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On the 29th of March 2017 we organised a Heritage & Brexit workshop to start a wider conversation between heritage policy-makers and academics, informed by current research and by knowledge of the policy landscape, with the goal of formulating an agenda for a programme of research on the heritage policy implications of Brexit. This report draws on the three debates we had that day. We very gratefully thank the participants for their ideas and contributions, and in particular the speakers who prepared excellent provocations, with a special mention for our two guests from afar, Višnja Kisić from Belgrade, Serbia and Torgrim Sneve Guttormsen from Oslo, Norway. A full list of participants can be found at the end of this report, page 21.

Finally, we would like to note that this event took place on the day the Prime Minister signed Article 50, and before the General election (June 08, 2017), and therefore the report does not take any recent changes in strategy or politics into account.
Introduction

In the aftermath of the referendum decision to leave the European Union, there has been a maelstrom of commentary on the implications for the United Kingdom of this momentous decision, with major foci of debate on the economic implications and the cultural and political issues embedded within issues of freedom of movement and migration. Perhaps not surprisingly, the implications for heritage policy and management don’t leap out within commentaries on Brexit. Nevertheless, like most policy sectors there are significant short and medium term implications as the UK seeks to disentangle itself from European law and regulation. Furthermore, the vote highlights deeper cultural schisms within the UK that link, in part, to ideas of heritage and have implications for what heritage ‘is’ and what it does, in a post-Brexit country.

In this report we summarise and reflect on the various debates held during the ESRC IAA funded 1 Heritage & Brexit Workshop on the 29th of March. Our aim was to start a wider conversation between heritage policy-makers and academics, informed by current research and by knowledge of the policy landscape, with the goal of formulating an agenda for a programme of research on the heritage policy implications of Brexit. In total 26 participants (15 m /11 f) joined us on the Newcastle London campus, 8 practitioner/ policy-makers and 18 academics including 5 early career researchers. UK based academics came from eight different universities, while practitioners included representation of the main heritage bodies in England such as Historic England, The Heritage Alliance, Heritage Lottery Fund and the Institute of Historic Building Conservation, as well as the Scottish heritage agency Historic Environment Scotland. We also had guest speakers from Norway and Serbia, two non-EU European countries, who both work in positions combining practice and academia.

The event, which ran between 12.30 and 18.00, took an interactive approach. After a short introduction we started with the first session on the implications of Brexit for heritage policy and practice, starting with 4 short 3-minute statements, followed by a group debate. A similar setup was followed for the next session, a discussion on the long term cultural implications of Brexit for heritage. A third session was connecting and reflecting on the previous sessions, followed by an agenda setting exercise. The event was closed by network-drinks.

With this report we aimed to capture the main points made in the debates, and set out an initial agenda, based on the suggestions in the third session. This is a summary, not necessarily capturing our own views or of any one individual.

1 http://www.ncl.ac.uk/hss/impact/iaa; http://www.esrc.ac.uk/funding/funding-opportunities/impact-acceleration-accounts/
Part 1: Heritage policy and practice

Debating the implications of Brexit for heritage policy and practice

The heritage sector is a policy arena with relatively little direct EU involvement but the consequences in terms of resources, regulation, and free movement are nevertheless likely to be considerable. The principal practical implications of Brexit are therefore first considered in terms of these three themes, as presented by and commented on by the various speakers across the heritage field. This will be followed by a set of related themes emerging from the debate.

Resources

Loss of funding is most prominent and likely has significant impact, as it is unlikely this will be replaced. With the interdisciplinary nature of the sector, it is hard to determine direct or secondary impacts of funding in many cases, and unexpected impacts might appear. The Heritage Alliance estimates an EU financial input into heritage projects or heritage focused work of at least £450 million in England between 2007 and 2016. While a recent report on EU funding for academia estimates current contributions of EU funding in strong heritage related disciplines such as archaeology and architecture and planning on respectively 38% and 21% of their current annual research budgets. The loss of (match) funding is one of the main identified issues by the concerned bodies (IHBC, HE, Heritage Alliance, HLF) as well as academics. This concerns direct funding to heritage projects and research under a wide diversity of EU programmes (e.g. CAP, ERDF, H2020), including many projects with heritage benefits but where heritage is not identified as a beneficiary, e.g. schemes towards local economy, job creation, regional development, cultural industry, agriculture and rural economy, digital technologies and smart cities and SMEs. Losing this EU pocket of money means there is a strong push for the national government to invest. As well as being important in itself, funding is often significant in forming part of a cocktail of funding providing, for example, match funding with the Heritage Lottery Fund.

Regulation

Responsibility for heritage policy rests with the member states of the European Union, although regulations concerned with environmental impact assessment (EIA Directive 2014/52/EU) are important in the management of heritage through the planning system. There are also concerns around the loss of regulations and access to information (e.g. sharing through the Internal Market Information System and Europol) around the import and export of cultural objects, potentially making the UK a centre for illicit

---

4 http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/imi-net/index_en.htm
5 https://www.europol.europa.eu/
trafficking. In particular there are concerns that, following the Great Repeal Bill, the mechanisms for deciding which laws and regulations to maintain and which to repeal will be subject to inadequate parliamentary scrutiny.\(^6\) Heritage practitioners and academics alike fear the potential loss of influence by soft power on, as well as, from EU and Council of Europe (CoE) charters. More significant at the European level than the EU in the management of cultural built heritage has been the role of the CoE, with its pan-European membership of 47 member states. The CoE has produced a series of conventions on cultural heritage issues.\(^7\) While unlikely, it is unclear at the time of writing whether the UK will seek to change its relationship with this organisation, of which the UK is one of the founding members,\(^8\) post Brexit.

**Freedom of movement**

Potential changes to freedom of movement are a third issue of concern to the heritage sector, both in terms of labour and materials. Recent figures ONS statistics suggests about 10% of the UK construction industry labour force is from outside the UK and as it stands, the UK hasn’t trained enough people to fill the skills gap EU workers across the heritage sector will leave, as there already is a skills gap, and an aging demographic in the sector.\(^9\) A change of attitude towards education and skill building is one of the issues that need attention. The lack of value put on craftsmanship and vocational education is embedded in the system. It would be potentially beneficial for heritage if Brexit would be used as an opportunity to foreground issues around skills and resources on political agendas. It is however likely the UK will be depending on a non-UK workforce. As such, another important issue is how future visa systems will be devised. Non-UK EU citizens are said to have an important role in the heritage labour market across a full range of skill levels with, at one end of the spectrum construction or seasonal workers in heritage attractions and, at the other, a heavy reliance on particular skills, such as painting conservation. Big infrastructure projects, such as HS2, are expected to create a shortage of archaeological skills. The heritage sector argues that a visa system needs to be considered in terms of skills rather than salaries; highly skilled professionals in the heritage sector are often not particularly well remunerated. It is important to highlight are also issues around the Irish border and movement between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland, which is a wider concerning issue.

**Opportunities**

Opportunities of Brexit raised by the sector all have to do with potential reform of current regulatory and value systems. The above mentioned foregrounding of crafts and skills and vocational education for example, or strengthening the lobby for rural subsidy better address heritage issues, and VAT reforms. However, the long-standing campaign of the heritage sector against anomalous VAT rules that place standard VAT rates upon

---

\(^6\) [http://www.open-britain.co.uk/great_repeal_bill_secondary_legislation](http://www.open-britain.co.uk/great_repeal_bill_secondary_legislation)


\(^8\) [https://www.gov.uk/government/world/organisations/uk-delegation-to-the-council-of-europe](https://www.gov.uk/government/world/organisations/uk-delegation-to-the-council-of-europe)

maintenance and building repair but zero rate new construction are highly unlikely to be changed, even though the argument to not change this has been the EU VAT directives, not least as there is a very long queue of sectors with special pleading on VAT reform.

Another opportunity might be what is called European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation. This was first developed in 2006, and upgraded in 2013. It is a group of countries working together on a particular topic or geographic region. As long as there are two EU countries, you can have third parties. The legal construct is like a company. It would enable stronger relationships and would allow the transfer of mobility and policy. It's not a substitute but it is certainly something that might be useful to investigate.

Emerging themes

Knowledge exchange

The UK has a history of exporting its knowledge and expertise around the world via different kinds of organisations, and Brexit might be an additional push for both the heritage and cultural sectors to increase that. A related issue might be the potential loss of influence by soft power e.g. influence on, as well as, from EU/ COE charters. Will the UK heritage experts lose the EU and potentially CoE as a platform of negotiation and promotion of their ideas? UK nationals have been invested and involved in the development of quite a few documents by the EU and CE on heritage related topics. It was feared that such perspectives and reflections on heritage could get lost in the process of disentangling legal structures, and the UK might turn its back on that even though many of the ideas came from this country. However, in other European but non-EU contexts such as the Western Balkans, actors in civil society and institutions are pushing forward these ideas. Arguably the political will is greater as those countries are on their way ‘in’ rather than ‘out’ as the UK, but the impact of civil society, third sector organisations, industry, to bend political will and create national platform for idea-development will become more crucial for the heritage sector. Participants agreed it is important to stay open to what can be learned from other situations and practices. It was also questioned if the UK (England?) needs to move away from an embedded sense of ‘we are setting the trends’ in this context.

Neoliberal discourse

The smaller state ideology, with its regime of austerity and deregulation not only provides uncertainty over long term funding, and increased competition for money. It has already led to decreased capacity due to a strong decline in conservation jobs, particularly within local authorities over the last decade. A recent report shows that over the past 10 years, the number of conservation specialists that provide advice to local authorities (including FTEs directly employed by a local authority) has fallen by 35.8% (292.4 FTE). The heritage sector needs to be very conscious of the need to collaborate and take part in the wider, European, debate on conservation and heritage. It is however hard to find the resources for such

---

10 https://portal.cor.europa.eu/egtc/Pages/welcome.aspx
11 http://ihbc.org.uk/resources_head/SelectPapers/files/8LAresources.pdf (PDF)
collaborations, when there are not even resources for all core activities. At the same time, there is an awareness that a self-sustaining heritage sector needs more alliances with other countries, organisations, institutions, and private sector, as sources of knowledge and income.

Inter-local competitiveness as well as the need to ‘win’ (e.g. funding, favours, attention, lobby, policy, being on the agenda) as a sector, is leading to a focus on economic gain. Understandings of what heritage does are often side tracked into hard statistics; heritage creates X no. of jobs, attracts Y no. of families etc. Proving that heritage overall is an economic good, and a productive and instrumental tool in urban and rural regeneration, by bringing money, jobs, companies, cultural activities, etc. is often one of the main goals in showcasing good practices of heritage-led regeneration. The underlying neo-liberal economic policies and politics are also likely promote a kind of elite heritage that follows authorised heritage discourse, as it represents the most ‘profitable’ mainstream heritage assets. This is a very exclusive discourse, many disempowered communities or areas are not reflected of those kinds of authorised heritages.

There is a role for all of us, practice, academia, and civil society alike, to make sure the movement of ideas and exchange of knowledge is continued, and potentially increases. Sharing knowledge and practices is valued and important. This also means we should have a better overview of who is doing what, what is out there, who’s thinking about what, who’s producing what and looking at where the gaps might be. Even just a basic audit / overview of who’s working in this area and on what would be helpful.

We are all experts in our own right, how to better articulate, use and combine the value that lies in that, and what does it take to bring that expertise into play? The heritage field could also take a stronger voice in the public debate about the future of heritage and how heritage is going to shape our future.

**Skill building and resource management**

Repair and maintenance of historic buildings is also significant in the wider building industry. It directly generated £9.7bn in construction sector output in 2015 (over 10% in a 90bn industry). Recent figures ONS statistics suggests about 10% of the UK construction industry labour force is from outside the UK. As it stands, the UK hasn’t trained enough people to fill the gap EU workers across the heritage sector might leave. In practical terms, this means important work in the heritage sector (e.g. traditional building skills) has not been economically attractive enough to a wide enough range of potential workers within the sector. Thus education and skill building is one of the issues that need to be considered. Also in relation to the geographically diverse nature of the historic environment, by spreading the benefits of skills, jobs, investment and engagement across the UK, in rural and urban environments. Another thing to consider is how future visa systems will be devised with the sector depending upon low and high skilled EU labour with the added complication high-skilled jobs are not always well

---

remunerated. So preferably, such systems should not be based on income as is currently the case for non-EU workers (having to earn over £35,000 to qualify for permanent residence after 5 years). Important to highlight are also issues around the Irish border and movement between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland, which is a wider concerning issue, but has been flagged up for example by archaeologists and academics. In ideological terms, it seems that this way of not addressing or dealing with the value of craftsmanship and vocational education is embedded in the system. Foregrounding these issues around skills and loss of resources on political agendas, such as the industrial strategy, would be very beneficial for heritage. Value shifts underlying that might open up scope to think about heritage in different ways.
Part 2: Long term cultural implications

Debating the long term cultural implications of Brexit for heritage

“We don’t have a clue how to define Brexit and, from there, how to go on with the long term implications…”

(Workshop participant, March 2017).

As sketched out above, Brexit is likely to have practical consequences for the heritage sector. Although these might be less significant the implications for other sectors, with more direct links to EU directives, including sectors as environmental management and spatial planning, heritage is likely to experience secondary impacts. In the second discussion we opened up a debate on how much the issues that seem to underpin Brexit are concerned with heritage in some way and whether there are some longer term shifts around, for example, national identity that will come to bear upon how we think about what heritage is and what it is for. The following themes reflect the main discussions.

Identity, belonging, cohesion

Nationalism, regionalism, identity, belonging, nostalgia, are all concepts that have relevance in the context of Brexit. One of the main themes throughout the debate was the question: Can heritage provide social cohesion, rootedness and identity, and if so what does that mean? Rather than asking how heritage can, for example, create identity or provide social cohesion, maybe we should ask under what circumstances heritage is potentially helpful for aiding particular kinds of social cohesion and how it can build collectives that are not divisive. This means we need to build a stronger empirical base that actually helps us to explain how, for whom, and under which circumstances, certain heritage ‘does’ some of these different social functions that we often claim. What links exist between visitor preferences and political beliefs and identities? How does heritage act for whom? Brexit can be used as a ‘wake-up call’, and a push to develop such an evidence base, which can equally address those who feel disenfranchised or empowered by the vote to leave.

We need explore further what identity and belonging mean in relation to those framings and vice versa, how nostalgia plays a role in the (re)framing of heritage. Rootedness and identity can be conservative, progressive, liberal, neo-liberal, and more. As such, uses of heritage are diverse, and it has and will be used by all sides of the political spectrum. By developing a shared European heritage to support a joint European identity and shared European values, the EU is also doing this, culminating next year with a European Year of Cultural Heritage. There will always be this romanticising, this nostalgia, this yearning for a better past, as forces in society use heritage in order to negotiate their own position in society.

As for practice, this led to the reflection on the use of community value in heritage assessments. One of the core values in a character appraisal is community value, and that’s the bit that we never really develop. It’s there
and in some places it's put into practice extremely well but is it ever really used to its full advantage and potential? A more critical and reflective look at these practices as a sector, is deemed needed, to gain a better understanding on why it is that some groups are not reached. Shouldn’t the approach be "tell me what is your story, and what are you interested in? What do you want to research / understand?" rather than, “this is your heritage and it is important, let me explain why.”

We also need to provide space for discussing the making of historic inequalities, social structures, framings, the positioning of different groups within society and how this came to be about, by (re)viewing the history of a particular place. While heritage often contributes to or reproduces those framings, it can also provide a platform for questioning them and simulate debate and learning. Brexit very much feeds into this debate about re-inscribing heritage, the rethinking and reframing of heritage from different political realms.

One of the specific remarks in this respect was around the fixations and omissions of the UK (English?!) ways of framing heritage. Some seem to be unusually deep, such as the obsession with elite domesticity and social stratification manifest in country houses, and romanticising 19th and 20th century labour, both industrial and agricultural, as well as a wide spread disinclination to engage in politics of regret and so on. Is the UK gradually getting through the filters of its class based society? Is it going deep enough? There still doesn’t seem to be a narrative for all the various forms of British working class life.

What does the rise of neo-colonial sentiment of Britain mean in the context of Brexit? For knowledge exchange and collaboration, for how we imagine the future of British society and its relation to the world, and what is the role for heritage in this imaginary?

Is there an emergence of a new 21st century romantic behind Brexit? If romantic ideas are based on a disenchantment with contemporary events then what kind of early 21st century romantic is behind Brexit?

European identity and belonging were also discussed. The EU and Europe are not the same, but Brexit can be seen as a divorce, and this conjures up ideas of severance, disowning and disinheritance. One of the references provided in this context was the publication 'Memory Lands' (Sharon McDonald, 2013). She argues, there is a particular way of ‘doing the past in Europe’ that can be identified across territories. Will the UK leave this European memory complex, or if it was ever really part of it? In this context, it was also questioned of the UK would become a ‘Europe maker’, a force that makes Europe from the outside because of its fundamental difference like Russia or Turkey, or a ‘Europe supporter’ like for example Norway?

In relation to the potential loss of soft power on the EU stage, the recently released calls under ODA funding through the GCRF and the Newton scheme that is available to academic institutions, provide a vehicle for exercising soft power on a global stage. We might be taking the nature and workings of soft powers for granted. There is scope for furthering understandings on this, and theorising it for heritage. New geopolitical
economic and policy changes will impact the long term position in terms of funding, partnerships, policies and so on. There are opportunities to reimagining this landscape and push forward to crowbar changes to the heritage sector that wouldn’t otherwise happen.

**Constructing new heritage figures through Brexit?**

What heritage is good for society, what are values that we would bring to the fore? Some of the main drivers for widening the scope of heritage have been diversity, social cohesion, and sharing. As such, we are persuading people that this progressive, inclusive vision is the right one, what does that do? And, perhaps paradoxically, who is excluded by that? On the other hand, if you consider yourself a liberal, and buy into the diversity discourse, Brexit can be felt as a kind of rejection of everything you stand for, as a very direct challenge of values.

While it might not have been the heritage sector that has pushed people into voting for Brexit, it is part of a general culture that is in need of reflection, reconsideration, rethinking. So, what language do we use when talking about Brexit? The language, actions, implicit values and power structures that we use and reproduce are not just describing Brexit, they are constructing Brexit. We are constructing pathways through Brexit as we talk, think and do. As such, we should also ask, what kind of heritage is Brexit itself producing? What values are being constructed at this juncture? What is reflected through the way we construct Brexit, and we construct the heritage sector?

Position heritage as democratic or inclusive is positioning people in a certain kind of way, which builds expectations and is self-fashioning as well. Take the romantic figure of the artist, it assumes a certain kind of person, a certain kind of work. Can you not be an artist if you are not a globetrotting, open-minded, diversity loving person that is just scraping by? How about a heritage manager, heritage visitor, heritage researcher? We need to think about what ideas and identities we (re)produce, and use this knowledge to avoid narrow and exclusive definitions. So, what kind of figures are we talking for heritage? Can we broaden possibilities? When looking at the heritage sector, what kind of consequences do we want our words and actions to have?

Brexit has been framed as a nationalist as well as a global perspective, an escape into the ‘real’ world, out of fortress EU, a call for wider global collaboration. These are framings as well and attributions. How do the heritage and museum sectors contribute to certain framings of the world? Did those framings make it possible for Brexit to come along?

Another question posed was: How exclusive is the diversity claim? A call for diversity might be divisive, excluding people who do not ‘buy into’ the diversity discourse. That doesn’t make thinking about how to make heritage inclusive less important, but it does stimulate rethinking the diversity agenda. What are other models of inclusion, how can we challenge the current model?

We could say heritage is doing precisely what it was built to do. Do we not just need to own up to the fact that heritage is fundamentally about
linked processes of inclusion and exclusion? How can we develop an inclusive heritage discourse that can accommodate for the exclusive, the excluded? A discourse that recognises that there are different sorts of discourses about heritage, that heritage is multi-vocal, multi-disciplinary, multi-interpretable, and that there are different ways to imagining heritage as a field.

We could use the production and constructing of Brexit as future heritage in this context. What we produce and how we frame it now will frame Brexit as an event, it will influence how it will get utilised, how it will get interpreted. Documenting and selecting voices and interpret them is crucial in this. How can this reflect the different arguments that exist within society? The single narrative is not constructive or conclusive. Mapping the distance, the confusion, the pre- and post-vote framings, the conflicts around this issue could actually help us go on and frame the whole heritage field as being more multi-vocal, more inclusive, more ambiguous than it usually is.

**What can heritage do?**

The struggle of facts versus opinions not based on facts, shows there are different approaches to reality. Some forms of direct democracy, such as a referendum, make these approaches very explicit, and how then do we deal with the production of these ‘knowledge making opinions’? Maybe we need to focus not on ‘what heritage is’ but on ‘what heritage does’? We have to reveal what are the processes and mechanisms behind heritage making that is being used by all different actors. Being able to deconstruct how heritage gets produced and how it gets used and how it gets manipulated, are very relevant in this world of ‘alternative facts’ and ‘post-truth’. Educating each other, not on what heritage is but how it functions for different political purposes, to emancipate each other, in knowing to recognise where the manipulation comes from. It decreases the conflicting potential and the manipulated potential that is there very much. That is also where the value of the expertise lies.

Brexit provides a reminder to the heritage sector that heritage provides the opportunity, (call, need) to offer different kinds of historic perspectives for the current moment and think about its own discourses and the effects this discourse has on the current positions within the bigger society. What is heritage, and what does it do, how are heritage, and the heritage professional, framed? What are the consequences?
Part 3: Setting an Agenda

The aim of this session was to set a wider research agenda that engages with Brexit and heritage, heritage’s involvement in Brexit, the heritage of Brexit, and beyond. This agenda would need further debate in the context of both the long and short issues arising from Brexit, including but not exclusively the ones mentioned above.

The sector has already started to identify the potential direct impacts in terms of resources, regulation, and freedom of movement. Those issues, and their direct and secondary impacts will need further addressing, in terms of developing understanding of the impacts, and lobbying for a good position in the new set up, to make sure the culture and heritage sectors don’t lose out even further. Most of those debates need to take place in a wider context in strong collaboration with wider sectors, e.g. foregrounding skills based education, getting a visa system that doesn’t function on salary only, renegotiating VAT in the construction sector.

Further questions / themes emerging from the debates are:

Unpicking the machinery of heritage:
- We need to unpick the way that heritage is used. E.g. further the empirical base and provide / develop tools that are fit for purpose in enabling the sector, and the general public, to think about, and deconstruct, how heritage is used and what it is used for.
- If we want to be inclusive, are we willing to hear the stories that do not support the liberal, diversity loving heritage discourse?
- Exploring techniques, tools, platforms for unpicking the workings, the machinery of heritage. How can you actually engage audiences in that rather than it being something that takes place at a scholarly level or at a professional level?
- Keep educating all generations of heritage volunteers and professionals, including those in civil society organisations, as they are often very much embedded in heritage projects about this too. In this context: keep questioning the heritage representation of truth and authenticity
- Collaboration between policy, practice and academia is important in this respect.

Role of heritage in Brexit
- Thinking of Brexit as heritage, what is it, what does it mean,
- What was / is the role of heritage, implicitly and explicitly, in the construction of Brexit, pre and post vote to leave, pre and post Brexit?
- We are constructing Brexit and pathways through it right now. How will that influence heritage? How is our imagination of the future reflected through language and what kind of consequences that will have for practitioners in heritage sectors.
• Can we accommodate for inclusive heritage, that recognises that there are different sorts of discourses about heritage, that heritage is multi-vocal, multi-disciplinary, multi-interpretable, and that there are different ways to imagining heritage as a field? Subsequently, how do we produce data now that allows for this multiplicity, so we avoid or one, or two or three dividing narratives being enforced?

• Exploring the geographical dimension of heritage and Brexit, in the UK, e.g. Scottish and Northern Irish perspectives might be very different. But also beyond the UK, e.g. European heritage and Brexit, the context of ODA / Global Challenges (research funding).

**New mechanisms, platforms, and imaginaries for and of heritage**

• Understanding the role of the expert, and the current antipathy towards expertise, is a wider questions that very much applies to heritage. Especially in a context of growing localism, community engagement, crowd sourcing etc. What are the implications, are new heritage paradigms emerging? Are new tools or mechanisms needed? What does it take to bring expertise into play?

• How do we make sure we stay open to global and European practice to keep the much valued knowledge exchange, sharing of practices and learnings, learning from wider community?

• In terms of such knowledge exchange, sharing of practices and learnings, learning from wider community, do we do enough to reach out, make full use of the tools and mechanisms we have available?

• There is a role for all of us, practice, academia, and civil society alike, to make sure the movement of ideas and exchange of knowledge is continued, and potentially increases. A basic audit of who's working in the heritage field would be useful. It would also aid a better collaboration between practice and academia.

• How to keep / develop the tool of soft power, not only influence on, as well as, from EU/ COE charters, but also EU as a platform of negotiation and promotion of heritage ideas?

• Do we need to take a stronger voice in the public debate about what heritage is and does, about the future of heritage and the heritage of the future?

• Develop the idea of heritage as a future making practice and the need to be imaginative and perhaps a little bit more playful and a little bit more creative with how we engage heritage.

• Wider global social and cultural challenges that also inter-act with heritage, such as climate change and human rights, will intersected with Brexit.
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