CSIC ● incipit

Laboratory of Ideas:
Re-Constructing Scenographies

Santiago de Compostela   September 24-25, 2014

Felipe Criado Boado, David Barreiro, Rocío Varela-Pousa

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to provide some ideas and concepts discussed in the workshop "Re-Constructing Scenographies", which was celebrated in Santiago de Compostela on September 24th and 25th, 2014.

The aim of the Laboratory of Ideas was to discuss about the future economic scenarios for archaeology, including the possibility for a radically alternative economic scenario for Heritage as a broader field of activity, from the data collected about archaeological activity in Europe, through the DISCO Project: "Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe, 2012-2014" (financed by *Lifelong Learning Programme* of European Commission).

The Laboratory of Ideas has been the starting point of a research that will be leaded in the coming years by the Institute of Heritage Sciences (Incipit) in the NEARCH Project: "New Scenarios for a community-involved archaeology" (funded by the *Culture Programme* of European Commission), in order to define new models of activity for the archaeological sector.

Cultural Heritage: new scenarios for the actors

Heritage does not exist, but instead is a function of the social valuing added to it. The act of valuing comes first before the act of appropriating, which is the very essence of any heritagization process. Our recent past and our present "do things", and some of these things are categorized by our culture as heritage, because in history and in the modern day they are attributed a certain value; they meant something, and this meaning has been important for the social actors (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1995, Robertson 2012, Hafstein 2005, Sánchez-Carretero 2013).

As a result, the existing heritage objects are a result of a categorization -made in the present day (Barreiro 2012), basically from hegemonic spheres that may be either academic, scientific and research-based, or technical and involving administrative management-, of realities (which may be tangible or intangible, material or ideal) produced by societies (whether our own, the subaltern societies or "the others", including indigenous societies: Hall 1999, Smith 2008; Meskell 2012). All societies have their own way of managing the Past, memory, tradition and cultural products; but *heritage* is a specific concept/process of European Modernity. Other cultures don't have *heritage* or concepts similar to that, although as a part of the Globalization (since 15th Century), they have incorporated (assimilated) this concept (or similar), making use of it.

Many different actors are involved in the process of heritagization, producing different narratives, uses and claims, in relation to heritage (Sánchez Carretero 2012). All of these voices

are legitimate; they only derive from diverse world-views and different experiences of reality and political contexts.

However, the hegemonic spheres in these societies (Academy, Public Administration…) are the ones who study, manage and give name to heritage. This is called *Authorized Heritage Discourse* (AHD) (Smith 2006, Waterton and Smith 2009). The AHD has at length prevailed over other voices, arguing that their perspective is "the correct" because they know the "real past", they use rigorous methodologies, etc (Alonso 2011). It was a better version, or even the true discourse, because it has the benefit of being a scientific knowledge. From this perspective, society is reduced to play the role of a passive spectator and/or consumer who must be educated about how the past "really" was (or what the "culture" is).

Archaeology, as a scientific discipline, has supported the traditional paradigm (society as passive spectator), strengthening the public outreach of heritage and applying unidirectional models of knowledge transfer, which consolidates the divide between science and world, between research and management, between experts and public.

Moreover, this AHD is fully integrated into the capitalist system of production and circulation of commodities. In many cases, therefore, their goals legally recognized (the protection and promotion of cultural heritage), as the administration is the representative of the "popular will", should be submitted to hegemonic economic interests. This submission varies depending on the degree of commodification of heritage. In those areas with lower uptake of a heritage industry (Hewison 1987) usually prevail interests linked to the exploitation of land and real estate speculation, against heritage itself. Where the heritage industry is more consolidated, is the heritage itself that is reified and turned into a commodity ready to be consumed by tourists (Lowenthal 1998).

In this context, paradoxically, the AHD must still act as a mediator between the different proposals of social participation in the process of heritagization, and as warranty (the ultimate frontier) against the private interests that are also present in these processes (often as neoliberal practices). It must play the role of "the public" in the processes of heritagization. But this role is often questioned by those who defend the heritage *as a common*, because they identify "the public" with the institutional, expert and technocratic discourse which support domain practices.

Moreover, one must ask the human consequences of this process of change in the configuration of the discipline. Will be (a new model of) archaeology able to absorb all the labour and workers generated during the AHD hegemony and the submission to the "creative destruction on the land" (Harvey 2010)? In any case, beyond the pressing needs of the professional archaeologists who still survive the crisis, it is the obligation of scientific institutions to work in settings that prefigure alternative economic models and ways, and claim for another scientific policy.

Today the balance between experts and the public is changing. In every field of experience (from politics to science) and also in heritage, the public demands active participation. In close relation with the very process of building a Public Science (Funtowicz et al. 2000, Waterton and Smith 2009, Criado et al. 2010), this demand for a "public turn" in heritage management, something that is increasingly obvious in practices and in the literature, still needs to be examined in detail and theorized. This type of research is part of a critical turn in heritage studies and is part of the demand to build a public perspective at every level of experience, including those related to knowledge and research what are compromised with the creation and development of a new 'public science'. The heritage of the 21st century cannot be removed, in its widest sense, from the public dimension, in order to include every type of

community: subalterns, hybrids and mestizos, indigenous and vernacular (García Canclini 1995).

We need to shift towards a new paradigm, which this project defines as *Critical Heritage Studies*, which ranges from unveiling (in a critical sense) the social conditions for producing heritage, its discourses and its practices, to recognizing (in a positive, pragmatic sense) the intimate link between heritage and public, consisting of different types of publics, communities and actors. This project focuses on the notion that there can be no heritage without social links, considered as the close bonds between the value assigned to the heritage and the social context that assigns it.

Moreover, society is demanding today an active participation at every level of political, social and economic practices, including heritage. In the wake (or wave) of the financial crisis and neoliberal policies in recent times, new practices are emerging, as: crowdfunding, collaborative consumption, cooperatives, social currency, ethical finances, P2P loans or informal exchange networks, for instance. All of them, despite their intrinsic diversity, respond to the same profile: to make sustainable community projects that promote the value generated by and for the common, including the heritage material assets themselves, and using tools increasingly inclusive and democratic.

This social demand connects with some research areas which can be useful to our objectives. We are talking about Social Innovation, as a new kind of thinking in the ways of developing societies. Initial studies of the innovation process, carried out mostly in the decades of the '50 and '60 of the past century have followed a technological imperative focused on developing new products and processes as a result of investment in R & D. At the '80 other ways of different innovation emerged, the result of an interactive process of exchanging know-how, experience and work to solve problems. This model has been termed by Jensen et al (2007) as "Doing, Using and Interacting" (DUI-mode). Recently, however, the study of innovation has been associated with innovative activities promoted and motivated by organizations whose aims are to meet social needs through processes of mutual aid, community development, social care, etc. (Mulgan et al. 2007).

Some initiatives arise as an alternative to the hegemonic political and economic model, although but whose success seems difficult without a change in systemic model (see, for example, the European Strategy for Social Innovation: European Commission, 2013). In fact, despite these attempts of co-optation by the dominant model, the concept of "social innovation" seems to fit and correspond to certain sociological trend line, with new conditions for the development of culture. These new conditions are related with 1) the network as model of social organization that involves more participation and empowerment, and as a pattern of communication and behaviour (supported in the massive use of ICT); 2) the blurring of boundaries between production and consumption; 3) the increase of collaborative and cooperative production versus individual responsibility (as well as the open and shared knowledge) and 4) the increased interest in the care of the things and beings and 5) the growing role of more sustainable values as articulators of social life.

The socially innovative, open and inclusive, multi-vocal and communal (as the empowered Public) character of heritage (desirable and utopian but rooted on the tradition) is the starting point for new political and economic scenarios (of social change and sustainability), to which our research suggests.

Thinking in a new scenography

We know that all is changing in the old scenario of Cultural Heritage, and also that are emerging new actors demanding a main role in the function. Then we need a new scenography for the future. We need renew the concept of scientific and heritage practices, and the very understanding and valuing of heritagization processes:

1. Replacing an academic and linear concept of heritagization for another that would be open, participative and collaborative.
2. Deconstructing policies at international, national or local level that promote globalization in an uncritical way, and lead towards the adoption of a previously defined international agenda of interests.
3. Creating a new language for communication and inter-understanding (new concepts), an alternative language that would make it possible to consider new realities from a different perspective. We still lack a thesaurus of shared terms and concepts to talk about the new realities of heritage.
4. Introducing a new set of concepts in heritage management such as user community, STS specialist, scientific activism, heritage strong appropriation, heritage *prosumer*, and heritage as *commons* or heritage as a *cultural repository*.
5. Enabling the integration and participation of other values beyond the production of knowledge: emotions, attitudes, experiences, creativity...
6. Extending our practice involving other non-specific (or conventional) disciplines of heritage such as sociology, anthropology, economics, educational sciences, information and communication ...
7. Creating public spaces for dialogue between different types of knowledge and interests, for inclusion and interaction between researchers and managers, between the authorities and the public and between different communities, in order to satisfy different demands and to harmonize (or to solve) conflicting heritage perspectives.
8. Recognizing what or who the public is, and how it is identified and defined.
9. Thinking in the public not only as a user of heritage, but also as *producer* in their own lives: public becomes a heritage *prosumer.*
10. Applying methods to assess the social value of heritage, including basic foundations on techniques for ethnographic, anthropological, sociological, economic and market analyses.
11. Produce systems for detecting and analysing the social valuing of heritage, something which just a few years ago seemed to be a scientific nightmare that could only be addressed only from a reductionist scientific strategy, but which today is feasible thanks to advances in ICT and in reputation technologies applied to websites and social networks.
12. Creating a dialogue between multi-vocal actors, even multi-cultural when different societies are involved, increased migratory flows and increased globalization, multiplying the potential conflicts that affect heritage, and conditioning their attitude and reception towards heritage/s.
13. Promoting multi-agent heritage practices and collaborative actions between government organizations (OGs) and social agents.
14. Putting the public in the centre of the heritage processes, and at the same time, identifying how experts can react to the demands of the social actors regarding the role of heritage in their daily lives.
15. Creating open, participative and interdisciplinary archaeological practice. Heritage is the subject of the investigation and simultaneously the social context where the scientific practice is applied.

16. Facilitating the strong appropriation of heritage by the public, instead of the weak appropriation that has been promoted up until now, and then encouraging the active involvement of multivocal agents and social co-production in heritage.

17. Basing the heritage management projects in community-based situations on discovering the link between this heritage and "its" public, and on recognizing the link between the developer of the project with the community and public who interact with the heritage objects.

18. Linking heritage to social innovation processes, and thereby with (very) new cultural and heritage industries, by incorporating them into the new models of open innovation based on active public involvement.

19. Transforming the heritage experience and practices into "living labs", a recent development in Europe (2008) that is as successful and potentially close to heritage. Heritage as a living-lab is a crucial case that shows all of the possibilities for exchange between formal and informal knowledge, between experts and the general public.

20. Avoiding the temptation, when studying the public dimension, of *epistemic populism* (i.e.: "simply assuming that knowledge produced from the bottom up is automatically catalogued as subaltern epistemic knowledge " – Grosfoguel 2006, González-Ruibal 2012), recognizing at the same time that this is not self-generated but instead responds to power structures, wherever they are produced. A precise account of the public dimension in heritage could reveal the effect of these strategies.

This list is merely a collection of different topics but always related to a reflection on future scenarios of cultural heritage in all its conceptual breadth, its plurality, its conflicts and its potential to foster the emergence of new patterns of economic activity.

His mere reading will suggest many reflections and reviews, which will be useful for the research we have to develop in the context of NEARCH Project.

Guiding the discussion

The discussion deals with 3 central questions:

1. Is possible an economic use of Heritage, but being sustainable and alternative to the existing?
2. In what ways can and must Archaeology change to be adapted to the new models of activity that are emerging?
3. How can Archaeology contribute to this process of transformation of the hegemonic paradigm? How we can contribute to the present discussion on Economics Theory to overcome the neoclassical paradigm?

Those questions are complex; therefore, the research is presented as an essentially exploratory and thoughtful process, not only aimed at obtaining specific data.

We must get allies in other disciplines and fields: not only for learning from/by them, but also for contributing from Heritage and Archaeology into the main ongoing "intellectual war".

The future of Europe is also played on the grounds of Heritage and Archaeology. Not only because their central position to negotiate present engagement with materiality, past, memory and identity… but also because they create opportunities to bring into existence new values and practices, to materialize new forms of action to design post-crisis scenarios.

However, we cannot forget that these practices have little to do with hegemonic strategies. Therefore, "intellectual war" becomes political struggle.

References

Alonso, P. (2011). Por una arqueología menor: de la producción de discursos a la producción de subjetividad. *Revista Arkeogazte, 1*: 21-36.

Bendix, R. et al. (2012). *Heritage Regimes and the State*. Universitätsverlag Göttingen.

Barreiro, David 2012. Arqueología aplicada y patrimonio: Memoria y utopía. *Complutum* 23 (2): 29-46.

Criado-Boado, Felipe y David Barreiro (2013). El patrimonio era otra cosa. *Estudios Atacameños*, 45: 5-18.

Criado-Boado, Felipe, Alberto Corsín, Alexis de Greiff, et al. (2010): Definition of the Science and Society Field. CYTED, Programa Iberoamericano de Ciencia y Tecnología para el Desarrollo. http://hdl.handle.net/10261/20961

De Greiff, Alexis y Oscar Javier Maldonado (2011). "Apropiación fuerte" del conocimiento: una propuesta para construir políticas inclusivas de ciencia, tecnología e innovación en América Latina. En Antonio Arellano y Pablo Kreimer (dirs), *Estudio social de la ciencia y la tecnología desde América Latina*. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre editories, pp. 209-62.

European Comission. (2013). *Guide to Social Innovation*

http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/presenta/social_innovation/social_innovation_2013.pdf

Funtowicz, S., J. Ravetz, I. Shepherd and D. Wilkinson. (2000). 'Science and Governance in the European Union, *Science and Public Policy* 27: 327-336

García Canclini, N. (1995). *Hybrid cultures: strategies for entering and leaving modernity*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

González-Ruibal, Alfredo (2012). Hacia otra arqueología: diez propuestas. *Complutum*, 23(2), 103-116.

Grosfoguel, R. (2006). La descolonización de la economía política y los estudios postcoloniales: transmodernidad, pensamiento fronterizo y colonialidad global. *Tabula Rasa*, 4, 17-48.

Hafstein, V. T. (2005). *The making of intangible cultural heritage: Tradition and authenticity,community and humanity*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hall, S. (1999). "Whose heritage? Un-settling 'the heritage', re-imagining the post-nation." *Third Text*, 13(49), 3-13.

Harvey, D. (2010). *The Enigma of Capital: and the Crises of Capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, D. C. (2001). Heritage pasts and heritage presents: Temporality, meaning and the scope of heritage studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Volume 7, 4: 319-338.

Hewison, R. (1987). *The Heritage Industry: Britain in a climate of decline*. London: Methuen.

Jensen, M. B., Johnson, B., Lorenz, E. and Lundvall, B.A. Forms of knowledge and modes of innovation. (2007). *Research Policy*, 36: 680-693.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (1995). Theorizing Heritage. *Ethnomusicology* 39.3: 367-380.

Lowenthal, D. (1998). *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Meskell, L. (2012). *The nature of heritage: the new South Africa*, Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Mulgan, G.; Tucker, S.; Ali, R.; Sanders, B. (2007). Social Innovation What is, why it matters and how it can be accelerated. *Skoll Centre for Social Entrepreneurship. Working Paper*. Oxford Said Business School, 2007

Robertson, J.M. (ed) (2012). *Heritage From Below*. London: Ashgate

Sánchez-Carretero, Cristina (2013). Significance and Social Value of Cultural Heritage: Analyzing the Fractures of Heritage. In Rogerio-Candelera, Lazzari and Cano (eds.). *Science and Technology for the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*. London, Taylor & Francis, pp. 387-392.

Sánchez-Carretero, Cristina (2012). Hacia una antropología del conflicto aplicada al patrimonio". En Beatriz Santamarina (ed), *Geopolíticas patrimoniales: De culturas, naturalezas e inmaterialidades. Una mirada etnográfica*. Valencia: Editorial Germania, col. Antropo-lógicas, pp. 195-210.

Smith, L. (2006). *Uses of heritage.* London: Routledge.

Smith, L. T. (2008). *Decolonizing methodologies: research and indigenous peoples.* London: Zed Books.

Tunbridge, J.E. and G.J. Ashworth (1996): *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.

Uzzell, D. (2009). "Where is the discipline in heritage studies? ", in M. L. S. Sørensen and J. Carman, (eds.), *Heritage Studies: Methods and Approaches*. New York: Routledge, pp. 326-333.

Waterton, E. and Smith, L. (2009): There is No Such *Thing* as Heritage. En Waterton and Smith 2009: 10-27.

Waterton, E. and Smith, L. (Eds.) (2009). *Taking Archaeology out of Heritage*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.