

CHAPTER ONE: Understanding Heritage Activism: Learning from Social Movement Studies

Tod Jones, Ali Mozaffari, and James M. Jasper

The first chapter of this volume located heritage activism in both heritage practice and heritage research. It argued that social movements have always been important to the generation of heritage, and are now increasingly central to how researchers define heritage due to the recognition of the importance of resident and other non-expert practitioners to its creation and upkeep. These shifts are apparent if we look at the changing definitions of heritage. Before the 1970s heritage was defined as ‘individual inheritance’ rather than practices and things related to the history or identity (Graham, Ashworth, and Tunbridge 2000: 1). After challenges from activist groups in the 1960s and 1970s, the definition of heritage diversified and, in recent decades, recast as the ‘contemporary use of the past’ (Graham, Ashworth, and Tunbridge 2000: 2), a ‘cultural process’ (Smith 2006: 44) and more recently a ‘relational dialogue’ (Harrison 2013: 213). The redefinition of heritage suggests a growing focus on the social and material relations and networks that are in a mutual relationship with heritage. These include different groups, species, and things and networks they use to maintain and interact with heritage (Harrison 2013, 2015). It is now understood that heritage has multiple meanings because of the multiplicity underpinning its conception, and that this often causes conflict and contests (Silverman 2011; Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996). The centrality of conflict to much heritage is because of the way social movements use heritage in their activism.

Social movement studies has a long history of analysing contestation and can provide a number of perspectives and concepts that may prove useful to heritage scholars. Social movements are defined as ‘sustained, intentional efforts to foster or retard broad legal and

social changes, primarily outside the normal institutional channels endorsed by authorities' (Jasper 2014: 5). The study of social movements necessarily includes understanding other individuals and groups as well as the broader social-political setting as these influence the direction and path of social movements. This is a field that originally emerged in sociology in the late 1960s and 1970s but now includes participants in psychology, political science, anthropology, and other disciplines (Klandermans and Roggeband 2007).

Complementing the introduction, which located activism in the history and study of heritage, this chapter focuses on social movement studies in order to explore new ways of approaching heritage activists and movements. We begin by explaining our use of the language and concepts of social movements, and then identify how this approach assists analysis of contemporary heritage. Heritage researchers are just beginning to explore the field of social movements (Jones, Mozaffari, and Jasper 2018; Message 2015; Mozaffari 2015), and our hope is to suggest its most useful current approaches. The second half of this chapter deploys examples of existing heritage research from the perspective of social movements, next to examples from within this volume, to demonstrate our approach and tools for understanding the dynamics of heritage contests and heritage formation. The outcomes of contention shapes heritage both in its strategic use (what is heritage) and its material form (what becomes heritage). Building on our earlier work (Jones, Mozaffari, and Jasper 2018), we argue our approach expands the disciplinary and methodological aspects of heritage research through analysing heritage politics; strengthening approaches to heritage that allow for the consideration of the range of interactions between micropolitics and macrostructures; and illustrating the role of social movements in shaping and spreading of heritage, even when they are not successful in achieving their goals. In conclusion we reflect on the potentials of a social movements approach to furthering research in heritage studies.

Social Movements Research

Early social movement theories generally took psychological approaches that focused on individual behaviour, such as grievance theories and crowd theory (Klapp 1969). These theories tended to be anti-protest. In the 1970s competing structuralist theories emphasized institutional constraints, in particular the resources available to different groups (resource mobilization theory, (McCarthy and Zald 1977)) and the structural openings of the polity (political opportunity structure, (Kriesi et al. 1995; McAdam 1995)). While providing important insights into the influence of different types of political systems and organization on social movements, these theories struggled to understand persuasion, or the way groups use a variety of means to influence decisions at the micro-political level, and the reasons why people's decisions do not always flow with structural forces (Jasper 2014: 15–38). Kylie Message (2015: 260) notes that the application of social movement approaches, particularly in cultural fields such as heritage and museums, 'need to overcome constrained structuralist forms of analysis'. Contemporary social movements approaches are now addressing the micropolitics of emotion and affect (Woods et al. 2012) as well as the range of objects and meanings deployed to understand agency (Waitt and Farbotko 2014) in addition to the structuralist constraints and influences on groups advocating for and against change.

This chapter employs and explains an interactionist perspective on social movements that uses the language of strategic players and arenas (Jasper and Duyvendak 2015) and incorporates emotions (Jasper 1998, 2014). Considering heritage in terms of players and arenas, and their strategic interactions employs a nuanced understanding of heritage and its contestation that takes into account the role of negotiation as well as a variety of means and methods of persuasion, which may not always result in overt conflict. Players are those who engage in strategic action with some shared goals and sense of identity (Jasper 2015: 10). Players may be simple—individuals—or compound—groups of affiliated individuals or

organizations or even whole societies that engage in action. Either way, players are evolving, mutually-constituted entities that have multiple, concurrent, shifting and at times preconscious goals, and use various means and strategies in pursuing them. The multiplicity of goals for each player suggests that the role of a player must be determined through empirical investigations rather than deduced from preconceived theories (Jasper 2015: 14). Players' goals and priorities shift due to internal conflicts and external opportunities.

Arenas are places in which rules (formal and informal) and resources facilitate and govern players' interactions, with decisions and outcomes at stake. The rules that constitute an arena can be challenged, ignored or replaced, in which case a new arena may emerge. Like players, arenas may be formal and institutionalized (courts) or informal and amorphous (public opinion); they may comprise players only, or players and spectators; and they may be related to or affect one another (such as the mood and morale of players and their decisions). Arenas, while related to structural forces, are transformable rather than fixed, and they create and contain cultural meanings. They are often filled with meaningful physical objects that influence action. For instance, room size and layout, amplification devices, other technologies, and seating arrangements can all influence how contention unfolds.

Not all actions occur in arenas; some are intended to influence arenas from the outside by sending messages to various players. For example, the primary purpose of a protest march is not to make movement decisions but to put other players on notice and to prepare participants for further action. These are staging areas or pre-arenas for what occurs in arenas. On the other hand, each compound player also forms its own arenas such as when it needs to make decisions about its own actions. A protest group or a university faculty meets to decide what it will say or do in other arenas—when meeting in this way it is itself forming an arena.

Social Movements in Heritage Research

Most critical heritage theorists deploy causal factors that we find in the field of social movements, not least because scholars have begun to acknowledge heritage activism as organized forces that fit almost any definition of social movement (Mozaffari 2015, 2016). Social movements are increasingly recognized as important actors in heritage contests (De Cesari and Herzfeld 2015; Herzfeld 2015; Rio and Hviding 2011). Iain Robertson (2012a: 15) directly acknowledges the relationship between social movements' circumstances, goals and strategies and the formation of heritage: 'Certain expressions of a sense of inheritance from the past, therefore, would appear to have the capacity to function as a resource for social movements and also as the dynamic product of these movements.' Heritage is invoked as both a 'creative force that engages people in diverse courses of action towards new political contexts' (Rio and Hviding 2011: 25), and a discourse of neoliberal economic and spatial transformation that displaces existing communities that social movements can also use in their resistance (De Cesari and Herzfeld 2015). Both are accurate and indicate the key issue of how social and economic structures interact with agency in the production of heritage. While some social movements theories (particularly those based on resource mobilization) have been critiqued for having a structuralist bias (Gerbaudo and Treré 2015; Jasper 2014), heritage studies has been critiqued for making assumptions about the structural positions of different actors (such as Harvey's (2015) critique of the local and De Cesari and Herzfeld's (2015) critique of NGOs). Both critiques of instrumentalism require a similar solution: concepts and methods that focus on and explain the perspectives, options and decisions of all of the different players involved in a heritage conflict. The allocation of heritage as a creative force, effect of a limiting structure, or anything else, should be situation specific and should make use of empirical evidence to draw careful and constrained conclusions.

Some heritage scholarship relies implicitly or explicitly on a language of ‘elites’ (Smith 2006), which often captures what Marxists called the ruling class. The idea of an elite tends to fuse various kinds of group advantages, as if they were tightly correlated, into a catch-all notion of ‘power’. This language makes it hard to understand how non-elites, without power, can ever exert influence in contestation (Robertson 2012b). The concepts of players and arenas recognizes that elites are not the only players in an arena, even while it shows that some players have more resources, especially money, so that they usually win. But outcomes can never be assumed in advance, or easily explained on the basis of ‘power’. Clever strategic choices can sometimes compensate for a lack of resources.

Harrison’s (2013: 13–41) location of heritage within contemporary debates about structure and agency moves beyond bipolar models like dominant-subaltern and local-global. Drawing in particular from Latour (2004, 2005) and Deleuze and Guattari (1987), Harrison argues for an actor-network approach to heritage that conceives of agency over heritage as distributed through specific ‘assemblages’ (DeLanda 2006; Deleuze and Guattari 1987) of people, technologies, and things. As Latour clarifies, this is not to suggest that the latter exercise agency in the way humans do, but that they are participants in actions and as such have a range of influences and functions (2005: 72). Both our approach to social movements¹ and actor-network theory (ANT) seek to overcome macro-micro divisions and the undue explanatory power given to structure in social movement theory and social sciences more generally. However, an approach framed through players and arenas and ANT have important differences.

First, there is a difference between actors and players. For Latour (2005), an actor is not the source of action but part of an ensemble that carries out the action, and this includes both human and non-human (animals and objects). In our approach, however, the term players excludes non-human actors—things—on their own, but it takes into account how

players are influenced by and make use of things, such as places, arenas, resources, emotions, affect, and objects. Second, an arena is a locus of social action where materials, players and norms associated with the arena shape contention and its outcomes. This is quite different to an actor-network which assists with tracing a relation that is understood only temporally with the passage of each actor and ultimately ‘social fluid’ through it. While arenas are focused on understanding contention, actor-networks draw attention to the distinctive kinds of effects that material objects and processes exert as a consequence of the positions they occupy within specifically configured networks of relations (Joyce and Bennett 2010).

Focusing on players and arenas identifies the linked causal mechanisms of action and inaction at the observable level of individuals and their interactions (Jasper and Duyvendak 2015). A gain in one arena may lead to either a gain or a loss in another arena, linking them together. The approach we advocate is geared towards analysing interactions and activities with the greatest capacity (whether realized or latent) to generate or resist society-wide shifts (sea-changes) in how heritage is understood and treated. Things—material objects—are important in contests over heritage inasmuch as they are part of, facilitate, and afford certain experiences and interactions. Players in heritage contests make specific claims, devise certain strategies to achieve their goals, and attempt to persuade others to recognize and join their cause. These are the characteristics of the realm of social movements. Players’ claims may be interpretations or valuations of what the past has left us, but also imply claims to a kind of ownership of and the right to influence a group’s heritage. They are necessarily political because they contest others’ claims. This process of claims and counterclaims, strategic actions and political persuasion form the core of social movements studies.

Heritage and Social Movements

We have argued that there is a case for drawing on a particular approach to social movement concepts in heritage research. To pursue this line of argumentation systematically requires a

focus on particular issues and may be directed by specific questions (Jones, Mozaffari, and Jasper 2018). In the following sections we refer to existing and emerging scholarship to elicit the particular perspective that underpin a social movements approach to heritage as we see it. While using exemplars presents social movement analysis in action, it also presents a problem; that the breadth of a social movements approach to heritage cannot be captured in a single example as each example highlights parts of the approach. Our solution is to present and explore empirical directions and tasks through an engagement with both our and other people's heritage research in order to identify the important currents and questions in the literature. The division of the empirical directions into themes helps to clarify the social movements approach we are advocating.

Players

Given that players are the essential component of social movements, understanding heritage activism begins with identifying and cataloguing the various players, noting that they may be individuals or compound players, unofficial or official. Understanding their constitution, networks and resources is crucial to understanding the dynamics and outcomes of heritage contests, and therefore what the category of heritage includes. It is important to start by cataloguing the players, potential and activated, in as much detail as possible. Cataloguing should include individuals as well as compound players such as NGOs, private companies, and government agencies. Players will differ significantly. In particular, it is important to understand the different resources they have at their disposal, their allies, and their personal skills and capacities. The extent of their organizational knowledge and capabilities will also influence their effectiveness.

Raphael Samuel's (1994: 295–9) writing on the National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or Natural Beauty in the United Kingdom—which at the time was accused of being a conservative institution that acted in the interests of rich gentry (Hewison 1987; Wright

1985)—contains a useful example of players. Samuel looked to the three players who founded the National Trust, and identified a shared basis in a commitment to public access and Christian Socialism that remains important today. Robert Hunter was a lawyer who had been fighting common rights cases for around 30 years, and had worked on commons preservation with John Stuart Mill. Octavia Hill had a career in social housing, a defender of public access to open space, and a disciple of John Ruskin, the leading advocate of social commitment in the arts in the second half of the nineteenth century. Canon Rawnsley, like Octavia Hill and Robert Hunter, was influenced by Christian Socialism and a follower of Ruskin. They prosecuted their ideals through their organizations, social networks, writings, and political lobbying.

Octavia Hill's public profile, public speaking, and advocacy in the media was particularly important (Hall 2016). She had built a public profile through her work advocating for social housing and women and children's rights and education. Although not exceedingly wealthy, her commitment to social reform, public access, and Christian socialism provided a strong network and platform for advocacy of heritage (Darley 2016). She was a credible advocate for public access to and preservation of heritage sites. Her organizational capacity and allies, many of whom were lawyers and social reformers, helped establish an organizational structure that has endured. She continues to be an effective player for the National Trust in the United Kingdom today due to her public commitments and her achievements.² Indeed, Hill's strain of activism continues to inform the National Trust's understanding of its role and actions. The strategies of Hill, such as claims for public access and education, and her use of the media, remain the favoured strategies of the National Trust.

Individuals who regularly influence the path of contestation become central to a cause or movement, either through their symbolism to the general public, or becoming a symbol for a group, tactic, place, or moral position. Significant figures, such as Hill, tend to remain

important as symbols after they pass away, and their importance can shift. The ongoing controversy over the British imperialist and founder of The British South Africa Company, Cecil Rhodes, and the focus on his statues in Cape Town and at Oxford University in the Rhodes Must Fall movement is a recent example of how social movements can use past figures as villains to prosecute a case for reforms (Knudsen and Andersen 2019).

The Indonesian nationalist Sukarno is another important figure. Sukarno was the most publicly prominent Indonesian nationalist leader during the last few decades of Dutch colonial period, the Japanese interregnum from 1942 to 1945, and as Indonesia's first President from 1945 until 1965. Sukarno was an incredible orator,³ and over a number of years enunciated a number of nationalist concepts and slogans that remain important today. Sukarno's terms and principles were central to government policy from 1955 until 1965, when he was forced to resign by the Indonesian military (Jones 2013). A number of his terms were related to Indonesia's shared national heritage, and could not be discarded by the military dictatorship of General Suharto. Instead, Sukarno's place in nationalist history was rewritten, and his terms were redefined.⁴ The resources that the military dictatorship were able to deploy once they had control of the state were substantial, and they included the state cultural institutions that managed heritage.

Katharine McGregor's (2003) study of the National Monument History Museum (Monas Museum) is an interesting study in how historical players are reinterpreted between regimes. Monas Museum consists of a series of historical dioramas depicting key nationalist historical events. Conceived during a period when Sukarno was in power, the dioramas were reviewed during the early Suharto period, and became an early representation of the new government's perspective on history. Sukarno's role in history shifted from the early plans to the finished dioramas. An important change was an attempt to reduce the connection between Sukarno and the creation of the Pancasila, or the five unifying principles of the Indonesian

nation-state. The Monas Museum emphasized that there were three creators of the Pancasila, and shifted the date of its creation from Sukarno's public announcement. From a revolutionary program under Sukarno, Pancasila came to exemplify a conservative approach to social change and political reform that was embedded into the education system and bureaucracy. The most prominent Indonesian nationalist of the twentieth century was transformed into one of many founding fathers, alongside many military men, and his radical politics and principles was repressed and reinterpreted as he became a nationalist symbol for an authoritarian regime. However, like in his lifetime, Sukarno's radicalism, complexity, and broad popularity prevents a singular interpretation, and he remains a potent figure for different causes.

Heritage activism includes both activists who are advocating for the preservation of heritage like Octavia Hill, and the use of heritage by activists who are advocating for or against social change. The skills, resources, and networks of key players, like Octavia Hill and Sukarno, are crucial to how effectively they articulate and advocate for heritage. While we have focussed on individuals, compound players are also very important, in particular state agencies, community groups, and businesses. Thing's chapter in this volume indicates how internal conflict within a player (in Thing's case the organization advocating for Sonaha rights in Nepal) can prevent it from taking action. Mozaffari's chapter in this volume indicates how particular agencies were able to assert expertise in support of their advocacy for the Sivand Dam near the tomb of Cyrus the Great in Iran, and how heritage activists contested their authority. The choices of different players have ongoing implications for how heritage is conceived. To understand these choices, we need to understand the arenas within which these choices are made.

Arenas

Contestation unfolds in real (e.g. court rooms) or metaphoric places (e.g. newspapers or social media), resulting in arenas for social action. Arenas are bundles of rules and resources that allow or encourage particular interactions to take place, and where something is at stake (Jasper 2015). The rules in arenas can be formal (as in a court) or informal and flexible (as a dinner party), or somewhere between (like a town hall meeting). It is important to understand how different individuals and groups get access to arenas (like a nomination to a town planning committee, a recommendation from a friend, or through a local government election to a council). However, access and resources are not the only determinants of who wins in different arenas. Events that unfold in arenas, some of which are pivotal to heritage movements, can be influenced by arenas' physical settings, possibilities for entrances, exits and audiences, access to direct proceedings and set agendas, and the technologies that regulate (decorum) and disseminate interactions (media). Arenas are physical, visceral places⁵ that influence the outcomes of contention.

The World Heritage Committee is a much-observed arena in Heritage Studies. It has strong rules about regulation, membership, and the process of nominating and deciding on inscription onto the World Heritage List (Bertacchini, Liuzza, and Meskell 2015). Assessments of applications for World Heritage designation are undertaken at arm's length from the Committee by the International Centre for the Study of Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), or the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), and its operations are overseen by the World Heritage Office within UNESCO. Access to the Committee is only open to nation-states who are signatories to UNESCO's Convention concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage, and appointed to the Committee during UNESCO's General Assembly.

Despite small changes in the rules governing the Committee's operations at that time, a major change occurred in 2009 when a new group of nation-states, including China, Brazil, and Egypt, became members. The relationships between the BRICS nations (Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa) and some other members strengthened a trend towards politicized decision making, and it became increasingly common for the Committee to vote against the advice of the expert groups (Meskell and Brumann 2015). The debates and voting became increasingly and obviously political, revealing the priorities of the nation-state delegates. For instance, the Historic District of Panama, two archaeological sites that date back to 1519 and 1671 respectively that were the launching point for Spanish colonization of the Western parts of Latin America, and a historic neighbourhood, were in the process of being encircled by a new highway when the World Heritage Committee met in 2012 in Saint Petersburg to discuss putting the area on the list of World Heritage in Danger. At this meeting, a series of photographs were shown of a viaduct that was under construction to support the highway, which were surreally ignored by their spokesperson. Representatives from the World Heritage Centre, due to the conventions of diplomacy, are unable to challenge or contradict the state party (Meskell 2014: 232). The highway was routed through an archaeological site that would destroy Spanish relics. At a later meeting in 2013, the South African Ambassador requested numerous pictures, before calling seventeenth century buildings 'unsightly villages' and claiming the viaduct improved the view, a perspective supported by India and Qatar (Meskell 2014: 233). After long debate, and then being sent to a subcommittee, a decision was made to not revoke or change the Listing, but to instead request boundary modifications and revisit the listing in two years. These interactions and practices are now webcast globally, which appears to have little impact on the committee's operations (Meskell 2015).

The case of the Historic District of Panama also indicates the importance of linked arenas. The politicization of UNESCO increases the importance of other, linked political arenas and decisions. A coalition of eleven civic groups in Panama had demanded a halt to construction. On the other side, a Brazilian company had been contracted to build the third stage of the highway, and was integrated into the government delegation that represented Panama and a UNESCO session in 2013 (Meskell 2014). Trade-offs across arenas have become increasingly public and acceptable despite poor conservation outcomes (Meskell 2015), including Qatar and South Africa finalizing trade agreements with Panama after their vocal support in the Committee (Meskell et al. 2014). There are also transactions with individual players; individual representatives receive gifts from different nations seeking favour from delegates, and there are numerous receptions and side events (Meskell 2015).

Often social movements will use contention in public arenas to draw attention to their cause and strengthen their group. During the public consultation period for the prospective World Heritage listing of the Ningaloo Coast in Western Australia, coastal campers who felt threatened by changes to tenure arrangements were organized by station owners to travel in convoy to town hall-style meetings where they read prepared questions to Western Australian officials (T. Jones, R. Jones, and M. Hughes 2016). The physical structure of town-hall format facilitated questions from the floor, which were then used to put pressure on the officials who stood in front of them, and supporters of inscription who felt the rising tension. Protestors asked questions surrounded by their friends and supporters, and bureaucrats' responses stoked anger further. Opponents of the Ningaloo World Heritage listing found this format so useful that they arranged an unofficial public meeting with a sympathetic politician after the consultation period had closed.

A few chapters in this book, as well as recent research, indicate the importance of both media and social media as arenas for contention and decision making. Mozafarri's

chapter on Iran indicates how heritage activists are able to contest official decisions and perspectives in news media despite strong state controls over behaviour and expression. It is possible to debate within the rules of political expression in Iran, and influence public opinion. This chapter is also an important reminder that the political system restricts opportunities for activism more in some parts of Asia than others. Heritage activists in Iran have to be more careful in their newspaper articles than is the case in other countries with more open public spheres and political systems. Social media is increasingly important for heritage movements. Jones, Riomandha and Salim's chapter on a contemporary heritage group in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, indicates how the rules and structures of social media shape interactions and debates, and Chong's chapter demonstrates it is also important for heritage activists in Singapore. Online heritage arenas are often combined with offline activities, and make much use of evocative images and videos (see also Gregory 2014; Knudsen and Andersen 2019). As Jones, Riomandha and Salim argue, social media constitutes a fundamental shift in both engagement in heritage activism, but also how heritage sites are engaged with, visited, and ultimately constituted. The alignments of online and offline arenas has already become very important to activism. The settings and material and immaterial structures that shape heritage contests are both online and offline.

As we can see, arenas have different characteristics and serve different (although not fixed) objectives, and at times with unpredictable results. While there is usually logic in choosing arenas, neither the logic nor the timing is linear and players usually operate in a number of arenas concurrently. A common way of forcing players into a different arena in heritage is through court challenges and appeals against planning decisions. Entering a new strategic arena always raises the engagement dilemma: the outcomes are always uncertain, and even the strongest player can never fully control what happens (Jasper 2006: 26).

Thinking-feeling Processes and Making and Sustaining Activists

Thinking-feeling processes are important to players' actions and responses, including their commitment to particular causes. They have always been important to social movements (Jasper 2014). In recent heritage (and museum studies) literature, thinking-feeling processes fall under the broad rubric of emotions and affect and are influenced by a growing interest in the area particularly in sociology and anthropology. Although valuable, this interest has not translated into a systematic identification and study of emotions and affect—thinking-feeling processes—in heritage movements. However, there are some useful grounding propositions that we can glean from a selective reading of the scholarship for the purposes of our discussion.

Iain Robertson's (2015) article on the Scottish blackhouses, following his trajectory of research on 'heritage from below', analyses the history and memory of land rights, dispossessions, and linguistic displacements (from Gaelic to English) in the Scottish highlands and islands. There, blackhouse ruins function as an allegory that mediates quotidian practices and memories of past dispossessions and as such it expresses 'the heritage of the marginalized' (as opposed to official tourist heritage of the same edifice), and a history of connection with the landscape. This heritage from below is always grasped multi-sensorially, with individuals engaging in a 'spatial dance' between past and present. This kind of heritage and the identity work it performs are not necessarily about direct political action, but about preserving identities through historically-rooted practices that includes memories of social movement activities and political protests.

Activists can use emotions and affect to reject heritage, and in doing so reject identities and historical legacies. The Rhodes Must Fall movement in South Africa began when a student activist, Chumani Maxwele threw human faeces on a statue of Rhodes at the University of Cape Town on 15 March 2015. Knudsen and Andersen (2019) identify how the

affective reaction of disgust that people feel on viewing or hearing about shit on the statue aligns with the disgust that students thought should be accorded the legacy and images of Rhodes on campus. Indeed Maxwele states at the time: ‘As black students we are disgusted by the fact that this statue still stands here today as it is a symbol of white supremacy’ (Goodrich and Bombardella 2016: 7). The act of throwing human faeces began a broader movement that aimed to challenge the policies and politics of tertiary education in University of Cape Town specifically, South Africa more generally, and had an aligned movement at Oxford questioning Rhodes legacies there. The valued heritage of past regimes and opposition groups is an emotive focus for action, such as the destruction of the Seated Buddha of Jehan Abad in the Swat Valley by the Taliban (De Nardi 2018).

In their book chapter, ‘The Elephant in the Room: Heritage, Affect, and Emotion’, Smith and Campbell (2015) argue for the significance of the study of affect and emotions to a critical understanding of heritage. Following Reddy (2001) and Sayer (2007), they point out that ‘[e]motions are socially, culturally, discursively, and politically mediated’ evaluative judgements ‘of matters that are understood as affecting our well-being’ (2015: 448, 451). Thus, they correctly emphasize the significance of context broadly understood in analysing the role of emotions and that emotions are in turn consequential in reshaping contexts, an observation also made in Robertson’s (2015) reading of the blackhouse ruins. In other words, emotions are the result of both structural aspects of a specific context as well as the agency of the feeling individual(s). Thus, the background, social status, educational level and other characteristics of the individual too are pertinent in emotional engagements with heritage. Here, emotions are central to the things that underpin heritage: memory, commemoration, remembering, affect, and identity making.

Smith and Campbell (2015) emphasize the relationship between thinking (judgements and evaluations) and cognitive emotive processes that become significant when social

movements energize through collective actions and articulating identities. Encounters with heritage involve complex, multi-level emotions that cannot be essentialized to simplistic categories such as deep versus shallow or progressive versus conservative. Thus, museums and heritage sites are characterized as places of feeling and ‘arenas’ for managing emotions (ibid. 445). In our understanding, museums and heritage sites often form pre-arenas for collective action, meaning places that instigate and energize thinking-feeling processes, intergroup discussions, and potential forms of mobilization. Without outlining a robust or systematic approach, one that allows for a critical reading of heritage production and collective action, their chapter is nonetheless a genuine call to the examination of the role of emotions in heritage contexts pertaining to issues such as social justice.

Already, a common thread is emerging between Robertson and Smith and Campbell. This thread calls multiple modes of emotions to be taken seriously as the basis for heritage formation and thus containing analytical value. It also suggests the significance of place and of embodied or bodily and multi-sensorial engagement with material surroundings in giving rise to thinking-feeling processes and heritage itself. We have elsewhere considered such processes and their connection to heritage in relation to the World Heritage site of Pasargadae in Iran (Jones, Mozaffari, and Jasper 2018) in the context of recruiting and sustaining activists. At a gathering at Pasargadae, activists held hands and sang nationalist songs while observed by the security apparatus in an action that both consolidated the group and sent a message to opponents and potential supporters (Jones, Mozaffari, and Jasper 2018). Emotion and affect are often important for these essential tasks (Jasper 2014). In this volume, chapters engage with such processes in various ways. One of those ways is the consideration of social media platforms as pre-arenas for heritage mobilization and action.

For example, in chapter two ‘The Past is Always New’, Jones, Riomandha and Salim examine the activities of a successful online platform, BOL BRUTU, in Indonesia. The

group, whose founders and most of their members are from an educated 'middle class', engages with and represents what they term as marginal heritage, meaning a heritage that falls outside the purview of state preservation practices. Similar to what Smith and Campbell note, here the interest began through site visitation, thus a direct sensory experience of place, but was then expanded through a Facebook platform. Their mode of practice, which is centred around imaginative, creative and fun engagements with sites facilitates an affective affiliation with artefacts and sites for platform members while at the same time raising awareness at a national and international level about heritages in the margin. The emotions that are activated from such sites are not necessarily that of outrage and protest, but also include care, respect, and affinity. Their activism straddles online-offline modes thus bridging the discursive and visual (photographs) on one hand and the experiential through site visitations on the other hand. The act of walking on sites is itself a mode of acquiring knowledge (Ingold 2011) but also reinforcing scaled connections between people, place, the past, and the future (similar to the case of blackhouse ruins). However, the sensibilities that propel the activity and the activities themselves are always context-specific. Thinking-feeling processes are therefore also important also for maintaining the interest, commitment, and energy of movement members.

In a contrastive case, in chapter four, Terence Chong discusses the case of Bukit Brown cemetery in Singapore, part of the largest Chinese burial grounds outside China, which was earmarked for residential development in 2011. While the emotive aspects of this place would become clear to the Chinese population of Singapore, it also propelled careful planning and protest organization on the part of Singapore Heritage Society and other civil society groups, to avert destruction. Here, the cemetery was at once an emotional resource and a pre-arena for staging protests and for putting heritage on the national agenda.

In sum, a starting point for understanding thinking-feeling processes in heritage movements is to be specific about the tactics people use, the kind of mood or excitement that is aroused and the causes for that, and the detailed consideration of how bodies are engaged collectively and in what spaces and spatial configurations. Thinking-feeling processes are essential to any social movement because of the way they consolidate and maintain the movement and draw in new supporters. Heritage sites, objects, and traditions are particularly useful due to their symbolism and historical connections, and therefore the possibilities for evoking responses and emotions through its strategic use.

Narratives

Culturally-rooted narratives are essential tools of communication, persuasion and meaning making in any movement (Polletta 2006). The body of literature that presently forms the corpus of scholarship in critical heritage studies is replete with implicit or explicit claims and counter-claims about identity, memory, and the past in present. Indeed, arguably this was at the root of the idea of dissonance in heritage—dissonance being ‘the mismatch between heritage and people, in space and time’ (Graham, Ashworth, and Tunbridge 2000: 89). At the core of any dissonant heritage, are divergent, at times conflicting, ideas of the past and the identities they sustain. Claims and narratives about heritage can work at local (sub-national), national, and transnational levels. Such claims are raised in relation to significant places, individuals (historic heroes), event and artefacts. Here we focus on the relationship between the narratives of heritage activists, the broader identity narratives within which these claims are made (such as national, religious, or ethnic narratives), and how these shape the claims of activists about heritage.

Examining the evolution of the National Museum of Iran, Mozaffari (2014) demonstrates how successive state ideologies have sought authentication through heritage and how this has a direct effect on the displays and narratives of the museum. Specifically, he

speaks of two identity narratives, one associated with Shiism (the official religion of Iran) and the other with the Persianate (pre-Islamic) within heritage displays and sites. The World Heritage site of Pasargadae has been the focus of conflicting narratives and activist political agendas, and continues to be a symbol for activist groups with a range of agendas within and outside Iran (Jones, Mozaffari, and Jasper 2018; Mozaffari 2017). The site of Pasargadae has served as an object of nostalgia and the symbol of the fall from imperial glory, but it has also been mobilized by many to counter the official cultural preferences and identity proclamations of the Islamic Republic, in short the primacy of Islamism. However, some of the slogans chanted on the same site have become contentious at both regional and sub-national scales (drawing criticism from Arab neighbours as well as some ethno-nationalist and irredentist groups within Iran) (Mozaffari 2017). Yet again, some groups from within the state establishment as well as a majority of people take the site as a symbol of national unity and identity, a claim corroborated by massive participations in New Year celebrations around the Tomb of Cyrus the Great.

Narratives perform a similar, albeit perhaps less confrontational, function in other forms of heritage activism around Asia. Chong's chapter clearly demonstrates how heritage activism has served to rewrite the position and history of ethnic groups, for example the Chinese, within the grand narrative of nationhood in Singapore. The result of activism has not been a radical rewriting of the story of the nation which was already culturally diverse and multi-ethnic. Rather it was introducing a nuance in the framing of ethnic groups (for example the Chinese) through their heritage within the meta-narrative of the nation. At a different scale but culturally no less significant is the case taken up by Douglas in chapter six. Referring to the traditional craft of Dumbara Rata, she shows how the implementation of state-driven modernizing processes—heritage protection policies working in tandem with commercialization of handicrafts—have resulted in the emergence of new subjectivities that

destabilize presumed cultural norms and social relations. Cognisant of their position and implicit power due to the ownership of production knowledge, individuals of ‘lower’ caste have begun questioning and this destabilizing age-old cultural narratives in relation to caste system in a village, a phenomenon contested by the wealthier upper caste who traditionally owned production workshops.

It is thus clear that narratives have a significant role in the formation of heritage and heritage movements. We recommend a systematic consideration of narratives, a detailed (as much as possible) understanding of the claims and counter-claims of contending groups, attention to the metaphors and allegories they use, and consideration of how heritage movement narratives are positioned relative to powerful meta-narratives (e.g. national, ethnic, religious) within which situated claims are positioned.

Collective Identities

Many heritage movements encompass strategies that redefine existing identities as well as actions to create and shape new identities as a driver of the proliferation of heritage (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996). Collective identities are shaped and concretely expressed as a result of the convergence senses of time and place—in all their multitudinous forms. In their seminal work, *A Geography of Heritage*, Graham et al. (2000: 75-95) argue challenges to the Western grand narratives of heritage were driven by diversifying collective identities, and their expression through the increasing creation, consumption, and use of heritage. The Rhodes Must Fall movement is one example of how heritage is used to contest and critique existing collective identities (Knudsen and Andersen 2019). Throughout this book there are multiple examples of how collective identities are constituted and contested through heritage processes. Thing’s chapter on the Sonaha ethnic movement in Nepal is an example of how collective identity and heritage are expressed through collective action. Jones, Riemandha and Salim’s chapter analyses how a social movement’s engagement with heritage can be a

way to creatively explore collective identities. It can equally be a way to consolidate conservative identities and reject change (Harvey 2015).

Recent scholarship demonstrates the role of non-state actors, such as NGOs, in challenging or renegotiating collective identities. For example, Mozaffari's work (2015, and in this volume) shows the role of grassroots heritage societies in challenging the Iranian state identities in relation to the country's pre-Islamic past, which has deeper historical roots than Islam. The Iranian NGOs frame and express wider sentiments within the society in relation to Iran's past with reference to particular characters and sites such as the World Heritage site of Pasargadae and expressed through various forms of media as well as celebrations and performances on sites (also see Jones, Mozaffari, and Jasper 2018; Mozaffari 2016, 2017). In a series of studies, De Cesari (2010a, b) shows that heritage is also mobilized as a form of resistance to produce and maintain a collective identity even in the absence of a state or under the conditions of occupation. In the absence of a state, she argues (2010a: 630), 'NGOs supported by international funding' have taken on the task of preserving a Palestinian past and identity. A significant part of that identity is a response to and rejection of Israeli occupation. The memorial referent for this identity is the 1948 mass exodus of Palestinians from their homes, known as the Nakba, forced by Israeli army. In a specific case, the organization and content of the Palestinian art *biennales* becomes the vehicle for creatively merging folklore, art, and heritage, combining resistance with nation-building in the absence of a state (De Cesari 2010a).

The above examples show the various ways, historical depths, and scales in which collective identities are made and contested, that there are various mediums of expression for identity claims. While we have not gone into a detailed analysis of claim-making, our discussion demonstrates how heritage relates to the group claims over collective identities. Further analysis would look at the scales through which these narratives are constructed,

including the characters constructed and emotions evoked, and the tensions that exist between contested identities.

Patterns of Contention

Considerations of heritage and social movements need to be grounded in both space and time. Patterns of contention shift over time, and this can relate to the sequence of events, as well as the internal politics of the different players involved. The Rhodes Must Fall movement began with and was enlivened by acts of activist vandalism and artistic expression. The statue was covered in various materials more than once, and a performance artist posed with feathers on the empty plinth (Knudsen and Andersen 2019). Other important elements were University of Cape Town meetings, protests, and criticisms of events and attitudes within the social movement. This included an incident of sexual harassment at a Rhodes Must Fall protest, and subsequent critiques and protests at the gender politics and leadership of the movement (Knudsen and Andersen 2019: 245).

The importance of these patterns, shaped both by politics and events external and internal to social movements, are common to many examples of heritage movements. External events of protest and contention enliven movements and engage their members, and internal events can prevent action, or energize participants. As we have discussed elsewhere (Jones, Mozaffari, and Jasper 2018), in the case of the Iranian heritage activists actions over Pasargadae, there was a four month hiatus due to a disagreement between two key leaders following a disagreement over who should consult with officials during a protest at parliament house (Jones, Mozaffari, and Jasper 2018). In our example as in many other social movements, activist strategies change in time and across locations, with due consideration to what is possible and plausible on the ground, and to the members of their movement.

No social movement lasts forever, and only a few last beyond the life of their issue. Maintaining the unity and energy of a social movement requires constant hard work and

energy. The Sonaha groups in Thing's chapter struggle to maintain cohesion over time in the face of the opportunities for different villages to gain access to resources in the National Park. The Indonesian group in Jones, Riomandha, and Salim's chapter was beginning to wind down at the time of the analysis as demonstrated by its declining online activity, and they now rarely undertake trips (while Facebook is still used to share photographs and have discussions). While the method we recommend provides tools to zoom in and analyse key events and moments of contention, analysis also requires the bigger picture of who is winning over time and why, the effects on the internal politics and events of different compound players, and whether claims grow more or less radical in reaction to other players' responses. While an event may be important to an activist movement, its place in and importance to the broader escalating or de-escalating spiral of activity needs to be explained in order to understand its significance.

Discussion and Conclusion

Understanding heritage as a 'cultural process' unavoidably includes activism and contentious politics, which are the province of social movements research. Social movements research demonstrates that collective identity is an open question driven by the contingencies of social interactions. An approach to heritage that cognisant of scholarship in social movements encompasses a good dose of ethnographic methods, but is more than ethnographic fieldwork. This is particularly because a social movements perspective can highlight the dynamics of group decision making and the relationship between internal and external pressures, encompassing activist and other interest groups' formulation and use of heritage. This approach transcends a tendency within heritage studies to divide people and groups into elite and subaltern, and make political assumptions on the basis of structuralist positions (local/national, NGO/private organizations), essentializing collective identity through a structural perspective. We have advocated for a non-essentialist approach that affords

different groups the agency to shape heritage while recognizing their different structural constraints and opportunities. Importantly, from the interactions of players, it is clear that the boundary between the official and unofficial is porous. Heritage movements do not come only ‘from below’ but from many directions.

The concept of players requires a nuanced understanding of the variety of positions and rifts within the state and civil society, the geometries of the public sphere as well as the porous boundary between state and society. We seek to avoid simplistic divisions into stakeholder or interest groups. The details and contingencies of the micropolitics of arenas are worthy of careful analysis as we showed through our discussion of the World Heritage forum. Despite the influence of online broadcasting of sessions that was intended to increase transparency, political expediency bulwarked by the conventions of diplomacy has continued to win the day despite the obvious ridiculousness of some of the claims by World Heritage Committee members. This can be contrasted with the effect of hurling human faeces onto the statue of Rhodes at University of Cape Town. Heritage was crucial to this thinking-feeling processes that energized activists, and conveyed their attitudes and demands to other players, and moved the struggles into University committees, including those across the Atlantic at Oxford University. The strength of a social-movement approach is its attention to the details of social interactions within their broader structural context, right down to the micropolitics of a moment and out to a compound player’s resources and strategic decisions.

Approaching heritage activism in this way draws attention to how resources and power in their various forms (structural forces) influence interactions in place and time, and how strategies and circumstances can overcome deficiencies in resources and political power. Analysis of heritage movements and activism needs to capture the contingencies of different moments, and locate those moments in the entwined process of shaping heritage and players’ pursuit of goals. This chapter, and indeed this book, contribute to what we hope will become

a nuanced and powerful set of tools for analysing the dynamics of contention and interaction, which have been the drivers of the proliferation of heritage. These analytical tools should enable a detailed account the social relations that constitute one of the most important dimensions of the heritage process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research for and production of this chapter was made possible in part thanks to grant awarded by the Australian Research Council (Grant Number DE170100104).to Ali Mozaffari.

NOTES

¹ For a longer account of the approach we are advocating, see Jasper (2014).

² For instance, the website for the National Trust (UK) has a page devoted to her life and legacy (<https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/features/octavia-hill---her-life-and-legacy>, accessed 21 February 2019).

³ For instance, Sukarno famously used his 1930 trial by the Dutch colonial government to make a series of nationalist speeches now called Indonesia accuses (Soekarno 1975).

⁴ For instance, Bowen demonstrates how the term gotong royong that means self-help and facilitated popular participation under Sukarno, became a way of legitimating top-down programs under Suharto (1986).

⁵ We include social media here in that Facebook and Instagram are sites that organize and display images and comments in a specific order. The screen itself shapes the interactions, and people view this in specific, distributed locations.

Bibliography

- Bertacchini, E., C. Liuzza, and L. Meskell. 2015. 'Shifting the Balance of Power in the UNESCO World Heritage Committee: An Empirical Assessment', *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 23(3): 1–21. doi: 10.1080/10286632.2015.1048243.
- Bowen, J.R. 1986. 'On the Political Construction of Tradition: *gotong royong* in Indonesia', *Journal of Asian Studies* XLV (3): 545-561.
- Darley, G. 2016. 'Octavia Hill: Lessons in Campaigning', in E. Baigent and B. Cowell (eds), *Octavia Hill, Social Activism and the Remaking of British Society*. London: School of Advanced Study, University of London, pp. 27–44.
- De Cesari, C. 2010a. 'Creative Heritage: Palestinian Heritage NGOs and Defiant Arts of Government', *American Anthropologist* 112(4): 625–637.
- De Cesari, C. 2010b. 'World Heritage and Mosaic Universalism: A View from Palestine', *Journal of Social Archaeology* 10(3): 299–324.
- De Cesari, C., and M. Herzfeld. 2015. 'Urban Heritage and Social Movements', in L. Meskell (ed.), *Global Heritage: A Reader*. Chichester, U.K.: Wiley Blackwell, pp. 171–95.
- De Landa, M. 2006. *A New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity*. London and New York: Continuum.
- Deleuze, G., and F. Guattari. 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. B. Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- De Nardi, S. 2018. 'Everyday Heritage Activism in Swat Valley: Ethnographic Reflections on a Politics of Hope', *Heritage & Society* 1–22. doi: 10.1080/2159032X.2018.1556831.
- Gerbaudo, P., and E. Treré. 2015. 'In Search of the "We" of Social Media Activism: Introduction to the Special Issue on Social Media and Protest Identities', *Information, Communication & Society* 18(8): 865–871. doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2015.1043319.
- Goodrich, A., and P. Bombardella. 2016. 'What are Statues Good for? Winning the Battle or Losing the Battleground?', *Koers* 81(3): 1–10. doi: 10.19108/KOERS.81.3.2212.
- Graham, B., G. Ashworth, and J. Tunbridge. 2000. *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Gregory, J. 2014. 'Connecting with the Past Through Social Media: The "Beautiful Buildings and Cool Places Perth Has Lost" Facebook group', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21(1): 22–45. doi: 10.1080/13527258.2014.884015.

- Hall, M. 2016. 'Octavia Hill and the National Trust', in E. Baigent and B. Cowell (eds), *Octavia Hill, Social Activism and the Remaking of British Society*. School of Advanced Study, University of London, pp. 209–240.
- Harrison, R. 2013. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. Oxon: Routledge.
- . 2015. 'Heritage and Globalization', in E. Waterton and S. Watson (eds), *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 297–312.
- Harvey, D. 2015. 'Heritage and Scale: Settings, Boundaries and Relations', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21(6): 577–93. doi:10.1080/13527258.2014.955812.
- Herzfeld, M. 2015. 'Heritage and the Right to the City: When Securing the Past Creates Insecurity in the Present', *Heritage & Society* 8(1): 3–23. doi: 10.1179/2159032X15Z.00000000035.
- Hewison, R. 1987. *The Heritage Industry: Britain in a Climate of Decline*. London: Methuen.
- Ingold, T. 2011. *Being Alive: Essays on Movement, Knowledge and Description*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Jasper, J.M. 1998. 'The Emotions of Protest: Affective and Reactive Emotions in and around Social Movements', *Sociological Forum* 13(3): 397–424. doi: 10.2307/684696.
- . 2014. *Protest: A Cultural Introduction to Social Movements*. United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons.
- . 2015. 'Introduction. Playing the game', in J.M. Jasper and J.W. Duyvendak (eds), *Players and Arenas. The Interactive Dynamics of Protest*.
- Jasper, J.M., and J.W. Duyvendak (eds). 2015. *Players and Arenas. The Interactive Dynamics of Protest*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Jones, T. 2013. *Culture, Power, and Authoritarianism in the Indonesian State: Cultural Policy across the Twentieth Century to the Reform Era*. Leiden: BRILL.
- 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): 242–260. DOI:10.1080/13527258.2015.1120226.
- Jones, T., Mozaffari, A. and Jasper, J.M., 2017. Heritage Contests: What Can We Learn from Social Movements?. *Heritage & Society*, 10(1), pp.1-25.
- Joyce, P., and T. Bennett. 2010. 'Material Powers Introduction', in T. Bennet and P. Joyce (eds), *Material Powers. Cultural Studies, History and the Material Turn*. Oxon and New York: Routledge, pp. 1–21.

- Klandermans, B., and C.M. Roggeband (eds). 2007. *The Handbook of Social Movements Across Disciplines*. New York: Springer.
- Klapp, O.E. 1969. *Collective Search for Identity*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Knudsen, B.T, and C. Andersen. 2019. 'Affective Politics and Colonial Heritage, Rhodes Must Fall at UCT and Oxford', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 25(3): 239–258. doi: 10.1080/13527258.2018.1481134.
- Kriesi, H., R. Koopmans, J.W. Duyvendak and M.G. Giugni. 1995. *New Social Movements in Western Europe: A Comparative Analysis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Latour, B. 2004. *Politics of Nature: How to Bring the Sciences into Democracy*, trans. C. Porter. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- . 2005. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McAdam, D. 1995. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930–1970*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McCarthy, J., and M.N. Zald. 1977. 'Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory', *American Journal of Sociology* 82(6): 1212–41.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2777934>.
- McGregor, K.E. 2003. 'Representing the Indonesian Past: The National Monument History Museum from Guided Democracy to the New Order', *Indonesia* 75(1): 91–122.
- Meskel, L. 2014. 'States of Conservation: Protection, Politics, and pacting within UNESCO's World Heritage Committee', *Anthropological Quarterly* 87 (1): 217–243. doi: 10.1353/anq.2014.0009.
- . 2015. 'Transacting UNESCO World Heritage: Gifts and Exchanges on a Global Stage', *Social Anthropology* 23(1): 3–21. DOI: 10.1111/1469-8676.12100.
- Meskel, L., and C. Brumann. 2015. 'UNESCO and New World Orders', in L. Meskel (ed.), *Global Heritage: A Reader*. Chichester, U.K.: Wiley Blackwell, pp. 22–42.
- Meskel, L., C. Liuzza, E. Bertacchini, and D. Saccone. 2014. 'Multilateralism and UNESCO World Heritage: decision-making, States Parties and political processes', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*: 21(21): 423–440. doi: 10.1080/13527258.2014.945614.
- Message, K. 2015. 'Contentious Politics and Museums as Contact Zones', in A. Witcomb and K. Message (eds), *The International Handbooks of Museum Studies*. Chichester, U.K.: Wiley Blackwell, pp. 253–82.

- Mozaffari, A. 2014. *Forming National Identity in Iran: The Idea of Homeland Derived from Ancient Persian and Islamic Imaginations of Place*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- . 2015. ‘The Heritage “NGO”’: A Case Study on the Role of Grass Roots Heritage Societies in Iran and Their Perception of Cultural Heritage’, *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21(9): 1–19. doi:10.1080/13527258.2015.1028961.
- . 2016. ‘Open Letter to the President Elect: An Example of Heritage Activism through the Media in Iran’, in T. Kerr and J. Stephens (eds), *Indian Ocean Futures: Communities, Sustainability and Security*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 15–33.
- . 2017. ‘Picturing Pasargadae: Visual Representation and the Ambiguities of Heritage in Iran’, *Iranian Studies* 50(4): 601–634.
- Polletta, F. 2006. *It was like a fever*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Reddy, W.M. 2001. *The navigation of feeling: A framework for the history of emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rio, K.M., and E. Hviding. 2011. ‘Introduction: Pacific Made: Social Movements between Cultural Heritage and the State’, in K. M. Rio and E. Hviding (eds), *Made in Oceania: Social Movements, Cultural Heritage and the State in the Pacific*. Wantage: Sean Kingston Publishing, pp. 5–30.
- Robertson, I.J.M. (ed.). 2012a. *Heritage from Below, Heritage, Culture and Identity*. Farnham, Surrey, England: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- . 2012b. ‘Introduction: Heritage from Below’, *Heritage from Below*. Farnham, Surrey, England: Ashgate Publishing Ltd, pp. 1–27.
- . 2015. ‘Hardscrabble Heritage: The Ruined Blackhouse and Crofting Landscape as Heritage from below’, *Landscape Research* 40(8): 993–1009. doi:10.1080/01426397.2015.1074986.
- Samuel, R. 1994. *Theatres of Memory: Past and Present in Contemporary Culture*. London; New York: Verso.
- Sayer, A. 2007. ‘Class, Moral Worth and Recognition’, in T. Lovell (ed.), *(Mis)recognition, Social Inequality and Social Justice: Nancy Fraser and Pierre Bourdieu*. London: Routledge, pp. 88–102.
- Silverman, H. (ed.). 2011. *Contested Cultural Heritage: Religion, Nationalism, Erasure, and Exclusion in a Global World*. New York: Springer.
- Smith, L. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Smith, L., and G. Campbell. 2015. 'The Elephant in the Room: Heritage, Affect, and Emotion', in W. Logan, M.N. Craith and U. Kockel, *A Companion to Heritage Studies*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, pp. 443–460.
- Soekarno. 1975. *Indonesia Accuses! Soekarno's Defence Oration in the Political Trial of 1930*, trans R.K. Paget. Kuala Lumpur, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tunbridge, J.E., and G.J. Ashworth. 1996. *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. Chichester and New York: J. Wiley.
- Waitt, G., E. Ryan and C. Farbotko. 2014. 'A Visceral Politics of Sound', *Antipode* 46(1): 283–300. doi: 10.1111/anti.12032.
- Woods, M., J. Anderson, S. Guilbert and S. Watkin. 2012. "'The Country(side) is Angry": Emotion and Explanation in Protest Mobilization', *Social and Cultural Geography* 13(6): 567–585. doi: 10.1080/14649365.2012.704643.
- Wright, P. 1985. *On Living in an Old Country: The National Past in Contemporary Britain*. London: Verso.