



WAGENINGEN
UNIVERSITY & RESEARCH

The ex/inclusion paradox in heritage management : the Mobarak mosque in The Hague

Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development

Knippenberg, Karim; Duineveld, Martijn; Buizer, Marleen

<https://doi.org/10.1108/JCHMSD-09-2019-0112>

This publication is made publicly available in the institutional repository of Wageningen University and Research, under the terms of article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, also known as the Amendment Taverne. This has been done with explicit consent by the author.

Article 25fa states that the author of a short scientific work funded either wholly or partially by Dutch public funds is entitled to make that work publicly available for no consideration following a reasonable period of time after the work was first published, provided that clear reference is made to the source of the first publication of the work.

This publication is distributed under The Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU) 'Article 25fa implementation' project. In this project research outputs of researchers employed by Dutch Universities that comply with the legal requirements of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act are distributed online and free of cost or other barriers in institutional repositories. Research outputs are distributed six months after their first online publication in the original published version and with proper attribution to the source of the original publication.

You are permitted to download and use the publication for personal purposes. All rights remain with the author(s) and / or copyright owner(s) of this work. Any use of the publication or parts of it other than authorised under article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright act is prohibited. Wageningen University & Research and the author(s) of this publication shall not be held responsible or liable for any damages resulting from your (re)use of this publication.

For questions regarding the public availability of this publication please contact openscience.library@wur.nl

The ex/inclusion paradox in heritage management: the Mobarak mosque in The Hague

Ex/inclusion
paradox in
heritage
management

259

Karim van Knippenberg

Department for Mobility and Spatial Planning, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

Martijn Duineveld

*Department of Environmental Sciences, Wageningen University and Research,
The Hague, Netherlands, and*

Marleen Buizer

*Department of Social Sciences, Wageningen University and Research,
The Hague, Netherlands*

Received 16 September 2019

Revised 6 November 2019

Accepted 26 December 2019

Abstract

Purpose – In the field of critical heritage studies, it has often been argued that a more inclusive and participatory heritage management approach neutralises differences and can contribute to a more contemporary, plural, democratic and inclusive notion of heritage. Yet, the needs and aspirations of those assumed being excluded from heritage making are not always taken into account, because the analysis and critique often focussed on the dominant heritage discourses, organisations and institutions. This paper conceptualises heritage from below and explores and reconceptualises how subdominant notions of heritage relate to dominant, institutionalised conceptualisations of heritage.

Design/methodology/approach – Based on a case study of the Mobarak mosque in The Hague, the authors present the multiplicity of subdominant conceptualisations of heritage, the ways heritage is (expected to be) recognised and represented by the community and the complexity of issues of social inclusion/exclusion.

Findings – The authors conclude that inclusive and/or participatory heritage management practices are inclusive in name only when the needs and aspirations of those seemingly being “excluded” are not fully understood and taken into account.

Originality/value – A binary heritage/non-heritage framework, the authors argue, is limited to understand matter that matters. Also the authors find that the assumption that there is a growing desire among local community groups to include their histories and related materialities as heritage in the dominant heritage discourse should be challenged.

Keywords Heritage management, Minority groups, Authorised heritage discourse (AHD), Social inclusion/exclusion

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

Within the field of critical heritage studies, it has been widely acknowledged that heritage is inevitably part of the processes of social inclusion and exclusion (Waterton and Watson, 2015; Graham *et al.*, 2000). This observation has been picked up by, and is acknowledged in, various governance contexts around the world, and the calls for a wider participation in heritage management are increasingly heard (Harvey, 2001; Parkinson *et al.*, 2016; Waterton and Smith, 2010). In combination with the reality of increasingly multi-cultural societies in Europe, heritage sectors in different countries are putting more and more emphasis on opening up heritage conservation and management practices to wider participation, to enhance social inclusion (Pendlebury *et al.*, 2004). At the same time there is a strong impetus to demonstrate the socially progressive potential of heritage (Pendlebury *et al.*, 2004), and this too endorses the quest for a more participatory heritage approach, one which is open to diverse interpretations of heritage.



Journal of Cultural Heritage
Management and Sustainable
Development

Vol. 10 No. 3, 2020
pp. 259-269

© Emerald Publishing Limited
2044-1266

DOI 10.1108/JCHMSD-09-2019-0112

Waterton (2010) notes that there is only limited research available on social inclusion/exclusion in relation to heritage management practices. Yet, some have explored the coalescence of heritage and social inclusion/exclusion (e.g. Newman and McLean, 1998; Smith, 2006; Pendlebury *et al.*, 2004). Next to this, various scholars (e.g. Tomalin and Starkey, 2017, Gard'ner, 2004, Buciek *et al.*, 2006, Ludwig, 2016) addressed the needs and aspirations of ethnic minority groups to include their opinion on practices regarding the designation and protection of heritage sites[1]. A relatively large number of these studies suggest that there is a growing desire among local community groups and minority groups to be involved in heritage management practices and to engage influentially in heritage conservation matters. However, most of the studies are in a way contributing to the establishment of a conceptual framework whereby the heritage sector “must simply add the excluded and assimilate them into the fold rather than challenge underlying preconceptions” (Smith, 2006). It appears that the current debates over “whose heritage” are driven less by pragmatic concerns over the requirements of the populace and more by political considerations over diversity mainstreaming (Pendlebury *et al.*, 2004; Ludwig, 2013). Yet, one could counter-argue that social inclusion is not achieved by simply suggesting a more inclusive and participatory heritage management approach. In fact, “merely enabling more people to enjoy heritage, or extending how it is defined to recognize the diversity of society, does not in itself challenge power relations and control over the process by which heritage is defined and managed” (Pendlebury *et al.*, 2004). What thus needs to be explored in more detail is the perspective of those being excluded from the heritage-making process. In this article we therefore aim to go beyond the more familiar heritage critique in terms of selectivity, elitism and politics and instead focus on those being excluded from the process of assessing what heritages are worthwhile to remember, protect and share. We question whether minority groups themselves want to be included in the heritage-making process and how. The Mobarak mosque in The Hague (The Netherlands) and its users, the Ahmadiyya Muslim community (from now on, the Ahmadiyya), will serve as a case study.

The Mobarak mosque is used by the Ahmadiyya, one of the branches and schools in Islam, founded in Punjab, British India, near the end of the nineteenth century (Valentine, 2008). Since the early 1920s, the Ahmadiyya movement’s missionary activities were expanded almost worldwide and missionaries were sent to the Netherlands for lectures and discussion on Islam, resulting in the establishment of a stationary missionary post in The Hague in 1947 (Roose, 2009). The first plans to build a mosque in the Netherlands were already announced in 1950 by the Ahmadiyya, and five years later the mosque was built and opened. Since then, it is known as the first purpose-built mosque in the Netherlands[2] (Roose, 2009). Although the mosque has received attention from governmental organisations over the past years, it is currently not listed as a heritage site, not by the municipality nor by the national government. In fact, in the Dutch heritage registers, neither the Mobarak mosque nor any other purposely built mosque is currently listed as a monument (Rijksdienst Voor Het Cultureel Erfgoed, 2018).

To study this case more in depth, we used and combined on-site participant observations, qualitative semi-structured interviews and a document-, website- and policy study. We conducted six in-depth interviews which approximately took between 1 and 3 h. Both spokesman of the Ahmadiyya community and randomly selected members of the community were interviewed. Next to the in-depth interviews, nine more informal interviews were conducted during the participant observations. We also participated in on-site community activities, such as the weekly “Friday prayer”, and the community meeting afterwards. During these meetings with the Ahmadiyya, all kinds of other potential information sources, such as historic photographs or videos, newspaper articles and information leaflets about the mosque, were shown (see bibliography for an overview of sources provided). The information gathered from (policy) documents, articles, websites, newspapers and so on is the third main

source of data collection. During this research, and in particular the data collection, we continuously reflected on our role as researcher in relation to the community since we wanted to observe and analyse both the Ahmadiyya community and the heritage community, instead of becoming part of them.

The case study departed with the (later understood as naïve) assumption that the Ahmadiyya and their mosque are a community and a heritage object excluded from, or subjected by, the dominant conceptualisations of heritage. We focus on the more nuanced, personal issues as perceived by the Ahmadiyya community members regarding the dilemmas of heritage and social inclusion/exclusion. This results in interesting insights about the Ahmadiyya's understanding of heritage. Our findings challenge the assumption that the outplacement of people's histories and heritage outside of the dominant heritage discourse is problematic, disabling and undemocratic (e.g. [Hall, 1999](#); [Smith, 2006](#)). We question whether there is indeed, as is often assumed, a desire among local communities to be involved in heritage management practices and to engage in heritage conservation matters (e.g. [Littler and Naidoo, 2005](#); [Waterton and Smith, 2008](#)). Before deepening these insights, the next section first introduces the contemporary and critical academic conceptualisations of heritage.

Heritage, power and knowledge

This article is nested in a post-structuralist understanding of heritage, which recognises heritage as a discursive construction. In other words: heritage is made up in discourse ([Felder et al., 2015](#)). In line with the Foucauldian tradition of discourse theory, a discourse can be defined as a structured series of concepts that provide access to a certain part or aspect of reality, while at the same time other aspects or parts are veiled ([Foucault, 1972](#)). Discourses are practices that “systematically form the objects about which they speak” ([Foucault, 1972](#)). Heritage in this view is a framework of ideas and practices, which are intrinsically embedded with power that shape and delineate heritage objects as both material and intangible and simultaneously structure how objects and practices are valued. Yet, since heritage means/is different things, to different people, at different times and in different contexts ([Ludwig, 2013](#)), multiple and potentially competing representations of heritage can exist and compete at the same time. Simply put in the words of [Tunbridge and Ashworth \(1996\)](#): “all heritage is someone's heritage and therefore logically not someone else's”. Heritage is thus part of the process of social inclusion and – by extension– social exclusion ([Graham et al., 2000](#)).

This, [Smith \(2006\)](#) points out, can be “disabling for those whose sense of history and place exist outside of the dominant heritage message or discourse, though it can be enabling for those whose sense of past either sits within or finds synergy with authorised views”. Furthermore, [Hall \(1999\)](#)'s statement that heritage is constructed, such that “those who cannot see themselves reflected in its mirror cannot properly ‘belong’” is particularly accurate when placed within the context of contemporary calls for social inclusion and multiculturalism. This “intrinsic” dissonance of heritage, accentuated by a contemporary call for social inclusion and multiculturalism, is thus a source for possible contestation. To address this issue, many scholars in the field of heritage studies are concerned with issues of power relations. In the majority of those studies, references are made to the critical work already undertaken by [Smith \(2006\)](#) in which she has observed that heritage professionals ascribe value to the historic built environment through an authorised heritage discourse (AHD). This is a particular way of seeing heritage that privileges the cultural symbols of the White, middle/upper classes and excludes a range of alternative ways of understanding heritage ([Smith, 2006](#)). This theory reveals a binary hierarchical distinction between the AHD and other heritage discourses, and it emphasises that the AHD is the dominant discourse that closes down alternative versions of heritage ([Ludwig, 2013](#); [Waterton and Watson, 2010](#)).

Smith (2006) furthermore argues that AHD is often naturalised, taken for granted within society to such a degree that it remains unquestioned. The AHD can thus seek to control fundamental questions about why some heritage objects are considered valuable and extend this to what should be protected (Pendlebury, 2013). However, at the same time, various authors, particularly Pendlebury (2013), argue that the AHD is changing and becoming more flexible. Heritage practitioners in the Netherlands and elsewhere are seeking for more dynamic concepts of heritage (Vecco, 2010). In the Dutch context, for example, Janssen *et al.* (2014) note a growth in interest and input from non-experts in determining what qualifies as heritage and how it should be dealt with. It's this context on which we will elaborate in the next section.

Setting the context: heritage policies and the oldest Dutch mosque

The Dutch heritage management system, alike many other European heritage systems, used to be focussed on protection and preservation of monuments guided by governmental laws and regulations (Bloemers *et al.*, 2010). Over the course of the 1990s, a number of European countries recognised that heritage planning had to move from control-based approaches to conservation towards those based on dynamic management of change (Janssen *et al.*, 2014). This call for a more integrated and inclusive heritage planning also influenced the debate on heritage conservation and spatial planning in the Netherlands (Janssen *et al.*, 2014; Duineveld, 2006, Van Der Valk, 2014), and accordingly, during the 1980 and 1990s, major changes took place, which repositioned heritage in spatial development: from a focus on (isolated) preservation to (integrated) conservation and, more recently, a broader notion of heritage planning emerged (Ashworth, 2011; Bosma, 2010, Van Der Valk, 2010, 2014). Although formal listing and conservation of heritage is still very much influenced by existing legalisation and formalised heritage management practices (for an overview of Dutch heritage law and regulations, see Rijksdienst Voor Het Cultureel Erfgoed, 2011, Ministry of Education Culture and Science, 2015; Ministry of Education Culture and Science, 2016), we see, nevertheless, that other novel ideas about heritage management slowly but gradually become codified in (national) policy documents, laws and treaties (Janssen *et al.*, 2017).

Indeed, the interest of Dutch state departments in buildings such as mosques is a recent phenomenon (Roose, 2009). The Mobarak mosque never received as much governmental attention as it does nowadays. In fact, when the Ahmadiyya presented their first sketches for the mosque, the municipality indicated strict building regulations as stated in the municipal zoning plan (Gemeente Den Haag, 2012). Eventually the mosque was not built according to the initial sketches. The municipality disapproved the design, because the exterior of the mosque looked too much like a mosque (Nos, 2015; Valentine, 2008, Haagsche Courant, 2005). Initially, since the zoning plan forbid the incorporation of certain cultural symbols, the Mobarak mosque was re-designed as a genuine modern Dutch villa (Nos, 2015; Roose, 2009). Only when two turrets were added in 1963 (Roose, 2009), on the entrance portal and when, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary in 2005, the minaret was belatedly built (Ad/Haagsche Courant, 2005, De Volkskrant, 2005), the building became recognisable as a mosque. Nowadays, mosques are no longer considered exotic buildings and they are part of Dutch urban landscapes for more than 50 years. There are now more than 450 mosques in the Netherlands. Yet, they are still hardly represented in Dutch heritage registers. Neither the Mobarak mosque nor any other purposely full built mosque^[3] is currently listed as a monument (Rijksdienst Voor Het Cultureel Erfgoed, 2018).

Hybrid heritage: the Mobarak mosque as heritage, a monument, an object, an idea or ideal?

Although the mosque has received attention from governmental organisations over the past years, the Mobarak mosque is currently not part of the official heritage discourse in the sense

that it is neither listed nor recognised as monument by the Dutch state (not by the Dutch government, nor by the municipality). Yet what does this mosque mean for its users? Is the materiality of the mosque important or is the mosque constituted as immaterial? Do the Ahmadiyya consider their mosque to be monumental and heritage and if so, is it managed as such, and do they feel included/excluded from the dominant heritage discourse?

The construction of an immaterial heritage discourse

As said before, the Mobarak mosque is known as the first mosque in the Netherlands and most of the interviewees immediately referred to the building's history as a special feature of the mosque and showed us all kind of historic photographs and videos, newspaper articles and information leaflets about the mosque to underline its importance nowadays and in the past. The construction of this mosque, it was argued, should be seen as a significant turning point in Dutch history: from that moment there were mosques in the Netherlands.

The fact that the Mobarak mosque is the first purpose-built one is seen as an essential part of the history of and constructed by the Ahmadiyya community in The Hague. This fact is well known among the members of the community and is seen as an important historic narrative that gets communicated continuously within the Ahmadiyya community and beyond. Throughout the history of the Ahmadiyya community, the narrative of having the first mosque in the Netherlands became central to the appropriation and valuing of the mosque.

When asking the respondents to explain the importance of the mosque for them personally, they referred to the building as a social meeting place where all kinds of activities are organised, or they highlighted the religious function of the building. Yet, at the same time, they mentioned that the mosque as such is not essential for fulfilling these roles. Meetings and social activities can, for example, be organised in small meeting rooms, as is done by other communities. The interviewees also make a distinction between the historical and functional significance of the building. Although the mosque is important to them because it is the first mosque of the Netherlands, it is foremost a place to worship God. One of the interviewees stated this:

The building as such is nothing more than a pile of stones, it derives its value from what happens within the building namely the worshipping of God, that is the most important. If this building would not any longer be used as a place of worship, it will lose its value. In that case the building would be as valuable as a random pile of stones.

This interviewee thus explains that this relationship with God makes the building particularly special. To clarify his point, he refers to the Black Stone which is set into the Kaaba in Mecca. As he explains: "Similar to our mosque, the Black Stone itself has no value, yet because prophet Muhammad set it into the Kaaba's wall himself, it has become an important holy Islamic relic". He further explained that according to the rules of the Islam, a Muslim should not worship places, buildings or objects, though in some cases, a special relation between on the one hand an object, building or place and on the other hand God adds an additional layer of value. If this bond with God does not any longer exist, for example, because the mosque loses its function, the mosque as an object or building is not valuable anymore as this interviewee explains: "If we stop worshipping God in the Mobarak mosque, the building is not special anymore, it would just be an address in The Hague".

Heritage?

Now we will deepen our insights in the meaning of heritage by exploring how heritage is produced, understood and used by the Ahmadiyya. Broadly speaking, heritage management and the process of listing and protection are seen as a good thing. As one

interviewee states: "I do think it is good to protect special or significant buildings for future generations". At the same time, the definition of heritage appeared to differ slightly among the members of the Ahmadiyya community. Some of them referred to more objective aspects, such as the building's age, whereas others mentioned more personal aspects. Furthermore, references were made to the building's history:

A monument is a building where significant historic events took place or a building which has a unique history. For instance, this mosque. It will forever and ever, be the first official, purpose built mosque of the Netherlands, this unique characterization cannot be taken away.

As the aforementioned quote illustrates, this personal definition of heritage would include buildings where significant historic events took place or a building which has a unique history. For some interviewees, a heritage status would mean recognition for their history, as their history would then become part of Dutch history. Yet, a status as official heritage site does not seem to be a very important issue for the Ahmadiyya. One of the main reasons to take this stance is that the status as a heritage site is not related to the function of the building and the act of worshipping God. This is stated as follows:

The Mobarak mosque derives its value from the fact that it is a place to worship God, this 'spiritual' value won't increase if the building is listed as an official heritage site" and "Seen from a spiritual perspective, nothing will change if the mosque will be listed: our prayers won't be more sacred if we say our prayers in a mosque which has a status as listed monument.

A status as an official listed heritage object is only of interest for societal purposes. This is furthermore underlined by another interviewee who argues that the religious function of the mosque is the most important and a (potential) heritage status is merely a side issue. See, for example, the following quote:

Life is impermanent, the world is impermanent, so tell me why should I care about a side issue like a status as listed monument? An official document stating the heritage status probably ends up as just a piece of paper, and does thus not add any value. Besides, it won't change history, it won't change the mosque's history. A heritage status is merely symbolism, it does not really change anything.

Moreover, the Ahmadiyya are rather sceptical with regard to issues of conservation related to a status of official listed heritage. It is, for example, stated that: "I am not sure whether it is a positive thing to be listed as an official heritage site, it would for sure be more difficult to make changes to the building's architecture or exterior".

The fact that the Mobarak mosque is currently not listed does, however, not mean that interviewees experience a lack of recognition or inclusion. "We consciously choose not to be listed, while we just do not want a heritage status. Because it is our own decision, we do not feel a lack of recognition". Accordingly, the community is not looking for recognition as such, but more for a way to distinguish the Mobarak mosque from all (approximately 500) other mosques in the Netherlands: "This is not just a random mosque, it is the first mosque of the Netherlands, this special fact needs to be recognized somehow".

Monumental? The "beyond heritage status recognition"

The Ahmadiyya community will never demand a status as listed monument, as several members of the community expressed, while they are already happy and grateful for being allowed to build mosques in the Netherlands and for the fact that there is freedom of religion in the Netherlands. This feeling of being recognised beyond or despite of having no formal heritage status is also constituted by the high number of dignitaries, heads of state and other people from the "elite" who visited the mosque. The Dutch Queen, for example, visited the mosque to commemorate the building's 50th anniversary in 2005. "We were very honoured when the Queen visited the mosque, for us it felt like an act of recognition, especially while it is

the only mosque in the Netherlands ever visited by the queen". These policies, rules and practices are generally seen by the Ahmadiyya as more important than a recognition as an official heritage site.

This "beyond heritage status recognition" can also be illustrated by a story about Madurodam, which was brought up by various interviewees. Madurodam is a touristic attraction showing models, which are exact replicas of special buildings and objects in the Netherlands. One interviewee told us that such a model of the mosque exists and the community has expressed a request to locate this miniature model in the park (which is located within walking distance of the mosque). This request was, however, rejected, while it was believed that the miniature mosque would scare away potential visitors. After that, no new attempts were undertaken to locate the miniature. This appeared to be a delicate issue:

If it is Madurodam's aim to represent all the important, historic buildings of the Netherlands (such as windmills, churches and houses), then the Mobarak mosque certainly deserves to be represented in the park, while it is part of Dutch history.

Later on, he elaborates by stating that:

first there were no mosques, no Islam, in the Netherlands. Then a mosque was built, from that moment onwards, the Islam as well as mosques were a visual part of the landscape of the Netherlands, this is thus a significant turning point in history. Since then, mosques are part of Dutch history, they are part of the culture of the Netherlands.

To him it seems incomprehensible why such a significant turning point in history is not represented in the story about Dutch history and Dutch identity. Likewise, one interviewee told us that a request for a sign, indicating the first mosque, was not allowed by the municipality.

Heritage multiple

The Ahmadiyya's definition of heritage is a rather hybrid and more complex one. It emphasises a broad range of meanings and is characterised by a particular interest in certain narratives that are linked to the Mobarak mosque. Besides, it appears that there is a clear distinction between building and function as their understanding of heritage focusses only partially on objects that are assumed to be valuable, instead are the stories and practices related to the building that give it its particular significance. This case is not unlike many others. In fact, the interviewees' definition of heritage is in line with wider trends in the community heritage discourse as several scholars (Ludwig, 2016; Waterton and Watson, 2010) argue that subdominant conceptualisations of heritage are often more focussed on encompassing social and cultural context and significance (Waterton and Watson, 2013). This perspective on cultural heritage and community seems to correspond with, for example, Smith's argument that heritage is a cultural process (Smith, 2006). The articulation of ideas of heritage lies in social processes that surround places and artefacts and not in the artefacts themselves (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996). This idea of heritage, as an "act of passing on and receiving memories" or "as an act of communication and meaning making" is, however, a form of heritage which is difficult to read together with other understandings of heritage (e.g. expert view on heritage which focusses on physicality of heritage) (Smith, 2006).

In this case we see a similar disparity between different understandings of heritage, but the fact that the heritage of the Ahmadiyya is not part of the official heritage discourse does not mean that a lack of recognition is felt. The interviewees indicate that they are not concerned about being excluded, or about a lack of recognition as they argue that this is not an issue for them. Other acts of recognition, such as the Queen's visit, are seen as more important than being part of the official heritage discourse. Representation of the mosque in the Madurodam miniature park is seen as a form of "official" recognition, alike a heritage

status. Whereas scholars, such as Hall (1999), argue that a lack of recognition can be felt if the heritage of a certain group is not represented, this case shows that being part of the official heritage discourse is not for all groups the ultimate goal. A slightly different and more hybrid understanding of heritage, in combination with valuing other acts of recognition, makes that being part of the process of assessing what heritages are worthwhile to remember, protect and share is not really an issue for the Ahmadiyya. This case study shows that the relation between subdominant and dominant conceptualisations of heritage is not as straightforward as often assumed. When it comes to the hierarchical distinction between dominant heritage conceptualisations and subdominant ones, it is argued that dominant conceptualisation cannot engage with subdominant ones while this should “destabilise the existing cultural and social power structures” (Smith, 2006). Yet, this case shows that the process of exclusion is a two-way process, it is not only the AHD that excludes, exclusion also depends on other factors, related to the one who is excluded.

This reconceptualisation of the relation between subdominant conceptualisations of heritage and dominant, institutionalised conceptualisations of heritage brings an interesting paradox to the foreground: simply naming a process to be inclusive, without truly exploring the needs and aspirations of those being “excluded”, does not in itself lead to a more inclusive heritage management approach. Instead, it contributes to the upholding of a framework that is holding us back from actually achieving social inclusion.

Implications for the politics of in- and exclusion

Based on these insights, we identify two main implications for the politics of in- and exclusion in heritage management. As said earlier, this case shows that the process of exclusion is a two-way process, it is not only the AHD that excludes, exclusion also depends on other factors, related to the one who is excluded. This challenges one of the fundamental rationales of the AHD, as it shows that the often assumed hierarchical distinction between various conceptualisations of heritage needs some nuance when it comes to communities whose idea of heritage anyhow differs and is difficult to read together with more general understandings of heritage. Because understandings of heritage can differ amongst different communities, exclusion from the dominant heritage discourse does not necessarily mean that exclusion is problematic, disabling or undemocratic. The assumption that there is a growing desire among local community groups to include their histories and heritage in the dominant heritage discourse and to engage in heritage conservation matters should not be expected *a priori*. Assuming the excluded aim to be included in the mainstream heritage discourses, thereby suggesting openness and inclusion, is in fact reproducing and perpetuating the (self-observed) superiority of the AHD. It's therefore not only important to address questions such as who decides what heritage is and whose heritage is it, as (Graham *et al.*, 2000) noted, but also to explore what ideas and understandings of heritage exist within different communities, including the very idea of “heritage” itself. Related to this, it is also important to consider whether communities want their idea of which of their matter matters to be included as heritage in the dominant heritage discourse, or whether there are other more important practices than government listings of heritage to them that render recognition.

The overall lesson learned from this example is that social inclusion is not simply an issue of “adding the excluded and assimilate them into the fold” (Smith, 2006). Based on the empirical data found in this research, statements such as “those who cannot see themselves reflected in the mirror cannot properly “belong”” (Hall, 1999) need some nuances, because this lack of recognition is not necessarily felt by those being excluded. Instead of assuming that there is a growing desire among local community groups and minority groups to be involved in heritage management practices and to engage influentially in heritage conservation matters, the focus should be on exploring the perspective of those being excluded. A heritage management approach which focusses on inclusion will be inclusive in name only when the

perspective of those seemingly being “excluded” is not fully understood. Understanding various conceptualisations of heritage is a crucial step in achieving social inclusion, without doing so the issue of exclusion/inclusion remains to be foremost a theoretical issue and besides, this contributes to the upholding of a framework that is holding us back from actually achieving social inclusion. Social exclusion is now firmly on the political agenda, not only in The Netherlands, but throughout Europe. The political will is in place. Yet, social inclusion can only be achieved if we truly understand the needs and aspirations of those being “excluded”.

Notes

1. These studies are addressing European heritage planning system (e.g. England, Denmark), not necessarily addressing the Dutch context.
2. That is, previous Islamic communities had mosques, though these mosques were housed in already existing buildings.
3. Some mosques are housed in already existing, monumental buildings, like former churches.

References

- Ashworth, G. (2011), “Preservation, conservation and heritage: approaches to the past in the present through the built environment”, *Asian anthropology*, Vol. 10, pp. 1-18.
- Bloemers, T., Kars, H., Van der Valk, A. and Wijnen, M. (2010), *The Cultural Landscape & Heritage Paradox: Protection and Development of the Dutch Archaeological–Historical Landscape and its European Dimension*, Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.
- Bosma, K. (2010), “Heritage policy in spatial planning”, in Bloemers, J.H.F., Kars, H., Valk, A.V.D. and Wijnen, M. (Eds), *The Cultural Landscape & Heritage Paradox: Protection and Development of the Dutch Archaeological–Historical Landscape and its European Dimension*, Amsterdam University press, Amsterdam.
- Buciek, K., Bærenholdt, J. and Juul, K. (2006), “Whose heritage? immigration and place narratives in Denmark”, *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, Vol. 88, pp. 185-197.
- Duineveld, M. (2006), *Van Oude Dingen, de Mensen die Voorbij Gaan... Over de Voorwaarden Meer Recht te Kunnen Doen Aan de Gewaardeerde Cultuurhistories van Groepen Burgers*, Doctoral thesis Wageningen Universiteit, Wageningen.
- Felder, M., Duineveld, M. and Assche, K.V. (2015), “Absence/presence and the ontological politics of heritage: the case of Barrack 57”, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 21, pp. 460-475.
- Foucault, M. (1972), *The Archeology of Knowledge*, Routledge, New York.
- Gard’ner, J. (2004), “Heritage protection and social inclusion: a case study from the Bangladeshi community of east London”, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 10, pp. 75-92.
- Graham, B., Ashworth, G. and Tunbridge, J. (2000), *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture, and Economy*, Arnold, Oxford University Press, London, New York.
- Hall, S. (1999), “Whose heritage? Un-settling ‘the heritage’, re-imagining the post-nation”, *Third Text*, Vol. 13, pp. 3-13.
- Harvey, D. (2001), “Heritage pasts and heritage presents: temporality, meaning and the scope of heritage studies”, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 7, pp. 319-338.
- Janssen, J., Luiten, E., Renes, H. and Rouwendal, J. (2014), “Heritage planning and spatial development in The Netherlands: changing policies and perspectives”, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 20, pp. 1-21.
- Janssen, J., Luiten, E., Renes, H. and Stegmeijer, E. (2017), “Heritage as sector, factor and vector: conceptualizing the shifting relationship between heritage management and spatial planning”, *European Planning Studies*, Vol. 25, pp. 1654-1672.

- Littler, J. and Naidoo, R. (2005), *The Politics of Heritage: The Legacies of 'race'*, Routledge, London, New York.
- Ludwig, C. (2013), "From bricks and mortar to social meanings: a critical examination of local heritage designation in England", Doctoral thesis, Northumbria University.
- Ludwig, C. (2016), "From bricks and mortar to social heritage: planning space for diversities in the AHD", *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 22, pp. 811-827.
- Newman, A. and McLean, F. (1998), "Heritage builds communities: the application of heritage resources to the problems of social exclusion", *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 4, pp. 143-153.
- Parkinson, A., Scott, M. and Redmond, D. (2016), "Competing discourses of built heritage: lay values in Irish conservation planning", *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 22, pp. 261-273.
- Pendlebury, J. (2013), "Conservation values, the authorised heritage discourse and the conservation-planning assemblage", *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 19, pp. 709-727.
- Pendlebury, J., Townshend, T. and Gilroy, R. (2004), "The conservation of English cultural built heritage: a force for social inclusion?", *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 10, pp. 11-31.
- Roose, E. (2009), *The Architectural Representation of Islam: Muslim-Commissioned Mosque Design in the Netherlands*, Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.
- Smith, L. (2006), *Uses of Heritage*, Routledge, London.
- Tomalin, E. and Starkey, C. (2017), "Buddhist buildings in England: the construction of 'under-represented' faith heritage in a multicultural and post-Christian setting", *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 23, pp. 156-172.
- Tunbridge, J. and Ashworth, G. (1996), *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.
- Van Der Valk, A. (2010), "Planning the past. Lessons to be learned from 'protecting and developing the Dutch archaeological-historical landscape' (PDL/BBO)", in Bloemers, J.H.F., Kars, H., Valk, A.V.D. and Wijnen, M. (Eds), *The Cultural Landscape & Heritage Paradox: Protection and Development of the Dutch Archaeological-Historical Landscape and its European Dimension*, Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.
- Van Der Valk, A. (2014), "Preservation and development: the cultural landscape and heritage paradox in The Netherlands", *Landscape Research*, Vol. 39, pp. 158-173.
- Vecco, M. (2010), "A definition of cultural heritage: from the tangible to the intangible", *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, Vol. 11, pp. 321-324.
- Waterton, E. (2010), *Politics, Policy and the Discourses of Heritage in Britain*, Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire.
- Waterton, E. and Smith, L. (2008), "Heritage protection for the 21st century", *Cultural Trends*, Vol. 17, pp. 197-203.
- Waterton, E. and Smith, L. (2010), "The recognition and misrecognition of community heritage", *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 16, pp. 4-15.
- Waterton, E. and Watson, S. (2010), "Special issue: heritage and community engagement: collaboration or contestation?", *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 16, pp. 1-3.
- Waterton, E. and Watson, S. (2013), "Framing theory: towards a critical imagination in heritage studies", *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 19, pp. 546-561.
- Waterton, E. and Watson, S. (2015), *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*, Palgrave Macmillan, Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire.

Newspaper articles, websites and information leaflets used as sources

- Ad/Haagsche Courant (2005), *Oudste Moskee Heeft Voortaan Minaretten*, A.W. Sijthoff's Uitgeverij, Rijswijk.

- De Volkskrant (2005), "Eindelijk Een Minaret", *De Volkskrant* 9 December, Amsterdam.
- Gemeente Den Haag (2012), *Bestemmingsplan Benoordenhout Vastgesteld*, The Hague.
- AD Haagsche Courant (2005), *De Eerste Moskee Moest Op Een Villa Lijken*, A.W. Sijthoff's Uitgeverij, Rijswijk, (accessed 23 June 2005).
- Ministry of Education Culture and Science (2015), *Erfgoedwet*, Ministerie van Onderwijs Cultuur en Wetenschap, The Hague.
- Ministry of Education Culture and Science (2016), *Heritage Act 2016*, Ministerie van Onderwijs Cultuur en Wetenschap, The Hague.
- Nos (2015), *Oudste Moskee Van Nederland Bestaat Zestig Jaar*, NOS, Hilversum, (accessed 9 December 2005).
- Rijksdienst Voor Het Cultureel Erfgoed (2011), *Visie Erfgoed en Ruimte - Kiezen Voor Karakter*, Rijksdienst Voor Het Cultureel Erfgoed, Amersfoort.
- Rijksdienst Voor Het Cultureel Erfgoed (2018), *Rijksmonumentenregister*, Rijksdienst Voor Het Cultureel Erfgoed, Amersfoort.
- Valentine, S. (2008), *Islam and the Ahmadiyya Jama'at: History, Belief, Practice*, Columbia University Press, New York.

Corresponding author

Karim van Knippenberg can be contacted at: karim.vanknippenberg@ugent.be

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm

Or contact us for further details: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

Reproduced with permission of copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.