

Introduction

Dalya Yafa Markovich, Christiane Dätsch

How do heritage and cultural narratives mediate ideology? The intersection of cultural heritage and nationality has been the focus of research that attempted to answer this question in the field of heritage studies in the modern state. The aim of this book is to problematize the conventional conceptualizations and debates by shedding light on non-European societies that are characterized by emerging nationalism as opposed to Western European societies that face multinational unification, immigration, and refugee waves, as well as post-national political and economic forces.

The concept of nation is closely tied to the idea that heritage, material and visual, tangible and intangible, is a testimony of the group's origin and history. This concept of transformation from the old order to modernity has originated in Europe during the 19th century (Greenfeld 1993). It was at this point that the potential contribution of "cultural goods" to the national construction of collective identity became recognized. The concept of cultural heritage itself is variable. Cultural heritage is interpreted differently, depending on place and time, and on the national contexts and conditions in and through which heritage has evolved. A vast body of research is already dedicated to the mutual effects of nationality and cultural heritage. From a rather essentialist point of view, cultural heritage is taken as the material that generates the sense of belonging and identity, that all people are supposed to seek, and that eventually ties the groups' members together.¹ In this manner, cultural heritage is perceived as synonymous with the modern concept of nationality. In other words, different nations (democratic, fascist, socialist) are conceptualized through different cultural aspects or forms that are part of their "ethnic cores". These cultural aspects or forms are believed to be driven by different ethnic and religious primordial ties (ethnonationalism), and shared, to reunite the group in a subconscious (and

1 Researchers have made a distinction between civic political nationalism and ethnic nationalism, which eventually became the dominant type of nationalism (Kohn 1944; Kedourie 1960). Despite the claim that there are two distinct forms of nationalism, Tamir (2019) argues that in reality the boundaries between them are blurred, allowing for advocates of civic nationalism to distinguish themselves from ethnic nationalism while promoting a vision of "nationless nationalism".

sometimes nonrational) manner under the national umbrella (Smith 1971; Connor 1994). Thus, cultural heritage is perceived as the main component of nationality; nationality is perceived as a cultural system that infuses heritage (Smith 2009).

Some less deterministic theories view cultural heritage as a process that does not contain fixed ingredients that have been bequeathed to the nation (Sewell 2004). Cultural heritage is rather viewed as a dynamic arena that is being structured, built, shaped, negotiated, and modified through the national lens (Anderson 1983; Gellner 1983). Cultural heritage is perceived as one of the dominant resources available in the process of making the national “figures of memory” transcendent (Assmann and Czaplicka 1995). Furthermore, cultural heritage is even believed to be imagined mostly in light of the nations’ interests and in line with its class stratification and class power relations (Hobsbawn and Ranger 1991). Hence, ethnic and religious groups tend to understand their cultural heritage and identity mostly when they are combined with the national ideology, which becomes one of the main focal points and banal ideas of the modern states’ culture and identity (Billig 1995). The positions and access of different groups to the project of nation building, which shape the nature of the national heritage, like gender inequalities (Yuval-Davis 1998) and race and religion inequalities (Goldschmidt and Mcalister 2004), have usually not been taken into consideration in the theorization of the national phenomena.

Cultural heritage definition from a Western European angle

The first definition of cultural heritage in international law was not blind to the connections of cultural heritage to nationality. Cultural heritage was defined as material and visual goods that should be cared for or protected because they are an important part of the culture of a nation, or a region that is part of a nation, that owns those goods, and require legal protection (Hague Convention 1954). But when referring to the protection of heritage, even as early as in the Hague Convention, “cultural property” was also described as the cultural heritage of all humankind (ibid). In UNESCO’s Convention in 1972 it was declared that cultural and natural heritage should be protected in order to protect human civilization as a whole. When expanding the definition of heritage to include intangible sources – living expressions, oral traditions, performing arts, social practices, rituals, languages, and traditional skills (UNESCO 2003; González 2008), as well as archives and libraries (Documentary Heritage 2010) – the local collective memory was described as part of the memory of the world.

Even when the preservation of these sources possessed a significant symbolic meaning that aimed to protect specific ethnic minorities, the definition of cultural heritage presupposed a less deterministic and more dynamic concept of culture that blurred the boundary between the ethnic and national divisions and the world. In

other words, UNESCO was not ignoring the emergence of the nation state, but still, heritage conventions were more occupied with care for all humankind than with approaches that relate to a particular nation and national feelings and identity (Weigel 2016).

Shifts towards the universalistic discourse were further driven by the increasing interconnectedness of Western Europe through technology. Technological practices allowed cultural heritage to sever its ties to a specific geography or ideology (UNESCO commission) and sabotage the concept of homogeneity offered by nationalism. The various aspects that enabled to communicate and translate culture, among them: the digitization of cultural heritage and online interactive preservation projects (Bachmann-Medick 2004), were undermining the commitment to a certain ethnic-national group by highlighting supranational commonalities. These trends preferred to view culture not as a process that holds fixed national, ethnic, racial, and religious semantics (Sewell 1999), but rather as “shared heritage”. Sharing heritage through consultation, dialogue, and cooperation redefines culture as an ever-expanding universal archive that presents a transcultural, dynamic, and multi-layered narrative or space. Even in its local forms, heritage is no longer perceived as the asset that defines the imagined borders and locus of a particular identification, but as a perspective that should blend with other perspectives to create a multicultural arena of ideas.

The striving for all-encompassing universal definitions can be understood in light of the criticism directed at the link between nationalism and heritage. Firstly, the connection between self-rule, self-definition, and nationalism, which seemingly found its expression in cultural heritage, was attacked based on a conception of the nation state as a weakened democratic mechanism. Nationalism was identified with ethnocratic societies and states in which the need for self-definition and governmental autonomy was translated into creating a cultural heritage that helped create a dominating political community. In other words, the nation state was perceived as an invisible knowledge-power mechanism that sought to create hegemony by constructing cultural heritages that served the ideological agenda of the holders of political capital, while marginalizing the Other. The national community was defined by contrasting it to other ethno-national communities, and sometimes by dispossessing other ethno-national groups of their civil and even human rights. Although nationalism still constitutes the most significant unifying force in the modern era, it is also identified as a divisive and isolationist force, undermining liberal-democratic principles, and therefore as a social arrangement that must not be consecrated by creating a shared cultural corpus. The examples in which culture or the democratic

mechanism are trampled in the name of preserving national cultural heritage are legion.²

Secondly, the nation state is perceived as a force driven by the capitalist economic logic. And in particular, when capitalist power seeks to profit from propagating national narratives. Turning the national narrative into a commodity requires adapting it for the broadest possible consumer public;³ a tendency that undermines the autonomy of culture, both in terms of preserving the past and in terms of its future development.

Cultural heritage definition from a non-European angle

The nation-state's understanding of cultural heritage is inextricably linked to the emergence of the Western way of understanding both history (as a remembered construct of the past), and the culture of memory (as a narrative of the collective's shared history) (Assmann 2018). In the 18th century, cultural heritage was mainly used as an argument for the demarcation of European culture from non-European cultures,

2 Such as for example the Israeli-Palestinian struggle over the respective demarcation of each of the groups' ethno-national cultural heritages. The management of archaeological sites in the West Bank illustrates this. See the public debate following the discovery of a Hebrew inscription from the 13th century BC (probably the earliest inscription found to this date) at Mount Ebal in Samaria, which is under Palestinian civic control and Israeli security control (Area B). In this case, the finding was discovered in three large piles of debris. While the Palestinians neglected the piles and even trampled them, the Israelis invaded the area, loaded the debris onto trucks and drove it to an Israeli settlement where it was sifted through, and the inscription was fished out. The question of the legality of transferring the debris from one ethno-national group to another, and of the ownership of the findings, provoked a heated public debate over the definition of "cultural heritage".

3 Such was the case of the Disney Park which was supposed to be built in the town of Haymarket, Virginia. The park was meant to comprise 9 theme complexes dedicated to different periods in American history. The idea was shelved after an organization called PHA – *Protect Historic America* argued that the park would compromise the emotional and educational effect that a visit to a national heritage site is supposed to induce, by recreating the heritage out of rubber, fiberglass, and neon lights. In this case, ethno-national zeal protected the cultural heritage from turning into a commodity depleted of ideology and values. However, in many other cases it is precisely ethno-national zeal that objectifies the cultural heritage and turns it into a generic commodity. Thus for example, in the port city of Vlorë, Albania, which was home to a tiny Jewish community of 200 people, a Jewish museum is currently being built under the initiative of the *Albanian-American Development Foundation* (AADF) in order to attract tourists, thus turning the "Jewish Museum" into a decontextualized brand and commodity that are supposed to enhance the economy of the nation state by inventing a cultural heritage.

and in the 19th century for the self-description of the newly emerging European nation-states. Since the 20th century the concept of the nation state has been spread and legitimized in other parts of the world. This is when the career of “cultural heritage” in non-European identity-construction projects started. The discourse in the emerging post-colonial nation states was tied to sovereignty and territory, especially in countries that had been torn by conflict. And this is when the concept of shared heritage became split from the common universal-liberal perspective adopted in European settings (Tauschek 2013; UNESCO 2018).⁴

The mobilization of cultural heritage for battles between different ethno-national groups within the new nation states founded outside Western Europe also came side by side with struggles against Western globalization forces. The nation state's opposition to the activity of supranational corporations stems from the fear that the latter would erode the local cultural traditions from the outside, in favor of an amalgam of styles, perceptions, and tastes under an imposed Western cultural logic.⁵ The non-Western nation states' opposition to globalization also stems from the fear that capitalist globalization processes would lead to the sale of cultural heritage for profit, and thus contribute to the continuing erosion of the nation's cultural uniqueness.⁶

-
- 4 Thus, for example, a Palestinization of the Arab public sphere in Israel has been evident since 2000. The tendency finds its expression most markedly in monuments that are being erected in Arab towns in Israel, representing symbols and events from the Palestinian national history. These include the column in the city of Tira commemorating the Palestinian casualties of 1948; a commemoration site in memory of the Palestinians killed by Israeli security forces in Kafr Qasim; a monument built in the city of Tayibe to commemorate those killed on Land Day; a huge mosaic dedicated to the Arab Revolt of 1936–1939 installed in the center of the city of Baka al-Gharbiyye; and more. This commemoration effort operates “from the ground up” and is sometimes backed by institutionalized commemoration by the Arab municipalities. Similar initiatives in joined Jewish-Arab cities have encountered opposition, such as the attempt to change the name of Lohamei HaGeta'ot (Fighters of the Ghettos) Street in Ramle to Tawfiq Ziad (a well-known Palestinian politician, member of the Israeli Parliament) Street.
 - 5 An example relating to taste, in both senses of the word, is the attempt by national groups to fight global corporations' efforts to gain control over the taste of food. See for example the Palestinian Authority's *Khaleek Baladi* (Stay Baladi or Go Local) campaign (in collaboration with the European Union), which markets varieties of local heritage in an endeavour to represent the Palestinians' authentic ties with the land. The concept of “balad”i is derived from the Arab word *balad* (Arabic for village, town, region) and signifies an intimate connection with the land. A project of this type demonstrates the doomed rear-guard battles waged by national cultural heritages against globalization.
 - 6 See for example the public outcry that arose in the state of Israel around the sale by the *Pentagon public auction house* of the control stick of one of the IDF fighter jets that bombed the nuclear reactor in Iraq. The state of Israel claimed it “is a part of the history of the state of Israel, and has cultural, research and historical value” (Aderet 2022, p. 14), but the court rejected the claim and allowed the sale.

The processes of digitization and online preservation of national heritage fostered by international organizations constitute another threat on the perceptions of nationalism prevalent outside the West. Ever since the ontology of cultural heritage stopped being written by humans alone, the online world has turned cultural heritage into an active, agencied player that together with human beings drives networks of history, psychology, economy, and society. These moves are not only perceived as undermining the non-Western national narrative, but also as failing to take into account possibilities such as “digital forgetting”, which might be caused due to the biased choices of eurocentric (and English-language-based) algorithms, or to the impossibility of maintaining online sites in non-Western parts of the world.⁷

Cultural heritage definition as “shared cultural heritage”

How is a shared cultural heritage created? Where should the shared cultural heritage be preserved and by whom?

The concept of shared heritage suggests a different juxtaposition of cultural heritage, sovereignty, and self-determination. It allows a reading that understands shared heritage as a pre-modern universal archive and as a transcultural thought that can reveal contacts, communications, and transformations like layers of rock (Weigel 2016). The aim of this concept of shared heritage is to make cultural exchanges and transfer processes concretely visible in order to revise nation-state narratives and property claims in favor of new narratives that emphasize aspects of a shared history. Nations who once faced each other as strangers or enemies could find commonalities rather than differences through this new way of viewing their history. This discourse raises cardinal questions regarding inclusion and exclusion mechanisms, collective memory, and the canonization processes. The idea of a worldwide access to objects of one's own culture of origin deconstructs notions of concrete ownership of cultural heritage, while emphasizing a borderless human heritage that is free of nation-state power relations and property claims.

This discourse, which is sometimes called the “multicultural” or “communitarianism turn”, removed the national factor from the political program of acknowledgement and recognition (Kymlicka 1989). In this liberal democratic narrative, nationality was supposed to be cut off from the nation state. Emotions, feelings, and memories that infuse the desired congruence between people and cultural ideas, were expected to go beyond the national ideology and experiences, while marking nationality as a dividing force. According to the shared heritage definitions, cultural

7 Thus, for example, a site that has not been updated will not come up in search results, because Google's search engines don't show more than 1,000 results.

heritage is a more individual-participatory based affinity, which goes beyond the national ideology and can intersect and create a hybrid, in-between, “third space” identities and focuses of identifications. This approach creates non-difference and even diminishes the morality of the national approach, seeing nationalism as an inferior stage of political development in comparison with the liberal one (Tamir 2019). If the introduction opened with the question: how do heritage and cultural narratives mediate ideology? then it ends with the question: can shared heritage be an ideology-free concept? At the time, these questions are invaded again by the murderous reality in the Middle East. On October 7, 2023 the Hamas terrorist organization carried out a horrific massacre that took the lives of more than 1400 Israelis, most of them unarmed civilian (babies, women, elderly people, and Holocaust survivors), who were raped, shot, mutilated, and burned alive. The bloody war raging in Gaza, at the time of writing, is causing sufferings and numerous casualties of Hamas members and their civilian supporters that fight against the IDF troops, and of unarmed civilians. These horrific events reposition (national) ideology at the center of the discussion: how can one construct the past, the memories, and the heritage without the mediation of ideology?

About the book

The edited volume delves into 18 insightful case studies that cover a wide range of heritage types from a variety of disciplines in the Middle East and Europe, exploring the negotiation between culture and national ideology in the construction of cultural heritage. To elaborate the distinctions between the different case studies through the prism of the various national modes and forms, the book is divided into 4 sections that illuminate the possibility to produce and understand cultural heritage with and beyond national ideology.

Part I Theoretical approach

Chapter 1. *The concept of heritage – A national perspective* by Dalya Yafa Markovich, elaborates the ways in which the Israeli nation state constructs its heritage, which owes its existence to various ethnic, race, and ideological groups or cultures, by unifying them through patriotic emotions that are soaked with trauma. The chapter delves into the constant tension between particular cultural heritages and the common national heritage, and into the social construction of hierarchies and inequalities between specific groups and the national heritage. It concludes by arguing that groups that share the national identity, but hold a different cultural heritage, are excluded to the social-cultural margins since they are labeled as ethnic-national hybrids. The chapter concludes that the use of heritage in nation states, even in societies that

are consolidated by a common national affiliation, establishes structural hierarchies that fuel processes of exclusion of particular ethnic, race, and religious groups.

Chapter 2. *Common, shared, contradictory heritage? A concept and its dimensions* by Christiane Dätsch describe different reference points that exist beyond the national concept: globalization, digitalization, supranationally, and migration. It tries to trace the fields of application, dealing with migrated material heritage (through travel or theft) as well as migrated people (as recipients of their own, but also foreign cultural heritage). On the one hand, “shared heritage” reflects the desire of the world community to show its connectedness, to encourage a dialogue, and to understand culture as a work for peace. On the other hand, “shared heritage” makes visible the limits of its own application, for example, when the cultural heritage of minorities is not visible in the majority society, or when questions of ownership have not been clarified, as in the postcolonial context (once oppressed ethnic groups insist on visibility and recognition). Thus, the concept of “shared heritage” makes visible the “simultaneity of the non-simultaneous” in different heritage discourses between the West and the rest of the world.

Part II Nationality and the construction of cultural heritage

Chapter 3. *The Dawn Multicultural Theater: Sharing heritage through documentary theater* by Sigal Peres analyses the contribution of theaters to the construction of heritage through the lens of the national culture. While canonical theaters aspire to contribute to the creation of a powerful communal national solidarity and heritage, theaters of marginalized groups tend to represent an alternative to that heritage. The case of the *Dawn Theater* is different. The Theater tells the story of the Iraqi Jewish community, which was not included in the Israeli national narrative and heritage due to the Arab-Muslim context in which the community evolved. Despite that, the theater preferred to highlight the Iraqi Jewish community’s contribution to the nation. Thus, while the “Dawn Theater” claims that the Iraqi Jewish ethnic group’s heritage and narrative should be acknowledged, at the same time it accepts the hegemonic national heritage and narrative by wishing to be included in it.

Chapter 4. *From the Mellah in Marrakesh to Israel and back* by Gil Kenan tells the story of the *Marrakesh Jewish Association in Israel*. Using the methods of auto-ethnography, Kenan analyzes the role of the Marrakesh Association, founded by his father, in safeguarding the narratives and authentic material traces of the marginalized Moroccan Jewish ethnic group within the Israeli national heritage. In their annual yearly conferences, the Marrakesh Association shifted the community’s heritage from the *Mellah* – the Jewish quarter – to the heart of Israel, where a model of the quarter was built to host the members’ meetings. This shift bypassed the Zionist binary division between Israelis and immigrants, Jews and Arabs, center and margins, through the spatial and cultural deterritorialization of the Moroccan Jews’ her-

itage. The bricolage created in these conferences did not wish to replace the nation's shared heritage, but to widen the boundaries of the national cultural heritage and be included in it.

Chapter 5. *War memorials as a non-monologic heritage site* by Sapir Barel puts at its center the way a war monument can act as an alternative visual-material sign of the nationalized collective heritage and memory. Delving into the case study of the *Monument to the Negev Brigade* (1963–1968) in Israel, which was designed by Danny Karavan in memory of the Israeli fallen soldiers who lost their lives during the '48 war, the chapter shows how the Monument avoids a mono-perspectival culture of memory. The analysis of the symbolic landscape of the monument reveals the visual and material ways in which the monument is involved both in the nation and military building project, and in questioning the necessity of war. By folding together the geometrical-abstract and the realistic shapes and forms, which blend on the desert's horizon, the Monument suggests a new narrative of heritage that can be shared alongside the mono-perspectival culture of memory.

Chapter 6. *Arab-Hebrew bread: The story of the hubeza and the split local heritage* by Michal Levit describes the complex story of the *hubeza* – a local, wild, edible, and widespread plant in Israel. The *hubeza* is part of the traditional Israeli Palestinian cuisine and heritage and was part of the mythologized Jewish-Israeli cuisine and heritage after playing a major nutritional role in the '48 war. At the end of the war the *hubeza* was marginalized from the Jewish-Israeli cuisines and left only in the geographically-separated local Palestinian cuisine. Then it was repositioned in exclusive upper-class Jewish restaurants, in line with the “from farm to table” global culinary discourse. The analysis of newspaper articles and restaurants' menus featuring the *hubeza* shows that these changes reflect ethnic, national, and class differentiations. Thus, the history of sharing this culinary heritage, then removing it from recipes and from the Jewish-Israeli dis(course), and then adding it back again, reflects separated heritages that evolve in a disconnected manner rather than a shared one.

Part III Multinational divisions and the construction of cultural heritage

Chapter 7. *Liselotte Grschebina. A woman with a camera wandering between two heritages* by Orly Zimmerman analyzes photography through the lens of the central role photography played in the “cultural industry” that built the visual archives of Zionism. Liselotte Grschebina, a German-Jewish photographer that worked in Palestine/Eretz-Israel in the service of the *Jewish National Fund* (Keren Kayemet) until the founding of the state of Israel, was one of these Zionist photographs. Armed with the techniques she acquired in Nazi Germany, Grschebina focused mostly on the image of the “New Jew”, i.e., the Zionist pioneers that were constructed against the stereotypical antisemite Jewish image. The combination of the Nazi photographic praxis with the Zionist ideological narratives created affinities between these two

opposing cultures. The merging of these two components helped to construct the Zionist collective heritage against the Nazi heritage, while using the German techniques to portray the Zionist everyday life and heritage.

Chapter 8. *“What shall I cook?” Erna Meyer’s WIZO-Cookbook in the field of tension between nation building and shared cultural heritage* by Ann-Kathrin Müller tells the story of the cookbook *Wie kocht man in Erez Israel* (How to Cook in Erez Israel), published in 1936. The author, Dr. Erna Meyer, a national economist and household expert that emigrated from Germany, translated her knowledge to the Jewish-Zionist inhabitants of mandatory Palestine. Analyzing Meyer’s cookbook as an intangible cultural heritage shows the ways that food culture contributed to the new Zionist cultural heritage and identity. While until the 1920s the translation of the European cuisine to the local cuisine was influenced by a romantic fascination with the Arab population, this changed with the increasing tensions between the non-Jewish population and the expanding *Yishuv*. From that stage the “exotic” was turning into “primitive”. The evolution of Meyer’s cookbook as a cautious in-between site reflects the effects of the opposing national groups on the possibility to create shared heritage.

Chapter 9. *Modernist interior design as a shared heritage? The Frankfurt kitchen in Tel Aviv* by Elfi Madeleine Carle expands on the architectural concepts of the Bauhaus *International Style*, developed in Weissenhof Estate (1927) in Stuttgart, and adopted by Jewish immigrants that fled Germany and settled in Tel Aviv in the 1940s. The analysis follows the process of adoption of the interior and exterior architectural designs, and the ways they were implemented by the Jewish-Zionist pioneers. Even though the Bauhaus was characterized by designs that were supposed to be derived from a rationalized universal functionality, like the *Frankfurt kitchen*, their adaption reveals that the International Style was localized and recruited to the developing local national culture and heritage. The Bauhaus was used to construct the Zionist local national heritage by emphasizing its Western-centric appeal and recruiting it to the nation building project, while rejecting the Middle-Eastern, and especially the Arab and Muslim styles.

Chapter 10. *Colonial monuments and the treatment of history. The example of the toppled Colston monument in Bristol* by Jana Weyer examines the connection between monuments and heritage. Monuments have been erected since ancient times as representations of the power and authority of ideas and values. As such, the monuments meant to anchor the hegemonic ideology and implement it in the consciousness of monument’s subjects. In the 18th and 19th centuries monuments that represent the hegemony, mainly nobility, were joined by statues of civic figures, mostly from the fields of art, education, and philanthropy. However, some of the new civic role models had an ambivalent past. The case of Edward Coleston (1636–1721), a philanthropist to his hometown of Bristol, England, is one of them. Coleston’s monument was erected in the city at the end of the 19th century. But the fortune he made from slave trading came to haunt him in the 1990s. Becoming a material representation of

the colonial heritage, the statue was toppled during a *Black Lives Matter* demonstration, creating a controversy regarding the ways cultural heritage should be transformed and readjusted in order to create a new collective heritage and memory that can be shared.

Chapter 11. *The Story of a monument, Land Day in Sakhnin, 1976–1978* by Tal Ben Zvi analyzes the struggle embedded in the *Land Day monument* in Sakhnin, Israel. The monument was designed by Palestinian and Jewish artists to commemorate six Palestinian citizens of Israel who were shot in 1976 during demonstrations against the government's attempt to confiscate land. How can we understand the supposed role of a monument that echoes the national struggle of an ethnic-national group that has no sovereignty, and whose members are citizens of another nation state with which they have a tense relationship? In the troubled space between “Otherness” and “belonging”, the Land Day monument displays particular Palestinian ethnic-national characteristics as well as universal-humanistic characteristics that strive to normalize the Palestinian struggle within the national majority. Instead of representing just the national Palestinian uprising, the monument wished to become a bridge for dialogue between groups – an opportunity that was missed.

Chapter 12. *Musical (world) heritage? The West-Eastern Divan Orchestra* by Kai Erdlenbruch and Kinneret Suissa explores the *West Eastern Divan Orchestra*, which is composed of musicians from Arab/Muslim countries and from Israel. Having been constructed as a project that aims to integrate Muslims and Jews, Arabs and Israelis, through classical music, the Orchestra imagines itself as a transnational phenomenon that is stronger than any opposing national affiliation/culture. Thus, classical music is perceived in this case as an integrative force. Even though classical music represents the heritage of European cultures, it acts as a humanistic-universal platform that can overcome national cultures and conflicts. This transnational concept is not only supposed to replace the national concept, but also to create a new shared heritage that marks a moral humanistic and a-historical divan diaspora. In other words, the trans-national is the global power, capital, and habitus of the West.

Part IV The postnational concept and the construction of shared heritage

Chapter 13. *Encoding the spatial DNA of Tel Aviv's White City* by Sharon Golan expands on the significant architecture in the heart of the city of Tel Aviv. This part of the city, characterized by Bauhaus designs and named the “White City”, was built mainly by German-Jewish immigrants, using German knowhow and German building material. Hence, one can argue that the heritage is a shared German Israeli one. However, one could also argue that by building a new home in the Levant, the immigrants differentiated themselves both from the common traditional Arab building style and from the common traditional German Heimat style, which was considered as degenerate art by the Nazi regime. Moreover, the local Bauhaus style cannot be referred to

as purely German, as it adapted itself to the local and cultural conditions of the Levant and the surroundings of a different socio-geographic setting. Thus, if the heritage is a shared one, what does its narrative represent? The historic urban landscape of Tel Aviv can be understood as a physical manifestation of a “shared heritage” that stands for diverse international influences, creating a new language and public domain, and symbolizing a unique historic manifesto of modernism situated between Europe and the Levant.

Chapter 14. *German remembrance? Jewish museums in Germany. The example of the Jewish Museum Göppingen* by Sarai Hannah-Marie Schulz deals with the case study of ethnographic museum. Ethnographic museums are dedicated to selecting and transmitting shared heritage through the institutionalized public commemoration of what is perceived to be worth remembering as well as forgetting. Thus, exhibiting cultural heritage can serve to unveil the past beyond the hegemonic conventions. That is not always the case with the German Jewish museums, which are mostly managed by non-Jewish curators for non-Jewish spectators. This tendency has been accused of leading to an exoticization of the Jewish communities and their disattachment from the German cultural heritage and context. The Jewish Museum Göppingen-Jebenhausen tries to tackle this phenomenon by crossing the boundaries between the local German residence and the former Jewish one. By creating a transboundary discourse and praxis, the museum is fighting against the de-Germanization of the Jews on the one hand, and against their interpretation solely through a German point of view on the other. This policy can lead to an intercultural understanding that overrides national and religious affiliations towards a construction of shared heritage.

Chapter 15. *Shared memories, shared heritage? Museal concepts of (im-)migration in Germany* by Christiane Dätsch reveals the role of museums as agencies of material and cultural heritage, which constructs public remembering and canonizes significant identity. As opposed to the traditional role of museums, this chapter explores DOMiD – *House of Immigrant Society* – a museum-in-the-making of non-hegemonic ethnic-national groups. The process led by DOMiD to create an exhibition of various German “guest workers” communities that were not included in the German culture and heritage shows new heritage-building in the making. This process wishes to create a migrants’ collective heritage that represents the diverse origins of the migrants or the “culture of migration”, and also to construct a shared heritage of migrants or a “culture of migration” that can be integrated with the German heritage. However, rather than the process of assimilation, the museum’s narrative emphasizes the dialogic nature and the transcultural potential that heritage holds, by moving beyond the binary structures East/West and national/multinational.

Chapter 16. *Own or foreign heritage? Young Muslims in Auschwitz (2012–2021)* by Sophia Isabel Baur problematizes the heritage construction of disadvantaged young Muslims with an immigrant background in Germany. These youngsters have

been usually socialized by their communities on narratives that oppose Jews and Judaism. However, German heritage is being thought in German schools against the backdrop of the holocaust of the Jewish world. In other words, the school demands the abandonment of antisemitic views in order to be included in the German heritage and society, and thus further alienates various underprivileged Muslim communities. The project *Young Muslims in Auschwitz*, held in Duisburg-Marxloh, attempted to deconstruct this contradiction by visiting Auschwitz with the youngsters. The tour aimed to challenge the complexity of being German and Muslim, and also to enable an overcoming of the polarized cultural-ideological views by juxtaposing the Muslim and German narratives in a universal-humanistic oriented shared heritage.

Chapter 17. *The use of digital space for equal shared cultural heritage for Jews and Arabs in Israel* by Boaz Lev Tov and Kussai Haj-Yehia shows the effects of the digital revolution on the cultural heritage of excluded groups. Marginalized groups usually suffer from a lack of cultural visibility due to deliberate policy. This situation, which characterizes the Arab Palestinians living in Israel, led to the construction of an open, non-institutional, digital space called *Tarasa Digital Initiative* that documents oral memories and heritage of everyday life activities from a non-experts' point of view. The study examines the modes of engagement that the digital tools make possible. The findings show that even though more Jews than Arabs shared their heritage on the platform, the mutual exposure to memories and cultural heritages creates multiple, ongoing, public interfaces between Jews and Arabs that hitch the democratic digital space to the development of a shared heritage.

Chapter 18. *Shared heritage on the Hartmannswillerkopf* by Gerd Krumeich tells the story of the *Hartmannswillerkopf* memorial site from the perspective of the 21st century, when Western Europe can look back on the longest period of peace on the continent. The time when national conflicts were resolved with the help of wars and at the cost of countless human lives seems to be over. It has been replaced by a desire for supranational European solidarity and an emphasis on commonalities rather than divisions. And yet, the commemoration strategy of different European countries often follows their national history(s), which tend to adopt the narrative of heroism. This narrative serves as a symbolic representation of the hegemonic collective values. An examination of the historical site of Hartmannswillerkopf in Alsace, France, which serves as a military cemetery, a museum, and a walk-in war site of the First World War, shows how a new narrative can emerge through dialogical remembering, joint research, and educational programs that are aware of the various perspectives of the nations involved. This transnational collaboration interprets the past in ways that strive to deconstruct the national monologic remembering of war, and thus create a shared heritage of peace.

Bibliography

- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities*. Verso.
- Assmann, J., & Czaplicka, J. (1995). Collective memory and cultural identity. *New German Critique*, 65, 125–133.
- Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*. SAGE Publications.
- Blake, J. (2015). From global to local heritage: Intangible cultural heritage and the role of the museum. *Anthropology of the Middle East*, 10(1), 22–40.
- Brubaker, R., & Cooper, F. (2000). Beyond “identity”. *Theory and Society*, 29, 1–47.
- Connor, W. F. (1994). *Ethnonationalism: The quest for understanding*. Princeton University Press.
- Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and nationalism*. Blackwell.
- Goldschmidt, H., & Mcalister, E. (Eds.) (2004). *Race, nation, and religion in the Americas*. Oxford University Press.
- González, M. (2008). Intangible heritage tourism and identity. *Tourism Management*, 29, 807–810.
- Greenfeld, L. (1993). *Nationalism: Five roads to modernity*. Harvard University press.
- Hafstein, V. (2004). The politics of origins: Collective creation revisited. *Journal of American Folklore*, 117(465), 300–315.
- Hague Convention. (1954). *The Hague convention for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict*. UNESCO.
- Hobsbawn, E., & Ranger, T. (Eds.) (1983). *The invention of tradition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hobsbawn, E. (1991). *Nations and nationalism since 1980: Program, myth, reality*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kedourie, E. (1960). *Nationalism*. Hutchinson.
- Kohn, H. (1944). *The idea of nationalism: A study in its origins and background*. Macmillan.
- Milstein, M. (2020). Memory of the Nakba in the Palestinian public sphere. *Tel Aviv Notes*, 14(5). <https://dayan.org/content/memory-nakba-palestinian-public-sphere>
- Paul-Binyamin, I., & Potchter, O. (2020). Religious students in a public secular college: Feeling unique in a milieu of diversity. *British Journal of Religious Education*, 42(3), 350–363.
- Smith D. A. (1971). *Theories of nationalism*. Duckworth.
- Smith D. A. (2009). *Ethno-symbolism and nationalism – A cultural approach*. Routledge.
- Sewell, H. W. (2004). *Practicing history*. Routledge.
- Tamir, Y. (2019). Not so civic: Is there a difference between ethnic and civic nationalism? *Annual Reviews*, 22, 419–434.
- UNESCO. (1972). *UNESCO's convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage* (1972).

- UNESCO. (2003). *UNESCO's convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage*.
- Winter, T. (2014). Beyond eurocentrism? Heritage conservation and the politics of difference, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 20(2), 123–137.
- Documentary Heritage. (2010). *Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage*.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1998). *Women, ethnicity and nationalism*. Taylor & Francis.

