Music and Cultural Heritage Making in Latin America: An Afterword

Anthony Seeger (University of California Los Angeles/Smithsonian Institution)

Resumen

A la hora de considerar el papel de um postfacio para una lograda colección de artículos etnograficamente orientados y bien argumentados, me parece que podría hacer dos cosas para contextualizarlos. Em primer lugar, situar estos trabajos em el contexto de otras compilaciones de artículos que abordan las estratégias y efectos de algunos projectos de Patrimonio Cultural Inmaterial (PCI) fuera de las Américas. Em segundo lugar, me proponho discutir la influencia de la UNESCO em este tipo de projectos.

Abstract

In pondering the role of an Afterword to such an accomplished group of closely argued ethnography-based papers, it seemed to me that I could try to do two things to contextualize their contributions. First, I could place these papers in the context of a few other collections of essays that examine the strategies and effects of Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) projects outside of the Americas. Second, I will discuss the influence of UNESCO on intangible cultural heritage (ICH) projects.

Palabras clave
UNESCO, patrimonio inmaterial, patrimonialización.

Keywords
UNESCO, intangible heritage, patrimonialization.

Fecha de recepción: junio 2018
Fecha de aceptación: diciembre 2018
Fecha de publicación: junio 2019

Received: June 2018
Acceptance Date: December 2018
Release Date: June 2019

Music and Cultural Heritage Making in Latin America: An Afterword

Anthony Seeger (University of California Los Angeles/Smithsonian Institution)

The incisive and critical essays on the growing influence of patrimony policies and projects in five Latin American countries assembled here are major contributions to understanding the impact of those projects on local communities and the ways different actors are endeavoring to make use of them to advance their own agendas. Every essay raises critical issues in the implementation of cultural patrimony projects, many of which have been influenced by UNESCO initiatives in Intangible Cultural Heritage. They question some of the key features of the 2003 UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage as they have been implemented by national governments and engaged with by local populations and raise the issue of who benefits from the implementation projects.   One of the salient contributions of the essays as a body is their demonstration of the relationship between 21st century *patrimonialismo* ("heritage-ism") and 20th century *indigenismo*, a nation-building strategy employed by elites in the Andean countries of South America, as well as in Mexico and several countries in Central America.   Although today's *patrimonialismo* carries some of the baggage of *indigenismo*, Indigenous peoples and local communities have found ways to insert their own objectives into the projects.

In pondering the role of an Afterword to such an accomplished group of closely argued ethnography-based papers, it seemed to me that I could try to do two things to contextualize their contributions. First, I could place these papers in the context of a few other collections of essays that examine the strategies and effects of Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) projects outside of the Americas. I do this because these papers are part of a global process of examining the effects of ICH policies. Many conferences have been held around the world to discuss the process of heritage making and the three books I mention are cited to indicate the global reach of concern about this process. Second, even though the implementation of ICH policies is specific to the political, social, and cultural processes and historical contexts of individual countries and regions, I think it is important to mention some of the larger international contexts that have influenced those national policies during the past 20 years. Third, they reveal how little reporting on Latin American patrimonialization has appeared in previous English-language compilations.

Second, I will discuss the influence of UNESCO on intangible cultural heritage (ICH) projects. Most countries in Latin America had legislation and institutions that dealt with cultural heritage before the 21st century. But the ways cultural policies and processes have developed in the five countries described in these papers would certainly have been different had not UNESCO reviewed its 1989 Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore (hereafter called "1989 Recommendation"), implemented a program in 1998 called the Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity (hereafter called "Masterpieces"), and developed a new Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2003 (hereafter called the "2003 Convention") of which all five of these nations are signatories.   To discuss this context, I will comment on some of the procedures I witnessed or participated in at UNESCO during the period before the 2003 Convention and make a few observations about ICH in Brazil, a country not covered in this collection.

A global phenomenon and a global review

As of June 2018, the 2003 Convention had been ratified by 178 countries. Its impact on the cultural policies of signatory nations around the world has often been very large. It is difficult to overstate the influence it has had on how heritage is understood and legislated in ministries of culture around the world and how so-called safeguarding projects are implemented. Yet, as these essays demonstrate, ambiguities in the Convention, pre-existing social hierarchies, local and national political interests, and opportunistic economic ambitions often have shaped the actual policies in each country.

<u>Studies of the Heritage Process</u>

Critical scholarship on the local impact of national policies for safeguarding intangible heritage has accompanied the impact of UNESCO activities in ICH but it has taken a while to learn enough about the impact of UNESCO-encouraged national programs on specific local populations to address the results in much detail. Latin American examples are rare in the publications I have encountered. Among the edited English-language volumes describing aspects of specific projects in different parts of the world are Keith Howard's *Music as Intangible Cultural Heritage: Policy Ideology and Practice in the Preservation of East Asian Traditions* (Howard 2012), Bendix et al. *Heritage Regimes and the State* (Bendix, Eggert, and Peselmann 2013), and Foster and Gilman's *UNESCO on the Ground: Local Perspectives on Global Policy for Intangible Cultural Heritage* (Foster and Gilman 2015).[1] Like this collection, each volume originated in an earlier conference. Howard's introduction provides a detailed description of the history of UNESCO's involvement with ICH and an informative description of state-sponsored cultural heritage policies in East Asia, many of which predated the UNESCO Convention and influenced aspects of it. The Japanese system influenced several Asian countries as well as some programs in the United States and UNESCO. The UNESCO program Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage (1988-2005) was also partially funded by Japan. The essays, largely written by ethnomusicologists, address specific issues or programs in five East Asian countries.

The edited volume by Bendix, Eggert, and Peselmann takes a more analytic approach to the subject of ICH and the State, with an excellent introduction to the subject by the editors and important keynote address by Kristen Kuutma (2012). One of the essays addresses Cuba, but the volume is weighted more toward Europe with a few cases from Africa and Southeast Asia. In the final comparative essay, Chiara del Cesari describes the difficulty of writing about cultural heritage, and concludes

> (…) to gauge how heritage affects people's lives we clearly need more ethnography. Several essays in this volume call for specificity and ethnographic detail and indeed we ought to continue along this path. In particular, we ought to unpack the rhetoric of democratic heritage and heritage as development, and to trace the real meanings of "involvement," "local communities" and "development." We ought to see the real people and the true stories that hide behind such terms (Cesari 2013: 411).

---

[1] There have been many other important contributions to understanding the effects of ICH safeguarding projects, among them those described by Macchiarella (2011) regarding community ideas of ownership and reactions to the popularity of their choral groups and LIU Guiteng (2018) at the 2018 ICTM Study Groups meeting in Beijing on the effects on Tibetan religious activities of the touristification of their ceremonies. A volume edited by Barley Norton and Naomi Matsumoto (2019) appeared too late to be included in this discussion.

Foster and Gilman's edited volume (2015) focuses on the people and stories, while at the same time addressing some of the policy issues in six projects. This volume also contains no examples from Latin America.

The essays in this issue of TRANS also focus on people and stories, in the specific context of state ICH/Patrimony regimes and efforts of groups to obtain recognition and improve their lives through a heritage process. These papers are notable for the perceptiveness of the questions they ask and the revelation of the influence of national and local political aspirations, commercial interests, and local conflicts in the heritagization procedures in Latin America.

As in East Asia, national policies focusing on cultural heritage in Latin America did not begin with UNESCO.   Mexico's "Carta de México en defesa del patrimônio cultural" dates from 1946 and several other Latin American countries also developed statutes for the protection of or recognition of cultural heritage.   In Brazil, the Office of the National Heritage and Artistic Heritage (SPHAN) was established in 1937 and in the same year the modernist intellectual Mário de Andrade called for a "comprehensive and ethnographic vision of cultural heritage" (Cavalcanti, forthcoming). The policies of SPHAN have shifted over the years and its recent focus on Intangible Cultural Heritage with the involvement of tradition bearers is an important refinement of its earlier focus.

Is there anything specific to Latin America in the heritage cases described here and elsewhere? For parts of the region, especially most the nations represented in these papers, 20th century *indigenismo,* as discussed in the introduction by Bigenho, Stobart and Mújica, influenced the development and implementation of current policies. Another feature of these studies is their attention to the power relations and conflicting objectives that appear in most heritage projects. They tend to see heritage not as an "item" but as a part of a larger set of social processes where diverse actors use heritage as a resource for obtaining a variety of objectives. More than most studies these contributions highlight the efforts of governments and elites to control decision-making by local communities and (often) subordinated groups.   Several papers deal with communities of Indigenous descent or identification, which have a specific history that is quite different from that of most Indigenous communities in Lowland South America (Brazil, Venezuela, etc.). The rise of powerful Indigenous people's rights movements in the 21st century, especially in the Andes, is quite different from those found in other parts of the world and adds to the value of these papers for a comparative perspective on ICH and heritage making processes. While efforts at self-determination and agency by local communities have a long history in Latin America, the heritage-making process has provided new opportunities for many participants. And, as the papers show, conflicts arise during the preparation of projects and in their aftermath.

The UNESCO Context of Heritage

During the years I was involved in examining the 1989 Recommendation, administering the technical and scientific evaluations of nominations for the UNESCO Masterpieces project, and other UNESCO activities, some of the difficulties detailed in the papers were already apparent.

The 1989 UNESCO Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture was the first UNESCO "instrument" or policy document for the protection of intangible cultural heritage--specifically traditional culture and folklore. Thirteen years in development, the Recommendation had relatively little impact on the UNESCO member states, only six of which sent reports on their activities when requested to do so by the UNESCO Director-General in 1990. There are different types of "instruments" within UNESCO. A "Convention" that is ratified by nations, who then must

implement its terms, is far more important than a "Recommendation, " whose implementation is optional.[2]   At the early stages of discussions of the 1989 Recommendation the need for a new "instrument" was affirmed; that this would become a "convention" emerged during later discussions (Seitel 2001).

Noriko Aikawa Faure, former Director of UNESCO's Intangible Cultural Heritage Center, describes some of the criticisms of the Recommendation, especially the criticisms of its emphasis on products, its focus on research, its outdated conceptual framework, and its inadequate attention to the initiatives of the tradition bearers (Aikawa Faure 2009). There was a strong feeling within UNESCO and beyond that a stronger and broader instrument was required to address intangible cultural heritage in a rapidly changing global context. Between 1995 and 1999, the UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage Center convened a series of regional meetings to evaluate the Recommendation. These were followed by a global meeting at the Smithsonian Institution in the USA (Seitel 2001), one result of which was a call for the creation of a new UNESCO instrument. That provided the necessary momentum for the creation of the 2003 Convention on the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. The process of the drafting of the 2003 Convention was very complex and involved many actors and months of meetings—and also compromises. The reason some of the sentences are so long and the provisions so complex is that nobody wanted what was important to them left out.

I was primarily involved with UNESCO's Intangible Cultural Heritage Center from 1997-2005. As President and later Secretary General of the International Council for Traditional Music (ICTM), an international NGO in consultative relations with UNESCO, I participated in the later stages of the evaluation of the 1989 Recommendation and in discussions about the need for creating a new UNESCO "instrument" for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. I attended the regional discussions of the Proclamation in Accra, Ghana and in Beirut, Lebanon. At Noriko Aikawa's request, I suggested to the Director of the Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, Richard Kurin, that the Smithsonian Institution's Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage host the final Global Assessment of the Recommendation in Washington D.C.   It was held in June 2000. The concluding document of the meeting called for the preparation of a new instrument to address Intangible Cultural Heritage. This led to the formulation of the 2003 Convention (described in Aikawa-Faure 2009). I also coordinated the ICTM evaluation of dossiers in the areas of music and dance for the UNESCO program "Proclamation of the Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity" (hereafter "Masterpieces") in 2003 and 2005. I have described the ICTM role in evaluating the nominations in some detail in an earlier article (Seeger 2009) and will not do so here at length. This program is mentioned in several of the papers here, especially Hachmeyer's fascinating discussion of the results of the proclamation of the "Cosmovision of the Kallawaya" in 2003. Hachmeyer's paper was a surprise to me, because the ICTM had not been asked to review that dossier for the 2003 Proclamation. A different NGO was assigned that dossier, and I don't recall which one it was. Usually, when a nomination involved music and something else (dance, theatre, etc.), two NGOs—the ICTM and another—were asked to review the dossier. Perhaps the ICTM did not receive the Cosmovision nomination because music was not central to the argument in the dossier. Although the video that accompanied the nomination (and the summary video created by UNESCO) featured music and dance, the nomination focused primarily on herbal practices. As I recall, the jury's discussion focused on Kallawaya medicinal and plant knowledge and cosmology. My notes do not indicate a long discussion and it was recommended for being Proclaimed a Masterpiece of the Oral

---

[2] The "Geneva Convention" or "Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War," for example, was binding on the nations that signed it and covered the treatment of prisoners by all sides in World War II.

and Intangible Heritage of Humanity. The actual proclamation was the prerogative of the Director General of UNESCO after reviewing the international jury's recommendations.

The Masterpieces program established many of the parameters for the ideology and the procedures used to nominate ICH to the "Representative List" and the "List in Need of Urgent Safeguarding" that have been discussed in most of the papers. The principal goals of the Masterpieces project were repeatedly described in UNESCO documents of the time, and will be somewhat familiar to those who have read the goals of the 2003 Convention:

1. raise awareness and recognise the importance of oral and intangible heritage and the need to safeguard and revitalise it;

2. evaluate and take stock of the world's oral and intangible heritage;

3. encourage countries to establish national inventories of the intangible heritage and provide legal and administrative measures for its protection;

4. promote the participation of traditional artists and local creators in identifying and revitalising the intangible heritage. (UNESCO 2001).

The submission process for nominations was extremely detailed and quite difficult for local groups or even national agencies to complete and submit. The applications required often redundant responses to long lists of questions and successful nominations were frequently prepared with the assistance of cultural bureaucrats or academic scholars who were accustomed to applying for funds. The UNESCO Intangible Heritage Section (now called the "Living Heritage Entity" [UNESCO 2019]), part of the Division of Cultural Heritage, provided some grants and staff support to nations that asked for assistance in preparing the dossiers.[3] One of the differences between the Masterpieces nominations and the Representative List of the 2003 Convention is that whatever was nominated to be proclaimed as a Masterpiece, was required to be in some way endangered and an action plan had to address how to safeguard it.

The nominations were submitted to the Paris office of UNESCO where they were reviewed to be sure they were complete. The UNESCO office selected which UNESCO-affiliated NGOs would review each nomination and forwarded the dossiers to those NGOs. As Secretary General of the ICTM it was my job to assign appropriate reviewers to each dossier and edit their final documents for clarity. I would select specialists who knew about the element being nominated and also something about the intellectual and academic aspects of the country so they could evaluate the nomination itself and also evaluate the experience of those who participated in preparing it. Even after the initial UNESCO office review, however, the applications were very uneven. In some cases, it was clear that the people who prepared them knew relatively little about the local people who practiced the traditions nominated. Only rarely could it be determined that traditional artists and local creators were fully and actively involved in identifying and safeguarding their own heritage. The nominations from Latin America were generally better done and more complete than submissions from some other parts of the world. A few dossiers failed to provide any signatures from local practitioners indicating their approval of the action plan. These were an essential part of the application and decisions could be delayed for this reason. The people preparing the dossiers often failed to consult anthropologists, musicologists, and linguists in their own countries who were

---

[3] I should add that the specialists doing the Scientific and Technical review for the ICTM were often frustrated by the repetitive questions that needed to be addressed. Part of my job was to convince them to persevere in doing so. The redundancy was required in order to make each dossier and evaluation comparable, which facilitated the final evaluations but required a lot of patient and repetitive work.

already familiar with the practices nominated and who might have contributed both knowledge and contacts to local communities and individuals to improve the applications. The preparers sometimes appeared to know very little about the local context in which the elements were embedded. In one memorable case, the ignorance of the tradition was such that half of the living practitioners listed in the proposal were in fact already dead.

Both the Masterpieces program and the 2003 Convention were intentionally designed to invert the traditional hierarchy between high-status policy makers and academic researchers and those known as "tradition bearers," who often had a lower status in the national arena. This marked a major change in cultural policy for many countries. It was probably responsible for some of the problems encountered in the dossiers. This focus on local communities and tradition bearers was one of the major UNESCO initiatives in both programs: to turn the heritage-making process upside down so that policies and projects would progress from the bottom (frequently lower status knowledge bearers) up to ministries of culture and national governments. It was intended to promote initiatives that were developed from communities and individuals and to increase cultural diversity. As these papers show, it has not been easy for nations and ministries of culture to understand and implement this radical change. Instead, old top-down decision-making continues to operate, whether in the selection of what ICH to register (as in the case described by Jose Manuel Izquierdo König for Chile) or in the elaboration of the nomination file (illustrated by Sara Lucia Guerrero Arenas' beautifully described development of the nomination of the Fiesta de Candelaria). Occasionally, we also encountered the complete omission of low-status people from descriptions and safeguarding plans, in an alarming tendency to reduce existing diversity. For example, Roma musicians were omitted from at least one European nomination and replaced by urban revivalist musicians, even though the minority group musicians were almost always the musicians at the nominated events. Similarly, the Muslim costume makers for a South Asian Hindu festival were not mentioned in the nomination or action plan for the festival. It is impossible to know whether these changes were made by members of the local communities or by government workers. Ideally, in the Masterpieces program the tradition bearers would develop the nominations and the policy makers would approve them swiftly and work with the community on action plans to safeguard them that would benefit the tradition bearers. But many of the nominations submitted for the Masterpieces program were clearly created from the top down. They were born in a conference room in a capital city and then eventually presented to tradition bearers for their approval and participation.

There were some good examples of Masterpieces dossiers that followed the UNESCO guidelines and worked closely with local communities and tradition bearers to prepare the nominations. In the case of Brazilian "Oral and Graphic Expressions of the Wajãpi"[4] proclaimed in 2003, the project was developed through a collaboration of the Indigenous Wajãpi leaders with anthropologists in São Paulo and had the specific objective of enabling the community to regain rights and control over their body-paint designs. The anthropologists had worked with them for years and were able to help them prepare the onerous application materials. Some Wajãpi leaders were disturbed that their ritual body paint designs were being used by T-shirt manufacturers and other entrepreneurs in nearby cities. The action plan included making an inventory of designs in order to register and protect them. Formal registration of designs was an important way to protect

---

[4] See https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/oral-and-graphic-expressions-of-the-wajapi-00049 (accessed 28 March 2019)

Indigenous designs from unlicensed use, under Brazilian law. This project reflects an observation by Bigenho and Stobart that local communities are using the heritage processes to try to exert control over musical forms and other cultural objects.

In the case of the successful Brazilian nomination of the "Samba de Roda of the Recôncavo of Bahia",[5] proclaimed in 2005, the selection of the Samba de Roda began from the top down.[6] But during the research and inventorying process, local Samba de Roda groups organized themselves into vocal spokespeople for their own interests (Sandroni 2010; Sandroni and Sant'Anna 2006; Cavalcanti, forthcoming) and became active in the preparation of the dossier. This does not mean the groups were happy with the long-term results of their successful nominations. Some of the Samba de Roda performers felt that they had benefitted little from the proclamation of their dance and song form. Their audiences did not increase as much as they expected and the anticipated tourism failed to materialize. As with the Arhuaco *Vallenato* musicians of the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, described by Yeshica Serrano Riobó, the inclusion of the Vallenato on the UNESCO List did not resolve many of the problems that led to their active participation in the nomination process. In all these ways, the Masterpieces Program anticipated issues that arose in the nominations to the Selected Lists after 2005.

There are many reasons for the difference between the ideals of the 2003 Convention and its application, including ingrained social and political hierarchies, national development policies, and the structure of the relationship of UNESCO and the nations (called Nation Parties) that comprise it. One of the most important of these is that while UNESCO can create declarations, praise excellent proposals, and publicize best practices, it cannot interfere directly in the internal activities of a nation.[7] This contributes to some of the specific problems identified in these assembled papers. The terms of the 2003 Convention were created by UNESCO with the objective of changing the traditional power dynamics in cultural policies, but UNESCO has little influence over how the principles are applied. As these papers make clear, many of the problems emerge in the development and implementation of the safeguarding plans.

This was certainly true for the Masterpieces program. The weakest part of virtually all the dossiers reviewed by the ICTM was the required "action plan," or description of steps to be taken that would safeguard the element of ICH being nominated for proclamation. These plans were supposed to be projects developed with the local communities to "safeguard" the element nominated. An examination of the budgets accompanying the plans revealed that frequently most of the project money was allocated to paying film crews, researchers, and travel to the region from capital cities. Very little funding was directed toward the local tradition-bearers and the institutions of which they were a part. Many of the ICTM members doing the "technical and scientific reviews" directed their most detailed comments on the dossiers to the action plans. But the implantation of the action plans was an area over which the UNESCO officers in Paris had little control. They

---

[5] https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/samba-de-roda-of-the-reconcavo-of-bahia-00101 (accessed 28 March 2019)

[6]   Brazil's nomination of the Samba de Roda for the Proclamation in 2005 apparently grew from the suggestion by Minister of Culture and musician Gilberto Gil that the Samba be nominated. After consultation, the group found that for the Masterpieces project the element nominated had to be in some way "endangered", which was not the case of the popular Samba. Samba de Roda, however, was a rural form with several threats to its sustainability that fit the requirements (Sandroni 2010; and 2011).

[7] Elsewhere I have described the organization of UNESCO and the frequent difficulty of identifying what people mean when they refer to "UNESCO" (Seeger 2015). UNESCO has a headquarters in Paris, regional offices around the world, and "national committees "in many countries. Important for South America is the regional center, CRESPIAL, in Peru. UNESCO does not have a large budget of its own for funding projects and must take care not to alienate its member nations.

forwarded the concerns of the ICTM reviewers to the nations, but once the element was proclaimed a Masterpiece (or, later, put on one of the Lists), the UNESCO office in Paris had little control over the implementation of the action plans unless they provided the funding. UNESCO had some special funds to assist countries without economic resources in the implementation of their action plans. I was told they would review the action plans again during the funding process, considering the review of the NGOs in these discussions, but I do not know how often it recommended changes in them.

From the reports of the preceding papers in this volume, the implementation of procedures intended to "safeguard" elements of ICH are still often centrally developed and frequently confuse safeguarding with preserving, economic development, and tourism. These were not primary objectives of the 2003 Convention, though they were discussed. Article 2 paragraph 1 of the 2003 Convention mentions sustainable development, but I suspect the original emphasis was on the word "sustainable" to avoid the excesses of predatory development projects that displace local populations, ignore their desires, and yield benefits to entrepreneurs and outsiders to the detriment of tradition bearers and the institutions and practices they value. Within national and local contexts, however, the word "development" appears to have frequently been the primary attraction of heritage making projects, and its sustainability (including the sustainability of the initiatives of the "tradition bearers" in local communities) has been given less attention.

But it would be wrong to place all the blame on politicians and developers for the failure to implement action plans successfully. Anthropologists are implicated as well. Anthropologist Richard Kurin has written, 'The ethnographic literature documents many cases in which well-intentioned efforts to help actually harmed local traditions' (Kurin 2002: 145). The history of applied anthropology is filled with failed projects and lessons for later efforts. None of the authors in this collection appear to have been actively involved in preparing nominations for the "Representative Lists" of the 2003 Convention, but other scholars have been. Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett observed: "Safeguarding requires highly specialized skills that are of a different order from the equally specialized skills needed for the actual performance of Kutiyattam or Bunraku or Georgian Polyphonic song" (2004: 55). One might add to her observation that successful action plans require skills not always needed for scholarly study and publications. Neither scholars nor practitioners necessarily have the understanding and tools to develop successful safeguarding projects, even discounting the effects of political and economic processes. But I do think that an understanding of safeguarding projects in a comparative perspective can be useful. Local aspirations can benefit from access to information about other attempts to do something similar—something that applied scholarship can provide. [8] Many action plans seem to be re-inventing a process that has revealed its flaws in other places. Lessons from ICH work in China, Indonesia, India, and elsewhere can be instructive for communities in Latin America even though the sociocultural contexts in which they are undertaken are very different.

In 2004, the ICTM did a scientific and technical evaluation of 59 nomination dossiers. Each nomination was supposed to describe how the element being nominated was endangered (that was a requirement of the application). Some of these nominations were of truly disappearing forms, including a few where there was some doubt whether there were still any living practitioners, or where practitioners were being silenced, arrested, or subject to abuse; other nominations were

---

[8] It is probably worth noting that this author is most familiar with the Indigenous peoples of Brazil, whose populations are smaller and where in some cases a united leadership can make planning a far less conflictual process than in the much larger Indigenous communities in the Andes discussed in these papers.

"endangered" in a relatively limited way—but one important to the practitioners. For a conference paper a few years ago, I examined the reviews and grouped the types of endangerment mentioned in the nominations into categories. The list reveals the diversity of the reported threats and suggests the difficulty of resolving them. I grouped them into categories as follows: rapid social change & urbanization 15 nominations; loss of knowledge bearers/aged performers (related but different from the first category) 11; damage by tourism 8; competition with commercial media 8; conversion and missionary influence 8 (Christianity & Islam 4 each); political pressure to modify a musical form 7; lack of financial support 6; discrimination against group by ethnicity, race, or class, but not specifically religion 5; hegemony of the national school system 2; lack of raw materials 2; not indicated 3; other 3. The details ranged from rising rents in urban areas to the depopulation of rural communities and the rise of commercial entertainment media, to the loss of valued participants who converted to a new religion. Sometimes even a change in traffic regulations or the prohibition of street performers could inhibit the relationship between performers and audiences and prevent the former from making a living.[9] Many of the nominations revealed a tension between the local community and national priorities and education systems.

The 2003 Convention ignored the historical realities and power relations that operate within most nations and attempted to create a new dynamic for cultural policies. The Convention's use of the undefined word "community or group" tends to ignore the fact that "communities" and "groups"—however defined—are frequently divided over many issues, including over the value of different kinds of ICH and the best means to safeguard them. There are frequently heated debates over who is and who is not a member of a group, and over whose version of heritage is the "true" or correct one. These are probably impossible to resolve in the abstract, but they should be expected to appear in most heritage projects.

Conflicts that emerged during plans for safeguarding ICH are at the heart of several papers in this volume, among them Sara Guerrero Arenas' detailed description of how consensus was reached for the Fiesta de la Virgen de Candelaria de Puno and Yeshica Serrano Riobó's description of the differences of opinion within the "community" over what is Arhuaca "tradition." Many families and even some individuals may be divided on ICH issues as well. The word "community" has become ideologically so associated with homogenous and harmonious groups that the reality often comes as a surprise to those developing cultural projects. The inevitability of internal conflicts at both the local and the national level was not incorporated into the wording of the 2003 Convention. As a result, there is no discussion in the document of mechanisms to address these conflicts during the safeguarding planning and realization.[10] Nor is there any indication that the conflicts may in fact be a productive part of safeguarding ICH. The best procedure may be to expect the process to take time and require working through conflicts. Brazilian anthropologist Maria Laura Cavalcanti, who has a lot of experience with Brazilian cultural heritage, takes a less negative view of the conflicts that often arise during these discussions. In the concluding paragraph of an essay on ICH in Brazil she writes: "The characteristics of each [ICH] Registry and consequent safeguarding

---

[9] Localities that are concerned about the loss of their performing arts should look first to the local regulations that make their practice difficult: laws of silence, prohibitions or high cost of performing on streets and in public places, and other regulations that may make sense in one context but have the sometimes unintended effect of ending a cultural practice valued by some part of the larger community. If we want to know where the problems are, the best informed people are those who practice the heritage form.

[10] I have sometimes wondered whether it is the importance of Durkheim to French anthropology and of Karl Marx to much of the anthropology in Latin America that leads to the different perspectives on social conflict. For the former it is an aberration, for the second a normal part of social processes. Some cultural policies are certainly influenced by the social scientists in their own countries.

actions vary from case to case. But the entire route of each cultural good's Registry is necessarily permeated by tensions, frictions that do not prevent success, but are on the contrary entirely part of a process that relies in a very fundamental way on a dialogue with the social groups involved" (Cavalcanti, forthcoming).

Patrimony and Tourism.

Safeguarding cultural heritage is frequently associated with developing infrastructure for tourists. During discussions of the Masterpieces dossiers by the international jury that made recommendations as to which nominations should be proclaimed by the UNESCO Director General as masterpieces, the subject of tourism was raised several times and it was also discussed during the preparation of the 2003 Convention. Tourism was often described in negative terms and at least one Masterpieces nomination was rejected by the international jury because it appeared to be designed largely as developing a center for tourism. The objective of the nominations was supposed to focus on safeguarding ICH and the tradition bearers' objectives. It was clear to anyone with an understanding of the global economy that it would be a mistake to ignore the potential of exploiting heritage for purposes of tourism and profit. And this has clearly happened in Latin America. Not all ICH projects attract the expected number of tourists or the benefits anticipated from them. On the other hand, some traditions may only be performed today because of tourism. Countries and local communities around the world compete with one another to get local activities nominated to regional, national or the UNESCO lists as a means of attracting tourism and investment.[11] Yet tourism often brings few benefits to the local practitioners. Indeed, the rising cost of real estate and a desire for the comfort and convenience of tourists may make it more difficult for practitioners to continue valued practices. This is especially clear in where the conflict between religious practice and public spectacles for tourists is a central issue (described by Guerrero Arenas for Peru).

How much do we know about the outcomes from the hundreds or thousands of cultural projects that have resulted from the implementation of the 2003 Declaration in 178 countries? For the most part we know very little about them. In 2004 I suggested to the UNESCO office that they contract the original ICTM evaluators of the nominations for those ICH elements proclaimed as "Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity" to do follow-up studies to see what the actual result was of implementing the action plans on the ground. There was no funding for this and instead UNESCO has relied on occasional reports from the countries themselves. But this involves an obvious conflict of interest—the people or organizations responsible for implementing the projects were usually also responsible for evaluating themselves—and the results would rarely be self-critical. Fortunately, scholars like the authors of the papers in this issue and in the collections described earlier are helping us to understand the some of the results. They tend to be quite critical of them. Mexico appears to have established a broad commission to review the effects of its heritage projects. This is an idea that should be emulated elsewhere.

What began as a UNESCO decision to review an ineffective recommendation on traditional culture and folklore has become a major influence on cultural policies in the 178 countries that have signed the 2003 Convention on the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. This influence deserves to be considered. Furthermore, the implementation of the Convention should be modified

---

[11] In Portugal, and probably elsewhere, enterprises compete for the opportunity of preparing ICH nominations for villages and charge a high price for preparing the dossier. They do not necessarily know much about the ICH in a local community or about the details of safeguarding, but they are specialists in preparing successful dossiers (Salwa El-Shawan Castelo-Branco, personal communication).

if current practices are not fulfilling the original objectives of giving local practitioners the agency to nominate and direct projects of valued elements, practices, and their processes.

BIBLIOGRAFIA

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

Bendix, Regina F., Aditya Eggert, and Arnika Peselmann (eds.). 2012. *Heritage Regimes and the State.* Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.

Brumann, Christoph and David Berliner (ed.). 2016. *World Heritage on the Ground, Ethnographic Perspectives.* New York, Oxford: Berghahn.

Cavalcanti, Maria Laura Viveiros de Castro. Forthcoming. "The legal protection of Intangible cultural heritage in Brazil". In *The legal protection of Intangible cultural heritage. A comparative perspective,* ed. Pier Luiti Petrillo. New York: Springer,

De Cesari, Chiara. 2013. "Thinking Through Heritage Regimes". In *Heritage Regimes and the State*, eds., Regina F. Bendix, Aditya Eggert, and Arnika Peselmann, 399-413. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.

Foster, Michael Dylan and Lisa Gilman (eds.). 2015. *UNESCO on the Ground: Local Perspectives on Intangible Cultural Heritage.* Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Freyre, Gilberto. 1986 [1933]*. The Masters and the Slaves = Casa-grande & senzala : A Study in the Development of Brazilian Civilization.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

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

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. 2004. "Intangible heritage as metacultural production", *Museum International* 56 (1-2): 52-64.

Kurin, Richard. 2002. "Comment on Peter M. Nas, Masterpieces of Oral and Intangible Culture, Reflections on the UNESCO World Heritage List", *Current Anthropology* 42 (1): 144-5.

Kurin, Richard. 2004. "Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in the 2003 UNESCO Convention: A Critical Appraisal", *Museum International,* 56(1-2): 66-76.

Liu, Guiteng. 2018. "The Game of Rights—Dispelling and Protecting Intrinsic Inheritance Relations of the Religious Ritual Music: A Case Study of Music and Dance of Leruo (June Ceremony) in Regong, Qinghai". Paper delivered at The Joint Symposium of the ICTM Study Groups on Applied Ethnomusicology and Music, Education and Social Inclusion, Beijing, China. July 7-10, 2018.

Macchiarella, Ignazio. 2013. "Dove il tocco di re Mida non arriva. A proposito di proclamazioni Unesco e musica. (Where the King Midas touch doesn't arrive: Unesco proclamation and music)". *La Ricerca folklorica* n . 64:71-79. Retrieved from JSTOR: http://www.jstor.org./stable/23629708

Norton, Barley and Naomi Matsumoto (eds.). 2019. *Music as Heritage: Historical and Ethnographic Perspectives.* New York: Routledge.

Rees, Helen. 2012. "Intangible Cultural Heritage in China Today: Policy and Practice in the Early 21st Century". In *Music as Intangible Cultural Heritage: Policy, Ideology, and Practice in the Preservation of East Asian Traditions,* ed. Keith Howard, 23–54. Farnham, Surrey, UK: Ashgate.

Sandroni, Carlos. 2010. "Samba de roda, patrimônio imaterial da humanidade". *Estudos Avançados* 24 (69): 373-388.

Sandroni, Carlos and Marcia Sant'Anna (eds.). 2006. *Samba de Roda do Recôncavo Baiano.* Brasília, DF: Iphan.

Seeger, Anthony. 2009. "Lessons Learned from the ICTM (NGO) Evaluation of Nominations for the UNESCO Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity, 2001-2005". In *Intangible Heritage,* eds. Laurajane Smith and Natusko Akagawa, 112-128. London: Routledge.

_____. 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 and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Seitel, Peter. 2001. "Summary Report on the Regional Seminars". In *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment*, ed. Peter Seitel, 36–41. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage.

Smith, Laurajane and Natusko Akagawa (eds.). 2009. *Intangible Heritage*. London: Routledge.

UNESCO. 2001. *First Proclamation of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity.* Paris:

UNESCO. 2019. https://ich.unesco.org/en/secretariat-00032

Anthony Seeger is Professor of Ethnomusicology at the University of California, Los Angeles, and Director Emeritus of Smithsonian Folkways Recordings. He is the author of *Why Suyá Sing: A Musical Anthropology of an Amazonian People* (Cambridge University Press, 1987) and co-editor of *Early Field Recordings: A Catalogue of the Cylinder Collections at the Indiana University Archives of Traditional Music* (Indiana University Press, 1987). His numerous published articles have focused on issues of land and human rights for Brazilian Indians, issues of archiving and intellectual property, and ethnomusicological theory and method.