From *Indigenismo* to *Patrimonialismo*: An Introduction to the Special Issue on Music and Cultural Heritage Making in Latin America

Michelle Bigenho (Colgate University, USA), Henry Stobart (Royal Holloway University of London, UK), and Richard Mújica Angulo (CIDES, UMSA, Bolivia)

Resumen

Además de señalar lo que vienen en los artículos de este dossier, esta introducción presenta a los lectores cierta orientación con respecto al "patrimonio inmaterial," su relación con la música, y sus significados en contextos latinoamericanos. Se parte del planteamiento que el patrimonio no es igual que la cultura y que el patrimonio se tiene que construir a partir de la conciencia de la idea de "la cultura" (entre comillas) que surge en los viajes inter-étnicos (Carneiro da Cunha, 2009). Mientras el patrimonio inmaterial parece tener más relación con los hechos musicales, se exploran las diferencias, no ontológicas sino políticas, entre el patrimonio material e inmaterial. El patrimonio inmaterial resulta ser como el Otro de los patrimonios y esto marca desigualdades que se replican en las instituciones administrativas. A pesar de las iniciativas de UNESCO, a través de su centro regional CRESPIAL a través de lo cual se promocionan los listados multi-nacionales del patrimonio cultural inmaterial, los procesos de hacer patrimonio varían ampliamente en América Latina. También suelen reflejar competencias locales o nacionalistas, donde el declarar patrimonio podría ser concebido casi como una alternativa a la propiedad intelectual. A pesar de lo sonoro de las expresiones musicales, se plantea que los cambios mundiales en los medios de comunicación contribuyen a un énfasis en lo visual; entonces discusiones sobre los hechos musicales patrimonializables muchas veces van por lo visto y no por lo escuchado. En relación a cuestiones regionales, planteamos que lo que llamamos *el patrimonialismo* en muchos países de América Latina es algo muy integral al momento neoliberal y multicultural, pero que también hay que entenderlo como la etapa subsiguiente y por ende vinculada, aunque diferenciada de las políticas estatales del indigenismo del siglo XX. En el patrimonialismo del siglo XXI, los Otros están motivados a utilizar sus propias "culturas" como recursos potenciales de extracción, como posibles caminos al desarrollo y/o como nuevas maneras de reivindicar una serie de derechos. Al cerrar, se consideran los papeles de las pericias y los estudios académicos en el patrimonialismo.

Abstract

Besides previewing the articles in the dossier, this introduction offers readers some guidance on the concept of "intangible heritage," its relationship to music, and its meanings in Latin American contexts. The introduction takes as a starting point the contention that heritage is not the same as culture, and that heritage necessarily builds on a consciousness of the idea of "culture" (in quotes), which emerges through interethnic journeys (Carneiro da Cunha 2009). Although music's attributes might seem to have more in common with intangible than tangible heritage, closer consideration shows that this tangible/intangible distinction is more political than ontological. Intangible heritage ends up being like heritage's Other, in turn reflecting inequalities that are replicated in administrative institutions. Despite UNESCO-derived initiatives, like its regional center CRESPIAL that promotes multi-county intangible cultural heritage listings, heritage-making processes vary widely across Latin America. They also often reflect local or nationalistic competitions, where heritage law may be conceived as something almost like an alternative to intellectual property. Despite the sonic dimension of musical expressions, it is argued that transformations in global media have contributed to an emphasis on the visual; consequently, discussions about music heritage often focus on what is seen and not on what is heard. In relation to regional issues, we suggest that what we call "*patrimonialismo*" in many countries of Latin America is integral to the neoliberal and multicultural moment, but that it must also be understood as a successive phase linked to but distinct from twentieth-century state policies of *indigenismo*. In twenty-first century patrimonialismo, the Others are motivated to use their own "cultures" as a possible resource for extraction, as possible paths to development, and/or as new ways to lay claim to a series of rights. To close, we consider the roles of expertise and academic research in patrimonialismo.

From *Indigenismo* to *Patrimonialismo*: An Introduction to the Special Issue on Music and Cultural Heritage Making in Latin America

Michelle Bigenho (Colgate University, EEUU), Henry Stobart (Royal Holloway University of London, Inglaterra), and Richard Mújica Angulo (CIDES, UMSA, Bolivia)

This special issue gathers articles that address questions at the intersection of music and cultural heritage in Latin America. With the editorial team (Bigenho, Mújica, and Stobart), we began these conversations on three occasions: at an international symposium that the Pachakamani Collective organized in La Paz titled "Reflections on the Heritagization of Music in Bolivia" (2016), at a panel titled "Heritage Otherwise" of the Latin American Studies Association Congress in Lima (2017), and at another panel titled "Ethnography of Law and Indigenous Heritage" at the International Law and Society Conference in Mexico City (2017).[1] To develop the dialogue of the special issue, we have privileged Spanish as the common language among the editing authors, even writing first in that language, while for some of us (Bigenho and Stobart), our first language is English.[2] We also recognize that because of the editorial team's language limitations we have not included texts in Portuguese, thus leaving out of this collection important relevant work being developed in Brazil. (However, Seeger, makes passing reference to Brazilian case studies in his Afterword).

In addition to introducing the articles of this special issue, this introduction aims to provide an orientation for readers in relation to "intangible heritage," its relation to music, and its meaning in Latin American contexts. We begin with a distinction between culture and heritage. We take as a given the idea that heritage does not exist as such, but rather needs to be made (Bendix 2009: 255; Kuutma 2012: 24). If the anthropologist Marilyn Strathern has written, "the nice thing about culture is that everyone has it" (1995), one cannot say the same of heritage. Although we could say that today, many aspire to have it. Strathern used this phrase to title her book chapter that discussed how the culture concept, developed by anthropologists, now had other meanings in its global circulation (1995). George Yúdice, from the areas of American Studies and Literature, writes about a broad role of culture, a role that leads to the expediency of culture or the use of culture as a resource (2003: 11). However, we return to anthropology to develop greater clarity about an important distinction. We could say that the concept of heritage is more like the "culture" (in quotation marks) about which the anthropologist Manuela Carneiro da Cunha writes (2009). Culture, without quotation marks, is what everyone has and what anthropologists study in depth; the second concept of "culture" in quotation marks is something that lately has accrued value in the global market; the problem, according to Carneiro da Cunha, is that these two concepts, although belonging to very different discourses, consistently are mixed and confused with one another (2009: 3). "Culture" in quotation marks exists in an intercultural universe where those who have it are conscious of the fact and are performing their "culture" for the world (Carneiro Da Cunha 2009: 3). So "culture," of which heritage is an example, depends on the conditions of an intercultural nexus. Following the ideas of Bruno Latour, who seeks to reconstruct the social (2005), here we try to reconstruct the processes through which heritage is made.

---

[1] This last panel contained a trans-hemispheric dialogue that we continue to develop in other works. We thank the National Science Foundation and the Latin American Studies Association, entities that made it possible for some authors of this issue to attend and participate in the conferences in Peru and Mexico.

[2] Subsequent translations into English have been created in a few cases.

Of course a narrative exists about the UNESCO effects in these processes--in other words, the importance of the UNESCO Conventions of World Heritage of 1972 and of Intangible Heritage of 2003. Although these facts are important for entering the topic and for understanding how intangible cultural heritage is framed, it seems problematic to leave it at that. With a few notable exceptions, many studies of heritage provide perspectives from and towards Europe and the Global North.[3] On the other hand, although the heritage politics of UNESCO emerged with the participation of Member States from Latin America, and also with the specific and sometimes well-known voices of anthropologists who are from or work in this region, like Lourdes Arizpe and Manuela Carneiro Da Cunha (Aikawa-Faure 2009: 23-24; see also Seeger 2015), we insist on looking at the articulation of these policies in the Latin American contexts where they have been applied. Much like the narrative of modernity that emerges in the centre and is markedly different in the peripheries and margins (Pratt 2002), dialogues with UNESCO define the politics that heritagize things, but this does not mean that UNESCO should be seen as all-determining. As Anthony Seeger indicates, UNESCO politics are not monolithic; rather they are the outcome of a very complex consensus (2015: 131). Nevertheless, such a consensus sometimes congeals and seems like one uniform policy coming from UNESCO, even though policies assume distinct forms according to the different contexts where they are applied. Dorothy Noyes reminds us that the power of the state continues to play a predominant role in intangible cultural heritage practices (2015:167). So, to write about heritage in Latin America, we must take into account the cultural politics of Latin American states.

In the rest of the article: 1) We explore the differences—not ontological, but rather political—between tangible and intangible heritage. Intangible heritage ends up like the Other of heritages and this marks the inequalities that are replicated in administrative institutions. 2) Then we present some of the motivations, dynamics, and institutions that are involved in the declaratory processes of heritage in Latin America. 3) We also explore how the debates about musical things that might become heritage often concentrate on what is seen and not on what is heard, and this fact is connected to certain changes in media. 4) In relation to regional questions, we argue that what we call *patrimonialismo*, in many Latin American countries is something very integral to the neoliberal and multicultural moment; but that it also should be understood as a stage subsequent to and therefore also related to the state politics of *indigenismo* coming from the 20th century. (Like *indigenismo*, we purposely leave *patrimonialismo* untranslated to English) 5) To close, we consider the role of expertise and academic studies in patrimonialismo.

The Politics of the Tangible and the Intangible

At the 2000 Annual Meeting of the Museum of Ethnography and Folklore in La Paz, Bolivia, a round table was convened with the title "Tangible and Intangible Heritage in Andean Ethnomusicological, Acoustic, and Organological Areas" (Sánchez 2001). Several national and international scholars of Bolivian music participated, touching on topics related to musical instruments and including questions related to intellectual property. It was not coincidental that those who studied music began to turn their attention to heritage at this moment, and began to think more about this new category of "intangible heritage," what would become termed in Spanish as "inmaterial heritage." (In the English translation we will keep the reference as "intangible heritage.")

Music entered the rubric of what would become UNESCO's 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Heritage. However, the adjective "intangible" obfuscates more than it

---

[3] For exceptions see, for example, Albro (2010); Arizpe (2006); Breglia (2006); Collins (2011); De Cesari (2010); De Jorio (2016); Lacarrieu (2008), or some chapters in the edited volumes of Howard (2012) and Norton and Matsumoto (2018).

clarifies, particularly if one considers the respective tangibility or intangibility of the elements to be made into heritage. The division between tangibility and intangibility has no ontological basis in those things that actually are made into heritage. However, this divide does have a historical basis in UNESCO and thus reverberates in the cultural, administrative, and disciplinary politics of heritage. The World Heritage Convention of 1972 established processes by which *sites, monuments, and buildings* could be named and conserved as places considered to have "outstanding" and "universal" significance *for humanity*. This was universal unmarked heritage, originally without any qualitative adjective beyond "world." When it was observed that this 1972 list filled up with sites from Europe, the West, and the Global North (Munjeri 2009: 132; Skounti 2009: 79, 90; Harrison 2013: 95-111), campaigns began to consider other kinds of heritage--the immaterial or intangible—as a balancing of global accounts in the symbolic economies of heritage. Beyond this balancing of accounts, heritage scholars have criticized World Heritage for being Eurocentric and based on a mix of "Enlightenment and Romanticist philosophies," what Laurajane Smith summarizes and critiques as "authorized heritage discourse"; this discourse does not take into account local communities, depends on experts that are not from the places (many of them have degrees and titles in archaeology, architecture, or art history), prioritizes aesthetic values, and defines "the authentic" in terms of that which is historically original (Smith and Waterton 2009: 290-291; also see Lowthorp 2015: 33).

At the beginning of the 20th Century, a different heritage takes the stage that receives from UNESCO the label of "intangible." The 2003 Convention indicates that "communities, groups, or individuals" are the authorities in questions of intangible heritage. Obviously, the phrase "communities, groups, or individuals" has multiple ambiguities in its interpretations. Nevertheless, there is the intention to look at this heritage not from the perspective of experts from above, but rather from the culture bearers, from the quotidian experts from below. With this second kind of heritage, the communities of culture bearers are supposedly taken into account; if world heritage seems to come from above, the other heritage is sought from the bottom up; at least, such are the intentions (Hertz 2015). This heritage still engages expertise. In practice, the experts linked to this heritage tend to come from the academic disciplines of folklore, ethnomusicology, sociology, and cultural anthropology. Prior to the 2003 Convention, UNESCO premiered in 2001 a List of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity; but the word "masterpiece" was abandoned in the officialdom of the new Convention, with the intention of following more egalitarian processes (Foster 2015: 6). Instead of naming "masterpieces," the 2003 Convention set up a "Representative List."

Within the rubric of intangible heritage, priority no longer was granted to the logic of something distinguished, something that had to be preserved for humanity; instead, "the communities" took a privileged position. In practice, such "communities," in many cases are nation-states, placed side by side in a cultural relativism, each one competing as if it were a cultural Olympics (Harrison 2013: 141; Foster 2015: 6; Turtinen 2000). In this way, the Representative List ends up being a "metacultural artifact" (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2004: 56). It is assumed that the signatories of the 2003 Convention will take inventory of *the totality* of their intangible heritage, following a logic not too distant from that which reigned in late 19th century anthropology, when it was thought necessary to document all cultures before they disappeared (Lacarrieu 2008: 4,12; Brown 2005: 48).

Heritage making in "the intangible" still tends to form "things" (Lacarrieu 2008: 7), and that presents another problem about the inventory. As anthropologist Lourdes Arizpe pointed out, the processes of creation should be even more important than the products (Lacarrieu 2008: 11), but

an inventory seeks to list *things*. Additionally, taking an inventory, as it turns out, often requires funding. On the one hand, it is not clear who will provide funding for these activities, even more so within decentralizing politics and autonomies. States are passing these responsibilities to local governments, while local actors often continue waiting for backing from "the State." On the other hand, it is not entirely clear that the supposed culture "bearers" are all that interested in completing these totalizing inventories. In the case of some indigenous peoples, reticence exists around taking an inventory that could end up being controlled by states that have not stopped being colonizers (Marrie 2009: 177).

Sometimes, as in the case of Bolivia, it is not the inventory that dominates local practices, but rather the promulgation of multiple declaratory laws about intangible cultural heritage, processes through which certain inequalities continue to be reproduced, and some indigenous peoples continue to rearticulate their struggles for territory and self-determination. Such processes indicate the importance of considering legal systems, territorialities, and the structured relations between the State and indigenous peoples. We will return to this point when we touch on the themes of indigenismo and patrimonialismo.

Turning back to general studies of heritage: After so much critique of the material and the "authorized heritage discourse," Rodney Harrison, trained in archaeology, made a call for heritage studies scholars to return to materiality, or at least to bring an *analytical balance*; drawing from the ontological turn, he suggested paying attention to the material world, as much as to the discursive one (2013). However, in these debates, one should not lose sight of the institutional realities that continue to mark the more political than ontological difference between tangible and intangible heritage (Kuutma 2012: 24). It is in the juncture of being "the Other" of heritage, the Other of World Heritage, that intangible heritage contains its most important sense of differentiation. These are the divisions that affect the structuring of ministries of culture, and within these institutions, different voices of expertise compete. The different values of academic disciplines enter the scene. Often archaeology, architecture, and art history rule the day in heritage administration. Ethnomusicology, folklore, and cultural anthropology tend to take a second place in ministerial work.

To summarize, one can waste time trying to distinguish which is tangible heritage and which is intangible heritage. As Amanda Kearney suggests, the separation here does not exist in phenomenological terms between the material and the immaterial because "any discussion of intangibility implicates tangibility (of the body)" (2009: 211). Nevertheless, in practice, intangible heritage, where one usually encounters references to music, tends to be about minorities and often represents a process that reinforces inequalities (Lacarrieu 2008: 4). Therefore, the historic and administrative divisions coming from UNESCO do have relevant effects: in how work is divided; in the structuring of ministries of culture; and in the disciplines that lend expertise to heritage-making processes.

Heritage Making in Latin American Countries: Motivations and Processes

In the process of identifying contrasts between "tradition" and "heritage," (see culture, without quotation marks and "culture" in Carneiro da Cunha 2009), the Swedish ethnologist Owe Ronström (2013) proposed that "Heritage tends to resist local people's claims for indigenous rights. Heritage tends to 'empty' objects and spaces, which makes it possible to refill them with all kinds of owners and inhabitants" (2013: 12). Although these generalized points find resonance in some Latin American cases, it is also important to emphasize that heritage making is often seen as one strategy, among others, for claiming diverse rights. For many people, heritage declarations are seen much

like a form of intellectual property, although as such, they carry no legal protections (Bigenho and Stobart 2014). From one country to another, a great variety exists in relation to the processes and institutions of heritage making. In some countries, multiple and specific laws about heritage have been passed at local, regional, and national levels; and national legal declarations draw on multiple governing bodies for decision-making (for example, like the Chamber of Deputies in Bolivia), while other countries involve the directives of the Ministry of Culture, which gains its legitimacy through a single general law of heritage (for example, in Peru). Some regional and national heritage laws are motivated by perceived "improper appropriation" of a cultural expression, and are presented as an act of defence. Passionate nationalist conflicts over intangible cultural heritage have emerged between bordering countries, as in the case between Peru and Bolivia (Bigenho and Stobart 2016). This type of nationalist competition over heritage goes completely against the objectives of UNESCO, whose institutions—like CRESPIAL—explicitly try to encourage collaboration between countries.

CRESPIAL, the Regional Centre for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage for Latin America, is a UNESCO entity (created in 2006, with Peruvian funding and also with its office in this country). Fifteen Latin American countries participate in the office: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Chile, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Paraguay, Peru, Mexico, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Its principal objectives are to articulate, exchange, and communicate about the activities related to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in the region; to promote the implementation of the 2003 UNESCO Convention; to reinforce the cooperation and the capacities of the countries of the region, and to raise awareness in States about the involvement of communities in activities for the safeguarding of their own heritage. Within this framework, CRESPIAL carries out direct actions with Member States in the areas that have been mentioned; they also produce publications about the policies, as well as about the actions, of member countries in relation to heritage.

After the 2003 Convention was established, the area of intangible cultural heritage in Latin America gradually gained importance within the public policies of these countries. With the goal of better understanding this situation, CRESPIAL undertook a study about the state of the art of intangible cultural heritage in each country (2008). Here, the persistence of the folklore paradigm was revealed, a conservationist vision of "the cultural," and a legislative framework for its preservation. In 2017, they updated this study (in press) that in recent meetings demonstrated that today all these countries possess organic or general laws of Culture framed in the legislative realm of intangible cultural heritage.

Additionally, the office is working on multinational safeguarding programs, about communication and skill building that involve three specific ethnic groups: Aymaras, Guaranís, and Afro-descendants. The first one, called "Safeguarding the Intangible Cultural Heritage of the Aymara Communities of Bolivia, Chile, and Peru," received recognition in 2009 on UNESCO's Register of Good Safeguarding Practices for Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. Through an appreciation and safeguarding of the Aymara population's cultural expressions, a registration and research of music was completed, followed by a study of oral tradition; now a study of knowledges and know-how is underway. The second multinational project, "Safeguarding the Guarani Cultural Universe" managed to bring together five countries (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay), proposing the need to design and apply safeguarding policies that would be agreed upon and socialized within the Guarani communities and organizations. In spite of more than seven regional meetings held since 2007 to plan collective actions and to share what different countries had achieved, significant progress was not made because of government changes and their effects on

technical teams and the search for funding. The third case involves a pilot project "The Afrodescendant Cultural Universe," which began in May 2012 and in which thirteen countries participate (Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Chile, Ecuador, México, Paraguay, Perú, Uruguay, and Venezuela). This project took as a starting point the heterogeneity of the contexts and processes that Afrodescendant populations have experienced throughout their history and into the present. This has turned out to be one of the projects that has made the most progress, as they have already completed established tasks, which included producing a review of related research and also creating a record of music, dance, and song forms (see Ruiz Rodríguez in this special issue).

In the end, these projects opened up space for multiple activities, from debates about how to work on intangible heritage in each country, to all that is related to the recognition of indigenous peoples, at the technical-operational level, as well as at the legal level. Participants also shared applied methodologies for fieldwork that included participatory processes with the communities. These processes were proposed as challenges for the countries involved, because cultural policies of the State did not always succeed in meeting the necessities, expectations, and representations of "cultural heritage" as seen from local perspectives.

The Senses, Media, and Heritage

Contrary to UNESCO organizers' aims of creating in the 2003 Convention something that would recognize the equal positions of all member nation-states, in many cases uses of this Convention have fanned the flames of international competition. Some countries try to fill the list with their own elements, often entering into squabbles in the process. However, the *sounds* of music usually are not at the centre of what leads to conflicts.[4] It is notable that the boom in music-related heritage making did not arrive in the era of radios and cassettes, but in the era of YouTube, Facebook, and Whatsapp---all online platforms that can be *seen* on a smartphone. Additionally, music often becomes heritage, not as something separate, but as part of festive or ritual events; contexts that frequently include dances and characters in colourful costumes. In intangible heritage, sight dominates; what catches visual attention takes priority (see Bigenho and Stobart 2016).

In other contexts, this attention to the visual has been studied in development projects that aspire to foment tourism. The anthropologist, Jenny Chio has noted that rural inhabitants of a Miao village in the Guizhou Province of China are incentivized to make a spectacle of themselves with "the imperative to be *more visibly* ethnic" (2017: 418). She builds on research about Chinese development politics in Tibet, as documented by the geographer, Emily Yeh, who uses the ideas of Guy Debord about "the spectacle" to develop the idea of "the image as a technique of power" (Yeh 2013: 236). Debord focused on the spectacle as something always linked to commodification—a process that supposedly takes something essential from an expression, something that is imagined to have existed at some previous moment before the expression became a spectacle (Debord 1994). Chio wanted to move away from an interpretation that always sees the making of spectacle as something that tarnishes; she proposed the making of spectacles as a "world-making practice," and this practice is seen within a framework of "the politics of appearance" (Chio 2017: 419-420). The seen, the visual, and the politics of appearance certainly are very present in matters of intangible

---

[4] We stress that music has important intersensory dimensions, where its sonic aspect works alongside and interacts with other sensory modalities. For example, in a festive context, key aspects of performance, affect and meaning may be connected. These may include the tastes and smells of food and drink, as well as visual and tactile dimensions (Stobart 2018 [2002]).

heritage, even when it comes to musical sounds.

Transformations in media communications have much to do with heritage making. The elements on the UNESCO List that focus on music almost always are presented on the website with videos and photos. These images are a central aspect of the dossier that UNESCO solicits, although their instructions lack detailed guidance about the focus, content, and selection of video materials (Norton 2018). We note that a website is now a relatively "old" platform in comparison with the applications of a smartphone. Images of dancers in striking costumes circulate rapidly via new social media platforms, becoming much more accessible with the exponential growth in popularity of the smartphone. Even as the quality and the cost of smartphone service vary across Latin America, the quantity of smartphone users in the region has tripled since 2012 to reach an estimated 236 million users.[5] The widespread use of smartphones in Latin America has shaped current debates on intangible heritage, with people increasingly making claims on-line about their "culture", and complaining when others use it inappropriately. The focus on the visual can be disappointing for those who want to pay more attention to sounds. On the other hand, the attention to the visual could facilitate the analytical integration of music in festive rituals or in forms of collaborative documentation that might contribute to cultural sustainability (Yoshitaka 2018). However, there are notable cases where this attention to the visual has caused serious disagreements. For example, we turn to a case between Peru and Bolivia. The frictions that arose in relation to Carnival of Oruro (Bolivia) and the Virgin of Candelaria in Puno (Peru), took place with pressures from the organization that represents the dance troupes of Oruro. While these dancers were angry at the Puneños, the same bands that played for Oruro continued to be contracted for performances in Puno, Peru. The dance troupes of Oruro were vociferous in their complaints about their musician compatriots, telling them they should "wear the Bolivian T-shirt."

In summary, music within heritage making has the possibility of being linked and even reconnected with ritual contexts that evoke all the senses. However, in very high profile cases, we see a tendency to make music part of visual spectacles. Musical sounds end up occupying a second place in many heritage-making processes. In the age of television, the attention paid to the visual and not to sound was also present in questions of musical spectacles, for example, like a "Concert for the Indigenous Peoples" in Bolivia in 1995 (see Bigenho 2002). However, today's media, which has brought wider access and great speed of circulation, takes to a whole other level the question of "the image as a technique of power" (Yeh 2013: 236). The spectacle, the search for "the authentic," and the recuperation of something sacred all lend themselves to tourism projects (Chio 2017; MacCannell 1973; Graburn 1989). But the images of these spectacles also lend themselves to exchanges over social media platforms, where the visual reigns and where nationalist expressions happen to be particularly strident (Stobart 2010).

From *Indigenismo* to *Patrimonialismo*

Rodney Harrison writes about "the abundance of heritage in our late-modern world" (2013: 2), and this author presents the heritage boom as something linked to a public interest in the past, an interest that has grown at the same time as people position themselves in relation to modernity, technological changes, deindustrialization, and the formation of a tourist perspective (Harrison 2013: 69). While he writes about heritage in the world, and about the tangible as well as the

---

[5]   eMarketer. n.d. "Number of smartphone users in Latin America from 2012 to 2020". *Statista*. https://www.statista.com/statistics/285611/number-of-smartphone-users-in-latin-america/ Accessed June 18, 2018

intangible, we see this argument, with its emphasis on a relation with *the past*, as coming from a more Eurocentric perspective; and he also applies an archaeologist's perspective, as this is his training. Although his argument aims to be global and universal, in relation to heritage many of his points of reference do not resonate with what one encounters in Latin American heritage-making processes, and even less so in relation to the heritage that becomes registered as "intangible."

We propose that to better understand the contemporary boom in heritage in Latin America, 1) one has to view a historical trajectory that is distinct from the European one, a trajectory in which it is not the relation with the past that is primary, but rather the relation with *cultural differences within nation-states*, 2) it also is necessary to go back and consider some of the earlier Latin American politics that dealt with these differences—politics which were not those of heritage, but rather those of *indigenismo* that began in the early 20th century. In the 20th century politics of indigenismo, states began to recognize the value of "culture," but first in the formation of nations. Here we refer to "culture" as what emerges from inter-ethnic travel (Carneiro da Cunha 2009).

These "cultural differences" often come with the presence of indigenous peoples. In the UNESCO Representative List for intangible heritage, one can note a great variety in the number of elements that have been inscribed by different Latin American countries. Some countries enthusiastically have taken advantage of the opportunities the 2003 Convention has offered; others have been reluctant to participate in it.[6] For example, Peru has 9 elements in the UNESCO Representative List of intangible heritage; Mexico has 9; Brazil has 8; Colombia has 7; and Bolivia has 5. These countries seem to be involved in a very active way with intangible heritage projects. In contrast, in the cases of Uruguay, Argentina, Venezuela, and Chile, each country has just one single element on the List; they are much less active in this area.[7] The countries with more elements on the Representative List tend to be countries that also have significant populations of indigenous peoples, not always in statistical terms, but also in terms of the role they play in the national imaginary. For example, the indigenous population in Brazil, in relative terms, is not large, but these people play an important role in how Brazilians imagine their nation (Ramos 1998). In the case of Brazil, other elements related to marginalized populations also become heritage: those of Afrodescendants. We argue that this correlation between intangible heritage and marginalized peoples is not a coincidence. To what degree is heritage a strategy used by nations that have significant populations that historically have been marginalized? We argue that in order to understand what is distinct about heritage in 21st century Latin America, one needs to go back to the 20th century cultural politics of indigenismo, a first moment when several, although not all, Latin American states began to address seriously the cultural differences that existed within their national territories. Indigenismo--somewhat like what we could call the subsequent "*patrimonialismo*"--consisted of cultural policies that attempted to deal with the themes of cultural differences within nation-states. Of course, the past was still important, for example, in relation to Pre-Columbian archaeological sites. But even here, of greatest importance were the colonial and even neocolonial relations through which the national became defined in reference to the local indigenous populations. Additionally, there are long traditions in Latin America and even in the discipline of anthropology, of constructing the Other or indigenous peoples as a representation of the past

---

[6] Outside of Latin America, other places also have been reluctant to participate in the 2003 Convention, as is seen in the case of northern Europe (Norton and Matsumo 2018).

[7] During a colloquium Stobart attended about "Music and Indigenous Peoples of America" in Montevideo (2015), Uruguayan students interrupted the proceedings to express their profound sorrow for the loss of their country's indigenous heritage. One of them circulated several rocks among the participants, noting that these had existed a long time ago when Uruguay still had an indigenous population. The students' grief, they explained, was compounded by the recognition that their own ancestors had been complicit in the processes that destroyed indigenous peoples.

(Fabian 1983; Ramos 1998; Stobart 2016: 22). However, we propose that marginality and otherness—not the past—are more determinant in questions of intangible heritage in Latin America.

We locate heritage making in relation to the indigenista politics of the last century--when nations were being forged--, and in relation to present cultural policies that are structured through multiculturalism and neoliberalism. We do not pretend to present a universal argument, but rather one that aims to provide insights for a better understanding of the particularities of heritage in Latin America. We argue that the boom in heritage in this region is something very integral to the neoliberal and multicultural moment, but that it can also be understood as a period subsequent to and thus related to indigenismo.

Indigenismo in its hemispheric form can be described as the study, celebration, and incorporation of indigenous peoples in nation-state projects (Saldívar 2011: 67; Giraudo and Lewis 2012: 3). The indigenous world conceptualized as a living past also figures in indigenismo, roots of nations that, in clear contradiction, are simultaneously praised, assimilated, and considered as something to overcome (Mijangos Díaz and López Torres 2011; Giraudo and Lewis 2012). For example, the post-revolutionary politics in Mexico in the 1920s included education projects by the Minister José Vasconcelos that celebrated indigenous people *at the same time* as they called for their assimilation into a mestizo nation (Mijangos Díaz and López Torres 2011: 54). Indigenismo had inter-American forms since the First Interamerican Indigenista Congress held in 1940 in Pátzcuaro (Michoacán, México) (Giraudo 2012: 12, Hellier-Tinoco 2011: 121). Many different indigenismos emerged from that moment, although one can note some shared characteristics. Their politics tended to celebrate traditions of indigenous peoples as they pushed to modernize and "improve" them (Giraudo and Lewis 2012: 3). As they transformed into national culture the images, dances, and music of indigenous peoples, they also promoted national narratives of mestizaje as the basis upon which to incorporate different citizens into the nation (see Máiz 2004: 136; Bigenho 2006; Bigenho 2009). Indigenismo and mestizaje end up being "twin discourses" of the 20th Century (Bigenho 2006: 268), and they have to do with "forging a fatherland" where, in most cases, indigenous subjects were represented by non-indigenous peoples (Coronado 2009).

These indigenista politics became an integral part of some state projects, as in the case of the Mexican revolutionary state and the 1952 Revolutionary Bolivian state. In other words, the elements that today people want to make into heritage, from early to mid-20th century were seen as things by which to weave the cultural differences within that territory into a new culture of the nation-state. For example, the Mexican state applied cultural relativism, with the work of anthropologists at the National Indigenista Institute (INI, in Spanish); between 1948 and 2003 this institute promoted a sensibility about cultural differences, as they also supported national integration (Saldívar 2011: 69-70).[8] Bolivian indigenismo has roots in mestizo fears, following the indigenous rebellions at the end of the 19th Century (García Pabón 1998:126; Paz Soldán 2003: 13; Rossells 2004: 34; Salmón 1997: 21; Sanjinés 2004: 71-78). The Bolivian State of the 1952 Revolution promoted cultural policies that brought indigenous musical expressions into the centre of the mestizo national project (Bigenho 2006; Bigenho 2009; Rios 2010).

Before turning to the critiques of indigenismo and the shift to patrimonialismo of the 21st Century, it is also worth considering these cultural elements in relation to what in Latin America has been called "the popular." Today, much of what falls under the label of "intangible heritage" used

---

[8] In 2003 the INI of Mexico became the National Commission for the Development of the Indigenous Peoples (Saldívar 2011:69).

to be called "popular culture" and this reference also had its political associations with the left. In the popular, Latin American analysts saw the possibility of rebellion and the promises of radical political proposals. A key text in these discourses was that of William Rowe and Vivian Schelling, in which the authors used ideas about memory and modernity. They rejected the idea of modernity as something unidirectional coming only from the west (1991). "The popular" indexed many things: the foundation of a nationalist culture; a marker of distance from the metropolitan class; and a sign of underdevelopment (Franco 1999: 209). At this time, popular culture was seen as something that had to be documented before it disappeared, or as something through which to create resistance to capitalism (Franco 1999: 171). In the resistance reading, they also took ideas from Antonio Gramsci, working with his concept of the national-popular. In this second perspective, as with the case of novelist/anthropologist José María Arguedas in Peru, folklore studies were proposed as a form of cultural politics against capitalism (Franco 1999: 172). Within the supposedly mestizo states, "indians" were transformed into "peasants" and they had "their class dimensions as the exploited and potential protagonist of the revolution" (Máiz 2004: 136).

Many authors have written about a "crisis of the popular" in Latin America, something that began in the 1980s and linked up with the beginnings of neoliberalism (Franco 1999: 208; Williams 2002: 7; Kantaris and O'Bryen 2013: 2). After this so-called "crisis," the Latin American left began talking about "citizenship" and "civil society" instead of "the popular" (Franco 1999: 208). The term "multitude" entered discussions and researchers focussed on new social movements (Hardt and Negri 2004; Olivera and Lewis 2004). One might ask what these social movements have to do with heritage. While patrimonialismo is involved in the juncture of neoliberalism, it also has political roots in these new social movements that emerge with the crisis of the popular. Patrimonialismo is characterized by this ambiguity: at the same time that things as potential heritage can be seen as new commodities in a market where *everything* is up for sale, so too do historically marginalized populations take up heritage discourses to make demands and claim their rights.

Patrimonialismo, Indianism, and New Rights

Between the ideals and the facts, critical perspectives on indigenismo entered the scene even before the crisis of "the popular." In 1971, a group of Latin American anthropologists wrote the Declaration of Barbados in which they critiqued indigenista politics as "colonial" (Giraudo and Lewis 2012: 5). Similarly, mestizaje also became critiqued as a continuation of colonial relations (Rivera Cusicanqui 1993). Indigenismo also entered into crisis when several agrarian reforms failed (Máiz 2004: 143). Jorge Coronado interpreted indigenismo as "a reaction to—and implementation of—modernization in a region that is marginal to Europe and the United States" (2009: 2). In studying the Mexican context, Emiko Saldívar discovered that "indigenismo is not about creating equality or hegemony, but about reproducing 'the state's' right to rule" (2011: 70). Ramón Máiz found that indigenista projects incorporated indigenous peoples in national projects, but "in a marginal and precarious way (2004: 135).

In spite of all the critiques of indigenismos, these politics formed bases for ethnic and indigenous movements at the end of the 20th Century. During this time, some aspects of indigenous peoples' politics changed in the world. The International Labour Organization Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples (1989) established principles of prior consultation. In 1992, the indigenous peoples of Latin America marked 500 years of resistance to colonialism. In 1995, the United Nations began its first, followed by a second, Decade of Indigenous Peoples. In 2000, the United Nations established the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. In 2007, the United Nations

Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples was adopted and in the initial votes, all Latin American countries voted in favour of the Declaration, with the exception of Colombia, a country that at first abstained.[9]

Several Latin American countries were making constitutional changes that indicated "a growing path of recognizing cultural pluralism" (Máiz 2004: 148). In contrast with the indigenista politics, many of these constitutional changes began to touch on more weighty themes like territorial rights, bilingual education, and the right to "free, prior, and informed consent." This final topic was seen as something more substantial than a mere "prior consultation," something that would permit indigenous peoples to reclaim control over many resources (Schilling Vacaflor 2017: 1060). Indigenous peoples themselves learned the discourses of rights and they began to claim and exercise them (Speed 2008). In spite of the "great distance between legal declarations and the implementation of public politics," what comes from these constitutional transformations is a rupture "with the monocultural logic of the nation-state" and a legal basis from which indigenous peoples can make demands, first for their cultures and education, and then for their autonomy and self-determination (Máiz 2004: 148-149). These politics, what Henri Favre called "Indianismo" (1998) or what Xavier Albó called "the return of the Indian," (1991) are different from indigenismo, but still linked with it. The big difference is that with Indianismo, indigenous citizens are demanding their own rights. For example, although indigenismo in Colombia did not achieve the same importance as it did in Peru and Mexico, the cultural policies of Colombian indigenismo created intellectual circles and alliances that facilitated indigenous social movements themselves (Troyan 2008: 81-85). In this way, the indigenous rights consecrated in the 1991 Colombian Constitution have roots in the 1930s (Troyan 2008: 87). It is within this trajectory, from indigenista to indianista politics, that one must locate the boom in Latin American heritage, particularly in relation to the 2003 Convention that makes special mention of indigenous peoples.[10]

The article of Yeshica Serrano Riobó, in this special issue, features a complex dynamic of patrimonialismo, between the rights-claiming politics of indigenous peoples in Colombia (a national declaration for the Ancestral Knowledge of the indigenous peoples of the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta) and the significant presence of indigenous musicians in the vallenato, a music genre that fuses Spanish, Afro-descendant, and indigenous elements, and that also has its official declaration with UNESCO. Instead of a narrative of mestizaje, Serrano suggests instead that the vallenato case can be interpreted as an example of *indigenization*.

An example explored by José Manuel Izquierdo König presents a case that sits in contrast with the other articles of this issue; most of the articles are developed in national contexts where the politics of indigenismo have been very present. As we already mentioned, Chile only has a single declaration in the UNESCO List of intangible heritage, and according to Izquierdo, this listing, the *baile chino* (left untranslated to English on the List) is associated with "pre-Columbian" roots and its UNESCO listing was a surprise to many Chileans. The author explains how Chile forged a "primarily Spanish" nation, leaving aside indigenous elements in this process. In other words, indigenismo did not have the same prominent place in Chile as it had in other national projects of the last century. In contrast with the other contexts of this special issue (Mexico, Colombia, Peru, and Bolivia), the

---

[9] Conversely, countries of British colonialism (Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States) initially opposed the Declaration.

[10] "Recognizing that communities, in particular indigenous communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals, play an important role in the production, safeguarding, maintenance and re-creation of the intangible cultural heritage, thus helping to enrich cultural diversity and human creativity…"(UNESCO 2003).

state's enthusiasm for politics of "culture" is something that only recently has emerged with the development of patrimonialismo.

Patrimonialismo emerges simultaneously with the surge in Indianist politics, but also at the moment when neoliberal forms of governance begin to rule. Although neoliberalism is characterized by shrinking states that are pulling back from their social programmes and commitments, at the same time, the same states are bursting forth with new legal framings (Sawyer 2004: 14). In Bolivia, under a state that since 2006 self-proclaims its anti-neoliberal position, one still sees a proliferation of laws, and many of them are in relation to patrimonialist initiatives. These laws are forming at each level of government-- especially since Bolivia's 2010 Law of Autonomies--and do not necessarily correspond with UNESCO politics. These legal processes are marking and developing the new and complex articulations of departmental, municipal, and sometimes indigenous autonomies (in this issue see Bigenho and Stobart; and Hachmeyer).

In neoliberal policies, the local populations are incentivised to participate in their own politics of recognition (Coombe and Weiss 2015: 5; Albro 2010). Charles Hale has shown how multiculturalism can dance quite well with neoliberalism; as certain cultural rights become recognized, other paths of political opposition become closed off (2005). Even in contexts where neoliberalism has been challenged, as in the case of Bolivia, the country continues, in contradictory ways, to depend on an extractivist capitalist economy (Postero 2013). Heritage becomes seen as one more "resource" that can be extracted and sold in a global market. And these are the ambiguities of patrimonialismo. With indigenismo, people who generally were not indigenous made the decisions at the moment of contemplating the relation with modernities; and here they used "cultures" of Others to forge their nations. Conversely, in patrimonialismo of the 21st Century, the Others become motivated to use their own cultures as a resource for potential extraction, as a possible path to development (see Radcliffe 2006; Andolina, Laurie, and Radcliffe 2009) and/or as a new way of claiming a series of rights. Even in cases that seem motivated by the claiming of rights, processes of commodification and the desires of professionalization are at play. Hachmeyer's article about the qantu panpipes of "the "Kallawaya Nation" in Bolivia, something that comes under the UNESCO declaration for the "Andean Cosmovision of the Kallawaya", shows how the processes of heritage making have come to restrict who, in local contexts, participates in playing qantu music. In the processes of heritage making and the assertion of rights, Hachmeyer shows how indigenous music becomes transformed, taking on professional characteristics that privilege external values and standards, for example like "equal temperament" (which means the musical octave divided into twelve equal semitones).

This case also points to the impossible but persistent dichotomy that appears in the moment of patrimonialismo and the proliferation of the discourses about rights: the division between cultural and economic rights. Such a separation remains impossible in practice in spite of the institutional attempts to impose it. For example, when experts began to discuss an instrument for intangible heritage, they insisted that "UNESCO should not duplicate the activities of other organizations particularly in the field of economic rights for which specialised agencies such as WIPO and WTO have specific expertise" (Aikawa-Faure 2009: 34). As such, the organizations of the United Nations cut the cake of rights, and it was assumed that UNESCO should focus on "the cultural dimension" and leave to other entities the question of economic rights, those generally imagined in relation to laws of intellectual property.

However, in practice these rights cannot be pulled apart. In heritage matters, questions of cultural identity and material economics cannot be separated, and they are considered together with topics that are very important for indigenous peoples, like autonomy and self-determination

(see Ruiz Rodríguez 2011: 34; Brown 2004; Kearney 2009: 214; Coombe and Weiss 2015: 56). It could be that for indigenous peoples and other collectivities the protections offered by laws of intellectual property are completely inappropriate (Coombe 1998; Brown 2003; Bigenho, Cordero, Mújica, Rozo, and Stobart 2015; Bigenho and Stobart 2014). But this does not mean that historically marginalized populations will not use these legal instruments as strategies to improve their lot. For example, Hachmeyer (in this issue) documents how a municipal government in Bolivia passed a "law of ancestral musics" in 2016 that declared their music as "collective intellectual property of the indigenous Kallawaya Nation."

With the discursive tools to reclaim their own rights, those who have been marginalized imagine for themselves paths out of poverty that might include tourism and variations on the theme of selling one's "culture." But these moves are rarely only about commodification; politics of identity and of asserting rights generally are also in the mix of motivations. For those who have a more narrow and legalistic vision, heritage should not have anything to do with intellectual property. When this does occur, UNESCO declarations function somewhat like a trademark (see Seeger 2015: 138). In such contexts, the production of and control over knowledges becomes incredibly important.

Knowledges in the New Economy of *Patrimonialismo*

Many authors have focused on the importance of research for the elaboration of cultural policies (for example see Ruiz Rodríguez 2011: 31). For Latin America, it is important to take into account that such research projects also were undertaken during the age of 20th Century indigenismo. Anthropologists, sociologists, folklorists, and archaeologists have studied cultures for indigenista projects of nation-states. The production of knowledge in the age of patrimonialismo varies somewhat from this previous era. If research used to serve nationalist projects or regional ones of nationalist import, now the dynamic is much more dispersed and varied. Today, many states recognize the diverse cultures in their territories, and sometimes this recognition is accompanied by politics of decentralization and/or autonomies, the responsibilities of carrying out the research can rest on local administrators. As such, states "respect" rights and autonomies, but they also let the autonomous entities seek their own funding for research and projects.

In spite of the fact that intangible heritage supposedly has its own experts in "the community" and in the "culture bearers" (Blake 2009), the article by Bigenho and Stobart, in this special issue, examines how the protagonists of patrimonialist politics still appeal to academic expertise to put together a heritage case file, a kind of archive of aspirations (Appadurai 2003) that serves to promote a declaratory law about a piece of "heritage." Academic expertise has also participated in supporting cultural policies of indigenismo. Anthropologists were integral to many state projects of indigenismo. However, disciplinary norms have changed significantly between the era of indigenismo and that of patrimonialismo. In putting together cases, actors make selective use of academic discourses (Rodríguez 2011: 32), and often the anthropological knowledge presented seems antiquated to anthropologists themselves (Bendix 2009: 259).

To navigate these ideas about knowledges that support a case file, Sara Lucia Guerrero Arenas develops in this issue the very useful idea of what she calls "the heritage story approved by consensus." Between the labyrinth of "culture bearers," "communities," "groups," and "individuals," she shows how the case file for UNESCO has to tell a story that justifies a declaration of heritage. In the case of the Feast of the Virgin of Candelaria that she studies in Peru, the construction of such as story entails moving beyond the conflict between local anthropologists who

wanted to emphasize the beliefs thought to have Pre-Columbian roots, and a bishop who only wanted to recognize the Catholic elements of the rituals. In this case, to achieve a heritage story approved by consensus was a great challenge. We suggest that the politics of patrimonialismo bring very important questions about the role of academics and activists in these processes.

Also in this special issue, Carlos Ruiz Rodríguez charts the efforts of academics to revive the Afromexican *fandango de artesa* tradition in the face of culture bearer indifference, and the resigned view that traditions – like human beings – will inevitably fade away and die. In other words, the community challenges the very premise of heritage safeguarding. Over many decades, outsider initiatives have attempted to breathe life into the *artesa* tradition, but local engagement remained half-hearted until the dance was embraced as an emblem in Afromexican political activism – albeit in a more presentational format. Ruiz Rodríguez contrasts the sense of participation provoked when the dance was linked with locally meaningful political struggles with the community's lukewarm reception of academics' efforts to put the dance forward for UNESCO intangible heritage listing. This article raises fundamental questions about the local relevance of heritage making, safeguarding, and the roles of academics and other outsiders in such initiatives. Ruiz Rodríguez argues for the importance of stressing contemporary aspects of tradition, rather than insisting on past attributes (as often happens in heritage making and externally motivated revival initiatives). Also, while offering a sharp critique of heritage, he nonetheless keeps open the possibility that heritage making may be employed as a strategy in struggles for rights.

Although this special issue and introduction offer perspectives on some distinctive aspects of heritage in Latin America, like the historic impact of indigenismo, it can be problematic to generalize for such a large and diverse region. However, we do argue that something is lacking in analyses that extend to Latin American contexts Harrison's argument that the contemporary global heritage boom has to do with a public that is saturated in modernity and therefore fascinated with the past (2013). We also question the degree to which Owe Ronström's thoughtful characterization of heritage as "a homogenizing counterforce to the diversifying and globalizing forces of post- or late modernity", based on perspectives from Northern Europe, resonates with the Latin American context. Heritage in this region does not always seem to reflect forms of society that are "more disembedded, individualized, glocalized, fragmented, multicultural" (Ronström 2013: 16). As we hope this issue highlights, many other dynamics are at play. What is certain is that, in recent years, heritage in many places of Latin America has become such a high profile and controversial subject, that as researchers of music, we cannot possibly ignore it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aikawa-Faure, Noriko. 2009. "From the Proclamation of Masterpieces to the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage". In *Intangible Heritage*, eds. Laurajane Smith and Natsuko Akagawa, 13-44. London and New York: Routledge.

Albó, Xavier. 1991. "El retorno del indio" (con debate). *Revista andina* 9 (2-diciembre): 299-366.

Albro, Robert 2010. "Neoliberal Cultural Heritage and Bolivia's New Indigenous Public". In *Ethnographies of Neoliberalism*, ed. Carol J. Greenhouse, 146-161. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Andolina, Robert, Nina Laurie, and Sarah A. Radcliffe. 2009. *Indigenous Development in the Andes: Culture, Power, and Transnationalism.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Appadurai, Arjun. 2003. "Archive and Aspiration". In *Information is Alive: Art and Theory in Archiving and Retrieving Data*, eds. Joke Brouwer and Arjen Mulder, 14-25. Rotterdam: NAi Publishers.

Arizpe, Lourdes. 2006. "Los debates internacionales en torno al patrimonio cultural inmaterial". *Cuicuilco* 13 (38, septiembre-diciembre): 14-27.

Bendix, Regina. 2009. "Heritage Between Economy and Politics: An Assessment from the Perspective of Cultural Anthropology". In *Intangible Heritage*, eds. Laurajane Smith and Natsuko Akagawa, 253-269. London and New York: Routledge.

Bigenho, Michelle. 2002. *Sounding Indigenous: Authenticity in Bolivian Music Performance.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

_____. 2006. "Embodied Matters: Bolivian Fantasy and Indigenismo". *Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology* 11 (2): 267-293.

_____. 2009. "Para repensar el mestizaje boliviano a través del folklore boliviano: la reorganización del espacio urbano compartido en la Revolución de 1952". In *Estudios urbanos: En la encrucijada de la interdisciplinaridad*, Coord. Fernanda Wanderley, 243-268. La Paz CIDES-UMSA.

Bigenho, Michelle and Henry Stobart. 2014. "Rethinking Creativity, Recognition, and Indigenous Heritage". Bilingual website (English/Spanish) about a workshop in Coroico Bolivia, 2012 https://www.royalholloway.ac.uk/boliviamusicip/home.aspx

_____. 2016. "The Devil in Nationalism: Indigenous Heritage and the Challenges of Decolonization". *International Journal of Cultural Property* 23 (2): 141-166.

Bigenho, Michelle, Juan Carlos Cordero, Richard Mújica, Bernardo Rozo, and Henry Stobart. 2015. "La propiedad intelectual y las ambigüedades del dominio público: casos de la producción musical y la *patrimonialización*". In *Lo público en la pluralidad: Ensayos desde Bolivia y América Latina*, coord. Gonzalo Rojas Ortuste, 131-161. La Paz, Bolivia: CIDES-UMSA.

Blake, Janet. 2009. "UNESCO's 2003 Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage: The Implications of Community Involvement in 'Safeguarding.'" In *Intangible Heritage*, eds. Laurajane Smith and Natsuko Akagawa, 45-73. London and New York: Routledge.

Breglia, Lisa. 2006. *Monumental Ambivalence: The Politics of Heritage.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Brown, Michael F. 2003. *Who Owns Native Culture?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____. 2004. "Heritage as Property". In *Property in Question: Value Transformation in the Global Economy*, eds. Katherine Verdery and Caroline Humphrey, 49-68. Oxford: Berg.

_____. 2005. "Heritage Trouble: Recent Work on the Protection of Intangible Cultural Property". *International Journal of Cultural Property* 12: 40-61.

Carneiro da Cunha, Manuela. 2009. *"Culture" and Culture: Traditional Knowledge and Intellectual Rights*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.

Chio, Jenny. 2017. "Rendering Rural Modernity: Spectacle and Power in a Chinese Ethnic Tourism Village". *Critique of Anthropology* 37 (4): 418-439.

Collins, John F. 2011. "Culture Content and the Enclosure of Human Being: UNESCO's 'Intangible' Heritage in the New Millennium". *Radical History Review* 109 (Winter): 121-135.

Coombe, Rosemary. 1998. *The Cultural Life on Intellectual Properties: Authorship, Appropriation, and the Law.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Coombe, Rosemary J. and Lindsay M. Weiss. 2015. "Neoliberalism, Heritage Regimes, and Cultural Rights". In *Global Heritage: Reader*, ed. Lynn Meskell, 43-69. Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley-Blackwell.

Coronado, Jorge. 2009. *The Andes Imagined: Indigenismo, Society, and Modernity.* Pittsburgh: University of

Pittsburgh Press.

Crespial. 2008. *Estado del Arte del Patrimonio Cultural Inmaterial. Argentina, Bolivia, Brasil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador y Perú*. 1ra ed. (Ed.) Crespial (Comp.). Cusco: Centro Bartolomé de las Casas.

De Cesari, Chiara. 2010. "Creative Heritage: Palestinian Heritage NGOs and Defiant Arts of Government". *American Anthropologist* 112 (4): 625-637.

De Jorio, Rosa. 2016. *Cultural Heritage in Mali in the Neoliberal Era.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Debord, Guy. 1994. *The Society of the Spectacle*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. New York: Zone Books.

Fabian, Johannes. 1983. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbian University Press.

Favre, Henri.1998. *El indigenismo*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Foster, Michael Dylan. 2015. "UNESCO on the Ground". In *UNESCO on the Ground: Local Perspectives on Intangible Cultural Heritage*, eds. Michael Dylan Foster and Lisa Gilman, 1-14. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Franco, Jean. 1999. *Critical Passions: Selected Essays*, eds. and intro. Mary Louise Pratt and Kathleen Newman. Durham: Duke University Press.

García Pabón, Leonardo.1998. *La patria íntima: alegorías nacionales en la literatura y el cine de Bolivia*. La Paz: CESU/Plural Editores.

Giraudo, Laura. 2012. "Neither 'Scientific' Nor 'Colonialist': The Ambiguous Course of Inter-American Indigenismo in the 1940s". (Translation: Victoria J. Furio) *Latin American Perspectives* 39 (5): 12-32.

Giraudo, Laura and Stephen E. Lewis. 2012. "Introduction: Pan-American Indigenismo (1940-1970)". *Latin American Perspectives* 39 (5): 3-11.

Graburn, Nelson. 1989. "Tourism: The Sacred Journey". In *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism,* Second edition, ed. Valene L. Smith, 21-36. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hale, Charles. 2005. "Neoliberal Multiculturalism: The Remaking of Cultural Rights and Racial Dominance in Central America". *Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 28(1): 10-28.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2004. *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire.* New York: Penguin Books.

Harrison, Rodney. 2013. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. London and New York: Routledge.

Hellier-Tinoco, Ruth. 2011. *Embodying Mexico: Tourism, Nationalism and Performance.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Hertz, Ellen. 2015. "Bottoms, Genuine and Spurious". In *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice: Participation, Territory, and the Making of Heritage*, eds. Nicolas Adell, Regina F. Bendix, Chiara Bortolotto and Markus Tauschek, 25-57. Göttingen Studies in Cultural Property 8. Universitätsverlag Göttingen.

Howard, Keith (ed.), 2012. *Music as Intangible Cultural Heritage: Policy, Ideology, and Practice in the Preservation of East Asian Traditions.* Farnham: Ashgate.

Kantaris, Geoffrey and Rory O'Bryen. 2013. "Introduction: The Fragile Contemporaneity of the Popular". In *Latin American Popular Culture: Politics, Media, Affect*, eds. Geoffrey Kantaris and Rory O'Bryen, 1-42: Rochester, NY: Tamesis Boydell and Brewer.

Kearney, Amanda. 2009. "Intangible Cultural Heritage: Global Awareness and Local Interest". In *Intangible Heritage*, eds. Laurajane Smith and Natsuko Akagawa, 209-225. London and New York: Routledge.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. 2004. "Intangible Heritage as Metacultural Production". *Museum*

International 56 (1-2): 52-65.

Kuutma, Kristin. 2012. "Between Arbitration and Engineering: Concepts and Contingencies in the Shaping of Heritage". In *Heritage Regimes and the State*, eds. Regina Bendix, Aditya Eggert, and Arnika Peselmann, 21-36. Göttingen Studies in Cultural Property, Vol. 6. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.

Lacarrieu, Mónica. 2008. "¿Es necesario gestionar el patrimonio inmaterial? Notas y reflexiones para repensar las estrategias políticas y de gestión". *Boletín Gestión Cultural* 17 (septiembre). referencia directa al artículo: www. gestioncultural.org/boletin/2008/bgc17-MLacarrieu.pdf

Latour, Bruno. 2005. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lowthorp, Leah. 2015. "Voices on the Ground: Kutiyattam, UNESCO, and the Heritage of Humanity". In *UNESCO on the Ground: Local Perspectives on Intangible Cultural Heritage*, eds. Michael Dylan Foster and Lisa Gilman, 17-40. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

MacCannell, Dean. 1973. "Staged Authenticity: Arrangements of Social Space in Tourist Settings". *American Journal of Sociology* 79 (3): 589-603.

Máiz, Ramón. 2004. "El indigenismo político en América Latina". *Revista de Estudios Políticos* 123 (enero-marzo): 129-174.

Marrie, Henrietta. 2009. "The UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Protection and Maintenance of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Indigenous Peoples". In *Intangible Heritage*, eds. Laurajane Smith and Natsuko Akagawa, 169-192. London and New York: Routledge.

Mijangos Díaz, Eduardo and Alexandra López Torres. 2011. "El problema del indigenismo en el debate intelectual posrevolucionario". *Signos históricos* 25(enero-junio): 42-67.

Munjeri, Dawson. 2009. "Following the Length and Breadth of the Roots: Some Dimensions of Intangible Heritage". In *Intangible Heritage*, eds. Laurajane Smith and Natsuko Akagawa, 131-150. London and New York: Routledge.

Norton, Barley. 2018. "Filming Music as Heritage: The Cultural Politics of Audiovisual Representation". In *Music as Heritage: Historical and Ethnographic Perspectives*, eds. Barley Norton and Naomi Matsumoto, 79-101. London and New York: Routledge.

Norton, Barley and Naomi Matsumoto. 2018. "Introduction: Historical and Ethnographic Perspectives on Music as Heritage". In *Music as Heritage: Historical and Ethnographic Perspectives*, eds. Barley Norton and Naomi Matsumoto, 1-17. London and New York: Routledge.

Noyes, Dorothy. 2015. "From Cultural Forms to Policy Objects: Comparison in Scholarship and Policy". In *UNESCO on the Ground: Local Perspectives on Intangible Cultural Heritage*, eds. Michael Dylan Foster and Lisa Gilman, 161-175. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Olivera, Oscar and in collaboration with Tom Lewis. 2004. *Cochabamba! Water War in Bolivia.* Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Paz Soldán, Edmundo.   2003. *Alcides Arguedas y la narrativa de la nación enferma*. La Paz: Plural Editores.

Postero, Nancy. 2013. "Bolivia's Challenge to 'Colonial Neoliberalism'". In *Neoliberalism, Interrupted: Social Change and Contested Governance in Contemporary Latin America*, eds. Mark Goodale and Nancy Postero, 25-52. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Pratt, Mary Louise. 2002. "Modernity and Periphery: Toward a Global Relational Analysis". In *Beyond Dichotomies: Histories, Identities, Cultures, and the Challenge of Globalization*, ed. Elisabeth Mudimbe-Boyi, 21-48. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Radcliffe, Sarah A., ed. 2006. *Culture and Development in a Globalizing World: Geographies, Actors, and Paradigms*. London and New York: Routledge.

Ramos, Alcida Rita.1998. *Indigenism: Ethnic Politics in Brazil.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Rios, Fernando. 2010. "Bolero Trios, Mestizo Panpipe Ensembles, and Bolivia's 1952 Revolution: Urban La Paz Musicians and the Nationalist Revolutionary Movement". *Ethnomusicology* 54 (2): 281-317.

Rivera Cusicanqui, Silvia.1993. "La raíz: colonizadores y colonizados". In *Violencias encubiertas en Bolivia I*, coords. Xavier Albó and Raúl Barrios, 27–139. La Paz: CIPCA/ Aruwiyiri.

Ronström, Owe. 2013. "Traditional Music, Heritage Music". In *The Oxford Handbook of Music Revival*, eds. Caroline Bithell and Juniper Hill, 1-20 (Digital edition: www.oxfordhandbooks.com). Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Rossells, Beatriz. 2004. "Espejos y máscaras de la identidad: el discurso indigenista en las artes plásticas (1900–1950)". In *Estudios bolivianos 12: La cultura del pre-52*, ed. Ana Rebeca Prada M., 297–400. La Paz: Instituto de Estudios Bolivianos/CIMA.

Rowe, William and Vivian Schelling. 1991. *Memory and Modernity: Popular Culture in Latin America*. London: Verso.

Ruiz Rodríguez, Carlos. 2011. "Reflexiones en torno a la etnomusicología y el patrimonio musical de México". *Diario de campo* 5 (julio-septiembre): 30-34.

Saldívar, Emiko. 2011. "Everyday Practices of Indigenismo: An Ethnography of Anthropology and the State in Mexico". *Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology* 16 (1): 67-89.

Salmón, Josefa. 1997. *El espejo indígena: el discurso indigenista en Bolivia 1900-1956*. La Paz: Plural Editores/UMSA.

Sánchez, Walter. 2001. "Patrimonio, propiedad intelectual, autoría y 'música indígena'". In *Anales de la Reunión Anual de Etnología, MUSEF (Museo Nacional de Etnografía y Folklore)*, 105-126. La Paz, Bolivia: MUSEF.

Sanjinés C., Javier. 2004. *Mestizaje Upside-Down: Aesthetic Politics in Modern Bolivia*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Sawyer, Suzana. 2004. *Crude Chronicles: Indigenous Politics, Multinational Oil, and Neoliberalism in Ecuador*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Schilling-Vacaflor, Almut. 2017. "Who controls the territory and the resources? Free, prior and informed consent: FPIC as a contested human rights practice in Bolivia". *Third World Quarterly* 38 (5): 1058-1074.

Seeger, Anthony. 2015. "Understanding UNESCO: A Complex Organization with Many Parts and Many Actors". In *UNESCO on the Ground: Local Perspectives on Intangible Cultural Heritage*, eds. Michael Dylan Foster and Lisa Gilman, 131-142. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Skounti, Ahmed. 2009. "The Authentic Illusion: Humanity's Intangible Cultural Heritage, the Moroccan Experience". In *Intangible Heritage*, eds. Laurajane Smith and Natsuko Akagawa, 74-92. London and New York: Routledge.

Smith, Laurajane and Emma Waterton. 2009. "'The Envy of the World?' Intangible Heritage in England". In *Intangible Heritage*, eds. Laurajane Smith and Natsuko Akagawa, 289-302. London and New York: Routledge.

Speed, Shannon. 2008. *Rights in Rebellion: Indigenous Struggle and Human Rights in Chiapas.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Stobart, Henry. 2010. "Rampant Reproduction and Digital Democracy: Shifting Landscapes of Music Production and 'Piracy' in Bolivia". *Ethnomusicology Forum* 19 (1): 27-56.

_____. 2016. "Dancing in the Fields: Imagined Landscapes and Virtual Locality in Indigenous Andean Music Videos". *TRANS-Revista Transcultural de Música/Transcultural Music Review* 20 [Fecha de consulta: 29/06/2018]

_____. 2018 [2002]. "Sacrificios sensacionales: Deleitando los sentidos en los Andes bolivianos" (Translation: Marino Martínez). *Antropológica* 36 (40):197-223.

Strathern, Marilyn. 1995. "The Nice Thing about Culture is that Everyone Has It". In *Shifting Contexts: Transformations in Anthropological Knowledge*, ed. Marilyn Strathern, 153-176. London: Routledge.

Troyan, Brett. 2008. "Re-imagining the 'Indian' and the State: Indigenismo in Colombia, 1926-1947". *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies* 33(65): 81-106.

Turtinen, Jan. 2000. "Globalising Heritage: On UNESCO and the Transnational Construction of a World Heritage". SCORE Rapportserie 12, Stockholm: Stockholm Centre for Organizational Research.

Williams, Gareth. 2002. *The Other Side of the Popular: Neoliberalism and Subalternity in Latin America*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Yeh, Emily. 2013. *Taming Tibet: Landscape Transformation and the Gift of Chinese Development*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Yoshitaka, Terada 2018. "Audiovisual Media and Performing Arts in Danger". In *Music as Heritage: Historical and Ethnographic Perspectives*, eds. Barley Norton and Naomi Matsumoto, 61-78. London and New York: Routledge.

Yúdice, George. 2003. *The Expediency of Culture: Uses of Culture in the Global Era*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Michelle Bigenho is Professor of Anthropology and Africana & Latin American Studies at Colgate University. She is author of two monographs: *Intimate Distance: Andean Music in Japan* (2012) and *Sounding Indigenous: Authenticity in Bolivian Music Performance* (2002). She plays the violin and has participated in many performances and recordings with the Bolivian orchestra, "Música de Maestros." With Henry Stobart she has organized, run, and documented a National Science Foundation-funded workshop in Bolivia (2012), "Rethinking Creativity, Recognition, and Indigenous Heritage." They received an ACLS Collaborative Research Fellowship (2015), and on the basis of this research they have co-authored articles and are currently finishing a book manuscript on Bolivia's heritage fever.

Henry Stobart is Reader in Music/Ethnomusicology in the Music Department of Royal Holloway, University of London. His books include *Music and the Poetics of Production in the Bolivian Andes* (Ashgate 2006) and the edited volumes *Music, Indigeneity, Digital Media*, co-edited with Thomas Hilder and Shzr Ee Tan (University of Rochester Press 2017) and *The New (Ethno)musicologies* (Scarecrow, 2008). Since 2012 he has collaborated in several research projects with Michelle Bigenho, focused on intellectual property and heritage issues in Bolivia, which have received support from the National Science Foundation and an ACLS Collaborative Research Fellowship (2015).

Richard Mújica Angulo is a musician and researcher. He has a *licenciado* in Anthropology from the Universidad Mayor de San Andrés. He is currently studying for a Master's degree in Critical Development Studies at CIDES-UMSA. He belongs to the Collective PachaKamani: Espacio Intercultural de Práctica e Investigación Ancestral (La Paz, Bolivia) and also to ALTA-PI (Alternativas a la Propiedad Intelectual). He currently works as an anthropologist in the Cultural Heritage unit of the Bolivian Ministry of Cultures and Tourism.