

## FOREWORD

With the extraordinary boom in the tourism industry over the past decades, people's relationship with the knowledges of the past has largely surpassed the boundaries of school textbooks and history lessons to become embedded in the experience of travelling and visiting places<sup>1</sup>. The word *heritage* adorns the signs of sites, hotels, restaurants, cafes and resorts around the world so as to entice tourists with the promise of experiences supposedly more authentic and responding to the lifestyles and habits of reconstructed pasts. The very idea of a heritage tourism has become widely popular with reference to «travelling to experience the places and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past», following the definition of the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States<sup>2</sup>. At the same time, *heritage* has become the flag waved by local institutions, government bodies and communities to promote initiatives for conservation, preservation and promotion of monuments, landscapes, neighbourhoods, entire cities or «intangible» habits, customs and traditions. The United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) progressively emerged as a sort of global warrantor in the identification, selection and conservation of both tangible and intangible heritage, in particular since the establishment of the «Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage» in 1972. The World Heritage List (WHL) today numbers more than one thousand protected sites around the world, with Italy and China contending the lead in this particular statistic with 55 sites each, and every year UNESCO's World Heritage Committee gathers to decide on the candidatures advanced by State governments around the world. Although in international contexts such as that of UNESCO, issues regarding heritage are tackled from the point of view of preservation principles and techniques, in recent times these two interdependent aspects relating the concept and idea of heritage to the phenomenon of global tourism and to national and international politics of recognition, attracted wide attention and

ignited interdisciplinary debates regarding the implications of heritage as a «discourse» informing various aspects of society and culture<sup>3</sup>.

While anthropologists and sociologists joined for the most part archaeologists, architects and conservationists in proposing new «critical» perspectives in the analysis and definition of the areas of study concerning heritage, historians have remained relatively at the margins of both academic debates and professional committees entrusted to decide and select what deserves to be kept safe for future generations. At a first glance, it may appear that such a missing engagement responds to two main sets of motivations: on one hand, heritage practitioners and technicians may not be interested so much in ascertaining the historical validity of the narratives conveyed through the preservation of sites or intangible items, as in their concern for the technical aspects of conservation. For their part, historians may not consider heritage a valuable object of historical research, as the work of history engages more with the investigation of the past than with questioning the ways in which it is preserved and transmitted. Valuable exceptions in recent years have begun to re-read the history of modern preservationism, looking at how preservation is strictly intertwined with the trajectories of European imperialism in the nineteenth century and at how it took part in producing invented traditions. Along this line, the study of «entangled histories of heritage»<sup>4</sup> has become an important aspect in the investigation of the process of modernisation that accompanied the consolidation of the nation state as an «operational entity»<sup>5</sup> in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. In addition, the implications of the detachment of history as an academic discipline from its «applications» in various fields of public life have been part of a debate that involved historians concerning their role, their methodologies and their engagement outside the limits of academia<sup>6</sup>.

However, in the face of the massive proliferation of heritage in various forms and its becoming a global phenomenon involving millions of people every year through tourism, the processes of selection and preservation of cultural heritage pose new challenges to historical research and its impact on the transmission of ideas of the past. In fact, the impact of heritage politics must be viewed today under a different light, having a lot to do with the increased number of tourism mobility over the second half of the twentieth century: considering that the estimated number of tourist arrivals globally has increased from 25 million in 1950 to 1.5 billion in 2018, and that tourism produces the second largest share of the global GDP following finance, an analysis of the implications and effects of the production of heritage around the world

needs to take into account that the narratives of the past embedded in such processes have massive exposure<sup>7</sup>.

Moving from these premises, this special issue of *Quaderni Storici* aims to address questions relating to various aspects of the interrelation of heritage, preservation and the production of narratives of the past, as well as to bring them into a historiographical context by directly questioning their validity and the functions that they just performed. While scrutinising heritage discourses can be seen as an exercise in the discovery of «invented traditions», the articles of this issue try to reorient the perspective to see how in certain cases the construction of heritage sites becomes a way to certify and promote forms of pretended historical knowledge. This is true also in cases of intangible forms of heritage, as discussed in the articles by Recchia and Fattacciu. From this perspective, UNESCO and other international agencies become crucial actors in certifying the credibility of such narratives, thus making inclusion in the WHL a tool for promoting an officially recognised version of history. Moreover, although the idea of community has become central in recent attempts to reframe and de-colonise heritage<sup>8</sup>, as Fattacciu highlights in her article on Mexican food, only State governments can advance candidatures, and only one at a time, so that the interdependence between politics of national representations and the physical construction of sites that embody them is made explicit. The relationship between heritage and nationalism is made up of a complex dynamic of interplaying factors, which is not limited only to the power to select what deserves to be preserved as a valuable item of the past and what does not. The authors of this volume first of all question *how* different actors choose to preserve – and then to promote – heritage. The way, for instance, popular participation in a festival such as the one in Baalbeck in Lebanon became a means for reclaiming Lebanese cultural specificity within the Arab world allows us to see how heritage production – Baalbeck was inscribed in the WHL in 1984, while the festival was launched in 1956 – is intertwined with narratives of national glorification in creating a shared sense of participation in a common history. At the same time, collective rituals like the participation in the Amarnath pilgrimage in Kashmir can also become a means of affirming the government's legitimacy with regard to a specific territory and «reinforce dominant ideology and political inequality»<sup>9</sup>.

The extensive popularisation of heritage tourism invites us to question directly the role of the State as a producer of heritage. As Stuart Hall has pointed out, «collections of cultural artefacts and works of art have also been closely associated with informal public education», and so the production of historical narratives through preservation also

needs to be investigated as an outcome of the State's power to «preserve and represent cultures»<sup>10</sup>. Such is, for instance, the effort of many scholars who have considered their work to be placed in what have been defined *Critical Heritage Studies*, questioning the validity of a «scientific materialism» that since the late nineteenth century dominated all aspects related to the selection and conservation of heritage<sup>11</sup>. In this perspective, not only did the nation state emerge as the legitimate authority to claim what past deserved to be preserved, and how, but the complex series of operations relating to inscribing something as heritage has been confined to the hands of experts, who can thus confer objectivity to a selection process that is often highly arbitrary.

The provocative statement that opens Laurajane Smith's book *Uses of Heritage* – «there is no such thing as 'heritage'» – is an invitation to scholars and practitioners to understand heritage «ultimately as a cultural practice, involved in the construction and regulation of a range of values and understandings», and therefore also subject to manipulations that aim at hegemonizing the way we think, talk and write about the subject<sup>12</sup>. Within this dynamic, questioning the role that historical knowledge has in the definition of heritage items becomes central. From a reverse angle, within the framework of the massification of tourism globally, it is also meaningful to investigate the way in which the proliferation of heritage and discourses about the past influence the formation and transmission of «historical consciousness», or «people's self-conscious definition of some aspects of the past as 'history', their notion of the agency of the past, their apprehensions of time, and their 'temporal orientations'»<sup>13</sup>.

With respect to international organisations dealing with preservation, in the 1990s specular developments began to combat Eurocentric normative assumptions that regulated what could or could not obtain the recognised status of heritage. Beginning with the Nara Conference on Authenticity in 1994, a number of initiatives asserted the need to «recognise alternative curatorial practices and forms of cultural governance»<sup>14</sup> and in particular, challenged the notion of authenticity that was institutionalised through the 1964 Venice Charter adopted by the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and that had become one of the pillars for the inscription on the WHS<sup>15</sup>. Following the debate ignited by the Nara Conference, in 2003 UNESCO approved the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, with the aim of including within the framework of officially sanctioned heritage «practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some

cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage»<sup>16</sup>. As the result of more than a decade of debates and attempts to – albeit partially – reject «universally applicable» normative benchmarks, documents such as the 2003 Convention or the subsequent 2005 *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expression* testify to the great efforts that have been made to broaden the conception and definition of heritage beyond established European practices of conservation and preservation which had dominated the international scene up to the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century<sup>17</sup>.

These same movements also show how the attention that government institutions placed on matters regarding the recognition and legitimization of heritage discourses on an international level increased over the years. In fact, the movements that animated the critique of an excessively Eurocentric notion of heritage and questioned the institutions devoted to heritage listing and safeguarding, and rightly so, also revealed that there has been an increasing interest in instruments that legitimise bestowing an «added value» upon items from the past, beyond the traditional conception of tangible cultural heritage.<sup>18</sup> The reframing of discourses on authenticity and the consequent shift of emphasis from universalism to cultural diversity corresponded to an effort at broadening the spectrum of what could be authoritatively considered as heritage.<sup>19</sup> Not surprisingly, 549 items have already been inserted in UNESCO's *Lists of Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Register of good safeguarding practices* since their creation in 2008. One of the side effects of the diversification of the concept of authenticity and the introduction of the idea of *intangible* heritage has arguably been a proliferation in the accumulation of the past and in the categorisation of heritage items, again in the search for visibility and legitimacy.

In this regard, it has been emphasised how such a proliferation betrays an «obsession with not forgetting», which is not related exclusively to heritage but more generally to contemporary ways of collectively and publicly elaborating the past<sup>20</sup>. On one hand, according to Harrison, the «globalisation of official heritage practices» can be seen as a response to an increasing perception of risk and vulnerability of the past fostered by modernity's self-defining speed in technological, social, cultural and environmental change<sup>21</sup>. On the other hand, the massive and often politically-driven accumulation of the past needs to be taken as an invitation not only to investigate what is selected but also to pay more attention to what is omitted; not only what projects of conservation and preservation aim to highlight regarding specific pieces of heritage but also what they conceal. Romila Thapar rightly underscored that when an object, idea or value is «claimed as heritage, it can also

be used to define an identity in the present. It carries a meaning from the past yet its meaning in the present could be similar or dissimilar»<sup>22</sup>. For this reason, investigating heritage from an historical perspective implies first of all interrogating the meaning that a certain item had in the past, and being «aware of what aspects of whose heritage we are selecting, and why»<sup>23</sup>.

As in dealing with collective memory, where elements that emerge are often equally as important as those omitted, the authors of this volume undertook their case-studies with the specific intent of reading through the «leaks» in the narratives of the past that heritage politics purport to promote<sup>24</sup>. This aspect may appear to be fairly evident in the two cases regarding India included in this issue (Bobbio, Recchia), since they engage directly with the politics of re-writing the subcontinent's history with the aim of making the Hindu fundamentalist rhetoric hegemonic, but all articles, in different ways, address the theme of omission from different perspectives. Political decisions certainly play a key role in orienting choices about which histories need to be told and which forgotten. But at the same time, looking at how heritage sites are resignified over time throws light on the fact that the meanings with which heritage is endowed are not fixed, rather they may be functionally readapted according to changing socio-political contexts as in the Albanian case analysed by Vietti. Alternatively, certain characteristics may be highlighted, discarding others, in order to make heritage candidatures more likely to win UNESCO's World Heritage label, in a way that prioritises marketing considerations, economic opportunities and developmental concerns over a coherent adherence to reproducing historical truths (Fattacciu). Here the divergence between heritage production and history-making becomes even more striking: when heritage is converted to contemporary use, its historical meaning and significance, the context in which it was produced or conceived or developed, lose their importance. In the same way, placing the focus on the object (or intangible practice) and on its value to the present runs the risk of overlooking the fact that heritage always requires patronage to survive. A set of related questions arises from these considerations and constitutes the thread that runs through all the contributions to this volume. If the value endowed upon heritage is not intrinsic, then who possesses the authority to select heritage? To whom and how does it speak?

Viewed within the present-day context of massive proliferation of heritage, the relationship between conservation/preservation and patronage deserves particular attention. Patronage has always existed – in the form of protecting, funding, or maintaining buildings, religious institutions, artists and the like – and is one of the important reasons

why certain items have survived through the centuries and others have not. From an historical point of view, studying agents who actively patronised various institutions can be revealing of social or cultural contexts of the past: Ahmed Shah, the Gujarat Sultan founder of Ahmedabad city in 1411, and his successors attracted to the Sultanate court local stone and timber artisans, irrespective of their religion, to work on the construction of new symbolic buildings in the city, from the Jama Masjid and the Bhadra Fort to a number of religious institutions, shrines and minarets. At the same time, thriving trade guilds and religious communities funded the construction of temples and luxurious palaces, contributing to making the city famous for its beauty and a model of planning and architecture during the 16<sup>th</sup> century<sup>25</sup>.

Such examples are perfectly understandable in the context of the disintegration of the Delhi Sultanate from the late 14<sup>th</sup> century and of the emergence of rival autonomous centres of power, whose aim was to earn legitimacy as locally grounded rulers, claiming both their religious connotation and their authority. Today, while the city is considered one of the most important examples of Indo-Persian architecture, politicians, urban developers and administrators who sponsored its candidature for UNESCO's World Heritage List – no historian was enrolled in the team – highlighted aspects related to Muslim domination and subjugation as the marker of the city's foundation. What emerged as a new, syncretic style of architecture becomes in the narrative of the candidature documents an element used to emphasise the idea of Muslim rulers as alien and their legacy of monuments and buildings proof of their domination rather than of a thriving cultural context.

The way in which the past is narrated and produced thus shows how heritage can be seen as «a performance in which the meaning of the past is continuously negotiated in the context of the needs of the present»<sup>26</sup>. This constant negotiation, often hidden behind the claim to a scientific approach to preservation, makes heritage the stage where conflicting dynamics of representation find expression. Present and past contexts thus intermingle in producing narrations that are often imbued with values and meanings collateral to or only partially involved with the principles of preservation and conservation. This is true for intangible heritage as well, as shown in the promotion of Mexican cuisine: the shift in meaning between the first application, that focused on food as an element of national unity, and the second successful one, that highlighted the interplay of items embodying cultural traditions and community values, shows the important role that subjects promoting heritage preservation play in endowing material or immaterial items with new meanings and values. In the case of Mexican culinary tradi-

tions, the complex relationship between safeguarding/representing dynamic elements from the past and contemporary patronage needs to take into consideration a range of factors that amplify the areas of dispute between commodification, recognition and collective representation. Whose traditions are promoted and represented through intangible heritage? How do we consider the involvement of huge capital and economic interests in backing initiatives aimed at promoting heritage, as in the case of the involvement of GRUMA, world leader in flour production, in Mexico's application?

Within the highly bureaucratised procedures of international agencies such as UNESCO, issues of patronage manifest their close proximity to the crucial question of representation, identity and community. In fact, questions relating to selection processes and the agency of the actors involved, also imply also scrutinising narratives underlying heritage production as well as policies of preservation and their implications for the daily life practices of people and groups. The construction of state-sponsored narratives about the nation and its past not only affects the way in which communities are represented in the national ethos, but also has direct effects on the ways people access or are excluded from practising their citizenship rights on a daily basis. Such is the case of national constructions that directly exclude entire portions of society in order to justify current politics, or the production of heritage narratives that deliberately ignore controversial or undesirable elements in order to make «history safe, sterile and shorn of danger, subversion and seduction»<sup>27</sup>. As historian Gyanendra Pandey has rightfully stressed, the construction of concepts such as minority and majority in post-colonial States participates in the production of cycles of «routine violence», in the sense that it contributes to delimiting the boundaries of «politically or constitutionally recognized minority communities that are preconstituted, unchanging, and in that sense unhistorical»<sup>28</sup>. From this point of view, heritage politics can be seen as elements that enter – directly or indirectly – the process of fixing the boundaries of communities through the production of symbolic landmarks highlighting so-called, often manipulated, histories.

The every-day impact that policies of heritage conservation have on communities and societies does also manifest itself in more explicit and crude ways, such as the example of the effects that projects of renovation of historically relevant neighbourhoods have on the housing market and the resultant gentrification or evictions that often accompany these projects<sup>29</sup>. The fact that projects of heritage conservation are often realised with the direct or indirect involvement of private capital, and are often functional to generating large revenues, is another important



angle that needs to be taken into the picture. As in the case of the corn multinational GRUMA backing Mexico's candidature (Fattacciu), or the framing of the «Incredible India» national campaign (Bobbio), or again the impact of the redefinition of the Butrint heritage park on the village of Ksamil in post-communist Albania (Vietti), the profound interdependence between the protection of objects (or practices) of the past, patronage and economic interests can be traced on different scales. In these dynamics, the interests and aspirations of local communities are often considered of secondary importance, showing how, with the aim of reproducing a fixed, harmonious image of the past, the making of heritage often creates conflicting terrains where marginality, economic backwardness, cultural and social fragility find expression in the struggle for representation (Recchia). Expanding on these themes, the articles in this special issue seek to raise questions about the multi-layered effects that the production of narratives of the past through heritage generate in terms of socio-cultural and economic disputes.

Beyond the questions that this special issue attempts to raise and discuss, many aspects of the equation relating history and heritage remain to be investigated and analysed. The angle from which many of the articles develop their discourses does open new perspectives. Looking at how heritage participates in producing heavily loaded narratives of the historical past, in function of advancing politically – and economically – driven projects and national constructions, invites us to think also about the aesthetics through which the past is represented and transmitted. While in the case of tangible cultural heritage projects, such as monuments or neighbourhoods, aesthetic aspects have been widely studied in relation to architecture and conservation techniques, the form of such representations with respect to intangible heritage assumes more undefined boundaries. It has been highlighted how the consolidation of the notion of intangible heritage emerged, from the 1990s, in disaccord with Western hegemonic notions of conservation, authenticity, universalism. From this perspective, the recognition of «practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills»<sup>30</sup> as part of a people's (or even an individual's) heritage helped focus the attention on cultural specificities and diversity, recognising the need to re-discuss the norms for including and excluding items as heritage in international standards. The acknowledgment of differences in terms of evaluating authenticity as well as the importance of immaterial aspects and knowledge transmission as part of humanity's heritage has been hailed as the success of non-Western countries in asserting their role within UNESCO and the international debate on heritage at large: «You have your convention, now let us have ours», as a delegate of

a non-Western country has been reported saying at a UNESCO convention<sup>31</sup>.

However, such a de-centralisation of notions and standards regarding heritage did not necessarily imply deconstructing a Westernised hegemony in terms of representing and reproducing narratives of the past. Instead, the increasing commodification of both heritage items and intangible practices, which responded to the growing interests of the tourism industry as well as to branding campaigns, tended to reproduce cultural stereotypes recalling ideas of the exotic, or the oriental, or the indigenous as the tropes of a language where history becomes part of a «timeless, infinite global present»<sup>32</sup>. In this process, we see history blurring in favour of exoticized narratives that stimulate ethnographic curiosity for the culturally diverse, rather than investigations of past processes and events and their value for the present. Much research needs yet to be done in this direction, with the aim of understanding how the over proliferation of heritage production affects the understanding, the dissemination and the popularisation of knowledge about the past.

This poses methodological issues in terms of the selection, access to and uses of sources: in order to dismantle the narratives about the meaning and value of heritage as well as to investigate the processes that lay behind the selection, re-signification and production of each case study, the articles in this special issue rely on very different sets of sources. Since the underlying thread is the exploration of the entanglement between constructed narratives of the past, their political, socio-economic and cultural implications and the meaning they have in processes of re-production of nationalist narratives, the authors have supported the use of archival sources with field-based analyses, oral memories, and other popular sources. The result is that the proposed case-studies attempt to strike a balance between historically investigated processes of heritage signification and an evaluation of the implications that the manufacturing of historical knowledge have on daily life, political relations and cultural representations.

In line with these considerations, the present volume also engages in the long-lasting debate that sees a dialectic between micro and global history<sup>33</sup>. An approach that focuses on the understanding of the values and meanings ascribed to the past – through heritage – implied necessarily adopting multiple scales of observation. Starting with the micro, the localised dimension allowed us to investigate the ways in which place-specific dynamics of heritage production and politicisation resonate with wider contexts and overarching historical dilemmas. Questions posed in the articles of this special issue are thus directed not only at the items of heritage that are under scrutiny, but also at the various

articulations of the historical narratives which these items contain and represent.

### *Post Scriptum*

In view of the coronavirus pandemic that forced two thirds of the world into lockdown early in 2020, the articles of this special issue now need to be read in a different light. The tourism industry will surely suffer a backlash in the current year, and the economic consequences that will affect many European, American and Asian nations will probably have consequences on patterns of individual consumption and mobility. Moreover, this period of suspension urges us once more to reconsider the way we relate to our lifestyles, opportunities, resources and possibilities. As the articles of this issue demonstrate, heritage and the public use of history as a tourist attraction have not escaped the increasing commodification of all aspects of our daily life. Human past as a consumer good – part of the cycle of short-term mobility and frenzied accumulation of experiences and images of exotic or post-exotic places – has lost its potential for transmitting knowledge from one generation to another. Hopefully, along with many other fields of social and cultural life, the years to come will witness a more sustainable use, and production, of heritage and history.

TOMMASO BOBBIO  
 Università degli Studi di Torino  
 Dipartimento di Culture, Politica e Società  
 tommaso.bobbio@unito.it

### *Note al testo*

<sup>1</sup> See the classic work of J. URRY, *The Tourist Gaze*, London 2002; and more recent critical works such as M. D'ERAMO, *Il Selfie del Mondo*, Milano 2017 or S. LABADI, C. LONG (eds), *Heritage and Globalisation: Key Issues*, Abingdon 2010 (in particular part III).

<sup>2</sup> Definition taken from the Glossary of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, available at <https://savingplaces.org/stories/preservation-glossary-todays-word-heritage-tourism> (access, 10 February 2020).

<sup>3</sup> For the identification of heritage as a discursive practice I defer to the first chapter of Laurajane Smith's seminal work on the *Uses of Heritage*. L. SMITH, *Uses of Heritage*, Oxon-New York 2006, pp. 14-6.

<sup>4</sup> P. BETTS, C. ROSS, *Modern Historical Preservation. Towards a Global Perspective*, in «Past and Present», Supplement 10 (2015), pp. 7-26, p. 14.

<sup>5</sup> E. HOBBSBAWM, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: programme, myth, reality*, Cambridge 1992 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), p. 191.

<sup>6</sup> See for instance the special issue of «Quaderni Storici», 150 (2015), A. TORRE (a cura di), *Storia applicata*, on applied history, and in particular ID., *Public History e Patrimoine. Due casi di storia applicata*, pp. 629-59; and the *Foreword* to the same issue.

<sup>7</sup> Such figures on tourist arrivals are published in UNITED NATIONS WORLD TOURISM ORGANISATION (UNWTO), *World Tourism Barometer*, 18 January 2020 (online access 1 February 2020); data on the economic impact of tourism refer to both the direct and indirect impact of the industry and are taken from WORLD TRAVEL AND TOURISM COUNCIL (WTTC), *Travel and Tourism Economic Impact – 2017*, online report (access April 2017).

<sup>8</sup> SMITH, *Uses of Heritage* cit., p.35.

<sup>9</sup> F. RECCHIA, *Contentious Memoirs. Territorial control and the creation of heritage in Indian-occupied Kashmir*, in this volume.

<sup>10</sup> S. HALL, *Whose Heritage? Un-settling 'The Heritage', Re-imagining the Post-nation*, in «Third Text», 49 (Winter 1999-2000), pp. 3-13, p. 4.

<sup>11</sup> T. WINTER, *Clarifying the Critical in Critical Heritage Studies*, in «International Journal of Heritage Studies» (hereafter IJHS), 19/6, pp. 532-45, p. 537.

<sup>12</sup> SMITH, *Uses of Heritage* cit., p. 11-2.

<sup>13</sup> S. MACDONALD, *Undesirable Heritage: Fascist Material Culture and Historical Consciousness in Nuremberg*, in «IJHS», 12/1, 2006, pp. 9-28, p. 12.

<sup>14</sup> T. WINTER, *Beyond Eurocentrism? Heritage conservation and the politics of difference*, in «IJHS», 20/2 (2014), pp. 123-37 p. 126.

<sup>15</sup> A.E. GFELLER, *The Authenticity of Heritage: Global Norm-Making at the Crossroads of Cultures*, in «American Historical Review», 122/3 (2017), pp. 758-91.

<sup>16</sup> UNESCO, *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, art. 2.1.

<sup>17</sup> V.T. HAFSTEIN, *Intangible Heritage as a list: from masterpieces to representation*, in L. SMITH, N. AKAGAWA (eds), *Intangible Heritage*, Abingdon 2009, pp. 93-111.

<sup>18</sup> M. HERZFELD, *Value-added History*, in «IJHS», 25/9 (2019), pp. 992-5.

<sup>19</sup> In fact, one limit intrinsic to such critiques is that they were directed almost exclusively at intangible heritage and did not have the power to put into question the notion and definition of tangible cultural heritage, where definitions such as *Outstanding Universal Value* or instruments such as the Test of Authenticity remain criteria for the inscription on the WHL.

<sup>20</sup> R. HARRISON, *Forgetting to Remember, Remember to forget: late modern heritage practices, sustainability and the 'crisis' of accumulation of the past*, in «IJHS», 19/6 (2013), pp. 579-95, p. 581.

<sup>21</sup> Ivi, p. 582; for a general framework on such themes related to modernity I refer primarily to the works of D. HARVEY, *The condition of postmodernity: an enquiry into the origins of cultural change*, Oxford 2010; and, F. JAMESON, *Postmodernism, or, the cultural logic of late capitalism*, Durham (NC) 1991.

<sup>22</sup> R. THAPAR, *Indian Cultures as Heritage. Contemporary Pasts*, New Delhi 2018, p. 20.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>24</sup> C. GINZBURG, *History, Rhetoric, and Proof*, Hanover (NH)-London 1999, p. 84; P. BURKE, *History as Social Memory*, in T. BUTLER (ed.), *Memory: History, Culture and the Mind*, Oxford 1989; W. KANSTEINER, *Finding Meaning in Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies*, in «History and Theory», 41/2, (2002), pp. 179-97.

<sup>25</sup> Persian historian Muḥammad Qāsim Firishtah (1552-1623), who lived at the court of Bijapur in Deccan, in his history of the Muslim dynasties on the subcontinent, defined Ahmedabad the «handsomest city in Hindoostan, and perhaps in the world». Quoted in K. GILLION, *Ahmedabad: a Study in Indian Urban History*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1968, p. 15.

<sup>26</sup> K. GENTRY, L. SMITH, *Critical heritage studies and the legacies of the late-twentieth century heritage canon*, in «IJHS», 25/11 (2019), pp. 1148-68, p. 1149.

27 J. URRY, *How Societies Remember the past*, in S. MACDONALD, G. FYFE (eds) *Theorising Museums: Representing Identity and Diversity in a Changing World*, Oxford 1998.

28 G. PANDEY, *Routine Violence. Nations, Fragments, Histories*, Stanford 2006, pp. 182-3.

29 M. HERZFELD, *Engagement, Gentrification and the Neoliberal Hijacking of History*, in «Current Anthropology», 51/2 (2010), pp. S259-S267.

30 UNESCO, *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, art. 1, 2003.

31 In GFELLER, *The Authenticity of Heritage* cit., p. 790.

32 R. KAUR, *Post-exotic India: on remixed histories and smart images*, in «Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power», 23/3 (2016), pp. 307-26, p. 309; see also D. MASSEY, *Imagining Globalisation: Power-Geometries of Time-Space*, in A. BRAH, M.J. HIKMAN, M.M. GHAILL (eds), *Global Futures: Migration, Environment and Globalisation*, London 1999, pp. 27-44.

33 See, for instance, the forum on *Microstoria e storia globale*, in «Quaderni Storici», 150 (2015), pp. 813-48, and the recently published special issue of «Past and Present», 242/12 (November 2019) entirely dedicated to this debate.

Editorial Draft