

Paper programme

19th Cambridge Heritage Symposium

Heritage and Authoritarianism

11-12 May 2018

McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research

University of Cambridge

Welcome to the 19th Cambridge Heritage Conference!

Over the next two days we will be hearing from a wide and diverse range of speakers from different backgrounds and representing the broad disciplinary spectrum with which heritage research engages. We hope you will join us in discussing, sharing and challenging our individual and collective understandings of the relationship between Heritage and Authoritarianism, but also in celebrating the innovation and insight of our speakers and delegates.

The Cambridge Heritage Symposium has been going for more than twenty years and represents one of the highlights of the programme of heritage research events across the University of Cambridge. From the outset the Symposia have aimed to create an annual forum to bring together students, university and independent researchers, heritage practitioners and managers, to thinking critically and creatively about topical issues within the field. The themes of the Symposia have varied from exploring 'Heritage that Hurts' and 'Heritage Methodologies', and topics like the 'Olympic Heritage', '1914 Re-inherited', 'Packaging the Past', 'African Heritage Challenges' and 'Heritage and Revolution'. Over the years the organisers sought to retain the strong emphasis on discussion and have aimed at days that focus on learning together. We are delighted that this year's programme continues to reflect these aims.

This year has seen a number of exciting developments for heritage research at the University of Cambridge - not least the launch of the Cambridge Heritage Research Centre (CHRC). This initiative has been made possible by funding from the School of Humanities and Social Sciences and the McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research and represents the opportunity to not only raise the profile of heritage research at Cambridge, but also to act as a platform for new and exciting networks and collaborations which we hope many of you will become a part of.

The Cambridge Heritage Symposium organising committee are indebted to the McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research for their generous support and the European Commission for their funding of the Horizon 2020 Marie Skłodowska Curie Project '[Cultural Heritage of Dictatorship in Albania](#)' (C.H.O.D.I.A.), of which this conference is in partial fulfilment.

Professor Marie Louise Stig Sørensen (Director, CHRC) and Dr Dacia Viejo-Rose (Deputy Director, CHRC) and the organising committee (Dr Francesco Iacono, Flaminia Bartolini, Minjae Zoh), the Cambridge Heritage Research Group, and this year's Heritage MPhil students.

Table of Contents

WELCOME

CONFERENCE THEME

CONFERENCE SCHEDULE

PAPER ABSTRACTS AND BIOGRAPHIES

PARTICIPANTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

HERITAGE AND AUTHORITARIANISM

The theme of this year conference is “Heritage and Authoritarianism”. Over the last decade, critical heritage studies have stressed the importance of authority in different historical and social realities. Heritage theories, however, have been chiefly formulated from the standpoint of Western representative democracies. While authority is a relative property common to all state (and non-state) societies, on one extreme of this continuous scale, authoritarian political regimes have always exerted a profound influence on cultural heritage. Despite being articulated in the most diverse ways in the different contexts in which it was taking place, this influence has produced remarkable similarities through space and time.

A first one is certainly the tendency to emphasize military aspects, while obfuscating the representation of practices related to control, terror and repression. Directly connected, is the greater role of the ‘state’ as the main (if not the only) heritage stake-holder in contexts where other voices able to utter different perspectives are regularly silenced. Last but not least, while more broadly important for any state, nationalism and national ideology have regularly featured as a crucial and near-universal factor shaping heritage policies of authoritarian countries.

From European dictatorship of the 20th century to military regimes all over the world, this research seminar will seek to comparatively explore the relationship between cultural heritage and authoritarianism. The focus will be on a number of key subthemes, each developed in a session:

1. The authoritarian uses of the past. How are material remains mobilised by regimes? What are the outcomes of these processes in heritage practice?
2. The transition from and to authoritarianism. What is the role of transitional periods in determining heritage destruction, reinterpretation and memory work connected to the regime?
3. The material and immaterial legacy of the authoritarianism. What is the role of the (past) authoritarian experience in contemporary society? Is it always framed as a taboo or continues to loom large and trigger inflammatory debates?
4. The boundaries of authoritarianism. What are the differences between what can be conceptualised as heritage of authoritarianism and discourses typical of current (representative) democracies? Is this difference qualitative?

Through the exploration of these aspects, this seminar will considerably improve our broad understanding of the relationship between authority and heritage within and beyond authoritarian contexts, enriching the scholarly debate and reaching out to the broader world of practice.

SCHEDULE

11th May

8.30-9.00 Registration

9.00-9.15 Welcome

9.15-10.35 First session

Uses of the past during authoritarianism (Chair: Dacia Viejo-Rose)

Giorgia Aquilar – Staging Auctoritas: The (Anti) Authoritarianism of Heritage Doppelgangers

Minjae Zoh – The impact of ‘dictatorship’ on the management and uses of heritage sites

Hyun Kyung Lee – From the rise of the military dictatorship to the fall of its revenant: Park Chung Hee’s place-making at ‘Gwanghwamun Square’

10.35-10.50 Coffee break

10.50-11.50 Second session **(Chair: Flaminia Bartolini)**

Anjali Gera Roy – Whose Cultural Heritage? Marginalisation and Reinvention of Indian Hereditary Performers

Rouran Zhang – World Heritage Listing and Changes of Political Value: A Case Study in West Lake Cultural Landscapes in Hongzhou, China

11.50-12.50 First Keynote - **Ruth Ben-Ghiat** -*Authoritarianism and Heritage: A Reconsideration*

12.50-13.05 Poster session

13.05-14.00 Lunch

14.00-15.20 Third session:

Transition to and from authoritarianism (Chair: Lila Janik)

1st part

Alicia Stevens – Tactical ambiguity in museum exhibitions in post-regime Myanmar

Gruiă Badescu – Heritage-making and the criminalisation of authoritarian past: Political prisons and clandestine detention centres in Central and Eastern Europe and the Southern Cone of Latin America

Marek Swidrak – Erasing communism: The contemporary iconoclastic movement in Poland

15.20-15.35 Coffee break

15.35-16.35 Fourth session **(Chair: Francesco Iacono)**

2nd part

Joana Brites – ‘Don’t you (Forget About Me)’ : Portuguese contemporary art engaging the country’s dictatorship heritage

Nick Naumov – Socialist Heritage in Transition: the Monumental Discourse of 1300 Years Bulgaria

16.35-16.50 Coffee break

16.50-17.20 General discussion

17.20-17.50 Film “Intervista” by Anri Sala

17.50- 18.20 Wine reception

18.20-20.00 Conference dinner

12th of May

9.00-10.00 Fifth session

Legacies of authoritarianism (Chair: Paola Filippucci)

1st part

Flaminia Bartolini – Dealing with Dictatorial Past: Fascist Monuments and Conflicting Memories in Contemporary Italy

Miriam Saqqa Carazo – The monumental bodies – Biopolitics of Franquism

10.00-10.15 Coffee break

10.15-11.15 Second Keynote - **Alfredo González-Ruibal** -*Walking through the darkest valley. On heritage and hatred*

11.15-12.15 Sixth session (**Chair: Rob van deer Laarse**)

2nd part

Margaret Comer – Beyond a Dichotomy of Grief and Blame: Examining the Heritage of Stalinist Repression

Julie Deschapper – Russia, China, Cuba and their eternal monuments: For a transnational history of Socialist authoritarian heritage

12.15-12.30 Poster session

12.30-13.30 Lunch

13.30-14.30 Seventh session

Boundaries of authoritarianism (Chair: Marie Louise Stig Sørensen)

1st part

Francesco Iacono – Heritage in transition: Insights from the Albanian case study

Joel Geraetz – “Yesterday was Yesterday, Today is Today”: Authoritarianism, Resistance, and Tangible and Intangible Heritage in Contemporary Istanbul

14.30-14.45 Coffee break

14.45-15.45 Third keynote - **Rob Van der Laarse** - *The Heritage of Authoritarianism and the Authoritarian Revolt*

15.45-16.45 Eight session (**Chair: Minjae Zoh**)

2nd part

Jonathan Zilberg – Comparative Case Studies of Authoritarian Heritages in Indonesian Museums

Olimpia Dragouni – Instrumentalization of cultural heritage by authoritarian and non-authoritarian regimes in Greece and Macedonia – a comparative perspective

16.45-17.15 Conclusive remarks

17.15-18.00 General discussion

Poster session:

Marie Le Devehat - Gjirokastra's cultural heritage: The tumultuous story of a dictator's hometown

Malcom Angelucci and Stefano Kerschbamer - One Monument, One Town, Two Ideologies: the 'Monument to Victory' of Bolzano-Bozen between Fascism and Democracy.

Shraddha Bhatawadekar- Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj Terminus (erstwhile Victoria Terminus): Manifestations of Heritage and Authority

José Pedro Tenreiro - Reshaping Heritage: the restoration of Northern Portuguese monuments in the 1920s and 1930s

Rasa Pranskuniene - Fragility of boundaries: Authoritarianism and democracy discourse in the context of heritage

Janek Gryta- 'Shtetl-romance', preservation, and commercialisation. Jewish heritage sites of Kraków under Communism and during the transition to democracy.

PAPER ABSTRACTS AND BIOGRAPHIES

One monument, one town, two ideologies: The monument to the victory of Bolzano-Bozen

Malcolm Angelucci, University of Melbourne

This paper offers a critical reading of the first major attempt to publicly come to terms with the presence of an invasive, ideologically charged fascist monument in the border town of Bolzano-Bozen (South Tyrol, Italy). The ‘Monument to Victory’, a triumphal arch commissioned by Mussolini and inaugurated in 1928 to celebrate the annexation of the province after WWI, is still today the symbolic centre of a discourse that divides the town along an ethno-linguistic axis. This triggers ongoing political tensions, fostering extreme views in both Italian and German speaking communities. To address this while preserving the supposed artistic value of the site, a permanent exhibition inaugurated in 2014 inside the artefact, tried to provide historical contextualisation and foster a new, inclusive and democratic discourse around the past. In this sense, the monument provides an important case study to explore three themes: the fascist symbolic use of the past through public architecture; the legacy of authoritarian architecture in the contemporary cultural and political discourse; the attempt at re-conceptualising Fascist heritage by the current democratic government. The third aspect is the most problematic. We will discuss the new exhibition as a counter-monument, which directly challenges the ideology of the original, while inhabiting its space. We read this as a paratext, an attempt at re-orienting the interpretation of the artefact with the explicit intent of fostering open discussion, reflection and reconciliation. Our work on the content of the exhibition, the choices of the historians involved and the architectural and curatorial strategies will however question this dialogical underpinning and lay bare an agenda to establish the site as a new monologic myth of origin for the democratic and pacified town of the future; one that aims at producing a ‘reconciled’ citizen through a prescriptive perlocutionary experience that consistently effaces current political tensions.

Malcolm Angelucci is a Cassamarca Lecturer in the School of Languages and Linguistics at the University of Melbourne. From 2001 to 2009, he completed research in the fields of stylistics, narratology and genre, with a specific focus on 20th century Italian avant-garde poetics. Since 2009 he has worked and published in the area of Voice Studies, aesthetics and Theatre Studies. He has a particular interest in the nexus between voice, subjectivity, poetry and technology. This academic interest has led to a series of artistic works with *Illimine Collective*, an international group of artists who create multimedia installations and durational performances. Parallel to this, he has completed work on Fascist heritage in the Italian border-town Bolzano-Bozen, with particular focus on the contemporary, cultural and political life of fascist artefacts. He is author of the volume *Words Against Words: on the Rhetoric of Carlo Michelstaedter* (Troubadour, 2011) and editor of *Voice/Presence/Absence* (UTS ePress, 2014).

Staging auctoritas: The (anti)authoritarianism of heritage doppelgängers

Giorgia Aquilar

Literal quotations of classical buildings, direct allusions to heroic pasts, and shapes explicitly derived from bygone periods intervene in the transformation of urban heritage as means to set up precise types of order and put on stage forms of authoritarianism. Recalling undeniable shapes of power, authoritarian aesthetics collide against heritage ethics in the manipulation of foregone ideas, fragments, and constructs as instruments of propaganda. Against this backdrop, the proposed contribution aims at discussing the figure of “heritage Doppelgänger”, through a twofold interpretation. On the one hand, the authoritarian uses of the past can be exemplified by the stripped neoclassicism, where the literal reference to classical antiquities and imperial architecture served as means for modern regimes to represent power. On the other hand, the act of doubling may be applied strategically, paradoxically reversing the “bridge to tradition” by transmitting to posterity a mirrored heritage, capable of contrasting the unique dominance of authoritarian artefacts. In order to address this dual interpretation, the proposed paper investigates case studies of urban objects and tissues whose significance lies in the spatialization of authoritarian power. The use of material remains and replicas of ancient Greek and Hellenistic architecture in Munich's Königsplatz – mobilised by Leo von Klenze as symbols of greatness, and then employed by the Nazis to impose their authority – may serve as a paradigmatic example of the first understanding. On the flip side, the heated discussions about redesigning or tearing down Hitler's birth house in Braunau, for instance, might suggest the possibility to reason on heritage facsimiles as modes of liberation through appropriation, “destruction” through preservation. Overturning “auctoritas” in its etymological roots – Latin origin of “authority”, derived from *augeō*, “to augment” – heritage Doppelgängers may act as decreasing agents: not anymore means to perpetrate authoritarianism but to fight it, triggering mechanisms of transition towards anti-authoritarian afterlives.

Heritage-making and the criminalization of authoritarian pasts: Political prisons and clandestine detention centres in Central and Eastern Europe and the Southern Cone of Latin America

Gruia Badescu, University of Oxford

This paper scrutinizes how societies in transition from authoritarianism construct narratives of criminalization of the previous regime through the transformation of sites used for political violence in heritage sites of dictatorship, including prisons and clandestine detention centres. It discusses the practices of such criminalization through heritage-making in countries described by transitologists as part of the “third wave of democratization”, emerging out of military dictatorships in Latin America and socialist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe. The paper analyses the practices of memorialization of prisons and detention centres in Chile, former Yugoslavia and Romania in a comparative and transnational frame. First, it discusses the different mobilizations of actors and narratives in making heritage sites in the three

contexts, placing heritage-making in broader regional memory regimes. Second, it analyses the entanglement of architectural, museographic and NGO practices in the construction of criminalization across various scales, linking debates of memorialization of Goli Otok in Croatia with sites in Chile and Romania. The paper will show how in the absence of state programmes, local bottom-up initiatives in these diverse contexts have been connected by the circulation of concepts and practices through professional networks and encounters. The paper is based on fieldwork in the three countries conducted since 2016 as part of the AHRC-Labex project “Criminalization of Dictatorial Pasts in Europe and Latin America in Global Perspective”.

Gruia Badescu is a Research Associate at the School of Geography, University of Oxford. His research examines urban reconstruction and memorialization after difficult pasts, including war and political violence. His ongoing research as part of the AHRC-Labex project “The Criminalization of Dictatorial Pasts in Europe and Latin America in Global Perspective” examines processes of memorialization of sites used for political violence during previous dictatorial regimes, analysing the entanglement of practices and actors at local and transnational scales between South-eastern Europe and the southern cone of Latin America. His broader research examines the reconfiguration of sites associated with a difficult past, including memorialization and reconstruction after dictatorship and war, with fieldwork in Chile, Southeastern Europe and Lebanon. Based on his PhD dissertation, conducted at the Centre for Urban Conflicts Research, Department of Architecture, University of Cambridge, he is now working on a book on the relationship between architecture and 'coming to terms with the past'.

Dealing with a dictatorial past: Fascist monuments and conflicting memories in contemporary Italy

Flaminia Bartoli, University of Cambridge

This paper examines the reception of Fascist monuments in contemporary Italy as an expression of how the country has dealt with its troubled dictatorial past. The variety of cultural heritage left by the regime is a distinctive feature of any Italian city and is today both a symbolic and a physical witness of the invasiveness of the totalitarian regime. Taking the period from 2010, with increasing public debate about how to deal with divisive and conflicting remains, this paper looks at two emblematic case-studies that can aid our understanding of Fascist monument culture in contemporary Italy. The first considers a monument erected in 2012 as a memorial to the infamous murderer Rodolfo Graziani, the Fascist Marshall known as ‘the butcher’ for his efficacy in the conquest of Ethiopia. Built in Graziani’s resting place of Affile, the monument, which in 2017 was suggested to be demolished by orders of the national courts, shows how part of society still views Fascism as ‘positive’. The second examines how the city of Bolzano has dealt with a Fascist frieze on the Palace of Financial Offices representing Mussolini on horseback, and how the monument has been ‘disempowered’ through the addition in 2017 of an installation by the artists Arnold Holzkecht and Michele Bernardi. These two

monuments, conceived in different times and for different purposes, illustrate the variety of political reasons that can inform monument building. The differing responses to these monuments reflect similar attitudes seen trans-nationally, at a time when the legacies of difficult pasts are being re-negotiated, and new values are inscribed, or previous values removed from them.

Flaminia Bartolini is a Classical Archaeologist specialized in Heritage of the Dictatorship. She is a member of the Cambridge Heritage Research Centre and she is finalising her PhD in *Fascist Heritage and Italian renegotiation of the Dictatorial Past* at the Department of Archaeology, University of Cambridge. She holds a MPhil in Heritage Studies from the University of Cambridge and an Honours Degree in Archaeology and Greek and Roman Art History from the Third University of Rome. She gained several years of professional experience in the cultural heritage sector having worked for cultural institutions in Italy, Spain and the UK and she was a fellow at ICCROM in Rome in 2017. She is co-organising in 2018 the international conference on *Heritage and Authoritarianism* funded by the McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research at the University of Cambridge and the international workshop on *Fascist and National Socialist Antiquities and Materialities from the Interwar Era to the Present Day* generously funded by the DAAD in Cambridge. Her research interests are: Fascist material legacies, Fascist uses of the Past, Museums and difficult collections, conflicting memories and post-colonial legacies.

Authoritarianism and heritage: A reconsideration

Ruth Bhen-Ghiat, *New York University*

This keynote reflects on the many ways authoritarian regimes alter the countries and peoples they occupy, changing landscapes and institutions, imposing new cultures, and inflicting wounds on bodies and psyches that are not easily or quickly healed. To capture the devastating consequences of such governments, and the impact of their strongmen leaders, we need a flexible and dynamic notion of “heritage” that goes beyond the perpetuation of traditional cultural productions and norms.

Ruth Ben-Ghiat is Professor of History and Italian Studies at New York University. The recipient of Guggenheim, Fulbright, and other fellowships, she’s an expert on fascism, authoritarianism, and propaganda. She writes frequently for the media on those topics and on Donald Trump. Her current book project is *Strongmen: How They Rise, Why They Succeed, How They Fall* (Norton). She sits on the Board of Directors of the World Policy Institute.

Don't you (forget about me)': Portuguese contemporary art engaging the country's dictatorship heritage

Joana Brites, *University of Coimbra*

This paper aims to tackle the role of three contemporary Portuguese artists in addressing the nation's most "difficult heritage": the traces of its authoritarian rule (1933-1974), the longest European dictatorship. This "dissonant heritage" conflicts with the present identity that Portugal, regarded as Europe's leading tourism destination, wishes to project. Therefore, it is generally stuck in limbo. The meaning of its existence is not fully acknowledged, and its touristic fruition severely empties its ideological significance, whitening the material traces which testify the discriminatory and persecutory nature of the regime. This presentation examines the uncritical discourse which is present in two built heritage cases – the "Monument to Discoveries" (Lisbon) and the park "Portugal dos Pequenitos" (Coimbra), both constructed during the authoritarian regime – and its banalized consumption on social media. Following, the artwork of Ângela Ferreira on the first case ("Monument to Discoveries") and of Vasco Araújo on the second ("Portugal dos Pequenitos") will be analysed to demonstrate how contemporary artists are discovering, dismantling and reassembling, through different media, suppressed or ideologically emptied memories of the dictatorship heritage. Their role as a leading force in fostering a critical relationship with this heritage will be stressed. In turn, the censorship of Vasco Araújo's work in 2016 will be discussed and related with the lingering uneasiness to openly discuss this past. Finally, the artwork of Filipa César about Castro Marim, a town known today as a summer holiday destination, uncovers this location's history as a confined space used to segregate homosexuals during the dictatorship. The memory of Castro Marim as an exile

was completely erased from Portuguese collective memory and no comprehensive research has been published on the subject. Hence, to conclude, the benefits and risks of using art as an alternative model for history making, dissemination and consumption will be outlined.

Joana Brites is an Assistant Professor of Modern Art, Art History Methodologies and Heritage Studies at the Faculty of Arts and Humanities of the University of Coimbra (UC), where she is the Director of the Undergraduate Program Studies in Art History. She completed her master's and the doctorate in Art History (field of fascist architecture) and worked in the Office responsible for the application of UC for World Heritage Status. She is an Associate Researcher in the Centre for 20th Century Interdisciplinary Studies, and her research focuses on the art of authoritarian/totalitarian regimes; "unwanted heritage"; contemporary art and memory. She participates in various research projects and has several articles published in national and international scientific journals. At the moment she is also particularly interested in taking part in the development of artistic creations which deal with a "dissonant heritage" and result from a collaborative work between social scientists and artists.

Beyond a dichotomy of grief and blame: Examining the heritage of Stalinist repression

Margaret Comer, University of Cambridge

Although the field of critical heritage studies is a relatively new discipline, it has developed some key core concepts, including theories that the past is always political and that heritage is just as much about the present (and future) as it is about the past. These concepts become ever more charged when dealing with ‘dark heritage’ and the heritage of authoritarianism, especially at sites that could fall into both of these categories. The remembrance and memorialization of victims of authoritarian regimes are often just as much about contemporary politics and attitudes towards human rights as they are about the past and historical questions of victimhood and perpetration. A key point of conflict and contest at sites related to Soviet repression is the matter of victimhood and perpetration. At each site, who is identified as a victim, perpetrator, or bystander, and why? Who decides on these classifications, and, within each site’s interpretation, is there any reflection of the very real contestation and ambivalence that attend the application of these categories? The post-Soviet Russian case offers an array of different approaches to this dilemma, and this paper will analyze Moscow sites related to Stalinist repression through the lens of variable degrees of ‘grievability’, which takes Judith Butler’s (2009) work as a point of departure, as well as different types of ‘blameability’ as these are expressed in each site’s interpretation and memorialization. The paper will also explore the potential of a cyclical model for thinking through and categorizing the heritage of authoritarian repression, examining case studies from Germany and Poland in order to shed light on the different trajectories that societal attitudes towards the heritage of authoritarianism and atrocity can take over time and the reasons for these changes.

Russia, China, Cuba and their eternal monuments: For a transnational history of Socialist authoritarian heritage

Julia Deschepper, National Institute of Oriental Languages and Civilizations (Paris)

Since a decade, we do observe an undeniable growing interest in the fates of Socialist monuments in post (or still)-Socialist contexts. While being a part of this new field of research, this paper does not intend to examine the particularity of Soviet heritage after the fall of the USSR, nor to consider the monuments of Soviet authoritarianism in the contemporary Russian authoritarian context. It rather aims to start a reflection on the “remarkable similarities through space and time” that socialism have created in the way of conceptualizing and using heritage. In other words, whereas the Socialist world has been for long excluded from the history of heritage in the 20th century, this paper attempts to contribute to a transnational history of Socialist heritages, thus following up the works of Baller (1984) and Alonso Gonzáles (2016). First, taking on board the guidelines of critical heritage studies, it proposes an analysis of what makes heritage in Socialist authoritarian contexts, starting with the Soviet one that undeniably appears to have been a source of inspiration for future heritage experiences. Dictated by Marxist-Leninist imperatives, the Soviet conception of heritage promoted heritage as a tool to build a new society, participating in writing history, and was characterized by an immediate “heritagisation” of its own monumental productions. The paper then highlights, of course not being exhaustive, examples of circulations of this heritage conception between socialist regimes in the second half the century in order to address a comparative framework in space and time. The cases of

China (Zhang, 2004; Bellocq, 2006) and of Cuba (Alonso Gonzáles, 2015, 2016) happen to be highly relevant to understand the logic at stake. One of the main arguments developed is that “heritagisation” processes in these Socialist contexts which have been largely determined by their common historicity regime (Hartog, 2003), that could be defined as those of “futurism”. The case led to a conception of a heritage that, as a part of a broader social project, was thought to last not only for the future, but for eternity (Paperny, 2002). The paper particularly explores how functions of heritage and official “authorised heritage discourses” (Smith, 2006) were, despite inevitable differences, somehow highly similar.

Julia Deschepper is a PhD candidate in History at National Institute of Oriental Languages and Civilizations (Paris) since 2014 and an instructor of Russian and Soviet History. She holds a MA in History of International Relations (2013) and a MA in Cultural Heritage Management (2014) from Sorbonne University. Her research is dedicated to the concept of “Soviet heritage” in USSR and Russia. She precisely explores the evolution and the specificity of this concept, from its creation until its reinvestment nowadays, through both a Soviet Union’s cultural history and critical heritage studies’ lens. She recently organized the international conference “A French History of Soviet Heritage” and curated the exhibition “The birth of a Soviet heritage in France” (6 Octobre-5 November 2017, Bulac et Inalco). Since January 2017, she is co-directing the national project (funded by Labex Arts-H2H) “Comparative approaches on Soviet artistic avant-gardes”.

Instrumentalization of cultural heritage by authoritarian and non-authoritarian regimes in Greece and Macedonia – a comparative perspective

Olimpia Dragouni, Humboldt University

The Greek-Macedonian dispute over the name of Macedonia and right to “own” the term alongside the heritage of Alexander the Great has been heated for both countries for over 20 years. It also has caused serious practical consequences, affecting Macedonian economy (i.e. through embargo in 1990s) and geopolitical place (EU and NATO accession veto). Over the years, Macedonian discourse claimed that a heritage of the region can be shared by numerous countries, while Greece disagreed. Recent months saw new levels of good will – a consensus seems to be near, prompted mainly by EU enlargement perspective, and changes in governments of both countries. The new Macedonian government emerged after overthrowing the previous right-wing and semi-authoritarian regime and appears to be willing to compromise the chosen heritage - a week ago, the main route of the country was renamed from “Alexander the Great”, to “Friendship Highway”. Although the political elites seem to be focused on dialogue, ordinary citizens choose Heritage over Friendship. This puts both socialist governments coming from a popular vote in a difficult position. This paper aims to show this development as a consequence of a decades-long discourse introduced by the authoritarian regime in Greece and mimicked by Macedonia when the authority of Tito weakened and the Yugoslav state disintegrated, turning Macedonia into a parliamentary democracy with the right to write her own history. Using the standpoint of critical discourse analysis, by presenting how the narratives on owning and sharing heritage have emerged, absorbed and instrumentalised

archeological evidence (i.e. the discovery of Vergina graves of the family of Philip II of Macedon), the paper explores show the tension between authoritarianism and popular democracy, which both have their voice in this debate.

Olimpia Dragouni is Research Assistant at the Humboldt University in Berlin [Germany], Institute of Slavic Studies working in a DFG project: *Melting Borders: An Ethnography of the Movement of Peoples, Goods, and Symbols in Border-areas between Greece and the Republic of Macedonia*. My PhD dissertation: *Self-Identification of Slav-Speaking Elites From the Territory of Macedonia under Ottoman Rule (19th Century)*, currently in preparation for publishing, has been defended summa cum laude in 2015 at the Faculty of Liberal Arts, University of Warsaw [Poland]. Prior to that, I have studied European and Balkan Studies, Arabic and Islamic studies, and have been awarded with research scholarships in Sarajevo [Faculty of Islamic Studies 2013-2014], in Macedonia [UKiM, MANU 2011, 2013]. My research languages (order reflecting the level of fluency) are: Polish, Greek, English, Macedonian, B/H/S, Arabic.

Dr Paola Filippucci (Conference Chair) is a Fellow and Lecturer in Social Anthropology at Murray Edwards College. Since 2000, her research has focused on war commemoration with particular focus on the First World War and on how the war is remembered today on the former battlefields of the Western Front. She is currently preparing a monograph on this theme, on which she has also published a number of articles. As part of this research she also participates in archaeological excavations of Great War sites in Belgium and France.

Whose cultural heritage? Marginalization and reinvention of Indian hereditary performers

Anjali Gera Roy, Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur

Hindu authoritarianism, whose roots may be traced back to the colonial era, has its ideological underpinnings in the idea of a Hindu *rashtra* [nation] produced through a return to a pure ancient Hindu past. In its construction of an Indian nation propped on Sanskrit language and Hindu texts, it has systematically excised India's alternative Perso-Arabic cultural heritage and destroyed the syncretic cultural, and even religious, boundaries that prevailed in South Asia until the end of the 19th century. In particular, Hindu nationalist reformers, in collusion with upper caste brahmins and Christian missionaries, invented a sanskritized Indian national culture in the 1930s through sanitizing traditional cultural heritage produced, preserved and disseminated by hereditary performing communities of mirasis, tawa'ifs and bhandis. Middle class, upper caste reformers and nationalists, covered up, sometimes intentionally and willingly, the pivotal role played by these hereditary performers in preserving South Asian cultural heritage and installed middle-class performers in their place. The culture constructed by these middle-class cultural custodians became normalized as Indian national culture and was used to make a case for India's rich cultural heritage.

Traditional cultural heritage enshrined in the bodies of hereditary performers would have been completely extinguished but for the migration of tawa'ifs, musicians and scribes first to Parsi theatre and then to the newly emerging film industry following the loss of royal patronage. This paper argues that the migration of Urdu writers, tawa'ifs and musicians to Hindi cinema makes popular Indian cinema the sole eclectic space in which the trace of the famed syncretic 'Ganga jamuni tehzeeb' of the 19th century is still visible. It proposes that this syncretic cultural heritage can effectively resist the hindutva project of Hindu authoritarian interests.

Anjali Gera Roy is a Professor in the Department of Humanities of Social Sciences at the Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, who works on fiction, film and performance traditions of India, diasporas, oral histories and Partition 1947. She is the author of *Imperialism and Sikh Migration: the Komagata Maru Incident* (Routledge 2017), *Cinema of Enchantment: Perso-Arabic Genealogies of the Hindi Masala Film* (Orient Blackswan 2015) and *Bhangra Moves: From Ludhiana to London and Beyond* (Aldershot: Ashgate 2010). She has edited *Imagining Punjab, Punjabi and Punjabi in the Transnational Era* (London: Routledge 2015) and *The Magic of Bollywood: At Home and Abroad* (Delhi: Sage 2012). She has also co-edited (with Ajaya K Sahoo) *Diaspora and Transnationalisms: the Journey of the Komagata Maru* (Routledge 2017), (with Chua Beng Huat) *The Travels of Indian Cinema: From Bombay to LA* (Delhi: OUP 2012), (with Nandi Bhatia) *Partitioned Lives: Narratives of Home, Displacement and Resettlement* (Delhi: Pearson Longman 2008) and (with Nukhbah T Langah) a **special feature on "Siriaki Across India and Pakistan" in *Muse India: the Literary E-journal*, July-August 2011**. In addition, she has published more than 100 essays in literary, film and cultural studies. She has successfully completed a number of research projects on cinema, performance, digital media, migration, small towns and is currently engaged in a collaborative project on the afterlife of Partition 1947 and another on Digitizing the Vanishing Legacy of Hereditary Patuas [Scrollpainters] of West Bengal.

She has lectured in Universities in Australia, Singapore, New Zealand, Germany, Canada and US. She has been a Baden Wurttemberg Professorial Fellow in the South Asia Institute, University of Heidelberg, a Western Fellow, Visiting University Scholar Program in the University of Western Ontario, London, Senior Visiting Research Fellow & Senior Research Fellow in the Asia Research Institute, National University of Singapore, Senior Research Fellow of the Shastri Indo-Canadian Institute and Visiting Fellow in the Humanities Research Centre, Australian National University Canberra. She was awarded the Writer of the Year Award in 2011 by the IRCALC for her contributions to African literature and serves on the editorial boards of several journals.

Yesterday was yesterday, today is today: Authoritarianism, resistance, and tangible and intangible heritage in contemporary Istanbul

Joel Geraets, University of Bristol

Contemporary Turkey is at a turning point. Since the incumbent AKP's accession to power in 2002, the country has become increasingly beholden to strong-arm neoliberalism resulting in a sweeping tide of socially and materially invasive public policy, including mass "urban regeneration" which has seen vast swathes of the historic inner city of Istanbul bulldozed to make way for luxury developments and malls (Türkün 2011; Uysal 2012). Despite the major Gezi protests in 2013, since 2015 the resurgence of the Turkish-Kurdish conflict and the 2016 coup attempt has seen the AKP, and their autocratic President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, take increasingly authoritarian steps to suppress or eliminate opposition on every side. This crackdown comes in tandem with increasingly authoritarian, nationalist rhetoric in which Turkish heritage plays an ever more prominent part as the government looks backwards to the Ottoman Empire as a historic grounding for present action, both nationally and internationally. Taking the view from the street, this paper's aims are twofold: first, to highlight the complex issues relating to the diverse and vast tangible and intangible heritage in the city that underlie the rise of nationalism in Turkey; and second, in light of these issues, to analyse the proliferated narratives and materially grounded actions toward, and entangled relationships alongside, the city's material and immaterial heritage, both by state actors and by those who are in resistance to them. This is not the first time that cultural heritage has been in the sights of the Turkish government, and as increasing demagoguery recalls the nation's long history of ethnic friction, expulsions and cleansings, the instability that grips the nation poses a grave threat to both tangible and intangible heritage. For in Turkey "yesterday was yesterday, today is today" (Temelkuran 2016).

Joel Geraets is an archaeologist and anthropologist who focuses upon contemporary archaeology, visual anthropology, material culture, the archaeology of modern conflict, the archaeology and anthropology of landscape, and politics. Currently, this manifests in the form of an analysis of the material side of Turkish politics, specifically focusing upon the political graffiti and their place within the Turkish political and social landscape. This research, far from being self contained, has led me to focus upon other areas relating to Turkey and Turkish politics, including, predominately, the place of tangible and intangible cultural heritage within the nation, and their role in the political and social dynamics of the nation.

Walking through the darkest valley. On heritage and hatred

Alfredo González-Ruibal, *Institute of Heritage Sciences of the Spanish National Research Council (Incipit-CSIS)*

Negative heritage has received a lot of attention during the last couple of decades. This is perhaps best seen in the proliferation of terms that have been coined to describe it: hurtful, painful, dark, difficult, conflict, post-conflict, dissonant, taboo, traumatic, etc. Within negative heritage, the legacies of dictatorship and civil conflict are particularly problematic. If heritage helps reinforce collective identity—even some forms of negative heritage (i.e. 9/11 in the US), the legacy of oppressive regimes is almost always divisive and attempts to overcome it usually meet fierce opposition, even decades or centuries after the events.

Research on this kind of heritage has tended to focus on three issues: multivocality (the diverse and conflicting views that emerge around a specific monument or site), nostalgia (the idealization of a dark past by some sectors of the post-dictatorial society) and ideology (the legitimization of past political oppression through its material memories). Here I would like to explore an element that I feel has not been properly addressed: hatred. Legacies of dictatorship are, primordially, repositories of latent social violence that can be reactivated at any point. Starting with my experiences dealing with the heritage of civil war and dictatorship in Spain, I will explore other contexts (from Ukraine to the United States) where some forms of heritage continue to work as rallying points for political violence.

Alfredo González-Ruibal is an archaeologist with the Institute of Heritage Sciences of the Spanish National Research Council (Incipit-CSIC). He has been a postdoctoral researcher with the Archaeology Center of Stanford University and assistant professor at the Complutense University of Madrid. His main research focus is on the archaeology of the contemporary past and particularly the negative legacy of modernity (war, dictatorship, colonialism, predatory capitalism). He has conducted research on the material effects of supermodernity in Spain, Brazil, Equatorial Guinea and Ethiopia. In Spain, he has been conducting a project since 2006 on the archaeology of the Civil War and the Franco dictatorship (1936-1975). Through the excavation of battlefields, concentration camps, ruined model towns and monuments, he tries to construct an alternative narrative of the period based on things, rather than written documents or oral testimonies. He also uses fieldwork and its dissemination through social media as a provocation to elicit public reactions towards an uncomfortable past that is still highly divisive. Recent publications include the collected volume *Ethics and the archaeology of violence* (edited with Gabriel Moshenska, Springer, New York, 2015) and *Returning to the trenches. An archaeology of the Spanish Civil War* (in Spanish, Alianza, Madrid, 2016). Alfredo González-Ruibal is an archaeologist with the Institute of Heritage Sciences of the Spanish National Research Council (Incipit-CSIC). His research focuses on the archaeology of the recent past and more specifically on the negative side of modernity (conflict, dictatorship, colonialism). Since 2006 he has been investigating, from an archaeological point of view, the legacies of war and dictatorship in Spain, about which he has recently published the book (in Spanish): *Returning to the trenches. An archaeology of the Spanish Civil War*.

‘Shtetl-romance’, preservation, and commercialisation. Jewish heritage sites of Kraków under Communism and during the transition to democracy.

Janek Gryta, *University of Manchester*

It has often been proposed that the Jewish past of Poland had been largely forgotten and that first popular commemorations of the destroyed minority took place after the fall of Communism in 1989. Challenging this chronology the present article examines the commemorations in Kraków, the cultural capital of Poland, in the 1980s. It analyses the work of local Jewish museum and preservation projects developed during the decade and establishes that the Jewish past had been remembered in the city since at least 1980. It demonstrates that local, mid-ranking officials, a group situated mid-way in the polar

opposites of the government and the society, were responsible for this rediscovery of the Jewish past. In particular, this article points towards the heritage preservationists and comments on their importance for urban memory work.

Janek Gryta is a recent graduate from the University of Manchester. His first book entitled 'Remembering the Holocaust and the Jewish past in Kraków, 1976-2013' critically explores the role of the Jewish non-atrocity heritage and the memory of the Holocaust for Polish nation building during the crucial period of collapse of Communism and post-Communist transition. He is a cultural historian with particular interest in Eastern European history, nation building, and history of social consensus under Communism.

Heritage in transition: Insights from the Albanian case study

Francesco Iacono, University of Cambridge

The path through which authoritarian communist countries of the former eastern bloc mutated into western-style democracies has been long, winding and riddled with unexpected developments. In recent times, however, the so-called 'transition to democracy paradigm', on which this process was based and which involved the reinforcement of local institutions through internal and external intervention), has been increasingly criticised.

The main point of such a critique solidified around issues of leadership vis-à-vis institutions, and the inability to promote a greater role for emerging civil society. The core of such a critique has been seldom taken into account in the analysis of heritage making during/in the aftermath of transition and, as a result, these critical factors have rarely been analysed in post-communist countries. How has the interplay between leaders and institutional actors played in the formation of heritage discourses at different geographical level (e.g. local, national, regional)? What was the role of NGOs and associations? Have these fostered a grass-root interest in heritage and memory making, facilitating inclusion? In this paper I will try to offer an overview of these issues, focusing on Albania, a small post-socialist country in the south-eastern Balkans. Here, a formally successful period of democratic transition has translated into an attitude to heritage and heritagisation from the part of the main political actors which maintains surprising similarities with that of the pre-1991 regime. Notwithstanding the colour of the government in place, the approach of politicians (and above all of leaders) to past and memory, particularly in relation to the recent past, has been one of pro-active selection of what should and (above all) should not be considered part of the country's material inheritance.

Francesco Ianonco is an archaeologist and heritage specialist and has been involved in research projects in Albania, Greece and Italy. His research interests are quite broad and range in scope from cultural heritage of communism to Mediterranean archaeology, social theory (in particular Marxism) and history of the archaeological thought. His current Marie Skłodowska Curie project is entitled "Cultural Heritage of Dictatorship in Albania"

(CHODIA) and focuses on the recent (from the communist dictatorship period) cultural heritage of this country and its perception in contemporary society.

One monument, one town, two ideologies: The monument to the victory of Bolzano-Bozen (See abstract for co-presenter **Malcolm Angelucci**)

Stefano Kerschbamer, Independent scholar, Bolzano, Italy

Stefano Kerschbamer is an independent scholar, local historian and teacher based in Bolzano-Bozen (Italy). He has collaborated with a variety of public institutions on archival research, transcription and publication of war diaries (*Museo storico in Trento, Biblioteca Intercomunale di Primiero*) and engagement and development of teaching programs and materials (*Deutsches Schulamt - Bereich Innovation und Beratung, Bolzano-Bozen*). Stefano was part of the team that developed dedicated teaching and learning materials on the Monument to Victory of Bolzano and the related exhibition. He also coordinated and delivered targeted teaching and learning units for history teachers. With Dr Malcolm Angelucci (The University of Melbourne), Stefano co-authored the article 'One Monument, One Town, Two Ideologies: The Monument to Victory of Bolzano-Bozen', *Public History Review*, 2017.

**From the rise of the military dictatorship to the fall of its revenant:
Park Chung-hee's place-making at Gwanghwamun Square**

Hyun Kyung Lee, University of Cambridge/ Seoul National University

From November 2016 to March 2017, Gwanghwamun Square in Seoul was crowded with candlelit rallies as hundreds of thousands of ordinary citizens demanded South Korea's president Park Geun-hye resign amid a wide-ranging corruption and cronyism scandal. These peaceful demonstrations achieved Park's impeachment on March 10, 2017, and today Gwanghwamun Square represents Korean citizenship and genuine democracy.

Gwanghwamun Square was originally constructed under the regime of Park Chung-hee (1963–1979), Park Geun-hye's father. Park senior is one of the most controversial political leaders in Korean history, characterised Janus-like as the builder of the nation and as a domineering military dictator. Park seized power in 1961 through a military coup; his regime spent much subsequent energy trying to legitimise these suspect beginnings. The regime used cultural policy as a key tool in its quest for legitimacy, an endeavour dubbed 'revitalising the Korean spirit'. Inventing and reconstructing certain Korean traditions played a significant part in Park's efforts to build a strong nation with a consolidated national identity:

Gwanghwamun Square was a key project for visualising Park's political intentions. This paper examines place-making at Gwanghwamun Square as a material legacy of Park's dictatorship. It investigates how the 'Korean spirit' was visually represented and revitalised through this project and discusses how Korean tradition was invented at Gwanghwamun Square and incorporated into national anti-Japanese and anti-communist narratives. It also assesses how interpretations of Gwanghwamun Square changed between President Park Chung-hee's regime and his daughter's presidency and discusses the light the square casts on

the peculiarity of Park's military dictatorship, considering whether it can accurately be termed 'mass dictatorship'.

Hyun Kyung Lee is a post-doctoral research fellow working on the Academy of Korean Studies-funded research project "Beyond the Cold War, towards a community of Asia" at the Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities, University of Cambridge and the International Center for Korean Studies, Kyujanggak Institute, Seoul National University. Her research interests include difficult heritage (post-colonial/Cold War heritage), trans-national heritage networking, and the role of UNESCO programmes in East Asia. Her latest book *Memory and Punishment: Heritage and De-commissioned Prisons in East Asia*, written in collaboration with her Taiwanese colleague Shu-Mei Huang, is forthcoming from Routledge. She is also the author of *Difficult Heritage in Nation Building: South Korea and Post-conflict Japanese Colonial Occupation Architecture* (2018, from Palgrave Macmillan).

Socialist heritage in transition: the monumental discourse of 1300 years Bulgaria

Nikola Naumov, Kings College/London

In 1989 the fall of the Soviet Union brought new economic, socio-cultural and political realities to many Eastern European states, which were faced with a long and difficult period of transition. Along with economic restructuring and political changes, most of the post-socialist republics experienced a 'cultural transition', adopting new cultural policies concerning heritage management, interpretation and development. In this new social and political context, heritage has become an important site for the construction and contestation of new post-socialist identities as well as an important economic development tool through heritage tourism. The pre-1989 socialist era was a turbulent political period in which culture, heritage and history were under constant political influence. Large monumental sculptures of Lenin, Stalin and Dimitrov started to appear immediately after the coup d'état in 1944 and arguably, the most important visual representations were the Monuments to the Soviet Army. These 'victory monuments' commemorate the Soviet triumph over Nazi Germany and dominated urban space and iconography in many countries part of the Eastern Bloc in general, and Bulgaria in particular. This paper analyses the changing monumental discourse in post-socialist Bulgaria and focuses on how the political transition in 1989 has changed the 'authorised heritage discourse'. It tracks the ongoing debates and tensions about the problematic existence of *1300 Years Bulgaria* monument and analyses the aesthetic, symbolic, political and artistic values of the monument as perceived by the local stakeholders. The story behind its design, construction and symbolism has been the subject of endless political and social debates since its construction in 1981 and has reached a new dimension with the decision of Sofia Council to demolish it in 2017. The study concludes that coming to terms with the socialist past is not easy and despite the regime change, socialism still has an influence on political, social and cultural life in post-socialist Bulgaria.

Nikola (Nick) Naumov is currently completing his PhD in Human Geography at King's College London. He has research interests in the critical heritage studies and heritage tourism

with a focus on cultural and historical geographies of Eastern Europe, more specifically, the political and socio-cultural transitions with an emphasis on the changing interpretation of cultural heritage sites. His PhD explores the development, management and interpretation of cultural heritage in socialist and post-socialist Bulgaria. Nick is a full-time lecturer in Hospitality & Tourism Management at University of Northampton (UK), a visiting lecturer at ESH Paris Hotelschool (France) and regular guest lecturer at various institutions in Greece, Myanmar, Singapore and UK. Nick is a member of many professional bodies (e.g. Royal Geographical Society, Association for Critical Heritage Studies, International Geographical Union) and has presented his academic work at conferences in Italy, Bulgaria, United Kingdom, Turkey, Norway, Hong Kong, and others. He also acts as an ad-hoc reviewer for many tourism and hospitality journals.

Fragility of boundaries: Authoritarianism and democracy discourse in the context of heritage

Rasa Pranskūnienė, Aleksandras Stulginskis University

This Year Lithuania, like other Baltic states of Latvia and Estonia, is celebrating the Centennial of the “Restored Lithuania”. The 20th Century history of Lithuania was very complicated. Lithuania experienced a brief period of freedom and democracy in the beginning of the 20th Century; then between the wars experienced national authoritarianism and authoritarianism caused by the occupations (Soviet, Nazi and Soviet again); then during the 1990s, Lithuania experienced the rising freedom of democracy. This paper discusses the experiences of authoritarianism and heritage in the context of the tangible heritage sites in Lithuania, including: the Kaunas Our Lord Jesus Christ's Resurrection Basilica (built as Basilica in the interwar period, used as storeroom during the Nazi period, a radio factory during the Soviet period, and as a Basilica once again when finally restored after 1990); the Palace of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania (newly built in the beginning of Millenium in Vilnius, the former political, diplomatic, cultural center of the State, famous in Europe in the 15th-17th centuries, and demolished in the beginning of the 19th century) and Grūtas Park (the sculpture garden of Soviet-era statues, opened in 2001). The discussion continues to the present moment, with the removal of the Vilnius Green Bridge Soviet sculptures in 2015 (the Green Bridge, the oldest bridge over the Neris in Vilnius, was in Soviet times adorned by four groups of sculptures portraying socialistic realism). These cases reveal the intense relationship between heritage and authoritarianism, which even three decades later, in a democratic society, is still a painfully traumatic and multi-layered phenomenon. It remains unresolved and raises the question of where the fragile boundaries between authoritarianism and democracy are in the context of heritage.

Rasa Pranskūnienė is director of Aleksandras Stulginskis University museum (Lithuania); chairman of the study program “Cultural and Tourism Management” committee, Aleksandras Stulginskis University (Lithuania); lecturer of Business and Rural Development Management Institute, Faculty of Economics and Management, Aleksandras Stulginskis University (Lithuania); and a developer of interactive exhibition projects. She is also a member of ICOM CECA (The international council of museums and the international committee for

education and cultural action) Network of Researchers; member of ACHS (Association of critical heritage studies); member of EERA (European educational research association) and LERA (Lithuanian educational research association); participant of international projects “FP7” and “Horizon 2020” (European Researchers' Night); and a participant of classic Grounded Theory (GT) courses and qualitative research courses (Hermeneutic Phenomenology, Phenomenology in practice, Reflexive Phenomenology, Interactional Ethnography, Discourse analysis, Narrative analysis). She has a B.A. in Ethnology, (Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania), M.A. in Ethnic culture studies (Vytautas Magnus university, Lithuania), and a Ph.D. in Social sciences, Education, (Klaipeda University, Lithuania). Her scientific interests include: heritage, critical theory, cultural tourism management, museum education, interactivity, grounded theory and qualitative research methods.

The monumental bodies. Biopolitics of Franquism.

Miriam Saqqa Carazo, Spanish national research council (CSIC)/ University Complutense de Madrid

During the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) and in the first stage of the post-war period, the nascent new Francoist state carried out a process of management of the bodies of those considered victims of the victorious side. The bodies of the reprisals by the rebel army and its associated militias, or by the new forms of repression of the Francoist state, were held in prisons, concentration camps, forced into exile and buried in mass graves condemning them to the oblivion. However, the bodies that the regime considered victims, because they were members of what the Regime considered their side, were subject to premeditated and politicized management. This management was configured through administrative, judicial, forensic, commemorative and monumental mechanisms. This process of exhumations and management became the basis of which could be considered the construction of bodies as a victory monument for the Franco dictatorship. The management and monumentalisation around the bodies destined for the Martyrs and Fallen by God, along with the management of the bodies, transformed them into a monument for themselves. In the Spanish case, this process and the management of these bodies can be considered as a case of biopolitics of Francoism, and would be the basis for the consolidation of the hegemonic narrative of the Regime.

Miriam Saqqa Carazo is an archaeologist and physical anthropologist. A researcher at the Spanish National Research Council, she is PhD candidate in History and Archeology at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid. She holds a Master Degree in Physical Anthropology and a B.A. in History at the Autonomous University of Madrid. She has worked on archaeological projects and human remains researches in Spain and Palestine, including a research for the Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities of Palestine. She has also taught graduate and postgraduate courses at the Universidad de Oriente, Cuba. Currently, she investigates the exhumations carried out during and after the Civil War by the Spanish State, as part of the research project "BELOW GROUND: Mass Grave Exhumations and Human Rights in Historical, Transnational and Comparative Perspective".

Tactical ambiguity in museum exhibitions in post-regime Myanmar

Alicia Stevens, University of Cambridge

Since the democratic elections of 2015, cultural heritage in Myanmar is caught in a shifting political power dynamic between the former regime and the new government that runs counter to a national narrative of democracy and freedom. The military minority in government – which includes several members of the former regime - maintains 25% of the seats in parliament and control of the key government ministries of Home, Border and Defense. Both military and civilian government factions are outwardly engaged in the process of National Reconciliation with mutual interest in maintaining the appearance of democracy and freedom to the world, while surreptitiously negotiating (and constantly re-negotiating) the terms of a hybrid autocratic/democratic government structure. What this means for heritage is that the telling of significant events of the past decades of armed conflict is at times in the hands of the former oppressors. This paper examines data from two museums in Yangon (Rangoon) – one from regime times and a new democracy museum – to understand how the military minority uses heritage to establish meaning in post-regime Myanmar through the use of “tactical ambiguity” in museum interpretation.

Alicia Stevens is a PhD Candidate and Gates Cambridge Scholar in Archaeological Heritage and Museums at the University of Cambridge. She also holds an MPhil in heritage from Cambridge and an M.Sc. from Columbia University. She has two decades of experience in museum work as senior director of global programs at the American Museum of Natural History in New York City and international program coordinator for the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C. She has consulted for the United Nations, the World Bank, and the countries of Jordan, the United Arab Emirates, Mongolia, China, and others. She is a member and former board member of the Explorers Club and is on the advisory board of the Educational Travel Community.

Erasing communism: The contemporary iconoclastic movement in Poland

Marek Świdrak, Jagiellonian University

The paper is dedicated to the recent actions taken against the remains of the communist regime in Poland (1945-1989). The current government (in power since 2015) has devoted much effort to bring down the legacy of the previous political system by introducing various bills. One of the recent laws is dedicated to erasing the visible presence of the mentioned period in the public space. Actions taken in accordance with the bill have sparked a vigorous debate in Polish media and society. The decommunisation act requires local governments to remove statues and monuments and change the names of streets, buildings and institutions so that the rejected notions or persons would not be honoured in this way anymore. The aforementioned iconoclasm, unlike the one which took place in Poland right after 1989 and toppled monuments of the Soviet politicians, has been aimed at a much wider spectrum of

monuments. Now not only figures of Soviet-enforced politicians, but many much less disgraced citizens of Poland became "victims" of the crusade even though some had never held any political position. The bill led in some cases to hilarious effects such as attempts to change the omnipresent street name "Dworcowa" which was mistaken by some stakeholders as a name referring to Nikolai Dvortsov but in fact just informs you that there is a train station (dworzec) nearby. Unarguably the law enforced rejection of a vast amount of both tangible and intangible heritage, mostly of onomatological nature. Apart from showing the current iconoclasm in Poland, the paper gives an analysis of the situation within the framework of research conducted on the collective memory and compares the situation in Poland with recent debates in USA (concerning Confederate Monuments) or UK (concerning e.g. the case of the statue of Cecil Rhodes).

Marek Świdrak is a lawyer and an art historian. He gained his Master's degree in Law (2013), Bachelor's and Master's degree in History of Art (2013, 2015) and Bachelor's degree in Cultural Heritage Protection (2015) at the Jagiellonian University in Cracow, Poland. Currently he is studying for a PhD in the field of early modern European architecture at the Institute of History of Art at the Jagiellonian University where he is also a lecturer of International Heritage Law. Moreover, he works in the International Cultural Centre in Cracow, in the Heritage Education Department.

Reshaping Heritage: the restoration of Northern Portuguese monuments in the 1920s and 1930s

José Pedro Tenreiro, Lisbon School of Architecture

The problem of the restoration of the main Portuguese monuments is a matter that crossed different generations and decades. Although the first studies appeared in the nineteenth century, the first campaign of restoration of national monuments is only put into practice in the late 1920s, when the country is undergoing major changes. It is in the political context of the National Dictatorship (1926-1933) that the first stage of restoration works is undertaken, mostly regarding medieval churches in Northern Portugal. Most of the architects involved in the restoration projects of these monuments studied at Porto's Fine Arts School and integrate the General Directorate of National Buildings and Monuments created in 1929, shaping their professional profile to the image of their mentor and former professor Marques da Silva who was himself involved in the last restoration projects of the nineteenth century. A similar situation can be observed in their projects, recovering the methods of the Historicist-Academist model of the previous century. These restoration works are part of the first stage of public works of the new political regime, along with a campaign for scholar buildings, establishing in the monuments of the past the strong image of the state. Thus, this model of restoration, carried out until the late 1960s, is one of the tools used by the regime to reshape the taste of the public on architecture as well as a strategy to control the education of the younger architects, lasting over the fall of the dictatorship until today, as it can be seen on some of the newest restoration projects. This participation aims to show the continuity of

restoration strategies through time, crossing some of the most representative examples of the works undertaken in the 1920s and 1930s with the profile of the architects behind the projects.

José Pedro Tenreiro (Viseu, Portugal, 1984) is an architectural history researcher and an activist for architectural heritage, having concluded his degree in Architecture in 2008 and master in 2012 at the Faculty of Architecture of the University of Porto (Faculdade de Arquitectura da Universidade do Porto - FAUP). Apart from his architectural practice in Portugal and Switzerland as well as an independent research stay in Brussels, he has over the past 15 years developed a research on the architecture of the Porto region since 1871 until today. He is at the moment developing his PhD research at the Lisbon School of Architecture (Faculdade de Arquitectura da Universidade de Lisboa – FA-ULisboa) under the subject “The Threshold of Modernism - Eclectic Architecture in Porto and Northern Portugal, 1895-1925” supported by the doctoral scholarship FCT No. SFRH/BD/118667/2016.

The Heritage of Authoritarianism and the Authoritarian Revolt

Rob van der Laarse, *University of Amsterdam*

In 2017 a scientific edition of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* appeared with thousands of footnotes on the sources of the author's ideas. This semantic genealogy has been welcomed as an attractive way to explain Europe's most evil book to its citizens. *Mein Kampf* was for decades kept out of the public sphere, and it was the first time since 1945 that Hitler was allowed to speak again in public. Remarkably though, the editors did not explain modern readers the enormous appeal of this book among their predecessors. It was as if they simply could not believe anyone would still be attracted to war and racism after reading such an unattractive book. Yet it is not Hitler's mindscape which should interest us, but that of his millions of followers who did share his racial utopia of a strong, purified nation, and the offering their lives for the largest genocide and the biggest war in history. And as they mourned for decades after the war, it was not because of the Holocaust, but because of the loss of their leader. My keynote will deal with the *attraction* of fascism, and I will do so from a post-war perspective of Nazism as the complete negation of humanism and liberal democracy. If this negative legacy of authoritarianism centred around Auschwitz and the Holocaust as the crucial founding myth of the postwar project of European unification, how should we explain then the current Authoritarian Revolt of the New Right? Could it be that *Mein Kampf* would not be only a book of history, but still has a message to address to its readers? As to this, I will draw attention to the complex relationship of past motives and present meanings of the *heritage* of authoritarianism. For it is not only *Mein Kampf*, but also the sources which inspired Hitler, such as Oswald Spengler's *The Decline of the West* (1918-1922), the geopolitical work of Carl Schmitt and other thinkers of the *Konservative Revolution*, which promotes a new authoritarian project to turn decadent democracies into strong states, united in a crusade against the enemies of western civilization. And thus we may ask why the *modernity* of fascism is hardly recognised thus far by progressives, and why exactly this attraction of authoritarianism has made us blind for some uneasy continuities of the Third Reich's

‘makeability’ and *Ordnungswahn*. In postwar Europe, Nazism’s ‘difficult heritage’ has been almost completely tabooed as a force of evil, a negative heritage which was there, but not allowed to enter public space, to speak about, or to mention without an authorised scientific or artistic intervention. For European memory was built on the ‘house of the dead’ (Tony Judt) with Auschwitz-Birkenau as the ultimate mnemonic icon of ‘dark heritage’. Yet notions like dark or difficult heritage mainly show how the legacy of authoritarian regimes is mostly gazed from a humanist perspective as a return to barbarism. Not only does such narrative frames prevent us to explain the historic attraction of fascism and communism, it also neglects that instead of dark or difficult most heritage of authoritarianism is (silently) appropriated as modernism. We may therefore better look to new historical explanations which point, on the one hand, to the modernity of fascism (and communism), and on the other, to a continuous obsession with purity and degeneration. This is what I would call the ‘fatal attraction’ of authoritarian modernism, and which confronts us with the uncomfortable possibility that Nazism still ‘speaks’ to younger generations.

Rob van der Laarse holds the inter-university Westerbork chair in War and Conflict Heritage at VU University and the University of Amsterdam, and is founding director of the Heritage, Memory and Material Culture (AHM) research school at the humanities faculty of the University of Amsterdam. He studied history and anthropology at the UvA, where he graduated cum laude, and was awarded a Praemium Erasmianum research prize (1990). Professor Van der Laarse was fellow at several European universities, theme group leader at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study (NIAS), and currently theme leader at the interuniversity research centre ACCESS EUROPE. His research focuses on cultural landscapes, competing memories, and European cultural history on which he publishes widely. He is founding editor of AUP’s book series *Landscape and Heritage Studies* and *Heritage and Memory Studies*, and of the *Palgrave Studies in Cultural Heritage and Conflict* (with Britt Baillie and Ihab Saloul), and initiated several large research projects to the competing memories and contested heritage of the 20th century World Wars and the Holocaust, such as *Dynamics of Memory, Terrascapes* (awarded with the Euromediterraneo Prize 2013), and the European collaborative HERA-JRP project *Accessing Campscapes. Inclusive Strategies for European Conflicted Pasts (iC-ACCESS)*, and takes part in the H2020 MSCA-Innovative Training Network *Critical Heritage Studies and the Future of Europe (CHEurope)*.

Cultural Violence and the construction of 'atmosfears': legacies of authoritarianism in Spain

Dacia Viejo-Rose, University of Cambridge

The heritage management policies and practices of authoritarian regimes are replete with both bombastic statements about the past and unabashed re-writings of it. The imposition of one-dimensional heritage narratives can be seen in an unabashed array of performances, monument building, edited national curricula and text-books, as well as restoration projects. Using the example of Spain, this paper sets out to explore what the immediate consequences and medium-term legacies of such impositions might be. To do so it will borrow from

Galtung (1990) and Žižek (2005) to propose an analytic lens for examining cultural violence and suggest that heritage management practices can be used to intimidate and create an atmosphere of fear: an ‘atmosfear.’

Dacia Viejo-Rose is a Lecturer in Heritage at the Department of Archaeology, University of Cambridge, Deputy Director of the Cambridge Heritage Research Centre, and Director of Studies at Selwyn College, Cambridge. Her work focuses on cultural violence, how notions of risk inform heritage values, and reparations for the destruction of cultural heritage. Prior to her current positions she was a British Academy Post-doctoral Fellow (20012-2014). Her PhD (University of Cambridge, 2009) was published as "Reconstructing Spain: Cultural Heritage and Memory after Civil War" (SAP, 2011), she also co-edited the book "War and Cultural Heritage" (CUP, 2016).

A form too grand to be left aside: Aesthetic narratological socio-political critique of the Memorial Complex of Kaunas 9th Fort Museum

Rolandas Vytautas Lingys

The object of this paper is the Memorial complex of Kaunas 9th Fort Museum and its expositions, its reinterpretation and memory work before and after post-soviet transition. Opened in 1958 and expanded during 1974-1984, the complex was the second biggest place of Nazi organized crimes in Lithuanian territory along with the prison used by independent Lithuanian authoritarian regime, and it became the most suitable plane for constructing soviet Grand historical narrative. In the manner of critical heritage studies, this paper highlights the facets of authority in different historical and social realities. The main focus is directed towards critically assessing how post-soviet transition affected facets of remembering within the frame of the Museum and memorial complex. Case analysis of the Memorial complex of Kaunas 9th Fort Museum (its architectural and narratological aspects) before and after post-soviet transition provides in-depth understanding of how visual articulation becomes aesthetically instrumental within the politics of remembrance. Presenting a wide range of illustrative material (archive photographic images of the built form and expositions within) the paper underlines key critical issues on how the political realm was and, arguably, still is affecting memory work. The analysis highlights facets from its brutalist architecture and pathways interconnecting separate sections of the Memorial complex to spatial setting of the thematic expositions and works of art within it. Considering its scale, the research is constructed in a strict linear mode as a tour-guided aesthetic narratological socio-political critique of the built form and its former and present exposition content in relation to different political realms. Narratological inconsistencies and problematic aesthetic facets present the case of materialist cryptogram of domination not of the historical content, but of the form (of remembrance) itself.

World heritage listing and changes of political values: A case study in West Lake Cultural Landscape in Hongzhou, China

Rouran Zhang, *Nankai University*

This paper explores the changes in the political role of heritage during the process of World Heritage listing of a Chinese cultural heritage site, West Lake Cultural Landscape of Hangzhou. The study is based on three and a half months of fieldwork in Beijing, Shanghai and Hangzhou. First, it examines how the government officials and experts formulated the nomination dossier, and explores their purposes in seeking World Heritage listing and their understanding of heritage. In addition, tensions between governments' understanding of the values of the site and those of UNESCO and ICOMOS are mapped. Second, it examines how the Chinese government used the World Heritage 'brand' and policies to construct national and local narratives during and after the World Heritage listing. The paper argues that both national and local governments are quite cynical about the listing process, in that they not only recognize they are playing a game, but that the game is 'played' under Eurocentric rules and terms. They know some Chinese values do not fit into UNESCO's conception of 'outstanding universal value' (OUV), and they have 'edited out' those Chinese values, which could not be explained to Western experts, and utilised the discourses of international policy and expertise. Ultimately, these values and 'rules' frame the management of the sites to some extent, as the Chinese government must not, in order to maintain the WH listing, deviate too much from the rules of the game.

Rouran Zhang is a lecturer in College of Tourism and Service Management, Nankai University, Tianjin, China. He holds a PhD in Interdisciplinary Cross-Cultural Research from the Centre of Heritage and Museum Studies, Australian National University. He is a member of ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Cultural Tourism. His research interest is to extend understanding of the way Chinese domestic tourists and residents use heritage sites and map the tensions between their use, the World Heritage position and the Chinese Governments' position on heritage issues. Recently, He had signed a book contract with Routledge entitled '*Chinese Heritage Site and Tourist Audience*', The book will be published in 2019. More broadly he holds a B.A. and M.A. in urban planning and landscape architecture respectively. He is a member of the ongoing collaborative project of ICOMOS and IUCN entitled 'The Culture Nature Journey'.

The impacts of 'dictatorship' on the management and uses of heritage sites

Minjae Zoh, *University of Cambridge*

Many past dictators around the world have significantly influenced their country's heritage sites (i.e. via restoration, protection, promotion and (re)interpretation of their meanings and values). This paper, recognising the unique and distinct relationship between heritage and dictatorships, aims to question and shed light on 1) why dictators commonly turned to heritage, and 2) some of the impacts a dictator (with their degree of power, control and authority) can have on the management and uses of heritage sites in the medium and long terms. The paper explores as its central case study the dictatorial regime of Chun Doo Hwan (1980-1988), a military general who succeeded Park Chung Hee when he was unexpectedly

assassinated in 1979. In the study of South Korean heritage, Park Chung Hee has mostly received spotlight, but here, the focus will be given to Chun Doo Hwan. Chun assumed power by engineering a massacre (mass killing of citizens) in Gwangju in 1980 and for this his regime suffered a serious legitimacy problem. Like many dictators before him and around the world, Chun also turned to 'heritage.' He selected different sites to Park Chung Hee to establish his own trademark in the culture sector and also arguably intentionally publicised his interest in the heritage sites in the Jeolla province (where Gwangju is located). The heritage sites selected for restoration and promotion during this time can be said to have been almost entirely respondent to Chun to complement and assist in his image and narrative construction and reconstruction. This case is therefore instrumental for examining how and why heritage becomes used as a tool by a dictator and also for examining some of the impacts a dictator can have on how and which heritage sites become managed and used.

Minjae Zoh is currently a PhD candidate at the University of Cambridge. Prior to undertaking her PhD project, she studied at University College London (UCL) where she obtained both her undergraduate (BA, Archaeology) and Masters (MA, Public Archaeology) degrees. Her current PhD research investigates the impacts of 'Authorised Dictatorial Discourse' on the management and uses of heritage sites through the case of South Korea's Military Dictatorship Era (1961-1988). This concept stems from Laurajane Smith's (2006) seminal works on Authorised Heritage Discourse and her argument about how authorities in the form of decision-making bodies have medium and long-term impacts on the preservation and promotion of heritage sites, and that this happens detached from the wider public. Outside her PhD topic, her academic interests revolve around intangible heritage (namely oral traditions), museum displays and public outreach.

Indonesia and Zimbabwe: Towards a comparative study of authoritarian heritages in Asia and Africa

***Jonathon Zilberg**, University of Illinois at Urban-Champaign*

While the memorialization of catastrophic events in post-independence Zimbabwe is an entirely taboo subject, Indonesia presents several useful instances for study and qualitative comparison. This paper introduces examples which illustrate qualitative differences in the heritage of authoritarianism in one state and consider what these potentially offer the other. Indeed, the comparative study of heritage and authoritarianism is a timely and interesting topic in both countries. The topic is a no-go in Zimbabwe despite the recent ouster of President Robert Mugabe, and Indonesia has very recently banned such research - military museums are now officially designated as off limits for study by foreign researchers. Nevertheless, it is possible to make provisional comment on authoritarian heritage in both places, especially based on research data collected in the past in Aceh, Jambi, Jakarta and most recently east Java. In Indonesia, despite the transition from a former authoritarian order to a democratic one, the subject of how such events are officially remembered is heavily controlled and as far as the state is concerned still effectively taboo. The long shadow of authoritarianism thus shows just how intransigent hegemonic state narratives can be. How transformational traumatic events

are represented and remembered is a much-controlled subject - even though it is matter of considerable public debate and dispute wherever it takes place. By comparing several state and anti-state counter-memory projects in Indonesia this paper contrasts the narratives constantly bubbling below the surface concerning the independence war, the 1965 communist purge, the anti-Chinese unrest and the Trisakti student killings of May 1998, the separatist war in Aceh which ended with the tsunami in December 2004 and finally in the record of the suppression of activism in the post-New Order era symbolized in the unresolved murder of the activist Munir on September 7, 2004.

Jonathan Zilberg is a cultural anthropologist who specializes in museums and archives, art and religion. Over the last decade he has been studying institutional and other constraints limiting performance in Indonesian museums in Sumatra and Java. His research interests include the study of the role of popular culture in politics and memory specifically in the rise of religious intolerance. His specific area of expertise is the methodological and theoretical consequence of serendipity in practice anthropology. As a Contributing Researcher in the Department of Transtechnology at the University of Plymouth he regularly contributes to Leonardo on-line Reviews and has been involved in that context in the expanding debates over the nexus of art, science and the humanities. He received his doctorate in 1996 from the University of Illinois at Urban-Champaign (UIUC) and remains based there as an Associate Research Scholar with the Center for African Studies.

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Malcom Angelucci: malcolm.angelucci@unimelb.edu.au

Oliver Antczak: oa273@cam.ac.uk
Giorgia Aquilar: giorgia.aquilar@tum.de
Gruia Badescu: gruia.badescu@ouxex.ac.uk
[Flaminia Bartolini](mailto:Flaminia.Bartolini@cam.ac.uk); fb282@cam.ac.uk
Ruth Ben Ghiat: rb68@nyu.edu
Shraddha Bhatawadekar: shraddha.6886@gmail.com
Joana Brites: joanabrites@hotmail.com
Rianne de Beer: riannefdebeer@gmail.com
Yasmina Chanmi: yce22@cam.ac.uk
Yueying Chen: Y.Chen14@wlv.ac.uk
Margaret Comer: mac201@cam.ac.uk
Rangga Dachlan: rad76@cam.ac.uk
Ben Davenport: bkd20@cam.ac.uk
Laura Denon: lagd4@cam.ac.uk
Julie Deschepper: julie_desch@hotmail.fr
Olimpia Dragouni: olimpia.dragouni@al.uw.edu.pl
Atef Elsaka: atefelsaka82@gmail.com
Paola Filippucci: paola.filippucci@murrayedwards.cam.ac.uk
Bianca Gaudenzi: bg265@cam.ac.uk
Joel Geraets: jg9906@bristol.ac.uk
David Gill: David.W.Gill@uea.ac.uk
Emily Glass: Emily.Glass@bristol.ac.uk
Jan Gryta: jan.gryta@manchester.ac.uk
Serkan Gunay: 17020422@brookes.ac.uk
Mireya Hernandez: mireya.c.hernandez@gmail.com
Reem Hg: reemhgs@outlook.com
Alexandrea Ion: ai300@cam.ac.uk
Francesco Iacono: fi216@cam.ac.uk
Liliana Janik: lj102@cam.ac.uk
Stefano Kerschbamer: Stortis@yahoo.it
Andrea Kocsis: ak2003@cam.ac.uk
Alexa Laharty: ael54@cam.ac.uk
Kako Lavendier: kl474@cam.ac.uk
Marie Le Devehat: marie.devehat.17@ucl.ac.uk
Hyun Kyung Lee: hklec2278@gmail.com
Ya Chen (Rachel) Lee: rebecca.ycl@gmail.com
Alejandra Luz: luz.field.17@ucl.ac.uk
Catalina Maya: 17092880@brookes.ac.uk
Mukuna Meda: pembelemeda@gmail.com

Eva Meharry:	jedm3@cam.ac.uk
Nick Naumov:	Nick.Naumov@northampton.ac.uk
Gheorghe Alexandru Niculescu	alec_niculescu@yahoo.com

Munawar Nour	N.A.Munawar@uva.nl
Robert Parkinson	Robert.Parkinson@historicengland.org.uk
Mariana Pereira	mp850@cam.ac.uk
Pranskūnienė Rasa	rasapr@gmail.com
Emine Reis	17094615@brookes.ac.uk
Anjali Roy	anjali@hss.iitkgp.ernet.in
Zhang Rouran	RouranZHANG@live.cn
Alfredo Gonzales Rujbal-	alfredo.gonzalez-ruibal@incipit.csic.es
Anri Sala	
Miriam Saqqa	msc.sa.ca@gmail.com
Marie Louise Sorensen	mlss@cam.ac.uk
Alicia Stevens	avs43@cam.ac.uk
Marek Swidrak	marekswidrak@gmail.com
Lui Tam	TamL@cardiff.ac.uk
Arthur Tan	hmt48@cam.ac.uk
José Pedro Tenreiro	jpgtenreiro@gmail.com
Oya Topcuoglu	oya.topcuoglu@northwestern.edu
Robert van der Laarse	laarse@uva.nl
Dacia Viejo Rose	dv230@cam.ac.uk
Kevin Woolard	kevin.woolard@icloud.com
Jonathan Zilberg	jonathanzilberg@gmail.com
Minhye Zoh	minhyezoh@live.co.uk
Minjae Zoh	mz369@cam.ac.uk

ORGANISING COMMITTEE

Convenors:

Francesco Iacono

Flaminia Bartolini

Minjae Zoh

Conference team:

Andrea Koksis (Social media and Website)

Rangga Dachlan (Catering)

Charlotte Williams (Registration)

Mariana Pereira (Name-badge)

Oliver Antczak: (Logo and Poster Design)

Alicia Stevens (Programme)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Our heartfelt gratitude to **all the Heritage MPhil students** for helping out on the day of the conference.

As well as to the **McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research** for their generous financial support.

