

Negotiating instrumental and realist perspectives in European Heritage Research

by Christopher Whitehead*, Susannah Eckersley** and Gönül Bozoğlu***

Summary

This paper discusses the genesis and framing of the CoHERE (Critical Heritages of Europe: performing and representing identities) – a large, European Commission-funded project responding to an instrumental drive to solve critical social and political problems in Europe through recourse to heritage. The project is one of the largest investigations to date into the politics of heritage in and of Europe, concluding in March 2019 and comprising three years of research conducted by a consortium of institutions over nine countries, including eight universities, one research institute, two museums and a non-profit cultural network. twelve institutions, led by Newcastle University in the UK. Below, we discuss the European-level concerns, assumptions and desires involved in the funding of heritage research, our responses to this, and the political, scholarly and ethical dimensions of working to such agendas. This paper does not concern the findings of our research, which will emerge in forthcoming publications (a number of ‘work-in progress’ publications can be found on the CoHERE Critical Archive (<https://research.ncl.ac.uk/cohere/coherecriticalarchive/>)).

Keywords: Heritage, Instrumentalism, Europe, Identities

JEL Code: Z1, O3 and F5

Introduction: instrumentalist research agendas in European heritage

A core preoccupation of European-level¹ instrumental uses of heritage has been to provide a positive identity narrative rooted in a rich and varied, and yet shared, European past. On the one hand, this has been part of a shift in understanding at policy levels that heritage is an

* Professor of Museology, School of Arts and Cultures, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 7RU, UK.

** Lecturer in Museum and Heritage Studies, School of Arts and Cultures, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 7RU, UK.

*** Leverhulme Research Fellow, School of Arts and Cultures, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 7RU, UK.

¹ ‘European-level’ is intended here to comprise policy initiatives of multiple kinds and from different bodies, including the European Commission, European Parliament, Council of Europe as well as sectoral actors such as Europa Nostra, Culture Action Europe etc., that address and seek to frame notions of the value of heritage in and for ‘Europe’ as a trans- and/or supra-national entity. For a survey and classification of policy see Zito and Eckersley (forthcoming). Recent initiatives that rely on the notion and valorisation of a shared European heritage include, among others: *Conclusions on Cultural Heritage as a Strategic Resource for a Sustainable Europe* (Council of the European Union, 2014); *Communication Towards an Integrated Approach to Cultural Heritage for Europe* (European Commission, 2014); *Getting Cultural Heritage to Work for Europe* (European Commission, 2015); *Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe* (ChCfe, 2015); *Political Statement on the Occasion of the 60th Anniversary of the Rome Treaties: Culture at the Heart of a Sustainable Europe* (European Alliance for Culture and the Arts, 2017); *Strategy 21: European Heritage Strategy for the 21st Century* (Council of Europe, 2017); *A New European Agenda for Culture* (European Commission, 2018); *The Berlin Call to Action: Cultural Heritage for the Future of Europe* (Europa Nostra, 2018).

important driver of economic prosperity relating to tourism, regeneration and connections to creative industry. On the other hand, the idea of a shared heritage has been mobilised to counteract disaffection with the social and political project of the EU and to provide people with both solace and inspiration in times that are understood as moments of crisis, whether this relates to economic deficits at the personal or state level, the threat of encroachment by cultural others (such as refugees), the fragmentation both of the EU and of member states, or mixtures of these. This political desire and instrumentalism was one of the features of the European Commission's (EC) *Horizon 2020* Work Programme 'Europe in a Changing World: inclusive, innovative and reflective societies'² and in particular the sub-theme 'Emergence and transmission of European cultural heritage and Europeanisation'. Here, the EC set the following challenge for scholarship:

"The history of Europe and over sixty years of European integration have fostered the emergence of cultural heritage at different levels – local, regional, national and, recently, European. In all its forms, cultural heritage, values, institutions and language are crucial for the collective memories and sociability of groups but also for the personal development of citizens, enabling them to find their place in society. They also serve as a source of inspiration for the development of people's personalities and talents. Extending to the very heart of Europe and constituting a basis for EU construction, they play a key role in providing a sense of European belonging and EU citizenship as distinct from, but combined with, national citizenship. Cultural heritage and values are at the heart of our capability of overcoming the current EU crisis which could well provide the stimulus for revising EU policies so as to provide a solid basis for the emergence of a truly European cultural heritage and for passing it to future generations. The challenge is to explore and show how critical reflection on the historical, cultural and normative roots of Europe's cultural and democratic practices and institutions contribute to an evolving European identity today."

Assumptions to be found here concern the importance of cultural heritage for communitarian social relations, individual personal development, inclusive senses of belonging and future-making, both through the development of models of citizenship and value systems likely to encourage civility and its subsequent transmission to future generations. Valorising, sustaining and transmitting cultural heritage are understood as a powerful means of overcoming an 'EU crisis' marked by social and cultural divisions, disparities of wealth between nations, regions

² http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/wp/2014_2015/main/h2020-wp1415-societies_en.pdf

and groups, and reduced confidence in the political and social project of the EU. Indeed, these positions were reflected in the report of the Council of Europe's *Conclusions on Cultural Heritage as a Strategic Resource for a Sustainable Europe* (2014)³ and the Horizon 2020 Expert Group on heritage: *Getting Cultural Heritage to Work for Europe*. In the latter, heritage is presented not as a cost to society and a financial burden but as a boon to the European economy and a means of fostering 'greater unity and cohesion of European citizens', overcoming the challenges of demographic change, migration and political disengagement (2015: 7).

Positioning research with and against instrumentalism

Responses to the EC's research challenge can take multiple forms. One is to accept its assumptions and get to work, providing the EC with scholarship and interlinked policy recommendations that align unquestioningly with the instrumentalism and idealism embedded in the work programme. Another response is to debunk the challenge and to point at its propositions as fallacies and attempts at so much ideology and social engineering. Neither of these responses is (in our view) likely to achieve positive change. A third way is to work with the collectivisation agenda that is so clearly evident in the Work Programme, and yet to critique its framing and question its realism, on the grounds that these in fact undermine its purchase. We have explored that third way. This is a general subscription to the idea that heritage can produce civil and societal benefits (as we see them, as situated individuals with our own political and moral viewpoints), but that this should be tempered by a realist understanding of the ways in which heritage can be used against civility, against EU values, against unity and against difference.

This means engaging in instrumental cultural politics while at the same time thinking critically through its problematics. It involves recognition that there is a necessary attachment of ethics to heritage that often manifests in tacit or overt prescription. Soon, we are led inevitably to axiological discussions about exactly which human and social values, if any, constitute absolute goods. Following this, other questions emerge: why, and (sometimes) where and when did such values develop, or through which historical processes and memory practices – for example through reflection on 'never-again' iniquities such as genocides? If (European) heritage is understood not as an essential quantity but as contingent, as something mobilized and active within ethico-political constructs, then it is necessary for projects responding to the

³ https://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/educ/142705.pdf

instrumental challenges to take a position about what is good – again, from the subjective and political standpoint of the researchers and notwithstanding the cultural relativisms that emerge as automatic objections to moral expressions. In this sense, CoHERE is concerned at the most basic level with valorizing European heritages that enable: the development of identities based upon communitarian and egalitarian attitudes; non-prejudicial openness to difference; a commitment to peace; historical awareness; and equal opportunities for social and cultural participation.

Nevertheless, a realist view shows that heritage can be and often is active within quite different ethical constructs – even classifiable as malign – and CoHERE has to engage with these as important phenomena and problematics. Indeed, we were struck by the mismatch between official insistence on heritage as a fundamentally positive quantity within social and political relations, and some prevalent indications to the contrary. Under the surface of many of the most divisive socio-political events of the last decade in Europe (responses to refugeeism, referenda, populist nationalisms, xenophobia, separatism, the re-emergence of Fascism and Nazism, etc.) lie questions about history:

- What is Europe?
- Who is European and who is not?
- Are Europeans all the same or different?
- What historical events have shaped – or even created – Europe and Europeans?
- Do Europeans have a kind of collective ‘memory’ of the past – even of events before their lives – that makes them who they are?
- Who shares that memory? Who is excluded from doing so, how and why?

Our observation here was that heritage can be used to create shared senses of identity but also to emphasise difference, division and ideas about who belongs. The ways in which people make attachments to the past and in which historical stories, symbols and identities they choose are often charged with identity politics that have connections with key contemporary issues concerning the past, present and future definition of Europe and Europeanness, what values should prevail in Europe, who should be allowed to live there and under what conditions.

Critical heritages of Europe (CoHERE)

The CoHERE project seeks to identify, understand and valorise European heritages, engaging with their socio-political and cultural significance and their potential for developing communitarian identities. Addressing the EU Crisis identified by the Work Programme through

a study of relations between identities and representations and performances of history, it explores the ways in which heritages can be used for division and isolation, or to find common ground and ‘encourage modern visions and uses of its past’. The project is a multidisciplinary, including museum, heritage and memory studies, cultural history, education, musicology, ethnology, political science, archaeology, ethnolinguistics and digital interaction design. The research covers a carefully selected range of European territories and realities comparatively and in depth; it focuses on heritage practices in official and non-official spheres and engages with various cultural forms, from the living arts to museum displays, food culture, education, protest, commemorations and online/digital practice, among others. Key aims of the research are: 1) to interrogate the meanings, frameworks and expressions of European heritages both in theory, practice and policy; 2) to develop relational perspectives on heritages and cultural politics in Europe; and 3) to provide intellectual, creative cultural and practical instruments (including digital ones) for valorising European heritages and promoting communitarian identities.

Relevance to the work programme has been achieved through key approaches, which are: 1) the relational study of productions and experiences of heritage at institutional, social and personal levels, including research into people’s activities and attitudes; 2) research by practice and the provision of public-facing dissemination activities; and 3) the critically-informed development of instruments (e.g. models for policy, curricula, museum and heritage practice) intended to promote reflection on and valorisation of European heritages and to engender socially-inclusive attitudes. The project is multidisciplinary, including museum, heritage and memory studies, cultural history, education, musicology, ethnology, political science, archaeology, ethnolinguistics and digital interaction design. The research covers diverse European territories and realities comparatively and in depth.

Overarching project objectives are to:

- a) Critically review and theorise key concepts, such as ‘European heritages’, ‘European identity’ and ‘collective memory’ in relation to academic literature, museum and heritage practice, value cultures, politics and policy and EU structures and agendas.
- b) Understand the reach and purchase of ‘European heritages’ and ‘European identities’ and assess their challenges as well as the opportunities they contain for peaceful and communitarian social relations in Europe.
- c) Investigate how and why symbolic representations and performances construct ideas of place, history and heritage, tradition and belonging in Europe, identifying which of these representations and performances count as European heritage, to whom, where and when.

d) Analyse, through key examples (e.g. musics, food, histories, curricula), how heritage representations ‘travel’ between different institutional, social and personal spheres and how identities are negotiated and produced through this.

e) Explore how and why relationships with and attitudes to the past inform identity positions, social orderings and moral values in Europe.

f) Identify and propose governmental, policy, institutional, educational and community-linked heritage strategies that sustain and equitably transmit core social values of the EU.

g) Disseminate the research in numerous spheres and develop instruments that demonstrate and model its application, reaching diverse communities from policy makers and museum, heritage and education professionals to different publics, including children.

Various cultural forms have been explored, including: museums, heritage, landscapes, music, food, policy and policy making, educational curricula, historiography, festivals, concerts, re-enactments, protests, online/digital initiatives, tourism and languages. While we recognise and respond constructively to the instrumental nature of the call by generating ideas for heritage policy and practice, the project also explores problematics relating to the notion of ‘European identity’, attending to reactionary practices, retrenchments, xenophobia, racisms, nationalisms, religious tensions and the raft of non-‘European’ place identities. Also, while key EU public-facing institutions (e.g. the *Parlamentarium* and the *House of European History* opened in 2016 in Brussels) may present a coherent image of a historically-founded, shared European identity, the actual social purchase of this can be weak. Investigating these dissonances is a key part of the project. Cultural constructs of Europe, and forms identified and/or construed as shared or shareable heritage (e.g. particular musics), need to be studied relationally with socio-political realities and people’s identity and subject positions across Europe. This is especially significant in light of events and developments post-dating the publication of the Work Programme. Among many, we might cite: the PEGIDA protests in Germany and elsewhere (mobilising a ‘European’ identity not condoned by the EU or by national governments); responses to the Charlie Hebdo killings; accelerated changes in attitudes towards Muslims and Islam; anti-austerity protests, sometimes with historical dimensions, such as in the case of recent claims about Germany’s wartime debt to Greece; and referenda such as those concerning Scottish independence, Brexit and Catalonian independence.

We take a broad but delimited understanding of heritage (mindful of the notorious difficulty of assigning a consensus definition) as a *representational, discursive and performative practice involving conscious attempts to valorise aspects of the past in the present*. Our focus has been primarily on the representational dimensions of heritage practice as a conscious mode of

valorising the past in the present (and in creating grounds for the future), whether through: upholding, reviving or inventing traditions; performative re-enactments; reconstructions (e.g. of buildings); conservation decisions; commemorative practices; presentations of historical tangible and intangible culture; or imbuing and mobilising particular historical stories and phenomena with key significance for contemporary identities. Within the purview of CoHERE, heritage can be official or unofficial, tangible or intangible, or mixtures of these. It may not always be a social good productive of perceived-to-be progressive identities, respectful intergroup relations or benign moral positions, suggesting the existence of plural ‘heritages’ that are sometimes in conflict with one another, rather than a monolithic ‘common heritage’. Likewise, contemporary connections with events, cultures and sites from prehistory to the recent past may all be important for identity construction, and this is recognised in the temporal depth of the research. These statements formed starting points for the project, which has included a critical review of theory and practice relating to ‘European heritage’, as well as subsequent new theorisations within the CoHERE project.

In much scholarly literature concepts of heritage and memory are fundamentally linked to identity, to the extent that they have been perceived as a conceptual ‘triad’ (Anheir and Raj Isar, 2011) or ‘complex’ (Macdonald, 2013). The EC’s emphasis on the value of historical reflection on European cultural and democratic practices for an ‘evolving European identity today’ also connects these concepts, and involves an element of ‘becoming’ that underpins certain perspectives on identity, e.g. Richard Jenkins’ position that ‘Identity can only be understood as a process of ‘being’ or ‘becoming’’, and that ‘One’s identity – one’s identities, indeed, for who we are is always multi-dimensional, singular and plural – is never a final or settled matter’ (2008: 17).

A differently oriented account is developed by political scientist Montserrat Guibernau, some of whose thinking has inspired our own. She explores the dynamics between individual and group identities and posits that identity is ‘constructed both through belonging and through exclusion – as a choice or as imposed by others – and, in both cases, it involves various degrees of emotional attachment to a range of communities and groups’ (2013: 2). Stressing the relationship between belonging and emotional attachment, Guibernau notes that belonging requires that one embrace the attitudes of the group, to be loyal and obedient to it’. In return, the group offers a ‘‘home’, a familiar space – physical, virtual or imagined – where individuals share common interests, values, or a project’. In this space – which could be as broad as ‘Europe’, and in which one could talk about a shared economic, socio-political and moral project – belonging provides people ‘with an environment in which they matter’ (2013: 27).

We may then ask: what heritage techniques activate and transmit European belongings? How can they encourage communitarian values? What roles, for example, might digital technology and tourism initiatives play in this?

In relation to investigations of the production of identities, CoHERE involves the relational analysis of heritage representations in different locations or spheres: that of government and authoritative institutions, that of social groups, whether self-constituted (e.g. PEGIDA, or UK Remainers) or constituted by others (e.g. refugees); and that of individuals. We explore heritage representations that are important for the constitution of identities both within these spheres and between them, in the purchase that they have on one another and their often complex and negotiated relations to one another. For example, the EC-funded MeLa research (2011-15, EU FP *Grant Agreement 266757*) has shown that inclusive representations of multiculturalism as a social good in museums or in political discourse may align with some people's cosmopolitan identities and views of citizenship, but are viewed as an undesirable liberal fantasy by others. Meanwhile, sites, moments and monuments presented officially as significant for the development of a European identity signify differently for different groups both in local and European contexts, from the Acropolis to the Sieges of Vienna, to the concentration camps of the Holocaust and the fall of the Berlin Wall.

CoHERE is also concerned with the political construction of European memory, and addresses the central problem that the construction of a *singular* collective European memory is an attractive, but fundamentally self-defeating, means of creating a harmonious cultural space and legitimating the transformation into a 'superstate' within which individual nations would be happy to situate themselves (Pakier and Str ath, 2012: 19) and of which people would be happy to call themselves citizens. In this view, constructing a singular collective European memory is self-defeating precisely because the attempt to identify common ground, shared *lieux de m moire* and common roots 'has the opposite effect of raising tensions and fostering disagreement' (ibid). As a consequence, an alternative project emerges of 'demythologising' and deconstructing the notion of a single European memory, and by extension, a single heritage and identity – a project that is bolstered by reflection on the historical contingency of Europe as a mutable geopolitical construct and conglomeration of territories and (later on) of nation states. We ask what, if any, are the ways through these prospects – one utopian and instrumental but doomed to failure, and the other analytical and deconstructive but destructive of ideals – and whether 'unity in diversity' can be more than an empty motto when used in connection with European heritage and identity.

Scope

The scope of the Reflective challenge is vast and cannot be addressed within the scale of the project comprehensively, either geographically or phenomenologically. For this reason we have elected to identify territories and phenomena that allow us to characterise different forms of heritage practice in different geographical and socio-cultural contexts. Rather than attempting a wide but superficial coverage, the project takes an in-depth view of a number of phenomena that allows for wider insights, and at the same time offers innovative approaches to understandings of heritage. For example, we focus on traditional musics, song and dance, and on food and cuisine as heritage and what it means for local, national and European identities – a focus that allows us to move out of strictly public-sector practice and phenomena to examine links between heritages and commercial practice, such as the food and music industries.

With partners and sites of research situated geographically across Europe we are able, within reason given the financial parameters of the Call, to represent numerous territories. A key aspect of this is the opportunity to think through insider-outsider dynamics, in part through attention to the legacy of colonialism and its position within European heritages and identities, and in part through attention to the borders of Europe and EU accession politics. By looking closely at the latter in the case of Turkey – positioned as an outsider but where European identities have socio-political purchase within liberal civil society discourse, we track fault lines between constructions of heritage and identity that have geopolitical origins. The question: ‘what does it take to become ‘European’?’ is one that invokes notional differences and before-and-after states, as well as *a priori* contrasting heritages that may (or may not) be made to CoHERE in new historical representations and socio-political formations. It also invokes historical enmities that are sometimes still identifiable within politico-historical imaginaries and discourse, such as that between ‘Europeans’ and the Ottomans as fearsome Others (Whitehead and Bozoğlu 2015). Last but not least, questions of historical consciousness are built into the moral requirements of EU membership for Turkey to acknowledge the Armenian Genocide and take responsibility for it, bespeaking a specifically European political and moral philosophy of historical reflection as a means of ‘coming to terms’ with the past and creating grounds for the future (European Parliament Resolution of 17/4/2015). Acknowledgement of the ‘dark past’ becomes, in this sense, a means of entry into a European Union concerned both with eliminating the possibility of history repeating itself, closing historical antagonisms and iniquities, and creating foundations for the peaceful cohabitation of groups.

Approaches

The research methodology is multimodal and multi-disciplinary, in order to provide different perspectives on European heritages that can be brought into relation with one another dynamically, thus providing hitherto unavailable insights - for example in combining methods from heritage studies and political science to understand the processes and politics of the valorisation of the past. Above all, CoHERE involves a deep, interpretive study of symbolic practice in all spheres of interest (the sphere of public policy, of institutions and agencies, of communities and groups and of individuals). This involves analyzing museum displays, heritage interpretation, political and legal discourse, curricula, musics and languages, but it also means engaging qualitatively with communities and individuals to understand their lives, beliefs and practices.

The reason for this is to seek to understand the complex interrelations between valorisations of the past as they are produced and constructed by different actors in relation to different circumstances and imperatives. A focus on official productions of heritage alone would fail to capture any sense of their alignment with popular practice and people's identities and understandings of the past. We have adopted a predominantly qualitative research methodology because it allows a deep analysis of phenomena, and for the exploration of subjectivities, which are key to understandings of cultural production and reception (e.g. of museum displays, heritage interpretation or creative practice), experiences of heritage and identities. Another component of the methodology is practice-based, involving the development and expression of key concerns through exhibitions, performances, digital interactive design, film and other initiatives. Experimental research involves the development and, where possible, trialling of cultural policy and/or communication instruments designed to contribute to the more effective valorisation of European heritages. The scientific model is not the *in-vitro*, closed-laboratory process resulting in post-hoc delivery of findings to audiences. Rather, it actively connects to, and involves, stakeholders and audiences, involving the study of contemporary phenomena and the experimental co-productive development and real-world testing of new approaches, where possible in the form of research by practice.

The research operates within and on different spheres of European society, engaging with 'official' and non-official cultural productions, representations and performances of history, heritage and identity and seeking to understand the interrelationality between these. This means examining heritage actions at the levels of the EU, the nation state, the community group and the individual, and attending to alignments, mismatches, reactions and negotiations between

them. It also allows us to address the issue of the purchase upon citizens of top-down heritage actions and policies, in turn informing guidelines for policy and practice. This approach means that we expand the field of ‘heritage’ well beyond the confines of official productions, helping us to understand the discursive mobilisation and operation of heritage in contexts such as civil protest (which arguably has a ‘European heritage’ of its own), community initiatives, popular commemorations and online activity on social media platforms.

Conclusion: tilting the frame

One of the peculiarities of European-funded heritage studies projects is that they begin in an explicit context of policy. It can, of course, be argued that little scholarship in the field is totally free of drivers that derive directly or indirectly from policy interests or sensitivity to the markets for scholarship. But EU-funded projects emerge from specific political and sometimes economic motivations that require engagement from researchers, not just at the level of abstractions of the common good, and not just at the level of critiques of practice. And yet, the process of research into European heritages can be dissonant with the assumptions and political desires that seem at first sight to underlie EU funding. For example, a critical view will not reveal the kind of monolithic ‘European heritage’ that might ideally provide the social glue for mass cohesion, a new frame for economic development and a simple means of overcoming social, political and economic crisis. Nevertheless, as we show, one of the key challenges for our research is to advance scholarship and take a position that is at once responsive to and critical of political imperatives, as well as being constructive and useful for practice, both in policy making and in heritage work more broadly.

Europe, in a realist view, contains divided memories and is made of difference, and at the political and civil level it has been argued that this is not material to be harmonized or erased from history, and that a more proper civil project is to work to acknowledge, recognize and in some way process division – not to ‘resolve’ it – so that it becomes an accepted fact in a situation of peaceful and respectful group relations (Sznajder, 2013: 63; Pakier and Wawrzyniak, 2016: 9). In other terms, as Klaus Eder argues, it might be possible to conceive ‘another path of European integration in which the people no longer appear as the sum of individuals living in Europe, but as people linked to each other as bearers of conflicting interests and ideas’ (2014: 221). This seems deeply paradoxical – that division might be the grounds for commonality – but it has as one benefit a sense of possibility for the accommodation of difference. As another, it seems to chime with the EU motto – ‘Unity in Diversity’ – and might suggest ways of thinking this through so that it becomes more than a

convenient slogan. With increased attention to the nature, historical depth and effects of difference, the idea of Europe as a ‘cultural space of difference’ may nevertheless offer opportunities for historical reflection and awareness upon which more plural senses of belonging can be based.

The project comprises research *for* practice, in that it involves the production and modelling of instruments for heritage practice and policy, collaborative working between political and cultural organisations and audiences, and education. The research is *instrumental* in the sense that it aims to provide the means for identifying, valorising and transmitting heritage resources that support the development of progressive communitarian identities. This is intended as a way of contributing to the resolution of the multifaceted EU crisis acknowledged in the Call. At the same time CoHERE critically explores the historical, historiographical, theoretical and philosophical-ethical problematics inherent in the uses of heritage within identity politics. It is attentive to the dangers of constructing or engineering heritages solely for the purposes of achieving political objectives, and to the problems that obtain when an ‘authorised’ heritage is imposed (Smith 2006) that does not respond to or represent people’s identities. CoHERE steers a critical path between the overt valorisation of heritages for communitarian identities and the need to problematise and qualify instrumental uses of heritage. The project explores the historical roots of contemporary socio-political problematics and how heritage plays a role in powering such problematics and tensions, as well as how it might play a role in resolving and overcoming them. This involves an act of conscious position-taking on our parts as researchers that what we do is not apolitical nor value-free; that what we do can and should have ‘real-world’ effects and applications. Heritage is necessarily political because it involves the making of choices, selections and exclusions and symbolic valorisations that do some *work* in the present, often for the purposes of future-making (Harrison et al 2016). Heritage actors, like it or not, are always part-politicians; our scholarship is not and should not be a hermetic chamber isolating or liberating us from this. Unless we choose to step away from or scoff at the act of framing values (which is both unconstructive and irresponsible at the civil level) then we have to reflect, critique and act on value systems in pursuit of what we believe to be the social good. This does not at all mean a slavish service to political instrumentalism. We can and should question the frames and terms of the challenges set to us in large-scale heritage research that and understand the political origins, orientations and ramifications of funders’ aspirations. In this way we speak back to the powerful actors who set agendas; we help to tilt the frame from

which it is currently possible to see; we and complicate interpretations of problems in order to imagine different, more apposite, solutions.

List of references

ANHEIR, H.K. and Y. RAJ ISAR (2011), *Cultures and Globalization: Heritage, Memory and Identity*, London, Sage.

EDER, K. (2014), 'The EU in Search of its People: The birth of a society out of the crisis of Europe', *European Journal of Social Theory*, 17, 3, 219-237.

GUIBERNAU, M. (2013), *Belonging: Solidarity and Division in Modern Societies*, Cambridge, Polity.

HARRISON, R., BARTOLINI, N., DESILVEY, C., HOLTORF, C., LYONS, A., MACDONALD, S., MAY, S., MORGAN, J. and PENROSE, S., 2016. Heritage Futures. *Archaeology International*, 19, 68–72. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5334/ai.1912>

JENKINS, R. (2008), *Social Identity*, London and New York, Routledge.

MACDONALD, S. (2013), *Memorylands: Heritage and Identity in Europe Today*, London and New York, Routledge.

PAKIER, M. and B. STRÅTH (eds) (2010), *A European Memory? Contested Histories and the Politics of Remembrance*, New York – Oxford, Berghahn.

PAKIER, M. and J. WARWRZYNIAK (eds) (2016), *Memory and Change in Europe: Eastern Perspectives*, New York – Oxford, Berghahn.

SMITH, L. (2006), *Uses of Heritage*, London and New York, Routledge.

SZNAIDER, N. (2013), *Jewish Memory and the Cosmopolitan Order*, Cambridge, Polity.

WHITEHEAD, C. and G. BOZOĞLU (2015), 'Constitutive Others and the management of difference: museum representations of Turkish identities', in Whitehead, C., Lloyd, K., Eckersley, S. and Mason, R. (eds), *Museums, Migration and Identity in Europe*, Farnham, Ashgate.

ZITO, A. and ECKERSLEY, S. (2019) 'Instruments of European Heritage', in Whitehead, C., Eckersley, S., Daugbjerg, M. and Bozoğlu, G. (eds) *Multiple Europes: Dimensions of Heritage and Memory*, London and New York, Routledge, forthcoming.