Part IV: Unsettelling Ethnic, Migrant and Unilocal Heritage: Following Symbolic Boundary Making in Sensemaking Processes

Research participant Luis, who has lived in Cuxhaven since he was five and whose family stems from Portugal, has an ambivalent relationship to Portugal and his Portugueseness. On the one hand, he craves Portugal as the country offering him the a potentially carefree and easy life, a place to follow the 'bon-vivant' aspects of his being. On the other hand, Portugal is the country he cannot return to due to its catastrophic economic situation, offering no opportunities to young people in their 20s. In both narratives, Luis draws a symbolic boundary constructing what it means to be Portuguese in Cuxhaven. Following this, one could assume with Frederic Barth, that the 'cultural stuff' – language, food, folklore dance practices, attire, mentalities, landscape elements, cultural repertoires etc. – addressed in ethnicisation do not really matter to the process of ethnic boundary making itself (Barth 1969: 15). An analysis of the symbolic boundary-making processes in Ethnicised Heritage Situations, however, shows that the cultural endeavours and landscape of variations in sensemaking are organised along some criteria and moments that can be reconstructed in comparative analysis. Andreas Wimmer also argues that ethnic boundary making is often organised historically around 'dramatic cultural ruptures' (Wimmer 2010: 111), such as migration or conquest.

Part III of this book has shown that unsettled times do indeed change the discursive and concrete arena of ethnicised cultural festivals and associations to align with heritage regimes' worldmaking. A clearly bounded local communities of practice comes into being. Outside of such moments, the the three small towns' ethnicised heritage are shown to be largely lacking in an ethnicised community of practice. Part III also thematised highly institutionalised, outward-facing (and male-connoted) worldmaking that heritage repertoires tend to prioritise as being at odds with the use value that participants experience in their everyday reproduction of social life within their festival organisation and participation.

If we shift to sensemaking in Ethnicised Heritage Situations – to a perspective that focuses less on institutionalised practices and more on the ordinary, everyday processes of (e)valuation – we can begin to see how those operating within these dual spaces draw their symbolic boundaries, and how people employ heritage as a repertoire to produce both difference and belonging. In this use of heritage as a repertoire, certain elements can be seen to organise the relationship between boundaries and 'their' cultural stuff. As individual and collective actors draw on this 'cultural stuff' to construct symbolic boundaries and (e)valuate heritage situations, it becomes clear that their experiences of mobility play a decisive role in shaping processes of ethnic membership formation and the emergence of heritage situations. Mobility experiences – understood as moments of detachment from, and re-attachment to, new places – prove to be a central organising principle of boundary making and, thus, of the aspects of Ethnicised Heritage Situations examined in Part IV. For the research participants, sensemaking occurs precisely through these ruptures, around which their symbolic boundary making is organised.

Part IV therefore introduces how taking routes and setting roots, understood as processes of de/attachment to place, are complexly intertwined in Ethnicised Heritage Situations. The concept of 'taking routes' has been instrumental as a sensitising concept throughout the research process, reflecting my interest in the role of migration experiences in Ethnicised Heritage Situations. While I started focusing on migration as a specific form of mobility, other forms of physical mobility, such as residential and travel, also came to play a role. Additionally, 'setting roots' emerged as an in-vivo code in the material and became a sensitising concept derived from the research participants' language and expressions (Zaidi 2022: 3).[1] Individuals discussed having 'roots' or forms of 'homing' in the interview material, reflecting their place of upbringing or efforts to integrate into the small-town arenas and German national culture.

In Critical Heritage Studies, the taking of routes is mainly associated with migration as a form of mobility and is all too often limited to moving from 'here' to 'there'. This produces an imaginary of 'dual-territoriality' (Ang 2011: 92) that stems from the close relation of the concept of heritage to the nation and does not do justice to the complexity of the diasporan experience (Ang 2011: 92). Therefore, some heritage scholars studying migration call for a broader perspective on heritage and mobility as an ongoing process (e.g. Byrne 2002; Dellios and Henrich 2020).

Transnational and globalisation scholars define mobility as the predominant way of being in postmodern times (Pries 2001: 9). I employ the sensitising concepts

1 At first I was hesitant to use the notion of roots, as it suggests territorialised understandings of homing that do not do justice to the actual mobility of peoples. However, I find it useful as a pair with the concept of routes to make my argument. I understand it here as not only having pre-existing roots but more as the setting of roots in a new place.

of 'taking routes' and 'setting roots', taking from the new mobilities paradigm (Sheller and Urry 2006), wherein setting roots and taking routes are understood as ongoing, dynamic, and entangled processes of detachments/upscaling and attachment/regrounding. Sara Ahmed et al., for example, start their empirical research from an understanding that 'Being grounded is not necessarily about being fixed; being mobile is not necessarily about being detached' (2020: 1). Processes of placement and migration are simultaneous and context-dependent, happening on different scales – they are not opposites. All forms of mobility instead shape local places and vice versa: the phenomena of 'desire paths', physical steps that pound a route in the grass for others to follow along, provides a useful metaphor, or the process which has been described as 'infrastructural or institutional moorings that configure and enable mobilities' (Hannam, Sheller, and Urry 2006: 3).

But as Anthias (2008: 15) points out, being dislocated from one location, such as the nation, does not necessarily imply dislocation in terms of other places, such as social class. For processes of symbolic boundary making, this suggests that dimensions of belonging are not mutually exclusive. Individuals may navigate multiple boundaries simultaneously in their lives. I found no 'master membership', meaning a form of membership, like belonging to a Portuguese diaspora or being a soldier, that dominates all other groups they feel a part of in any of my research participants.

As a consequence of the new mobilities paradigm's conceptualisation of mobility and immobility, criticism is directed towards the notion of the nomadic, cosmopolitan and mobile subject for privileging a particular male and cosmopolitan form of mobility, which excludes those who cannot move as freely. 'Mobility is a resource to which not everyone has an equal relationship.' (Hannam et al. 2006: 3). In this context, it is essential to specify the status of my research participants. From a global perspective, they are relatively privileged as European citizens, able to move freely on the continent for travel, residential changes, or working migration. All the people I met had some mobility experience: for some, this meant migration, while for others, it involved travelling the world or residing in a metropolitan city for a certain period of their lifespan. Almost all of them migrated voluntarily, or their parents migrated voluntarily; they can be considered a part of the (lower) middle class, a status that Portuguese inhabitants of Cuxhaven sometimes only acquired in the process of mobility or as second-generation migrants, and all of them spoke the German language. Consequently, the importance assigned to continuous mobility experiences as opposed to departure and arrival experiences in Ethnicised Heritage Situations is situated within the context of Europe's governance of mobility, reflecting the political dimensions of taking routes.

The shift to sensemaking in Part IV offers new material for reconsidering prominent assumptions about the category of cultural heritage in global heritage discourse. Depending on the type of mobility, experiences of movement can prompt forms of heritage that exist for individuals across multiple localisms in

transnational simultaneity. To reground in a new place also means encountering minority/majority boundaries whose permeability shapes how heritage is employed as a cultural repertoire – often more decisively than membership in an ethnic community imagined as bound by fate. This perspective again challenges overly simplistic and uncritically positive links between heritage, identity and community, and oposes it with the complexity of relations between all elements in Ethnicised Heritage Situations.

9. Coming to Terms with Routes: Mobility Experiences, (Non)Ethnic Subjectivation, and Cosmopolitanisms in Heritage-Making

Place attachment, a significant aspect in both standard and scholarly approaches to cultural heritage, is often conceptualised in territorialised forms, encapsulated in cultural heritage discourse as the representation and recognition of one's ethnic roots and as a homogenising force (Berger et al. 2020; Frank 2009; Kuutma 2009). At times, this is the case in the form of strategic essentialism in political claim-making (Chakravorty Spivak 1988), for example when indigenous groups fight for their collective land ownership. Small towns as a specific type of settlement are often implicitly conceptualised with a territorialised or functionalist rather than a constructivist understanding of space in small-town research. However, a reconciliation with experiences of mobility, emphasising routes, non-ethnic forms of belonging, heterogeneity, and cosmopolitan attitudes primarily shapes the place attachments of the individuals under study. This sensemaking is where the small-town arenas are situated within transnational and global space (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2009).

The sense of attachment to the small towns emerges as a crucial and explicitly non-ethnic form of belonging, expressed consistently across all cases. The participants construct the small towns as simultaneously urban and rural. They engage in discourses around what signifies the small-town arena and co-construct the contents of a 'small-town cultural repertoire'. When explicit references are made to an ethnic minority or national heritage, such as traditional dance, costumes, or languages, these ethnicised heritages contribute to heterogeneity and homogeneity in the small-town arenas.[1]

1 This key finding is mirrored in the process category of ethnoheterogenesis that encompasses the genesis and continuously shifting social forms of ethnicities. Nina Clara Tiesler states the concept acknowledges 'that the coming-into-being of ethnicities is an ongoing process that typically involves de-ethnization as much as ethnization, forces of both hetero- and homogenization as well as a diversity of ethnic membership roles and multiple "ethnic options".´ (2015: xi). I could, accordingly, state that ethnic heritages are always ethnoheterogeneous.

Individuals with migration experience do give specifics around place de-/attachment, which still aligns with the finding that there is no ethnic 'master membership' in the research participants' sensemaking in Ethnicised Heritage Situations. First, their existence in multiple localities (towns, nations, local diasporic communities, regions) is a form of vernacular non-elitist cosmopolitanism, drawing from Pnina Werbner's (2006) conceptualisation. Second, this narrative highlights instances where individuals express place detachment by adopting an explicit cosmopolitan attitude, a noteworthy phenomenon where mobility experiences are transformed into a type of heritage. This chapter, therefore, introduces mobility experiences as temporal, with multilocality and transnational existence as spatial and non-ethnic boundary making as discursive elements in the three towns' Ethnicised Heritage Situations. They appear in the centre of the research participants' sensemaking, though only at the margins of global heritage discourse.

The 'moment of nonrecognition' (Glick Schiller et al. 2006) behind this chapter is how physical mobility experiences shaped the life stories of all my case studies, even those from East Frisia with no migration background. People in Cuxhaven and Zeven had experienced EU migration through border crossings. Dislocation significantly impacted the participants' narratives, echoing Werbner's (2005) observation that migration initiates a process of encountering new environments and landscapes, altering migrants' consciousness and expectations, alongside changes in their home countries and social circles, often leading to a sense of estrangement upon return. Christina from Cuxhaven expressed such a feeling of estrangement:

> Well, the culture, for example, the quote-unquote Portuguese culture that you live here is different from the Portuguese culture in Portugal. Because of course, that's the way it is, in Portugal, the world keeps turning as well, right? So, life goes on. We can't keep up with those developments a hundred percent, since, after all, we live in Germany, but the roots are the same, those always remain. (Christina)[2]

Christina shares her experience of dislocation, feeling disconnected from developments in Portugal, her home country. She sees both 'foreigners' and 'Portuguese emigrants' sharing this disconnection. In Cuxhaven, all interviewees migrated from Portugal as children with their parents or as young adults seeking employment. Their narratives invariably begin with their migration experience, highlighting the challenges such as language acquisition, managing family visits, engaging with the local diaspora, and adapting to the German job market or education system.

2 *„Also die Kultur zum Beispiel, die portugiesische Kultur, in Anführungsstrichen, die man hier auslebt, ist anders als die portugiesische Kultur aus Portugal. Das ist ja so, in Portugal geht die Welt ja auch weiter, ne? Also geht das Leben weiter. Wir kriegen diese Entwicklung nicht hundertprozentig mit, weil wir nun ja schließlich in Deutschland leben, aber die die Wurzeln sind die gleichen, die bleiben immer.*" (Christina)

In Zeven, most interviewees moved from the Netherlands as part of or affiliated with the Dutch military. Only one, a second-generation migrant, lacked migratory experience but maintained contact with Dutch family members. While migration challenges appeared more pronounced for those from Portugal, dislocation still affected Dutch immigrants in Zeven, as seen in Hilde's advice to her daughter, who migrated to Australia, emphasising the need to process such a life-altering experience. Still, it becomes clear that she does not seem to frame her own relocation as a 'leaving behind of everything', as opposed to her daughters:

> We agreed that we would try to see each other every year, but we wouldn't come visit the first year. You need all four seasons somewhere. That is so important. And we were so well-prepared, but still, you just can't imagine leaving everything behind. In good or in bad times. (Hilde)[3]

In Zeven, women faced explicit challenges when migrating, leaving behind their careers in the Netherlands to join their husbands. This transition often meant shifting from a working role to that of a homemaker and unpaid volunteer, as previously explored. Many of these women lived mobile lives, balancing caregiving responsibilities for family elders in their home country.

A striking observation was that participants from my East Frisian study also discussed significant moves in their life narratives. These relocations typically involved transitioning between urban areas and returning to provincial East Frisia. Participants often emphasised the value of living in Aurich/East Frisia and how their attachment to the region grew stronger after experiencing life elsewhere.

Experiences of dislocation relevant to my research participants' sensemaking in Ethnicised Heritage Situations extend beyond international migratory encounters; they also manifest when transitioning from rural East Frisia to a metropolitan city or when exploring the world as a young student. In all three case studies, experiences of dislocation serve as a central anchor point in individuals' biographical narratives, irrespective of whether they migrated internationally or not.

Rather than associating ethnicised heritages exclusively with a specific territory and ethnic origin, the research participants construct heritage as a process of coming to terms with routes and, for some, reconciling with simultaneous existences in multiple places.

---

3 *„Wir haben miteinander ausgemacht, wir versuchen, jedes Jahr einander zu sehen, aber das erste Jahr kommen wir nicht. Ihr braucht alle alle vier Jahreszeiten irgendwo. Das ist so wichtig. Und wir waren so gut vorbereitet und doch ist es so, man kann nicht vorstellen, alles hinter sich zu lassen. In guten oder in schlechten Zeiten."* (Hilde)

9.1 Mobility Experiences as a Unifying Thread: The Small-Town Boundary and Heterogeneity as an Effect of Heritage-Making

A symbolic boundary of significant importance to all research participants transcends ethnic considerations; it revolves around their membership in the small-town arenas of Cuxhaven, Aurich, or Zeven. The boundary of being a small-town resident was often more central to my interviewees' life narratives than any ethnic boundaries, and it intertwined with their experience of mobility. As Janin Dahinden and Emmanuel Charmillot. show for the small-scale boundary of 'the Valleyers', a peripheral(ised) place in Switzerland, 'the mobility of people within the valley is the first important dimension underlying the symbolic boundary of "Valley-ers".' (2022: 371). Mobility plays a similar role in my case of Zeveners, Aurichers, or Cuxhaveners.

9.1.1 Small Town Localisms

In small-town research, rurality and urbanity are not understood as opposed to one another but as two poles of a continuum (Steinführer 2021). Similarly, the individuals I interviewed construct their attachment to the small-town arenas on a continuum between centrality and provinciality. They employ what can be conceptualised as a small-town cultural repertoire, wherein neither centrality nor provinciality is addressed in positive or negative terms, and small towns are constructed as sitting 'in between'. They reference many of the life-world-related structural features of what might define small towns as a reasonable size, to identify as urban dwellers, social proximity and safety as opposed to bigger cities, emotional bonds to a place, or to give the urban centre a symbolic status (Steinführer et al. 2016: 327).

A small town's symbolic boundary can therefore be drawn along a rural-urban continuum and deficit-oriented as well as positive (e)valuations of living in a small-town arena. There also emerged an entanglement of people's place attachment to small towns with family/biographical heritage, social proximity, and landscape elements.

When the research participants residing in Aurich discussed their attachment to the town, mobility experiences stemming from moving (back) to the small town from a metropolis in Germany were almost always central. For them, valuing small-town life is related to experiences of having lived a metropolitan life. Social proximity and proximity to open landscapes are essential categories of small-town repertoire, signifying its more rural side. These elements were addressed as positive attributes of small-town life and can be situated on the provincial side of the rural-urban continuum.

Richard and Clara from Aurich described the town's reasonable size and social proximity favourably. Richard underlined how he goes everywhere by bike, even for a stroll or to take exercise in nature, which he can easily do due to the town's proximity

to the open landscape. His (e)valuation of Aurich as a small town is interlinked with when he left the province to live in a big city. Only when his father died did he return to Aurich to resettle and find his interest and love for the town's East Frisian history. He stated:

> The big city is tremendous. Just, at some point, well, when my father died… of course that messes with your head, you have to clear out the apartment and then all the childhood memories come back and all that jazz. And then I stumbled across so many things that he had collected about the history of this town. (Richard)[4]

Richard juxtaposed his experience of living in a big city with the intimacy and emotions of returning to Aurich to a place of family heritage, where his father's death led him to stay and become actively involved in the town's heritagisation. His whole life narrative, the whole interview, so to speak, is permeated by the contrast between having lived in a big city and the provincialism of his life in Aurich. After living in both worlds, he takes a localist position, as he is deeply attached to the town of Aurich. His family and the town's local heritage are entangled, which can be interpreted as an expression of the social proximity and place attachment of a small town's cultural repertoire.

Clara, another research participant active in Aurich also values the social proximity of living there. She described a feeling of coming home after her experiences of having grown up and lived in more metropolitan cities:

> When we leave for a few days, I'm already looking forward to coming home as we leave. I mean, the openness that I think is really there at every opportunity, including in shops, at the cash register in the Aldi for example. It's a bit different in cities. Here, you always strike up conversation, even when I've never been there before. Immediately, you encounter people who are open… I mean, I can't think of any moment where I don't feel at home here. (Clara)[5]

Only through her experiences in other parts of the country can Clara appreciate and feel at home in her East Frisian town. For Clara, to come home is to enter an open

4 *„Also Großstadt, tolle Nummer. Bloß irgendwann, ja gut, als mein Vater starb… das ist ja auch so eine Psychonummer, da muss man ja dann die Wohnung auflösen, dann kommen die ganzen Kindheitserinnerungen und laber Rhabarber. Und dann fielen wir so viele Dinge in die Hand, die er gesammelt hat über die Geschichte dieser Stadt.*" (Richard)

5 *„Wenn wir zum Beispiel jetzt ein paar Tage wegfahren, da freue ich mich schon beim Wegfahren auf's nach Hause kommen. Also die Offenheit, die, ich meine, schon da ist, bei allen GeZevenheiten, auch in Läden, auch bei Aldi an der Kasse, zum Beispiel. In Städten ist das ein bisschen anders. Hier kommt man immer in's Gespräch, obwohl ich noch nie da war. Gleich begegnen einem offene Menschen… Also ich wüsste keinen Moment, wo ich mich hier nicht zuhause fühle.*" (Clara)

and, compared to her experiences in big cities, much less anonymous social environment This is but one instance, where mobility experiences that are not linked to migration are crucial in place attachment and in the construction of a towns 'small-townness'. Place attachment increases the possibility for cultural productions in Aurich to emerge as heritage.

Being an Auricher also means living near nature and beautiful landscapes. Richard pointed out that landscapes are another essential element of small-town cultural repertoire. In an anecdote, he told me about different approaches to caring for nature and climate and described proximity to open landscape:

> What fascinates me, or surprises me, is that, even in this region, where people have known the environment in a down-to-earth way for generations, right, the rangers, the hunters, the farmers, truly for generations, that we have a phenomenon here that I really only know from the big city. From that kind of corner, the Greens. That's a party that developed in the metropolises. And complete, I would say, complete academic baloney. Abstract. That really surprised me, and kind of shocked me as well, that that academic nonsense has been painted over the rural traditions for environment and nature at this point. And of course, they came after ideological hunters first, they're the ones who make the animals die, the rangers were evil as well, who fell the trees. Well, if someone gets rid of my embankment hedge, then immediately someone will come and report that person and then it will cost them 21.000 €. Even if it's your own hedge. Or if you fell a tree in your own backyard, even if it's half dead already. That is so insane, I find it amusing. I mean, if you know Hamburg. Marzahn is really just high-rise buildings. Like, really, basically battery cages for humans. When they make the kind of fuss that is typical here, I fully understand that. They fight for every tree, they have to. But if I look at the people here, these people, really, it's just completely neurotic. We're surrounded by trees here.' (Richard)[6]

6 *„Was mich natürlich ein bisschen fasziniert, oder verwundert, ist, dass selbst in dieser Region, wo die Menschen das Umweltthema über Generationen bodenständig kannten, ja, also die Förster, die Jäger, die Landwirte, also über Generationen, dass wir hier sozusagen ein Phänomen haben, dass ich eigentlich nur aus der Großstadt kenne. Aus so einer Ecke, die Grünen. Das ist eine Partei, die ist in den Metropolen entstanden. Und völlig, ich sag mal, völlig universitärer Quark. Abstrakt. Das hat mich schwer gewundert, und zum Teil auch geschockt, dass dieser universitäre Unsinn sich inzwischen schon auch über die ländlichen Umwelt- und Naturtraditionen gelegt hat. Und die haben natürlich als erstes ideologische Jäger rausgebissen, das sind ja die, die die Tiere tot machen, die Förster waren ja auch böse, die die Bäume fällen. Also, wenn hier jemand meine Wallhecke wegmacht, dann kommt sofort irgendeiner und zeigt die an und dann kostet das 21.000 €. Auch wenn es die eigene ist. Oder einen Baum fällen im eigenen Garten, auch wenn der schon halb tot ist. Das ist so irre, also das finde ich amüsant. Also, wer Hamburg kennt. Das ist so wirklich Hochhaus, Marzahn. Also wirklich sozusagen die Legebatterie für Menschen. Wenn die so einen Zinnober machen, wie das hier üblich ist, dann habe ich volles Verständnis dafür. Es wird um jeden Baum gekämpft, muss auch. Aber wenn ich mir die hier angucke, die hier, wirklich, das ist einfach völlig neurotisch wir sind hier von Bäumen umstellt"* (Richard).

Valuing nature, open landscapes and social proximity are also relevant criteria of (e)valuation for people who (e)valuate Cuxhaven or Zeven. Research participants from Cuxhaven, for example, described their mentalities as open-minded and internationally oriented due to the proximity to the seaside and corresponding trade. And a research participant from Zeven underlined the amount of nature and space that living in the town means.

Besides that, the low cost of living, the calmness of living in a small town, and the solidarity and support among one another were praised repeatedly with regard to residing in Zeven. Joris underlined good neighbourly relations in Zeven, as did many other people I talked to in the town. Marta from Cuxhaven attributed the town a rather provincial status, stating 'I think it's a bit, well, calmer in Cuxhaven. A town.' (Marta).[7]

Christina also praised Cuxhaven's provinciality and calmness, comparing it to bigger cities:

> Cuxhaven is a little piece of heaven. When you look around at what is happening in Germany, with adolescents, drugs… Cuxhaven isn't completely safe from all that, but in comparison, Cuxhaven is pretty much what teens would call dead boring. For me, I find that nice. Cuxhaven is a city where you can relax and recuperate, body and soul. (Christina)[8]

In the cases of Dutch people in Zeven and Portuguese people in Cuxhaven, these positive attributes of their place of residence are most often, as is the case with people from Aurich, addressed relationally when comparing the towns to bigger metropolises. Countries of origin are another referent for the people with migration experience.

All these examples show how an experience of residential mobility prompts my research participants' sensemaking of a small town's symbolic boundary. Their attachment to their small-town arenas of residence, which I consider a potential for (non-ethnic) heritagisation, is closely related to their experience of taking routes. And the taking of routes in turn is nothing else but a moment of upheaval, an encounter with difference, that can be considered an important prerequisite of all heritagisation (Wobst 2010; Luhmann et al. 2022).

Being a small-town inhabitant in these case studies, then, is to value provinciality: to see social proximity and proximity to nature and open landscapes as positive

---

7 *„Ich glaub', das hier in Cuxhaven ist ein bisschen, also, ruhiger. Eine Kleinstadt."* (Marta)

8 *„Cuxhaven ist ein Stückchen vom Himmel. Wenn man sich umsieht, was in Deutschland geschieht, mit den Jugendlichen, Drogen… Cuxhaven bleibt auch nicht erspart davon, aber im Vergleich ist Cuxhaven relativ, wie die Jugendlichen sagen, tote Hose. Für mich find ich das schön. Also, Cuxhaven ist eine Stadt, da kann man sich erholen, Körper und Seele."* (Christina)

attributes of small-town life. As to the provincial status of small towns, deficit-oriented views also prevailed in the interview material. Some of these views referred to the very same social proximity that has been addressed in favourable terms elsewhere. Moreover, people from both Aurich and Zeven discussed how the towns are infrastructurally drained, specifically their centres. Furthermore, a research participant in his 20s told me what has to be done politically to prevent people from leaving the town, and he was keen to underline that he only understood the infrastructural difficulties of the town he grew up in after having left it for a while. He stated:

> It's kind of being bled dry, and that makes absolutely no sense at all. Neither the hospital closing, nor the fact that there is no rail connection. And there is a bunch of industry and commerce stuff coming to Zeven right now… After all, Zeven wants to be a regional centre, and at the same time its infrastructure is being bled dry, and it's all a bit contradictory. (Sebastian)[9]

One of my interview questions was about the places in and around their small towns of residence that research participants would take visitors to. Answering this question almost always started with a visit to the next big city. This means that all my interviewees were oriented towards bigger cities in this sense. And still, there was also, at times, urbanness instead of provinciality ascribed to the small towns themselves. Small towns are, after all, situated on a continuum of provinciality and centrality.

Richard, who enjoys cycling and taking exercise in the open landscape surrounding Aurich described himself as an urban dweller actively involved in reproducing and recognising the town's historic urban fabric. He gave the town's history a high symbolic relevance and the long-established structures for solving social-ecological problems. He also described Aurich as being a bit different from the rest of rural East Frisia due to its city status and relatively highly educated bureaucratic classes working in administration or secondary schools, while at the same time 'not being a university city' (Richard). Aurich, he gave the impression, is situated somewhere in the middle of the continuum between urbanity and rurality, between centrality and provinciality.

Such positionings can also be found in the narratives of people I interviewed in Cuxhaven. Luis, for example, posited Cuxhaven as urban when he distinguished it from his rural upbringing in Portugal. Asked about what signifies Cuxhaven's cultural landscape, he only half-jokingly stated 'money!' (Luis), saying that you can find everything you want on one central shopping street.

---

9 *„Das wird irgendwie ausgeblutet, und das ergibt überhaupt gar keinen Sinn. Weder, dass das Krankenhaus schließt, noch, dass es keine Bahnverbindung gibt. Und nach Zeven kommen gerade lauter Wirtschaftssachen… Zeven will eben Mittelzentrum sein und gleichzeitig wird die Infrastruktur halt ausgeblutet und das ist ein bisschen widersprüchlich alles.*" (Sebastian)

Dutch immigration to Zeven seems to have pushed the town toward urbanity in its inhabitants' perception. Many people were keen to tell me that the Dutch brought economic wealth and prosperity. Hilde remembered that their arrival in the 1960s was received in ambivalent terms by Zeven's inhabitants. On the one hand, the foreigners caused suspicion. On the other hand,

> People were happy about all the Dutch people living here. They had a bit more money, which meant they could buy more. So, Zeven was a bit more affluent, you could really feel that. At the time, we didn't have to pay sales taxes, and when you lived abroad, you received an allowance as well. (Hilde)[10]

They changed the provincial attitude of former inhabitants with their open-minded and fun attitude, as well as by entering relationships ships and marriages with German residents. Interestingly, the presence of many Portuguese people in Cuxhaven did a similar thing with the urban-rural continuum, as the diaspora community to Marta, one of my interviewees, gave the town a 'pioneering status' in rural Germany.

Immigration of non-German people, then, potentially alters the lifeworld-related features of small towns as experienced by their inhabitants, nudging them towards centrality and urbanity. It becomes evident that the construction of small towns as entities with distinct features and personal attachments is always juxtaposed with other places, such as larger metropolitan cities or locations in the immigrants' countries of origin. In the three small towns, such constructions are often prompted by experiences of actual physical mobility between these places, although research suggests that such travels can also be imagined.

Furthermore, the key criteria of (e)valuation within a small-town repertoire emphasise what the research participants define as lifeworld-related features that contribute to the unique position of small towns along a rural-urban continuum: social proximity, proximity to nature and open landscapes, infrastructural conditions, and population density. The small-town boundary, then, as a non-ethnicised form of symbolic boundary, holds significant importance in my research participants' local sensemaking processes.

9.1.2 Ethnicised Heritages as Regional: Producing Heterogeneity

Regional localisms also emerged as significant boundaries in my case studies. Individuals frequently referenced ethnicised heritages, linking them to specific regions

10 *„Man hat sich gefreut, dass die Holländer hier alle gewohnt haben. Die hatten etwas mehr Geld und konnten auch mehr kaufen. Also war der Wohlstand in Zeven etwas besser, das konnte man richtig spüren. Wir brauchten damals keine Mehrwertsteuer zu bezahlen und wenn man im Ausland lebte, bekam man auch Zuschuss.*" (Hilde)

of origin and forging connections between people and their respective places. This phenomenon heterogenises Dutch or Portuguese diaspora membership and contributes to the deconstruction of East Frisia as a homogeneous imagined community. Regional localism was evident in various aspects, including discussions about mentalities, language, food, and folklore dance costumes.

In Zeven, the significance of regional origins emerged as a noteworthy theme among several research participants. For instance, Joris highlighted the historical context and cultural distinctions he associates with the region of Brabant, his place of birth. He invoked a sense of regional pride while critiquing perceived cultural hegemony from other parts of the Netherlands:

> I'm from Brabant. We're the oppressed South, from before, by the Lords at the time in Holland. Well, and it's our own fault of course, what with the fruit from Holland, and the vegetables from Holland. But we're the Netherlands, and Holland is north and South Holland, and Utrecht is Utrecht, and Brabant is Brabant. We're Brabantians, and everything above that sewer there, those are Hollanders. (Joris)[11]

Additionally, the term 'Holland' as an everyday reference for the entire Netherlands is noted. This linguistic phenomenon is particularly prevalent in Germany, where 'Holland' is often used interchangeably with 'the Netherlands.'

Another participant, Hilde, underscored the contrast between living in the Western part of the Netherlands and her provincial life in Zeven. She described the Western region as stressful, suggesting a perception of urban hustle and bustle compared to the presumably more tranquil atmosphere of Zeven.

> We're from the Western Netherlands. Life goes very fast there. A lot of industry, a lot of work, a lot of people, a lot of everything. And everything is fast, fast, fast. It's all supposed to be done by yesterday. You get used to it. That's the pace. But here, it's much less. (Hilde)[12]

In general, she went on to state, people from different regions in the Netherlands 'think differently', just as people from the German South vary from the ones from the north, as well as mentalities in metropolises differ from small towns:

---

11 *„Ich komme aus Brabant. Und wir sind ja der unterdrückte Süden, von früher, von den Herren damals in Holland. Ja, und natürlich selbst schuld, mit dem Obst aus Holland, und dem Gemüse aus Holland. Aber wir sind die Niederlande, und Holland ist Nord- und Südholland, und Utrecht ist Utrecht, und Brabant ist Brabant. Wir sind Brabanter, und alles über der Kloake da, das sind Holländer.*" (Joris)

12 *„Wir sind aus dem Westen der Niederlande. Das Leben geht da sehr schnell. Viel Industrie, viel Arbeit, viele Leute, alles viel. Und alles schnell, schnell, schnell. Gestern soll es fertig sein. Daran gewöhnt man sich. Das ist das Tempo. Aber hier ist es viel weniger.*" (Hilde)

> You've been to the Netherlands, so you've seen that people in the Western part of the Netherlands think differently than in the north or the South. They're different people, like here in Germany, people in Bavaria think differently than people in Schleswig-Holstein. People from big cities think differently, and in Stuttgart they think differently than in Hamburg. (Hilde)[13]

While many interviewees in Zeven were keen to describe to me the regions they came from and the mentalities they associated with these regions (e.g., the industrialised, stressful west of the Netherlands, the conservative Bible belt), regional belonging played as much of a role in the case of Cuxhaven and Aurich. This regional attachment was evident in narratives of origin or accounts of individuals from specific regions in Portugal integrating into Cuxhaven and in the materialisation of regional origins through traditional dresses worn in local folklore groups and language.

In Cuxhaven, there are occasions when the fish festival coincides with the Catholic Fatima procession. During these moments, the two local rancho groups that perform in the fish festival are also invited to participate in the procession, wearing their traditional attire.

> Well, Portuguese folklore, our tradition... today they danced in the fish festival, and I told them, you don't have to get changed, it's beautiful if you march like this, because it shows our traditions even more. And, after all, we're all from different regions in Portugal. (Christina)[14]

On the one hand, the dresses represent 'our tradition', meaning the Portuguese life of Cuxhaven, a form of homogenisation. On the other hand, as artefacts and as migrated heritage, they show the different regional origins of the people wearing them:

> For example, one shows the rich widow, the black one, that's from around Aveiro, and then we have the typical fisherman from Vila do Conde, that's a totally different area, and then we have the one from Viana do Castelo, that's the one with all of that gold. So, every traditional dress represents a city in Portugal. (Christina)[15]

---

13 *„Du warst in den Niederlanden und du hast auch mal feststellen können, dass Leute im Westen der Niederlande anders denken als im Norden und im Süden. Das sind unterschiedliche Leute, wie hier in Deutschland, Leute in Bayern denken anders als die Leute in Schleswig-Holstein. Leute aus der Großstadt denken anders, und in Stuttgart denkt man anders als in Hamburg.*" (Hilde)

14 *„Also, portugiesische Folklore, unsere Tradition... heute haben sie im Fischerfest getanzt, und dann hab' ich gesagt, da braucht ihr euch nicht umziehen, das ist wunderschön, wenn ihr so lauft, weil das noch mehr unsere Tradition zeigt. Und wir sind ja alle aus unterschiedlichen Orten in Portugal.*" (Christina)

15 *„Die eine zeigt zum Beispiel die reiche Witwe, das ist die Schwarze, das ist so aus der Ecke Aveiro, und dann haben wir den typischen Fischer von Vila do Conde, das ist eine ganz andere Ecke, und dann haben*

Of course, Christina added, sometimes people wear dresses from a region they do not originate from, as the Portuguese group in Cuxhaven comes from diverse backgrounds. Beyond being mere garments, the dresses serve as tangible embodiments of the regional origins of the Portuguese inhabitants of Cuxhaven and signify a process of internal heterogenisation.

Traditional dress is also a means of heterogenisation in Aurich, wherein regional origins are posited against the unified region of East Frisia. Clara was keen to underline that there is no such thing as an East Frisian traditional dress:

> Well, the dancing dress is not really East Frisian, or only partly, when they put on blue striped or blue printed garments. For example, in Emden, they have red clothes, I'm not sure why. In the north they imitated Thälmannstracht, or whatever it's called, so they have dark blue and wine red, and everyone is wearing these funny hats. I guess they found some kind of documentation or pictures. I don't know exactly at the moment, since we are still trying to establish that. (Clara)[16]

Intra-regional boundaries within East Frisia were also drawn between the mentalities of dance groups coming from one of the East Frisian Islands or the mainland, as well as coming from small towns versus coming from a rural area:

> People from Borkum are totally different from those from Juist. Well, I only know the ones in the groups, but one has a certain Habitus, and it means something. The Wangerooger Damen, they're a women's group as well, and it's the same with the people from Aurich, there are a few… I don't want to say stuck up, but it kind of fits, when they say they're from Aurich. (Clara)[17]

In other words, there is no explicitly East Frisian traditional dress or mentality to be found; rather, the costumes signify intra-regional differences such as being provincial or more urban or living on or off the coast. Next to traditional dress and mentalities as ethnicised heritages, language use was also employed for regional boundary

---

wir die von Viana do Castelo, das ist die mit dem ganzen Gold. Also jede Tracht zeigt eine Stadt in Portugal." (Christina)

16 *„Naja, also die Tanzkleidung ist nicht so ostfriesisch, weil die sich blau gestreifte oder blau bedruckte Sachen angezogen haben. Zum Beispiel Emden, die haben so rote Kleider, wie die darauf kommen, weiß ich auch nicht. Im Norden haben die auch so 'ne Thälmannstracht, oder wie das heißt, nachgeahmt, die haben dann auch so dunkelblau und weinrot, und alle haben so komische Hüte auf. Da haben die wohl irgendwelche Dokumentationen oder Bilder gefunden. Ich weiß es momentan nicht so genau, weil wir das ja erst erarbeiten wollen.*" (Clara)

17 *„Die Borkumer sind ganz anders als die von Juist. Also, ich kenn' jetzt nur die aus den Gruppen, aber man hat ja so einen gewissen Habitus, und irgendwas ist da so dran. Die Wangerooger Damen, das ist auch eine Damenriege, und bei den Aurichern ist es auch so, da sind so einige… ich will nicht sagen hochnäsig, aber es würde so dazu passen, wenn sie meinen, sie kommen aus Aurich.*" (Clara)

making, as an accent allows for distinctions, such as discerning whether individuals come from the north of Portugal or speak in a strong Porto dialect.

The boundary-making processes I observed in relation to the mobility experiences of my research participants across all three case studies were dynamic and situated. They are not limited to determining ethnic membership and instead indicate that boundary – and heritage – making involve the often alleged homogenisation and heterogenisation. My analysis further reveals that these processes are relational regarding geographical experiences.

Forms of ethnic heritage such as traditional dress, mentalities, or languages are treated as 'cultural stuff' (Barth 1969) in symbolic boundary-making processes, serving both the homogenisation of (national/minority) membership and, more importantly, its heterogenisation along regional lines.

Taking a mobility lens means it is possible to transcend the notion that migrants are the primary carriers of mobility-laden heritages. In doing so, the concept of migrant and ethnic heritages as homogeneous minority heritages within majority society can be challenged, as can the presupposed dominating significance of ethnicised heritages for minority populations in the first place.

Instead, the Ethnicised Heritage Situations in these small-town arenas is characterised by a complex landscape of simultaneous memberships as place attachments. This sensemaking is opposed to linear developments towards social cohesion or homogenisation assumed in much heritage regime worldmaking (Hertz 2015; Noyes 2015). All mobility experiences and experiences of detachment give rise to localisms and a sense of place attachment. Attachment to the small towns of residence, characterised by features that are neither entirely rural nor urban, emerges as a crucial non-ethnic boundary across all my case studies. When ethnicised heritages are explicitly addressed, they are not solely utilised in processes of ethnic homogenisation but also contribute to heterogenisation. In what follows, I will delve deeper into the finding that just as homo- and heterogenisation processes work together in the Ethnicised Heritage Situations under study, so do modes of attachment and detachment, and they do so in specific ways for the people I met with migration experience from the Netherlands or Portugal.

9.2 Navigating Migration Experiences: Cosmopolitan Attitudes

It appears that migration heritage and potentially all, or at least most, minority (and majority) heritages are marked by mobility. While these findings are consistent across my case studies involving both migrant and national minorities in the three small towns, I also observed distinct forms of boundary making and subjectivation with those people that re-grounded in northern Germany with international migration experience. Two kinds of cosmopolitan attitudes emerge to shape the Ethni-

cised Heritage Situations under study: thin and thick cosmopolitanisms. As Victor Roudometof describes:

> The reality of internal globalization (or glocalization) is responsible for transforming people's everyday lives irrespective of whether they are transnational or not. Glocalization leads to two different versions of cosmopolitanism: first, a thick or rooted or situational cosmopolitanism and, second, a thin cosmopolitanism, whereby detachment allows for transcending the boundaries of one's culture or local. (2005: 113)

The mobility experience which itself transforms into heritage for my research participants can therefore be constituted as thin cosmopolitanism.

Thick, or rooted cosmopolitanism has also been described as 'vernacular cosmopolitanism' (Bhabha 2017; Werbner 2006) or 'everyday cosmopolitanism' (Vertovec 2009), underlining the existence of cosmopolitanism across class positionings and travellers' relative power and status. Advocates of such concepts refuse to see rootedness in territory and culture and cosmopolitan openness as oppositional. This implies that local, cosmopolitan, and national postures are not seen as absolutes; I can see them as relations of degree. No single dimension of belonging excludes other boundaries drawn simultaneously and in the same life. Different localisms or dimensions of belonging exist in the three small towns where there is no one 'master membership' for any of my research participants.

9.2.1 Multilocal Cosmopolitanism

Joris and Luis, two research participants who position themselves as mavericks or outsiders to a local Dutch or Portuguese community, describe fellow compatriots in Cuxhaven and Aurich as exclusive, at times arrogant. They employ this as a reason for their detachment, positioning themselves instead as open-minded while simultaneously underlining their emotional attachment to their countries of origin. In doing so, they emphasise their capacity to engage multiple national cultural repertoires. Together with Christina, they articulate overlapping attachments to different places that can be described, following Werbner, as a multilocal and 'rooted' cosmopolitanism. Such orientations allow for simultaneous attachment and detachment: as in Joris and Luis's ambivalence toward their compatriots, or Christina's sense of belonging in two places while also experiencing a temporal rift between them.

According to Werbner (1999), being cosmopolitan does not mean being completely detached. It is also an attitude or worldview not limited to elites and nomad travellers; it can be expressed by working-class and other less privileged people. She refers to people operating within the concepts of 'vernacular cosmopolitanism' (Bhabha 2017) or 'rooted cosmopolitanism' (Appiah 2010), who do not abandon ties

to morally and emotionally significant communities – families and ethnic groups – while remaining available to the world. They may feel sentimentally attached to several homes in different countries (Werbner 2006: 7).

Werbner's notion of rooted cosmopolitanism, applied to Pakistani diasporas in Britain, highlights participants grounded in localist attachments while being transnationally engaged and open-minded:

> There are Scottish Pakistanis and Welsh Pakistanis. Pakistani membership in Britain or Europe is thus mediated by several different dimensions of 'belonging.' Cosmopolitanism, in other words, does not necessarily imply an absence of belonging but the possibility of belonging to more than one ethnic and cultural localism simultaneously. (Werbner 1999: 34)

This multilocality also emerged in the three small towns I studied. My research participants expressed multilocal attachments and, at times, detachments – a vernacular form of cosmopolitanism that challenges the idea of migration as a linear process from dislocation to settlement (Byrne 2002). Migrant heritages are constructed in a transnational simultaneity that does not exclude being 'rooted' or taking localist postures.

Christina, who migrated to Cuxhaven from Portugal, expresses attachment to more than one location:[18]

> Well, many Portuguese say when they travel home, they're foreigners there. I don't have that problem. When they say they feel like foreigners, I can't relate to that. If I'm here today, I'll feel at home, if I'm in Portugal tomorrow, I'll immediately feel at home again. (Christina)[19]

She distinguishes herself from other Portuguese inhabitants, emphasising her integration and success. At the same time, she experiences a temporal rift, describing Portuguese heritage in Cuxhaven as 'always a step behind' Portugal regarding music and folklore:

---

18 I should also point out how situated such attitudes are. Many of my interviewees from Cuxhaven discussed how their feeling of belonging and ascriptions change whether they are in Portugal or in Germany. Those who used to be Portuguese in Germany and felt at home there came back after several years and transformed into being German in Portugal. I will not always be able to do justice and represent this form of situational importance. However, I will come back to it where I find it important to be mentioned in the context of my analysis.

19 *„Also, viele Portugiesen sagen, wenn sie nach Hause fahren, sind sie da fremd. Ich hab' dieses Problem nicht. Wenn sie sagen, sie fühlen sich fremd, kann ich es nicht nachvollziehen. Wenn ich heute hier bin, fühle ich mich zu Hause, wenn ich morgen in Portugal bin, fühle ich mich sofort wieder zuhause.*" (Christina)

> Well, the culture, for example, the quote-unquote Portuguese culture that you live here is different from the Portuguese culture in Portugal. Because of course, that's the way it is, in Portugal, the world keeps turning as well, right? So, life goes on. We can't keep up with those developments a hundred percent, since, after all, we live in Germany, but the roots are the same, those always remain. Just, maybe they changed something about the music for a folk tale. It's just like it is here in Germany, we aren't standing still here either, right? And us Portuguese who live somewhere else, of course we're always a step behind. I don't mean that in a negative way, but we need a bit longer for these developments. We can't grow alongside them because we aren't living alongside them. (Christina)[20]

Christina's example highlights how attachment to multiple localisms introduces a temporal dimension to heritagisation: heritage is experienced not only in space but also in time, as she maintains links to both her country of origin and her current residence. Her ability to feel at home in two places simultaneously reflects a highly situated form of rooted cosmopolitanism. One reason she quickly adapted to Cuxhaven was the presence of a loosely bound Portuguese diaspora already living in the small town. Her attachment to the town's Portuguese heritage does not preclude an attachment to Portugal, showing that multilocal cosmopolitanism can coexist with sentimentally grounded belonging.

Joris and Luis navigate local diaspora communities as self-defined outsiders or 'mavericks.' Unlike entrepreneurs, mavericks were once part of ethnic associations but later disengaged from their conventions, maintaining only loose connections (Becker 1973: 708). This position creates a conflictual and analytically revealing relation to local ethnicised social worlds. In both Cuxhaven and Zeven, they actively detach from local diaspora communities while emphasising attachment to their countries of origin and Germany, legitimising these boundaries through different national cultural repertoires encountered in their mobility experiences.

Luis lives in Cuxhaven. At the time of the interview, he was in his 20s and had lived in Portugal only for the first four years of his life. Since then, he has experienced Portugal during family visits, so his narration of going to Portugal on holidays sometimes sounded like a tourist's story. He is very family-oriented, even though he is

20 *„Also die Kultur zum Beispiel, die portugiesische Kultur, in Anführungsstrichen, die man hier auslebt, ist anders als die portugiesische Kultur aus Portugal. Das ist ja so, in Portugal geht die Welt ja auch weiter, ne? Also geht das Leben weiter. Wir kriegen diese Entwicklung nicht hundertprozentig mit, weil wir nun ja schließlich in Deutschland leben, aber die die Wurzeln sind die gleichen, die bleiben immer. Nur vielleicht haben sie bei einem Volksmärchen an der Musik was geändert. Es ist wie hier in Deutschland, hier bleibt man ja auch nicht stehen, ne? Und wir Portugiesen, die woanders leben, natürlich hängen wir immer einen Schritt zurück. Das ist nicht negativ gemeint, aber wir brauchen ein bisschen länger für diese Entwicklung. Wir können nicht mitkommen, weil wir da ja nicht mitleben.*" (Christina)

keen to differentiate from his family's Portugueseness and expectations. While his relationship with his family is ambivalent, Luis was quite evident in making a difference between fellow Portuguese people in the town and himself, which, in a way, de-minoritises his status in Cuxhaven. He positioned himself as an outsider in this respect. Discussing his social life, he prioritised his German friends, whom he trusts more:

> It's difficult to trust your own people, and it shouldn't be like that, but it's difficult. I prefer confiding in my German friends. With them, I know it's safe. (Luis)[21]

He also critiques fellow Portuguese in Cuxhaven:

> Well, there are just some people here, from our culture, who are idiots. Complete idiots, because they just love talking badly about others without ever having really gotten to know them, or knowing what they really do. And of course, we distance ourselves from those people accordingly, just like there are many Portuguese at my work whom I have distanced myself from, and I only say hello and goodbye to them now. (Luis)[22]

Another interviewee, Marta also described the Portuguese community in Cuxhaven as a closed group where word travels fast:

> Well, sometimes they talk too much and say things that are wrong, like rumours, for example, 'oh, I heard that such and such person…' (Marta)[23]

Joris, whom I would position as a maverick in the social world of Zeven's Dutch association, described his relation to his 'fellow compatriots' in the town in quite similar terms; he mistrusts them and finds them too superficial. Just like Luis, Joris regularly visits the social spaces of the Dutch clubhouse but positions himself at the borders of this social world, whose conventions and ways of being he does not want to be a part of. He described some excluding and negative experiences in the clubhouse and a lack of feeling to be accepted for who he is.

---

21 *„Es ist schwierig, seinen eigenen Leuten zu vertrauen, und das sollte eigentlich nicht so sein, aber es ist schwierig. Ich vertrau' mich lieber meinen deutschen Freunden an. Da weiß ich, da ist es safe.*" (Luis)

22 *„Also, hier gibt es einfach Menschen aus unserer Kultur, die sind Idioten. Richtige Vollidioten, weil die es einfach lieben, schlecht über andere zu reden, ohne die vorher richtig kennengelernt zu haben oder zu wissen, was die wirklich tun. Und von solchen Leuten distanzieren wir uns natürlich dementsprechend, genauso wie ich mich auch von vielen Portugiesen auf der Arbeit distanziere und nur noch hallo und tschüss sage.*" (Luis)

23 *„Also, manchmal sprechen sie zu viel und sagen Sachen, die falsch sind, also Gerüchte, zum Beispiel, „oh, ich habe gehört, dass die hier…*" (Marta)

Joris was in his 60s when I met him for the interview. He came to Zeven for a job in the military, which he left quickly after building a life in the town, including marrying a German woman, having children, and buying a house. He proudly described his successful career, despite many hardships. He was keen to underline the 'Germanness' of his life and social contacts in Zeven and how he feels accepted as part of his wife's family. His main issue with the members of the traditional association is a feeling of not being one among equals, as some of them feel entitled to reproduce the 'command and obedience' structure even after leaving their military posts:

> Most of them are ex-soldiers, military. I was a staff sergeant and there are a couple others, the lowest was a simple serviceman. And the sergeants, the officers that weren't colonels and all that, those are often people who say, 'no, I'm a civilian just like you.' But all the others, for 40, 45 years, they always called the shots. They told people to jump, and they jumped. No, no, there was nothing like that in the Dutch army. But they gave orders and others did what they told them to do. And now they're all walking around thinking that they can still do that, and sometimes they treat us that way. (Joris)[24]

In this hierarchy, Joris feels at the lowest point as an ex-soldier and civilian. Just like Luis, Joris underlined the 'Germanness' of his network of friends, whom he trusts more:

> When you're accepted by north Germans, you're accepted for life. Not so with the Dutch. They're like vacation acquaintances, really. Terrible. When I learned the difference, I thought, what is wrong with these people? They're so fake, saying things indirectly and 'oh, how nice' and all that. Building their own image, that's what they do with you. (Joris)[25]

Joris, Marta, and Luis, as outsiders and mavericks, differ from ethnic entrepreneurs in how they relate to local nationalised diaspora communities. While some en-

---

24 *„Die meisten davon, das sind Ex-Soldaten, Militär. Ich war Stabsunteroffizier und da sind noch so ein paar, der niedrigste war ein einfacher Soldat. Und die Unteroffiziere, wenn es keine Offiziere sind, die Oberst und so waren, das sind dann schon mal Menschen, die sagen, nee, ich bin Zivilist wie du auch.' Aber die anderen, die haben alle 40 Jahre, 45 Jahre, immer das Sagen gehabt. Die haben gesagt, springen, und die Leute sind gesprungen. Nee, nee, sowas war in der niederländischen Armee nicht. Aber die haben befohlen und die anderen haben gemacht. Und jetzt laufen die alle rum und denken, dass sie das immer noch können und gehen auch manchmal so mit uns um.*" (Joris)

25 *„Wenn man bei den Norddeutschen einmal akzeptiert ist, dann ist man das sein Leben lang. Bei den Niederländern nicht. Das sind so Urlaubsbekannte, wirklich. Fürchterlich. Als ich dann den Unterschied kennengelernt habe, habe ich gedacht, was ist denn jetzt kaputt? Die sind so falsch, durch die Blume und sowas und ‚ach, wie schön' und sowas. Sich selbst profilieren, das machen sie mit Ihnen.*" (Joris)

trepreneurs draw boundaries based on Dutchness or Portugueseness versus German ways, these mavericks are less attached to local communities and their heritage, instead affiliating with German friends and networks. This does not mean they lack national belonging; both Joris and Luis demonstrate a strong emotional connection to their countries of origin. Joris, for example, was keen to tell me that he likes being 'Oranje' (the colour of the Dutch football team):

> I think it's nice to be Oranje. And I'm proud to be Dutch, as well. (Joris)[26]

> By the way, I'm Oranje like hell, which means I support the king to no end. And, as an aside, I find it beautiful to support the king. So, I'm a royalist, maybe? (Joris)[27]

He told me that he gets emotional when it is the (then) king's birthday. Similarly, Luis expressed his affective attachment to Portugal when he described how it is his country of choice, a country that he would go back to if he could, a country where his heart and soul lie. In navigating their relation to 'fellow compatriots', Joris and Luis continuously construct German and Dutch/Portuguese national cultural repertoires. They employ these repertoires as a way to ethnicise specific 'cultural stuff' such as values or character traits in order to draw (and redraw) boundaries.

And they do so in situated and context-specific ways. In moments where Luis described his success in terms of education and career, he switches the way he employs national cultural repertoires. Luis has two very different narrations regarding Portugal as his country of origin. I have described these two narrations as 'Portugal as a heaven' regarding the sphere of culture and society, and 'Portugal as a failed state' regarding politics and the economy. The latter narration came into play when Luis discussed why people leave the country or why he cannot return. He painted a picture of Portugal as an economically drained country with a history of civil wars and an incapable government:

> People talked a lot about, okay, what really happened in Portugal? All of the wars, the scandal at the time… I actually still remember, we were all sitting at the dinner table, and we all looked out of the window and there were policemen who were holding something back. Because there was a civil war back then. It was terrible at the time, because of course, the people earned very little, and the state kept a lot. Of course, it's only with time that all that began to go back to normal, and while people can live, you can't compare what would be a full-time salary there

26 *„Ich finde das schön, Oranje zu sein. Ich bin auch stolz, Niederländer zu sein."* (Joris)

27 *„Ich bin übrigens Oranje wie die Pest, also ich bin königsgesinnt bis zum geht nicht mehr. Und das mal eben so zur Information, ich finde das sehr schön, königsgesinnt zu sein. Also, ich bin Royalist, vielleicht?"* (Joris)

> with here. They're dimensions apart, and that's, in my opinion, in large part due to the country. (Luis)[28]

At the same time, Portugal, his holidays there, and his family are places of longing for Luis. This feeling culminates in the statement that his body is in Germany, while his soul and mind reside in Portugal, even extending to his end-of-life wishes:

> I also firmly believe, if I were to, well, let's say, kick the bucket, and I were dead, well, my personal wish would really be to actually be buried there. So, not here, because here I know, okay, I'm here, like, my body is here, but it wouldn't be the same. My wish is also, and even in the future it will actually always stay that way, when I die, I want to be buried in my village, and if possible, even next to my parents as well. (Luis)[29]

Luis states that Germany means hard work for him and everyone around him. Quite in contrast, his firm 'bon-vivant' side is wholly bound to being Portuguese and only feels satisfied during his holidays to the country. His soul, he tells us, always remains much longer abroad than his body. And if he would have the option to return with a job prospect, he would immediately do so:

> Well, I would, if I had to choose right now, today, 'I'll give you a job there', with a monthly net salary of at least 1.2 thousand, I would move there. I wouldn't have a problem with it because I personally feel more comfortable there, since that's my country. (Luis)[30]

---

28 *„Man hat viel darüber geredet, okay, was ist in Portugal wirklich alles passiert? Die ganzen Kriege, der Skandal damals… Das weiß ich sogar noch, da saßen wir alle am Essenstisch, und da haben wir alle aus dem Fenster geguckt und da waren irgendwelche Polizisten, die irgendwas zurückgehalten haben. Weil, das war damals Bürgerkrieg. Das war schlimm zu dieser Zeit, weil natürlich, die Leute haben wenig verdient, und der Staat hat viel behalten. Das hat sich natürlich im Laufe der Zeit erst alles normalisiert, und die Leute können zwar leben, aber man kann ein Gehalt, was da Vollzeit ist, nicht mit hier vergleichen. Da sind Dimensionen dazwischen, und das liegt, meiner Meinung nach, viel an dem Land.*" (Luis)

29 *„Ich würde jetzt auch stark behaupten, also, wenn ich jetzt, sagen wir mal den Geist aufgeben würde, und ich wäre tot, also, mein Wunsch wäre es auch persönlich wirklich tatsächlich da beerdigt zu werden. Also, nicht hier, weil hier weiß ich, okay, ich bin hier, also, mein Körper ist hier, aber das wäre nicht das gleiche. Also, mein Wunsch ist es auch, tatsächlich auch in Zukunft wird das immer so bleiben, wenn ich sterbe, will ich in meinem Dorf beerdigt werden, wenn's geht sogar noch neben meinen Eltern.*" (Luis)

30 *„Also ich würd', wenn ich jetzt heute entscheiden müsste, ‚du kriegst da von mir nen Job', und ich würde da mindestens 1,2 netto raushauen, ich würd' dahinziehen. Ich hätt' da keine Probleme mit, weil ich mich persönlich da wohler fühl', weil das mein Land ist.*" (Luis)

Joris and Luis reject belonging to local nationalised communities, legitimising this boundary through Portuguese, German, and Dutch national repertoires. As Luis's case shows, they do so in differing, situated ways, reflecting a broader pattern across countries and political cultures. This aligns with Bonikowski's extension of Billig, describing nationhood as a cultural repertoire: 'Not only is the nation itself pervasive and deeply institutionalised, but the same may be true of the range of options available to everyday people for conceptualizing the nation's meaning' (Bonikowski 2017: 164).

The presence of these multilocal vernacular cosmopolitan attitudes – expressed through attachments, detachments, and navigations of national cultural repertoires – indicates that such experiences are a prerequisite for the formation of migrant heritage within the Ethnicised Heritage Situations of Zeven and Cuxhaven. This challenges conventional notions of migrant heritage as a linear movement from a national 'here' to a national 'there'; instead, heritage-making emerges as a process of coming to terms with routes, grounded in multilocality.

9.2.2 Detached Cosmopolitanism

I also observed thin and 'detached' forms of cosmopolitanism in cases of people with migration experience, an example of Ien Ang's (2011) call to fundamentally rethink how the experience of migration itself is transformed into heritage. When my research participants expressed such an attitude, mobility became a kind of heritage.

After growing up mostly in Portugal, Marta is now at school in Cuxhaven. When we talked about her future, she based her ambitions around her mobility heritage and language skills:

> I would like to be a flight attendant. I think that would be something for me because I like languages. I could already speak Portuguese, and then I learned English, and I can understand Spanish as well. And then I came here and learned German, and in Portugal I also learned French. (Marta)[31]

As ethnographer Christine R. Yano (2011) argues, the image of a flight attendant, specifically developed for the marketing images created around Japanese-American flight attendants in the 1950s, is strongly related to an image of cosmopolitanism that has been shown by research looking at the care work aspect to be bifurcated by racial and ethnic boundaries (Alex Jong-Seok Lee & Kathreen Barry). Jong-Seok Lee

31 *„Ich möchte gerne Flugbegleiterin werden. Ich glaub', das ist was für mich, weil ich gerne Sprachen mag. Ich konnte schon Portugiesisch, und dann habe ich Englisch gelernt, und Spanisch kann ich auch verstehen. Und dann bin ich hierhergekommen und hab' Deutsch gelernt, und in Portugal habe ich auch Französisch gelernt.*" (Marta)

shows that Emirates Airlines flight attendants are involved in reproducing hierarchies that are part of the airline's work culture not to endanger their 'privileged, yet precarious, cosmopolitan status', and to 'disavow being associated with the labour migrants deemed less desirable.' (2018: 128). Marta's image of being a flight attendant seemed to be shaped by the cosmopolitan image only, and she was also keen to underline that she has no vision of staying in her current residence in Germany.

Sebastian in Zeven was similarly young, as he has just finished university studies. Born in Zeven, his mobility heritage consists of his history of studying in several countries, travelling the world, and moving between his German and Dutch families. He is self-reflexive about the role of colonialism in the history of the Dutch empire when he narrated his travels to South Africa:

> In 20xx I was in South Africa. With the Afrikaans language, I always found it fascinating that I could understand a lot. And district names like 'Delft' or 'Leiden' always brought a smile to my face, though a rather painful one, as my next thought was shaped by the knowledge that all of that came to South Africa through colonialism. (Sebastian)[32]

What both interviewees have in common is a focus on the role of language skills in regard to their cosmopolitan positioning. While these two protagonists belong to a 'younger' generation, a couple I interviewed as members of the Dutch traditional association, who are not soldiers but a teachers/actor and a housewife, were keen to distinguish themselves from ordinary Dutch people who have not left the country as they did:

> But it's also important to note, if you move abroad, you're already not average anymore, since most Dutch people stay living in Holland. But if you do that differently, if you decide not to work in Holland anymore, but to work here in the barracks or at the school, those really are different people. We always travelled a lot. She went on a trip around the world. I've been travelling to Afrika and Asia and so on since '78. The people who are here aren't average Hollanders. (Merle)[33]

---

32 *„In 20xx war ich in Südafrika. Bei der afrikaansen Sprache fand ich es immer sehr spannend, dass ich viel verstehen konnte. Und bei Stadtteilnamen wie ‚Delft' oder ‚Leiden' hatte ich immer ein Schmunzeln im Gesicht, wenngleich ein eher schmerzhaftes, wenn im nächsten Gedanken dann mitschwang, dass das alles auf kolonialistischem Wege nach Südafrika gelangt ist.*" (Sebastian)

33 *„Aber wichtig ist auch, wenn man ins Ausland zieht, dann ist man schon nicht mehr Durchschnitt, denn die meisten Niederländer bleiben in Holland wohnen. Aber wenn man das anders macht, wenn man sich entscheidet, nicht mehr in Holland zu arbeiten, aber hier in der Kaserne oder an der Schule zu arbeiten, das sind schon andere Leute. Wir haben immer viel gereist. Sie hat eine Weltreise gemacht. Seit '78 mache ich Reisen nach Afrika und Asien und so. Was hier ist, das ist nicht der Durchschnittsholländer.*" (Merle)

Here, one can see how mobility experiences are employed to draw boundaries to all kinds of localisms or national attachments. On such thin cosmopolitanism, Roudomentof states: 'Locals are likely to value being a native of their country, having the country's citizenship and having a sense of belonging to its dominant national group. [thin] Cosmopolitans are likely not to value these attributes.' (2005: 125).

All three research participants express place detachment rather than attachment, which escapes most understandings of cultural heritage, even of intangible cultural heritage as territorialised and ethnic. These 'thin cosmopolitans' instead turn their mobility experiences into heritage in and of itself. Their mobility heritage makes them able to be citizens of the world. Coming to terms with routes via migration or diasporic heritage, then, is more than a story of dislocation and settlement in a new place. It is shaped by multilocal attachments, sometimes cosmopolitan detachments, and a transnational simultaneity.

9.3 Conclusion: Ethnicised Heritage Situations and Taking Routes in the Absence of a Master Membership

Two pivotal insights emerge from these findings that have implications for Critical Heritage Studies and Small-Town Research. First, the role of non-ethnic boundary making in Ethnicised Heritage Situations, as well as heterogeneity, cosmopolitan attitudes, and multiple forms of national membership in ethnic boundary making. Second, by exploring the role of mobility experiences in Ethnicised Heritage Situations, an argument arises that re/theorises cultural heritage.

The symbolic boundary of the small town is central to my research participants' lives most of the time, even though some of them are also migrant or diasporic subjects. In drawing that boundary, they engage with (e)valuative criteria from a small-town cultural repertoire as sketched out by Anett Steinführer et al. (2016) for a small-town research agenda. Even if ethnicised heritages do play a role, it is crucial to keep in mind that such heritages are always involved in processes of heterogenisation as well as homogenisation. Heritage research needs to consider the possibility that mobility experiences, sometimes materialised in artefacts such as traditional dress, language, or food, have the potential to produce heterogeneity rather than merely cohesion and homogeneity. This is yet another element, though not necessarily rupture, that the relation between symbolic boundary making and the 'cultural stuff' (Barth 1969:15) employed to draw them in Wimmer's words, is 'organized by' (Wimmer 2010:111).

The primary relevance of non-ethnic symbolic boundaries and the heterogeneity of ethnic boundary making I found in my research participants' sensemaking highlights the real difficulty in constructing those ethnic subjects that are supposed to take the 'places of recognition' (Taylor 2009: 41) frequently opened up by heritage

policies. I suggest that it might be necessary for heritage scholars to de-ethnicise research on migrant heritages. This could help minimise the danger of reproducing the reification of culture outlined in UNESCO's heritage convention, even if unintentionally, for example, binding groups of people in Europe to a territory (ibid).

Next to the co-presence of ethnic and non-ethnic symbolic boundaries and the absence of a 'master membership', the topic of mobility experiences emerged central to the lived experiences of research participants. When Laia Colomer discusses Third Culture Kids as global nomads, a privileged group of people that grew up moving globally, she argues that heritage studies have

> to move its analytical eyes from past elements that have been fixed geographically and culturally to places and materialities representing mobile lives. The latter not only represent the departure and arrival of people, both physically and metaphorically (as is common in the heritage of migration and postcolonial studies) but their continuous flow and mobility and how this experience develops in other visions. (2017: 923)

Individuals from Zeven and Cuxhaven with migration experience live in a continuous flow of de-/attachments due to their multilocal attachments and existence expressed in vernacular cosmopolitan attitudes that are explicitly not detached. These attitudes involve a simultaneous affiliation with multiple memberships that, if not related to being a small-town resident, are primarily framed around national memberships to a concrete nationalised diaspora community, the German nation, or their nations of origin. This supports findings from transnational studies that ethnic pathways of incorporation for migrants in small-scale cities are often framed around national membership (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2008).

For some, their mobility experiences prompt aspirations for detachment from specific places, making their mobility experiences their heritage. Cosmopolitans are born from migration experiences more than any other mobility experience. When Stuart Hall (Hall and Werbner 2008) reflects on the sense of loss involved in living in diasporas, he describes himself as a 'cosmopolitan by default'. Moving across national borders and regrounding in a new place might be more related to feelings of loss than moving from a metropolitan to a small-town environment.

However, going beyond Colomer's insight that the analysis of heritage has to take mobility and not groundedness as the starting point for the analysis of privileged 'third culture kids" heritage-making, it can be said that mobility experiences prompt heritagisation beyond the lives of global nomads or even less privileged international migrants. All heritagisation, particularly minority heritage-making addressed here via place attachment and localist attitudes, involves grappling with routes. These routes need not be international but can lead from urban centres to small towns, as in Aurich.

This critical insight should prompt a shift in focus within Critical Heritage Studies and the small-town research agenda towards the study of im/mobilities. Furthermore, it suggests that small towns, if not solely understood in territorialised terms, are part of global and transnational spaces, as argued by Glick Schiller and Çağlar (2009), a perspective reflected in my research participants' sensemaking.

This key finding also has consequences for theorising cultural heritage. It decentres the idea of migrating heritage and centres the, perhaps almost anthropological premise of the ontological entanglement of cultural heritage, mobility, and comparisons that Niklas Luhmann discusses when engaging with the notion of 'culture' as a historical concept. The idea of culture, Luhmann states, is a modern phenomenon that is entangled with processes of comparison to the alien. Culture always occurs on the level of a 'second-order' observation: 'The articulation and formulation of culture replaces the world-invariant forms of being on the basis of comparative observations – through reflection' (1999: 49). Ethnicised heritages, if not all, are about coming to terms with the experiences of difference encountered by taking routes, be they actual physical routes or other forms of mobility. Heritage scholar Martin Wobst (2010) goes so far as to argue that heritage is nothing else but recognisable difference.

I follow Stuart Hall's (1999) call on cultural heritage to refrain from thinking about roots and instead focus on their interplay with the experience of taking routes. This is the consistent consequence of constructivist understandings of heritage in pluralised societies. It does not mean heritage-making is not profoundly driven by foundational questions such as 'Where do I come from? Where do I belong?' as the next chapter will show, the concept of setting roots is significant in the research field. It simply means not answering these questions with a call to roots.

10. Setting Roots: Permeable Boundaries in Majority National Cultural Repertoires

It is clear that migration experiences do occupy a pivotal role in my research participants' heritage-making activities. But as my conversations with them developed, it became clear that when they used a language of heritage to describe their active participation in local sensemaking, their migration experience was less central than their positioning vis-à-vis the dominant German national cultural repertoire. Small towns are not only embedded in global and transnational spaces but are also situated within national dynamics. While my research participants did discuss the preservation of roots, they also talked about the making of a home, of setting roots in the small-town arenas.

As the last chapter showed how there is a need to de-ethnicise research on cultural diversity, cultural heritage, and migration, this chapter appeals to also de-migrantise (Dahinden 2016) such research, underlining the need to avoid overemphasising the role of migration experiences in Ethnicised Heritage Situations. Studies on migration and ethnicity find that dominant national cultural repertoires shape migrants' and other minorities' symbolic boundary-making processes, including their identification with ethnic memberships (see, e.g., Banai and Shoshana 2019: 17). Andreas Wimmer (2008: 984) describes the high stability of boundaries towards 'Germanness' across generations, and Andrea Klimt (2000: 264) shows the legal and 'ideological impermeability of Germanness' for Portuguese immigrants historically. In comparing the German national cultural repertoire in the late 1990s with the repertoires of France and the US, Richard Alba (2005) finds that for Turks in Germany, 'bright boundaries' that involve no ambiguity as to their membership in a minority group exist between the dominant repertoire and the possibilities for minorities to access it or become part of it. With bright boundaries, individuals are unmistakably positioned as a minority to a majority, they clearly know on which side of the boundary they are on. Here, assimilation is anticipated to manifest as crossing boundaries, often felt by the person as a transformation similar to conversion. This process involves departing from one group and shedding signs of belonging to it (Alba 2005: 22). Alba (ibid: 25) found blurred boundaries in the US, where individuals lack a clear definition or certainty in relation to the dominant

cultural repertoire's boundary; they are being viewed as belonging to both groups on either side of the boundary simultaneously, or they fluctuate between appearing as a member of one group or the other at different times. Alba's conceptualisation of bright and blurred boundaries is also central to Banai and Shoshana's (2019: 12) research on the relocation of Mizrahi Jewish ethnicities in three countries. They found that a relatively strong national cultural repertoire, with the experience of a bright boundary not to be easily crossed in the case of Germany, shaped the ways in which Mizrahi Jew inhabitants of Germany identify as ethnic.

This chapter focuses on the interplay between my research participants' ethnicised heritage-making as a form of sensemaking and the dominant national cultural repertoire in Germany. It draws on insights from Critical Heritage Studies, particularly the concept of diaspora heritage, which has been employed to explore the dynamic relationship between majority and minority heritages (Ang 2011; Arokiasamy 2012; Nikielska-Sekula 2019). This relationship between majority and minority positionings, which reflects local power dynamics, emerges as a significant factor in Ethnicised Heritage Situations, often overshadowing the impact of migration experiences.

In other words, the East Frisian inhabitants of Aurich and the Dutch inhabitants of Zeven show similarities in the ways they explicitly speak of ethnicised heritages. This specific language of ethnicised heritage differs from the one employed by Cuxhaven's Portuguese inhabitants, showing that it is not migratory experiences that determine the employment of a heritage repertoire. Instead, this disparity arises from the local power dynamics, where the blurred boundary to the dominant German culture proves porous for Dutch and East Frisian individuals, making their ethnic identification an option (Waters 1990). Opposed to that, this bright boundary is considerably robust for Portuguese inhabitants of Cuxhaven, whose ethnic marking is much less a question of choice.

In Zeven, attempting to trace a language of heritage presented a puzzling challenge in the analysis process, which provided me with the moment of non-recognition (Glick Schiller et al. 2006) that serves as a foundational point for the content of this chapter. Zeven's Dutch heritage, including visible landmarks in the cityscape such as sculptures, Dutch cafés, the old Dutch school, and Dutch festivals, was not framed by the participants as an intentional act of creating or appropriating heritage. Instead, they are perceived as 'what has been left' after the military withdrew from the town. Joris articulated this perspective: 'Those are the things where we can say, look, we did leave something good behind.' (Joris).[1] In a similar vein, when talking about the Dutch school after it closed, Sebastian said:

1 *„Das ist doch, wo wir dann sagen können, guck mal, wir haben doch was Gutes zurückgelassen."* (Joris)

> Well, they kept the name, so the Dutch influence was retained there, only in the name. The teachers were from the German secondary school. I don't know what happened to the teachers from the Dutch school. (Sebastian)[2]

I would not have expected this passiveness in terms of the town's Dutch heritage and was perplexed by certain Zeven participants' eagerness to emphasise their active engagement in a heritage of the German-dominant population.[3]

This inclination towards the German national cultural repertoire therefore needs exploring and comparing to how ethnicised heritages are actively addressed in the other two towns. There are parallels between the instances in Zeven and Aurich of an active appropriation of ethnicised heritage pertaining to a German cultural repertoire or one that is deliberately fashioned in opposition it. In contrast, Portuguese heritagisation takes on a more inward-oriented trajectory, giving rise to transnational moments for the participants. These accounts of transnational simultaneity reflect the intensity of rupture experienced by the people I met that migrated to Cuxhaven. Such dislocation can create a sense of division between mind and body, where the mind remains tied to Portugal while the body labours in Germany. In this context, even a visit to a Portuguese restaurant can create what might be called a transnational moment – a brief reunification of the body, mind and soul separated by migration.

The process of setting roots in the small-town arenas and drawing ethnicised boundaries therein is shaped by the relation individuals experience vis-à-vis the accessibility of the German national cultural repertoire. While it is possible to be both Dutch/East Frisian and German simultaneously, the boundary is much stronger and therefore bright, for the Portuguese inhabitants of Cuxhaven.

10.1 Blurred Boundaries: The Relevance of a German Majority Cultural Repertoire for Setting Roots in Zeven and Aurich

For some research participants, Dutchness and East Frisianness function as what Mary Waters (1990) describes as an 'ethnic option' – a flexible, symbolic identity that can be selectively claimed or downplayed. In practice, this option often leads participants to orient themselves more strongly toward the dominant German cultural repertoire, using their Dutch or East Frisian heritage strategically rather than as a

2 *„Also, der Name wurde behalten, also wurde der niederländische Einfluss da behalten, nur im Namen. Die Lehrer waren halt die vom Gymnasium. Ich weiß nicht, was mit den Lehrern von der niederländischen Schule passiert ist.*" (Sebatian)

3 It would be an interesting task to go back to the material and to ask in how far this orientation was partly prompted by my role as a 'majority-German' researcher in the interviews.

fixed marker of belonging. The choice to foreground German cultural belonging over ethnic heritage becomes a significant dimension of their sensemaking within the Ethnicised Heritage Situations of these small-town arenas.

10.1.1 Orientations Toward the Dominant German Cultural Repertoire

Research participants in Zeven explicitly employed a language of integration and underlined their active participation in German national cultural heritage. In other words, they illustrated their boundary crossing towards the dominant cultural repertoire. Hilde, for example, described her process of settling in Zeven and getting her children involved in German associations:

> And then my husband worked for five more years in the barracks, and in 2000, we said, we're staying here in Zeven. We bought this house, starting in '99 we lived here and didn't do everything in the barracks anymore. We wanted to properly integrate ourselves here, because we had decided to stay here when he retired, and that's what we did […] But our children as well, they were in the German track and field club and they also participated in other clubs. We found it very important for them to integrate themselves a bit as well, even though there was the Dutch school. All children are open and free and everyone speaks different languages, that isn't an issue at all. These days it isn't so uncommon, of course, but back then, in the '80s, it was uncommon then. (Hilde)[4]

To Hilde, buying a house or becoming a member of German sports clubs is a very conscious choice to integrate into the small-town arena, and she was keen to add that by doing so, they occupied a pioneering role in the 1980s. It might be true that during that time when the Dutch military barracks still functioned as a sort of enclave providing their soldiers and families with everything needed in life, choosing to move out and engage in other kinds of leisure activities was the exception rather than the rule.

Next to the language of integration in Zeven, a second form of orientation towards German, majority culture emerged. Some participants I met and interviewed

4 *„Dann hat mein Mann noch fünf Jahre auf der Kaserne gearbeitet, und in 2000 haben wir gesagt, wir bleiben hier in Zeven. Wir haben dieses Haus gekauft, seit 99 haben wir dann hier gelebt und nicht mehr alles in der Kaserne gemacht. Wir wollten uns hier auch richtig integrieren, weil wir uns vorgenommen haben, wenn er pensioniert wird, hier zu bleiben, und das haben wir dann auch gemacht […] Aber auch unsere Kinder waren bei dem deutschen Leichtathletikverein, und die haben auch andere Vereine besucht. Wir haben es sehr wichtig gefunden, dass sie sich auch ein bisschen integrieren, obwohl es die holländische Schule gab. Alle Kinder sind offen und frei, und alle Leute sprechen unterschiedliche Sprachen, das ist überhaupt kein Thema. Heutzutage ist es natürlich nicht so unüblich, aber damals in den 80er Jahren, da war das unüblich.*" (Hilde)

were keen to mention that they actively participated in German traditions and critical historical events. Hilde told me of her and her daughters' experiences traversing the border to the German Democratic Republic:

> In 88 we celebrated Christmas with 150 conscripts in Berlin. It was very interesting. We crossed the border with all the soldiers and all of us had to hand over our passports. That was a special experience, but of course it's horrible that the wall was there. […] Our eldest daughter went to the German secondary school, and she visited the GDR for two weeks, with the school. That's an experience that lasts a lifetime. And later, they could also really understand what it meant for people here when it wasn't like that anymore. In the Netherlands, you hear about it in the news, but here, we saw it, we felt it, we experienced it. (Hilde)[5]

To physically experience the border crossing to the GDR in the late 1980s was for Hilde an embodied and active reproduction of a German national cultural repertoire, 'to see it, to feel it.' In similarly active language, she described to me how she learned to tie traditional German wreath for Christmas:

> Two days ago, I got a wonderful compliment from our neighbour, they're traditional German people. I've been learning wreath tying, and for the first couple of years, I was only allowed to assist the others. Now they let me tie as well, and I was putting my wreaths for Christmas outside. They both weren't decorated yet, and then came our neighbour who said, 'oh, you tied them tightly!' And I said, 'yes, I learned that from you!'(Hilde)[6]

Hilde seems to value practising tying the wreath to get the recognition of her 'traditional German' neighbours. Again, a language of actively producing an ethnicised heritage is reserved for participating in the heritage of the dominating population rather than what has been 'left behind' by the Dutch military.

---

5 *„In ´88 haben wir mit 150 Wehrpflichtigen Weihnachten gefeiert in Berlin. Das war sehr spannend. Da sind wir dann über die Grenze mit all den Soldaten, und alle sollten ihren Pass vorzeigen. Das war etwas besonders, aber ist natürlich fürchterlich, dass die Mauer da war." […] Unsere älteste Tochter, die hat dann das Gymnasium besucht, und die war mal zwei Wochen in der DDR, mit der Schule. Die Erfahrung kriegt man für das ganze Leben mit. Und die konnten dann auch später richtig verstehen, was das hier bewegt hat, als das nicht mehr so war. In den Niederlanden hört man das in den Nachrichten, aber hier hat man das gesehen, man hat das gefühlt, man hat das gespürt."* (Hilde)

6 *„Ich habe vor zwei Tagen ein wunderschönes Kompliment von unserer Nachbarin bekommen, das sind traditionelle deutsche Leute. Ich habe Kranz binden gelernt, und die ersten Jahre durfte ich nur anreichen. Jetzt darf ich auch binden, und ich habe meine Kränze für Weihnachten draußen hingelegt. Die waren beide noch nicht geschmückt, und dann kam die Nachbarin, die hat gesagt, ‚oh, du hast fest gebunden!' Dann habe ich gesagt, 'ja, das habe ich von dir gelernt!'"* (Hilde)

Joris, another research participant, was keen to show how familiar he is with a kind of humour that he ascribed to the German national cultural repertoire:

> Well, back in my day, there were comedians like Otto Waalkes, Heinz Erhardt, or maybe Karl Valentin as well, and that was really a long time ago. They were funny. And now you think, come on, do they show anything other than comedians on TV anymore? And I also think much of it is… in the Netherlands we call it underwear humour. It's below the belt. Well, weirdly enough, people in Germany also say that schadenfreude is the best kind of joy. (Joris)[7]

To explicitly engage with an aspect of a German national cultural repertoire, be it German historical events, forms of humour and TV culture, or the tying of wreaths, is one way the Zeven research participants describe their setting roots in a new place. In a way, Joris and Hilde show how capable they are of employing a German national cultural repertoire since they were confronted with it in their relocation process. Setting roots in the small-town arenas means such active engagement with the dominant German national cultural repertoire and the dominant populations' heritages. I describe this as an orientation towards the German-dominant cultural repertoire.

Aurich's small-town arena also contains orientations toward a German national cultural repertoire, albeit in different ways. On the one hand, being East Frisian in Aurich is a majority position, and a language of integration was employed to address the need for new inhabitants to become part of this majority. On the other hand, there is a recurring narrative of East Frisia as a national minority different from the 'rest of the republic' due to their different heritages.

Clara moved to East Frisia in her 30s and told her story about integrating into the region. She learned to speak the local Lower German language and got used to and learned to appreciate people's ways of living and doing things. She contrasted this experience with that of her new neighbours from another part of the country:

> Of course, you have to be open to everything. A couple of houses down, we had neighbours that moved here as well, but they were older when they came here from Bielefeld. So of course they aren't in contact with East Frisians like I am, since I married an East Frisian and have been a part of the family and experienced all of the traditions. They had moved here, and they knew the people in the neighbourhood, but other than that, they didn't have many East Frisian acquaintances. And

7 *„Also in meiner Zeit gab es Otto Waalkes, Heinz Ehrhardt oder vielleicht noch Karl Valentin, und das ist ja schon lange her. Die waren witzig. Und jetzt denkt man, sag mal, kommt da noch irgendwas anderes im Fernsehen als Komiker? Und dann finde ich schon da ist viel… in den Niederlanden nennen wir das Unterhosenkomik. Das geht unter die Gürtellinie. Man sagt in Deutschland ja auch komischerweise 'Schadenfreude ist die schönste Freude'."* (Joris)

> of course, they had issues with the language, and when the neighbours were talking to each other in Lower German, they always complained a bit, which I think is really unacceptable. You can teach yourself to understand it, and if it's difficult for you, you need to put in the effort. (Clara)[8]

For Clara, newcomers from other parts of Germany must engage with and integrate into the ethnic ways of living and heritages of East Frisia to do the work she did in that situation. This focus on the specificities of an East Frisian cultural repertoire implies a boundary drawn towards a German national cultural repertoire.

The orientation towards a dominant culture in the case of Aurich most clearly shows itself in the talk of East Frisia being different from 'the rest of the republic,' which is mainly constructed as being metropolitan rather than provincial. The notion of the 'rest of the republic' implies that East Frisia is, in fact, considered a part of the Republic of Germany, as this quote from a woman who grew up in the region but by now lives elsewhere in northern Germany shows:

> When you get older, at some point, of course, you start school. At the time there was a conveniently located elementary school in the area, and two schools had been combined to make this school, so it wasn't small. We had the same teacher that had already been my parents' teacher, and rules that were a bit different from the rest of the republic, at least according to conversations I've had looking back on those times with friends from other parts of the republic. (Lena)[9]

There is a dominant myth that East Frisia is founded upon resistance to German unification attempts and nation-building. Richard ironically referred to this when he said: 'I think, since East Frisia is kind of on a peninsula, it's separated from the "Reich" a bit' (Richard).[10] By relating East Frisia to the 'Reich', Richard also references an

---

8 *„Man muss natürlich auch offen für alles sein. Wir hatten auch mal ein paar Häuser weiter Nachbarn, die waren auch zugezogen, aber erst im Alter aus Bielefeld. Die haben natürlich keinen Kontakt wie ich zu den Ostfriesen, weil ich ja auch mittlerweile einen Ostfriesen geheiratet habe, und da in der Familie mit drin gewesen bin und alle Traditionen miterlebt habe. Die waren zugezogen, hatten die Nachbarschaft, aber sonst nicht so viel ostfriesische Bekannte. Und die hatten natürlich Probleme mit der Sprache, und wenn die Nachbarn sich auf Plattdeutsch unterhielten, dann waren sie immer so ein bisschen am rummeckern, was ich überhaupt unmöglich finde. Da kann man sich reinhören, und wenn es nicht geht, muss man sich Mühe geben.*" (Clara)

9 *„Wenn man größer wird, kommt natürlich irgendwann der Schuleintritt. Damals gab es ganz praktisch eine Grundschule vor Ort, für die zwei Schulen zusammengelegt wurden, also keine kleine Sache. Wir hatten den gleichen Lehrer, den schon meine Eltern als Lehrer hatten, und Regeln, die sich vom Rest der Republik ein bisschen unterscheiden, zumindest was man später so mit Freunden aus anderen Teilen der Republik reflektiert.*" (Lena)

10 *„Ich glaube, weil Ostfriesland ja auch so ein bisschen auf einer Halbinsel ist, ist es ein bisschen vom ‚Reich' abgetrennt.*" (Richard)

integral part of East Frisia's founding narrative as a region of free and democratic people opposing the outside influence of the Prussian monarchy and German nation-building.

The historian Tobias Weger (2013) traces the intricacies of the idea of East Frisia as a region to nation-states, using the example of the 'Großfriesische' movement in the 1920s and 1930s. He states that regions are, up until today, often constructed as quasi-natural, historically grown opposites of nation-states. They were supposed to have the potential to 'reduce the preponderance of the nation by opening up an alternative means of identification' (Weger 2013: 144, my translation).

As opposed to the 'völkisch' ideas of an East Frisian Reich that was part of the 'Großfriesische' movement and that Weger deconstructs in his article, Richard approaches the topic in a much more ironic and reflexive way. He constantly underlined the constructed nature of the idea of East Frisia as a homogenous region and instead referred to it as an instance of 'small Europe':

> The former director [of a heritage institution] once said so beautifully, if we go back even further – so, all the chieftains who split each other's fontanels and beat each other up in the 13th and 14th centuries – that's actually little Europe. (Richard)[11]

Still, the region's East Frisian heritage is often constructed in tension between the German nation and its dominant cultural repertoire.

Another instance of such an orientation in Aurich is when a metropolitan high culture is constructed as part of the German cultural repertoire. Richard propagated the heritage value of certain 'red-brick' buildings in Aurich against the impressive and apparent value of buildings in Germany's metropolises:

> Of course we don't have buildings here in the style of St. Michael's Church in Hamburg or the Cologne Cathedral. But if you look beyond what's visually impressive, and know a bit about the history of a building, because one of those local historians found something out in the fifties… They researched really meticulously: what was here, and which count put a brick somewhere, and who knows what else, all these funny stories. When you go through the town with that background knowledge, these bricks suddenly start speaking to you. […] It's exactly what I said earlier about the Lamberti church tower. The tower itself isn't particularly attractive, but the story behind it is. (Richard)[12]

---

11 *„Der frühere Leiter [einer heritage institution] hat mal so schön gesagt, wenn wir noch weiter zurückgehen – also, die ganzen Häuptlinge, die sich ja hier gegenseitig im 13. Und 14. Jahrhundert, die Fontanelle gespalten haben, und sich geprügelt haben – das ist eigentlich klein Europa.*" (Richard)

12 *„Natürlich haben wir hier nicht Gebäude im Stile eines Michels in Hamburg oder Kölner Dom. Aber wenn man nicht unbedingt nach toller Optik geht, sondern so bisschen was über die Geschichte eines*

In this quote, the tangible heritage of Aurich is weighed and valued against urban heritage in the form of metropolitan 'mega-buildings' in the 'rest of the republic.' At the same time, it also clarifies that in all heritage-making, tangible and intangible processes are inseparable, and there is always an active moment of ascribing value to certain cultural artefacts and practices involved in turning something into heritage. Richard tells that 'the stones begin to speak' only through the investment of lay historians. To reveal the heritage value of historical buildings in Aurich to Richard is to make it, rather than passively transmit it, in opposition to the more obvious value of significant sights which are already a part of the German cultural repertoire.

In the case of Aurich, then, East Frisian heritage is constructed in opposition to the German-dominant cultural repertoire while simultaneously being a (minority) part of it. In Zeven, the participants underlined the active aspect, the agency of participating in the heritage of the dominant population. Both orient towards participation in or opposition towards a dominant German national cultural repertoire when they employ an explicit language of heritage as something to be actively made. This exemplifies the blurred boundary (Alba 2005: 25) between the dominant German national cultural repertoire as experienced by these research participants.

Coming from the other side of the majority-minority boundary, there is a tendency for the majority of small-town arenas of Aurich and Zeven to incorporate elements of minority groups. Building on a comparative social world/arena analysis of the towns, the ethnicised festivals are situated at the centre of the broader small-town arenas. The Four Evening Marches of setting to the Maypole are differently integrative than the Fatima procession in Cuxhaven. While in Zeven and Aurich, many actors and social worlds participate, this is not the case in Cuxhaven, where different festivals are 'scattered' across the arena. In being so differently integrative, the festivals serve various functions within the arena, either stabilising it as a sort of praxis side or pluralising it by pluralising 'Portugueseness'. Based on the distinction, one can say that in the cases of Aurich and Zeven, the cultural repertoire associated with the festivities is much less ethnicised, weaker, and more related to the relatively ambiguous group of being an inhabitant of those towns, a member of the majority culture. The festivals, or at least aspects of them, are incorporated into the majority culture.

Gebäudes weiß, weil das irgendwer von diesen Heimatforschern in den fünfziger Jahren herausgefunden hat… Die haben wirklich ganz akribisch geforscht: Was war denn hier, und welcher Graf hat irgendwo einen Stein hingelegt, und weiß der Henker, witzige Geschichten. Wenn man mit diesem Hintergrundwissen durch die Stadt geht, dann fangen diese Steine plötzlich an mit einem zu reden. […] Das ist genau das, was ich vorhin mit dem Lambertiturm meinte. Der Turm ist an sich jetzt nicht irgendwie attraktiv, aber die Geschichte dazu." (Richard)

10.1.2 Dutchness and East-Frisianess as an Ethnic Option

For the research participants from Zeven and Aurich to set roots in the small-town arenas, fluency in navigating German and Dutch / East Frisian cultural repertoires is key. This is an outcome of the possibility for both groups to quickly traverse the boundary to be a member of the German majority society. This contrasts previous research that highlights the firm boundary toward 'Germanness' in Germany for certain groups of people (Alba 2005; Banai and Shoshana 2019; Klimt 2000; Wimmer 2008) and shows that different positionings can exist vis-à-vis this boundary by different ethnicised minorities.

Being East Frisian does not exclude simultaneously being German. People with a Dutch family history in Zeven have the same option of being either German or Dutch in Germany. This option was expressed differently by different participants, showing that being Dutch is an ethnic option (Waters 1990).

First, the blurred boundary and ethnic option is shown by how fluently one moves from a Dutch cultural repertoire to a German one:

> My husband got his hunting licence, and he generally does all of that in German. He's a member of the Dutch traditional association, but he does pretty much everything with the Germans. (Hilde)[13]

Second, some research participants in Zeven explicitly expressed a duality in their lived experience: 'You do everything twice here. I read German and Dutch. I do work for German offices and for Dutch offices.' (Rubens).[14] In other words, one does not have to decide to be either German or Dutch, an experience the Portuguese inhabitants of Cuxhaven, as I will come to show, do not have. A research participant from Zeven wrote to me in an email:

> Not that I ever felt like I had to choose between the two 'identities', that wasn't the case at all. But I was aware that my experiences were somehow 'different', 'bifurcated', and that it wasn't that way for other 'just German' children. (Sebastian)[15]

Sebastian was born and raised in Zeven by a German mother and a Dutch ex-soldier father. Regarding this quote, I have to add a note of caution from the research pro-

13 *„Mein Mann hat seinen Jagdschein geholt, und das macht er eigentlich alles auf deutsch. Er ist Mitglied vom niederländischen Traditionsverein, aber er macht eigentlich alles mit den Deutschen.*" (Hilde)

14 *„Man macht alles doppelt hier. Ich lese Deutsch und Niederländisch. Ich mache Arbeit für deutsche Castingbüros und für niederländische Castingbüros.*" (Rubens)

15 *„Nicht, dass ich mich jemals gefühlt hätte, als würde ich mich zwischen den beiden ‚Identitäten' entscheiden müssen, das auf keinen Fall. Aber, dass meine Erfahrungen irgendwie ‚anders', ‚zweiteilig' waren, und andere ‚nur deutsche'" Kinder das so nicht hatten, war mir bewusst.*" (Sebastian)

cess instead. It is a story that shows the importance of the research situation and the moment of interviewing for the kind of knowledge that I construct in my analysis. I have discussed this tense field of reconstructing and creating differences in qualitative research elsewhere. Sebastian told me that he never had to decide whether he was Dutch or German, and this was consistent throughout my exchange with him. However, a focus on his Dutchness, being 'different' and somehow 'bifurcated' is a part of the narrative created in an email several days after the interview. Initially, he had told me:

> In my family, well, in my German family, it doesn't really matter. I mean, it's always noticeable, because my father has a Dutch accent. My Dutch aunt on the German side of my family has a slight Dutch accent as well. So, it's always kind of in the back of your mind, but it's not a topic of conversation. (Sebastian)[16]

The email he wrote after the interview contained much more detailed information about his Dutch and German heritage, his consumption of Dutch media, and his childhood memories of eating Dutch food. He rarely addressed these topics in the interview. Being Dutch during the interview meant having a family back in the Netherlands, and all things about Dutch culture were happening 'there' rather than 'here'; they were only symbolic (Gans 1996).

Sebastian's change in narrative shows how my questioning as a researcher, even though I did all I could not to prime or bias my interviewees by focusing on their migration history, did affect how he thinks about himself and his Dutchness. Rather than being a symbolic form of identification he resorts to only during family visits in the Netherlands or when his aunt brings *pepernotjes* for Christmas, Dutchness appears to have become more of a serious option after our conversation.

Still, Dutchness for Sebastian is clearly an ethnic option in Mary Water's (1990) sense. Waters invented the concept of 'ethnic options' to describe how ethnicity for white European descendants in the US is optional, a choice of which they might also have several in their family history. People with ethnic options can invoke their ethnicity when they want and in their desired ways. And they do have the possibility of having their ethnic identification of choice recognised and validated by broader society: 'To possess ethnic options in any real sense must mean that groups are actually able to assert at least some images and identities they desire, in a variety of social contexts and especially in public spaces' (Song 2001: 64).

16 „*In der Familie, also in meiner deutschen Familie, spielt es nicht wirklich eine Rolle. Ich meine, man merkt es immer, weil mein Vater einen holländischen Akzent hat. Meine holländische Tante auf deutscher Seite hat auch einen leichten holländischen Akzent. Also, man hat es irgendwie immer im Hinterkopf, aber es ist nicht Thema.*" (Sebastian)

Again, an ethnic option is evident when Sebastian told me of how he got out of compulsory military service in Germany. It was only during this process that he discovered he could get a Dutch passport, which would have been another reason to opt-out.

> What I also found out only some years ago, is that I have Dutch citizenship as well. I didn't know that. It was around 2021 when I found that out. It was more of a coincidence, because I wanted to register, or deregister, or something, at the citizens' office, and then the woman at the office said: 'It's recorded in our system that you have Dutch citizenship as well.' I had gotten it at birth, but I didn't know. I hadn't really been aware of that. I don't have a passport, but I could request one if I wanted. (Sebastian)[17]

Finding out he was Dutch and German and the privileges that came with this came to Sebastian as a big surprise. This option he was initially not aware of, just as my interview seemed to have made him very aware of the Dutch influences in his childhood.

Ethnic identification for the Dutch inhabitants of Zeven and the East Frisians of Aurich is optional, as is their engagement in actively constructing ethnicised heritages in the small-town arenas. When research participants from Zeven or Aurich employ an explicit language of heritage, they are oriented towards German majority culture. I argued that this is due to the highly porous blurred boundary between Dutchness and Germanness and East Frisianness and Germannes in Germany. The local situation of power, as expressed in majority-minority boundaries in my case studies, is more important to the setting of roots aspect of sensemaking in the Ethnicised Heritage Situations than whether one has migrated to a small town in Germany.

Sebastian described his experiences with other children with Dutch family history in kindergarten and school: 'In my area, many of the people with a Dutch background went to the Dutch school. And in the town, they still spoke German and everything. I mean, fluently' (Sebastian).[18] This kindergarten story can be nicely contrasted with a similar but different story from Luis in Cuxhaven, whose narrative

17 *„Was ich auch erst vor einigen Jahren erfahren habe, ist, dass ich auch die niederländische Staatsbürgerschaft habe. Das wusste ich nicht. Das war 2021 oder so, als ich das erfahren hab. Das war mehr zufällig, weil ich mich beim Bürgeramt anmelden wollte, oder abmelden, oder irgendwas, und die Dame auf dem Amt dann meinte: ‚Es steht in unserem System, dass sie auch die holländische Staatsbürgerschaft haben.' Die hatte ich bei Geburt bekommen, aber das wusste ich nicht. Das war mir so nicht bewusst. Ich habe keinen Pass, aber ich könnte ihn beantragen, wenn ich wollte.*" (Sebastian)

18 *„In meiner Umgebung sind einige von denen, die einen holländischen Hintergrund hatten, dann auch auf die holländische Schule gegangen. Und im Ort haben die trotzdem Deutsch gesprochen und alles. Also, fließend.*" (Sebastian)

quite in contrast is an example of the bright boundary experiences from individuals between Portuguesness and Germanness in Germany.

10.2 Bright Boundaries: Producing a Transnational Moment for Majority Culture in Cuxhaven

Luis's experience in kindergarten symbolises the bright boundary between the Portuguese inhabitants of Cuxhaven and the dominant German national repertoire. Unlike the fluid movement between Germanness and Dutchness described by Sebastian from Zeven, Luis's experience suggested a clear separation. His experience reflects the persistence of symbolic boundaries:

> When I came here, my childhood was of course a bit more difficult, since I could barely speak German. But in preschool I of course met many Portuguese children who were born here. Of course, things were a bit easier then. After that, it went really well and I quickly understood German. Then, at some point, I entered kindergarten, elementary school… I ended up having to take Portuguese classes, but that wasn't until sixth or seventh grade, when it got bad. My Portuguese got bad, really bad, I mean, I could barely speak it. (Luis)[19]

While the German language was accessible for Luis, being German never seemed to be an option. But at the same time, by coming closer the German language, he left behind Portuguese in the process.

Two other research participants described similar experiences but reacted in a different way when they explained the need to keep one's roots in the Portuguese homeland in order to set roots in Cuxhaven. One said:

> We actually don't necessarily need to integrate, the others need to adapt to us as well for a change. We have to fight for our roots. If you abandon your roots, at some point, you won't exist anymore. (field notes research assistant)

The other one added:

19 *„Als ich hier war, war meine Kindheit natürlich ein bisschen schwieriger, weil ich kaum deutsch konnte. Aber im Kindergarten habe ich natürlich viele portugiesische Kinder kennengelernt, die hier geboren wurden. Das war dann natürlich ein bisschen einfacher. Danach ging das voll gut, und ich hab' schnell das Deutsche aufgefasst. Dann kam ich irgendwann in die Vorschule, in die Grundschule… Später musste ich zum portugiesischen Unterricht, aber das fing erst in der sechsten oder siebten Klasse an, als es schlimm wurde. Mein Portugiesisch wurde schlimm, richtig schlimm, also, ich konnte es kaum sprechen.*" (Luis)

> If you give up your roots, what identity will you have tomorrow? Namely none. You need your roots in order to still have an identity tomorrow, when you move to another country. (field notes research assistant)

All of the research participants' experience indicate the bright nature of the boundary between being Portuguese and being German for the Portuguese inhabitants in Cuxhaven. In the case of bright boundaries for Alba,'there is no ambiguity in the location of individuals with respect to it' (2005: 24), and to assimilate means to cross the boundary towards the other side, which similarly leaves little ambiguity towards an individual's location.

A conversation with E., who has lived in Cuxhaven since the 1970s when her father, working in the fish industry, moved the whole family, is exemplary of how research participants in the field experience this bright boundary:

> She tells me she has the feeling that everyone is always talking about integration, but they actually don't live it themselves. She is mostly referring to the Germans. She tells me that she has a small house in Cuxhaven and that her neighbours haven't said hello to her for 20 years and only respond when she speaks to them. (field notes research assistant)

E. describes experiencing a bright boundary as a matter of attribution that lies outside of her strategies for action. She experiences this as a sort of double standard if one considers local discourses about integration.

In a study conducted in Cuxhaven between 2012 and 2016, Leonie Wagner (2016) reconstructed the history of migration, integration policies, and offerings in the small town from the perspective of experts who work in migrant inclusion as social workers and in the town's administration. The study shows that the experts see a big part of the population with a Portuguese migration background from the second or third generation as integrated well into upward social mobility. However, the Spanish are integrated better. Nevertheless, the study also thematised the experts' perception of the majority population and the Portuguese community living in 'two separated worlds' with little dialogue and strong segregation. To some experts, it seems evident that the Portuguese constitute a bounded community. Their presence is described in a 'problematic' manner, being portrayed as migrants facing challenges in integration, in need of resources, and lacking proficiency in the local language.

Being Portuguese in Cuxhaven means one does not have different ethnic options available that lead to recognition and validation by the wider society, which is a vast difference from being Dutch or East Frisian in similar small-town arenas. Instead, the Portuguese population in Cuxhaven is ethnically marked in their cohabitation within the town. These interpretations overlap with a study from Jaine Beswick and

Alicia Pozo-Gutiérrez on Portuguese and Spanish immigration to Great Britain. Due to the bright boundary experienced by Portuguese inhabitants of Great Britain, they argue, '"social class" emerges as a key variable, not only in terms of belonging to particular social strata at the time of arrival but more importantly, in terms of aspiration.' (2010: 57). Just as Luis from Cuxhaven distinguished himself from a local nationalised Portuguese community, another research participant that was encountered informally in the field made much more explicit this distinction along the lines of social class:

> He also addresses the topic of integration. Although he is committed to relations between Germany and Portugal and also helps 'new' Portuguese people in Cuxhaven, he doesn't actually seem to have a high opinion of them. Because, in his opinion, they don't try hard enough to integrate and learn the German language. He says that he tried to teach them the 'Ö' and that they just couldn't manage it because they weren't trying hard enough. (field notes research assistant)

As opposed to his fellow compatriots, this research participant states that he has left behind the smallness of the Portuguese group of inhabitants in Cuxhaven, which has everything to do with social mobility. He is an entrepreneur in the small-town arena social worlds, as is Christina, who similarly underlined the professional qualifications that distinguish her from fellow and unskilled compatriots. The relevance of social class and upward mobility in Cuxhaven's small-town arena Ethnicised Heritage Situations establishes the role of the local power situation in my case studies. It is a consequence of the low permeability experienced by Portuguese inhabitants toward the majority cultural repertoire.

Beswick and Pozo-Guitérrez further find that, as opposed to the Spanish population of UK, Portuguese cultural practices in the UK had not yet been turned into something symbolic and capitalised by the migrants themselves and the majority society to promote integration and multiculturalism. Instead, 'in the Portuguese case, however, essentialised symbols are only valued within the group' (2010: 58).

In their study on Mizrahi Jews in Israel, the US, and Germany, Banai and Shoshana describe this inward orientation as an agentic choice for the Mizrahi Jews in Germany arising out of the impossibility of traversing the boundary to Germanness. 'The exclusiveness of German national identity enables and even invites, the "choice" by our interviewees to renew their connection with Mizrahiness in its "lite" form.' (2019: 14).

The perceived inaccessibility of majority positions, maybe paradoxically, provides a space for the Portuguese minority in Cuxhaven's agentic choices to foster other forms of cultural and symbolic group formation. How the people I met in Cuxhaven refer to or experience Portuguese heritage speaks to alternative agentic choices.

Their ethnic identification, which differs from that of Mizrahi Jews in Banai and Shoshana's agentic choices, is much less voluntary. However, the agentic choice produced by the bright boundary to the German-dominant cultural repertoire is to stage an inward-oriented transnational moment in practising ethnicised Portuguese heritage in the small-town arena. This is opposed to the orientation towards the majority population's heritage, which were evident in the Ethnicised Heritage Situations in Zeven and Aurich.

When visiting the Catholic-Potuguese mass, when eating in the Portuguese cultural centre or one of the Portuguese restaurants, people told me they feel like they were in Portugal on an affective level. Christina expressed it this way when narrating her experiences in the local Portuguese mass:

> The German mass is an exclusively German mass, and the Portuguese one is a mixed mass. And when I say the Lord's Prayer in Portuguese and say the Lord's Prayer in German, I feel differently. In my own language, I feel almost every single word I say. In German, I speak along because the others are speaking as well. While I feel it too – after all, it is the Lord's Prayer – it's different. I can say that with a hundred percent certainty. I don't want to say better or worse, but definitely different […] For us Portuguese, the Portuguese mass is a piece of home. In this one hour, hour and a half you're there, you forget that you're in Germany, in Cuxhaven. In that moment, you think… you don't even think, you are in Portugal. (Christina)[20]

Christina also had a feeling of being home because of the immediate presence of so many Portuguese people in Cuxhaven after her arrival:

> I didn't have any difficulties, I didn't have any problems starting out or issues adjusting. I came here and immediately knew many Portuguese people, and there were a lot of Portuguese people here, and, i don't know, I felt at home right away. (Christina)[21]

---

20 *„Die deutsche Messe ist eine rein deutsche Messe, und die portugiesische eine gemischte Messe. Und wenn ich das Vaterunser auf portugiesisch bete und das Vaterunser auf deutsch bete, ich fühle dabei anders. In meiner eigenen Sprache fühle ich fast jedes einzelne Wort, das ich spreche. Auf deutsch spreche ich mit, weil die anderen auch sprechen. Ich fühle es zwar auch, das ist ja das Vaterunser, aber es ist anders. Das kann ich mit hundertprozentiger Sicherheit sagen. Ich möchte nicht sagen besser oder schlechter, aber auf jeden Fall anders […] Für uns Portugiesen ist die portugiesische Messe ein Stück Heimat. In dieser einen Stunde, anderthalb Stunden, die man da ist, vergisst man, dass man in Deutschland, in Cuxhaven ist. Man denkt in dem Moment… man denkt gar nicht, man ist in Portugal.*" (Christina)

21 *„Ich hatte keine Schwierigkeiten, ich hab' keine Eingewöhnungsschwierigkeiten gehabt, oder Einstiegsschwierigkeiten. Ich kam hierher, und ich hab'sofort ganz viele Portugiesen gekannt, und es waren auch viele Portugiesen hier, und, ich weiß nicht, ich fühlte mich gleich zu Hause.*" (Christina)

For another research participant, this presence amounts to being able to do everything as if one is in Portugal, without having to be capable of speaking German:

> I can, well, if I wanted to, I could speak Portuguese every day, or only speak Portuguese. That's why many people here in Cuxhaven can't speak German very well, because you don't really need it. Businesses or companies always have a Portuguese person who can explain things, or if you're sick, there's also a doctor who speaks Portuguese or Spanish. (Marta)[22]

How Christina and others relate to ethnicised heritages, such as the Portuguese mass or the Portuguese cultural centre, or to speaking Portuguese, is an essential aspect of their setting roots in Cuxhaven. In those moments, one can feel as if being in Portugal. This is an orientation not towards German-dominant culture but towards the Portuguese homeland. Werbner also found such transnational moments in her empirical studies of Pakistani diaspora life in Great Britain, defining them as an 'illusion of simultaneity […] as an important experiential force, especially within transnational families.' (2013: 108). Klimt (2000: 277) argues that the ability of Portuguese immigrants in Germany to inhabit transnational space increased with Portugal's entry into the European Union in the 1990s.

On the one hand, these narrations of transnational simultaneity answer what I have already described as the severity of the dislocation that the people I encountered in Cuxhaven experienced. This dislocation sometimes leads to a splitting of mind and body, of a feeling of the mind and soul still being in Portugal while the body is working hard in Germany. Therefore, the mass or a Portuguese restaurant visit produces what one could call a transnational moment. This moment bears within it a reunion of the body/soul and mind separated by migration.

On the other hand, the narration of transnational simultaneity is related to the bright boundary and, therefore, to the local position of power that the Portuguese inhabitants of Cuxhaven experience vis-à-vis the German-dominant cultural repertoire. Because the permeability of boundaries to German majority positions is strong for the Portuguese people in Cuxhaven, they are provided with such transnational moments as an agentic choice that the people in Zeven with a migration experience from the Netherlands do not have. More importantly, they probably do not need it due to their very different positioning in the local situation of power as a majority-minority boundary.

---

22 *„Ich kann, also, wenn ich das möchte, ich könnte jeden Tag portugiesisch sprechen, oder nur portugiesisch sprechen. Deswegen können viele Leute hier aus Cuxhaven nicht so gut deutsch, weil man das eigentlich nicht braucht. Es gibt bei Firmen oder Unternehmen immer einen Portugiesen, der etwas erklären kann, oder wenn du krank bist, gibt es auch einen Doktor, der portugiesisch oder spanisch spricht.*" (Marta)

What Werbner concludes as a paradox in the translocation of the culture of Pakistani-British migrants, then, might not hold for more privileged migrants from the Netherlands. It does, however, mirror what I found in the case of Cuxhaven's Portuguese heritages: 'The first and perhaps apparent paradox is that to sink roots in a new country, transnational migrants in the modern world begin by setting themselves culturally and socially apart' (Werbner 2005: 2).

For the Portuguese inhabitants of Zeven, then, the boundary to a German majority cultural repertoire presents itself vividly, and being marked as Portuguese often arises from attributions by the majority society. This positioning vis-à-vis the majority-minority boundary leads to an inward orientation, where individuals make agentic choices, particularly evident in the transnational moment created in the cultural centre of Portuguese mass in the church. While I advocate to make the notion of routes rather than roots concerning heritage more prominent, the term 'roots' is used by research participants in Cuxhaven, who employ it dually to assert that setting roots in Cuxhaven necessitates maintaining ties to Portugal as their place of origin. It is in this sense, that heritagisation in Ethnicised Heritage Situations is about both routes and roots.

10.3 Conclusion: The Importance of Local Relations of Power in Ethnicised Heritage Situations

The East Frisian and Dutch inhabitants of Aurich and Zeven experience a blurred boundary to the majority culture wherein their ethnic identification is an option. They can exist on both sides simultaneously and orient their heritagisation towards German majority culture. In contrast, the Portuguese inhabitants of Cuxhaven perceive a bright boundary for majority culture, leading them to create ethnicised heritages as transnational moments. While their heritage-making is oriented towards their countries or regions of origin, it is not a nostalgic adherence to a lost tradition but a situated product of locally grounded processes of inclusion and exclusion. It is also another way ethnic incorporation pathways in small towns form national membership (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2008: 47).

These findings underscore the deeply situated nature of all Ethnicised Heritage Situations, emphasising the importance of local power dynamics. Formulated differently, they show that small-town arenas, if not understood in territorialised forms, are embedded in transnational space and within the uneven power structures of the nation-state that influence Ethnicised Heritage Situations in all three cases, with and without migration as an essential aspect to them.

The role of migratory experiences has been reevaluated, leading me to argue that, within the context of cultural heritage still firmly tied to the nation, it may be more apt to broadly conceptualise migrant heritages as minority heritages in lo-

cal situations of power. This chapter advocates for a de-migrantised approach to research on cultural heritage and diversity. It emphasises the necessity of not overemphasising the role of migration experiences in Ethnicised Heritage Situations. This does not negate the significance of the experience of dislocation in migration; instead, de-migrantising in this context suggests not taking this influence on heritage-making for granted.

In Critical Heritage Studies, diaspora heritage is frequently invoked to explore the dynamic relationship between the national majority and diaspora heritages, constructed in dislocation and relocation moments. The sensemaking of my research participants, however, reveal that their ability (or lack thereof) to navigate boundaries to a German majority cultural repertoire significantly influences their ethnicised heritagisation.

Diasporas have often been described as paradigmatic transnational communities (Tölölyan 1996). Cultural analyses of diasporic life have highlighted how experiences of dislocation and relocation foster a form of community consciousness characterised by multiple attachments and layered identities, combining elements of both rootedness and mobility (Clifford 1994). Alexander argues for an 'engagement with both "roots" and "routes", with the places where movement ceases and where identities and explanations cohere – however momentarily' (2017: 1544) in the study of diaspora. My findings align with these perspectives, as I discovered that taking routes was necessary. Additionally, setting roots emerged prominently during the research process as a critical aspect of my research participants' sensemaking in Ethnicised Heritage Situations. As interpreted here, setting roots is not identical but connected to preserving one's roots. It should be understood not as a fixed and essentialist concept but within the framework of ongoing dislocation and relocation processes articulated by diaspora and new mobilities scholars. In my heuristic analytical concept of a Ethnicised Heritage Situations, the findings in this chapter provide nuance to the construction of national, migrant, ethnic, and majority/minority constructions of collective human actors, as per Adele Clarke's sense (2005), and their relationality to heritage-making in a given situation.

11. Conclusion – Ethnicised Heritage Situations in Small-Town Arenas. A Holistic Perspective on Cultural Heritage

Cultural Heritage, or the German term *Kulturerbe*, has long left the mustiness of the olden days where it was associated with nationalism, conservatism and old buildings that had been standing for hundreds of years. In recent decades, UNESCO policies and listings have played a considerable role in these changes, especially the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage, ratified in Germany in 2013. National heritage is no longer considered homogenous, with states called upon to recognise their internal cultural and ethnic diversity. Intangible cultural heritage is a central means to do so and is an influential concept on all scales of cultural policy promoting social cohesion. The international heritage regime operates not solely from the perspective of important global actors and official listing processes but also from the grassroots level.

The three small-town arenas of Aurich, Cuxhaven, and Zeven in northern Germany with their East Frisian, Portuguese or Dutch cultural productions show why local individuals and groups might adopt a language of heritage. Through analysis of the ways in which people (e)valuate their cultural doing and draw symbolic boundaries in the context of ethnicised festivals and associations, the theory of Ethnicised Heritage Situations emerged. Ethnicised Heritage Situations was put into practice to describe and analyse different elements relevant to heritagisation processes holistically and in comparative perspectives.

All research participants were involved in some capacity with Portuguese, Dutch or East Frisian cultural associations or in the (re)production of ethnicised festivals. Examples of these festivals include the Maypole setting in Aurich, the Fatima procession in Cuxhaven, and the Four Evening Marches in Zeven. They are the most visible representations of the towns' Dutch, Portuguese or East Frisian history and heritage, and they are central for small-town volunteer-based grassroots culture. They are, moreover, culmination points for individuals in the field to position themselves vis-à-vis different membership options. For Joris, to be in the club house on a Dutch public holiday is to feel simultaneously estranged from other members of the local

Dutch community and to be intensely emotionally attached to the Netherlands. For Marta, the Portuguese events and places are but a reminder of her multicultural upbringing and the potential to make use of that in her future as a cosmopolitan-oriented stewardess. A local restaurateur and organiser of the Maypole in Aurich made the festival appear more East Frisian only after visitors critiqued him accordingly.

The ethnic minority and migrant groupings in the three towns are all European citizens with the corresponding rights regarding mobility opportunities and social security. Most of my research participants could be considered (lower) middle class. The perspective taken in this book, then, is not one from the margins in this respect. And still, in Ethnicised Heritage Situations, certain temporal, spatial, and political/economic elements appear to be discursively central to the situation but are only at the margin of abstract global heritage discourse. My analysis has highlighted that 'heritage lists' – repertoires of evaluative criteria applied to cultural endeavours – do circulate in the research field. However, these are never definitive, are negotiated situationally, and are sometimes discarded in favour of other criteria or reinstated at specific moments.

One such moment of reinstatement was the unsettling of life in Zeven when thousands of Dutch military personnel and their families were withdrawn from the town's barracks, and the subsequent political upheaval that brought about a seemingly clearly bounded community of Dutch inhabitants and a discourse of European heritage. Another moment was when participating in Cuxhaven's Portuguese Catholic mass prompts a moment of transnational simultaneity that allowed active and affective participation in Portugal's cultural heritage across geographical distance.

Throughout this research process, a hidden research question kept emerging: my ongoing reflection on why and how to study ordinary cultural endeavours in the small-town arenas of Cuxhaven, Zeven and Aurich within a framework of global cultural heritage discourse. Given that official heritage listings or vocabulary are largely absent from the research field, this question has accompanied the project from its inception, where I pondered the implications of applying such a perspective, to its conclusion, where I found several useful empirical, methodological and theoretical answers to this conundrum.

One way out of this conundrum was to never answer the question of what cultural heritage is. Instead, I focused on what heritage does and has the potential to do within the context of pluralised society. This approach of categorical and empirical analysis was inspired by Pablo Alonso González (2019), who developed the concept of the heritage machine to study cultural heritage not as a deus ex machina but as an assemblage of entangled relations and parts. I adopted many of his model's epistemological and ontological presuppositions in developing my model of Ethnicised Heritage Situations. Following him, as positivist approaches to heritage might suggest, cultural heritage is not something 'out there' to be discovered. Nor is it solely

a construct of a researcher's mind. Instead, heritagisation is a 'historically objective reality that remains empirically analysable' (Alonso González 2019: 34). My theory of Ethnicised Heritage Situations, defined as the convergence of sensemaking (everyday categorisations and (e)valuations) and worldmaking (more generalised and institutionalised (e)valuations) aspects in cultural endeavours, serves to empirically study heritagisation in this sense. As it unfolds in this convergence, the process of heritagisation is a moment wherein heritage's virtual potentiality is realised in concrete situations.

But more often than finding active bearers of cultural heritages and heritages' potential being realised, the analysis using Ethnicised Heritage Situations as a framework sheds light on why individuals and groups do not adopt a language of heritage, or how heritage appears as an unintended consequence of actors engaged in cultural endeavours to other ends. These are processes that at times can be conflictual, or at least tense. I could only detect one moment during the multiple research stays and hours of narrative interviews in which the term cultural heritage was mentioned by research participants, and that was because the participant looked me up online and came across the title of my research project. As a sort of heritage expert my acting in the field led to a cultural policy term to be taken into consideration, which can be described in the term of Ethnicised Heritage Situations as a convergence of my worldmaking powers with a local's situated sensemaking. Heritagisation of cultural endeavours – the engagement with criteria of (e)valuation associated with a repertoire of cultural heritage – was explicitly rejected when Hilde, a highly engaged member of the local Dutch association was annoyed by some rare visitors who outspokenly established their engagement with the Dutch holiday as one of practising their Dutchness. To Hilde, Dutchness is rather expressed in her ordinary everyday doing. In the settled times my research was conducted in, there was no clearly bounded ethnicised community of practice to be found as a bearer of an ethnicised heritage that, according to global heritage discourse, normally constitutes a central actor.

It is exactly this possibility of keeping heritage's potential emergence open to empirical investigation that makes Ethnicised Heritage Situations such a useful contribution to further research on heritage and cultural diversity in pluralised societies. Heritagisation in Ethnicised Heritage Situations is not solely a dispossessing operation by dominant national or international heritage regimes and their cultural governance, nor an innocent act of empowerment by local communities of minorities. Instead, heritagisation is studied on a continuum from the everyday (sensemaking) to institutionalised (worldmaking) (e)valuations of cultural endeavours. It is in the convergence of processes of world- and sensemaking in specific situations that heritage may or may not emerge. This also implies that heritagisation in the complex entanglements and relations of elements in Ethnicised

Heritage Situations is a dynamic process that can involve de-heritagisation and re-heritagisation just as well.

The Situation, Cultural Repertoires of (E)Valuation and Heritage Regimes as Conceptual Grounds

The Ethnicised Heritage Situations theoretical model is an analytical tool I offer to get a grip on the complexity of (social) processes involved in the (e)valuation of culture and cultural heritage in pluralised societies. It allows an ambiguity as to whether such processes are driven by sense- or worldmaking, by heritage regime operations or grassroots needs. It is developed along three central theoretical lines of thinking that are associated with three terms: the situation, cultural repertoires of (e)valuation and heritage regimes.

The situation refers to the sociological concept of the definition of the situation as a basic unit of (empirical) analysis. It is central to Situational Analysis (Clarke 2012), the methodology chosen for my research project. In traditional sociological approaches, the situation is defined in concrete and often face-to-face interactions of the researched subjects and needs to be reconstructed through analysis. In Situational Analysis the term 'situation' is used in a post-structuralist and feminist framework, contextualising it within social world and arena frameworks. Consequently, the research process itself evolves as a situation whose boundaries are defined by the researcher. This operation is symmetrical to those of the researched subjects.

Ethnicised Heritage Situations are thus co-produced by different individuals, including the researcher and other elements as members of social worlds in arenas, each with a distinct influence on 'definitions of the situation'. This is why my analysis of Ethnicised Heritage Situations does involve a reconstruction of specific elements and their relations, such as the role of traditional dress as a non-human element of the situation for symbolic boundary making and the heterogenisation of heritage. Other such examples include temporal moments when ethnicised communities of practice appear as relevant social worlds in the arena or when ethnicised heritage criteria of (e)valuation are put into relation with the positioning of individuals in the field vis-à-vis dominant national cultural repertoires.

Cultural repertoires of (e)valuation represent how societal meaning-making structures that extend beyond specific situations operate within Ethnicised Heritage Situations. Within this framework, sensemaking by individual research participants and social worlds is approached through the lens of (e)valuation and boundary-making processes, in which various cultural repertoires of evaluation – among them cultural heritage – are mobilised. Rather than eliciting direct reflections on boundaries or repertoires, participants' life narratives and their accounts of social proximity, similarity and engagement in cultural endeavours provide

insight into how such repertoires are enacted. This approach aligns with Michelle Lamont's (2012) advancement of comparative cultural sociology, yet the analytical focus here lies not on cross-national comparison but on the comparative dynamics of evaluation and meaning-making within the scale of small-town contexts.

Importantly, global policy concepts that emanate from the scale of, for example, UNESCO's heritage regime, are mobile and cannot be understood as mere context to Ethnicised Heritage Situations, but as always already elements within them. The worldmaking dimensions of Ethnicised Heritage Situations can be examined through a heritage regime operations framework. Within Critical Heritage Studies, the concept of heritage regimes refers to sets of rules and norms that structure the relationships between state institutions and society on a global scale (Bendix et al. 2012). Heritage regime operations also have a Foucauldian side, where power functions not solely through domination but also productively, rendering discourse, power and subjectivation as closely intertwined processes. These operations unfold across multiple terrains, as discussed in research on migration regimes (Pott et al. 2018). In the Ethnicised Heritage Situations analysed in this project, heritage regimes operate through state regulation and domination, for instance via government cultural policies; through processes of subjectivation that provide spaces of recognition and intelligible subject positions; and through dominant discourses that establish and sustain particular narratives about the value of cultural heritage. A further terrain is the economy, which within the Ethnicised Heritage Situations analysed in this project is not characterised by an established heritage industry but by the participation of local business actors embedded in civil society.

To summarise, Ethnicised Heritage Situations as a theoretical model is defined by the convergence of worldmaking and sensemaking within cultural endeavours. While this definition may appear general and abstract, its grounding in theoretical perspectives from Situational Analysis, cultural sociology and Critical Heritage Studies provides a robust analytical framework. Through this synthesis, Ethnicised Heritage Situations emerges as a lens for examining the processes through which ethnic boundaries are constructed and negotiated, positioning boundary making as a central dynamic within cultural life. In doing so, the model situates Ethnicised Heritage Situations at the intersection of heritage, difference and collective identity formation – an intersection that lies at the heart of contemporary debates on cultural heritage.

Core Elements of Ethnicised Heritage Situations

My study is grounded in a rigorous comparative Situational Analysis (Clarke 2012) of problem-centred interviews, participatory observation, and local newspaper discourse from Aurich, Cuxhaven and Zeven. This approach has allowed for insights

into imagined and concrete ethnicised communities (chapters 7 and 8), the role of mobility experiences (chapter 9), and the permeability of boundaries between majority and minority positions (chapter 10) in how cultural endeavours are valued for producing membership and belonging. Experiences of physical mobility and the encounters that these entail are precursors for all heritagisation, even for those without migratory experiences. The reproduction of social life in concrete communities emerges as a central intention of being engaged in cultural endeavours.

The theoretical model of Ethnicised Heritage Situations has shown that cultural heritage functions not as a static inheritance but as a dynamic field of negotiation in which sensemaking and worldmaking are continuously intertwined. Across the small-town arenas of Cuxhaven, Zeven and Aurich, the analysis demonstrated that heritage practices are rarely driven by a single, bounded 'local community'. Instead, they emerge through the interplay of multiple actors and logics – ranging from supraregional institutions such as churches, municipalities and associations, to individual entrepreneurs, volunteers and residents whose motivations are shaped as much by sociability and care as by recognition or expertise. These diverse forms of engagement reveal that heritage governance is not only imposed by UNESCO-led regimes but also precedes and exceeds them, with global and local criteria of (e)valuation overlapping in uneven ways.

A key insight is that small towns act as specific arenas of negotiation, where proximity, limited diversity, and positioning between rurality and urbanity inflect how heritagisation takes form. Ethnicity plays a role, but is often relativised by local belonging: participants tended to identify more strongly as small-town residents than as members of ethnic groups. At the same time, mobility experiences – whether migratory or residential – infused heritage practices with a vernacular cosmopolitanism, enabling participants to draw on multiple attachments and (national) repertoires of (e)valuation simultaneously. These processes show how heritage can be both homogenising and heterogenising, depending on how roots and routes are mobilised.

Put simply, the research participants' sensemaking in Ethnicised Heritage Situations orients them not primarily towards being migrants or being ethnic but towards being localised (in multiple places) and having mobility experiences.

The European or UNESCO heritage regimes' worldmaking is not an intervention coming from the outside to penetrate local social life, a linear and one-way operation. Instead of being a context to Ethnicised Heritage Situations, these processes are always already a part of the situation – shaping and being shaped by the diffusion of the global concept to the small-town arenas. Moreover, heritage regime worldmaking is represented in the research field by heritage regime actors or exchange-value-oriented criteria of (e)valuation in the sensemaking of local entrepreneurs. Large supraregional organisations, such as the church in Cuxhaven or the military in Zeven, play important roles in festival (re)production, while some entrepreneurs

employ consumer orientation, expertise and recognition as key criteria of (e)valuation, akin to a heritage repertoire, to describe their engagement in cultural endeavours.

The findings suggest that Ethnicised Heritage Situations are a relational and complex field. Economic, social and symbolic criteria of (e)valuation intersect with gendered care practices, local power dynamics and global heritage regimes. Ethnicised Heritage Situations are thus moments where lifeworlds and institutional orders meet, sometimes productively, sometimes as forms of dispossession. Importantly, the analysis challenges assumptions that migration and ethnicity are the primary frames for understanding intangible heritage. Instead, small-town arenas reveal alternative elements relevant in producing cultural diversity and belonging – mobility, local belonging and care – that are central to how and when heritage emerges.

Asking Unsettling Questions with Ethnicised Heritage Situations

This study offers a theoretical and empirical contribution to Critical Heritage Studies, research on migration and cultural diversity in small towns, and cultural and political sociology, including migration sociology. At its centre stands the theoretical model of Ethnicised Heritage Situations, which helps to rethink cultural heritage in pluralised societies through empirical analysis in which heritagisation is conceptualised as the convergence of worldmaking and sensemaking.

The empirical insights gained through Ethnicised Heritage Situations expose several crucial axes for re/theorising the heritage category as perceived and discussed in Critical Heritage Studies. First, the ontologisation of local communities of practice must be questioned. Rather than their role as bearers of heritages, heritage regimes, often represented by large institutions such as the church in Cuxhaven or the military in Zeven, appear as producers of the ethnicised festivals in the three small towns. Their influence points to the relevance of understanding heritagisation as always already entangled with supraregional and national structures – particularly within European contexts.

Second, while parts of Critical Heritage Studies have moved towards privileging ethnicised or postnational forms of heritage, this study demonstrates that, in small-town arenas, ethnic belonging is often expressed through membership in a nation-state that *is* or *is not* Germany, taking the form of majority or minority belonging. The more revealing dynamic, therefore, lies not in the opposition between national and ethnic heritages but in how majority-minority relations shape local power dynamics and symbolic boundary making.

Third, small-town actors navigate multiple attachments simultaneously, combining national identifications with vernacular forms of cosmopolitanism and mul-

tilocal belonging. The analysis shows that experiences of physical mobility – and the encounters they entail – are central to all heritagisation processes, not only those directly related to migration.

Fourth, the study identifies inward- and use-value-oriented criteria of (e)valuation that foreground care-ethical orientations and the materiality of care work, often performed by women. This dimension reveals the gendered nature of heritage production and the invisible labour sustaining social life. Non-linear conceptions of time further challenge the linear and preservationist assumptions of heritage discourse, suggesting that temporality in heritage should also be understood as cyclical.

While not originally conceived as small-town research, this study contributes to emerging work that positions small towns as key sites for investigating global and local dynamics of migration, cultural diversity and heritage-making. These towns – Aurich, Cuxhaven and Zeven – reveal that small-scale settings are deeply embedded in transnational processes. Their relative proximity, limited diversity and intermediate position between rurality and urbanity create distinctive social ecologies for boundary making and belonging. By analysing the ethnically marked cultural endeavours of Portuguese, Dutch and East Frisian groups, this study adds new empirical material on under-researched forms of minority cultural life in peripheral regions. Migration here is approached not as a demographic challenge or a deficit of integration, but as an ordinary dimension of cultural and symbolic boundary formation in small-town life. The study, therefore, extends migration sociology – particularly in the German context – beyond its predominant focus on metropolitan settings. Peripheral small towns emerge here as crucial yet overlooked sites for understanding how migration and diversity are lived, negotiated and institutionalised.

Through Ethnicised Heritage Situations, the research also offers a theoretical framework for understanding how the worldmaking of global heritage regimes interacts with the everyday sensemaking of local actors. This approach can be applied beyond heritage itself, offering a model for studying the mutual constitution of global discourses and local practices in other domains, including environmental policy or cultural citizenship (Delanty 2002) and performative dimensions of belonging (Kleinschmidt et al. 2022).

During the research process, it was notable how reflexive the participants' approach to their cultural engagement was. Richard, for example, was not only engaged in making visible the history of Aurich as part of East Frisia as a mediamaker but was also very keen on bringing across the idea of East Frisia as a coherent region in the imagination. East Frisia, he told me, is 'Europe in small', with many different regionalisms and conflicts around them. He did not necessarily need the seriousness of an unambiguous East Frisian identity claim to be engaged in East Frisian history and festivals. Similarly, Christina was very aware of the fact that those member of a traditional folk dance group who attend the Fatima procession in traditional dress

are perceived as Portuguese by outsiders, even though the type of dress rather show differentiations between different regions of origin from within Portugal.

The theory of Ethnicised Heritage Situations also advances reflexivity – both within research and beyond it. In the research process, this reflexivity was grounded in the Situational Analysis approach. The concept of the situation aided in recognising that every research situation is itself situated in at least two ways: the researcher is active in that they provide one among several definitions of the situation, and all such definitions are shaped by the social worlds in which these definitions emerge. To map the situation of research in Situational Analysis is always to map oneself into it as well.

Building on this foundation, Ethnicised Heritage Situations as a theoretical frame of thinking has the potential to help reflexivity beyond research to the realm of heritage management and policy-making. It provides a tool for understanding how global heritage regimes, local actors and policy frameworks intersect in practice. With this complexity-oriented perspective, Ethnicised Heritage Situations provides much-needed reflexivity for heritage experts and managers by encouraging them to map the fields of action in which they intervene and to locate their own positionality within these configurations, including recognising how many culture-led policies continue to be shaped by urban-centric logics. Such an approach is particularly valuable in the field of intangible heritage policies, where comprehensive anthropological definitions of culture extend policy frameworks deep into the lifeworlds of ordinary people.

Such worldmaking processes of the (e)valuation of culture are, as I have opened this book with and taken up throughout, not always harmonious and, as I would like to add now, possibly not asked for from a grassroots perspective. If the main criteria of (e)valuation employed vis-à-vis a local museum in East Frisia, a festival in Zeven or an associational event in Cuxhaven is its function in reproducing social life; if festivals are boundary objects, bringing together different social worlds for limited amounts of time, without the need to label them as Dutch or East Frisian; if a Catholic mass in Cuxhaven is a moment of transnational simultaneity with no need to be projected outward – one could ask to what extent such ordinary culture can or should be an object of cultural and heritage policy operations.

While it would go too far at this point to fully engage into answering this question, I would like to bring up two possibly provocative thoughts as a way to approaching an answer. First, there is an argument made by Paul Hugger in 1989, that Doreen Götzky (2013) pointed me toward. Hugger argues that the use of a broad concept of culture within policy discourse primarily serves to legitimise existing power relations. By concealing its elitist orientation under an inclusive rhetoric of cultural diversity, cultural policy effectively stabilises a hegemonic status quo. He denies that cultural policy can meaningfully govern everyday culture in the sense defined by UNESCO, since such culture is characterised by its own internal logic and autonomy. As

he puts it, 'everyday culture is, first and foremost, self-organisation; it is a self-regulating system' (Hugger 1989: 163, my translation). Against this background he cautions that all cultural policy is elite policy and that instead of instrumentalising or managing it, the political task lies in safeguarding the social and spatial conditions that allow everyday culture to flourish, making it a task of broad societal concern cutting across many different policy domains.

Second, studying cultural heritage as a social process and powerful category, my project engages in re/theorising the cultural heritage category in pluralised societies at the nexus of 'heritage, identity, and community'. Ethnicised Heritage Situations encourages radically rethinking the role of conceptions of time, large institutions, communities, use values, mobility experiences and the role of place in this project of ideology. Together, these insights open up the question of whether heritage as a category can be retained through radical re/theorisation, or whether these impulses ultimately carry a utopian surplus that could lead to heritages' dissolution.

If I am to stay true to my heritage agnostic position (Brumann 2014a: 174), which leaves judgement on heritagisations' ethical and political potential and aftermath open to empirical research, more such research should be conducted to ultimately take a stance on these questions. In addressing this study's limits, further research could for example look at places other than peripheral small towns – two of which in the case of this study may be described as 'large' small towns. Comparisons to metropolitan areas or between towns with distinct demographic trajectories, such as shrinking or post-shrinking towns are an option. Future research could also expand to include other migrant groupings, especially those with more precarious legal or social positions, and attend more closely to the intersections of class, status and mobility within small-town contexts.

Most importantly though, it should be Hilde, Joris or Rubens and Merle that decide on whether to celebrate Dutch King's Day in the club house or whether the Four Evening Marches is part of Zeven's Dutch heritage and should be recognised as such. And it should be Christina, Rafael and Marta that have a say in how their individual and family histories are intertwined with labour migration from Portugal to Cuxhaven in the 1960s. And it is for the inhabitants of Aurich that partake in the central maypole setting to decide on whether the festival is authentically East Frisian or not, they could even decide not to bother with this question at all.

There is, then, an importance of literacy in the convergence of local actors in small-town arenas and in the convergence of world- and sensemaking in Ethnicised Heritage Situations. Local actors should be empowered to comprehend the potential risks and challenges involved in official heritage listing processes by institutions such as UNESCO, the European Union or nation-states, encouraging them to make informed decisions. I am undecided as to whether I would advise them to actively pursue this aim. Every embrace of communities as cultural bearers by heritage regimes entails a reorganisation of the world- and sensemaking aspects of cultural

endeavours, strengthening the former and potentially mutinying central aspects of the latter. At the very least, I believe local actors in grassroots culture should be aware of the option to deny involvement in such processes.