

TR

Terrorscapes

—  
May 2017  
Insights Issue

—  
The Difficult Heritage  
of Non-Sites of Memory  
—

A C E

Lieux Défigurés

Bad Place

de Mémoire

S

Voids

Traumascapes

Memorylands

The third issue of TRACES Journal presents a compelling reflection about “Non-Sites of Memory” with an essay by anthropologist Roma Sendyka focusing on the controversial memories of genocide. More specifically, it analyses the sites of mass murders in Eastern Europe which in spite of their peaceful and uncontaminated appearance conceal suffering and contested histories.

TRACES#03 – Articles collected through open call for papers and selected with peer review are available at [www.traces.polimi.it/journal](http://www.traces.polimi.it/journal)



While the infamous concentration and extermination camps have been progressively turned into sites of commemoration, these places still remain unknown. Despite the fact that official commemoration and academic research are slowly making progress, some early art projects had already explored and questioned these places like in the case of French director Claude Lanzmann. During an interview about the work he had done in the 1970s on the abandoned sites of mass murders and death camps in Poland, Lanzmann used the word “nothingness” to describe the void in which nothing remains because there is nothing to see. However, under this “nothingness”, under these apparently placid and natural woods and clearings, there are still traces. During the 1980s, a particular branch of archaeology—later defined *conflict archaeology* or *archaeology of the contemporary past*—began to investigate these places of violence, initiating a deep reflection about the possibilities offered by new digging techniques.

# { foreword }

Elena Pirazzoli, PhD in History of Art, independent researcher in Memorial Studies and Visual Studies, collaborates with historical institutes and foundations among which Villa Emma Foundation, Modena and Monte Sole Peace School, Bologna.

Nevertheless, the question then arises as to why excavate to reveal these traces? And there are numerous reasons such as preventing looting, proving evidence to negationists, contributing to historical researches... Above all, this process becomes particularly relevant for the relatives of the victims who are given a place for private and public mourning and commemoration.

After more than seventy years since these dramatic events occurred, the reflection on these places could constitute an alternative for memory practices. The recent movie *Austerlitz*, directed by Sergei Loznitsa (2016), illustrates the risks of tourism consumption associated to places of memory, as demonstrated by the often superficial experience recorded by the people visiting the numerous concentration camps that have been transformed into memorials and museums. Loznitsa shows people walking, chatting, shooting photographs, selfies or videos, and yet in their eyes one may register that “there is nothing to see”.

The “hypervision” of our epoch paired with the narrative of the Holocaust gives us the erroneous presumption that we already know and understand it, as visiting sites of memory stripped of the political rituals of the past seems to be reduced to the mere communication of information. On the contrary, experiencing non-sites of memory could contribute to rethinking and reshaping the notion of these sites.

— Elena Pirazzoli

# The Difficult Heritage of Non-Sites of Memory. Contested Places, Contaminated Landscapes

by Roma Sendyka

## REMEMBERING KILLING SITES

In June 2014, Austrian writer Martin Pollack published the ground-breaking reportage *Kontaminierte Landschaften: Unruhe Bewahren*. In a meticulous, almost surgical and yet poetic meditation, he described the landscapes of Poland, Ukraine, Austria and Slovenia as peaceful settings, where familiar woods and meadows cover unreconciled suffering. “Contaminated landscapes”, as he called them, were locations of “mass murders, made but in secret, away from witnesses, oftentimes in the strictest confidence” (Pollack 2014, 20). The victims were “buried somewhere in the fields, nameless graves were levelled to the ground and made alike the surroundings so no one would find them. So they would melt into the landscape. In Babi Yar and in Katyn there are monuments commemorating those events. But in many other locations there is nothing, no monuments, no plaque, no cross” (Pollack 2014, 24). Pollack’s text reminds of other numerous abandoned sites of past violence in Eastern Europe. The recent “memory boom” has reshaped and offered a new perspective on genocide studies. In recent years, the Holocaust has ceased to be represented solely by the iconic figure of a death camp. There are increasingly more attempts to recognise the non-modern, almost primitive in

its primordial cruelty, “unseen Holocaust” of scattered executions and torments, and pay closer attention to dispersed “shattered spaces” (Meng 2011) that conflict between “high density” and “affecting” “**terrorscapes**” (van der Laarse 2013. Also see Versus 2014, 5), or “deeply psychologically invested” “**traumascape**” (Tumarkin 2005).

In Eastern Europe the topography of terror can be described through distinct numbers. Estimations from 2015 state that, “of the 5.6-5.8 million murdered Jews, approximately 2-2.2 million died in mass executions, 2.5 million in extermination camps, and approximately one million, due to other circumstances, in ghettos, other death camps or during death marches. The Germans and their Axis allies shot between 1.3-1.5 million non-Jews: partisans, Roma, specific groups of Soviet POWs, the mentally handicapped, Bosnian Serbs, and others. Among them, probably more than 100,000 non-Jewish civilians were shot within or nearby camps or prisons” and 100,000 Poles in Western Ukraine by Ukrainian Insurgent Army. [...] “All in all, one can estimate that at least 3.5 million men, women and children were shot under Axis rule. [...] It seems reasonable to give an estimate of *between 5,000 and 10,000 killing sites in these countries* [Poland, Former Soviet Union – R.S.] *and several hundred in other parts of Europe*” [emphasis added – R.S.] (Pohl 2015, 37). In his book *Bloodlands* (2011), Timothy Snyder writes that the area in Europe between Berlin and Moscow, Riga and Odessa witnessed 14 million deaths in a period of little more than a decade between the years 1933 and 1945; thus the scale of the unprecedented contamination of the Eastern landscape with death and violence becomes indisputable.

Therefore, one might ask what would be the consequences for our thinking on the past of the region if we realize that “more Eastern Europeans died on dispersed killing sites throughout this region than in the isolated concentration camps within it”? Many were “shot over ditches and pits” and “most of [them] died near where they had lived” (Snyder 2010, viii) and if — as Pollack puts it — people here still “live near, or in some cases, literally on graves” (Pollack 2014, 27), which are the social and cultural consequences of this widespread phenomenon on the region?

At first, the dramatic tone of Pollack’s question seems difficult to comprehend. Europe is filled with graves and graveyards, especially after World War I. The outrage that one might hear in Pollack’s writings concerns some of the most obscure aspects of the Eastern “bloodlands” phenomenon, i.e., a specific category among those 10,000 locations mentioned by Dieter Pohl, the sites that remain un-cared of, unmemorialised and abandoned. According to the diagnosis of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance, “the

places where these shootings occurred, most of them located in Eastern Europe, were neglected for decades. While official commemoration ceremonies, public remembrance and scholarly work have often focused on extermination camps, concentration camps, death marches and ghettos, only a few included 'Killing Sites' at the center of public attention" (IHRA 2015). Thus, Eastern Europe is, according to current research, dotted with dispersed, not commemorated, post-conflict sites containing human remains. The scale of the phenomenon must be considered since Europe has been recently defined as an aggregation of "memorylands" where landscapes are "filled up with products of collective memory work—heritage sites, memorials, museums, plaques and art installations designed to remind us of histories that might otherwise be lost" (Macdonald 2013, 1). Hence, why are so many sites, which are potentially meaningful based on their relevance for the European identity, excluded from "memory works", "visits", "quests to save", "volunteer-run heritage projects" (*ibidem*)? Why is Europe "obsessed with disappearance of collective memory and preservation"?

## **I consider these contested, left-out sites as diagnostic objects, raising fundamental issues regarding regional memory cultures in Eastern Europe.**

Why are so many sites, which are potentially meaningful based on their relevance for the European identity, excluded from common "memory works", "visits", "quests to save", "volunteer-run heritage projects"?

I would like to consider these contested, left-out sites as diagnostic objects, burdened with meaning since they raise fundamental issues regarding regional memory cultures in Eastern Europe and may be read as symptomatic for societal and cultural practices related to contested topographical objects. What does removing so many terror sites from the collective imagination tell us about Eastern Europe? Which social, cultural, sentimental or psychological effects does this practice have on communities living in these sites? How to discuss European memory cultures when including left-out, uncommemorated killing sites into European "memorylands"?

Moreover, what are the reasons of neglecting the past of contested sites? Are they religious, racial, economical, psychological or practical? Which are the contemporary practices of interacting with such abandoned sites? Perhaps, since they cannot be physically removed, they remain within a space of a given community and are in some ways used, managed, manipulated or

processed. Can local communities invest the sites with meaning? Eventually, what allows for reconciliation practices? What is necessary for a change of status? In other words, what allows for the inclusion of a site into memorial practices? What will anchor the site into the identity processes of a given group? In his book Martin Pollack asks, “What does it makes with us—the grave we face every day? The grave we live by, and we do not want to see?” (Pollack 2014, 27)

### RECOGNISING CLANDESTINE SITES

“*Es ist schwer zu erkennen, aber es war hier*” [“It is difficult to recognise, but it was here.” *Shoah*, Chapter 4, 00:07:05], says Szymon Srebrnik in the opening scenes from Claude Lanzmann’s *Shoah*, after guiding the filmmakers through the forest to reach an empty clearing in the woods covering today the site of a former death camp in Kulmhof. Lanzmann was the first to show us abandoned traumascapes: glades in forests, thickets, bushes, alone standing groups of trees... These places convey something disturbing that sets them apart. Uncanny feelings are not evoked through symbols, signs, plaques, tombstones and ruins. Nature covers the past transforming the scene while visitors do not see traces of violence unless they are properly guided. The perpetrators’ art of masking crimes seems to be carried on by other subjects: human beings who, by leaving the site uncultivated, hide its past coupled with the greenery that becomes an involuntary ally of the perpetrators.

The search for the difficult heritage of abandoned sites of trauma (Macdonald 2008) increased after the 1989 political transformations in Eastern Europe.

**Since they cannot be physically removed, they remain within a space of a given community and are in some ways used, managed, manipulated or processed.**



**Matków, Hrubieszów County, Lublin Voivodeship, eastern Poland.  
Site of a mass grave of 49 victims depicted prior to a commemoration  
by Rabbinical Commission for Cemeteries in November 2013.  
Courtesy of Rabbinical Commission for Cemeteries.**



**Pomiechówek Fort III penal-inquisitorial prison, Mazovia county, Poland.  
Photo by Roma Sendyka, 2016.**





**Radecznicza Killing site, Zamosc County,  
Lublin Voivodeship, eastern Poland.  
Photo by Roma Sendyka, 2016.**



**Laskarzew, Garwolin County,  
Masovian Voivodeship on Promnik river.  
Unmarked grave of two Jewish victims, 2016.  
Courtesy of Rabbinical Commission for Cemeteries**



What are the reasons of neglecting the past of contested sites? What allows for the inclusion of a site into memorial practices? What will anchor the site into the identity processes of a given group?

The breakthrough was stimulated by Patrick Desbois's 2007 publication, *Porteur de mémoires: sur les traces de la Shoah par balles*. Today the research is carried out by public historians, local activists, organisations such as Father Desbois' Foundation *Yahad - In Unum* (Together in Love) in Paris, the Rabbinical Commission for Jewish Cemeteries in Poland based in Warsaw, the *Zapomniane* (The Forgotten) and the *Pamięć, która trwa* (Memory that Lasts) Foundations, researchers from the *Yad Vashem* (The Untold Stories) Program for Ukraine, etc. However, if we only consider the estimated number of discussed sites and the fact that most eye-witnesses have already passed away, there are still little chances to discover where most abandoned graves are located.

How to discuss European memory cultures when including left-out, uncommemorated killing sites into European "memorylands"?

There are numerous reasons why these sites remain unknown. First, they are difficult to locate since there are no signs that help identify the victims and their stories. Visitors who are aware of these sites related to genocide often report a sense of absence, abandonment or emptiness. This is how Lanzmann described the places he filmed in Poland in the 1970s in an interview to the *Cahiers du Cinéma*, "There was nothing at all, sheer nothingness, and I had to make a film on the basis of this nothingness" (Liebman 2007, 39).

What makes these sites essential? Essential for understanding the memory cultures of Eastern Europe, but also other post-conflict regions?

Before researchers started investigating these sites, photographers had already recorded many of them in photo series such as *Deathly Still: Pictures of Former Concentration Camps* by Dirk Reinartz (1994), Michael Levin's *War Story* (1995), Alan Cohen's series *On European Ground* (2001), Susan Silas' *Helmbrechts Walk* (1993–2003), Sandra Vitaljić's *Infertile Grounds* (2009), Andrzej Kramarz's *A Piece of Land*, 2008–2009, Indre Šerpytyte's *1944–1991* and *Forest Brothers* (2011), Jason Francisco's *Alive and Destroyed* (2011–2013), Roz Mortimer's *Reduced to Silence* (2012), Elżbieta Janicka's and Wojciech Wilczyk's *Other City* (2013) and Ansgar Gilster's *Dead Corners* (work in progress). In these images one might see the "afterlife" of uncommemorated sites where a negative poetry of "nothingness" usually prevails. Typically, photographs of contested sites are devoid of any human presence. When faced with abandoned sites of trauma, the surrender of human cognitive faculties may be represented in different ways such as in *Everything is Illuminated*, a novel by Jonathan Safran Foer about the search of the eradicated town of Trachenbrod (Trachimbrod) in Poland, where over 5,000 Jews were massacred. Augustine, the woman who actually saved the author's grandfather's life during the Nazi liquidation of Trachimbrod, however warns him that, "There is nothing to see. It is only a field. I could exhibit you any field and it would be the same as exhibiting you Trachimbrod" (Foer 2002, 155). When they finally reach the

place, the guide comments, “this is all that you could see. It is always like this, always dark” (ivi, 184). Clearly, in order to recognise an abandoned site one needs an insider, a local “translator” able to decipher the almost indiscernible natural markers; a guide for the blinded newcomer.

**These sites convey something disturbing that sets them apart. They are imbued by a sense of nothingness. They share the fundamental quality of invisibility, transparency, in the sense that they do not hold the gaze of the passerby.**

#### DEFINING NON-SITES OF MEMORY

Lanzmann—as I previously mentioned—was probably the first to point to abandoned genocidal sites in Eastern Europe. In the 1970s he recorded former concentration camps that today have been mostly turned into memorial sites. His endeavour may be considered as the first effort to raise awareness about the controversial nature of traumatic sites which encompass both feelings of inclusion and exclusion in the collective imagination. He was also the first to try to coin a term that would best describe these sites. He named the quiet bends in the rivers, the clearings and the mounds he was shooting, *les lieux défigurés* (the disfigured sites), located simultaneously in the “here and now” as well as in the “there and then” (Lanzmann 1990, 29). Lanzmann also termed such spaces *les non-lieux de la mémoire* (non-sites of memory) (Lanzmann 1986). According to Dominic LaCapra (LaCapra 1997, 240), the definition—used in the title of a 1986 interview—relates to the attempt to contradict Pierre Nora’s concept of “sites of memory”. Indeed, abandoned, unmarked sites of destruction are not used by local communities or other groups as a memory anchor. These sites are actually the very opposite of the ones presented in the seminal volumes *Les Lieux de Mémoire* published from 1984 to 1992 (*Realms of Memory*, 1996–1998) and therefore constitute both a challenge and a critique of Pierre Nora’s work.

Several other interpretations have been proposed regarding topographical objects imbued with a negative character. Dolores Hayden in *The Power*

Why and how do we conceive them as sites despite everything, granting “there is nothing left”?

# Why are these sites despite everything, the sites par excellence, the essential sites?

(Didi-Huberman 2007, 115)



**1984 Les Lieux de Mémoire**

Pierre Nora

**1986 Le Non-Lieux de la Mémoire**

Claude Lanzmann

**1990 Les Lieux Défigurés**

Claude Lanzmann

**1995 Lieux Malgré Tout**

Georges Didi-Huberman

**1997 Bad Place**

Dolores Hayden

**1997-2003 Voids**

Andres Huyssen and Daniel Libeskind

**1999 Phantomsites**

Aleida Assmann

**2005 Traumascapas**

Maria Tumarkin

**2008 Difficult Heritage**

Sharon Macdonald

**2013 Memorylands**

Sharon Macdonald

**2013 Terrorscapes**

Rob Van der Laarse

**2014 Contaminated Landscapes**

Martin Pollack

of *Place: Urban Landscapes As Public History* (1997) chose a simple, vernacular notion of “bad place”. She wrote, “speaking critically of bad places is more effective than missing them as places” (1997, 18). Recently, Polish historian Magdalena Saryusz-Wolska accurately pointed out that German *Nicht-Ort* can be replaced by *Un-Ort*. The term describes the affective aspect of a trauma

place, i.e., the fact of being unpleasant, dangerous and annoying. However, the word *Un-Ort* turns out to be useless when one realises that its Greek equivalent *a-topos* is a founding structure of the word *utopia* (Saryusz-Wolska, 2011). Andres Huyssen (1997) and Daniel Liebeskind (2003) described some locations that share the qualities of abandoned trauma sites as “voids” since the word accentuates the loss connected to those locations. An interesting proposal can be

Roma Sendyka, Director of the Research Center for Memory Cultures, teaches at the Center for Anthropology of Literature and Cultural Studies at the Polish Studies Department, Jagiellonian University, Krakow. She is founder of the Curatorial Collective, specializes in criticism and theory, visual culture studies and memory studies. Her research focuses on relations between images sites and memory. She is currently working on a project on non-sites of memory in Central and Eastern Europe.

found in the work of Aleida Assmann who wrote in *Erinnerungsräume: Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses* (1999, 21) that, in case of a radical blockage of communication between past and presence, the *Geisterorte* or “phantomsites” can be developed while becoming an “arena for a free play of that what is imagined and that what has been repressed.”

I would rather recognise Lanzmann’s term as being the founding (and strongest) concept and the most capable of questioning the theories by Pierre Nora. I would also refuse the negative understanding of Lanzmann’s *non-lieu de mémoire* and propose to return to these specific places “in spite of everything”. Georges Didi-Huberman in his essay *Lieux Malgré Tout* from the *Phasmes* collection (1995) proposed to replace Lanzmann’s negative term *non-lieu* with the positive definition “the site despite everything” whereas, “there is no longer anything there to see” (Didi-Huberman 2007, 114). Subsequently, he posed the question that I believe successfully manages to focus on the main issue concerning these sites and allows for further inquiry, “why are these sites of destruction the sites despite everything, *the sites par excellence, the essential sites?*” (Didi-Huberman 2007, 115)

What makes these sites essential? Essential for understanding the memory cultures of Eastern Europe but also other post-conflict regions? Why

**They embody a peculiar mixture of repressed memories; things that we know about but do not want to discuss or have no words to describe.**

and how do we conceive them as sites *despite everything*, granting “there is nothing left”? What exactly distinguishes them from the topographical background since they only initially appear to blend in with the surrounding landscape? There must be a certain way of distancing, there must be a marker. In Claude Lanzmann’s *Shoah*, Srebrnik is able to point out his execution site because it stands out from the rest of the forest. I would claim that, “non-sites of memory” are not permanently forgotten, as Lanzmann asserts. These sites constitute an active presence in the life of the surrounding communities as they become part of social processes. However, most of them could be considered as negative elements since these sites are passed by, unnamed, unmarked, not built upon, unsown as if they were taboo sites, remembered through negation rather than positive features. They are often littered or vandalised. The distorted, “disfigured” and performatively articulated type of memory that persists in these sites cannot be easily equaled with concepts of “communicative” or “cultural” memory since they embody a peculiar mixture of repressed memories and knowledges; things that we know about but do not want to discuss or have no words to describe.

I have in mind several different types of non-sites of memory that are the result of numerous historical catastrophes, other than the Shoah. These are mostly sites that were disposals of human corpses—known as “mass graves” or “killing sites”, which were often also the scene of torture and executions (like the terrains of former labour camps, concentration camps, and death camps)—that have not been memorialised by being transformed into museums or monuments or that have “not been memorialised enough”. These sites may be part of a city landscape or be located in the countryside; they may be small or extensive; they may stand out from the surrounding landscape as a break in its familiar texture or blend into the landscape. Nonetheless, they share a certain affective aura that is difficult to rationalise. Something in these spaces is perceptibly “strange”. In order to develop a definition of these places, I would like to enlist a series of features they all have in common. Firstly, they cause a certain discomfort among the surrounding communities for whom commemorating them represents a greater threat to their collective identity rather than neglecting to memorialise them, in spite of the risk of provoking severe criticism. Secondly, the populations that are topographically ascribed to them do not need (or do not want) to engage their memory with them. The local communities seem to aim at forgetting these “disfigured”, uncanny and unsettling sites, as if they would like to negate their ontology (hence: *non-lieux*). They also evidently do not wish to remember them (hence: *non-mémoire*). So the Lanzmann’s definition in which the negative particle precedes Nora’s term (*les non-lieux de la mémoire*) should be in fact understood as *les non-lieux de la non-mémoire*. Both the topography and memory are defective in these locations. I strongly believe that the reasons underlying the reluctance to remember the past associated to these sites are definitely worth further investigating in order to better understand one of the most ambiguous practices associated to European memorylands.

# The “non-sites of memory” are not permanently forgotten.

## Bibliographical References

- Assmann, Aleida. 1999. *Erinnerungsräume: Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses*. Munich: C.H. Beck.
- Desbois, Patrick. 2007. *Porteur de mémoires: sur les traces de la Shoah par balles*. Paris: Michel Lafon.
- Desbois, Patrick. 2009. *The Holocaust by Bullets: A Priest's Journey to Uncover the Truth behind the Murder of 1.5 Million Jews*. Transl. by Catherine Spencer. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Didi-Huberman, George. 1995. *Phasmes. Essais sur l'apparition*. Paris: Minuit.
- Didi-Huberman, George. 2007. "The Site, Despite Everything." In *Claude Lanzmann's Shoah. Key Essays*, edited by Stuart Liebman, 113–23. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Foer, Jonathan Safran. 2002. *Everything Is Illuminated*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Hayden Dolores. 1997. *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes As Public History*. Boston: MIT Press.
- Huysen, Andreas. 1997. "The Voids of Berlin." *Critical Inquiry* 24, 1: 57–81.
- IHRA. 2015. *Killing Sites. Research and Remembrance*. Berlin: Metropol Verlag. [Accessed March 28, 2017] [www.holocaustremembrance.com/focus/killing-sites](http://www.holocaustremembrance.com/focus/killing-sites).
- Laarse, van der, Rob. 2013. "Beyond Auschwitz. Europe's Terrorspaces in the Age of Postmemory." In *Memory and Postwar Memorials. Confronting the Violence of the Past*, edited by Marc Silberman and Florence Vatan, 71–92. New York: Pagrave Macmillan.
- LaCapra, Dominick. 1997. "Lanzmann's «Shoah»: Here There Is No Why." *Critical Inquiry*, 2: 231–69.
- Lanzmann, Claude. 1990. "Les non-lieux de la mémoire." In *Au sujet de Shoah: le film de Claude Lanzmann*, edited by Michel Deguy, 280–92. Paris: Belin.
- Lanzmann, Claude and François Gantheret. 1986. "L'Entretien de Claude Lanzmann, Les non-lieux de mémoire." *Nouvelle Revue de Psychanalyse* 33: 293–305.
- Liebeskind, Daniel. 2003. "Trauma." In *Image and Remembrance: Representation and the Holocaust*, edited by Shelley Hornstein and Florence Jacobowitz, 43–58. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Liebman, Stuart. 2007. *Claude Lanzmann's Shoah: Key Essays*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Macdonald, Sharon. 2008. *Difficult Heritage: Negotiating the Nazi Past in Nuremberg and Beyond*. London: Routledge.
- Macdonald, Sharon. 2013. *Memorylands: Heritage and Identity in Europe Today*. New York: Routledge.
- Meng, Michael. 2011. *Shattered Spaces Encountering Jewish Ruins in Postwar Germany and Poland*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Nora, Pierre (ed.). 1984–1992. *Les Lieux de Mémoire*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Pohl, Deter. 2015. "Historiography and Nazi Killing Sites." In *Killing Sites: Research and Remembrance*, op. cit.
- Pollack, Martin. 2014. *Kontaminierte Landschaften: Unruhe bewahren*. St. Pölten: Residenz Verlag, 2014.
- Saryusz-Wolska, Magdalena. 2011. *Spotkania czasu z miejscem. Studia o pamięci i miastach*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Snyder, Timothy. 2010. *Bloodlands: Europe between Hitler and Stalin*. New York: Basic Books.
- Taylor, Charles. 2003. *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Durham: Duke University Press Books.
- Tumarkin, Maria. 2005. *Traumascaples: The Power and Fate of Places Transformed by Tragedy*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Publishing.
- Versus. 2014. *Versus: Quaderni di studi semiotici* 119. Milan: Bompiani.

TRACES is an independent quarterly peer-reviewed, non-profit journal that brings together original contributions to explore emerging issues in the field of heritage and museum studies.

Selected research papers published in a sixteen-page, custom-designed, off-set print, limited edition. Each issue investigates a specific topic from different perspectives focusing on practices, innovative approaches and experimental research actions.

Three issues per year: 'Snapshots', with graphic-based contributions raising questions and investigating practices; 'Dialogues', in which the topic unfolds through a semi-structured interview; and 'Insights', that expands the field of inquiry by means of theoretical and empirical critical thoughts.

#### Editor-in-Chief and Scientific Responsible

Prof. Luca Basso Peressut  
Department of Architecture and Urban Studies  
Politecnico di Milano

#### Associate Editor

Francesca Lanz

#### Editorial Board

Tal Adler, Julie Dawson, Marion Hamm,  
John Harries, Martin Krenn, Erica Lehrer,  
Sharon Macdonald, Suzana Milevska, Aisling  
O'Beirn, Alenka Pirman, Regina Römhild, Arnd  
Schneider, Karin Schneider, Klaus Schönberger,  
Roma Sendyka

#### Editorial Staff

Michela Bassanelli  
Cristina F. Colombo  
Alessandra Galasso (editing)

#### Graphic Design

Zetalab – Milano

#### Contacts

Piazza Leonardo da Vinci 26  
20133 Milano – Italy  
[www.traces.polimi.it](http://www.traces.polimi.it)  
[infoTRACES@polimi.it](mailto:infoTRACES@polimi.it)



TRACES Journal ensues from the research project  
*Transmitting Contentious Cultural Heritages with the Arts.*  
*From Intervention to Co-Production*, which has received  
funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research  
and Innovation Programme under grant agreement No. 693857.

For further information please visit [www.tracesproject.eu](http://www.tracesproject.eu)

The views expressed here are the sole responsibility  
of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the  
European Union.

ISSN 2531-4858



9

772531485809

Lieux Malgré Tout

Lieux

Non-Lieux de la Mémoire

Phantomsites

Contaminated Landscapes

