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Introduction

The uses of heritage and the postcolonial condition in Latin America

Olaf Kaltmeier and Mario Rufer

In the last decades, we have witnessed a strong expansion and diffusion of cultural heritage. From the most distant town to international forums, we observe the growing use of heritage rhetoric and practices. Subsequently, the proliferation of studies on heritage in Latin America has achieved, in the last few years, a notorious level of development and sophistication. The analyses go from an exploration of the senses pushed by the instituted actions (agents in statehood or supra-state interventions regulated by transnational mechanisms), to less programmatic social actions geared to claim denied, silenced, or hidden senses of origin and provenance, and even studies of layout, management, and promotion of heritage and its links to cultural consumption. This book, gathering the main contributions of the aforementioned branches, follows, however, a divergent question. The question that we editors formulated at the beginning was: Is there a specificity in the formulas of how the politics and narratives on heritage and heritizing are conceived, exploited, administrated, signified, and appropriated in Latin America, part of the global south?

A first warning that might seem obvious should be mentioned: that question rose from the basic premise of not assuming that heritage exists previously to the skein of politics and poetics that constitute it, the way Carolina Crespo notes in this work. We do not think, as editors, that there is a historical a priori regarding something that must be considered, registered, or legitimized as ‘heritage.’ What interested us from the beginning was to deconstruct and analyze a triple process from global south contexts: first, how does the notion of heritage became a central input with strong political connotations in actions with instituting goals (from the state or supra-state) as well as in actions ‘from the bases’ or peripheral to institutional wishes (rural communities, indigenous communities, sectors identified with certain sociopolitical causes). Second, we were interested in working on the ways and processes through which the notion of heritage was objectified and turned from a political gesture to an unquestionable object (Appadurai 1981; Arantes 1984; Castañeda 1996; Ferry 2005; Florescano 1993; Rozental 2014; Vaca and García 2012): as if heritage ‘exists’ (and in every case it should be known what to do with it). The discussion turned on the terms of the establishment of rules, norms, and guidelines that could specify the regulation of
the witness-objects (material objects or, in the last decades, also ‘intangible’). Third, we explore how notions and uses of heritage are transformed and act as transformers of the current cultural regimes in Latin America, especially in neoliberal and post-neoliberal contexts (Comaroff and Comaroff 1993; Herwitz 2012). The nucleus of the discussion consists in ambiguous dynamics of the commodification of heritage as an object or as a reference in the marketing surrounding places—from the city to the nation.

**Heritage, memory, postcoloniality**

In the two movements mentioned previously, we saw a base discussion dangerously diluted. The editors of this volume sustain that we pertain in societies that were gestated, administered, and politically regulated in modern-colonial power regimes: societies historically traversed by the ‘coloniality of power’ (Quijano 2000). In this sense, we believe it is necessary to ‘perceive a historic continuity between the conquest, the colonial order of the world and the postcolonial republic formation that extends until the present’ (Segato 2007b, 158; see also Turner 2000, 15–18). Of course we are not talking of continuities in the terms that classical structuralism perceived them or as a certain serial historiography conceived them, but instead as immutable series that weigh as historical sentences above the social subjects that live them. We speak, instead, of recognizing the silenced mimetic continuities, parodied under the apparent chiasm of the ‘national subject,’ protected by the disciplines under which shadows they were built upon, assumed, and practiced as ‘new political orders,’ metamorphosed in the apparent historic singularity of the national being present as autochthony, tradition, heritage (Rufer 2012).

Following Segato, we understand that:

> all states—colonial or national, the difference is irrelevant here—are otherness-like, otherness-phobic and otherness-producer at the same time. It allows the deployment of its others to enthrone itself, and any political process must be understood through those vertical processes of gestation of the whole ensemble and the cornering of identities.

(Segato 2007, 138, original emphasis)

If it happens in that manner, then what is the relationship of the narratives of heritage/heritizing and contemporary gestures of ‘community management’? What link exists between the administration of allowed identities inside ‘neoliberal multiculturalism’ and the overwhelming necessity of heritizing everything? And fundamentally, which political operations—and which senses of direction—are encased (several times hidden) in the apparent drive to make everything heritage?

Hence, the aim of the book is to explore the relevance of the politics of heritage and the uses of memory in the consolidation of these nation-states, as well as in the current disputes over resistances, hidden memories, undermined pasts, or the
Introduction: the uses of heritage

politics of nostalgia; the book also seeks to seize the local/global dimensions around heritage—with the intervention of UNESCO and other agents (see Kaltmeier, this volume; Castañeda 2009). At the same time, the relationship between collective memory (as a process created over the base of superimposed discursive devices) and heritage is marked by the difference with which the past is considered from the modern idea of rupture (Vaca 2012). The notion of heritage is inextricably linked to the modern will of indexical ordering of the past and showing it as ‘legacy’ through precise and institutionalized actions (generally, at least until World War II, as actions of any kind of state formation) (Hansen and Stepputat 2001; Pérez Monfort 2011).

It is relevant to mention that several of the authors participating in this book started their research exploring the field of politics of memory and the ‘uses’ of the past in the present. We explored how the ‘administration of the past’ (Rufer 2008) turned into one of the key gestures of the postcolonial nation. The different ‘productions of history’ (Cohen 1994) in textbooks, new museums, intervention and reposition of monuments, group, sectorial, or community actions to interpose hegemonic narrations of the past, have put the semic-discursive production on the past/memory/history triad on fertile moving terrain.

Was the new heritage boom linked with this performative gesture of the politics of memory in postcolonial contexts? That question is indirectly sustained in the texts of Kaltmeier, Rufer, and Crespo in this volume. Kaltmeier starts from a distinction that permeates this book as an epistemic gesture: ‘While in Western European countries, heritage has been transformed into a depoliticized lifestyle factor, heritage in postcolonial contexts has become a battleground on the interpretation of history and its projection into the future’ (see Kaltmeier, this volume). From this point of view, Kaltmeier will insist on the need to link the relevance of the politics of heritizing with the concept of indigeneity and coloniality in Latin America. To answer the initial question, the author unravels the role that is met by the forms of gestation and signifying heritage in postcolonial contexts, marked by the presence (demographical, political and public) of indigenous populations. Here, it is therefore worked in a double tension of conjuncture. On the one hand, one that marks colonial difference: starting with the quincentennial of the incorrectly called ‘Discovery’ of America, the discussion over heritage-acquired specific dimensions in terms of complaints, claims, and projections for the future of indigenous communities that repositioned their presence, memory, and legacy in the long Latino-American temporality. On the other hand, coloniality is also present in the gesture that tries—with precise policies—to domesticate this semi-political gesture in the new policies of identity of the multicultural nation-state (in its neoliberal and national-popular versions, depending on the case).

Carolina Crespo (in this volume) progresses in that direction by directly dissecting the poetics of the limits of ‘the permitted otherness’ in the present policies of heritage, fundamentally from indigenous populations. It is a clear analytical bet that also permeates all the works in this book; Crespo notes that she conceives the vision of heritage as process and political practice, pondering less what it is
from a normative analysis, than that which different social sectors are making out of it and the relations and implications that this generates. This requires being thought of more as a space for consensus, as a field of forces that involves tension in certain relations, subjectivities, emotional attachments, types of knowledge and visions of the social world and of the space inside the procedures of construction and dispute for hegemony.

The question over political tension between heritage and memory is also developed in the text by Rufer. The author presents how the notion of heritage, in certain cases, is used to absorb ‘the political’ of memory: sometimes memory can work like an enunciative strategy—of communal, sectorial, etc. (De Certeau 1980); as disruptive narratives with those trying to administer the past and transform it into a locked archive of the revisionist perspective. But the notion of heritage sometimes works in a functional manner to liberal multiculturalism, fundamentally acting as a ‘poisoned gift’: with the promise of being the reflection of the identity that is ‘now recognized’ and pondered upon, that identity stays, nevertheless, enclosed over itself in the non-profaniation logic of heritage: it must be guarded, extremely cared for, subtracted to experience. For the author, this is a reediting of the colonial will over the administration of the past and the present. Nevertheless, it presents its own fissures: from its precise analysis, Crespo, Rufer, and Kaltmeier explain how communities resignify and return the ‘heritizing’ gesture with the uneasy will of the action of memory (Pollack 2006). Therefore, with the concept that pertains to the hegemonic guidelines, they build a supplement of meaning (Bhabha 2002): crossing out the conservative gesture of institutional politics of heritage, imprinting a gamut of political senses over incompleteness, loss, hierarchy, and grievance.

Heritage and nation-state

From the nineteenth century onward, the uses of cultural heritage supported the modern nation-state building processes in the Americas, as well as their identity politics as homogenous territories. Nevertheless, in Latin American postcolonial societies, heritage can be conceived of a Western gift related to coloniality that regulates the narration of histories. In this sense especially, the narration and conception of indigeneity and coloniality pose a problem to heritage politics in the Americas.

The colonial rupture makes it impossible to construct a historical continuity from a remote past to the contemporary nation. Relying on the concept of ‘shared history,’ we argue that we can speak of a shared heritage that is common in terms of the basic grammar of heritage and articulated histories, but divided alongside the basic difference between colonizers and colonized. This problem is also evident in contemporary uses of the past. The last decades were crucial to the emergence of new debates: subcultures, new identities, hidden voices, and multicultural discourse as a kind of new hegemonic platform also involving concepts such as heritage and/or memory. Thereby we can observe a proliferation of heritage agents, especially beyond the scope of the nation-state (Escalante Gonzalbo 2011).
One main concern of this volume is to get beyond a container-vision of heritage that seeks to construct a diachronic continuity in a given territory. Instead, we want to point out the relational character of heritage focusing on transnational and translocal flows and interchanges of ideas, concepts, and practices, as well as on the creation of contact zones (Pratt 1998) where the meaning of heritage is negotiated and contested (López Caballero 2011).

In order to understand the entangled and relational character of heritage, we have to rethink our concepts. Several theoretical displacements seem necessary: we no longer think of culture as a system but also as a resource; we no longer deal only with historiographies, but also with ‘uses of the past’; we no longer work only with identities but also with ‘processes of identification.’ Heritage is also analyzed from its processes of construction in relation to the aforementioned variables (culture, identity, the past).

It is also evident that the relationship between heritage and nation-states must be able to show the performative dimension of the state. What concrete form does a policy of identities acquire when otherness that is controlled and limited by actions of statehood becomes an oppositional cultural good within the forces that play for the equilibrium of power. Celina Chocobare analyzes this side working on the uses of the past and the Ranquel ‘identity’ in San Luis, Argentina. Looking for a repositioning that would evidence the identity specificity (and exceptionality) of the region, the government of San Luis in Argentina proposes actions of specific recognition of the Ranquel indigenous community, and to achieve it deploys a series of particular uses of the past through local legislative resources and cultural management. The paradoxes of these uses of indigenous heritage highlight the ambiguity between politics of identification and the administration of difference. Gustavo Blázquez also shows how the notion of culture becomes a specific tool for the government and administration. The author discusses how a resource so seemingly innocuous such as popular music (the Argentinian cuarteto cordobés in this case) acquires a crucial dimension: its process of heritizing, analyzed from an ethnographic sensibility, unveiling the form in which the state reinvents itself day-by-day, extending its sovereignty over that which it defines as traditional, popular, and culturally ‘proper.’

On a different note, Frida Gorbach explores the way certain fundamental pieces of the hegemonic and monumental construction of national identity such as the National Museum of Anthropology of Mexico still continue reediting the fortress of the anthropology/heritage/nation-state triad. Starting with the exhibition of the relationship between dramaturgy and the power of ceremony that celebrated the 50 years of the National Museum, the author underpins a careful text on the diverse narratives (from classical authors up to contemporary works of art). These narratives discuss how, even in times of the recognition of otherness and exhibition of diversities, the nation-state reinvents the rubric of heritizing and the documentary/monumental gesture of disciplinary power and the exhibition complex.

Beyond ‘the stone’ as a key material testimony of the relation triad already explained, we question what happens with the most rooted and naturalized
exponents of the national symbolic universe: do anthems, rosettes, flags, and their uses still have something to tell us? How can we reframe the question by its political dimension in diffuse texts of loss of allure of the homogeneous nation, and yet, of horrible reissues of nationalist pulsations, even in their versions of a ‘pluricultural nation’? On the other hand, we were aware of the lack of attention over one of the most recently referred elements such as heritage (in the logic of ‘rescue’ and ‘no profanation’) but less analyzed in their processes of negotiation: language. How can we critically analyze the undeniable defense of indigenous languages in Latin America, but in a context of discontinuity with key historical references that make that defense a decontextualized cause in the concrete social scene of ‘linguistic dispossession’ that many communities live today?

On the first point, Judith Butler and Gayatri Spivak marked the political character of singing and performing publicly the national anthems in diasporic and migration contexts in the book *Who Sings the Nation State* (2009). In this volume, Sarah Corona Berkin takes this question to the study of graphic representations of the Mexican national anthem in different states. The author shows how the national anthem was disseminated in a process that unified heritizing with mandatory pedagogy in the plot of national postrevolutionary conformation in that country. The crucial part of Corona Berkin’s argument is that the preoccupations of the postcolonial nation-state to retain the authority of representations over the Mexican identity are perceived by those who are enabled to sing/perform the anthem in the images of the unique and free textbook edited by the Secretaría de Educación Pública (SEP; Ministry of Education): children, women, indigenous people, mestizos, and whites form a mosaic of identity/otherness that can only be understood in inter-positional terms, with a politically precise, contextual, and temporal sense of direction.

The second aspect, related to language, is examined by María del Carmen de la Peza—also in Mexico. Starting from a triple analysis: theoretical (on community, heritage, and language), historical (on the contextual dimension of pilferage and linguistic exclusion), and intellectual (on the specific oeuvre of Alfonso Reyes), the author highlights the paradox of heritizing the languages in Mexico. On the one hand, she explains how the ‘right’ of language was conceived as intangible heritage based on recent politics of UNESCO. However, the process of colonial-national ‘castellanización’ (the compulsory immersion into Spanish language) meant the ‘prohibition’ of accessing one’s own language, its deauthorizing. In that moment, the interdiction of the possibility of speaking is inaugurated as an implicit beginning of the (post)colonial policy of language. That policy was never justly reverted because access to Castilian was always marked by the original foreclosure of dispossession violence of the mother tongue. That way, the author states: ‘Even though the Mexican State has privileged Spanish as the national language for the effects of public and political interaction, most Mexicans are functional illiterates and do not live Spanish as their own language’ (see De la Peza, this volume). A pluricultural state that acknowledges the value of linguistic diversity with the rhetoric of intangible heritage does not take responsibility for those primary processes, and overall, it continues administering which subjects,
when, in which way, over which things and in what language, and who can actually speak (and who will continue to be unable to do so).

Seen from the perspective of everyday reproduction of statehood, the policies of heritage escort the processes of identification and otherness, even when they are ‘poetics of recognition’ over those who have been silenced in the long history of the modern nation. In ways of classifying, naming, and producing heritage by legitimizing the existence of precise heirs (indigenous peoples, afro communities, subnational collectivities), an aporetic reproduction is produced: in the action through which they are recognized, those ‘other interns’ are also moved into a differentiated and otherness producing partiality; and they form part of the nation-state that in the processes recognizes and grants, continues to exercise the power of the legislative perspective, administrating subjectivities/subjections, and extending its sovereignty (Briones 2005). This point created the ethic of suspicion by which this book addresses the problem of heritage linked to diversity, difference, and differentiation as historical, contextual, and political complex phenomena.

Heritage, difference, and signification

We have highlighted that in the face of institutional wishes, there are diverse and contextual processes of tension and response. The classical notions of heritage linked to a transferable property by basic rules of lineage and heritage that form a ‘legacy’ (Vaca 2012) are intertwined in processes of hegemonization of the national state (Florescano 1993) and also with dense forms in local and community spheres that signify and process the sedimentations of postcolonial capitalism (Ferry 2005; Garcia Canclini 1993). Definitely, as expressed by Sandra Rozental in this volume, communities have learned and processed that heritage is something that has the form of a ‘potential expropriation’: something that can be extracted, taken, disappeared (as a relic/monument that ‘belongs’ to the whole nation—and therefore disappears from the community environment and the links it strengthened—or as a good-merchandise that is privatized and turned into cumulative wealth). How is heritage sectorized, how does it affect regulations and community links, how does it interweave with the logic of resources, consumptions, or fetishism, and how they signify precise categories in those processes? Rozental uses her text to work those textured questions, through the Mexican community of Coatlinchán, and from the communal circulation of stories of ‘buried treasures.’ The author links the historical meaning of ‘treasures’ in the production of history, with the affective stories of violence, exploitation, and dispossession lived and conjured up by the community.

At the same time, the practices of definition, classification, visibility, and recognition normally pay little attention to the processes of silencing and to the place of those processes of construction of heritage narratives. On the one hand, there are a series of managers and authorities of ordering, taxonomy, and selection of narratives destined to become part of exhibited cultural heritage (either in terms of objects, accounts, or ‘culture’). On those managers and authorities (and on the
codified construction of their authority and legitimacy), little has been researched. At the same time, violent and traumatic processes that are at the base of the modern conformation of communities (and in the distribution and negotiation of their identities in the glocal concert) usually are aborted in heritage narratives. Carolina Crespo and Mario Rufer devote themselves to analyze these processes of silencing with epistemological potential.

Crespo draws attention to how events of displacement, pilferage, and plundering make certain accounts gradually excluded from the narratives on local memories—even from communal circulation. Without doubt, in the construction of the notion of heritage by indigenous communities, these processes of silencing are key elements to understanding what is at play in the construction of an ‘archive’ as a regime of the enunciable in systems of heritizing.

Rufer, through the exploration of Mexican community museums, analyzes the way in which they are perceived (and negotiated) in the limits of present-day heritage narratives; the author specifically analyzes how the modalities of cultural management of diversity tries to delimit the intensity, topic, and direction of community discussions on belonging, local history, heritage, memory, and violence; at the same time, he returns to the specific gesture of how this institutional intent is circumvented, in how it is adapted and questioned in a specific way through narratives created in communities that process and return the ‘poisoned gift’ of the state with an iconoclastic force that strains the hegemonic direction.

Heritage, transnationalism, and neoliberalism

In the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth centuries, the nation-state can be conceived of, in Bourdieu’s terms, as a ‘reserve bank of consecration’ that allocated and administrated symbolic capital. This especially included the recognition and the mise-en-scène of heritage. In the last third of the twentieth century, this model of state formation has been transformed through neoliberal waves of globalization. In regard to the conceptualization and administration of heritage, we can identify three main dynamics in this cultural–political context.

The first dynamic concerns the ongoing commodification and the penetration of the market in nearly all aspects of social life. This includes the field of cultural production where authors such as George Yudice and Toby Miller have identified an ‘expediency of culture’ and the growing impact of cultural industry, which in postcolonial societies especially includes the marketing of cultural heritages. Cultural studies scholars and cultural sociologists have argued for the existence of an ongoing de-differentiation between economy and culture in late capitalist societies. In a similar vein, Daniel Mato (2007) points out that the classical definition of cultural industries, introduced by Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer, is now being substituted by dynamics in which all industries make use of culture and of heritage. In this sense, not only is the cultural commodified, but also other commodities and objects underlie logics of cultural marketing that often finds expression in heritage branding. The search for an authentic and unique heritage in postcolonial societies in Latin America is often related to
colonialism, indigeneity, and Afro-Americanity (see Kaltmeier and Cánepa in this volume) Cultural studies scholar Graham Huggan (2001) speaks in this context about the emergence of a veritable ‘postcolonial alterity industry,’ where the construction of exotic alterity serves as a means to enter the market.

The growing commodification of all social relations also implies the reshaping of the relationship between state and market. As Foucault advises, this should not be reduced to a simple equation of ‘more market’ means ‘less state.’ Instead we deal with new forms of governmentality that also include the emergence of new forms of cultural politics, including the redefinition of heritage. This finds its expression in the contemporary trends of ‘city marketing’ and ‘nation branding.’ Gisela Cánepa problematizes with her case study on the museum exhibition Inca—Kings of the Andes ‘on an emerging cultural regime, paying specially attention to the way it is operating in Peru since the neoliberal reforms implemented by Alberto Fujimori in the early 1990s and in the postwar context’ (in this volume).

In a similar vein, Gustavo Blázquez analyzes (in this volume) how the invention of the musical format of the cuarteto in Córdoba as cultural heritage is related to the ‘transformation of culture into expediency and the legitimization of the figure of ‘cultural manager’ as a technician specialized in designing and administrating cultural policies.’

At this point, the debate of cultural homogenization in globalization process resurges, as some authors argue that a globalized and normed heritage produces ‘landscapes of consumption tending to consume their own contexts,’ not least because of the ‘homogenizing effect on places and cultures’ of tourism (Sack 1992, 158–159), while on the other hand authenticity and local particularity is needed to make the heritage game work.

A second dynamic is the growing interconnectedness of horizons of interaction in regard to heritage. After World War II, we can observe the emergence of a real transnational heritage field with a broad array of institutionalized actors and new experts. Especially the concept of world heritage, and its subsequent amplification from monuments, to areas, to landscapes, to immaterial heritage, has not only been a normalizing instance but also a catalyst and transformer of heritage. Thereby, supranational institutions like UNESCO are increasingly becoming embattled arenas for heritage politics, that not only attend the petitions of nation-states but that develop their own heritage agendas, thereby creating spaces of intervention for sub-national actors. In this sense, local communities are also increasingly involved in the heritage field, as it is highlighted by Herwitz (2012, 5): ‘This common language (of heritage, the authors) makes identity a globally comprehensible, consumable item and provides local populations with a relevant profile. Having (suddenly) a heritage makes you (potentially) an international player.’

Beyond the homogenization tendency through market logic, the question arises: to what extent does the internationalization of heritage regimes with its rules of certification and codification as well as its cultural grammar also lead to a homogenization of heritage. On the other hand, it can be argued that the inclusion of new actors in the heritage field constantly challenges established rules of the
game and leads to a permanent transformation of heritage and its uses (see Kaltmeier, this volume).

Although there exists a strong link between the proliferation of heritage and the neoliberal market regime, heritage can function also as an obstacle toward commodification. Post-neoliberal Latin American governments in Ecuador and Venezuela are involved in neo-nationalist heritage discourses that are related to the foundational narratives of the nineteenth century with reference to heroes of the national pantheon such as Simón Bolívar or Eloy Alfaro. In doing so, such heritage politics may repeat the silencing of indigenous and Afro-American presences that characterized postcolonial heritage politics since the nineteenth century. However, in Bolivia, the Evo Morales government is engaged in the re-foundation of the nation through a deep process of decolonization and reinvention of indigenous heritage that may lead to a significant rupture in the established patterns of Latin American postcolonial heritage politics.

This collection of essays is the outcome of an intensive interdisciplinary and intercultural interchange of ideas. The authors united here have worked together since 2012 on the idea of ‘Entangled Heritages in Latin America.’ We have discussed their approaches and concepts in panels organized at the Biannual Conference of the International Association of Inter-American Studies 2012 in Guadalajara, Mexico, and 2014 in Lima, Peru, as well at the 2013 conference of the **Consejo Europeo de Investigaciones Sociales de Amèrica Latina** (CEISAL) in Porto, Portugal. In 2013, we deepened the interchange of ideas through an exchange with the BMBF-Research Network for Latin America ‘Citizenship, Ethnicity, and Belonging’ and in a three-day workshop on the banks of the Lake Chapala in Guadalajara. We hope that the reader will be able to see and enjoys this intense exchange while reading the essays presented in *Entangled heritages*. *Postcolonial perspectives on the uses of the past in Latin America.*
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