'They have different ways of doing things'[i]: cemeteries, diversity and local place attachment.

Dr. Katie McClymont,

Department of Geography and Environmental Management,

University of the West of England,

Frenchay Campus, Coldharbour Lane, Bristol,

BS16 1QA, UK

+44 117 3281936

katie.mcclymont@uwe.ac.uk

@DrKatieMcC

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5517-3262

This paper explores how local place attachment and group identity are conceived by those who manage civic cemeteries, and those who, by their memorial practices, co-create them. Engaging with debates about (post)colonialism and belonging, the paper presents evidence from both interviews and photographs, conceptually framing the meaning of these with reference to Lefebvre's spatial triad: of space as perceived, conceived and lived. It identifies a disjuncture between the way cemetery managers view group and individual identities, and the way this manifests in memorial practices. Formal 'representations of space' are influenced by neo-colonial narratives of 'insiders' and 'outsiders' whereas greater diversity and categorical transgressions are apparent in spatial practices. This has implications for the management and articulation civic identity and contemporary understandings of belonging beyond as well as within public places of memorial and remembrance.

'They have different ways of doing things'[ii]: cemeteries, diversity and local place attachment.

This paper explores how local place attachment and group identity are conceived by those who manage civic cemeteries, and those who, by their memorial practices, co-create them. Engaging with debates about (post)colonialism and belonging, the paper presents evidence from both interviews and photographs, conceptually framing the meaning of these with reference to Lefebvre's spatial triad of space as perceived, conceived and lived. It identifies a disjuncture between the way cemetery managers view group and individual identities, and the way this manifests in memorial practices. Formal 'representations of space' are influenced by neo-colonial narratives of 'insiders' and 'outsiders' whereas greater diversity and categorical transgressions are apparent in spatial practices. This has implications for the management and articulation civic identity and contemporary understandings of belonging beyond as well as within public places of memorial and remembrance.

Introduction

Notions of identity and belonging in the context of urban development are important internationally and at all scales and across myriad spaces. Sites of death and remembrance are no exception from this. As practices and beliefs about death and dying remain a fundamental part of being human in any culture (Kellahear, 2007), the sites which relate to this hold a particular social significance, despite often being overlooked by contemporary planning and city management. Complicated and hard to define (Rugg, 2000); 'deathscapes' (Maddrell and

Sidaway, 2010) encompass all spatial aspects of death, bodily disposal and remembrance. This paper aims to investigate how identity is perceived and represented in public cemeteries in England and Wales, raising questions about how belonging and place attachment are shaped by and within landscapes and practices of death. It contributes to debates about diaspora identity within contemporary Europe and beyond, as well as to discussions about the maintenance, management and planning of spaces of bodily disposal and remembrance.

The expression of the importance of place attachment in 'continuing bonds' with the dead has been documented in works noting the use of vernacular language, symbols of local identity and the choice of specific materials in memorial practices (Maddrell, 2009; Maddrell and Marjavaara, 2016). Moreover, research has begun to consider the deathscapes implications of international migration and the context of postcolonialism (Venhorst et al. 2013; Hunter, 2016; Gunaratnam, 2013; Jassal, 2015). This paper brings together these two issues that concomitantly manifest in the physicality of cemetery space across most contemporary cities in the Global North. As built form, deathscapes in general, but particularly municipal cemeteries, are part of the public representation of collective memory (Hayden, 1997). They are a physical marker of the dead of a city, and their myriad identities. Moreover, memorials and therefore cemeteries bring together private/personal practices with civic, public and/or nationalist identities, and in so doing 'produce' *public* space (Burk, 2003). This process is not neutral, but highly politically charged (Graham and Whelan, 2007) and intertwined with discourses of heritage and nationhood (Hall, 1999), creating 'insiders' and 'outsiders' with implicit reference to narratives of colonialism (Anderson, 1983; Young, 2000; Beebeejaun, 2004; Thomas, 2008). Memorialisation is therefore fundamental to the making of a 'nation' (Hayden, 1997; Graham and Whelan, 2007), meaning cemeteries hold

complex possibilities in establishing or denying the legitimacy of immigrant and minority ethnic groups as part of the 'host' society.

To explore this further, it is necessary to have an understanding of space which allows for places to hold simultaneously contradictory meanings. The paper draws briefly on Lefebvre's (1991) conceptualisations of space as lived, conceived and perceived to contrast the version of place identity in the cemetery held by cemetery managers with that displayed on memorials. It considers if and how dominant post-colonial narratives shape the 'representation of space' articulated by cemetery managers, and how their understanding of the public's attachment to place creates or reinforces notions of 'insiders' and 'outsiders'. By also looking at and photographing memorial practices within the same cemeteries[iii], the paper aims to highlight how the unofficial, the 'lived' space unsettles these dominant narratives by revealing spatial practices which blur the sharp distinctions of assumed group identities.

The paper draws on interviews with cemetery managers in nine of England and Wales' largest cities as well as photographs of memorial practices within the cemeteries in these cities. Although public cemeteries form only one aspect of the deathscapes within a city, they offer a particular insight into contrast between official representations and lived practices. Local practices vary, but officially, municipalities, and therefore municipal cemeteries, cater for the whole of their city's population: for all faiths and those with no or no expressed/organised faith; rather than for a targeted religious group or lifestyle preference. Although not all aspects of practice are therefore encompassed by this research- it does not directly examine private facilities or churchyards for example, the paper's findings have relevance to debates about 'deathscapes' more widely. Through the use of both interviews and visual material, not only can the intricacy of spatial practice be demonstrated, but the

4

paper also demonstrates the complexity of local and transnational identities and the role they play in cemeteries as repositories of civic belonging. Considerations of desires and practices of migrant/BME groups, in terms of choices about bodily repatriation or burial in 'host' communities are beyond the scope of this paper. These important issues remain largely underresearched in a UK context, and are of particular salience because of the disjuncture identified here between official views and visible practice.[iv]

The paper next outlines the way (post)colonial ideas continue to frame 'insider' and 'outsider' identities in policy discourses. It then highlights the implications of these for thinking about deathscapes, and specifically cemeteries, with particular attention paid to the role of cemeteries in local identity and place attachment. It next briefly discusses how Lefebvre's ideas help to conceptually frame the upcoming analysis, before considering the benefits and challenges of photographs as research data and how they are analysed and interpreted. It then presents the findings, which demonstrate the importance and complexity of identity and local place attachment.

The legacy of (post)colonialism

The legacy of colonialism still underpins assumptions about who are 'insiders' or 'outsiders' within a nation (Said, 2003; Gilroy, 1986; Young, 2000) even when this is used to try to make practices more inclusive (Beebeejaun, 2004, 2012). Constructed within colonial relations of the nineteenth century, the orientalist gaze renders those who are not Westerners as strange, exotic and irrational; and fundamentally 'different' or 'other'. This is re-enforced by the construction of national identities, or 'imagined communities' (Anderson, 1983) which symbolically construct those who are *inside* 'the nation' as the same; having shared identities,

values and practices, despite actual material and practical differences. This differentiation forms the basis of the way 'race' has been conceived, and in turn relates to questions of who is eligible for the benefits of belonging to a nation. It remains an underpinning ideology in the shaping of (post) colonial relations in both the global North and South (Sandercock, 2003; Porter, 2006). Empires may have fallen, but the ways in which people from different backgrounds are perceived, conceived and treated remain entrenched within this notion of difference. Despite calls for inclusion and recognition (Iveson and Fincher, 2008); too often policy is made in a way which overlooks 'the porosity and internal heterogeneity of cultures [… instead] cultures were seen as homogenous, largely fixed mutually exclusive and typically antipathetic entities' (Thomas, 2008: 4). Those who are deemed outside of the imagined 'norm' of the nation, differ only in fixed, specific and uniform ways. Different ('faith' or 'ethnic') groups are different only in as much as they are different from each other, and different from the established norms of the nation, rather than perceived as diverse collections of people with one common identity marker. This is of particular importance in the ways in which migrants (and their descendants) are both seen and treated within 'host' nations, as expressed clearly by Barabantseva:

> The delineation of migrants locates them as groups that are not contemporaneous with non-migrant groups, but that belong to a different time and place of origin (and therefore struggling to integrate). The other, non-ethnic aspects of migrant lives, those detached from the hegemonic national and ethnic narratives, are not sufficiently explored. (2016: 103)

In turn this relies on 'an implicit belief that there is a British and normal way use private space' (Beebeejaun, 2014: 444) based on the assumed aspects of shared identity. This relates to decisions which are made about how space (at both the civic and the domestic scale) should be ordered- it should be done in line with British norms, and in a multicultural

society, making exceptions for 'minority needs' (cf Heath and Demireva, 2014). This reinforces identity divisions which are not necessarily based on empirical evidence.

In terms of deathscapes, the increasing diversity of faiths and traditions within UK cities following postwar migration patterns (Dwyer and Bressey, 2008) has brought a new range of practices to UK and European deathscapes. There is a growing body of research covering the practices and issues around death, dying and bodily disposal amongst diaspora/migrant communities in Europe (Hunter and Soom Amman, 2016). Studies highlight how practices both adapt to new settings and maintain traditions of faith or country of origin. Maddrell (2011) discusses how Hindu communities in Leicestershire, England have used water from the Ganges to 'sacralise' the River Soar, so that the ritual scattering of ashes can take place without their leaving the UK. Venhorst et al. (2013) describe the invention of the 'ritual expert' in Muslim funerals in the Netherlands; someone who is able to assist Muslims to maintain traditional practices, but is not themselves part of this tradition. These examples demonstrate both the importance of tradition and how this can be upheld, albeit in a new way, in a different setting. These practices are framed as different, but not as static, fixed or discrete. Indeed, they are very much formed by 'host' cultures in which they are practiced, challenging the binary divides of post-colonial ideology.

In contrast, Torres et al. (2016) present finding about how end of life care workers in Sweden negotiate the needs of those who come from different cultural backgrounds to themselves. They state that 'the core of their (care practitioners) understanding of patients with migrant backgrounds lay expectations of difference' (Torres et al. 2016; 114). The way caregivers described 'migrant' patients and their families lead to their 'othering', and in turn impacted on staff's confidence in dealing with them. This demonstrates how the narratives of

colonialism permeate practice in this area, and how this can have an impact in the experiences of those both working in and receiving end of life care. The assumptions revealed here do not reflect the subtlies of diverse and changing practice in communities of migrant origins discussed above, and they stress the importance of understanding practitioner or official views as part of a dynamic relationship in identity practices.

Memorials and identity

The changes and challenges discussed above need to be considered alongside the importance of local place attachment, specifically expressed through memorial practices. The inscriptions on and wider materiality of memorials link deceased people to places of importance to them; be it the place in which they were born, died or elsewhere and are often specific to a town, village or neighbourhood; but also a wider region or country (Maddrell, 2009, Maddrell and Marjavaara, 2016). This is done through epitaphs, images/symbols inscribed on headstones (also see Figures 1-3 in this paper) and the use of material specific to a different place from that in which the memorial is found. These practices are underpinned with notions of 'home' and 'dwelling' (cf Heidegger, 1962; Tuan, 1977, also see Worpole, 2003) which are particularly poignant when considering the meaning 'home' for migrants (Kaplan and Chacko, 2015; Chacko, 2015; Gilmartin and Migge 2015). In light of the above discussion; these are likely to be complex and multifaceted, but also framed within the constructions of 'insiders' and 'outsiders' which still dominates much UK and European practice.

These issues are further discussed by Hunter (2016) who considers issues of belonging and how two different 'outsider' practices of death and disposal are negotiated in a UK context. Considering the development of a new Muslim burial ground outside of

Glasgow, and attempts to gain permission for outdoor (Hindu) cremation, he draws on Hage's (1995) notions of homeliness and discourses of domestication to demonstrate how these deathscape practices were invoked and critiqued in 'competing expressions of the question for the homely and familiar' (Hunter, 2016: 259). Claims by the proponents and opponents of each case can be seen as claims to 'belonging' within a nation/place. Deathscapes and their attendant practices offer a unique window into this debate:

> Death in diaspora may be the occasion to lay what are perhaps the deepest and most permanent foundations for settlement and belonging of migrants and subsequent generations, through burial and other funerary practices in the adopted homeland. (Hunter, 2016; 249)

These studies reveal the increasing complexity that international migration brings to deathscape practices; but also how groups and individuals are neither solely confined by a notion of established practice from a place of origin or 'outsider' faith, nor forced to adopt wholesale the practices of a new society or country of residence. This raises questions about the expression of personal identities, and the mediation of their material practices by officials. Perceptions of public judgement on what is (in)appropriate behaviour within a cemetery (Deering, 2012) are framed by 'normalising discourses … about what constitutes 'fitting' memorialising activity" (Woodthorpe, 2010: 131) from cemetery managers and beyond. Practices which are deemed as outside the UK cultural norm: practices pertaining to 'other' faiths and traditions may therefore be positioned as 'other' and 'outsider', raising questions of how personal memorialisation interacts with public policy or civic and national ideology. Although the Institute for Cemetery and Crematoria Management's (ICCM[v]) *Charter for the Bereaved* (2014) highlights the importance of 'a meaningful funeral service with a content that meets with [the bereaved] own specific needs and requirements' there is little further explicit academic or policy consideration of how this intersects with broader cultural assumptions of identity, or what explicit measures are needed to ensure this reaches all

groups and individuals within them. This sets a contested backdrop for any discussion about identity and deathscapes, yet highlights their importance as places of local attachment and meaning making.

Moreover, the ways in which identity and belonging is expressed within memorial practices has importance beyond that of personal identity and preferences. Cemeteries and memorials are key aspect of public national identity (Hayden, 1997; Burk, 2003; Graham and Whelan, 2007). They are a physical, public display of who has lived and died in that place. Specifically discussing migrants in memorial, Buciek and Juul argue that 'places of memory act as a means to give them visibility as persons and citizens in the countries of reception' (Buciek and Juul, 2008: 119). This 'making visible' confers a certain legitimacy and permanence on the identities of those there memorialised; not only as individuals, but as persons having a relationship with that place. More than just stating the physical presence of people born in other countries, memorial practices offer ways to represent more nuanced forms of identity and attachment. Through the choice of words, symbols and materials, identity and belonging can be represented and claimed in a public and potentially durable manner.

However, this is a difficult and complex issue in which the meaning of any practice is not immediately apparent or pregiven, as expressed by Reimers (1999) in her research into Swedish cemeteries and immigrant graves:

> Because Swedish identity is the norm at a Swedish cemetery it does not need to be enhanced. Symbols and customs have to deviate from the norm, thereby creating a boundary against the majority in order to serve as markers and expressions of ethnic or cultural identity. However, when practices in accordance with Swedish norms are deployed on immigrant graves, *they*

deviate from the tradition of provenance and consequently become significant as markers that express a far from self-evident identification with the surrounding culture. (Reimers, 1999: 152, emphasis added)

This means that it is not as simple as migrant/minority groups simply assimilating to 'host' practices to become part of that nation. Their very nature as 'other' disallows this, and in turn, unsettles the meanings of the traditional 'host' practice as it challenges the divisions on which these narratives are based. Moreover, this suggests that looking both at memorial practices (Maddrell and Marjavaara, 2016) and practitioner discourses (Balkan, 2016; Torres et al. 2015; Beebeejaun, 2012) may offer different views into this topic, and ones which together may transgress and unsettle the dominant discourses of 'insiders' and 'outsider'.

Seeing and hearing space: Lefebvre, interviews, photographs.

The paper now briefly draws upon Lefebvre's (1991) framing of space to provide a useful analytical lens to take this topic further. There is now a wealth of literature on the way Lefebvre's work deepens analysis in the spatial disciplines, (see for example Leary, 2009, 2013; Kipfer et al. 2013) and this paper neither tries nor aims to either cover this debate, nor to substantially contribute to the development of these ideas. It draws on Lefebvre's conceptualisation of space as seeing space as 'an unfinished product that is continuously *perceived, conceived* and *lived*' (Buser, 2012: 294, emphasis added), providing a useful point of reference for how the same space can hold multiple meanings, and how this is inescapably within a network of power relations. This 'spatial triad' enables the identification a disjuncture between 'official' and 'lived' versions of the same place, with the possibility of making visible the experience of minority groups in relation to their positioning within the dominant 'version' of the city (McCann, 1999).

The three aspects of Lefebvre's triad are as follows. The first of these is representations of space. This is the official 'scientific' abstracted version of a place, how somewhere is *conceived* in documents such as policies and plans. In opposition to this is the idea of spaces of representation. This is a different, *lived* construction of space, potentially in opposition to the dominant representation of space by what are necessarily positioned as subaltern practices. By living an official space in a different way, a different construction of the meaning of this space is possible (Leary, 2009; Knott, 2005). Finally, spatial practices both contain and challenge the other aspects of the triad; space as *perceived*. Spatial practices are the material embodiment of space, something that is constantly renegotiated and reinterpreted, rather than an abstract empty vessel, beyond the conflicts of signification. Spatial practices allow for "discontinuous and incommensurable social spaces that are situated in a common location" (Carp, 2008: 129): co-existing and conflicting materialities of spaces of representation and representations of space.

In terms of cemeteries (or deathscapes more widely), this framework allows their space to simultaneously hold multiple meanings, to represent different incommensurable identities and different, non-compatible ways of dividing and defining the people who inhabit them. It is useful as it focuses primarily on their material spatialities, a specific aspect of wider spatialities of grief (Maddrell, 2015). The spatial triad gives insight into how 'official' constructions of space shape the practices therein, but also shows how they do not have the power to fix this meaning- the other aspects of the triad can contest and unsettle these claims. It also raises questions about verbal methods (i.e. interviews) being adequate as the only means of researching space. By their nature, places provide 'an assault on all ways of knowing' (Hayden, 1997, p18), so the question of how they can be researched and represented is a perennial one in geography, planning and related spatial disciplines (Pink,

2001; Rose, 2012; Harper, 2012; Johnston and Lorimer, 2013). Using Lefebvre's framework, verbal methods and their presentation in written academic work lean to re-creating a representation of space, even if they do not intend to only capture this aspect of space. Visual approaches can offer 'better access to the immediate lived and felt everyday world… help(ing) researchers to 'come closer to lived life'' (Oldthrup and Cartsensen, 2012:226). This can offer a stronger way of representing 'the multi-layered multiplicity of urban space' (Wells, 2007: 143) notwithstanding critiques of the subjectivity and interpretability of photography (Crang, 2010; Pink, 2001).

Photographs connect with the viewer in a different way to words because they can simultaneously offer something beyond and outside of personal experience and understanding, but within that, offer something with which the viewer can connect (Shurkus, 2014). Barthes develops these ideas in his classic text *Camera Lucidia* (1980), describing this connection as a photograph's *punctum*; a small unintentional detail which allows for the photograph to connect outside of itself, for it to hook into a viewer's personal understanding and emotional experience[vi], connecting the 'lived' with the 'perceived' (Lefebvre, 1991) beyond the need for the necessarily representational medium of words/language. There is something within the captured image of the memorials which is beyond a description of them. It may not be a pure reflection of 'lived' space, especially when reproduced within an academic paper, but offers another texture or layer of representation that helps build up a richer account of lived space In relation to considering meaning, identity and place attachment amongst diverse groups within deathscapes and memorial practices, this interpretation of photographs provides a means of unsettling categorical definitions of identity, as will be demonstrated in the subsequent sections.

Cemeteries represented and cemeteries 'lived'

The paper next presents research findings from in-depth, semi-structured interviews with nine cemeteries managers from across England and Wales. It first presents how cemetery managers describe the diverse groups who use the cemeteries in the cities in which they work, and then contrasts this with images of memorial practices from those cemeteries. It then discusses how cemetery managers see notions of local place attachment for the (ancestrally) British population, local to the area; again contrasting this with photographs. The paper only presents a small sample of images, but the following comments and analysis are made on the basis of the wider range gathered and observed within the research process. When quoting from the interviews, the text has been anonymised with a number replacing a name/place of work. This is so that the reader can identified quotes from the same person without compromising the anonymity of participants. The cities were chosen as they represented a broad geographical spread of the largest urban areas outside of London, including six of the ten 'Core Cities' (Core Cities, 2018) with other cities of similar size chosen because of access to willing participants. London is notably over-represented in the research into cemeteries (Francis et al, 2005; Woodthorpe, 2011; Gandy, 2012) and it was felt that it was important to compensate for this, as well as demonstrating a more diverse range of practices which had the potential to explore local/regional identities. The chosen cemetery managers were all employed by a local authority and had management responsibilities for at least one public cemetery, overseeing day-to-day issues of burials, cremations and grounds maintenance as well as managing the staff directly responsible for these tasks. Some had wider responsibilities to manage local parks too and many had some strategic oversight into considerations for provision of new sites/services. All were white, and there were three women and six men. Interviews were conducted in the offices of the managers, recorded with

informed consent of the participants, and transcribed. They were then coded allowing the themes of identity and difference to emerge.

By looking at the diverse memorial practices in cemeteries, suggestions of place attachment and identity can be derived from what is seen inscribed on left on graves/memorial plaques. The paper is not suggesting any identity is so simple it can just be written (or drawn) on a memorial and literally read and understood by its audience. However, the information which is placed publically to remember a deceased person by, has its own importance which should not be overlooked when researching this area. Moreover, photographs are of particular value because of their role in unsettling dominant assumptions about categorical identity in a way which both challenges and connects with the viewer (Barthes, 1980). In the following sections, twelve photographs are presented and discussed. Although the written analysis presents an important part of this paper's argument, the photographs should be seen as much a part of this themselves.

However, when researching multicultural identity in cemeteries, my position as a white British researcher is problematic. In looking for immigrant and minority ethnic grave markings/memorial practices, I define, and therefore reinforce these orientalised, supposed boundaries of who is an 'insider' and an 'outsider' from a position of power, both in my cultural upbringing and also my position as an academic. This may be particularly problematic in photography as the object photographed has no voice in the way interview participants do. However, the photographed object itself is represented more literally (Barthes, 1980), more completely, than edited and analysed interview transcripts. Despite this, my choice of what to photograph and present is unavoidable, and by no means neutral (Crang, 2010; Pink, 2001). In practical terms, and regarding research ethics, I was very

conscious of not taking photographs of graves which were being visited, and endeavoured to keep a distance apart from any other visitor to the cemetery when looking at graves. Because of the scale of the sites, and that I was visiting on weekdays, this did not pose any particular difficulties. In terms of the photographs analysed and displayed in this paper, a difficult choice about anonymity has been made. I have chosen to display photographs without removal of names or other identifying features. These gravestones are all publically visible to anyone who enters the public cemetery in which they are found, and although explicit permission to photograph and reproduce them has not been sought, it can be argued that it would be wrong to anonymise then as this would be withholding their (public) memory. I do not see this as a definitive position, or one necessary to be emulated by other researchers. There is not scope in this paper to develop these concerns comprehensively but this outlines my current rationale.

Different groups; distinct needs?

Across all the interviews, managers noted that they needed to serve specific needs for people whose ancestors (or selves) did not originate locally. Most managers stated that they had been approached by diverse[vii] groups wanting to establish specific areas within the cemetery. This is reflected in research findings from the Netherlands and Belgium (Kadrouch-Outmany, 2016) where different Muslim groups claim separate burial space defending and reifying the boundaries of 'their' identity by claims for separate cemetery space, in turn, designating fixed notions of insiders and outsiders. In this research, responses from UK cemetery managers ranged from ambivalence about whether this would cause future problems by not leaving enough space without designation, to responding positively to requests: *'if we've been approached by any particular culture that have asked us to reserve an area for them, that's something we've done, and would still be willing to do'* (Cemetery

manager 3).   Further, some national or cultural groups, though not creating officially designated areas within the cemetery, were seen as wanting to be buried close to others from a similar background as *'they tend to want to be in the same sort of location'* (Cemetery manager 6).   This illustrates that the management of public cemetery space in UK is responsive to diverse needs, but in a way which is informed by a mind-set of 'insiders' and 'outsiders'.   By identifying a group, with certain specific needs, it's 'otherness' becomes static and reified (Beebeejaun, 2004; Barabantseva, 2016). This can be done by communities as well as officials (Kadrouch-Outmany, 2016) However, here, this practice is a form of 'governmental' belonging (Hunter, 2016; Hage, 1995): as 'officials'; public sector cemetery managers- are empowered to define who is or is not an 'outsider', concomitantly reinforcing these notions and their authority.   Groups that need/desire certain 'things', (be it material or a practice) which differentiate them from an assumed indigenous 'insider', become a distinct 'them/they'.   Cemetery managers talked about the general public as 'they', but clearly delineated between this 'they' and the reified and fixed group identity given to those belonging to an 'outsider' community.   This division and understanding of difference permeated thinking about all aspects of cemetery management as illustrated in the following quotes:

> The West Indian community for example, generally the women will sing and the men will backfill the grave at the end of the service, you know, and that's something that the West Indian community often do. (Cemetery manager 4)

> The Polish Community tend to be right on the case in terms of maintenance, and do visit regular. Whereas some of the other faiths, you don't see people from one year to the next. (Cemetery manager 6)

One of the reasons the Asians come here is they can park their coaches, they can't park them

at [facility in neighbouring authority]. (Cemetery manager 2)

There are two, interlinked assumptions about identity of 'others' expressed in these statements. The first is that 'others' are entirely different and separate from 'us'. Their difference is their defining feature and core to their identity. The second is that this difference, as well as an absolute divide between 'us' and 'them', also represents a uniformity between all those who are different from us in any given category or population. In contrast to these articulations of difference, the material practices of memorialisation do not present such clear bounded identities, as demonstrated in Figures 1 and 2. This concurs with Pickering's (2001: 72 cited in Torres et al. 2016: 114) claim that 'the location of the Other is primarily in language', that difference is readily found and reified in 'the ways we *refer to* and *talk* about the "Others"' (Torres et al. 2016: 115, emphasis added). Moreover, it demonstrates an example of the *representation* of cemetery space- the way the space is constructed by the managers' understandings creates a certain reality; but one which is challenged by perceiving the space differently.

The images presented here are fairly typical of UK cemeteries, in terms of the size, shape and materials of headstones, and the amount and type of text and visual materials inscribed on them. There are variations between sites and cites, and over time, but the vast majority of graves in UK cemeteries are marked with headstones, many with kerbsets to mark out the area of the grave and allow the friends and family of the deceased person to lay flowers and other memorial items. It is also important to note that graves are usually purchased with a 99 year lease in UK cemeteries, with practices of grave reuse after 10-20 years- common in some European contexts- not taking place in the UK. Figures 1 and 2 present images which challenge these two assumptions about identity and 'otherness'. These

are somewhere between 'lived' and 'perceived' space: the former for those who directly and emotionally engage with a given grave and/or cemetery, and the latter for those who observe or interact with these images either via this paper or in their original setting. By its very nature, 'lived space' is something which cannot be represented in its wholeness; however photographs present its different quality more adequately than words alone. Figure 1 firstly demonstrates shared memorial practices across 'insider' and 'outsider' groups, and Figure 2 demonstrates the overlapping between supposedly distinct groups of both personal and familial identities.

[INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE]

Figure 1 Shared Memorial Practices (Source: authors own)

The four images in Figure 1 demonstrates the use of locally common memorial goods or phrases on graves which also identify with (ancestrally) migrant groups or are in specifically designated areas in the cemeteries. The mixing of memorial practices and choice of words on these gravestones unsettles the distinctions of 'them' and 'us' which underpins categorical neo-colonial assumptions which structure the way cemetery managers discuss different burial practices and requirements. The first photograph, of a Muslim gravestone, also displays the large floral tribute reading 'MUM', common to graves more generally. This challenges a notion of a distinct and uniform set of Muslim practices which do not interact with local or 'insider' ones. The second image displays a similar concern: a Muslim stone with gnomes, footballs and a plaque reading 'Dad's garden': everyday memorial items in all areas of the cemetery, challenging the separateness of Muslim/non-Muslim identity. The third image is again in the same lines, however, what is of note here is the *local* vernacular. The words 'Nana and Grampy' (from small flower holder stone) were common terms to refer to grandparents within that cemetery, demonstrating the local influence on the choice of language for an inscription, not just that the range of goods available may sway what is

placed on a grave. The final image demonstrates this unsettling of assumed otherness in a slightly different way. The claim of being a 'great hairdresser to the community' places the deceased strongly within a local area, rather than only or fundamentally an 'outsider' from Jamaica. However, the inscription of his place of birth *as* Jamaica makes his role in the community less straightforward. The question can be raised as to what 'the community' refers to here; but whether it is a straightforward local area, or a notion of locally based Jamaican diaspora, the simplicity of categorical 'insiders' and 'outsiders' is unsettled. The way these attributes jar with the assumptions of the neo-colonial dominant discourse can be seen as their 'punctum', their element that unsettles and connects. They also demonstrate that lived/perceived space is not the same as the official representations- there may be distinct and diverse groups with specific needs; but there is also much more overlap, complexity and individuality that this framing alone would allow.

[INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE]

Figure 2 Multiple identities (Source: authors own)

Figure 2 continues to unsettle the assumptions of clear distinctions between 'insiders' and 'outsiders'. Here, they collectively display commemorational identities which symbolise more than one cultural attachment, be it for one individual, or for a family or couple who are not from the same single grouping. The first photograph represents two 'outsider' groups; the juxtaposition of harp *and* the eagle (symbols of Irish and Polish origins) questioning assumptions of tightly bounded homogeneity within either the Polish or Irish communities- if tightly bounded, which one should this stone belong to? In a similar manner, the next image's punctum is also '*the-and-the':* the Shamrock and the Daffodils (symbols of Irish and Welsh origins). However, these two symbols are attributed to one person in the case. Moreover, as this is a photograph of a stone in a Welsh cemetery, the identities here are of both 'insider' and 'outsider'. The next image differs from the previous two as the punctum in

this is the image of Jesus. Not uncommon within cemetery landscapes in itself, it here stands out amongst the other graves in the vicinity which are also largely inscribed with Chinese characters [viii], challenging a notion of uniform practice from 'a' Chinese community. Moreover, the names of mourners/living relatives are inscribed in a different language from some of the rest of the gravestone, specifically in English. In this photograph, the names, appearing traditionally English, jar with the otherwise 'outsider' status of the gravestone. This both echoes Reimers' (1999) concerns about the complexity of migrant groups taking on host practices and unsettles the absoluteness ascribed to categorical identity. The fourth image demonstrates the development of identities over time, with the inscription moving from Cyrillic Russian to English, demonstrating how both past and current language and country of dwelling can be part of an identity simultaneously.

By presenting this sample of images, the paper aims to begin to demonstrate the power of photographs. Their small unsettling details both disrupt and connect with the viewer (Barthes, 1980) to challenge dominant neo-colonial narrative of identity, both of group sameness, and 'their' absolute different to 'insiders'. Further, the use of these images offers a tentative way spatial practices, here material practices of memorialisation and how they present a different (cemetery) space from the conceptions of the managers; space cannot be understood by words alone.

A local cemetery for local people?

The sense of 'otherness' articulated by cemetery managers when discussing the needs and desires of (ancestrally) migrant groups was reinforced by the way that 'insider' identities were described; specifically the shared importance of local place attachment. This supports previous findings which emphases the importance of local connections in memorial practices

(Maddrell, 2009). From the interviews, there was a strong view, across all cities, that local residents remained closely attached to their *local* cemetery, rather than content to use any other cemetery within the city that offered more space, better financial value or extra facilities. A sense of shared belonging in local identity was expressed in statements such as 'they're disappointed that they haven't still got their local cemetery' (Cemetery manager 1), and 'it's almost a tribal thing where they're linked to that particular cemetery' (Cemetery manager 2) emphasising a collective being 'they', when referring to the difficulties seen in some cities with getting people to accept new sites. This sense of super-local or neighbourhood identity was so pronounced that it was often cited as influencing disposal choices: 'families that are local there, would even consider cremation...rather than be buried at (other cemetery on other side of the city) (Cemetery manager 3). Managers stated that they either provided space, or planned to provide space, for the scattering of ashes and memorial plaques in cemeteries which were otherwise full, for residents of that neighbourhood or local community. This sense of local attachment often went beyond a desire to be buried/memorialised near to living loved ones, as many managers stated that a sense of local identity was so strong that people often wanted to be buried back in cemeteries which are close to their 'original' home, despite where they may have resided at the time of death. This links back to questions of 'home' and 'belonging' (Tuan, 1977), but also to the wider questions of civic identity and public memory of a city (Hayden, 1997; Graham and Whelan, 2007; Burk, 2003).

However, the importance of local identity in relation to the cemetery was not mentioned with 'outsider' groups. Identity for those groups was assumed to be about their religious or cultural needs rather than any continuing bonds with the local area. This is not to be critical of cemetery managers, or to suggest that they making prejudice assumptions or

treat certain people in a less valued way, it merely demonstrates the consequences of the dominant framing narrative of 'insiders' and 'outsiders'. In Figure 3, both *local* place attachment and diaspora/international identities co-exist, unsettling categorical assumptions about practice and choices founded on (post) colonial narratives. Specifically, it displays four images of gravestones which suggest that connections to place are not either/or choices between current locality and country of (ancestral) origin.

[INSERT FIGURE 3 HERE]

Figure 3 Local place attachment (Source: authors own)

The first two images display the importance of local place attachment by the inscriptions 'Handsworth' and 'Gillott Road, Edgbaston' in turn- connections to city neighbourhoods close to the cemetery in which they are found[ix]. In the second of these, this connection to local place stands out particularly because it is the only inscription in English, and in the first because of its contrast with 'Bangladesh' in English and the specific locational details inscribed in Bengali (see footnote for translation). The third image[x] is similar to the preceding two, but also reflects the analysis of Figures 1 and 2; using the sort of language common to many neighbouring memorials: specifically terms such as 'In Loving Memory' and 'a Beloved Wife and Mother' as well as displaying names which appear both 'insider' and 'outsider'. The fourth image also displays local and global connections with the depictions of both Jamaica and Aston Villa Football Club. This is worthy of particular note because not only it does demonstrate a connection with a place of residence; support for a local football team demonstrates belonging in a way which (at best) cuts across many other differences between people, but also locates their emotional allegiances to a specific place. However, by also including the Jamaican flag, identity is presented as more diverse and multifaceted. These images hint at spatial connections which are more complex and

overlapping than suggested in the discourses of cemetery mangers, and further unsettle and transgress the dominant neo-colonial narratives.

Conclusions

Public sector cemetery managers in the UK accommodate and actively provide for a wide range of faith and cultural needs, but the way they conceive bereaved people and their families is still framed by neo-colonial ideas of ethnicity and difference. This means that ethnic/religious 'others' are assumed to have faith/cultural identities and attachments which are mutually exclusive to local place attachment, in turn differentiating them from the ancestrally 'local' population; reinforcing exclusionary imperialist conceptions of identity and belonging. Cemetery managers representations of cemetery space can be seen as practices of governmental belonging (Hunter, 2016; Hage, 1999); moreover they temporally fix (ancestrally) migrant group's identities as something different and unchanging (Barabantseva, 2016); verbally creating and reifying a notion of the Other (Pickering, 2001, cited in Torres et al. 2016). The presentation and analysis of Figures 1-3 suggests that spatial practices are not this simple. Faith and/or country of (ancestral) origin are important, but these are not discretely bounded categories, either from other 'outsiders', or from the local attachments and practice of 'insiders'.

On the basis of the interviews, cemetery space is one of separateness- different and distinct groups coming to inhabit space and have presence in the city- rather than one of shared and (mutually) changing local history. However, the photographs suggest that this is not the case: local place attachment and minority ethnic religion are not necessarily mutually exclusive, and cultural practices, even around death and remembrance, are personally and locally mediated. In terms of practical considerations, there were no discussions in the

interviews as to whether groups or individuals from minority religious faiths or ancestrally migrant origin would also prefer cemetery space in their immediate locality, whether this local identity also was part of their notion of continuing bonds with the dead. Figure 3 suggests most directly that this may be the case, with the images unsettling a simple, binary divide; however, the area remains substantially under-researched. This is not to be unduly critical of the attitudes and assumptions of UK cemetery managers. As is noted elsewhere (Kadrouch-Outmany, 2016), boundary maintenance and the reification of categorical identities is something done by migrant-origin group members too, although divisions claimed may not be coterminous with those of managers, and there is variation between nations and regions. These contested notions of identity, and their relationship to practice, further claims about the importance of memorials in ongoing negotiations of continued bonds (Maddrell, 2009; Maddrell and Marjarvaara, 2016), and the contested nature of cemetery space (Woodthorpe, 2011; McClymont, 2016). Moreover, they raise important issues for future research and policy agendas.

Methodologically, the role of photographs is important here on two counts. Looking at memorials (and photographing them to record them) is important research in itself[xi]. It demonstrates what has been done, rather than what people claim to have done or to wish to do. It captures a wider range of practices (although only twelve photographs are used within this paper, these are a selection from thousands taken during the research process) than would be possible through interviews/surveys. Moreover, it allow readers to connect with the research subject, and engage with issues of personal identity and multifaith memorialisation in a different way that words alone (Barthes, 1980). By including photographs of memorials in addition to descriptions, the aim is to allow for a different understanding to develop, not one solely mediated by my words as an author (notwithstanding the earlier caveats).

Furthermore, this maintenance of 'insider/outsider' divide as a primary category of (local) identity influences how cemeteries function as public memory of whole, multi-cultural city, as symbols of civic identity. Cemetery managers operate by finding space for 'immigrants' positioned as guests rather than full citizens. The lived and perceived spatiality of the cemetery appears somewhat at odds with this, however, demonstrating importance of photographs as an alternative way of *knowing* space. By analysing space as divergent: difference places co-existing in one site, the research has illustrated that official conceptions may influence spatial practices, but they do not dominate space as lived. By drawing on both interviews and photographs, the research engages with different dimensions of the cemetery, and so begins to develop a more complex understanding of identity and belonging, both in the contexts of death and dying, and in the ongoing legacy of postcolonialism. This deeper understanding could form the basis of being able to provide and plan for inclusive and culturally rich cities for the living and the dead.

References

Anderson, B., 1983. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. London: Verso.

Balkan, O., 2016. Between Civil Society and the State: Bureaucratic Competence and Cultural Mediation among Muslim Undertakers in Berlin. Journal of Intercultural Studies, 37(2), 147–161.

Barabantseva, E., 2016. Seeing Beyond an 'Ethnic Enclave': the Time/space of Manchester Chinatown. Identities, 23 (1) 99-115.

Barthes, R., 1980 [2000]. Camera Lucida. London: Vintage.

Beebeejaun, Y., 2012. Including the Excluded? Changing the Understandings of Ethnicity in Contemporary English Planning, Planning Theory and Practice. 13(4) 529-548.

Beebeejaun, Y., 2004. What's in a Nation? Constructing ethnicity in the British planning system, Planning Theory and Practice. 5(4), 437–451.

Buciek, K. and Juul, K., 2008. 'We Are Here, Yet We Are Not Here' The Heritage of Excluded Groups. In: B. Graham and P. Howard, eds. The Ashgate research companion to Heritage and Identity. Aldershot: Ashgate, 105-124.

Burk, A.L., 2003. Private Griefs, Public Place. Political Geography 22, 317-333.

Carp, J., 2008. 'Ground-Truthing' Representations of Social Space: Using Lefebvre's Conceptual Triad. Journal of Planning Education and Research, 28 (2), 129-142.

Chacko, E., 2015. Hybrid Sensibilities: Highly Skilled Asian Indians Negotiating Identity in Private and Public Spaces of Washington, DC. Journal of Cultural Geography, 32 (1), 115-128.

Core Cities, 2018. https://www.corecities.com/about-us . Accessed 10th March 2018.

Crang, M., 2010. Visual Methods and Methodologies. In: D DeLyser, S. Herbert, S. Aitken, M. Crang, and L. McDowell, eds. The SAGE handbook of Qualitative Geography. London: Sage, 208-224.

Deering, B., 2010. From Anti-social Behaviour to X-rated: Exploring Social Diversity and Conflict in the Cemetery. In: A. Maddrell and J. Sidaway eds. Deathscapes: Spaces for Death, Dying, Mourning and Remembrance. Farnham: Ashgate, 75-94.

Dwyer, C. and Bressey, C., 2008. New Geographies of Race and Racism, Ashgate: Aldershot.

Francis, D., Kellaher, L., and Neophytou, G., 2005. The Secret Cemetery. Oxford: Berg.

Gandy, M., 2012. Queer Ecology: Nature, Sexuality, and Heterotopic Alliances. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 30 (4), 727-747.

Graham, B and Whelan, Y., 2007. The legacies of the dead: commemorating the Troubles in Northern Ireland, Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 25 47-495.

Gilroy, P., 1987. There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack: The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation. London: Routledge.

Gilmartin, M. and Migge, B., 2015. Home Stories: Immigrant Narratives of Place and Identity in Contemporary Ireland. Journal of Cultural Geography, 32, (1), 83-101.

Gunaratnam, Y., 2013. Death and the Migrant: Bodies, Borders and Care. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Hage, G., 1996. The Spatial Imaginary of National Practices: Dwelling-Domesticating/Being- Exterminating. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 14 (4), 463-485.

Hall, S., 1999. Un-settling 'The Heritage', Re-imagining the Post-nationWhose heritage? Third Text, 13 (49), 3-13.

Harper, D., 2012 Visual Sociology. London: Routledge.

Hayden, D., 1997. The Power of Place. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Heath, A. and Demireva, N., 2014. Has Multiculturalism Failed in Britain? Ethnic and Racial Studies, 37 (1), 161-180.

Heidegger, M., 1962. Being and Time. New York: Harper and Row.

Hunter, A., 2016. Deathscapes in Diaspora: Contesting Space and Negotiating Home in Contexts of Post-Migration Diversity. Social and Cultural Geography, 17(2), 247–261.

Hunter, A., and Soom Ammann, E., 2016. End-of-Life Care and Rituals in Contexts of Post-migration Diversity in Europe: An Introduction. Journal of Intercultural Studies, 37(2), 95–102.

Institute of Cemetery and Crematoria Managers (ICCM) 2014. Charter for the Bereaved. Available from http://www.iccm-uk.com/iccm/downloads.php Accessed 26th September 2017.

Fincher, R. and Iveson, K., 2008. Planning and Diversity in the City: Redistribution, Recognition and Encounter. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jassal, L.K., 2015. Necromobilities: The Multi-sited Geographies of Death and Disposal in a Mobile World. Mobilities, 10 (3), 486-509.

Johnston, C. and Lorimer, H., 2014. Sensing the City. Cultural Geographies, 21(4), 673-680.

Kellehear, A., 2007. A Social History of Dying. Cambridge: CUP.

Kaplan, D and Chacko, E., 2015. Placing Immigrant Identities. Journal of Cultural Geography, 32(1), 129-138.

Kadrouch-Outmany, K. K., 2016. Religion at the Cemetery: Islamic Burials in the Netherlands and Belgium. Contemporary Islam, 10(1), 87–105.

Kipfer, S., Saberi, P. and Wieditz, T., 2013. Henri Lefebvre: Debates and controversies. Progress in Human Geography, 37 (1), 115-134.

Knott, K., 2005. The Location of Religion: a Spatial Analysis. London: Routledge.

Leary, M.E., 2009. The Production of Space through a Shrine and Vendetta in Manchester: Lefebvre's Spatial Triad and the Regeneration of a Place Renamed Castlefield. Planning Theory and Practice, 10(2), 189-212.

Leary, M.E., 2013. A Lefebvrian Analysis of the Production of Glorious, Gruesome Public Space in Manchester. Progress in Planning, 85, 1-52.

Lefebvre, H., 1991. The Production of Space. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Maddrell, A., 2015. Mapping Grief. A Conceptual Framework for Understanding the Spatial Dimensions of Bereavement, Mourning and Remembrance. Social and Cultural Geography, 17 (2) 166-188.

Maddrell, A., 2013. Living with the Deceased: Absence, Presence and Absence-presence. Cultural Geographies, 20 (4), 501-522.

Maddrell. A., 2011. Bereavement, Belief and Sense-Making in the Contemporary British Landscape: Three Case Studies. In: C. Brace, A. Bailey, S. Carter, D. Harvey, and N. Thomas, eds. Emerging Geographies of Belief. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 216-238.

Maddrell, A., 2009. Mapping Changing Shades of Grief and Consolation in the Historic Landscape of St Patrick's Isle, Isle of Man. In: M. Smith, J. Davidson, L. Cameron and L. Bondi, eds. Emotion, Place and Culture. Farnham: Ashgate, 35-55.

Maddrell, A and Marjavaara, R., 2016. 'Placing' the Dead: the significance of post-mortal place identities in a mobile world', paper presented to: Deathscapes of the

Future: International perspectives on mobility, diversity and sustainability Context - Issues – Interventions. UWE, Bristol, 7th July 2016.

Maddrell, A., and Sidaway, J., eds., 2010. Deathscapes: Spaces for Death, Dying, Mourning and Remembrance. Farnham: Ashgate.

McCann, E.J., 1999. Race, Protest, and Public Space: Contextualizing Lefebvre in the U.S. City. Antipode 31 (2) 163-184.

McClymont, K., 2016. That eccentric use of land at the top of the hill": Stories of the City, Planning and Cemeteries. Mortality, 21 (4), 378-396.

Oldrup, H. and Carstensen, T., 2012. Producing Geographical Knowledge through Visual Methods. Geografiska Annaler: Series B Human Geography, 94(3), 223-237.

Pink, S., 2001. Doing Visual Ethnography. London: Sage.

Porter, L., 2006. Planning in (Post) Colonial Settings: Challenges for Theory and Practice. Planning Theory and Practice, 7(4), 383-396.

Reimers, E., 1999. Death and Identity: Graves and Funerals as Cultural Communication. Mortality, 4(2), 147-166.

Rose, G., 2012. Visual Methodologies: an Introduction to Researching with Visual Materials. London: SAGE.

Rugg, J., 2000. Defining the Place of Burial: What makes a Cemetery a Cemetery? Mortality, 5, 259–275.

Sandercock, L. 200.3 Cosmopolis II: Mongrel Cities in the 21st Century. New York and London: Continuum.

Said, E.W., 2003. Orientalism. London:Penguin

Shurkus, M., 2014. Camera Lucida and Affect: Beyond Representation. Photographies, 7(1), 67-83.

Thomas, H., 2008. Race Equality and Planning: a Changing Agenda. Planning Practice and Research, 23 (1), 1-17.

Torres, S., Ågård, P., and Milberg, A., 2016. The 'Other' in End-of-life Care: Providers' Understandings of Patients with Migrant Backgrounds.   Journal of Intercultural Studies, 37 (2), 103-117.

Tuan,Y-F., 1977. Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Venhorst, C., Quartier, T., Nissen, P. and Venbrux, E., 2013. Islamic Ritual Experts in a Migration Context: Motivation and Authority in the Ritual Cleansing of the Deceased. Mortality, 18 (3), 235-250.

Wells, K., 2007. The Material and Visual Cultures of Cities. Space and Culture, 10 (2), 136-144.

Woodthorpe, K., 2011. Sustaining the Contemporary Cemetery: Implementing Policy alongside Conflicting Perspectives and Purpose. Mortality, 16(3), 259-276.

Woodthorpe, K., 2010. Private Grief in Public Spaces: Interpreting Memorialisation in the Contemporary Cemetery. In: J. Hockey, C. Komaromy and K. Woodthorpe eds. The Matter of Death: Space, Place and Materiality. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 117-132.

Worpole, K., 2003. Last Landscapes : the Architecture of the Cemetery in the West. London: Reaktion Books.

Young, I.M., 1990. Justice and the Politics of Difference. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.

---

i This quote is from cemetery manager 3 when discussing practices within the local Chinese community.
ii This quote is from cemetery manager 3 when discussing practices within the local Chinese community.
iii Meaning the ones the cemetery managers interviewed have jurisdiction over, at times this was one site, in other cases, several.
iv See the Deathscapes and Diversity Project: www.deathscapesanddiversity.org.uk for information about current work on this topic.

[v] The UK's professional association for bereavement service providers.

[vi] The 'absence-presence' provoked by a photograph can parallel that felt in bereavement practices which invoke continuing bonds with the deceased (Maddrell, 2013). On this basis, photographs of memorials have a particularly problematic status. Gravestone pictures and inscriptions, amongst other memorial practices, capture some of this strange 'anterior-future' tense which Barthes attributes to photographs: of something that is, yet is not. A photograph of a memorial is hence a double detachment, fixing and dislocating the image of that which is already a static and unchanging abstraction of a person (notwithstanding issues of weathering and more temporary memorial practices such as placing cards or floral tributes on the grave). A photograph of a gravestone differs from the stone itself because of its mobility and temporal fixing. Therefore, photographs of gravestones can be removed from their context, assembled together without aging or weathering or any influence of other memorial practices. They are objectifications of objects; however, this does not diminish their importance as research material in this area.

[vii] This covers a range of ethno-nationalist and faith based identities such as Polish, Muslim and Chinese.

[viii] English translation of inscription reads: 14th February 1966 The Grave of Gentleman Mr. WAI KING CHEN Zhejiang Dinghai Taishan Village *Translator's note: the Chinese word "Xiang" can be translated as "Village" or directly used as "Xiang", which is an area bigger than a village smaller than a town.

[ix] Translations of inscriptions are respectively: 'Village: Ishan Pur Police Station: Jagannathpur' (First image which also reads Handsworth) and 'In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful There is absolutely no deity worthy of worship except Allah, and Mohamed (saws) is the Messenger of Allah. Recite Fatiha on this grave! We belong to Allah and to Him we shall return. Muhammad Abdul Hameed Dated of birth: 20-05-34 Date of death: 13 March 1985 418 Gillott Road, Edgbaston'

[x] Translation of the text in Arabic:' In the name of Allah the Compassionate, the Merciful The tomb of the late Haj Ali Salaman Al Zuberi who passed away on the first of Ramadan 1384 Hijri. O Allah bless him with your wide mercy and put him in your spacious paradise. Al Fatiha upon the soul of Prophet Mohammed, Peace be upon him'

[xi] Also see https://transmortality.uni.lu/Project-RIP