. The notion of scale is very apparent from a spatial point of view, with heritage discussed at site-specific, national, regional and (with the concept of World Heritage) global levels (Jones, Jones and Hughes 2016). Different forms of ‘heritage’ are scrutinized; not only World Heritage sites (Zhu) but also the regional idea of European cultural heritage recognized through the mechanism of the European Heritage Label (Lähdesmäki and Mäkinen) and the growing phenomenon of digital heritage (Bettiva and Stainforth).

Yujie Zhu explores the theme of heritage contestation through the lens of the politics of scale with his analysis of cultural heritage production and consumption in China. In this chapter we see the impact of global heritage discourses and policies on localized levels favouring some voices while ignoring others, and we encounter the ‘jumping among scales’ that takes place as heritage variously ‘up-’ and ‘downscales’. Zhu examines these phenomena through the case study of the Old Town of Lijiang World Heritage Site.

Working with a continental scale, Tuuli Lähdesmäki and Katja Mäkinen consider the role of politics of scale in the development of the European Union’s (EU’s) European Heritage Label. They problematize the tensions between various national identities and narratives across Europe and the efforts of this initiative to select sites that may be interpreted in particular ways to attempt to achieve a ‘pan-European’-scaled objective. This inevitably leads to the favouring of certain voices and narratives over others, fitting to the European Commission’s political agenda of creating unity and enhancing (cultural) integration in Europe, among other things. Rhiannon Bettiva and Elizabeth Stainforth focus on digital heritage – from digitized heritage collections being placed online through to the upscaling impact on potential audiences that digitization offers. Similar to Lähdesmäki and Mäkinen, they also note regional- and national-scale political

agendas at play in their examples of Europeana and the Digital Public Library of America, in their positions as large-scale heritage aggregators.

In ‘Part II: Scale in Heritage Institutions and Policies’, authors discuss the policies and politics of heritage management structures – ranging in scale from local municipal heritage authorities to the implementation of UNESCO-endorsed international policy – and their explicit and implicit uses of scale in meaning making, governing and managing heritage. Scale as an instrument of power is particularly relevant to this part, as the different hierarchies of policy and heritage agency structures influence heavily the conceptualization and management of the heritage in question.

The heritage management strategies deployed at Angkor Wat World Heritage Area in Cambodia are critiqued by Rowena Butland, who teases out the connection of heritage ‘value’ to the social constructs at play and the inevitable inclusion or exclusion of different stakeholders or interest groups and their particular values through an institutionalized and policy-regulated form of cultural heritage management. Harking back to Zhu’s example in Part I, this is another case of global-scale policy and practice having an at times troubling, and certainly transformative, influence on local heritage management.

María Lois considers cross-border and transnational scales of heritage making in the context of EU-funded programmes, especially the supranational BIN-SAL border region in Spain and Portugal. She notes how the EU cross-border politics become also scalar politics through the process of heritage meaning making. Satu Kähkönen and Tuuli Lähdesmäki also present an example from within Europe, focusing on local scales in the Nordic countries, and Finnish municipality levels of scale in particular, to discuss the holistic approach to heritage put forward through the concept of cultural environment. They also note, within the notion of politics of

scale, a porosity of spatial borders owing to the ambiguous and flexible nature of the very concept of cultural environments. The border-based and in some cases border-free contexts explored in both of these chapters present ample challenges for policy writers and decision makers.

The 'Part III: Scale in Heritage Practices' chapters discuss various practices through which scaled nature and hierarchical structures of heritage are created, maintained and transmitted but also questioned, deconstructed and proposed as alternatives seeking to dismantle these hierarchical structures. They perhaps take a more applied perspective, drawing especially upon the notion of scale as a process and scale as a network. We see also the impact of the researchers on practices on their case studies, be it at a local, national or regional scale. Suzie Thomas reflects upon her and her research colleagues' research practice in relation to the 'dark' heritage legacy of the Second World War in Finnish Lapland in a scaled manner, presenting insight not only into the heritage being researched but also the contribution to the up- or downscaling of that heritage by the very act of research itself.

Eni Buljubašić and Tuuli Lähdesmäki investigate the evolving nature of Dalmatian klapa singing and how this UNESCO-labelled intangible cultural heritage practice has become politicized in Croatia's reconfiguration of its national identity as Mediterranean, scaled within an EU-orientated context. The example is a dynamic one, illustrating also the fluidity of heritage politics and the rapidity with which identities related to different scales can change and evolve. National and regional identity scales also figure in Michael Windover and Hilary Grant's study of 'radio heritage' in Newfoundland, Canada. They identify the different scalar configurations of radio broadcast in Newfoundland during and after its transition from a British colony to a Canadian province. Aspects as nuanced as the regional accents of radio presenters through to the

significance of the takeover of radio broadcasts by the national Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in Ottawa have had an impact on the socio-economic and political conditions in Newfoundland, inevitably intertwined with scales of heritage and identity. As they note, '[r]adio made Newfoundland a global village.'

Finally, Kristin Kuutma concludes the volume, drawing together and reflecting upon the theoretical discussion of politics of scale as presented in the previous parts. Reflecting especially on the concept of intangible cultural heritage, framed through UNESCO policies in particular, she discusses how these theoretical views and approaches link to other aspects of Critical Heritage Studies and influence identification, ownership and representation of heritage at interscalar levels.

This edited volume offers a refreshed frame for the continuously evolving field of Critical Heritage Studies by discussing how heritage and scale interact in the processes of heritage making. We demonstrate the numerous ways in which scale, and especially politics of scale, influence concepts of policy affecting (and practices influencing and evolving) heritage. The volume seeks to respond to needs in current heritage research by providing a global, interdisciplinary and critical exploration of the scaled nature of relationships involved in the production and meaning making of heritage. By developing 'politics of scale' as both a theoretical and methodological approach, this volume contributes to the understanding of how heritage discourses and practices affect and produce other scaled divisions in culture and society. Meanwhile, the project is by no means a conclusion to this avenue of enquiry but rather aims to stimulate and further debate and conversation.

## <A>Acknowledgements

<FL>The introduction and editing of this volume are related to research projects funded by European Research Council, decision no. 636177, EUROHERIT, and Academy of Finland, decision no. 274295, EUCHE (Lähdesmäki); Australian National University and Zhejiang University, China (Zhu); and Academy of Finland, decision no. 275497 (Thomas).

**Tuuli Lähdesmäki** (PhD, DSocSc) is an Academy Research Fellow and Adjunct Professor at the Department of Music, Art and Culture Studies, University of Jyväskylä (JYU), Finland. Lähdesmäki specializes in heritage, culture and identity politics, particularly in the European context. She currently leads the research projects ‘European Cultural Heritage in the Making: Politics, Affects and Agency’ (EUCHE), funded by the Academy of Finland, and ‘Legitimation of European Cultural Heritage and the Dynamics of Identity Politics in the EU’ (EUROHERIT), funded by the European Research Council. She is the Co-PI in JYU’s research profiling area ‘Crises Redefined: Historical Continuity and Societal Change’ (CRISES).

**Yujie Zhu** is a Lecturer at the School of Archaeology and Anthropology, the Australian National University. He is the author of *Heritage and Romantic Consumption in China* (Amsterdam University Press, 2018) and the co-editor of *Sustainable Tourism Management at World Heritage Sites* (UNWTO 2009). He has also published more than thirty articles that appeared in leading anthropology, tourism, and heritage journals, including *American Anthropologist*, *Annals of Tourism Research*, and *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. In addition, Yujie is the

vice chair of the IUAES Commission on the Anthropology of Tourism and an executive committee member of the Association of Critical Heritage Studies.

**Suzie Thomas** (BA, MA, PhD) is Professor of Cultural Heritage Studies at the University of Helsinki, Finland. She is interested in non-professional and so-called alternative engagements with cultural heritage, ‘dark’ heritage and heritage crime. She worked as a Postdoctoral Researcher on the Academy of Finland Project ‘Lapland’s Dark Heritage: Understanding the Cultural Legacy of Northern Finland’s WWII German Materialities within Interdisciplinary Perspectives’ (decision number 275497) and is now Principle Investigator of Academy of Finland Consortium Project ‘SuALT: Collaborative Research Infrastructure for Archaeological Finds and Public Engagement through Linked Open Data’ (decision numbers: 310854, 310859 and 310860). She teaches masters-level courses in Cultural Heritage Studies and Museum Studies.

## <A>References

- Ashworth, G. 1994. ‘From History to Heritage – From Heritage to Identity’, in G. Ashworth and P. Larkham (eds), *Building a New Heritage: Tourism, Culture and Identity in the New Europe*. London: Routledge, pp. 13–30.
- Ashworth, G. and B. Graham. 1997. ‘Heritage, Identity and Europe’, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 88(4): 381–88.
- . 2005. ‘Senses of Place, Senses of Time and Heritage’, in G. Ashworth and B. Graham (eds), *Senses of Place: Senses of Time*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 3–14.



- Ashworth, G., B. Graham and J. Tunbridge. 2007. *Pluralising Pasts: Heritage, Identity and Place in Multicultural Societies*. London: Pluto Press.
- Bendix, R., A. Eggert and A. Peselmann. 2012. 'Introduction: Heritage Regimes and the State', in R. Bendix, A. Eggert and A. Peselmann (eds), *Heritage Regimes and the State*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen, pp. 11–20.
- Bortolotto, C. 2012. 'The French Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage: Domesticating a Global Paradigm into French Heritage Regime', in R. Bendix, A. Eggert and A. Peselmann (eds), *Heritage Regimes and the State*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen, pp. 265–82.
- Brenner, N. 2001. 'The Limits to Scale? Methodological Reflections on Scalar Structuration', *Progress in Human Geography* 25(4): 591–614.
- Castells, M. 1996. *The Rise of the Network Society: The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture Vol. I*. Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dicks, B. 2000. *Heritage, Place and Community*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Glendinning, M. 2013. *The Conservation Movement: A History of Architectural Preservation: Antiquity to Modernity*. London: Routledge.
- Graham, B., G. Ashworth and J. Tunbridge. 2000. *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy*. London: Hodder Arnold Publication.
- Graham, B. and P. Howard (eds). 2008. *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*. London: Ashgate.
- Harrison, R. 2013. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. New York: Routledge.
- Harvey, D. 2015. 'Heritage and Scale: Settings, Boundaries and Relations', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21(6): 577–93.

- Herod, A. 1997. 'Labor's Spatial Praxis and the Geography of Contract Bargaining in the US East Coast Longshore Industry, 1953–1989', *Political Geography* 16(2): 145–69.
- Jonas, A. 1994. 'The Scale Politics of Spatiality', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 12(3): 257–64.
- Jones, T., R. Jones and M. Hughes. 2016. 'Heritage Designation and Scale: A World Heritage Case Study of the Ningaloo Coast', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 22(3): 242–60.
- Kean, H. 2008. 'Personal and Public Histories: Issues in the Presentation of the Past', in B. Graham and P. Howard (eds), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 55–69.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. 2004. 'Intangible Heritage as Metacultural Production', *Museum International* 56(1–2): 52–65.
- Labadi, S. 2007. 'Representations of the Nation and Cultural Diversity in Discourses on World Heritage', *Journal of Social Archaeology* 7(2): 147–70.
- Lähdesmäki, T. 2014. 'Transnational Heritage in the Making: Strategies for Narrating Cultural Heritage as European in the Intergovernmental Initiative of the European Heritage Label', *Ethnologica Europaea* 44(1): 75–93.
- Latour, B. 1996. 'On Actor-Network Theory: A Few Clarifications', *Soziale Welt* 47: 369–81.
- Leitner, H., C. Pavlik and E. Sheppard. 2002. 'Networks, Governance, and the Politics of Scale: Inter-urban Networks and the European Union', in A. Herod and W. Wright (eds), *Geographies of Power: Placing Scale*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 274–303.
- Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Liwanag, M. 2016. 'The Case for Ethical Guidelines: Preventing Conflict in the Selection of World Heritage Sites', in H. Silverman, E. Waterton and S. Watson (eds), *Heritage in Action: Making the Past in the Present*. Cham: Springer, pp. 19–32.
- Luke, C. and M. Kersel. 2012. *Cultural Diplomacy and Archaeology: Soft Power, Hard Heritage*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Marston, S. 2000. 'The Social Construction of Scale', *Progress in Human Geography* 24(2): 219–42.
- Marston, S., J. Jones and K. Woodward. 2005. 'Human Geography without Scale', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30(4): 416–32.
- Massey, D. 1993 'Power-geometry and a Progressive Sense of Place', in J. Bird, B. Curtis, T. Putnam, G. Robertson and L. Tickner (eds), *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change*. London: Routledge, pp. 59–69.
- . 2005. *For Space*. London: Sage.
- Meskel, L., C. Liuzza, E. Bertacchini and D. Saccone. 2015. 'Multilateralism and UNESCO World Heritage: Decision-making, States Parties and Political Processes', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21(5): 423–40.
- Munjeri, D. 2004. 'Tangible and Intangible Heritage: From Difference to Convergence', *Museum International* 56(1–2): 12–20.
- Salazar, N. and Y. Zhu. 2015. 'Heritage and Tourism', in L. Meskel (ed.), *Global Heritage: A Reader*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 240–58.
- Smith, L. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge.
- . 2012. '2012 Manifesto', *Association of Critical Heritage Studies*. Retrieved 6 December 2016 from <http://www.criticalheritagestudies.org/history/>.

- Smith, L. and N. Akagawa. 2009. 'Introduction', in L. Smith and N. Akagawa (eds), *Intangible Heritage*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–10.
- Smith, N. 1990. *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Swyngedouw, E. 1997. 'Neither Global Nor Local: "Glocalization" and the Politics of Scale', in K. Cox (ed.), *Spaces of Globalization: Reasserting the Power of the Local*. New York/London: Guilford/Longman, pp. 137–66.
- . 2000. 'Elite Power, Global Forces and the Political Economy of "Glocal" Development', in G. Clark, M. Gertler and M. Feldman (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Economic Geography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 541–58.
- . 2004. 'Scaled Geographies: Nature, Place, and the Politics of Scale', in E. Sheppard and R.B. McMaster (eds), *Scale and Geographic Inquiry: Nature, Society, and Method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 129–53.
- Tunbridge, J. E., and Ashworth, G. J. 1996. *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. New York: John Wiley.
- Winter, T. 2014. 'Beyond Eurocentrism? Heritage Conservation and the Politics of Difference', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 20(2): 123–37.