

# Landscape and heritage interplay: Spatial and temporal explorations

**Mario Katić**

University of Zadar, makatic@unizd.hr

**Nataša Gregorič Bon**

Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, ngregoric@zrc-sazu

**John Eade**

University of Roehampton, J.Eade@roehampton.ac.uk

Over the past few decades, landscape and heritage are topics that have been widely discussed in social sciences and humanities alike (Del Mármol, Morell & Chalcraft 2014; Harvey & Waterton 2015; Brumann & Berliner 2016). This is also true of anthropology, where both the topics, whether together or separately, have been approached from a variety of ethnographic contexts and theoretical stances (Herzfeld 1991, 2009, 2016; Brumann & Berliner 2016; Macdonald 2009, 2015). One example is provided by Michael Herzfeld's early work which subtly dealt with the meanings of history, heritage and landscape in a Cretan town in Greece.<sup>1</sup> He vividly describes in *A Place in History* (1991), for example, the outcomes of when bureaucracy set on 'historic conservation meets with the local population' in Rethemnos, whose inhabitants are suspicious towards the state's monumentalisation of 'their' past and resistant to the official heritagisation of the built landscape (Herzfeld 1991).

What happens when official heritage-making rhetoric meets the local population and their intimate remembrances of the layered past embedded in the landscape where they live? Chapters gathered in this special issue each in their own way explain how these intimate remembering, local memories, present experiences and future becomings of the material or immaterial past can never be fully contained by the administrative, normative and official understandings of history. However, as the ethnographic material amply illustrates, they are all, with the passage of time, rubbed against with the dominant discourse of protection and preservation of what is now commonly recognized as "cultural heritage". What, we should ask, is heritage and how is it built, reshaped, or even destroyed? In what ways are its role and meaning often permeated with local structures (such as kinship, custom or tradition) reshaping the landscapes?

This special issue offers a set of nuanced conceptualizations and explanations into what happens when the official and administrative conceptualizations of the historical and monumental past meet with the local histories, intimate remembrances and landmarks of

---

<sup>1</sup> In his latter work in Italy (Rome), and Thailand (Bangkok) he pertains to this topic by shedding the light on the global in the heart of the local.

life. As the chapters clearly show, such meetings often disclose multiple entanglements between what is understood and ascribed by administration and what is lived, embodied and emplaced in actual peoples' lives and their landscape. Moreover, in uncovering and analysing such deep entanglements in particular geographical and sociocultural settings such as Asia (India, China and Japan) and Europe (France and Poland), the chapters in this issue explain how the landscape and heritage are in continuous interplay both forming and reconstituting each other (Harvey 2015). However, this does not bind them solely to processual nature lacking in structural nodes and fixity. Their transfiguration still manages to keep something that stays the same or at least similar. This could be kinship structure (Herzfeld 1991), the religious and spiritual entanglements with a particular landscape (Niedźwiedź, Chapter 3) or claims of appropriation (Bloch, Chapter 1).

Drawing on from different theoretical standpoints and disciplinary approaches (anthropology, cultural studies, human geography and sociology) the chapters gathered in this special issue, each in their own way, focus on two interrelated issues. One of them specifically concerns a deep interplay between landscape and heritage whereas the other shows how in this interplay landscape emplaces as well as generates various temporalities whereas heritage encapsulates and evolves spatiality.

## **Landscape and temporality**

This special issue will take you on a reading walk through different landscapes – ranging from the expansive bright-green rice paddies of Hirado, Japan; through the placid silence of the Chinese-Japanese Friendship Garden in China; to the bustling marketplace, full of tourists and vendors, where narrow streets and houses still mourn their dwellers, now evicted Hampi residents in India; to the glorious, awe-inspiring vastness of Łagiewniki shrines; through the Mediterranean bushes, green hills and vast gorges of the historical Cathar trail in France. In this detour, the chapters disclose different human, non-human, affective, material and temporal layers that configure landscapes in different geographical locations across Europe and Asia. This configuration is brought to a closer view in moments of national, transnational, religious evocation of a particular past brought out to promulgate a single history in order to reaffirm the structures of power. But when something is brought out or evoked in order to generate a single history line, something else is pushed behind, covered, evicted or exiled. What happens in such moments of constructing a formal or “official” history-line that is usually rewritten and promoted by the agents of power – religious (Niedźwiedź, Chapter 3), international and national (Bloch, Chapter 1; Bofulin, Chapter 2; Delakorda-Kawashima Chapter 4), and economic institutions (Menzel, Chapter 5)? And what happens to the intimate pasts, collective memories and remembrings that have been left behind or were suppressed? As most of the chapters illustrate and explain, these various dimensions of the pasts are not evicted and erased but “just” set aside or covered up. The articles of this special issue show how in particular historical moments these various voices of the pasts have the capacity to evoke affects and silently reconfigure a particular landscape. But before we develop this more in detail let us pause on the long anthropological discussion of the concept of landscape that is at the heart of this special issue.

The anthropological take on the landscape comprises a wide array of research which dates back to 1980 (Bender 1996). Since then, landscape has no longer been conceptualized as a passive background but as an active foreground that is created by and creative of life-worlds (Bender 1993, 1996: 323; Tilley 1994: 233). This conceptualisation has paved a broad spectrum of theoretical and methodological approaches which can be coarsely divided into four different interrelated approaches. One is representational (Cosgrove & Daniels 1988); another is archaeological and geographical (Olwig 1996, 2002; Jones & Olwig 2008; Bender 1996); the third is experiential and phenomenological (Ingold 1993, 2000; Tilley 1994; Hirsch & O’Hanlon 1995; Basso 1996; Árnason, Ellison, Vergunst & Whitehouse 2012; Telban 2016) and the fourth ontological and environmental (Descola 2016; Tsing 2017; Virtanen, Lundell, Honkasalo 2017).

The representational approach derives from the naturalistic conceptualisation of landscape which defines it as a ‘neutral backdrop to activity’ (Tilley 1994: 23), a pictorial and aesthetic way of representing and structuring the surroundings (Daniels & Cosgrove 1988). This approach which puts forth the physical conception of the environment that results from human labour (Descola 2016) is mainly grounded in the studies of history and archaeology.

The second, phenomenological approach has paved an important intellectual path in anthropology that focuses on experiential, emotional and cognitive dimensions of landscape that are continuously reproduced by people who travel through or dwell there. Landscape is bound to human activity and other non-human agents, all of which constitute the landscape-in-the-making. This processual understanding of landscape sets its meaning between the physical environment and the setting that is inhabited by people who make sense of the landscape and make it meaningful. The phenomenological landscape is thus the foreground of everyday experience as well the background for potential social existence (Hirsch & O’Hanlon 1995: 22).

The third approach, which is derivative of human geography, archaeology and partly anthropology, tends to uphold the representational and distant, pictorial conceptualizations of the landscape and personal existential experience of it. The geographer, Kenneth R. Olwig, for example, defines landscape as a bounded territory shaped by political practices (Bender 1993; Olwig 1996, 2002). The English term ‘landscape’ originates from Germanic *Landschaf*en or Nordic *Landskap* that refer to ‘the physical manifestation’ of a particular place as an extension of common laws that define the polity landscape (Olwig 2002: 9). Similarly, the meaning of landscape in Romanic languages, *territoire*, *pays* or *domain*, etymologically correspond to the larger political space of those in power (Olwig 2002).

The last, ontological approach to landscape reflects the work of Philippe Descola (2016) and Anna L. Tsing (2017). While Descola conceptualizes landscape as a transfiguration, evolving material mediations *in situ* and sensory-aesthetic realms *in visu* (ibid.; Virtanen, Lundell & Honkasalo 2017); Tsing (2017) defines it as a “gather-in-the-making”. Both scholars ground their theories on the multiple entanglements between human, non-human and material realities which configure different but interrelated scales of landscape encapsulating the past, present and what is yet to come. This approach does not view the landscape solely as a surface, human experience or political territory but enmeshes all these realms into a wider spatio-temporal dimension.

Although most of the chapters presented in *Landscape and Heritage* do not explicitly discuss the landscapes in their respective geographical locations, they all implicitly address them in relation to heritage-making. However, this does not turn landscapes into passive representations upon which the heritage “drama” takes place. The landscapes discussed here constitute the “background of” as well as the “medium for” human, non-human and material dwellings and their agencies. They are laden with past histories, individual and collective memories, present rememberings, experiences and future becomings. They have power to evoke various effects and affects that reconfigure them in time. Moreover, landscapes not only encapsulate the “surface” of a particular land but also embrace what lies above, below, beyond, and besides their surface. Landscapes, however, entail various spatial and temporal scales and are as such important part of world-making practices.

Most of the chapters discuss how people in various geographical landscapes talk about them, experience them, manage and fashion them with memories and affective energies in such a way that these landscapes fashion people too. The various ways of these “fashionings” in turn leave concrete, material traces which, due to the present-day legal (local and global) discourses, constitute part of the heritage-making system that often produces the so-called monumental landscapes. The latter, as most of the chapters reveal, are an outcome of global, national, neo-liberal, political interests eroded, carved and monumentalized by administrative and legal norms that have a tendency to transform them into a means of commodity consumption (Brimann & Berliner 2016).

The articles presented here illustrate how, in a particular landscape, administrative, political, national, transnational policies seek to manage space and time by coordinating them within a single historical line and spatial scale. This attempt triggers tensions and contestations on the local, national and international levels alike. Natalia Bloch, in her article about the monumentalization of the Hampi medieval bazaar and the Virupaksha temple in India, describes how the local residents never fully enact the structures of power but develop a series of tactics through which they negotiate and manage these structures. She interestingly explains what happens when the dominant policy transforms the present settlement of Hampi into past heritage through the local population’s eviction from the city center. It appears that through this eviction and its “beautification” for commercial and economic purposes, Hampi’s landscape evokes among the former residents both sadness and sorrow, which has consequences for their future and hope (or lack thereof).

A different situation is described by Ariadne Menzel’s article about the hikers’ and tourist experience of the historical Cathar trail in southern France. With the trail’s inclusion on the list of world heritage sites, the route and hilly landscape become redefined and assigned to a single historical line in order to serve the tourist, commercial and wider national agenda. Like Bloch, Menzel shows how the hikers or tourists resist the dominant heritage agenda inscribed in the tourist guides, various promotional material and historical accounts, and pursue their own intimate experience of the Cathar trail, the hilly landscape and scenic views. It seems that despite the powerful historical narrative that strives to fit the trail into the monumental topography of world cultural heritage, the trail somehow still “manages” to dwell in the present, remaining open to the yet-to-come.

## Affective landscapes

In this section we want to discuss aspects of landscape and heritage-making which have been repeatedly addressed by the majority of articles in this special issue but not explicitly elaborated upon due to their prime focus on heritage-making.

One of the issues explored by Martina Bofulin and Anna Niedźwiedź, and to a lesser extent by Natalia Bloch and Tinka Delakorda-Kawashima, concerns the affective energies discharged through local landscapes. Hence, Martina Bofulin opens her chapter with the demolition of the memorial wall inside the Chinese-Japanese Friendship Garden in the north-eastern Chinese county of Fangzheng. This event evoked several contestations that escalated into a public outrage of international proportions. The outrage was hushed up and the silence and peace, which the author describes when she enters the Chino-Japanese Garden in 2014, was restored. Yet, this pervasive calm and stillness is palpable solely within the fenced pine grove garden of friendship, where the dead souls of Japanese colonial settlers rest in peace. Outside the garden, which is locked by gates adorned with golden characters, is the domain of heated contestations between national and international policy makers. It seems that the act of reconciliation resides only within the fence of the friendship garden where different dimensions of the past can rest peacefully under the pine trees. However, due to the national assignment of a single past as official history, the various pasts resonating inside the garden have become dissonant outside it.

It might be useful to evoke here Yael Navaro-Yashin's notion of 'affective geographies' which she used in the context of Northern Cyprus where many ruins exude melancholic affects (2009: 14; 2012). Drawing on Deleuze's conceptualization of affect, Navaro-Yashin explains that melancholy is both external, embroiled in the landscape, and internal, i.e. embodied in subjectivities (ibid.). To return to the friendship garden in China, it seems that neither the tranquillity of the pine grove garden nor the author, who is surrounded by it, are affective on their own; both, through their interplay, produce and transmit the quietness lingering inside the garden.

The sense of peace is also expressed by Anna Niedźwiedź's interlocutors, who are visitors and pilgrims at the Łagiewniki religious site in the suburbs of Kraków, southern Poland. Despite the fact that, as Niedźwiedź clarifies, this immense religious complex, which stretches over dozens of hectares, is a relatively new addition to Kraków's religious infrastructure, it has already gained considerable attention. Although most of her interlocutors dislike the colossal, "modern style" construction of the Divine Mercy shrine, they do find a "divine" peace and "sacred" atmosphere there, which is both inviting and redemptive. Niedźwiedź further explains that the worshippers see this immense religious complex, consisting of two shrines, one of which boasts a 77-meter-high tower attached to it, a 19<sup>th</sup> century brick convent with a chapel, an open air altar, a hotel for pilgrims, cafes, bookstores and boarding school, as charged with sacred power and a "huge amount of energy". Several worshippers often associate this divine "energy" with the site's two holy figures. One of them is the late local nun, Faustina Kowalska, who is said to have had visionary encounters with Christ and was recognized as a saint by Pope John Paul II. The second figure is John Paul II himself, who during the Nazi occupation of Poland used to

walk through the Łagiewniki area to his daily work and stopped at the Łagiewniki chapel to pray. These two holy figures, along with the shrines and churches, have generated a sacred topography, which is charged with a “divine” and peaceful “atmosphere” that attracts the worshippers and pilgrims, who enjoy the ambience and “recharge the batteries” as one of the worshippers explained. This “spiritual dimension”, discharged in the Łagiewniki landscape, “cannot fully be described with words” as several worshippers explain. Here let us turn back to Navaro-Yashin and her reading of affect through the work of Guattari, who defines it as pre- or extra-linguistic. He sees affect as ‘hazy and atmospheric’ (Guattari 1996: 158) – a non-discursive sensation generated by space or environment. The religious topography of Łagiewniki shrines and the worshipper’s relation to it produce and transmit divine and sacred “energy” that generates Łagiewniki’s holy landscape. Holiness and divinity do not pertain solely to the worshipper’s subjectivity but are also emplaced in the landscape or wider environment. It seems that the worshippers, along with the sacred topography, generate a locus of and for affective transmission.

An exploration of landscape’s immanent features and aura has also been developed in recent studies of pilgrimage elsewhere. For example, in her study of pilgrimage walks to the sites of small ancient chapels scattered across the Isle of Man off the British mainland coast, Avril Maddrell argues that ‘the pilgrim encounters the landscape visually and materially, engaging with it kinetically, sensually and imaginatively, both seeing and becoming part of the picture, literally and metaphorically marking and being marked’ (Maddrell 2011: 17).

The urban landscape of Hampi, once the capital of the Hindu Vijayanagara Empire in southern India, is loaded with a different affective charge. After 1986, when Hampi was added to the World Heritage list of protected areas, it became the focus of several interventions that have generated numerous discords and contestations at local, national and international levels. In 2011 these political, administrative, archaeological and tourist interventions in the urban architecture and local life led to the eviction of the Hampi residents as we have already noted. Bloch interestingly describes how this eviction and the evocation of the medieval past pushed Hampi’s present into a medieval past. The city center became monumentalised and frozen into a “global heritage site”. This “spatial cleaning” led to what Bloch describes as a “taxonomic panic”, drawing on Herzfeld’s concept, which was revealed through the feelings of fear and sorrow displayed by the Hampi residents. According to Bloch, ‘the changing of the landscape of Hampi was filled with affection’, which suddenly “pushed” the residents into a feeling of sadness and hopelessness about the future. As she concludes, the local authorities along with the transnational heritage policy makers plan to evict the rest of the population from Hampi and “freeze” the city into an archaeological past.

This “geography of affects”, to use Navaro-Yashin’s term, leads us to the next geographical location – Hirado in Japan. As Tinka Delakorda-Kawashima notes, Hirado was recently (in 2007) designated as one of Japan’s “important cultural landscapes” where national and transnational authorities seek to “disclose” the secret nature of the religious landscape settled by the Hidden Christians, and carve it into a visible monumental landscape. This conversion from invisible and intangible to visible and tangible provoked silent

disagreement among the Hidden Christians. Delakorda-Kawashima describes how Hidden Christian practices, which were strictly prohibited from the Tokugawa period up to 1873, became secretly emplaced in their landscape and embroiled in their daily practices. The feeling of secrecy pervades the whole Hidden Christian environment, which could be said to consist of multiple entanglements between the living and the dead and their material and spiritual worlds. More than the “affective geography”, Delakorda-Kawashima’s article discloses how the hidden and enclosed realms of the Hirado landscape and its residents persistently and silently refuse their disclosure.

This adventurous walk through so-called “affective geographies” (Navaro Yashin 2012) takes us through many transmissions of the meanings of landscape that continuously oscillate from the subjective to the objective and back again. The meaning of landscape, however, is never reduced only to the aesthetic view and its representation, or an intimate experience of hikers, tourist, local people etc., nor does it get interpreted solely through the historical and political imposition of power marking its territory. As all the articles in this special issue demonstrate, landscapes are embroiled with human, non-human, spiritual, affective and material dimensions and, as such, constitute an important dimension to worldmaking practices (cf. Petrović-Šteger 2009).

## **Heritage, contestation and tourism**

Can there be another “thing” in this world that evokes more emotions, senses and affects than heritage? From personal, group to national levels heritage is always a sensorial stimulus, a symbol of the community, a reason for conflict and an attraction that draws people. As already mentioned, all the papers in this special issue are heavily involved in heritage-making questions and cover almost all the possible scenarios.

We have Hampi in India that is on UNESCO list and confronts the most “classic” problem shared by almost all the sites on the list: by being on the list, Hampi draws a massive number of people whose presence contributes to the city’s economic development, but inevitably changes the city and, at least from institutional point of view, threatens those parts of the city that made it a part of the UNESCO world. In the Japanese landscape in Hirado we have another member of the UNESCO list – the Churches and Christian Sites in Nagasaki, which also displays the process of heritage-making through its attempt to include the Hidden Christians’ religious traditions in UNESCO’s list of intangible cultural heritage. Here we see an additional twist to the story: the intangibility of the Hidden Christians is being represented through their “cultural landscape”, i.e. their interaction with the environment. As a result, cultivating rice fields, using water, cutting trees and everyday life becomes just as important as the performance of their religious practices.

In the Chinese case we have another “classic” case – difficult/dissonant heritage. In the Chinese-Japanese Friendship Garden we can observe what happens when heritage is not something to be “proud of” and when powerful interests do not want to preserve it and have it represented on some official list. In the European city of Krakow we encounter quite the opposite situation. Two religious heritage sites have been created based around new Roman Catholic saints: Sr. Faustina and Pope John Paul II. The agenda of those promoting these sites is to attract pilgrims as many as possible and root them within the city’s past

and the “old” heritage sites, which are also on the UNESCO list. In the other European case study, the official heritage Cathar Trail is framed around the “invented” tradition of Cathar castles, which does not actually fulfill the main intention of its promoters – attracting tourists. Of course, a significant number of people visit the Cathar Trail, but, according to Ariadne Menzel, they are not there because of cultural heritage and cultural landscape, but for the natural landscape.

## **Discussion**

What can we learn of more general import from these diverse case studies and, in some instances, the very different processes, landscape scenarios and heritage relations they reveal? What they all have in common is the process of heritage making, conflict and contestation around heritage issues on different levels, and tourism as a starting and/or ending point in the discussion. Yet, what exactly is heritage? How does the process of heritage making function and how does contestation and tourism enter onto the stage?

All societies have almost always had a relationship with their past, so it is normal that individuals and societies develop their own definitions of heritage and that these change over time (Kaminski, Benson & Arnold 2014: 5). UNESCO, as the most famous global organization for “creating” and protecting the heritage, has broadly defined heritage as something which we inherit from the past and can be passed on to future generations. On the other hand, experts, who deal with heritage, such as Laurajane Smith, argue that there is no such thing as unmediated heritage (2006: 11). She proceeds to explain that the construction of heritage is dominated by a hegemonic discourse which:

validates a set of practices and performances, which populates both popular and expert constructions of “heritage” and undermines alternative and subaltern ideas about “heritage”. At the same time, the ‘work’ that ‘heritage’ ‘does’ as a social and cultural practice is obscured, as a result of the naturalizing effects of what I call the ‘authorized heritage discourse’ (2006: 11).

Emma Waterton and Laurajane Smith locate the origins of this discourse within nineteenth century Western Europe. Here heritage was defined as positive “stuff” from the past that current generations must care for, protect and pass on to future generations (2009: 12). In this context heritage has educational qualities but also the ability to forge a sense of common identity (2009: 13) – heritage was about the construction of a range of identities (2009: 14).

This framing of heritage takes its cue from the grand narratives about the nation; it privileges monumentality, materiality, scientific judgment, social consensus and nation building (Smith 2006:11). Because it is influenced by elite values and experiences, it excludes those understandings of heritage that are outside of it (Waterton & Smith 2009: 15). It is also a professional discourse that privileges expert values and knowledge (Smith 2006: 4). Yet, heritage is always subject to negotiations:

Heritage becomes not so much the thing or place identified by the AHD [authorized heritage discourse] as ‘heritage’, but instead the values and



meanings that are constructed at and around them – heritage is what is done and not what is conserved, preserved or managed. (Waterton & Smith 2009: 15)

Alongside professional and elite discourses, there is also a range of popular discourses and practices that can challenge these dominant discourses (Smith 2006: 4). Heritage can be seen as ‘living’ and a tool for ‘sustainable’ development – a scenario where diverse communities are actively involved in heritage making and transmission (Adell et al. 2015: 8). Hence, the key actors in heritage making should no longer be scientists but communities, playing a key role in the process of recognizing something as ‘heritage’ and safeguarding it (Adell et al. 2015: 10).

By framing something as heritage we give it an authority to represent values that we associate with ‘identity’, ‘belonging’ and ‘sense of place’ (Waterton & Smith 2009: 16):

At one level heritage is about the promotion of a consensus version of history by state sanctioned cultural institutions and elites to regulate cultural and social tensions in the present. On the other hand, heritage may also be a resource that is used to challenge and redefine received values and identities by a range of subaltern groups. Heritage is not necessarily about the stasis of cultural values and meanings, but may equally be about cultural change. It may, for instance, be about reworking the meanings of the past as the cultural, social and political needs of the present change and develop, or it may be about challenging the ways in which groups and communities are perceived and classified by others. Heritage is about negotiation – about using the past, and collective or individual memories, to negotiate new ways of being and expressing identity. (Smith 2006: 4)

Heritage can also be dissonant and contested (Smith 2006: 3; Gonzales-Ruibal & Hall 2015). The concept of contested cultural heritage has been present for at least 30 years (see for example Herzfeld 1982; Bruner 1983). Alfredo Gonzales-Ruibal and Martin Hall draw a general distinction between contested heritage as a direct outcome of violence, and heritage that existed before the conflict but was changed forever because of that conflict (2015). According to Silverman, contested heritage is a result of the:

world where religious, ethnic, national, political, and other groups manipulate (appropriate, use, misuse, exclude, erase) markers and manifestations of their own and others’ cultural heritage as a means for asserting, defending, or denying critical claims to power, land, legitimacy, and so forth. (Silverman 2011: 1)

Silverman concludes that the contestation of heritage is inevitable because heritage is intimately associated with identity on all possible levels (ibid.: 10), and it is also inherently political and open to manipulation (ibid.: 24.). Even the claims to analytical detachment that experts may use is, according to Gonzales-Ruibal and Hall, never justified since they are always invariably implicated in the context in which they work (2015).

More issues of contested heritage were generated by the global growth of tourism that involved the marketing of major sites by their national and international promoters

(Silverman 2011: 10). World Heritage Sites on the UNESCO list are more attractive to tourists than other sites, so countries and communities have vigorously competed to get sites included on the list (*ibid.*: 22). The expansion of the number of World Heritage Sites has coincided with the growth of global tourism (Salazar & Zhu 2015: 246). Both private and public sectors are converting heritage resources into destinations and attractions that bring billions every year and employ millions of people (*ibid.*: 240). An estimated one-third of all international tourism is related to cultural heritage sites, while their interface is extremely complex and, in the tourism setting, heritage can be (mis)used in a variety of ways for different purposes (*ibid.*: 240). Heritage, designed and objectified according to political and economic agendas, can lead to conflict between various interest groups (*ibid.*: 243). Discussions about the relationship between heritage and tourism can also lead to the central issue of authenticity. Tourists are believed to look for “authentic” heritage, which can have different meanings for different people and be in conflict with expert and professional understandings (*ibid.*: 244).

There is one more process that started in late 1980s and connects heritage and tourism but also landscape – heritage/tourist routes. The idea was to link cultural heritage sites through larger routes and one of the first routes was the UNESCO Silk Roads Project that presented trade and cultural exchange between East and West. A similar initiative was the Iron Roads in Africa project, which followed the heritage of ironworking across the continent. Cultural heritage routes have also been promoted in Europe, starting with the Santiago de Compostela Pilgrim Route in 1987 (Bangstand 2011: 282). These routes represent a different approach to cultural heritage, since wider contexts and entire landscapes are considered and the emphasis is on movement, networks, migration, etc. (*ibid.*: 284). These cultural heritage routes provide a broader and more exhaustive account of cultural change (*ibid.*: 285).

So to refer once more to the question posed at the beginning of this introduction: what happens when the official rhetoric about heritage-making meets the local population and their intimate remembrances of the past, which are layered in their landscape where they dwell?

Reading from these different case studies with different scenarios, the simplest answer would be: it all depends on the geographical, geopolitical and cultural context. Thus, despite the push for a single history, this history can never be fully detached from its particular spatiality and temporality. For this reason, the same official rhetoric, state policies and strategies can produce very different responses “on the ground”, which may also be displayed in the landscape of the location (Bofulin 2015: 84). These case studies show that heritage-making and its material remnants in landscape or materialization in the landscape is always a two way street that could be simplified into top-down and bottom-up perspectives. Yet, since things are always messy, this simplification is just an analytical framework. Nevertheless, from Japan to Poland we have from one side a variety of imagined and designed tangible and intangible heritages that aim to promote a specific grand narratives but also develop economic perspective of the broader region, while on the other hand we have heritage in practice, living heritage that does not always or never correspond with imagined heritage. Even in the case of commemorating the dead Japanese in China where

heritage-making was initially a grassroots process, official institutions became dominant and through political and economic practices they “created” contested heritage.

Although contemporary heritage experts signify a community as the main subject, reading these case studies we can legitimately ask whether this is the case in practice? We could also return to an old anthropological question: what is community and who represents the community? Although these two different perspectives are obvious, it is important to stress that the top down perspective could involve institutional, political and religious elites, but they could also be different scientific experts and tourist agents whose ideas confront those of people living the heritage. On the other hand, looking at the bottom up perspective, we have to be aware of its diversity: it includes pilgrims in Poland who enjoy the scenery but also pray for different personal reasons; tourists who just want to walk along the Cathar trail and enjoy the natural surroundings without too much waste of time looking at cultural heritage; Japanese veterans and descendants of war orphans who want to visit the graves of their friends and family; hidden Christians who want to stay “hidden”; and Hampi entrepreneurs who nostalgically remember times when Hampi was not a UNESCO heritage site but only a pilgrimage destination.

Through heritage making landscapes are being dramatically transformed as we can see in the Krakow case and its new religious geography. At Hampi this transformation involved local residents being erased from the center and segregated and pushed behind, while the landscape is reduced to built heritage. Controversies over emplaced heritage can force people and groups to take sides whether they wanted to or not as the Chinese-Japanese Friendship Garden shows. We can also detect a new trend in heritage-making that connects intangible and tangible heritage mostly through different designed tourist/heritage trails that are presented through cultural landscapes, as we see in the Hidden Christians case study.

Heritage and landscape do not move as parallel lines, but are constantly folded into each other: no linearity and no stability. There is depth of time, but no convenient or uncluttered isolation of the self in the here and now. (Harvey 2015: 921)

At both Krakow and Hampi the shaping and experience of landscape and heritage are bound up with religious and spiritual forms of pilgrimage, while the visits to the memorial garden at Fanzhang by the Japanese descendants of those, who lived there during Japanese occupation, could be usefully interpreted in terms of the relationship between tourism and pilgrimage (see Eade & Katić 2017). This raises the wider question of the role played by religious and spiritual beliefs and practices in heritage making and people’s emotional engagement with landscape over time. If we use this wider lens, we can also bring the issue of religious contestation into the equation since the heritage and landscape in the Cathar case study are mediated through official narratives which seek to link contemporary tourism and hiking to past struggles between the Cathars and local political and religious elites. Furthermore, the relationship between landscape and heritage in the Japanese Hidden Christian case study cannot be understood fully without taking into consideration their historical experience of persecution.

The contributions to this special issue remind us, therefore, of the continuing relevance of religious and spiritual beliefs and practices in the secular politics of heritage making. The spaces people are moving through are shaped by rememberings of past struggles so that including particular places on a secular UNESCO list, for example, raises a variety of questions about who lives where, who is represented by whom and for what purposes (cultural, economic, political) and their relationship to local, national and transnational structures and processes.

## Acknowledgements

The idea for this Special Issue was inspired at the international and interdisciplinary conference *Movements, Narratives and Landscapes* which the editors organized at the University of Zadar in 2015. The latter was supported by the Department of Geography and Department of Ethnology and Anthropology of University of Zadar and the Slovenian Research Agency (Promotion of Science abroad, MU-PROM/2014-012, 2015 and the Basic research project, Ethnography of Land and Water Routes, J6-6839, 2014-2016). We thank to all the contributors for their invaluable help, patience and comments to chapters. Our gratitude also extends to Mirela Hrovatin, Lukasz Kaczmarek, Boštjan Kravanja, Marc Morell, Helena Motoh, Kenneth R. Olwig, Jaka Repič, Gilles de Rapper, Jonathan Skinner, Jo Vergunst and Katja Hrobat Virloget for their insightful commentaries on the earlier drafts of this Special Issue. Nataša Gregorič Bon is also grateful to her colleagues Maja Petrovič-Šteger and Ana Jelnikar for their constructive comments and suggestions on how to improve some parts of this introduction.

## References

- Adell, Nicolas, Regina Bendix, Chiara Bortolotto & Markus Tauschek. 2015. Introduction. In: Nicolas Adell, Regina Bendix, Chiara Bortolotto & Markus Tauschek (eds.). *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice: Participation, Territory and the Making of Heritage*. Göttingen: University of Göttingen, pp. 7–25
- Árnason, Arnar, Nicolas Ellison, Jo Vergunst & Andrew Whitehouse (eds.). 2012. *Landscapes Beyond Land. Routes, Aesthetics, Narratives (EASA Series)*. New York & Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Bangstad, Torgeir Rinke. 2011. Routes of Industrial Heritage: On the Animation of Sedentary Objects. *Culture Unbound* 3: 279–94.
- Bender, Barbara (ed.). 1993. *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*. Oxford: Berg.
- Bender, Barbara. 1996. Landscape. In: Barnard, Alan & Jonathan Spencer (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. London & New York: Routledge, pp. 323–4.
- Basso, Keith. 1996. *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language among the Western Apache*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Bofulin, Martina. 2015. Od domoljubov do izdajalcev. Migracije, razvoj in izgradnja 'okrajev izseljencev' v Ljudski republiki Kitajski. *Glasnik SED* 55(3-4): 78–86.
- Brumann, Christoph & Berliner, David (eds.). 2016. *World Heritage on the Ground. Ethnographic Perspectives*. New York & Oxford: Berghahn.
- Bruner, Edward. 1983. Introduction. The opening up of anthropology. In: Edward M. Bruner (ed.), *Text, Play, and Story: The Construction and Reconstruction of Self and Society*. Washington: American Ethnological Society, pp. 1–16.
- Cosgrove, Denis & Stephen Daniels (eds.). 1988. *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design and Use of Past Environments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Del Marmol, Camila, Marc Morell, Jasper Chalcraft (eds.). 2014. *The Making of Heritage*

- Seduction and Disenchantment*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Descola, Philippe. 2016. *Landscape as Transfiguration*. *Edward Westermarck Memorial Lecture, October 2015*. Suomen Antropologi 41(1): 3–14.
- Eade, John & Mario Katić. 2017. Commemorating the dead: military pilgrimage and battlefield tourism. In: John Eade & Mario Katić (eds.), *Military Pilgrimage and Battlefield Tourism: Commemorating the Dead*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.
- Gonzales-Ruibal, Alfredo & Martin Hall. 2015. Heritage and Violence. In: Lynn Maskell (ed.), *Global Heritage: A Reader*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, pp. 150–71
- Guattari, Felix. 1996. Ritornellos and Existential Affects. In: Genosko, G. (ed.), *The Guattari Reader/ Pierre Felix Guattari*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 158–71.
- Harvey, David & Emma Waterton. 2015. Editorial: Landscapes of Heritage and Heritage Landscapes. *Landscape Research* 40(8): 905–10.
- Harvey, David. 2015. Landscape and Heritage: Trajectories and Consequences. *Landscape Research* 40(8): 911–924.
- Herzfeld, Michael. 1982. *Ours Once More: Folklore, Ideology, and the Making of Modern Greece*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Herzfeld, Michael. 1991. *A Place in History. Social and Monumental Time in a Cretan Town*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Herzfeld, Michael. 2009. *Evicted from Eternity: The Restructuring of Modern Rome*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Herzfeld, Michael. 2016. *Siege of the Spirits: Community and Polity in Bangkok*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hirsch, Eric & Michael O’Hanlon (eds.). 1995. *The Anthropology of Landscape: Perspectives on Place and Space*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ingold, Tim. 1993. The Temporality of the Landscape. *World Archaeology* 25(2): 152–74.
- Ingold, Tim. 2000. *The Perception of the Environment: Essays on Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Jones, Michael & Kenneth R. Olwig (eds.). 2008. *Nordic Landscapes. Region and Belonging on the Northern Edges of Europe*. Minneapolis & London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kaminski, Jamie, Angela Benson & David Arnold. 2014. Introduction. In: Jamie Kaminski, Angela Benson & David Arnold (eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Cultural Heritage Tourism*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Macdonald, Sharon. 2009. *Difficult Heritage. Negotiating the Nazi past in Nuremberg and also Beyond*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Macdonald, Sharon. 2015. Is ‘Difficult Heritage’ Still ‘Difficult’? *Museum International* 67(1-4): 6–22.
- Maddrell, Avril. 2011. Praying the Keeills’. Rhythm, Meaning and Experience on Pilgrimage Journeys in the Isle of Man. *Landabréfid* 25: 15–29.
- Navaro-Yashin, Yael. 2009. Affective Spaces, Melancholic Objects: Ruination and the Production of the Anthropological Knowledge. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 15: 1–18.
- Navaro-Yashin, Yael. 2012. *The Make-Believe Space. Affective Geography in a Postwar Polity*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Olwig, Kenneth R. 1996. Recovering the Substantive Nature of Landscape. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 86(4): 630–53.
- Olwig, Kenneth R. 2002. *Landscape, Nature and the Body Politic: From Britain’s Renaissance to America’s New World*. Madison: University Wisconsin Press.
- Petrović-Šteger, Maja. 2009. Anatomizing Conflict – Accommodating Human Remains. In: Maryon McDonald & Lambert Helen (eds.), *Social Bodies*. London: Berghahn, pp. 47–76.
- Salazar, Noel & Yujie Zhu. 2015. Heritage and Tourism. In: Lynn Maskell (ed.), *Global Heritage: A Reader*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, pp. 240–259
- Silverman, Helaine. 2011. Contested Cultural Heritage: A Selective Historiography. In: Helain Silverman (ed.), *Contested Cultural Heritage: Religion, Nationalism, Erasure and Exclusion in a Global World*. New York, Heidelberg & London: Springer, pp. 1–49.
- Smith, Laura Jane. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. Routledge: London & New York.
- Telban, Borut. 2016. *Kraji in časi v novogvinejski pokrajini (Zbirka Prostor, kraj, čas)*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC.

- Tilley, Christopher. 1994. *A Phenomenology of Landscape*. Oxford: Berg.
- Tsing, Anna L. 2017. The Buck, the Bull, and the Dream of the Stag: Some Unexpected Weeds of the Anthropocene. *Suomen Antropologi* 42 (1): 3–21.
- Waterton, Emma & Laurajane Smith. 2009. There is no Such Thing as Heritage. In: Emma Waterton & Laurajane Smith (eds.), *Taking Archeology out of Heritage*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholar Publishing, pp. 10–28.
- Virtanen, Pirjo Kristiina, Elenoora L. Lundell, Marja-Liisa Honkasalo. 2017. Introduction: Enquiries into Contemporary Ritual Landscapes. *Journal of Ethnology and Folkloristics* 11(1): 5–17.

CORRESPONDENCE: NATAŠA GREGORIČ BON, Institute of Anthropological and Spatial Studies, Research Centre SAZU, Novi trg 2, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia, E-mail: n.gregoric@zrc-sazu.si.