http://www.diva-portal.org

Preprint

This is the submitted version of a paper presented at *BETWEEN DREAM AND REALITY: DEBATING THE IMPACT OF WORLD HERITAGE LISTING, 14-15 NOVEMBER 2013,KULTRANS,UNIVERSITY OF OSLO.*

Citation for the original published paper:

Ronström, O. (2013)
Consequences of world heritage production: Views from Visby.
In: (pp. 1-16).

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Permanent link to this version:
http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-219725

On the consequences of world heritage production

Owe Ronström. Owe.ronstrom@etnologi.uu.se. Dep of cultural anthropology and ethnology. Uppsala Universitet, Campus Gotland

Abstract: In this article I discuss the case of The Hanseatic town of Visby, a small town in the island of Gotland, in the middle of Baltic Sea, which in 1995 was designated as Sweden's sixth and the world's 470th world heritage site. Using the findings from my earlier research project "Heritage Politics" as a starting point, I reflect over consequences of World Heritage production and address issues both at a local and specific level, and at a more global and abstract level, with the intention to show that the impact of World Heritage production both locally and at large, depend on how these levels become interconnected within the framework of the UNESCO World Heritage program.

Introduction

This article deals with consequences of world heritage production. Today, we find everywhere growing demands on producer responsibility. Products have to be tested, their impact assessed before release on the market. The insight is that nothing really becomes what you expected; there are always unexpected consequences and counter production. Any world heritage is a result of fundamental changes of a selected site that lead to further fundamental changes in the surrounding society. In the ever growing piles of documents prepared for the nomination of world heritages, consequences is a recurring theme. Only seldom, however, you will find discussions of the overall consequences of heritage production, nor of the producers' responsibilities. What would an impact assessment of world heritage look like? In what terms could the consequences of world heritage production be discussed? Taking off from an the research project "Heritage Politics" (Ronström 2008, Johansson 2009), I will address some issues both at a concrete local level, and at a more global, abstract level. My intention is to demonstrate how the impact of World Heritage production depend on how these levels interconnect within the framework of the UNESCO World Heritage programme.

World heritage is a complex phenomenon. Here, I will discuss one of its many facets, the heritage town. The starting point and concrete example is The Hanseatic town of Visby, which in 1995 became Sweden's sixth and the world's 470th world heritage site. Once one of the most prosperous places in Northern Europe, Gotland has since long been a marginalized part of Sweden, living mostly from agriculture and tourists attracted by the roses and ruins of the well-preserved medieval town, Visby. This is a place where time runs deep: the production of history in the island is certainly not new (Ronström 2004). Many different pasts have been staged already centuries back, which turns Gotland's history into meta-history, a history of histories. During the last two decades the island has seen an

intense heritage production. New types of pasts have been staged, by new types of people, for new types of markets and consumers. In remarkably short time “The Hanseatic town of Visby” was erected, a creation of urbanity and European medievality, cast in a limestone-grey and rose-red poetry (cf Ristilammi 1994).

Exchange office and brokers

An interesting aspect of world heritages is their function as exchange offices, where social, cultural and monetary capital can be transferred and exchanged. The phenomenal success of world heritage at large has do with a capacity to promise solutions to all kinds of problems, at all levels. In Visby these stretched from tidying up the old city center, preserving old buildings, attracting more visitors, promoting local businesses, to more general issues, such as recognition, national pride, peace and understanding. What makes world heritage attractive and lasting is that there seem to be something in it for everybody, which in turn makes exchanges possible and necessary. World heritage becomes a tool for international prestige, personal career, an arena for local conflicts, demands for rights of indigenous populations and much more.

To work all this out on the local level you need skilled brokers. The more complex the system, the higher demands on the brokering. World heritage is indeed a complex system, all kinds of historical, aesthetical, political and personal interests must be negotiated, which requires special skills (Turtinen 2006). While the world is full of unique and wonderful places, there are only around a thousand world heritages, which lead to the conclusion that the nomination of a site is not so much dependant on its inherent qualities as on the quality of the brokers.

Behind the nomination of Visby we find extremely competent brokers. In record time they managed to transform Visby from a worn out, marginalised small town to a renowned Middle Age icon. By successfully using and fusing their local, regional, national and global networks they were able take charge over a large part of the inner town, and to reconstruct it according to their vision. The central positions of the main actors in local and regional, as well as in national heritage circles, gave them access to economical and symbolic capital flows, which they were able to direct to their projects, which in turn gave them influence over all levels of the heritage production, from dreams and visions to concrete questions about methods, techniques, colours, and materials. The result is one of Sweden’s most post-modern cities.

Glocality

“Much of what is described as post-modern or late modern, is based on the experience of living in a world where absence and presence are mingled with each other in a historically new way”, sociologist

Anthony Giddens notes (1996:165). World heritage is precisely this, a new mode of producing and representing something absent in the present. World heritage sites are results of ”re-coding operations” (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998), ”metaforical transformations” (Grundberg 2000), or simply ”shifts” (Ronström 2008), between different historical, geographical, social, and cultural settings, and the individual and the collective, private and public, informal and formal, and between the informative and the performative (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998).

World heritage is the result of a new global gaze, a visual ordering of things, and ideas about necessary interventions. The world heritage convention is a new tool for intervention, built on a moral rhetoric and a practice with disciplining and civilising traits. It is a new instrument for bringing old national antiquarian aspirations into a new global capitalistic market economy, in order to convert expenses to revenues. And it is a sign that says something fundamental about our own time, about global politics and changes in how we understand ourselves and our place in the surrounding world.

A common way to explain such phenomena as World Heritage is to point at global trends or structures. The local example is seen as dependent upon and explained by the global. And yes, World heritage is a machinery that produces the local for global export. Together with multinational companies, food chains and the Internet, the World Heritage sites represent a global reality in the local sphere, by locally implementing ‘outstanding universal values’. But it is also a local phenomenon, a strategic resource for local development, and in local struggles for power and influence. The result is something new, glocality if you wish, a new type of interface with a number of interesting consequences. Here my focus is upon the how the global, general and abstract connect to and interact with the local, specific and concrete.

Visuality, form and content

Heritage is a new mode of production, using the obsolete, the mistaken, the outmoded, the dead and the defunct as its raw material, to paraphrase Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1998: 149). Even if the results are presented as old, and even if the heritage discourse is full of re-words (reconstruction, reparation, renewal, representation) heritage is an intervention in the present for purposes in the future, and as such a perfect illustration of Walter Benjamins famous metaphor: the angel of history moves rearwards forward (Benjamin 1939). The result is something completely new. In the case of Visby, not only were the images and narratives about the place re-framed and re-told, a large part of the inner town was rebuilt to fit better into the new image. Paradoxically, to become an authentic World Heritage town, Visby had to become more Visby-ish than itself. As a consequence the old city center was equipped with a new interface and tuned to a new key. A number of keying devices were deployed to foreground selected traces of olden times, while a number of signs of modernity were brought to the

background.

Central to the world heritage production in Visby was taking control of surfaces, facades, pavings, street signs, posters, ads. Cars and asphalt out, pedestrians and cobble stone in. Big company logos and neon lights out, a new type of shop signs in, oldish, in painted metal, swaying from specially made holders, together with smaller traffic signs, which soon became somewhat problematic in the central parts of inner town, as visitors do not always see or take notion of the signs. “Modern” materials out, cement, concrete, plastic. “Oldish” materials in, lime plaster, brick, wood, black metal, together with oldish light colours, yellow ochre, limestone grey, roof tile red. Bright colours out, together with technical devices, such as TV antennas, solar cells, air heat pumps. The result: a more homogenous, uniform town.

In Visby, what is to be consumed, and what can be consumed, is the visual appearance of streets and buildings. That behind the facades ordinary people live in old and often ragged buildings with worn out sewers and malfunctioning electricity is to be disregarded, since the prime object of the world heritage production is not the buildings, but the narratives and visual image of the buildings. Thus, the producers have to uncouple surface from depth, form from content, to be able to market surfaces and forms, without having to deal with depths and contents. In short, it is necessary to separate the facades from what is behind, the buildings from their inhabitants, the factory from its workers, the harbour from shipping etc. Whatever functions the objects once had, new ones must be introduced, based on what is possible for visitors to appreciate and consume. This creates an important field of tension between the town’s inhabitants, the heritage sector and the visitors. While the inhabitants are struggling to lead ordinary modern lives in a surrounding that offers increasing resistance, the heritage sector is struggling to preserve the image of a certain past to present to visitors, who in turn are constantly changing their interpretation and use of the site. This forces the heritage sector to redesign the heritage product, to adapt images, narratives and functions to the ever changing consumer behaviour (Ashworth 2009:4), which in turn tend to increase and fortify the tension between town dwellers and the heritage sector.[1]

Accessability and density

Accessibility is a keyword in Swedish political discourse these days, but in Visby’s old town access is often overruled by heritage values. Narrow cobblestone streets and medieval buildings are not easily combined with wheel chairs, walkers and baby strollers. Nor are medieval alleys and backyards easily

[1] The prevailing policy, condensed as “use and preserve”, can be seen as an adaptation of an old antiquarian practice to ever new demands from the globalised experience industry.

combined with cars and parking lots. As a consequence the central part of town has become less attractive to the disabled, the aged, and families with children, while at the same time becoming more attractive to the well-to-do, people willing to convert monetary capital into symbolic and cultural capital. This in turn has driven kindergartens, health services, grocery and hardware stores out, to give room to cafés, restaurants and boutiques focussing on life style products, design, and tourism. Today Visby is one of Sweden's most restaurant dense cities. For many of the new merchants the increase of cultural capital instigated by the world heritage nomination is a precondition, often also a survival condition. During the last years also the regional administration has decided to leave the old city center for the former regiment in the outskirts of town, where the heritage values do not collide as dramatically with the demands for accessibility and utility values put on any modern administrative body. This has created more space for exclusive apartments, and for more hotels, cafés, restaurants and boutiques.

Trough distinct and effective branding The Hanseatic town of Visby was launched on a global heritage market, which, among a number of things, led to increased aesthetisation and homogenization of the town's inner parts, and a fortification of the border between the controlled and expensive inner parts and the growing diversity in the cheaper outskirts of the town. The result of is raised density. A problem for many world heritages is that they are too scattered and diffuse, which makes them hard to embrace and experience (cf Diaz 2013). A solution is then to raise their density, to get more heritage per square meter, which is what happened in Visby, as in many other heritage towns. Raised density is a key to much cultural production of our time, and a prerequisite for the experience of entering into another time, another place, another world (Ronström, in press). As the on-going festivalisation of the world has produced large interconnected festival geographies, heritagisation has produced dense, globally interconnected heritage geographies. While the festival and heritage industries provide the destinations, the tourist industry provides the visitors.

Raised homogeneity and density at the local level are consequences of a central strategy in much world heritage production, to produce purity, often in terms of authenticity. Purity is necessary to produce visibility, and to bring the objects closer in accordance with the abstract ideas, narratives and pictures of these objects, which is a central objective in world heritage production. Traces of the mixed and the hybrid are to be reduced in order winkle out the pure and authentic in, under, or behind the objects. Paradoxically, while the world as a whole is going through intense creolisation and hybridization, world heritage produces arenas with an unmistakable homogeneity and purity, sometimes using a rhetoric, that in other contexts would not only be politically incorrect, but even provoke a strong discontent (cf Bendix 2000, Nikolić 2012). A concrete example is when it in Visby was decided that trees must be cut to raise the visibility of the medieval city wall. Among the trees that were to be cut

down was a large healthy poplar, while an oak next to it, severely wounded by bonfires, was saved. This created a heated debate in the town. Among the arguments to save the oak was that it is an original Swedish tree, thus a natural part of the medieval mindscape, while the poplar is a later immigrant that has been transplanted in the wrong place (Walter 2006).

Purity and danger, homogenisation and diversity

As Mary Douglas (1991) has shown, purity is closely connected to safety, while impurity creates danger. In many places in Western Europe and the US, a growing middle class is striving to take control of public urban space, in order to increase safety. A common method is commercialisation. When public squares are remade into private shopping malls, citizens become customers. When the shops' opening hours set the limit for access, public arenas become less public and street musicians, political activists, beggars, and people that are just hanging out, can be effectively locked out whenever needed. Another equally efficient method turns out to be historic aesthetisation. During the last decades of the 20th century, one city center after another were remade to attract new inhabitants, tourists and capital. The message may not be as clear as in privately owned shopping malls, writes ethnologist Joakim Forsemalm (2003:43), but, even if it is not clear to all how an urban environment contribute to segregation, it is immediately clear to the pariahs of society: ”this is not for us.”.

So, not surprisingly, world heritage in towns like Visby proves to be a successful means to drive certain elements out of the inner town, by turning buildings and streets into signs that effectively tell which of us belong there and which of us should stay out. By taking control of the signs of style and taste and inscribe them in streets, buildings and certain types of exclusive cafés and restaurants, design and fashion boutiques, the low, undesirable and hybrid is driven out. The result is an abundant presence of the right sorts of cafés, restaurants and companies, and a corresponding absence of international chains, such as Lidl, MacDonalds, Hennes Mauritz – as of alcoholics, drug dealers and hookers..

Increased density and homogeneity, important consequences of world heritage production, are in turn prerequisites for the necessary image production. Here is where local heritage production connects most clearly to global branding. To produce the local and unique for global export is to packet and condense. Only as clearly identifiable, homogenized commodities, with easily distinguishable selling points, objects can be disembedded, uncoupled from the original context, and only as uncoupled objects they can be marketed and sold.

This has a number of interesting consequences. An important part of the tourist industry live from selling the local and unique. But, as Gregory Ashworth among others has noted, the more unique an

object, the less likely that the visitor will return. “Heritage tourists may spend more but they are harder to obtain, retain, and induce to return” (Ashworth 2007:9). The unique is best experienced once. So when world heritages as examples of the eternal and universal aspects of mankind’s history on earth are created around the uniquely distinctive, they are likely to face declining possibilities to attract visitors and to stay eternal and universal.

The idea behind the production of unique, authentic objects with marked distinctiveness is to make the world safe for diversity, by making local diversity globally visible. Distinctiveness is the entrance ticket to the world heritage arena, there is hardly room for two world heritages of the same kind. Paradoxically however, framing of a town such as Visby as distinctively medieval and Hanseatic, is also an effective means to produce quite the opposite, a homogenized glocal town, characterized by a fundamental time and placelessness. Homogenization at the local level is a necessary condition for competitive difference at the global level. A consequence of the heritage production in Visby, as in Nesebar, Bulgaria and Quebec city, Canada (Evans 2002), is a decreasing local diversity and complexity, in terms of forms, styles colors, and in terms of class, age and ethnic diversity.

Here is yet another point where world heritage connects to general global trends in interesting ways. The World Heritage Convention is a child of a time when we began to see the first traces of a massive increase of ideologies advocating cultural diversity. In the decades to come, a radical dehegemonisation of the world started, that, at least temporarily, led to its dehomogenisation. In the words of anthropologist Jonathan Friedman this meant a “revitalizing liberation of cultural difference, a veritable symphony of human variation” (Friedman 1994:27). During this era, with all its emphasis on diversity, and with all kinds of groups claiming recognition acts based on cultural differences, how are we to understand the emergence of a revolutionary notion of a single humanity, a common universal heritage and a set of outstanding universal values? A drastic but possible answer is that we are facing the rise of a new globalised urban middle class staging its dreams of esthetically controlled environment, freed from enervating disputes over ethnicities, religion, gender, class, sexuality... In such a light world heritage can be seen as a radical counter-force to increasing cultural diversity at the local level, an instrument for implementing re-homogenisation, possibly also re-hegemonisation of carefully selected parts of the world.

Frontstages and backstages

Heritage production creates vast areas of neglect and oblivion. Framing a town as “medieval” is as much about creating fronts and centers as backsides and peripheries, it is as much about foregrounding some things as about hiding other things, and as much about focusing upon a homogenized, bounded period of time, as not allowing for contemporary complexity and diversity. A globalised and

aestheticized heritage gaze is a precondition for the world heritages. It is a new type of gaze that imposes a new visual and spatial ordering, with front stages, things we should and must see, and backstages, things we should overlook. Since what is displayed front stage represents only a small part of all that there actually is to see, an effectively developed neglect or ignorance is necessary to establish the heritage gaze.

The Hanseatic town of Visby consists of the walled medieval inner city, 10% of the towns total area, with of 10% of its population. The rest lives in what the Norwegian sociologist Dag Österberg (1998) has called “the middle lands”, a kind of no mans land, neither town nor countryside, dominated by ”mazdaism”, and characterized by a way of life that circles around cars, not as a sign of high income, but as a sheer necessity. (Arnstberg 2004). Österberg writes that the most evidently present in such middle lands is absence, what sometimes is called placelessness. Around 90% of Visby’s inhabitants live in such middle lands. But in the narratives and images of Visby they are absent, as are the areas they inhabit.

What is the consequence of being written out of the representations of the place you inhabit? This is a question that many have pursued with great energy during the last half century, from indigenous populations to the large migrant groups of most European countries. But in the discussion about world heritage in Visby it is totally absent. Why is that? The answer points to a theme I already briefly have touched upon, the world heritages taken-for-grantedness, their status as self-evidently given, which in turn points to how the world heritage idea is a part of and establishes a new form of global cultural hegemony.

Gentrification and reserves

With increased homogenization and density, comes clearly visible distinctiveness, which brings about more visitors. And with more visitors come increased real estate values. With rising real estate values come increased social and cultural homogenization, and a strengthened emphasis on style and class. The result is gentrification, when earlier inhabitants have to give room to richer upper middle-class segments, striving to maximize precisely those values that world heritage produce. In Visby, gentrification is at once a precondition and a result of the world heritage. Already in the 1970’s a gentrification process started that transformed the old city center to housing for a new aesthetical and intellectual elite, with strong connections to the political elite. The new inner city dwellers introduced a new type of gaze, charged the city center with double authenticities, of the mythical Middle Ages and of the mystical island, and made it their lieu de memoire and trademark. The nomination of Visby as world heritage in 1995 is the logical consequence. Since then new inhabitants, an increasing number of visitors, and a new interface - grey as in limestone, wool, old roads, beaches, the Middle Ages,

elegance and refined taste – has driven real estate prices to ever new fantasy levels. Such a consequence of the world heritage production cannot have been difficult to foresee. Then why was it so easy to ignore, to disregard? Gentrification as a result of the world heritage production – was it perhaps the whole point?

World heritage creates new borders between frontstage and backstage, which in turn fortifies a social geography with a distinct functional separation between peripheral work and living zones and a central visitor's zone. Where do such fortifications lead? To reserves is one answer, for the old, authentic and beautiful, in a world where all that is solid seem to melt into air at increasing speed. And where do reserves lead? To segregated landscapes, the American geographer William Adams answers (2004). While nature reserves have become more numerous, nature at large is getting worse. While reserves may protect a small selected area, they at the same time contribute to legitimising an increased exploitation of the rest. Adams argues that "instead of environmental policies integrated in the production, what we get is a strictly segregated environment, a vast everyday monocultural landscape, with small pockets of preserved natural pearls here and there. (DN Oct 4, 2004). The argument can be stretched also to the cultural domain: if the world heritages are the preserved cultural pearls, what is the rest? What exactly is it that all the designated reserves produce? That there is a close connection between an accelerating environmental deterioration and the production of nature reserves is beyond doubt. How is the accelerating looting of the world's cultural resources connected to the increasing production of cultural reserves?

Global expert systems

Already in 1968 the radical environmentalist David Brower declared that "man needs an Earth National Park, to protect on this planet what he has not destroyed and what need not be destroyed" (Gillis 2004:167). What if we nominated planet Earth as a whole as World Heritage? This brings us to selection. The question we need to ask is of course what is selected as world heritage. But as selection requires selectors, we need also to ask who selects the selectors. World heritage production has a lot to do with the power that follows from selection precedence, formulation precedence and interpretative prerogative. So who decides who decide?

An aspect of world heritage is the rise of a new type global expertise in world heritage issues. In modern societies an increasing part of our life worlds are organized by abstract expertise systems (Giddens 1996: 79-140). To perform adequately the systems must appear as self-evident, taken for granted, and to this you need legitimate and trustworthy experts. UNESCOS World Heritage is one of those abstract systems. The necessary taken-for-grantedness is produced by the experts, which corresponds on the receivers' side to a fundamental trust in the system. In the case of world heritage

trust is not as much dependent on the concrete sites, as on how they are presented and represented, since the “outstanding universal values” are not inherent in the sites from start, but added during the nomination process.

Here Visby is a good example of a general trend: the production of a heritage town tends to move decisive influence over the towns pasts and present, its narratives and images, from public and political arenas to closed arenas controlled by officials and experts. What makes this shift possible is the depoliticisation of heritage that follows from the strong emphasis on history, preservation and aesthetics. Thereby important issues, such as use, function, form, symbolic representation, as also local and regional identities, can be left to architects, antiquarians and other official experts.

Finale

A prominent feature of the narratives about World heritage in Visby is the strength of the underlying agreements. The objectives were taken for granted. No discussion was considered necessary. Official political bodies could be ignored, to be consulted only afterwards. The result is a noticeable absence of debate and political battle. Urban renewal is a heated issue almost everywhere these days, but not in Visby. All decisions from start to finish were initiated and implemented by a small group of prominent persons in the local heritage sector, in a spirit of consensus and accord.

Also today a notable feature of the world heritage in Visby is its taken-for-grantedness, in combination with a certain collective pride, expressed in media, tourist brochures and in everyday interaction with the many visitors. That Visby is a world heritage is self-evident and unquestionable. No counter position is available, which makes the world heritage status a powerful discursive tool used in debates over urban development, for or against building permits, new housing projects, certain restoration techniques, colors, shapes etc (cf Eriksen 201X). Interestingly, a few years ago the owner of the towns leading business, with its headquarters in the central part of the old town, initiated an investigation of the attitudes towards world heritage among property owners. As one among very few that from start tried to speak openly against the nomination of Visby, he argued that since all democratic procedures were sidestepped during the nomination process, it should be possible to vote the town out of the heritage list, could he only raise enough support from Visby’s property owners. He contacted our university and two ethnology students took on the assignment. After interviewing the property owners they found that, yes, all owners had experienced various kinds of problems in their contacts with the local heritage administration, and yes, a majority of these could from an outsider’s point of view easily be connected to the world heritage status, but no, not a single one of the owners made that connection.

In practice, the world heritage status is of little practical importance in local everyday life. World

heritage is something abstract, a new narrative, trade mark, and also a new a source of local pride. It is a prize, a gold medal, to be displayed on some wall perhaps, but most people do not actively connect it to the changes during the last decades. So, to conclude, world heritage production in Visby have had a number of far-reaching consequences in the eye of the researching ethnologist, but not necessarily so in the eyes of other town dwellers. World heritage towns are complex phenomena, difficult to administer, promote, preserve, develop – and to understand. It may be difficult to achieve the status as a world heritage town, but that is just a small breeze compared to what follows. What is to be done? Who shall do it? How? When? Why? Who is to decide? And where do we get the money? Groping in the dark is what charachterises a large part of the local handling, at least in Visby. The world heritage as such may be obvious and self-evident, but the rest are questions yet to be answered.

Litteratur

Adams, W. M. (2004). *Against extinction: the story of conservation*. London: Earthscan Publications

Arnstberg, Karl-Olov 2004: Städer planerade för separering. *Axess*, nr 1

Ashworth, Gregory J. 2007: How do tourists consume heritage places? Examining the assumptions. www.dsems.unile.it/upload../dl/108.doc (nedladdad 20130719)

Ashworth, Gregory J. 2009: Can you sell your heritage to tourists? You can but don't count on it. Paper read at the conference, "Verdensarven i Norge – ressurser fra fortiden – verdier for framtiden" Bergen, 8.–9. juni 2009.

Bendix, Regina 2000: Heredity, hybridity and heritage. From one Fin de Siècle to the next. In *Folklore, Heritage Politics and Ethnic Diversity. A Festschrift for Barbro Klein*. Eds. Pertti J. Antonen in collaboration with Anna-Leena Siikala, Stein R. Mathisen and Leif Magnusson. Botkyrka, Sweden: Multicultural Centre. Pp 37-56

Benjamin, Walter (1939): *On the concept of history*. Full-text digital edition accessed 17/3 2011 at http://www.sfu.ca/~andrewf/CONCEPT2.html

Dagens Nyheter 4 okt 2004, 28 juli 2013

Díaz-Andreu, Margarita & Amílcar Vargas & Manuel Bea 2013: From Scrawls to World Heritage: assessing the impact of the inclusion of the Rock Art of the Mediterranean Basin on the Iberian Peninsula on the World Heritage List. Paper read at the conference "Between dream and reality: Debating the impact of World Heritage Listing." University of Oslo, 14-15 November 2013.

Douglas, Mary 1991: *Purity and danger: an analysis of the concepts of pollution and taboo*. London: Routledge

Eriksen, Anne 2009: Kulturarv och kulturarvinger. *Nytt norsk tidsskrift*, Volum 26, s. 474-480

Evans, Graeme 2002: Living in a World Heritage City: stakeholders in the dialectic of the universal and particular. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 2002, pp. 117-135

Friedman, Jonathan 1994: Modernitetens implosion. Den förrädiska samtiden. I: Oscar Hemer (red.) *Kulturen i den globala byn*. Lund: Aegis.

Forsemalm, Joakim 2003: Vems är staden? *Kulturella Perspektiv* 4, ss 40-46.

Giddens, Anthony 1996: *Modernitetens följder*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Gillis, John 2004: *Islands of the mind: how the human imagination created the Atlantic world*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Grundberg, Jonas 2000: *Kulturarvsförvaltningens samhällsuppdrag. En introduktion till kulturarvsförvaltningens teori och praktik*. Institutionen för Arkeologi, Göteborgs Universitet

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara 1998: *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums, and Heritage*. University of California Press

Nikolić, Dragan 2012 *Tre städer, två broar och ett museum: minne, politik och världsarv i Bosnien och Hercegovina*. Diss. Lund: Lunds universitet

Ristilammi, Per-Markku 1994: *Rosengård och den svarta poesin. En studie i modern annorlundahet*. Stockholm/Stehag: Symposium

Ronström, Owe 2004: Oh! Island in the sun": Telling the Gotlandic story. *Journal of Indian Folkloristics*. Vol V no 1/ 2 jan-dec 2003.

Ronström, Owe 2008: *Kulturarvspolitik. Visby. Från sliten småstad till medeltidsikon*. Stockholm: Carlssons

Ronström, Owe forthcoming: *Festivals and festivalisations*. Paris.
Turtinen, Jan 2006: *Världsarvets villkor. Intressen, förhandlingar och bruk i internationell politik*. (Diss.) Stockholms Universitet. Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis, Stockholm Studies in Ethnology I
Walter, Emilie 2006: Trädfällningar i Nordergravar. Uppsats för grundkurs (AB) i etnologi, vårterminen 2006. Högskolan på Gotland
Österberg, Dag 1998: *Arkitektur och sosiologi*. Oslo: Pax förlag.