



DisTerrMem
Disputed territories & memory

Literature Review

The role of cultural practitioners in managing memories of disputed territories

January 2020

Authors:

David Clarke, University of Bath, UK

Weronika Czyżewska-Poncyłjusz, Borderland Foundation, Poland

Umber bin Ibad, Forman Christian College, Pakistan

Joanna Wawrzyniak, University of Warsaw, Poland

www.disterrmem.eu



@DisTerrMem



Disterrmem-Disputed-Territories-Memory-113053853471251

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 823803.



Contents

Abstract	3
The Relationship between Memory, Territoriality and Cultural Practice - David Clarke	4
Memory and Cultural Heritage: From Reconciliation and Peace Building to Pilgrimage and Tourism- Weronika Czyżewska-Poncyłjusz, Umber bin Ibad, Joanna Wawrzyniak	20
Bibliography	33

Abstract

This literature review discusses the connections between space, memory and cultural practice from several standpoints. The first part on the *Relationship between Memory, Territoriality and Cultural Practice* brings to memory studies insights from the spatial turn in cultural and political geography. By the emphasis on 'lived' space, David Clarke raises the question of what is at stake in the memory of disputed territories, paying attention in particular to affect, embodiment and performance. By stressing individual, processual and open-ended engagements with place and memory, scholars working with affective and non-representational approaches understand place as multiple and becoming, which works against dominant accounts of geographical location that seek to define and delimit both geographically and temporally by insisting on historical fixity and an exclusionary spatial ordering. The second part on *Memory and Cultural Heritage: From Reconciliation and Peace Building to Pilgrimage and Tourism* by Weronika Czyżewska-Poncyłjusz, Umber bin Ibad and Joanna Wawrzyniak surveys recent scholarship on (i) reconciliation and peace building; (ii) heritage and reconciliation; (iii) and diasporas, pilgrimages and tourism. These fields offer insights to memory studies as it seeks to find ways in which cultural practices contribute to conflict transformation and post-conflict recovery. Recognition of the profound impact culture has on peace building and reconciliation processes leads to interdisciplinary efforts in creating models of art-based educational programs and socially engaged cultural practices on community levels that contribute to practice oriented approach to conflict resolution through culture. Special focus in this review is given to cultural practices at heritage sites which have potential to overcome antagonism and one-sidedness of memory practices, strategies, and forms in post-conflict societies. The review shows that while it is widely recognized that cultural practices might become a resource for both reconciliation and for renewal of conflicts, it is still not clear what type of heritage management is decisive in peace building and reconciliation.

The Relationship between Memory, Territoriality and Cultural Practice - David Clarke

In this first contribution concerning the role of cultural practitioners in managing memories of disputed territories, David Clarke explores the social nature of the production of space through the 'spatial turn' and the interaction between territoriality, memory and conflict. Building on the work of geographers and cultural theorists, David highlights the need to go beyond research focusing on the narratives of memory and to explore the lived experience of place, embodiment and performance in order to examine the potential of artistic practices in promoting co-existence and cultural exchange.

Memory, Territory and the Spatial Turn

The post-Cold War period has seen the rise of parallel theoretical pre-occupations in the arts and humanities: the increased prominence of the study of 'memory' and what has been called the 'spatial turn' (Wegner 2002). Both trends characterize broad fields of enquiry. However, generally speaking, we can state that memory studies, as it has come to be known, is above all concerned with how human societies construct their understanding of the past in the present, drawing on symbols, discourses, narratives and cultural practices. The spatial turn, which has been driven primarily by the work of cultural and political geographers, seeks to understand the social nature of the production of space. The social construction of these two categories (shared history and shared space) is understood as providing 'the context for modern identities – and the often-rigorous contestation of those identities' (Hoelscher and Alderman 2004, 348).

Across a range of disciplines that concern themselves with conflict, there is a recognition that there is a close relationship between constructions of space (particularly in terms of territory), shared understandings of the past, and the potential for conflict and violence between groups. As political scientists such as Manekin, Grossman and Mitts (2018, 1) have observed, for example, the link between territory and political violence is well established, as is the relationship between such conflict and the mobilization of symbolic claims to territory, including historical claims (Cf. Alexander B Murphy 1990). Where ownership and control of territory is in dispute between different groups, as McDowell and Braniff note (2014, 15),

‘[c]ontrolling perceptions of what happened and what did not happen within that place is of the utmost importance to groups vying for power and territory.’

In order to understand the potential contribution of cultural practitioners to managing such conflicts, it will be helpful to establish the relationship between memory and territory in theoretical terms, paying particular attention to that branch of memory studies that concerns itself with ‘cultural memory’, understood as ‘that body of reusable texts, images, and rituals specific to each society in each epoch, whose “cultivation” serves to stabilize and convey that society’s self-image’ (Assmann 1995, 132). In surveying this literature, we will also note intersections between the literature emerging from the discipline of memory studies and the work of cultural geographers, philosophers and others who concern themselves with the social production of space, particularly in relation to the construction of territory.

A first question concerns the nature of territory itself and the relationship of territory to memory. Cultural geographers, political geographers and political scientists understand modern territoriality in terms of an intersection between space, power and meaning. Whereas a shift in conceptions of the state in the late middle ages in Europe increasingly identified the state as a territorial unit, as opposed to relying on the authority of the prince to denote the geographical limits of state power (Sassen 2006, 80), the ethno-national states that emerged in the late 19th and early 20th centuries sought to align clearly delineated and territorial units with ethnically, linguistically and culturally homogenous populations. However, such (supposed) national homogeneity and territorial integrity also had to be discursively and symbolically produced. As scholars such as Delaney (Delaney 2005) and Newman observe, for example, this process involved an ‘interaction and feedback between the concrete and symbolic dimensions of the territorial discourse’ (Newman 1999, 26), mediated by institutions of power (Paasi 2000, 8). The articulation of the relationship between bounded territories, with their particular geographical features, and myths of origin, homeland and shared history led to forms of ‘geopeity’ (Newman 1999, 14). In other words, as Berenskoetter argues, the ‘national biographical narratives’ of modern states were increasingly understood as playing out at ‘sites which matter’ (2014, 276) to the national collective in question, and which allowed that national collective to experience a stable sense of self lived out in a distinct and historically grounded territory.

Theoretical work in memory studies recognized the relationship between cultural memory and territory early on, although this question has not always stood at the centre of researchers' concerns. Maurice Halbwachs (1877–1945), considered by many to be the founding father of memory studies, is best known for his introduction of the notion of competing 'frames' of collective memory, which characterize the various memory communities that an individual may adhere to. However, Halbwachs was also interested in the relationship between such collective frames of memory and the landscapes inhabited by those groups (Middleton and Brown 2011). In his essay 'The Legendary Topography of the Gospels in the Holy Land', Halbwachs points out the ways in which the 'truths' of groups become anchored in concrete forms, such as key events, key personalities, or key localities (Halbwachs 1992, 200). 'A society', Halbwachs argues, 'first of all needs to find landmarks' (1992, 222): in other words, in order for the memory of the past to be retained and organized, it needs to find symbolic expression in spatial terms. This chimes both with Berenskoetter's observations, noted above, and also with Zerubavel's assertion of the importance of continuity of place for the rhetoric of historical identity (Zerubavel 2003, 40–43). Smith, a key scholar of ethno-nationalism and memory, has described such processes in terms of a 'territorialization of memory' (Smith 1999, 151). In a more recent phenomenological account of the relationship between place, memory and collective identity, Trigg points out that such territorialisation also emerges from the development of shared spatial practices (e.g. forms of commemoration), instituting a sense of shared 'worldhood', 'the result of which is the assimilated sense of a collection of people having an identity' (Trigg 2012, 157–58).

However, far from presenting a straightforward account of how one (national) group is able to impose its own memory on a particular territory in order to assert a sense of continuity and identity, memory studies has also demonstrated that territories (and the symbolically charged places within those territories) are subject to ongoing contestation and evolution, in which different forces struggle over the meaning of the past and the meaning of territory as an expression of that past. Drawing on the insights of the spatial turn in the arts and humanities, Schlögel has noted that all spaces remain fundamentally plural, bearing the material and cultural traces of successive collectivities (2009, 68–69). At the same time, as Jordan shows, even within a single nation or culture, the selection of the particular material traces of the past

in the landscape that will be constructed as significant, preserved and incorporated into the discourse of cultural memory are subject to a process of negotiation between institutions and citizens, resulting in an 'uneven' landscape of remembrance of remembering and forgetting (2006, 173).

Geographer Doreen Massey challenges the notion that particular locations or territories need to be understood as either founded on a reactionary and exclusionary sense of identity, or as losing any sense of coherent identity due to competing understandings of them. Rather, she argues that 'locations are *constructions* out of intersections and interactions of concrete social relations and social processes in a situation of co-presence' (Massey 1994b, 135). Noting that "'place" and "community" have rarely been coterminous' (1994b, 147), Massey nevertheless asks how 'to hold on to that notion of geographical difference, of uniqueness, even of rootedness if people want that, without it being reactionary' (1994b, 152). Rather than seeing places (or, one might argue, territories) as the source of identity for one community, Massey argues that it is more productive to think of them as 'constructed out of a particular constellation of social relations, meeting and weaving together at a particular locus' (1994b, 154). Considering the role of history in the construction of place, Massey points out how the struggle to define the past of a place (a term she uses broadly to encompasses both localities and territories up to the national level) is part of the struggle to define its present and future, and should therefore be considered in the light of power relations (1994a, 190). Massey observes how competing actors struggle to define place as an 'envelope of space-time' that fixes a single meaning based on a particular understanding of the past (1994a, 188). In contrast, Massey suggests that it is necessary for us to find alternative conceptions of the relationship between place and the past that recognise 'that what has come together, in this place, now, is a conjunction of many histories and many spaces' (1994a, 191). Rather than the identity of place dissolving into many competing memories, Massey is arguing that coherence can be maintained through acknowledgement of the particular relationship of different pasts at a specific location.

Such a conception of the relationship between memory and territory clearly challenges ethno-nationalist conceptions. In situations of disputed territory, the polyvalence of any space can be perceived as a threat to the supposed homogeneity of the territory claimed by one group or

another. Under such situations of conflict, competing groups seek to emphasise the expression of their own history and identity in spatial terms, while presenting the history of others' presence in the landscape as a threat to the integrity of the territory in question. Here cultural practitioners, intellectuals, academics and officials may generate practices that seek to establish the territory in question as always having been part of the nation. These practices will be either 'deconstructive' or 'reconstructive' (Polak Springer 2015, 221) in nature, i.e. they either seek to dismantle the traces of the 'alien' culture, or to 'rediscover' traces of the appropriate national culture in the territory. As Paasi argues, cultural forms such as literature can play a role in the embedding of 'hegemonic narrative accounts of the territory in question', contributing to the 'symbolic narratives and material iconographies of the nation' (Paasi 2000, 9–10).

If cultural practices typical of ethno-nationalism tend to focus on the integrity of territory, an inherently exclusionary focus on ethnic, cultural and linguistic homogeneity, and the construction of historical continuity, what theoretical positions are there available to us that allow us to think about the role of cultural practice in challenging such understandings, particularly in relation to disputed territories and the populations who live in or long for them?

Yuri Lotman's theory of the semiosphere offers one approach to thinking about the relationship between cultural practice and space. Lotman argues that cultures create their own spaces, constructing borders with other cultures (Lotman 1992, 131), which are nevertheless permeable. Lotman's notion of culture as semiosphere by no means indicates a homogenous lifeworld either side of such borders, but rather insists that each semiosphere is itself striated by different levels of culture. Nevertheless, he maintains that 'the life of culture [...] demands a special space-time structure, for culture organizes itself in the form of a special space-time and cannot exist without it. This organization is realized in the form of the semiosphere and at the same time comes into being with the help of the semiosphere' (Lotman 1992, 133). Despite this dividing function, the border is presented by Lotman as a particularly productive location for the creation of new meaning:

the hottest spots for semioticizing processes are the boundaries of the semiosphere. The notion of boundary is an ambivalent one: it both separates and unites. It is always the boundary of something and so belongs to both frontier cultures, to both contiguous

semiospheres. The boundary is bilingual and polylingual. The boundary is a mechanism for translating texts of an alien semiotics into 'our' language, it is the place where what is 'external' is transformed into what is 'internal', it is a filtering membrane which so transforms foreign texts that they become part of the semiosphere's internal semiotics while still retaining their own characteristics. (Lotman 1992, 137)

Such a conception appears to acknowledge the necessity of cultural spaces, which may or may not be coterminous with geographical territories, while also celebrating the border as a site of creative engagement.

In Lotman's writing, the artistic work also takes on a special significance in terms of the creation of its own internal semiosphere, which is a reflection of, although non-identical with the space of the real world. According to Lotman, 'the structure of the space of a text [or a work of art, DC] becomes a model of the structure of the space of the universe, and the internal syntagmatics of the elements within a text becomes the language of spatial modelling' (Lotman 1977, 217). While the artistic work is always understood in relation to dominant spatial models in the culture's semiosphere (Lotman 1977, 218), a given work nevertheless constructs its own spatial model that comments on or conflicts with that which predominates in the cultural semiosphere (Lotman 1977, 224).

According to Nöth, Lotman's theory leads us to a view of cultures and artistic works as separate semiospheres, which are nevertheless 'in reciprocal inter-change' (Nöth 2015, 17). The notion that each artistic work could be a model of space, which is in dialogue with more dominant models in the broader culture, points to a particular role for art in challenging and critiquing the analogy of territory, culture and identity, especially given the fact that Lotman identifies borders between semiospheres as privileged sites for the creation of new meaning.

Lotman's approach bears comparison with the writing of French sociologist Henri Lefebvre, who is nevertheless more explicit about the potentially subversive effects of artistic practice in relation to culturally dominate spatial models. Lefebvre introduces three analytical categories: spatial practice, representations of space and representational spaces. The first category equates to the daily movement through and use of space by individuals, but in a context determined by the power of institutions and engrained spatial habits and routines (Lefebvre 1991, 38). The second category concerns what we might call the ideological conceptualization of space by those with particular kinds of power (e.g. planners, scientists). However, the third

category encompasses a relatively autonomous sphere of imagination, in which space is 'directly *lived* through its associated images and symbols' by its inhabitants and users, but also by artists and philosophers, who have the capacity to imagine space differently (Lefebvre 1991, 39).

Lefebvre stresses the ways in which such representational spaces, either as they emerge from the imaginations of those who live in a particular space, or in artistic practice, are freed from the instrumental sense-making and ideologically-driven coherence of official representations of space (Lefebvre 1991, 41). Emphasising the often unique nature of representational spaces (Lefebvre 1991, 42), Lefebvre comes to regard artistic practice as containing 'potentialities' for resistance to ideological representations of space (1991, 349), but also links these very closely to 'sensory-sensual', bodily or lived experiences of space (1991, 363). In this way, Lefebvre's work calls on us not simply to see the artistic work as a site of resistant meanings, which challenge predominant conceptions of space, but also of resistant (affective, bodily) experiences that call into question dominant ideologies. Although Lefebvre arguably fails to offer a fully worked-through theorization of the role of the body in representations of space its relationship the creative power of everyday experience (Simonsen 2005, 9), and remains vague on the commonalities between such experience and artistic production, his work is nevertheless provocative in terms of its emphasis on the potential of everyday experience and its reflection through artistic practice to challenge ideological constructions of space.

US geographer Edward Soja takes up Lefebvre's ideas, emphasising a 'trialectic' relationship between what he calls Firstspace, Secondspace and Thirdspace. Soja modifies Lefebvre's category of spatial practice, which he regards as that space which is subject to empirical measurement or quantification. This he contrasts with the Secondspace of (ideological) representations of space, and the resistant representational space of Lefebvre's 'lived space'. Key to Soja's project is the attempt to draw parallels between Lefebvre's approach and that of a range of poststructuralist and postmodern thinkers, including feminist geographers and postcolonial cultural scholars. He proposes that their attempts to imagine other kinds of space, be they socially marginal or interculturally hybrid, as well as new forms of resistant spatial practice, can be understood as a challenge to 'closed spatial epistemologies' (Soja 1996, 82). In his desire to incorporate a range of thinkers and practices under the heading of Thirdspace,

Soja pleads for a 'radically open' (Soja 1996, 82) definition of the term, which he prefers to regard as 'intentionally ambiguous' (Soja 1996, 162). Ultimately, what unites these different kinds of Thirdspace in Soja's view is simply '*an alternative envisioning of spatiality [that] directly challenges [...] all conventional modes of spatial thinking*' (Soja 1996, 163; emphasis in original). While such a definition is so broadly drawn that its analytical power is arguably limited, like Lefebvre Soja does focus our attention on the possibility of cultural practices that offer alternative accounts of particular spaces that are open to difference and resist ideological closure, while at the same time refusing to draw distinctions between such practices where they are the work of artists and intellectuals and everyday experiences of 'lived space', suggesting a potential continuum between artistic and social practice. Nevertheless, his exploration of Thirdspace places less of a theoretical emphasis on embodied experience than does Lefebvre's account.

Memory, Territory and the Affective Turn

This emphasis on 'lived' space also raises the question of what is at stake in the memory of disputed territories. As Misztal (2010) notes, memory studies has shown a marked tendency to focus on narratives, investigating the relationship between the construction of personal life-stories and socially constructed narratives, for example of the nation. Consequently, memory conflicts are often presented as primarily driven by competing narratives, even if, as Cento Bull and Hansen (2016) argue, commitment to specific narratives has a significant affective element, in that they construct different kinds of emotional relationship to other groups. In artistic practice, however, it is clear that it is not (just) narrative that is at stake. To give one illustrative anecdote, we can think about the experience of attending a performance in the synagogue in Sejny, Poland, to hear members of the local Polish and Lithuanian communities play hybrid forms of klezmer and eastern European folk music, while the audience can also see the names of Sejny's murdered Jewish community around the walls of this repurposed building. The experience of participating in this multi-generational orchestra, which has been playing for over 20 years, or the experience of sitting in an audience to listen to them play, can certainly be

interpreted as a kind of memory work, but the question remains as to how it is lived as memory work. What kind of habits, feelings and dispositions does such experience help to elicit and form, which cannot perhaps be reduced to interpretations of the site of the cultural work or the formulation of memory narratives? If we are paying attention to the role of cultural practice in memory work, then it seems important that we must also pay attention to the fact that participation in such practice is also embodied, associative, affective and part of a continuum of becoming that is bound up with everyday experiences of place.

One starting point for thinking about this dimension of cultural practice is the work of geographers and cultural theorists whose approaches have been identified with another 'turn' in arts and humanities research, namely the 'affective turn' (Glough 2007; Hemmings 2005). Among cultural geographers, such theorizing draws attention to the complexities of the lived experience of place, paying attention in particular to affect, embodiment and performance. Rather than seeing meanings and values as imposed upon situated bodies, such theory understands these meanings and values as 'emerging *from* practices and events in the world' (Anderson and Harrison 2010, 6). In addition, rather than seeing human beings as the source of all meaning, such theorizing envisions humans as 'in contact relations of modification and reciprocity with their environs', proposing that 'all action is interaction' (Anderson and Harrison 2010, 7). In this sense, it sees bodies (both human and non-human) as enactments, and not only as expressions of certain cultural meanings (Anderson and Harrison 2010, 9). This 'associative understanding of the social' breaks with constructivism's 'focus on collective symbolic orders' (Anderson and Harrison 2010, 16) and discursivity (Hemmings 2005, 549), which are regarded as fundamentally volatile orderings that are open to the possibility of change emerging through social practice (Anderson and Harrison 2010, 22).

As Jones (2011) points out, the affective turn's account of the ongoing becoming of the self in space can also pay attention to the role of individual and collective memory in shaping the relational experience of the present moment. As he and Garde-Hansen argue elsewhere, what are sometimes called 'non-representational' approaches encourage us to see memory not '(simply) as a burden of the past', but rather as 'fundamental to "becoming", and a key wellspring of agency, practice/habit, creativity and imagination' (2012, 8). By emphasising individual, processual and open-ended engagements with place and memory, scholars working

with affective and non-representational approaches answer Massey's call to understand place as multiple and becoming, which works against dominant accounts of geographical location that seek to define and delimit both geographically and temporally by insisting on historical fixity and an exclusionary spatial ordering.

Campbell's account of 'affective critical regionality' provides one version of such an approach to the relationship between individuals and specific geographies, although the role he gives to memory is relatively understated. In his analysis of the American West as imagined region, he counterposes the myths and entrenched cultural meanings of this space (what we might call the cultural memory of the West) with the disruptive affective and embodied processes experienced by individuals in contact with the geography of the region and its other inhabitants, as represented in poetry, prose and 'fictocriticism' by a number of regional authors. The exploration of such experiences, Campbell argues, undermines 'damaging notions of "invariance" and "endurance", providing comforting reassurance about place as stable, unchanging, and essentialized in the face of society's shifting processes' (Campbell 2016, 18). It also challenges the assumption that a region is 'the precise container of a "presupposed" people' (Campbell 2016, 13).

Karen Till's examination of place-based artistic activism that engages with questions of memory echoes some of the concerns outlined above. She critiques memory studies for what she regards as its tendency to regard place as a palimpsest of multiple symbolic orders that can be un- or recovered in the present and argues instead for a recognition that artistic practice at sites that have been marked by past violence can create 'a socially engaged form of memory-work through site-specific (re)makings of a traumatized region [...], establishing active places of memory that are more than locations of past events or nodes of national topographies' (Till 2008, 103). Such work, Till claims, treats places as 'embodied contexts of experience, but also porous and mobile, connected to other places, times and peoples' (Till 2008, 105). In doing so, Till argues, place-based artistic practice can 'communicate non-linguistic, bodily forms of knowing and feeling' and 'complex interface between bodies, subjectivities and social life' (Till 2008, 106).

Nevertheless, it should also be pointed out that non-representational and affect-oriented approaches to some of the issues we are dealing with here have been subject to critique for their apparently outright rejection of the importance of the narrative and the discursive. This can be seen, for example, in Brian Massumi's critique of constructivist cultural studies, against whose discursive focus he sets an emphasis on affect as a the body sphere of chaotic potentiality (affect) that is limited and reduced by its emergence into representation (understood broadly as any kind of mediated consciousness) (Massumi 2002). According to Massumi, the subversive potential of this sphere of affect lies in its un-assimilability to representation, which always leaves a remainder that, in its virtuality, points to the possibility of change. Critics of such approaches have accused theorists like Massumi of creating an artificial divide between the affective and the discursive that is tenable neither from a neuroscientific (Leys 2011), nor from a pragmatic point of view, with Wetherell (Wetherell 2012, 2013) in particular observing that in any given situated co-presence of human beings, there is a constant shifting back and forth between the felt and the discursively expressed. Wetherell describes this phenomenon in terms of 'affective-discursive practice'.

Ben Anderson's study of how 'affects relate to and become part of spatio-social relations' (2014, 1) also cautions against two key, interconnected assumptions of non-representational versions of affect theory, namely that affect exists before and in excess of the sphere of representation, and that its excessive nature is inherently subversive of such orders. He asserts instead, quoting Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick (2003, 19; Anderson 2014, 6) that '[a]ffects can be, and are, attached to things, people, ideas, sensations, relations, activities, ambitions, institutions, and any number of other things, including other affects', adding on his own account that

[a]ffects are constantly infusing embodied practices, resonating with discourses, coalescing around images, becoming part of institutions, animating political violences, catalysing political communities, and being known and intervened in, amongst much else. (2014, 6)

Rather than assuming that affect is something pre-existing representations (e.g. images, discourses, ideas of political community), Anderson therefore sees affect as something attached to such representations, but not unalterably so. Instead, he suggests that we need instead 'to pay attention to how representations function affectively and how affective life is imbued with representations' (2014, 14):

Affect is not some kind of ungraspable exteriority that representation can only fail in relation to. Instead representations are themselves active interventions in the world that may carry with them or result in changes in bodily capacity or affective conditions. (2014, 60)

Furthermore, in stressing the relationship between affect institutions, collective identities and violence, Anderson also questions the claim that affect is an inherent challenge to (oppressive) social order. Rather, he notes, ‘individual or collective affects become object-targets for action’ (2014, 24) on the part of ‘apparatuses’ of various forms of power, which are understood not simply in discursive terms, but which rather consist of

a thoroughly heterogeneous ensemble consisting of discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory discourses, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions – in short, the said as much as the unsaid. [...] The apparatus itself is the system of relations that are established between these elements. (2014, 34)

Anderson’s basic point here is that affect attaches itself through a range of interconnected social practices, in ways that may reinforce the dominant order just as much as they have the potential to challenge it. In the case of the disputed territories that are central to this project, one could point out that discourses of ethno-nationalism and the institutions that propagate them produce strong affective attachments, and that cultural practices can contribute to the attachment of certain kinds of affect (fear of the other, pride, mourning of loss, desire for revenge) that perpetuate conflict and an exclusionary understanding of territory.

Equally, however, Anderson does not see the function of affect only in relation to such apparatuses. While he argues that it ‘is important to trace [...] whether and how knowledges of affective life are inscribed in specific power relation or sets of power relations’ (2014, 75), he also argues that everyday life is not reducible to such power relations and ‘may involve other forms of organisation and processes of mediation’ (2014, 76). Anderson suggests that we pay attention to the ways in which ‘capacities to affect and be affected may be formed through a geo-historicity of encounters, or the way in which space provides a setting and support for encounters’ (2014, 92–93). While there is more to say about the detail of Anderson’s argument, he asks us to pay attention to the situatedness of embodied human subjects, both historically and geographically, and to consider how their experience of that situation is mediated by

affectively charged relations with other embodied human subjects, forms of social organization and practice, forms of representation, and the physical environment.

Anderson's view of the affective nature of encounters characterized by their 'geo-historicity' is broadly compatible with Murphy's recent analysis of the relationship between place, memory and artistic practice. Although writing in another context (that of traumatic memories of violence in Latin America), Murphy argues that artistic interventions can take the form of 'memory mapping', understood as

the aesthetic process of representing the affective, sensorial, polyvocal, and temporally layered relationship between past and present, anchored within the specificities of place. Memory mapping works to develop affective, visual maps of the relations between bodies, memories, lived experience, and the mnemonic potency of physical objects and spaces. (Murphy 2019, 21)

Although Murphy's focus, as the quotation above demonstrates, is primarily on the visual, she also notes that such 'mapping' could incorporate other forms of the sensory (2019, 189). Also, like Anderson, she sees no contradiction between the narrative or discursive, on the one hand, and the affective on the other, pointing to the potential of artistic practice to 'weav[e] affective, narrative webs' (2019, 188) at particular places:

How memory is mapped onto and through bodies, images, and specific places matters, as does how a story is recuperated, the efficacy of its transmission, and what connections are drawn to the present. (2019, 188)

It would be tempting to see cultural practice that engages with disputed territories simply in terms of the attempt to challenge a potentially dangerous representation of particular spaces as ethnically homogenous regions that have 'always been' the rightful location of one group or another. Representing other pasts, for example of co-existence and cultural exchange, undoubtedly has a value in challenging ethno-nationalist ideology, but affective approaches to place and memory show us that we need to consider what role the lived experience of cultural practice (whether as participant or recipient) has in the process of creating new understandings of disputed territory. The literature on reconciliation after conflict emphasises the construction of shared understandings and new conceptualisations of situated relationship. Asserting that conflicting groups are 'living in different "worlds" because they have attributed different meanings to "things"' (Jakubowska-Branicka 2014, 48), the literature on reconciliation focuses on the need to establish 'common referential ground' that will allow for a new 'envisioning of

our past-present-future' (Lebaron and Pilay 2006, 149 and 179). This process, which can be understood as a process as 'restorying' (Lederach 2005), does not, however, take place merely at the level of discursive interaction. Alongside storytelling, the use of ritual as a means of generating experiences of 'powerful emotions' and the 'emotional resonance' of metaphor have been credited with a productive potential in the process of dialogue (Lebaron and Pilay 2006, 123–27). Here there is clearly a potential for further exploration of the specifically experiential qualities of engagement in cultural practice, whether as participant/producer or recipient/audience member. Without rejecting the importance of narratives and sense making, paying attention to 'affective-discursive practice', to use Wetherell's term, would allow us to consider the relationship between making meaning about disputed territories and the experience of cultural practice that took fuller account of the affective, embodied and situated dimensions of that practice. It would also allow us to consider the extent to which cultural practice creates the conditions for new kinds of understandings of disputed territory to emerge, not only by discursive, but also by embodied, affective processes. Connections could also be made here to contemporary ritual studies, which, rather than working with a rigid definition of what ritual can be, prefers a contextual or practice-based approach that seeks to 'address how a particular community or culture ritualizes [...] and then address when and why ritualization is deemed to be the effective thing to do' (Bell 2009, 81; cf. Grimes 2014).

In this respect, Eckersley's analysis of a Silesian museum that caters both to local populations and expellee communities provides a helpful, if arguably negative, example. In the museum context, Eckersley is interested to examine

the complex relationship between the roles of memory, of re-encounter with things (tangible objects, intangible culture and concepts) and the re-framing of place as a concept (rather than merely as physical or cultural geography). (Eckersley 2017, 8)

However, she discovers that the museum's different publics (local Polish and expellee German) find in the same museum space the conditions for identification with the region of Silesia in two quite different ways. For the latter, the displaced community, their affective-discursive practice focuses on 'emotive and sensory attachments to place, such as through food, music, traditions, language or dialect' (2017, 11), whereas the resident Polish community, some of whose families were relocated to the area from Poland's eastern borderlands (*Kresy*) at the end

of World War Two, chiefly focus on the space commemorated in the museum in terms of their own memories of personal life-events, which took place in that region (2017, 23). While Eckersley argues that this represents an example of ‘agonistic’ memory in action (Cento Bull and Hansen 2016), there seems to be limited possibility of dialogue here. While the two distinct experiences of memory and place are facilitated in the museum space, they apparently exist in parallel, not in dialogue.

On the other hand, Pfeiffer and Weiglhofer’s analysis of German-Czech cross-border theatre work with young people makes the case that such projects ‘can contribute to a (re-)definition of what and where *Heimat* is – and who is part of it’ (Pfeiffer and Weiglhofer 2019, 184) by virtue of their staging of encounters between young people of different backgrounds in the shared (geographical and theatrical) space created by the preparation of a performance that draws on the multiple histories of the region. Pfeiffer and Weiglhofer note that by ‘interweaving the historical and the imaginary, the performance requires all to engage with the constructed side of our relation to the past as much as with the individual, embodied and lived’ (2019, 184).

What these two contrasting examples suggest is that, by paying attention not simply to the discursive construction of disputed territory in cultural practice, but also to its lived, embodied and affective aspects, we cannot assume that the mobilization of these aspects leads to a re-experiencing and re-interpretation of territory that is conducive to the more effective management of potentially polarising memories. However, in their very different outcomes they also allow us to pose the question of what *kind* of artistic interventions, or cultural interventions of other kinds (such as museums), might be capable of creating beneficial forms of affective-discursive practice.

Eckersley’s case study also points to the potential divergence between populations’ affective and embodied responses to cultural practice depending on their location within or outside the territory in question. This divergence also needs to be considered when addressing diasporic populations. While such populations can both exacerbate conflict and help to bring about reconciliation, their affective and attitudinal relationship to disputed territory in their homeland is fundamentally different from that of populations confronted with the realities of

conflict on a day-to-day basis (Demmers 2002, 94–95). A diasporic community’s sense of belonging and of connection to homeland is underpinned by strong emotions, which can be associated with religious worship, the maintenance of tradition, or the consumption of traditional foods, for example (Brown 2011). Equally, consuming media from the homeland, such as films or traditional music, can provide such a sense of cohesion and cultural identity, with significant affective components (Smets et al. 2013; Volgsten and Pripp 2016). As yet, the potential for engagement with cultural and artistic practice among diasporas in relation to conflicts in the homeland does not appear to have been central to the existing research. This could represent a further fruitful avenue of investigation for the project.

Memory and Cultural Heritage: From Reconciliation and Peace Building to Pilgrimage and Tourism- Weronika Czyżewska-Poncyłjusz, Umber bin Ibad, Joanna Wawrzyniak

The second half of this review connects a wealth of literature and research on memory and cultural heritage with peace building and reconciliation. Through various examples, the discussion below explores the role of art-based educational programs and socially engaged cultural practices, particularly at community level, in addressing the trauma of conflict and providing alternative narratives about the past as well as the future.

A growing literature on art, performance and commemoration at heritage sites around the globe provides important hints on how memory activism can be understood in the field of cultural practices (e.g. Kennedy and Graefenstein 2019; Bieberstein and Evren 2016; Liedeke and Smelik 2013; Till 2007). In particular place-based and site-specific cultural interventions are of interest for the management of memories of ‘disputed territories’. In the course of artistic practices, sites of dissonant heritage might be transformed to bring attention to forgotten pasts and injustices, to help to overcome trauma, or to challenge dominant regimes of memory ‘by creating spaces that revisit historical social relations and imagine new possibilities’ (Till 2007, 104), but they also might contribute to developing conflicts and divisions. Drawing on these insights, this part of the literature review surveys three strands of literature in order to look for cultural practices that might overcome antagonism and one-sidedness of memory practices, strategies, and forms: i) literature on reconciliation and peace building; ii) literature on heritage and reconciliation; iii) literature on diasporas, pilgrimages and tourism.

Reconciliation and peace building

Literature about conflict and conflict resolution is an academic discipline in itself. Despite the links between culture, identity and conflict, art and culture have traditionally been viewed as a soft area of peacebuilding and reconciliation efforts and have been underutilized in these fields. Since the 1990s, we observe an increased importance of the cultural dimension in conflict and

conflict transformation. 'Culture of peace' is a widely recognized field within conflict transformation (Boulding 2000). This different positioning of culture in 'peace studies' is connected with the recognition of a new type of conflict that Jay Rothman and Marie L. Olsen (2001) defined in detail as 'identity-based, ethno-political conflict' which has escaped the traditional resource and interest-based resolution methods:

The overt focus on resources or power politics in dealing with identity-based conflicts have merely tended to exacerbate or prolong the struggle, independent of whether or not the conflicts in question involved issues of resources and other tangible interests. This points to the fact that there is an urgent need for cooperation and multilateralism and for globally agreed, shared policies that integrate culture into peace-building strategies and programs (Preis and Mustea 2013).

This approach is present also in reconciliation studies in which reconciliation goes beyond resolution to refer not just to the political arrangements to resolve differences and hostile action but to the psychological process whereby understanding and tolerance lead to readiness to live together in a new framework of peace and well-being (Whittaker 2002).

Most up to date literature on conflict transformation through culture is being published in the form of reports and analysis prepared under the programs run by international organizations (UN, EU, Council of Europe), research institutes and NGO's. The great value in them is the fact that they focus very much on specific study cases from around the world and provide concrete recommendations for practitioners but also researchers from different fields (e.g. *Salzburg Global Seminar Report 2014*; Preis and Mustea 2013; *Changing The Story Report 2017-18*; *The Right to Art and Culture 2013-16*; *Culture and Conflict 2012-2013*; *Joint Research Institute for International Peace and Culture 2011*). The most recent of these, *The Art of Peace* report, based on an evidence review and country case studies by the University of West Scotland, assesses the value of culture in post-conflict recovery (Baily 2019). *Changing The Story* is an ongoing research project which brings together researchers and practitioners and documents the effects of their collaboration online.¹

¹See <https://changingthestory.leeds.ac.uk/about/>.

The research base on the contribution of culture to conflict resolution and post-conflict recovery is growing (Cohen 2005; Zelizer 2003; Naidu-Silverman 2015; Preis and Stanca Mustea 2013; Premaratna and Bleiker 2016). Art is becoming an increasingly important way to articulate issues surrounding war and conflict and, in its positive aspect, reconciliation. We can make a distinction between individual works by artists and cultural activities involving art, on the one hand, artistic programs engaging communities, on the other. Both are present and vital for the process of reconciliation, but on different levels. Artists are the voices of some of the most marginalized groups within societies: they mirror the social, cultural and political realities of their time and propose new and alternate imaginings for the future (Naidu-Silverman 2015). Kiki Fukushima (2011) notes that artistic productions, especially those brought in by international actors to a conflict zone, may allow people to feel that they are still part of a global community and that there are others who are interested and concerned about their situation. The academic evidence base has a particular focus on the therapeutic use of the arts in post-conflict contexts (Wise, Stephanie and Nash 2012) and its role in reconciliation and strengthening civil society (Cohen 2005; Naidu-Silverman 2015; Shank and Schirch 2008). Given the hopelessness, despair and trauma that come with violent conflict, art and cultural activities may present a temporary outlet from the actual situation, serving as an avenue for coping and imagining alternate scenarios to the reality of conflict (Naidu-Silverman 2015).

Cultural activities that engage the community in artistic and performance endeavors go deeper and are vital part of long-lasting transformation within the community. Cultural practices are believed to be important among communities just after traumatic conflicts but also and even more so in long term perspective of transformative development of the conflicted regions. John Paul Lederach (2005) observes that people in post-conflict milieus seldom use language to analyze conflict; instead, they use various metaphors and images to make sense of the reality of violence and their experiences. According to Stephanie Wise and Emily Nash (2012), the use of metaphor – such as ritual, drama, writing, movement and storytelling– in trauma recovery, enables trauma survivors to engage with their experiences of trauma while creating enough distance from the traumatic event, to prevent retraumatization. Several scholars (Cohen 2003; Fortier 2008; Cohen and Yalen 2004; Daly and Sarkin 2007) argue that one of the most important roles of art in post-conflict societies is its ability to restore

victims' capacities to participate in reconciliation processes, access their emotions and begin their individual healing processes. It is only through creative acts that are responsive and adaptive to survivors' needs that survivors of conflict can make new meanings and create new languages to understand their reality (Cohen and Yale, 2004; Lederach 2005). Further literature exists on particular cases of artists involvement in different communities recovering from conflicts. Cleveland in his book *Art & Upheaval: Artists at Work on the World's Front Lines* (Cleveland 2008) gathers and documents the efforts of artists involved in reconciliation and peace in conflict areas throughout the world. Sandoval and Fukushima have written on the upstream and preventative potential of culture (Sandoval 2016, 205; Fukushima and Kiki 2011). Also, the benefits of culture for neutralising the attraction of violent extremism and raising awareness about the effects of stigma and racism are recognized by scholars (Cockburn 2012; Sonn, Quayle, Belanji and Baker 2015).

Alternate narratives about the past and future

Examining the role of cultural practices in the processes of reconciliation and peace building researchers recognize that the most profound impact culture has through its ability to provide alternate narratives about the past and future. As the process of reconciliation proceeds, there is wide agreement that the successful outcome requires the formation of a new common outlook on the past. Once there is a shared and acknowledged perception of the past, both parties take a significant step towards achieving reconciliation (Bar-Tal 2009). Reconciliation implies that both parties not just get to know, but truly acknowledge what happened in the past (Gardner Feldman 1999; Hayes 1998; Norval 1999). This acknowledgement implies recognizing that there are two narratives of the conflict (Norval 1999; Salomon 2004). This is an important factor because the collective memories of each party's own past underpin the continuation of the conflict and obstruct peacemaking (Bar-Tal 2007). Reconciliation necessitates changing these societal beliefs about the past by learning about the rival group's collective memory and admitting one's own past misdeeds and responsibility for the outbreak and maintenance of the conflict. Through the process of negotiation about collective memories, in which one's own past is critically revised and synchronized with that of the other

group, a new narrative emerges. Often, however, preoccupation with the past requires more than a new narrative. Conflict grievances must not only be known, but also truly acknowledged by the rival society (Norval 1999). Some researchers have gone even further by asserting that collective acknowledgement of the past is not enough and that reconciliation must ultimately lead to a collective healing and forgiveness for the adversary's misdeeds (Staub 2000).

Within the existing research literature on forgiveness, there are many models of how people forgive. There are also many clinical models of how to help people forgive (Worthington 2006). Of great interest are interventions to promote forgiveness and reconciliation at the societal level (Staub 2006). Of special importance in promoting reconciliation are 'people to people' activities that bring together 'ordinary society members' from both sides to meet and/or work together on various projects that all aim at solidifying the reconciliation (Gawerc 2006). Building toward social reconciliation is a long and complex process, requiring attention to many different aspects and issues. Staub (2006) identifies four avenues to healing: truth, justice, creation of a shared history, and contact with out-group members. Kim, Kollontai and Hoyland (2008) point out that one of the most important issues is establishing a shared identity between the two aggrieved or separated parties. This complex undertaking involves an analysis of current identities— both as they are narrated within a community and to those outside the community—as well as adjudicating the different versions of history maintained by each party. Moreover, the purpose of a shared identity is not just to create a common past, but also to provide a platform for a different future.

Researchers working from a peace education perspective bring to the discussion the concept of 'sites of conscience': places of memory such as historic sites, place-based museums or memorials which provide safe spaces to remember and preserve even the most traumatic memories and at the same time enable their visitors to make connections between the past and related contemporary human rights issues (see the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience). This represents a response to critical reflection about conventional 'landscapes of remembrance', including their exclusionary or xenophobic rather than inclusionary cultural politics. Herborn and Hutchinson (2014) focus in their research on exploring the extent to which alternative grassroots 'sites of conscience' may offer far more life-affirming lessons about transcending destructive conflicts than official war memorial sites and museums do. Of

particular importance are the ideas and contributions of feminist peace educators, peace researchers and peace activists, such as Elise Boulding, Betty Reardon and Cynthia Cockburn. What is given most attention in this strand of critical inquiry are crucial questions of how to better resist militarizing assumptions about the future, including exploring nonviolent examples and potentials for creating peace cultures (Boulding 1990, 2000; Reardon and Cabezudo 2002; Cockburn 2012).

Arts-based development education and transformative learning

Cultural practitioners are often educators. Educational academics and practitioners across a range of cultural and political contexts examine the links between reconciliation and pedagogy, putting forward the notion that reconciliation projects should be regarded as public pedagogical interventions, with much to offer to wider theories of learning (Alhuwalhia et al., 2012). Challenging the contemporary and dominant ‘security-first’ and ‘liberal peace’ model of peacebuilding, researchers outline the role and potential of education to contribute to a more sustainable peacebuilding model (Novelli, Cardozo, Smith 2015). The work of Nancy Fraser (1995, 2005), Johan Galtung (1976, 1990) and John Paul Lederach (1995, 1997), among others, explores what sustainable peacebuilding might look like in post-conflict environments.

Fraser characterized two types of remedies to social injustices including ‘affirmative remedies’, which correct outcomes without changing structural frameworks or the status quo; and ‘transformative remedies’, correcting outcomes by restructuring the underlying generative framework (Fraser 199, 82, 86). Education that could also be applied through cultural practices can effectively contribute to what Fraser termed a ‘transformative remedy’. This transformative emphasis is closely connected to the notion of ‘sustainable peacebuilding’, or what Galtung (1975, in Smith et al, 2011, 12–13) identified as building a positive peace, defined as ‘the absence of structural violence, the presence of social justice and the conditions to eliminate the causes of violence’.

John Paul Lederach’s work has brought to this discussion the concept of the moral imagination, which could be simply defined as the ability to be grounded in the real world and at the same time to be able to imagine a better world. According to this concept there are four

essential elements for peacebuilding. First, there is the notion that we are all interdependent, and that change can be achieved through the recognition that the quality of our life is dependent on the quality of the life of others, including our enemies. Second, there is paradoxical curiosity that mobilizes the imagination: a type of curiosity that is creative and inquisitive and goes beyond the dualities that are highlighted during periods of conflict. For groups to live and work together in the pursuit of peace, they need to move beyond the divisions of self and other, differences and similarities (Lederach 2005). Scholars (see Fortier 2008; Preis and Stanca Mustea 2013; Seidl-Fox and Sridhar 2014) note that art and cultural activities can nurture this curiosity by providing platforms for the celebration of cultural diversity and intercultural exchange. Third, peacebuilding must provide space for the creative act, that is to say that it must itself become an art form, which lets us create that which does not yet exist, and, along with creativity and imagination, gives birth to new possibilities. Finally, there is the willingness to take risks, to step into the unknown without guarantees of success or even safety.

Many of these required capacities for reconciliation can be nourished, revitalized, and restored through aesthetic experiences, complex phenomena that Cohen and Yalen (2019) define as a profound and pleasurable transaction between a human being and certain cultural and artistic forms. They may arise when a person steps into the role of creator, composer, audience, participant, or performer.

In development studies researchers seem to take the same direction. Development has come to be regarded as a technical process, to be directed by 'experts', and dominated by economics. Clammer, however, argues that it is an art, one that involves a continuous balancing act between preserving existing cultural and biological diversity, drawing upon them and their component parts in the attempt to conceive of better and more humane and sustainable futures, and developing the quality of culture itself as the actual content of our everyday lifeworlds (Clammer 2014). In this quest there is a direct link to the concept of transformative learning (O'Sullivan 1999) which is directed at nurturing fundamental change: first in the individual learner and then as a result in the wider society. This educational strategies are grouped around the three main themes of peace, social justice and diversity (both social and

biological); the main goal is to give learners a planetary vision as well as a local one and nurturing of creativity rather than stuffing with ‘facts’ (Clammer 2014).

The volume *Culturally Relevant Arts Education for Social Justice: A Way Out of No Way*, presenting texts by different authors, discusses methodologies for linking the arts and social justice issues which have direct relevance to development education as they are potential models for a transformative pedagogy (Hanley, Noblit, Sheppard and Barone 2013). Bell and Desai (see also Stein and Faigin 2015) sought to connect arts with social justice pedagogy. They argued that: “The arts can help us remember, imagine, create, and transform the practices that sustain oppression as it endures across history and locality” (Bell and Desai 2011, 288). Bell, Desai and Irani have also written on storytelling for social justice as a means of developing counter narratives that challenge the normalizing or hegemonic stories of the dominant communities, deconstruct the self-interested assumptions of those majority discourses, and allow the experiences of minorities to emerge as the valid stuff of stories (Bell, Desai and Irani 2013, 15). On film in the context of social justice education and teaching the power of representation, personal agency and responsibility (Anderson 2013). Arts have been researched also in the context of social inclusion in education (e.g. Chappell and Chappell 2016).

Theatre for social change

There is a growing number of publications on global performance practices viewed through the lens of peacebuilding. This work emerges from the field of applied theatre, playback, theatre for development, and theatre of the oppressed, and increasingly focuses on collaboration between researchers and practitioners. The focus here is on assisting communities in using theatre as a method for pursuing social justice, and in helping individuals learn new tools for potential transformation. These techniques are derived from Boal’s pioneering work and have been developed in quite radical directions by performance artists such as Guillermo Gómez-Peña, Roberto Sifuentes and Coco Fusco (Gómez-Peña and Sifuentes 2011) who have developed detailed pedagogies for addressing issues of cross-cultural communication and deconstructing hegemonic attitudes to race, gender and colonialism. Among the key studies in

the field there is James Thompson's prolific work on applied theatre in the context of conflict (Thompson 2005; Thompson 2009; Thompson et al. 2014).

Among the most comprehensive publications in the field of peace building performance is two-volume anthology entitled *Acting Together: Performance and Creative Transformation of Conflict* published in the framework of Acting Together Project run by Brandies University. It describes peacebuilding performances in regions beset by violence and internal conflicts. The first volume focuses on the role of theatre and ritual play in both the midst and in the aftermath of direct violence. The second volume emphasizes the transformative power of performance in regions fractured by 'subtler' forms of structural violence and social exclusion.

Transitional justice and the role of art and civil society

Transitional justice is a rapidly emerging interdisciplinary field of study focusing on processes dealing with past human rights violations and the transition to a more peaceful and democratic state. Part of huge literature produced by researchers and practitioners concerns with civil society and the role of arts in the process of transitional justice and conflict transformation. The volume *The Art of Transitional Justice* (Rush, Peter, Simić 2014) examines the relationship between transitional justice and its associated practices of art (theatre, literature, photography and film). The volume brings to bear the insights from scholars, civil society groups, and art practitioners, as well as interdisciplinary collaborations. Another volume, *Transitional Justice, Culture and Society: Beyond Outreach* (Ramierz-Barat 2014) provides an overview of the contribution of NGOs and civil society more broadly to efforts to achieve transitional justice around the world. Among Transnational Justice literature there is also a focus on the building of memorials and recapturing public spaces to create social dialogue. Judy Barsalou and Victoria Baxter (2007) and Louis Bickford (2014) argue that architectural memorials, museums and commemorative activities are indispensable educational initiatives to establish the record beyond denial and prevent repetition.

Reconciliation and forgiveness through culture from the psychological point of view

Literature in the field of peace psychology tends to focus on the development of forgiveness from individual perspective. The position that stands out among most books on the subject is *Forgiveness and Reconciliation Psychological Pathways to Conflict Transformation and Peace Building* edited by Kalayjian and Paloutzian (2010), which gives readers access to the intersecting psychological and social processes involved as they affect all participants in conflict. Of particular interest for studying the role of culture and art in reconciliation is the chapter by Hagitte Gal-Ed on the potential contribution of art to peace (Gal-Ed 2010). Inspired by the concept of dialogue proposed by Martin Buber and his healing through meeting approach (Buber-Agassi 1999), she focuses in her research on a conceptual framework for developing a new modality in practicing art therapy and education for peace (Gal-Ed 2000). Other peace psychologists recognize that cultural interpretations and processes modulate harm and the healing of self (Sandage and Williamson 2005) and that forgiveness involves positively taking the role of another and exercising empathy (McCullough et al. 2003; Wade & Worthington 2005). But there is a lack of research examining concrete cultural practices and their role in this process. Very helpful here is the volume edited by Seedat, Suffla and Christie (2017), which explores different forms of community engagement for peace through the arts.

Heritage and reconciliation

Parallel insights to the peacebuilding and reconciliation literature can be found in the field of heritage studies, which, in addition to its expertise in preservation and conversation, has developed in recent years a growing interest in the role of cultural heritage in post-conflict societies. Inspired by work in decolonization, communication, actor network theory, emotion and affect, or hauntology studies (Harrison 2012; Smith 2006), and using concepts like 'healing heritage', 'shared heritage', 'heritage as space of conversation' (Giblin 2012; Harrison 2004; Ashley 2007), critical heritages studies intersects with memory studies in many respects. However, the burgeoning literature on the role of heritage in post-conflict societies does not bring an equivocal picture on what type of heritage management is decisive in peace building and reconciliation, while it is widely recognized that heritage sites might become a mnemonic resource for both intercultural dialogue and for renewal of conflicts (e.g. Giblin 2014; Labadi

2019; Lehrer 2010). Although most recent policy documents by international heritage experts recommend forms of heritage management that give space for expressing diverse memories, assuming that 'dissonance can empower de-naturalization of heritage, foster critical thinking and create opportunities for intense intercultural mediation' (Kisić 2017, 31), this goal is often only superficially addressed; and what is more, as Lähdesmäki (2019, 46) argues, the policy language often recreates or even reinforces essentialist distinctions between diverse social and cultural groups. Therefore, scholars studying critical heritage interventions claim that bottom-top rather than top-bottom engagement might lead to better results and they examine closely the successes and failures of cultural practitioners and the effects of their work on communities they work with (Lehrer 2010). These discussions address the various meanings of responsible curating. As Lehrer and Milton (2011) argue 'difficult knowledge' should not be easily disambiguated by linear narratives of recovery and truth. The goal is rather to set in motion ongoing conversations that give spaces for uncertainties, understanding and empathy.

A useful typology of diverse cultural heritage practices was recently proposed by Andersen, Timm Knudsen and Kølvråa (2019) who identified their four main modalities: repression, removal, reframing, and re-emergence. Repression denotes the rejection of heritage but at the same time, also its 'lingering existence'. Removal means active elimination of the unwanted heritage. Reframing changes the meaning of what is being presented, depoliticizing and commodifying heritage. Re-emergence is 'a lost opportunity from the past that returns to offer itself for creating alternative futures'. With re-emergence 'pluriverse epistemologies, entangled materialities and communal efforts' overcome the trap of identity politics by 'giving rise to activism and responsibility often afforded by affects, moods and atmospheres' (Timm Knudsen 2019). Conceived on a continuum rather than as mutually exclusive, these four modalities are organized along two axes, the first one relating to the complexity of social imagination from binary to hybrid, and the other to the political intensity generated by the reproduction of a socio-political order or its rupture and change (Kølvråa 2019).

While in critical heritage studies, provocative artistic and curatorial interventions at heritage sites are tools for expression of conflicting, alternative, mutivocal, dialogical or agonist memories, the considerable concern of sociological and psychological approach to heritage site relates to the sustainability of heritage site effects on their publics. Again, results are

inconclusive. For instance, the survey of visitors of the Museum of Memory and Human Rights in Santiago de Chile found that although its exhibition enlarges knowledge and evokes emotions among its visitors, and even alters their political views towards more supportive to democracy, most changes in political beliefs peter out with time (Balcells, Palanza, Voytas 2018). In another study psychologists (Bilewicz and Wójcik 2017) observed secondary traumatic stress disorder among high school visitors of the Auschwitz-Birkenau memorial museum. Their study also showed an emphatic reaction toward the victims was still associated with stress one month after the visit. On the whole, some museums are effective 'sites of persuasion' contributing to cosmopolitan human rights discourse (e.g. Apsel and Sodaro 2020), some are open for a dialogue (Cercel 2018), many remain sites of national self-centrism (Weiser 2017).

Beyond secular memory activism: pilgrimages and tourism

The literature discussed above mainly refers to peace building, reconciliation and heritage efforts that activate memories at the intersection of various types of secular expert discourses in post-conflict societies. However, religion is also worth considering as an important framework of memory activism, especially that in all countries covered by DisTerrMem project it plays an important role in shaping both the cultural memories and the sense of territorial belonging. The literature on diasporas and pilgrimages to the sacred sites gives significant insights on these issues (Ibad 2018; Margry 2008; Karla 2007).

To start with literature on diaspora and its relation to territory, it is driven by several contradicting ideas. On the one hand, authors like Bhabha (2004) shifted attention towards the de-territorialization, understanding diaspora culture as a 'third space'. Similarly, Appadurai's (1990) work on globalization and localization considers diasporas as participating in hybrid realities of the larger globalizing processes. On the other hand, however, Appadurai also acknowledges the discourses of homogenization that are used by the nationalist forces in order to have a better control of the minorities in ethnoscaples, mediascaples, technoscaples, finanscaples and ideoscaples. Other authors, like Dahinden (2005; 2009; 2010) call for taking the 'nation' in trans-nationalism seriously, pointing out that nation-state and ethnic categories still

play a major role in shaping the contemporary world, particularly under contemporary conditions of globalization which have created cultural, social, local and national backlashes. Koinova (2010, 148) argues that by filtering international pressures for democratization, diasporas use the universalist creed of liberalism instrumentally in order to increase their political clout with Western governments while simultaneously pursuing nationalist projects related to their country of origin. With regard to the particular South Asian context, researchers argued for the cosmopolitan tendencies in the diasporic Sikh culture (Sian 2013). Anjela Gera Roy observes that the Sikh diaspora has been able to mobilize a transnational narrative of Sikhi [Sikhism] particularly after 1984 (Roy 2016, 73). Conversely, literature on Pakistani diaspora shows it as largely concerned with the concept of Islamic Umma and with all other concerns, sacred and profane, subsumed within the globalized imaginings of Muslim diaspora (e.g. Donnan 1995; Werbner 2002). Despite dissonant histories, Muslim and Sikh diasporas have shown spaces for mutual interaction at the borders of Pakistan and India with the access to the sacred spaces in the Pakistani controlled region.

Given all these tendencies and tensions, diasporas' pilgrimages to the sacred sites in the land of origin need to be understood as multivalent cultural practices worth studying because they might either escalate the memory conflicts at a global scale or to retain the power to heal the wounds of traumatic memories.

Victor and Edith Turner (2011 [1978]), who opened up ways to understand pilgrimage, especially in Christian context, outlined three modes for understanding pilgrimage by identifying three types of *communitas*: i) pilgrims moving away from the everyday life to have the spontaneity of interrelatedness in order to celebrate common humanity through the emergence of the integral person from multiple *personae* that may be understood as *liminoid communitas*; ii) normative *communitas* representing the attempt to control pilgrims and pilgrimage shrines using the model of "the structured ritual system"; iii) and the *ideological communitas* working as the remembering the tributes of the *communitas* experience in the form of a utopian blue-print for the reformation of society. Turners' work has been contested in various ways. For instance, Eade and Sallnow (1991) pay special attention to the dynamics of power relations during the sacred journeys. They claim that

Pilgrimage is above all an arena for competing religious and secular discourses, for both the official co-optation and non-official recovery of religious meanings, for conflict between orthodoxies, sects, and confessional groups, for drives towards consensus and *communitas*, and for counter movements towards separateness and division (Eade and Sallnow 1991, 2-3).

They further suggest the methodology for exploring the pilgrimage in the triad of 'person', 'place' and 'text'.

Further important discussion relates to the blurred lines between pilgrimage and tourism (Aulet and Vidal 2018; Bandyopadhyay, Moris, Chick 2008; Olsen 2003). Nolan and Nolan (1992) suggest that 'at a well-visited shrine, visitors on any given day may represent a gradient from very pious and seriously prayerful, to purely secular and basically uninformed about the religious meaning of the place' (cited after Raj and Griffin 2015, 9). Badone and Roseman (2004) emphasize the need to understand sacred and profane from a postcolonial perspective. Instead of emphasizing binaries, they suggest that the journeys intersect both sacred and profane. The growing literature on tourism might also enrich studies of memory activism at religious heritage sites, especially following MacCannell's (1992,1) broad view of tourism as 'not just an aggregate of merely commercial activities', but as 'an ideological framing of history, nature, and tradition; a framing that has the power to reshape culture and nature to its own needs.' At the same time, tourism is still a tool in the hands of the states to disseminate shared cultural identities among their citizens (Bandyopadhyay 2006; Graburn 1997). On the whole, there is a need to understand further the aspects of religious tourism in the context of national and religious ideology of the state, capitalist policies, diasporic engagement, local agencies and the contradictions inherent to those processes that may end up increasing an antagonistic rather than a multi-perspectivist and agonistic sensibility in post-conflict societies.

Bibliography

Alhuwalhia, P., Atkinson, S., Bishop, P., Christie, P., Hattam, R. & Matthews, J 2012, *Reconciliation and Pedagogy*, Routledge, London.

Andersen, C, B Timm Knudsen, C Kølvrå [2019] *Keywords: Anthology Exploring the Keywords of Colonial Heritage*, <https://keywordsechoes.com/> [Jan 24, 2020]

Anderson B and P Harrison 2010, "The Promise of Non-Representational Theories" in B Anderson and P Harrison (eds) *Taking-Place: Non-Representational Theories and Geography*, pp. 1–34. Ashgate, London.

Anderson, B 2014, *Encountering Affect: Capacities, Apparatuses, Conditions*, Ashgate, Farham and Burlington.

Anderson, SM 2013, "Editing Lives: The Justice of Recognition Through Documentary Film Production" in M Stone Hanley, GW Noblit, GL Sheppard and T Barone (eds) *Culturally Relevant Arts Education for Social Justice: A Way Out of No Way*, pp. 108–118. Routledge, London and New York.

Appadurai, A 1990, "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy", *Theory, Culture and Society*, vol. 7, no. 203, pp. 295-310.

Apfel, J and Sodaro A 2020, *Museums and Sites of Persuasion: Politics, Memory and Human Rights*, Routledge, London.

Ashley, S 2007, "The Changing Face of Heritage at Canada's National Historic Sites", *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, vol. 13. no. 6, pp. 478-488.

Assmann, J 1995, "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity", *New German Critique*, vol. 65, pp. 125–133.

Aulet, S and D Vidal 2018 "Tourism and Religion: Sacred Spaces as Transmitters of Heritage Values", *Church, Communication and Culture*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 237-259.

Badone, E and SR Roseman (eds) 2004, *Intersecting Journeys: The Anthropology of Pilgrimage and Tourism*, University of Illinois Press, Chicago.

Baily A 2019, *The Art of Peace: The Value of Culture in post-Conflict Recovery*, British Council britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/the_art_of_peace_0419.pdf [Jan 23, 2020]

Balcess, L, V Palanza, E Voytas, 2018, "Do Museums Promote Reconciliation? A Field Experiment on Transitional Justice", Paper prepared for presentation at the International Studies Association Annual Convention, San Francisco, April 4th-7th, 2018. <http://web.isanet.org/Web/Conferences/San%20Francisco%202018-s/Archive/d263dc13-0674-4cd5-8c6a-724cb3d2de69.pdf> [Jan 24, 2020].

Bandyopadhyay, R, DB Moris and G Chick 2008, "Religion and Identity on India's Heritage Tourism", *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 790–808.

Bandyopadhyay, R, 2006, "Representative Dissonance in Heritage Tourism in India", A Thesis in Leisure Studies Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The Pennsylvania State University The Graduate School Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Management https://etda.libraries.psu.edu/files/final_submissions/5429 [Jan 25, 2020]

Barnes, H and M-H Coetzee (eds) 2014, *Applied Drama/Theatre as Social Intervention in Conflict and Post-Conflict Contexts*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle.

- Barsalou J and V Baxter, 2007, "The Urge to Remember: The Role of Memorials in Social Reconstruction and Transitional Justice", The United States Institute of Peace, pp. 1-24.
- Bar-Tal D 2009, "Reconciliation as a Foundation of Culture of Peace", in J de Rivera (ed.), 2009, *Handbook on Building Cultures of Peace*, Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, Dodrecht et al.
- Bar-Tal, D, E Halperin, and J de Rivera 2007, "Collective Emotions in Conflicts: Societal Implications", *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 63, pp. 441–460.
- Bell, C 2009, *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Bell, LA, D Dipti and I Kayhan 2013, "Storytelling for Social Justice: Creating Arts-based Counterstories to Resist Racism". In M Stone Hanley, GW Noblit, GL Sheppard and T Barone (eds) *Culturally Relevant Arts Education for Social Justice: A Way Out of No Way*, pp. 15-24. Routledge, London and New York.
- Bell, LA. and Desai, D 2011, "Imagining Otherwise: Connecting the Arts and Social Justice to Envision and Act for Change", *Equity and Excellence in Education*, vol. 44 no. 3, pp. 287–295.
- Berenskoetter, F 2014, "Parameters of a National Biography", *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 262–88.
- Bhabha, HK 2004, *The Location of Culture*, Routledge, Abingdon.
- Bickford L 2014, "Memoryworks/Memory Works" in C Ramierz-Barat (ed) *Transitional Justice, Culture and Society: Beyond Outreach*, Social Science Research Council, New York, pp. 491-529.
- Bilewicz, M and AD Wojcik 2017, "Visiting Auschwitz: Evidence of Secondary Traumatization Among High School Student", *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, vol. 88. no 3, pp. 328-334.
- Boulding, E 1990, *Building a Global Civic Culture: Education for an Interdependent World*, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse NY.
- Boulding, E 2000, *Cultures of Peace: The Hidden Side of History*, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse NY.
- Brown, J 2011, "Expressions of Diasporic Belonging: The Divergent Emotional Geographies of Britain's Polish Communities", *Emotion, Space and Society*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 229–37.
- Buber-Agassi, J (ed) 1999, *Martin Buber on Psychology and Psychotherapy: Essays, Letters, and Dialogues*, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse NY.
- Campbell N 2016, *Affective Critical Regionality*, Rowman and Littlefield, London and New York.
- Cento Bull A and HL Hansen 2016, "On Agonistic Memory", *Memory Studies*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 390–404.
- Cercel, C 2018, "The Military History Museum in Dresden: Between Forum and Temple", *History and Memory*, vol. 30, no. 1, 3-39.
- "Changing the story. A year in review 2017-2018". Report for Changing the Story Program, The Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF) and Network Plus.
- Chappell, SV and Chappell, D 2016, "Building social inclusion through critical arts-based pedagogies in university classroom communities", *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 292–308.

Christie, DJ, Wagner, RV, and Winter, DD (eds) 2001, *Peace, Conflict, and Violence: Peace Psychology for the 21st Century*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Clammer, J 2014, *Art, Culture and International Development: Humanizing Social Transformation*, Routledge, London.

Cleveland, W 2008, *Art and Upheaval: Artists on the World's Frontlines*, NYU Press, New York.

Cockburn, C 2012, *Antimilitarism: Political and Gender Dynamics of Peace Movements*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Cohen, C 2003, "Engaging with the Art to Promote Coexistence." in A Chayes and M Minow (eds) *Imagine Coexistence: Restoring Humanity After Violent Ethnic Conflict*, pp. 267 – 293, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Cohen, C 2005, "Creative Approaches to Reconciliation" in M. Fitzduff and C Stout (eds) *The Psychology of Resolving Global Conflicts: from War to Peace*, Greenwood Publishing Group, Westport.

Cohen, C and C Yalen 2019, "Recasting Reconciliation through Culture and the Art: A Virtual Collection. Posting a Theoretical Framework", The International Centre for Ethics, Justice and Public Life at Brandeis University.

http://www.brandeis.edu/ethics/peacebuildingart/pdfs/peacebuildingart/recasting_framework.pdf. [July 23, 2019]

Cohen, CE, VR Gutierrez and PO Walker (eds) 2011, *Acting Together: Performance and Creative Transformation of Conflict*, New Village Press, Oakland CA.

"Conference Report: Fostering Peace through Cultural Initiatives: Perspectives from Japan and Germany" 2019, https://www.jpff.go.jp/j/publish/intel/cul_initiative/pdf/cul_initiative.pdf [Jan 24, 2020]

"Conflict Transformation through Culture Peace-Building and the Arts 2014", Salzburg Global Seminar Session Report 532, https://www.salzburgglobal.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Documents/2010-2019/2014/532/SalzburgGlobal_Report_532.pdf [Jan 24, 2020].

"Culture and Conflict: Challenges for Europe Foreign Policy", *EUNIC Yearbook 2012-2013*.

Dahinden, J 2005, "Contesting Transnationalism? Lessons from the Study of Albanian migration networks from former Yugoslavia", *Global Networks*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 191-208.

Dahinden, J 2009, "Are We All Transnationals Now? Network Transnationalism and Transnational Subjectivity: The Differing Impacts of Globalization on the Inhabitants of a Small Swiss City", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 32, no. 8, pp. 1365-1386.

Dahinden, J 2010, "The Dynamics of Migrants' Transnational Formations: Between Mobility and Locality" in R Baubock and T Faist (ed.) *Diaspora and Transnationalism: Concepts, Theories and Methods*, pp. 51-72, Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.

Daly, E and J Sarkin 2007, *Reconciliation in Divided Societies: Finding Common Ground*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

- De Greiff P 2014, "On Making the Invisible Visible: The Role of Cultural Interventions in Transitional Justice Processes" in C Ramierz-Barat (ed) *Transitional Justice, Culture and Society: Beyond Outreach*, Social Science Research Council, New York, pp.1-26.
- De Rivera J (ed) 2009, *Handbook on Building Cultures of Peace*, Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, New York.
- Delaney, D 2005, *Territory: A Short Introduction*, Blackwell, London.
- Demmers, J 2002, "Diaspora and Conflict: Locality, Long-Distance Nationalism, and Delocalisation of Conflict Dynamics", *Javnost*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 85–96.
- Donnan, H, 1995, "Pilgrimage and Islam in Rural Pakistan: The Influence of the "Hajj"", *Etnofoor*, vol. 8, no 1, pp. 63-82.
- Eade J and MJ Sallnow, *Contesting the Sacred: The Anthropology of Pilgrimage*, University of Illinois Press, Chicago.
- Eckersley, S 2017, "People-Place-Process' and Attachment in the Museum", *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 6–30.
- Fortier, A 2008, "Culture and Conflict: Introduction", www.krachtvancultuur.nl/en/specials/culture-and-conflict/Introduction.html [Sept18, 2019]
- Fraser, N 1995, "From Redistribution to Recognition? Dilemmas of Justice in a 'Post-Socialist' Age", *New Left Review*, vol. 212, pp. 68–93.
- Fraser, N 2005, "Reframing Justice in a Globalized world", *New Left Review*, vol. 36, pp. 79–88.
- Fraser, N and A. Honneth, 2003, *Redistribution or Recognition? A Political-Philosophical Exchange*, trans. J. Golb, J. Ingram, and C. Wilke. Verso, London, New York.
- Fukushima, K 2011, "Peace and Culture: Fostering Peace Through Cultural Contributions." In *Conflict and Culture: Fostering Peace through Cultural Initiatives*, Joint Research Institute for International Peace and Culture, Aoyama Gakuin University, The Japan Foundation, New York. https://docplayer.net/52735834-Conflict-and-culture-fostering-peace-through-cultural-initiatives.html#show_full_text [Sept 17, 2019]
- Gal-Ed H 2010, "Art and Meaning: ARTiculation© as a Modality in Processing Forgiveness and Peace Consciousness" in A Kalayjian and R Paloutzian (ed), *Forgiveness and Reconciliation Psychological Pathways to Conflict Transformation and Peace Building*, pp. 97-119, Springer, Dodrecht et al.
- Gal-Ed, H 2000, "Art as a Paradigm for Peace", Jewish Education News, Special Focus on The Arts in Jewish education, CAJE Publication.
- Galtung, J 1976, "Three Approaches to Peace: Peacekeeping, Peacemaking and Peacebuilding", in Galtung, J. *Peace, War and Defence: Essays in Peace Research*, vol. 2, pp. 282-304. Christian Ejlertsen, Copenhagen.
- Galtung, J 1990, "Cultural Violence", *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 291-305.

- Gardner FL 1999, "The Principle and Practice of 'Reconciliation' in German Foreign Policy: Relations with France, Israel, Poland and the Czech Republic", *International Affairs*, vol. 75, pp. 333–356.
- Gawerc, MI 2006, "Peace-Building: Theoretical and Concrete Perspectives", *Peace and Change*, vol. 31, pp. 435–478.
- Giblin, JD 2014, "Post-conflict Heritage: Symbolic Healing and Cultural Renewal", *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 500-518.
- Gómez-Peña, G and R Sifuentes 2011, *Exercises for Rebel Artists: Radical Performance Pedagogy*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Graburn, N 1997 "Tourism and Cultural Development in East Asia and Oceania" in S Yamashita, KH Din, and J.S Eades (eds), *Tourism and Cultural Development in Asia and Oceania*, pp. 194-214, University Kebangsaan Malays, Kuala Lumpur.
- Grewal, JS 2007, *Sikh Ideology, Polity and Social Order: From Guru Nanak to Maharaja Ranjit Singh*, Manohar Publishers, New Dehli.
- Grimes, RL 2014, *The Craft of Ritual Studies*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Halbwachs, M 1992, *On Collective Memory*, University of Chicago Press, London and Chicago.
- Harlap, Y and H Aristzabal 2013, "Using Theatre to Promote Social Justice in Communities: Pedagogical Approaches to Community and Individual Learning", in Stone Hanley, M, GW Noblit, GL Sheppard and T Barone eds. 2013, *Culturally Relevant Arts Education for Social Justice: A Way Out of No Way*, pp. 25– 35. Routledge, London and New York.
- Harrison, R 2004, *Shared Landscapes: Archaeologies of Attachment and the Pastoral Industry in New South Wales*, University of New South Wales Press, Sydney.
- Harrison, R 2012, *Heritage: Critical Approaches*, Routledge, London.
- Hayes, G. 1998, "We Suffer our Memories: Thinking about the Past, Healing, and Reconciliation." *American Imago*, vol. 55, pp. 29–50.
- Hemmings, C 2005, "Invoking Affect: Cultural Theory and the Ontological Turn", *Cultural Studies* vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 548–67.
- Herborn PJ and FP Hutchinson 2014, "Landscapes of Remembrance' and Sites of Conscience: Exploring Ways of Learning Beyond Militarising 'Maps' of the Future", *Journal of Peace Education*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 131-149.
- Hoelscher, S and D H. Alderman 2004, "Memory and Place: Geographies of a Critical Relationship", *Social and Cultural Geography*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 347–56.
- Ibad, UB, 2018, *Sufi Shrines and the Pakistani State: The End of Religious Pluralism*, I.B. Tauris, London.
- Jakubowska-Branicka, I 2014, "Hate Narratives" in J Kurczewski (ed) *Reconciliation in Bloodlands: Assessing Actions and Outcomes in Contemporary Central-Eastern Europe*, pp. 43–61, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.

- Jones, O 2011, "Geography, Memory and Non-Representational Geographies", *Geography Compass*, vol. 12, pp. 875–85.
- Jones, O and J Garde-Hansen 2012, "Introduction" in *Geography and Memory: Explorations in Identity, Place and Becoming*, pp. 1–18, Palgrave Macmillan, Houndmills.
- Jordan, JM 2006, *Structures of Memory: Understanding Urban Change in Berlin and Beyond*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Kalayjian, A and RF Paloutzian (ed.) 2010, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation Psychological Pathways to Conflict Transformation and Peace Building*, Springer, Dodrecht et al
- Kalra, VS (ed). 2007, *Pakistani Diasporas: Culture, Conflict and Change*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Kaplan, A 2002, *Development Practitioners and Social Process: Artists of the Invisible*, Pluto Press, London.
- Kennedy R. and S Graefenstein 2019, "From the Transnational to the Intimate: Multidirectional Memory, the Holocaust and Colonial Violence in Australia and Beyond", *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 403-422.
- Kim SCH, P Kollontai and G Hoyland 2008, *Peace and Reconciliation: In Search of a Shared Identity*, Ashgate, Hampshire.
- Kisić, V 2017, *Governing Heritage Dissonance: Promises and Realities of Selected Cultural Policies*, European Cultural Foundation, Amsterdam.
- Koinova, M 2010, "Diasporas and International Politics: Utilising the Universalistic Creed of Liberalism for Particularistic and Nationalist Purposes" in R Baubock and T Faist (ed.) *Diaspora and Transnationalism: Concepts, Theories and Methods*, pp. 149-166, Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.
- Kølvraa C, "Modalities of Heritage Practice" in Andersen, C, B Timm Knudsen, C Kølvraa [2019] *Keywords: Anthology Exploring the Keywords of Colonial Heritage*, <https://keywordsechoes.com/> [Jan 24, 2020]
- Kosofsky Sedgwick, E 2003, *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performance*, Duke University Press, Durham, North Carolina and London.
- Labadi, S 2019, *The Cultural Turn in International Aid Impacts and Challenges for Heritage and the Creative Industries*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Lähdesmäki, T 2019, "Conflicts and Reconciliation in the Postmillennial Heritage-Policy Discourses of the Council of Europe and the European Union" in T Lähdesmäki, L Passerini, S Kaasik-Krogerus, I van Huis (eds) *Dissonant Heritages and Memories in Contemporary Europe*, Palgrave Macmillan, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-11464-0> [Jan 25, 2020].
- Lebaron, M and V Pilay 2006, *Conflict Across Cultures: A Unique Experience of Bridging Differences*, Intercultural Press, Boston MA.
- Lederach, JP 2005, *The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

- Lederach, JP 1995, *Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Cultures*. Syracuse University Press, Syracuse NY.
- Lederach, JP 1997, *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*, U.S. Institute of Peace Press, Washington, D.C.
- Lefebvre, H 1991, *The Production of Space*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Lehrer, E 2010, "Can there be a conciliatory heritage?", *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, vol. 16, no. 4-5, pp. 269-288.
- Lehrer, E and C Milton 2011, "Introduction: Witnesses to Witnessing" in E Lehrer, C Milton, M Patterson (eds), *Curating Difficult Knowledge: Violent Pasts in Public Places*, pp. 1-19, Palgrave, Basingstoke.
- Leys, R 2011, "The Turn to Affect: A Critique", *Critical Enquiry*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 434-72.
- Liedeke P and A Smelik (eds) 2013, *Performing Memory in Art and Popular Culture*, Routledge, New York.
- Lotman, J 1977, *The Structure of the Artistic Text*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
- Lotman, J 1992, *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis.
- Low, MC 2008, "Empire and the Hajj: Pilgrims, Plagues, and Pan-Islam under British Surveillance, 1865-1908", *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 269-290.
- MacCannell, D 1992, *Empty Meeting Grounds: The Tourists Papers*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Manekin, D, G Grossman, and T Mitts 2018, "Contested Ground: Disentangling Material and Symbolic Attachment to Disputed Territory", *Political Science Research and Methods*, vol. 22, pp. 1-19.
- Margry, PJ, 2008, *Shrines and Pilgrimage in the Modern World*, Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.
- Massey, D, 1994b, *Space, Place and Gender*, Polity, Cambridge.
- Massey, D 1994a, "Places and Their Pasts", *History Workshop Journal*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 182-92.
- Massumi, B 2002, *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*, Duke University Press, Durham, North Carolina and London.
- McCullough, ME, KI Pargament and CE Thoresen 2000, "The Psychology of Forgiveness: History, Conceptual Issues, and Overview" in ME McCullough, KI Pargament and CE Thoresen (eds) *Forgiveness: Theory, Research, and Practice*, pp. 1-14. Guilford, New York,
- Middleton, D and S D. Brown 2011, "Memory and Space in the Work of Maurice Halbwachs" in *Cultural Memories: The Geographical Point of View*, pp. 29-4, KTS/Springer, Dordrecht, Heidelberg, London and New York.

- Misztal, BA 2010, "Narrative's Reliance on Memory: The Case for an Interdisciplinary Exchange between Memory and Narrative Studies", *Life Writing*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 85–97.
- Modirzadeh, L 2013, "Documentary Theatre in Education: Empathy Building as a Tool for Social Change" in M Stone Hanley, GW Noblit, GL Sheppard and T Barone (eds) *Culturally Relevant Arts Education for Social Justice: A Way Out of No Way*, pp. 47– 57. Routledge, London and New York.
- Murphy BK 1999, *Transforming Ourselves: Transforming the World: An Open Conspiracy for Social Change*, Zed Books, London and New York.
- Murphy, AB 1990, "Historical Justifications for Territorial Claims", *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol. 80, no. 4, pp. 531–48.
- Murphy, KM 2019, *Mapping Memory: Visuality, Affect and Embodied Politics in the Americas*, Fordham University Press, New York.
- Naidu-Silverman E 2015, "The Contribution of Art and Culture in Peace and Reconciliation Processes in Asia – A literature review and case studies from Pakistan, Nepal, Myanmar, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Sri Lanka, and Bangladesh", Danish Centre for Culture and Development (CKU). https://issuu.com/cku-centerforkulturogudvikling/docs/the_contribution_of_art_and_culture [Jan 24, 2020].
- Newman, D 1999, "Real Spaces, Symbolic Spaces: Interrelated Notions of Territory in the Arab-Israeli Conflict" in P Diehl (ed) *A Road Map to War: Territorial Dimensions of International Conflict*, pp. 3–34. Vanderbilt University Press, Nashville, Tenn.
- Nolan, M and S Nolan 1992, "Religious Sites as Tourism Attractions in Europe", *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol. 19, p. 1-17.
- Norval, AJ 1999, "Truth and Reconciliation: The Birth of the Present and the Reworking of History", *Journal of African Studies*, vol. 25, pp. 499–519.
- Nöth, W 2015, "The Topography of Yuri Lotman's Semiosphere", *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, vol. 18, no. 1. pp. 11–26.
- Novelli, M, MTA Lopes Cardozo, A Smith, 2015, *A Theoretical Framework for Analysing the Contribution of Education to Sustainable Peacebuilding: 4Rs in Conflict-Affected Contexts*, University of Amsterdam <http://learningforpeace.unicef.org/partners/research-consortium/research-outputs/> [Jan 24, 2020].
- O'Sullivan E 1999, *Transformative Learning: Educational Vision for the 21st Century*, Zed Books, London and New York.
- Olsen, DH, 2003 "Heritage, Tourism, and the Commodification of Religion", *Tourism Recreation Research*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 99-104.
- Paasi, A 2000, "Territorial Identities as Social Constructs", *Hagar – International Social Science Review* 1 (March), pp. 91–113.
- Pfeiffer, K and M Weiglhofer 2019, "Negotiating Contested Heritages through Theatre and Storytelling" in U Kockel, MN Craith, B Tjarve, and C Clopot (eds) *Heritages, Identities and Europe: Exploring Cultural Forms and Expressions*, pp. 173–87. Routledge, London.

Polak-Springer, P 2015 *Recovered Territory: A German-Polish Conflict over Land and Culture, 1919–1989*, Berghahn, New-York and Oxford.

Preis, A-B and C Stanca-Mustea 2013, "The Role of Culture in Peace and Reconciliation", UNESCO. <http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/images/PeaceReconciliationENG.pdf> [July 25, 2019]

Premaratna N and R Bleiker 2016, "Arts and Theatre for Peacebuilding", in OP Richmond, S Pogodda, J Ramović (eds), *The Palgrave Handbook of Disciplinary and Regional Approaches to Peace*, pp. 82-94. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Purewal, NK and Lallie, HS 2013 "Sikh Kirtan in the Diaspora: Identity, Innovation and Revivalism" in M Hawley (ed), *The Sikh Diaspora: Theory, Agency, and Experience*, Brill Publishers, Leiden, pp. 381-403.

Raj R and KA Griffin 2015, "Introduction to Sacred and Secular Journeys" in R Raj and K Griffin (eds), *Religious Tourism and Pilgrimage Management: An International Perspective*, pp. 1-16. CABI, Wallingford and Boston, MA.

Reardon, B., and A. Cabezudo 2002, *Learning to Abolish War: Teaching toward a Culture of Peace*, Hague Appeal for Peace, New York.

Rothman J. and ML Olsen, 2001, "From Interests to Identities: Towards a New Emphasis in Interactive Conflict Resolution", *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 289-292.

Rush, P and O Simić, eds 2014, *The Arts of Transitional Justice. Culture, Activism, and Memory after Atrocity*, Springer-Verlag, New York.

Salomon, G 2004, "A Narrative-Based View of Coexistence Education", *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 273–287.

Sandage, S. J and I Williamson 2005, "Forgiveness in Cultural Context" in E. L. Worthington (ed), *Handbook of Forgiveness*, pp. 41–55. Routledge, New York.

Sandoval, E 2016, "Music in Peacebuilding: a Critical Literature Review", *Journal of Peace Education*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 200-217.

Sassen, S 2006, *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages*, Princeton University Press, Princeton and Oxford.

Schlögel, K 2009, *Im Raume Lesen Wir Die Zeit*, Fischer, Frankfurt am Main.

Seedat M, S Suffla, DJ Christie (eds) 2017, *Emancipatory and Participatory Methodologies in Peace, Critical, and Community Psychology*, Springer International Publishing.

Seidl-Fox, S and S Sridhar 2014, "Conflict Transformation through Culture, Peace-Building and the Arts", Salzburg Global Seminar, Session Report 531.

https://www.salzburgglobal.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Documents/2010-2019/2014/532/SalzburgGlobal_Report_532.pdf. [Sept 18, 2019]

Shank, M and Schirch, L 2008, *Strategic Arts-based Peacebuilding. Peace History Society and Peace and Justice Studies Association*, http://escolapau.uab.es/img/programas/musica/strategic_arts.pdf [Jan 24, 2020].

- Sian, Katy P 2013, *Unsettling Sikh and Muslim Conflict: Mistaken Identities, Forced Conversions, and Postcolonial Formations*, Lexington Books, Lanham et al.
- Simonsen, K 2005, "Bodies, Sensations, Space and Time: The Contribution from Henri Lefebvre", *Geografiska Annaler, Series B: Human Geography*, vol. 87. no. 1, pp. 1–14.
- Smets, K, P Meers, R Vande Winkel, and S van Bauwel, 2013, "Pride and Popcorn: Consuming the Idea of Community at Film Screenings in the Turkish Diaspora", *Identities*, vol. 20. no 2, pp. 115–32.
- Smith, AD, 1999, *Myths and Memories of the Nation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Smith, L 2006, *Uses of Heritage*, Routledge, London.
- Soja, E, 1996, *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*, Blackwell, Malden, Mass and Oxford.
- Sonn, CC, AF Quayle, B Belanji, AM Baker 2015, "Responding to Racialization through Arts Practice: The Case of Participatory Theatre", *Journal of Community Psychology*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 244–259.
- Staub, E 2000, "Genocide and Mass Killing: Origins, Prevention, Healing, and Reconciliation", *Political Psychology*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 367–382.
- Staub, E 2006, "Constructive Rather Than Harmful Forgiveness, Reconciliation, and Ways to Promote Them After Genocide and Mass Killing" in E. Worthington (ed) *Handbook of Forgiveness*, Brunner-Routledge, New York, pp. 443-459.
- Stein, CH and DA Faigin 2015, "Community-based Arts Initiatives: Exploring Science of the Arts", *American Journal of Community Psychology*, vol. 55, no. 1-2, pp. 70–73.
- Stone Hanley, M, GW Noblit, GL Sheppard and T Barone eds. 2013, *Culturally Relevant Arts Education for Social Justice: A Way Out of No Way*, Routledge, London and New York.
- "The Right to Art and Culture 2013-16. Danish Experiences with the Power of Art, Culture and Creative Industries in Development Cooperation" n.d, Centre for Culture and Development (CKU) https://issuu.com/cku-centerforkulturogudvikling/docs/cku_final_report_web?fbclid=IwAR08yPLApNBaOCgX3e6jcy-0I-GP6b2E2IZ02aKm362MuUMyX00Z8fWUEuo [Jan 24, 2020]
- Thompson, J 2005, *Digging up Stories: Applied Theatre, Performance and War*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Thompson, J 2009, *Performance Affects: Applied Theatre and the End of Effect*, Palgrave Macmillan Ltd., London.
- Thompson, J 2014, "Artistic Expression during Conflict" in *Conflict Transformation through Culture Peace-Building and the Arts*, Salzburg Global Seminar Session Report 532, https://www.salzburgglobal.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Documents/2010-2019/2014/532/SalzburgGlobal_Report_532.pdf [Jan 24, 2020].
- Ticinieto Clough, P 2007, "Introduction" in P Ticinieto Clough and J Halle (eds) *The Affective Turn: Theorizing the Social*, pp. 1–32. Duke University Press, Durham, North Carolina and London.

- Till, KE, 2008, "Artistic and Activist Memory-Work: Approaching Place-Based Practice", *Memory Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 99–113.
- Timm Knudsen B, "Re-emergence" in Andersen, C, B Timm Knudsen, C Kølvråa [2019]
Keywords: Anthology Exploring the Keywords of Colonial Heritage,
<https://keywordsechoes.com/> [Jan 24, 2020]
- Trigg, D 2012, *The Memory of Place: A Phenomenology of the Uncanny*, Ohio University Press, Athens, Ohio.
- Turner V and E Turner 2011 [1978], *Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture*, Introduction by D Ross, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Velthuisen, AG and KD Ferguson 2018, "The Poetics of Peace: From Aesthetic Knowledge to Reconciliation", *The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa*, vol. 14 no.1, pp. 1-10.
- Volgsten, U and O Pripp 2016, "Music, Memory, and Affect Attunement: Connecting Kurdish Diaspora in Stockholm", *Culture Unbound*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 144–64.
- von Bieberstein, A and E Evren, "From Aggressive Humanism to Improper Mourning: Burying the Victims of Europe's Border Regime in Berlin", *Social Research: An International Quarterly*, vol. 83, no. 2, 2016, pp. 453-479.
- Wade, NG and EL Worthington, 2005, "In Search of a Common core: A Content Analysis of Interventions to Promote Forgiveness", *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 160–177.
- Walton, O, S Plonski, Z Yousef, J Goodhand and P Meehan (eds) 2018, *Borderlands and Peacebuilding: A View from the Margins (Accord Insight, no. 4)*, Conciliation Resources, London.
- Wegner, PE 2002, "Spatial Criticism: Critical Geography, Space, Place and Textuality" in J. Wolfreys, *Introducing Criticism in the 21st Century*, pp. 179–203, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Weiser, E 2017, *Museum Rhetoric: Building Civic Identity in National Spaces*, The Pennsylvania State University Press, Philadelphia.
- Werbner, P 2002, *Imagined Diasporas among Manchester Muslims: The Public Performance of Pakistani Transnational Identity Politics*, James Currey and School of American Research Press, Oxford and Santa Fe.
- Wetherell, M 2012, *Affect and Emotion: A New Social Science Understanding*, Sage, London.
- Wetherell, M. 2013, "Affect and Discourse – What's the Problem? From Affect as Excess to Affective/Discursive Practice", *Subjectivity*, vol. 6, pp. 349–68.
- Whittaker DJ 2002, *Conflict and Reconciliation in the Contemporary World*, Routledge, London.
- Wise, S and E Nash 2012, "Metaphor as Heroic Mediator: Imagination, Creative Art Therapy, and Group Process as Agents of Healing with Veterans" in R Scurfield, R Monsour and KT Platoni (eds), *Healing War Trauma: A Handbook of Creative Approaches*, pp. 99–114, Routledge, New York--London.

Worthington, EL Jr 2006, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: Theory and Application*, Routledge, New York--London.

Zelizer, C 2003, "The Role of Artistic Processes in Peacebuilding in Bosnia-Herzegovina", *Peace and Conflict Studies*, vol. 10, pp. 62-75.

Zerubavel, E 2003, *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.