



Introduction: Heritage-Outside-In

Susan L. T. Ashley & Sybille Frank

To cite this article: Susan L. T. Ashley & Sybille Frank (2016) Introduction: Heritage-Outside-In, International Journal of Heritage Studies, 22:7, 501-503, DOI: [10.1080/13527258.2016.1184704](https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2016.1184704)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2016.1184704>



Published online: 21 Jun 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 134



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Introduction: Heritage-Outside-In

Susan L. T. Ashley and Sybille Frank

‘Heritage’ is one social imaginary used by people to define identity in relation to ideas about the past. But global flows of people, ideas, imaginations and technologies (Appadurai 1996; Urry 2007) are challenging established group/community/national identities and the dominating systems and discourses of power that constitute heritage. This special issue offers a range of insights about those challenges to the nature and importance of heritage and identities from the perspectives of those ‘outside’ the authorised realm of heritage discourse (Smith 2006). Important to us are the power relations that constitute the shifting, contested and puzzling assumptions of difference used to define ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ positionality (Hall 1999; Littler 2005).

We see ‘heritage-making’ as a process of cultural production in relation to the past by which people make sense of their world and their place within it, as well as strategically assert their voices in the public sphere. Heritage is interpreted not as an intrinsic quality possessed by objects, buildings or places or even intangible practices, but a signification or valuation of the past undertaken by all humans to give meaning to their lives. Heritage as ‘making’ is a performative act; an active and affective expression of individual and community senses of self (Robertson 2012). Performative heritage seen as an act of voice infers a more political expressing of opinion, being heard, and registering that opinion in a way that is recognised and valued in democratised world-making. Heritage expression as ‘world-making’ draws on Arendt (1958) who passionately argued for a public realm with the power to gather strangers together, mobilising both semblance and difference in order to confront the complexities and uncertainties of human life in diverse communities (Simon and Ashley 2010). In this process, peoples will seek to retain the ability to make worlds (choose, express and change their rooted identities) in ways that they control socially, economically and politically. By making heritage, ‘outside’ or minority individuals and groups represent their own cultural difference, but also articulate their relationship to the collective polity in their home/place/nation (Shryock 2004).

Much international academic research about heritage and marginalised or minority peoples situates such peoples as ‘beneficiaries’ of mainstream institutional social inclusion activities (Lynch and Alberti 2010). This special issue takes the ‘outsider’ perspective, inspecting independent heritage-making actions and projects driven by ethnic, racial and other (sub)cultural groups and individuals. The research topics presented here aim to understand heritage-making activities as phenomena within globalisation and de-colonialisation, bound up in the negotiation of identities and subjectivities by marginalised or migratory peoples, thus shaped by the social, cultural and political ecologies of signification on the ground.

The ‘outside-in’ approach is an essential component of critical heritage studies, which advocates a theoretically and politically informed analysis of the processes in society that produce and consume the past, often from a bottom up perspective (Smith 2012; Winter 2013; Witcomb and Buckley 2013). While heritage scholars have long included critical perspectives (e.g. Hewison 1987; Lowenthal 1996), critical heritage theorists foreground power relations and invite ‘the active participation of people and communities who to date have been marginalised in the creation and management of “heritage”’ (Smith 2012, 534). This special issue looks at those multifaceted power relations that ground in transcontinental

movements of people to distant countries as settlers, scholars, soldiers or subjects. It investigates the long-term impact their mobilities have had on social relations, identities and spatial structures in their regions of destination and/or origin that are surfacing today in contested heritage-making and heritage-unmaking processes. The articles employ language about ‘immigrants,’ ‘Indigenous people’ or ‘minorities’ for analytical purposes, with a full understanding that such categorisations are fuzzy, premature and at worst racialising. This constitutes an imagined sector of communities, usually non-Western, by race or colonial status. The authors acknowledge this as problematic: understanding the deployment and rationalisation of such categorisations by scrutinising cases from different parts of the world is a key step in most of the articles presented here.

This issue brings together a series of authors who inspect key aspects in this negotiation of heritage and identities. Laying the groundwork with her provocative commentary is Roshi Naidoo in *All that we are: heritage inside out and upside down*. Naidoo makes clear the problems with dualisms and boundary-making that binaries like ‘outside-in’ produce. She questions who constitutes inside-ness and outside-ness, what perspectives are privileged, and what subjectivities are produced by such positionalities. But further, Naidoo challenges heritage academics and practitioners to examine their own intellectual work for assumptions, discursive formations and conceptual models of ‘whiteness’ that presume to know what constitutes the centre. The peer-review process behind Naidoo’s article was itself a microcosm of the problems she highlights in the article.

Naidoo establishes just what is at stake in the outside-in paradigm within heritage studies, where race and otherness are central concerns. Typically, heritage has been invoked as a useful concept to create an authorised and racialised version of group, community or national identity. A specified narrative of the past establishes the terms of who is positioned inside and outside this imagined community. The embellishment and perpetuation of that special narrative about the past as ‘heritage’ is reinforced in public spaces. *Negotiating German colonial heritage in Berlin’s Afrikanisches Viertel* demonstrates not only how such narratives have been solidified through street-naming in Berlin’s African Quarter, but also how these long unquestioned heritage meanings are disputed by ‘outsiders.’ This example highlights how colonial-critical and non-white perspectives on the German colonial heritage have been brought to the centre in public arenas, but how those contesting authorised narratives are still marginalised agents. In this paper, Susanne Förster, Sybille Frank, Georg Krajewsky and Jona Scherer analyse the conflicts of agency and conflicting notions of temporality and spatiality of those involved in this heritage-making, which affected their inside-outside positioning.

While the outside-in boundary is, as the first two papers demonstrate, often conceptualised as non-white migrants coping with or being accommodated by insider white culture, the next two articles turn that imagining upside down. Cangbai Wang studies the attitudes towards heritage of diasporic Overseas Chinese returning to their ancestral homelands in China. In *The Turtle Garden: Tan Kah Kee’s last spiritual world*, Wang explores how Tan Kah Kee, while a national symbol of Chinese patriotism, had very conflicted views of his heritage and his former nation. Through the elaborate natural and artistic space of his extraordinary Turtle Garden, Tan created a new vision of heritage and new style of civic museum. Here he could express his complex ideas on the past, spirituality, Chinese identity and the Chinese nation, bringing an ‘outside’ and dissenting view of heritage back into mainland China.

In the following article, Eyrún Eyþórsdóttir and Kristín Loftsdóttir discuss the interesting case of Icelandic settlers in Brazil, who re-constitute an imagined Icelandic and Viking heritage within this South American nation. *Vikings in Brazil: the Iceland Brazil Association shaping Icelandic heritage* presents the case of heritage used as status symbol: in effect, a means of Europeanising or racial whitening for social gain. In a case that reflects processes studied in other nations colonised by Europeans, Eyþórsdóttir and Loftsdóttir detail the attitudes of diverse Brazilians with Icelandic descent or connections as they use a shared sensibility, more than any history or traditions, as a way of creating community and establishing their difference from those outside their group. Their self-perceived ethnic distinctness gives them a sense of value and privilege, because of its association with an exotic white Europeaness.

In *Acts of heritage, acts of value: memorialising at the Chattri Indian Memorial, UK*, Susan Ashley draws attention to both tangible heritage and affective heritage practices that lie outside of typical

memorialising processes in the UK. She explores the changing value placed on this WWI memorial as it moved from official site of King and Empire to site for grassroots heritage activities by once-colonised people now living in the UK. The isolated monument is now enlivened annually by a hybrid Anglo-Indian ceremony that is chaotic, cross-cultural and electrifying. Ashley argues that by en-acting at this site in an embodied way, participants are able to exert and draw attention to their ‘presence,’ a confrontation of racism in the UK and a redrawing or decentring of what is valued as heritage.

The final article in this special issue demonstrates the human consequences of heritage-making processes that render others invisible. David Neufeld describes how colonial expansion in the Yukon in Canada engulfed Indigenous peoples, led to identity-destroying cultural policies such as residential schools, and reduced original inhabitants to ‘outsiders’ in their own land. In his article *Our land is our voice: First Nation heritage-making in the Tr'ondëk/Klondike*, Neufeld demonstrates how Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in ideas about heritage, based on the land and the Treasure Box, exist alternatively from, but in relationship with, the authorised story of white settler pioneering that once dominated heritage narratives in the Yukon. The Treasure Box can be seen as a different conceptualising of heritage that carries ancestors, wisdom, relationships and the land, among other qualities, which allows people to make their way in the world and into the future.

The trope of ‘Heritage-Outside-In’ has been deployed by the authors in this special issue with the intention of challenging normative ideas about what constitutes cultural heritage and whose voices are foregrounded. It is thus not founded on a simple ‘outside-inside’ binary. We conceptualise ‘Heritage-Outside-In’ as a continuum, as an analytic tool that helps us to grasp power relations between social groups that are complex, mutable and alternating and that will change whenever we alter the focus. By this we also want to draw attention to how we often designate ‘insideness’ and ‘outsideness’ within unequal relations of power using unquestioned assumptions about positionality and subjectivity. Shifting attention to those being excluded from, or subjected by, authorised heritage narratives makes their knowledge-making central, not marginal, to understanding how the past is ‘heritagised’ through a dynamic process of valuation deployed by different social groups; a communicative and relationship-building practice that recognises the multiple aims and subjectivities in the making of heritage.

References

- Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Arendt, Hannah. 1958. *The Human Condition*. 2nd ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hall, Stuart. 1999. “Whose Heritage? Un-settling ‘the Heritage’, Re-imagining the Post-nation.” *Third Text* 13 (49): 3–13.
- Hewison, Robert. 1987. *The Heritage Industry. Britain in a Climate of Decline*. London: Methuen.
- Littler, Jo. 2005. “Introduction. British Heritage and the Legacies of ‘Race.’” In *The Politics of Heritage: The Legacies of ‘Race’*, edited by Jo Littler and Roshi Naidoo, 1–19. London: Routledge.
- Lowenthal, David. 1996. *Possessed by the Past*. New York: Free Press.
- Lynch, Bernadette T., and Samuel J. M. Alberti. 2010. “Legacies of Prejudice: Racism, Co-production and Radical Trust in the Museum.” *Museum Management and Curatorship* 25 (1): 13–35.
- Robertson, Iain, ed. 2012. *Heritage from Below*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.
- Shryock, Andrew. 2004. “Other Conscious/Self Aware: First Thoughts on Cultural Intimacy and Mass Mediation.” In *Off Stage/on Display: Intimacy and Ethnography in the Age of Public Culture*, edited by Andrew Shryock, 1–28. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Simon, Roger I., and Susan L. T. Ashley. 2010. “Heritage and Practices of Public Formation.” *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16 (4–5): 247–254.
- Smith, Laurajane. 2006. *The Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, Laurajane. 2012. “Editorial. A Critical Heritage Studies?” *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 18 (6): 533–540.
- Urry, John. 2007. *Mobilities*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Winter, Tim. 2013. “Clarifying the Critical in Critical Heritage Studies.” *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 19 (6): 532–545.
- Witcomb, Andrea, and Kristal Buckley. 2013. “Engaging with the Future of ‘Critical Heritage Studies’: Looking Back in Order to Look Forward.” *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 19 (6): 562–578.