

Patrimonial Citizenship, Manuel Lima Ferreira Filho

in *ANTROPOLÓGICAS*, ano 19, 26 (2), 134-155, 2015, (translated from the Portuguese original by Nuno Porto)

In this article, I develop the concept of ‘patrimonial citizenship’. Based on my trajectory as an anthropologist working in the field of cultural heritage, I articulate a conceptual repertoire accumulated over many academic research field experiences, and over the production of technical reports demanded by authorities managing patrimonial policies. I revisit James Holston’s notion of *insurgent citizenship* in a dialogue with anthropological approaches to cultural management. The notion of patrimonial citizenship is inspired by the concepts of *insurgency* and *agency*. In my analysis, the myth of the nation and its operability in affirming the hegemony of national culture, are thought through the lens of cultural patrimony. I associate this with the idea of social action, or praxis, in which the adhesion or the resistance to and the negation of totalizing patrimonial policies, frames the action of social and ethnic collectives modulated between the myth and the anti-myth of the nation.

From heritage to citizenship

I have been approaching cultural heritage from academic dimensions – through my lectures, students’ supervision, coordination of institutional research projects and in the constitution of the network of anthropologists of the Brazilian Association of Anthropology (ABA) – or by acting outside the academic world in forms that have materialized as technical consulting reports, heritage education workshops and formal applications to the register of Brazilian intangible patrimony.

From the standpoint of the anthropologist’s know-how, I have produced some reflections on the interaction and friction between the anthropological concept of culture and that of cultural heritage from the State’s perspective (Lima Filho 2009, 2012a, 2012b, 2013 and 2015).

Several years of professional activity in this field have encouraged me to seek a dialogue between the theoretical repertoire (concept) and the (technical) practice of anthropology. In countries such as Brazil and others in Latin America, as well as in Africa, the themes of race, ethnicity, gender, violence and subalternity, resonate a past of colonial conceptions and practices. And the anthropological practice does not shy away from confronting political issues directly related to human rights, social justice, and democracy. With patrimony issues this cannot be any different. Departing from this perspective, the concept that I have nominated patrimonial citizenship deserves now a narrative through writing, one of the core activities of the anthropologist’s work (Cardoso de Oliveira 2000).

While participating in a study group about the situation of Latinos in the United States, where concepts such as identity, multiculturalism and cultural citizenship were found useful, Renato Rosaldo (1997) considered that, on the one hand, the notion of citizenship is understood as a universal concept when all citizens of a particular nation-state are equal before the law. However, he argues, it is necessary to distinguish the formal level of a universal theory¹ from a substantive level of exclusionary practices directly related to race, gender, and class. He argues that the contemporary citizenship policy must necessarily take into account the role that social movements have had in exercising the claim for rights in view of new areas such as feminism, black and indigenous movements, ecology and vulnerable minorities such as children (Rosaldo 1997: 27). While Hall & Hell (1990 apud Rosaldo 1997) warn of an increasing quantitative view of cultural citizenship, for Rosaldo such expansion is marked by its qualitative character because the idea of citizenship is marked by the notion of culture: “we need to understand the way citizenship is informed by culture, the way that claims to citizenship are reinforced or subverted by cultural assumptions and practices” (Rosaldo 1997: 35).

Antonio Augusto Arantes (1996) adds another dimension that permeates the contemporary theme of citizenship: the right to information and the access to symbolic goods, substantiating the field of social communication, the market and the interpenetration of the public and private spheres. Arantes argues that “citizenship does not have an ‘essence’, but it is a movable and changeable political-cultural artefact” (Arantes 1996: 10).

It is worth recalling the considerations made by Marilena Chauí (2006) built on her experience in the São Paulo Department of Culture as the manager of the state’s policy related to the support of social memory and cultural heritage. Public power as a cultural subject and, therefore, a producer of culture, determined “for society the forms and cultural contents defined by the ruling groups, in order to reinforce their own ideology” (Chauí 2006: 47). Used by the cultural organs with the intention of operating and producing an official culture, exhibited nationally and internationally with authority and monumental marks of an authoritarian tradition.

¹ Most studies in the sociological perspective regarding the term citizenship refer to T. H. Marshall (1950) who referred in the publication of Hobhouse of 1916 when he associated rights and duties of the citizen of a certain State. Marshall related citizenship to the notion of social class and presented a description of the development of civil, political and social rights in Great Britain between the eighteenth and twentieth centuries as Morris (2010: 41) and Savarlien (1987: 177) clarify.

The hegemony of this tradition provoked in Marilena Chauí the question: “Would the politics of historical, cultural and environmental heritage be condemned to the meager and pompous form of Celebration of the winner’s story?” (Chauí 2006: 123). By looking at another conception of cultural policy, the historical, cultural and environmental patrimony has been assumed in the conduct of São Paulo’s public policies as a social and cultural practice of multiple and different social agents and the memory as a right of the citizen as an action of all social subjects and not as official production of history. The cultural management experience of Marilena Chauí listed the following propositions inherent to the practice of cultural citizenship as a process: the right to information, the right to cultural enjoyment, the right to cultural production and the right to participation (Chauí 2006: 96-101).

Roberto Da Matta (1997) takes citizenship as a central theme of his interpretations about Brazil presenting the categories of *variation* and *perversion* of citizenship that in the Brazilian case associate to practices of power, hierarchy and social relations. Therefore, the anthropologist distrusts a universal citizenship:

“Can we speak of a single conception of citizenship as a hegemonic form of political participation, or do we necessarily have to discuss the hypothesis of a society with multiple forms and sources of citizenship?” (Da Matta 1991: 85) and concludes: “[...] there is a form of universalist citizenship, built upon modern roles that are linked to the operation of a bureaucracy and a market, and other forms of membership to Brazilian society – other forms of citizenship typically relational emanating from the spaces of the house. In other words, there is a Brazilian *nation* that operates based on its citizens, and a Brazilian *society* that works on the basis of traditional mediations” (Da Matta 1991: 93 – author’s italics).

Moving forward on the topic of citizenship, I turn to James Holston’s ethnography in Brazil, including his historical perspective of the urban context of the city of São Paulo. For him, the Brazilian case combines the formal notion of citizenship based on the principles of the nation-state, with a more substantive character marked by the distribution of rights, meanings, institutions and practices for certain citizens, that is, for certain categories of citizens. In other words, there would be a social production of citizenship, thus establishing a paradox or even an aporia: citizenship for all is on the horizon, but citizenship of differentiated classes, women, the elderly, the pregnant amongst others. I highlight two central ideas of Holston’s study that seem to be useful in relationship with the theme of cultural heritage. For him the agency of the citizens investigated in Brazil is not only one of resistance, but also one that produces commitment,

persistence and inertia. Thus, citizens actively maintain a committed regimen of citizenship as much as they resist to it. The other concept is that of insurgency applied to citizenship. In his words “insurgency describes the process that is an acting counter, a counterpolitics, that destabilizes the present and renders it fragile, defamiliarizing the coherence with which it usually presents itself” (Holston 2009: 34) coining the term *insurgent citizenship*. Although James Holston thinks citizenship informed by the conjuncture of a comparative urban anthropology, I am interested here in the connotation of the term insurgency that combines engagement, but also inertia, and that somehow approximates to what Antonio Arantes has called a ‘cultural inflection’ and Renato Rosaldo as identified as the strengthening or subversion of citizenship by cultural practices and assertions. Marilena Chauí aligns citizenship as a process that connects information, enjoyment, production and participation of social actors and, on his turn, Roberto Da Matta uses the categories variation and perversion to identify a sub-citizenship in the Brazilian case.

Such positions are in some way complementary for different reasons: studies of districts of São Paulo; ethnographic mapping of Latinos in the United States; the organization of a book on citizenship edited by the Brazilian State Heritage Agency (IPHAN)²; the experience of cultural management as a state policy and, finally, the variations of the citizenship theme in Brazil in the relational perspective between the house and the street. One cannot think of the concept of citizenship and of its applications without taking into account the conception and the cultural and historical trajectories of the social and ethnic groups that experience them and their respective agencies. In a particular way, I identify myself with the definition formulated by Emirbayer & Mische (1998) that conceptualize agency³:

² IPHAN is the acronym for the Brazilian heritage department, the Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional (TN).

³ The concepts of action and agency are correlated and a tradition in the social sciences. The debate has explored the relationship between structure and agent, in other words the tension between society and individual with theories that emphasize the social order, structure, or dynamics of agents. Thus, the reflections of symbolic interactionism, pragmatism, phenomenology and the notion of networks contribute to this debate. Emirbayer & Mische associate the ‘interactional’, ‘projective’ and ‘practical-evaluative’ (Stones 2010: 13-17) elements to the agency phenomenon and give conceptual impetus to the term. In anthropology the writings of Marilyn Strathern have had great impact, because different from the previous theories that associate structure and subject, Strathern perpetuated by her studies in Melanesia calls attention to the native theories of the agency in which the relational principle of the subject is operated by a decoder Native (Strathern 2006). Particularly I think that the notions of Strathern's agency, of Emirbayer & Mische, including also that of Giddens can be modulated to the types of case analyzed.

“[...] as a temporally embedded process of social engagement, informed by the past (in its ‘iterational’ or usual aspect) but also oriented toward the future (as a ‘projective’ capacity to imagine alternative possibilities) and toward the present (as a ‘practical-evaluative’ capacity to contextualize past habits and future projects within the contingencies of the moment)” (Emirbyer & Mische 1998: 962).

In view of this, I bring these considerations both of anthropological and of management nature to the fields of reception by social collectives in relation to patrimonial policies of the State internationally idealized through UNESCO, mainly in line with the policy of registration⁴ and of record of intangible or immaterial patrimony⁵. In this sense, insurgency, inertia, engagement or cultural modulation set the confrontational tone voiced by specific groups towards Nation-state policies, particularly in Latin America where all countries were signatories to the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.

Framed in this manner, I consider as *patrimonial citizenship* the highly plastic operational capacity for social action that social and ethnic groups have, in their collective or individualized dimensions to build strategies to interact with patrimonial policies (adhere or resist) both at the international, national or local level, in order to mark a constitutive identity field, by the alignment of equals or by the radicality of difference. Such cognitive ability and agency explores categories minted in the epistemic construction of anthropology, such as culture, nature, territory, tradition, kinship, identity, in interaction with the patrimonial categories like registration and inventory and, finally, framed by native categories such as ourselves and not ourselves, objects, myths, rites, human and nonhuman, relatives, consanguine and affine relatives, chiefs, shamans, artists, the body, painting, the young and the old, those who know how to do, and many other categories indexed by specific linguistic and cultural systems. That is, heritage is inserted in the myth of the nation and through it one can aspire to cultural citizenship by means of intercultural modulations. However, patrimony may equally reside outside the myth (the non-patrimony) and

⁴ The institution of the legal regiment of registration, with reference to the notion of exceptionality, in Brazil was given by Decree no. 25, of November 30, 1937. The decree establishes that cultural goods must be inscribed in four Books of Record: Book of the Archeological, Ethnographic and Landscape Record; Book of the Historical Record; Book of Record of Fine Arts and Book of Record of Applied Arts

⁵ Decree No. 3,551 of August 4, 2000 established the registration of intangible cultural assets as a component of the Brazilian cultural heritage, with reference to the notion of relevance. The decree establishes that intangible assets must be entered in the following books: Book of Knowledge, Book of Record of Celebrations, Book of Registration of Forms of Expression and Book of Registration of places, The same decree created the national patrimony program immaterial.

may not legitimize the discourse on national culture replicated by national hegemony that has marked some productions of Brazilian anthropology about national culture as Mônica Pechincha has noted (2006: 35). What would the place of the subaltern in the representation of the Brazilian patrimony, one that does not fit the exceptionality or relevance / representativeness of patrimony be? The reverse of patrimony takes place in patrimonial citizenship, bolstering forms of insurgent citizenship. This possibility has been neglected by other authors when they write about patrimony. And yet, the analysis of patrimony distanced from the myth of the nation is only possible if we consider notions of conflict and insurgency as integral to the concept of citizenship. In this way, patrimonial action draws a measuring scale between the nation's myth and the resistance to / denial of it, assumed by social actors who politically situate themselves on the margins, in the cleavages, that is, it works toward an idea of the anti-myth⁶ of the nation.

The operational elasticity that I impute to patrimonial citizenship allows individuals and collectives to enter a field marked by asymmetric production of state power, instructed by a colonialist historical practice and by the maintenance of a liberal economic model, which is nourished by the maintenance of hierarchies fantasized by an uncritical multiculturalism drafted in the conceptual framework of cultural industries, already denounced by the Frankfurt School notably by Adorno (2002). The notion of registration (*tombamento*) and recording is embedded in this bias, legally indexed by the Brazilian State under notions of exceptionality and relevance that I have already considered conceptual and pragmatic reducers:

“I perceive a conceptual trap from which the creators of law could not escape. In its first article, second paragraph, the legal text says: ‘The entry in one of the books of record will always have as a reference the historical continuity of the good and its national ‘relevance’ to the memory, identity and formation of Brazilian society’. [...] Now, it is noticed that the word ‘relevance’ is for the Law of Immaterial [Patrimony] as the word ‘exceptional’ stands for the Law of Registration [Decreto de Tombamento]. Both are selective, excluding”. (Lima Filho 2009: 622).

In this power game, either under the purpose to restrict the reach of the net of patrimonial policies, either as a resource finalized by the human condition of survival in social contexts of countries such as Brazil where the basic conditions of life are lacking, such as health, safety,

⁶ The notion of anti-myth was developed by Roberto Da Matta (1970) when he analyzed two myths: the conquest of fire and the civilized origin of the Timbiras. But I refer here to the interpretation of anti-myth associated with ideology, which in the words of Julio Cesar Melatti: “a myth of a more dynamic character, which makes possible the creation of new categories and the passage to a more complex order, that of political ideology” (Melatti 2016).

housing and education, social actors assume themselves as participants in the game of political action (Bourdieu 1997) and remind us of Weber's instrumental rational action, or subvert order within politics itself and make culture a resource of cultural economy, convenience (Yúdice 2006) or a weapon:

“[...] ‘natives’ from the four corners of the planet have appropriated the category [culture], in the name of the value of their own ‘culture’, to defend their specific ways of being in relation to human and institutional alterities with different weights and measures. There is often an unexpected agency, the formation of networks and spaces of sharing with horizons that broaden or close [...] the metaphor of ‘culture as a weapon’, the capacity for ‘objectification’ of the recognition of culture, something that occurs when someone from the outside is willing to represent what communities live and experience. More than this, we have a continuity in reverse of this process, as when the ‘objectified’ subject appropriates the representation and presuppositions of the observer [...]” (Mafra 2011: 607).

The complexity of this intercultural weaving on a case-by-case basis does not fall within the trap of a totalizing patrimonial policy, registration or recording. Here, a more horizontal conception of patrimony is conceived, which is not equivalent, although it may happen, to the collections, and therefore patrimony is not necessarily a category of universal recurrence as Pomian (1987) has thought and by which Gonçalves was seduced (2006: 26 and 2007: 45). Patrimony is a Western category and what non-Westerners do with it is a modulation of the encounter of history with culture. That is why heritage policies anchored in representativeness, exceptionality, or relevance as UNESCO wants and as adopted by Brazilian policies, are imploded in an already classic inspiration of Marshal Sahlins (1977 and 2003) by the cultural thinking of otherness: glued or radically distant from us, but permanently boiling in a plethora of cultural re-appropriations, marking the construction of social subjects by means of a mythical / historical, intercultural narrative identity.

Thus, on the one hand we have the Weberian cartography of the economic sphere, alerting to a totalizing Western dimension of heritage with semantic / ideological use of a category of diversity imbued with colonialism and with what José Jorge de Carvalho has called a ‘aesthetic impunity’:

“While a choreographer from the Rio-São Paulo axis can ‘anthropophagically’ appropriate a particular performative knowledge of a creole drum from Maranhão, for example, no creole-drummer cannot exercise this same cultural cannibalism over an ‘erudite’ dance group performing at the Municipal Theater of Rio de Janeiro. [...] The anthropophagic motto works, in practice, as a kind of secret code of *aesthetic impunity*

(my emphasis) and the maintenance of the privileges of the Brazilian ruling class. In this anthropophagy (obviously, a one-way anthropophagy), two interconnected classes celebrate, through national symbols themselves, their privileges vis-a-vis the artists of indigenous and Afro-Brazilian communities: the class that has always felt impunity to accomplish the always celebrated modernist cultural synthesis (based in cultural loans that, over time, become robbery) and the class (which is its historical continuation) that now proposes and executes the inventories of Brazilian intangible cultural patrimony [...]” (Carvalho 2004: 07).

But I also think that the Other, the target of anthropophagy of its cultural referents, is not passive, and if positioned only at an extreme pole of passivity, runs the risk of being essentialized. If for Monica Pechincha (2006: 62) Roberto Da Matta, in his interpretation regarding citizenship in Brazil, creates room for representation but not for the voice of the Other, I note, however, that in the patrimonial processes of registration of cultural referents, social groups have assumed a *topos* in the relational conjuncture with the policies of the State.

Hence the notion of insurgency attached to citizenship could help to think of the game of heritage or the ‘weapon of culture’ in intercultural praxis. Therefore, we have the configuration of an intercultural operability driven by a native habitus, an alterity more or less close to us, mixed or distant, but in factual interaction. In this way, heritage is useful both when Portuguese language, non-indigenous school, and political office are useful or not to indigenous peoples in the intercultural power play. The Karajá doll⁷ can and should go to the Museum and its patrimonialization may increase the empowerment of women and domestic arrangements in an ethnic group strongly marked by the gender dimension. The Aruanã masks, however, must be burned, claiming therefore, that they are not a native collection, it is manufacturing to ritual usage circumscribed by the principle of culture. If they are in museums, the masks of Aruanã are examples of colonialist, unethical, violent practice, whatever level of interaction may have occurred among the Karajá, travelers, ethnologists, and *bushmen*⁸. Patrimony is good to play if

⁷ The Karajá dolls were registered as Brazilian immaterial patrimony on January 25, 2012 in the Book of Knowledge (Knowledge and Practices Associated with the Modes of Making Karajá Dolls) and in the Book of Celebrations (Ritxoko: Artistic and Cosmological Expressions of Karajá People) (Silva 2015).

⁸ I cite the examples of how the masks of Aruanã were negotiated between the Karajá and the ethnologist Ehrenreich (1888) in the constitution of collections: “It was thanks to the help of the boss Pedro Manco that I was able to bring some interesting masks. Without his intercession, the superstitious distrust of the members of the tribe could hardly have been overcome, for a series of travelers, especially Spinola himself, had taken the imprudence of desecrating these sacred objects”. And “nevertheless, they did not allow us to carry just like that the masks found in the forest, because they thought there were women in the vicinity. To transport the masks to our camp, our comrades had to wear them specially for this purpose” (Ehrenreich 1948: 72-77).

the players are willing to do so⁹. Otherwise, patrimony will be refracted by social groups. This capacity of refraction or of choice of how far should the patrimonial game proceed is more a characteristic of the malleability of the notion of patrimonial citizenship. That is, the refraction / option breaks with the passivity of inertia.

It is in the exploration of these cleavages and of social and ethnic fractures that the operability of patrimonial citizenship moves in order to extract from the patrimony a sap of performance and identity game in the sense of “[...] activating local knowledges, discontinuous, disqualified, non legitimized, against the unitary theoretical instance that would purport to purify them, to hierarchize them, and order them in the name of a true knowledge, in the name of a science held by some” (Foucault 1979: 171). To be aware of the baktinian location of speech or non-speech, in Spivak’s terms (2012) of the knowledge of the subaltern: the indigenous, the bushman, the peasant, the maroon, the riverine, the ‘slummed’¹⁰ and the multiple ways of being present in a world crisscrossed by cultural polyphony and by a permanent power production game.

With this in mind, I will now examine some processes for registering cultural heritage outside and within the official policies of the Brazilian immaterial heritage registry in order to make visible the connotation of what I have called modulation and its connections to the concept of patrimonial citizenship.

⁹ I draw your attention so as not to be deluded by a romanticized vision of the patrimonial game. For this, the critical considerations that Coombe & Baide (2015) make about the limits and uses of cultural heritage in regards to the complex network of neoliberal actions that move behind categories such as community protection, human rights and indigenous knowledge, and while still employing professionals to implement practices of self-interest in 'heritage' areas: “Heritage is obviously being taken up as a political resource in new and surprising ways. As international heritage bodies are called upon to involve and engage local communities in the project of protecting heritage and safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, their work is increasingly imbricated in encounters with corporate, indigenous, and transnational actors who have incorporated heritage norms into their own agendas. If such intersections pose limits to the emancipatory expectations we should have for heritage governance in some instances, they also suggest that heritage governance on resource frontiers is a site of intensified struggles whose outcomes are unpredictable. Industry actors are using international heritage vocabularies in new exercises of corporate social responsibility that might be considered novel forms of public-private policy in which industrial and community agents voluntarily take up and reframe global legal principles of sustainability, community, and heritage for their own ends. [...] Mining companies have attempted to usurp or co-opt global norms that position heritage as a development resource by funding tenure-track faculty positions, endowing research chairs, and offering their own staff as experts to serve in global heritage institutions” (Coombe & Baird 2015:349).

¹⁰ “favelado” in the original, meaning someone who lives in a slum. The term is usually used with a pejorative intention. (TN)

Modulations in heritage practices

Patrimonial citizenship is directly related to the sociological notion of Weberian social action (Weber 1979) whose rational and irrational dimensions (in the field of subjectivity) present themselves as a methodological strategy in order to understand / interpret the movement of social and ethnic collectives undergoing contact with the patrimonial policies. Likewise, the notion of agency broadens / complements the effectiveness of the Weberian strategy as it includes the complexity of the contemporary world ruled by information flows and high permeability of social subjects and multiple identity affiliations (gender, religious affiliation, class, and ethnicity), which are in permanent contact with the fruition of increasingly available information, and provide the same social subjects with the breakdown of cultural / political / citizen inertia. The notion of agency proposed by Anthony Giddens (2009), which puts side by side the ability of people (agents) to do something (action) with the notion of power exercised in some way by social subjects even in case of subordination (Long & Ploeg 2011) thus supports the operability of patrimonial citizenship as well as Emirbyer & Mische's (1998) proposal that relates engagement with temporal forms does, when it articulates the present (capacity for evaluation), the past (memory) and the future (projects).

The notion of modulation that embraces the concept of patrimonial citizenship allows the response of this inertial rupture according to the personal / collective biography of the actor (s) that are a target to patrimonial policies. Biography crossed by historical, economic, political, gender, race, class and social identity dimensions. Hence the modulation.

I can begin with two distinct examples of modulation inherent to patrimony citizenship. When I took the proposal to the Karajá from the village of Santa Isabel do Morro, in the House of Men, about registering the Karajá (ritxòò) dolls as Brazilian cultural heritage, a man at that meeting defended the idea, claiming that if it was to be classified as Brazilian then everything was fine. Now, the history of the Karajá from this particular village is directly related to the governmental plan of the March to the West¹¹, receiving the visits of President Getúlio Vargas in 1940 and Juscelino Kubstichek in 1960 (Lima Filho 2001). Modulation, in the case of ceramic

¹¹ The so-called 'March to the West' was a project led by the Getúlio Vargas (1882-1954) government in the *Estado Novo* period (1937-1946) to occupy and develop the interior of Brazil, in which indigenous groups were seen as nonexistent. This project was launched on the eve of 1938. (TN)

dolls, was the prestige of the nation, the past gave meaning to the present (Lima Filho 2015). But differently, when some time later a young leader from the same village saw on the website of the National Museum a photograph of a mask of Aruanã warned me, annoyed, that he would prosecute the National Museum, as those masks – under the strict cultural principles of the Karajá – cannot be exhibited to women. Here, the same group used the artifice of the nation (the court case) against the nation itself, a federal institution of research and postgraduate education. Differential modulations with patrimonial policies, via patrimonial citizenship. In this same reasoning¹², I found the interesting information of a statement made by a young Tapirapé student from a Tupi village of Mato Grosso, enrolled in the intercultural graduation at the Federal University of Goiás: that he was at the University to learn only what he was interested in applying in his community, the rest was not relevant. An intriguing case of intercultural modulation. This modulation can still be exemplified by the control that the saint mother Mãe Meninazinha d'Oxum at São João de Meriti in the Baixada Fluminense, Rio de Janeiro, during the recording process of the Candomblé music, in determining to the anthropologist Edmundo Pereira (2016) what could or not be recorded, where to record and which photos would make it to the CD project, that is what was restricted to the sacred and its members and what could be publicized:

“The first decision was that the recordings would be made at Ilê itself, where a small mobile studio was mounted. [...] It was up to Mãe Meninazinha d'Oxum, with suggestions from other members of the house, to choose the repertoire to be recorded. The cover was chosen so as to represent, via the objects, the two orishas patrons of the house: the necklace of beads of Oxum and popcorn that serves as food to Omolu” (Pereira & Pacheco 2004: 01).

I now turn to the first steps of the Brazilian State in the installation of the Brazilian immaterial patrimony registry policy. The first movement was toward the Kuarup registry, a mythological / ritual complex of the indigenous peoples of the Upper Xingu River (Agostinho 1974) who rejected the proposal. The target was then directed to the Wajãpi of Amapá who had their *Kusiwa Art - Body Painting and Graphic Art* registered in the Registry Book of Expressive

¹² I had access to this information in a lecture by the anthropologist Mônica Pechincha about her experience with the indigenous intercultural graduation of the Federal University of Goiás in 2015.

Forms in 2002 and, in the following year, received from UNESCO the title of *Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity* at the initiative of the Council of Wajãpi / Apina Villages.

“In November 2003, UNESCO selected ‘Graphic Expressions and Orality among the Wajãpi of Amapá’ as a Masterpiece of Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity. This record represented another step in Wajãpi’s long process of thinking about their ‘culture’. It was, and continues to be, a stimulus to retake the discussion, in the villages, of a whole set of problems related to the disinterest of the young generations and of many adults in the traditional knowledge and practices, devalued or even put under suspicion by virtue of the coexistence with the bitter prejudices of most of the representatives of the surrounding society who relate to the Wajãpi. Their expectation is not to ‘eternalize’ their culture but to consolidate their capacity to appropriate new objects, techniques and knowledge in a way that does not, as has hitherto, hinder their own cultural practices. The ‘Integrated plan for valuing traditional knowledge for the sustainable socio-environmental development of the Wajãpi do Amapá community’ presented to UNESCO aims to mobilize the community around actions that value, in the villages, both oral transmission forms and knowledge related to resource management, health, village history, cosmology, rituals ...” (Gallois 2006: 69-70).

It is noted that the first movements of the patrimonial actions draw a trajectory that moves from the pole of the rejection (Xingu people) to the pole in favor, carried out by the Council of the Wajãpi / Apina Villages. However, even with the adherence of the Wajãpi to the purpose of the policies of the Brazilian heritage and after UNESCO, attention should be paid to the reflection of the anthropologist Dominique Gallois on the experience of registration with indigenous peoples:

“The safeguarding of indigenous oral traditions, as well as the practices associated with them, is a new field for public policies, especially in Brazil. In some indigenous communities, strategies are being tested that supranational programs and national agencies seek to improve with the collaboration of universities and nongovernmental organizations, forming a still fragile panel of very diverse and sometimes contradictory experiments. The difficulties refer, above all, to the conditions made available for the protection of indigenous immaterial patrimony, which fluctuate in accordance with the political and economic contexts. Thus, the adequacy of protection measures always involves complex negotiations. Who are the agents responsible for the inventory of these cultural traditions? Who has the power to choose between one or another tradition, between one or another community? What is meant to preserve in a tradition: the productions, the recording of these productions or their means of expression? How to effectively engage a community in preservation policy? [...] the ‘conservation’ procedures commonly used for the protection of material assets are not adequate for the preservation of intangible heritage, which requires a much more complex set of procedures” (Gallois 2006: 72).

The exercise of patrimonial citizenship in the first cases of immaterial patrimony registration in Brazil already presents the characteristic of modulation. Modulation that can be appropriately observed as we get closer observations of the cleavages of the groups and their peculiarities towards public policies of patrimony. I will now turn to the first two cases of registration of Brazilian immaterial patrimony that had in common issues of conflict, having as context the application of patrimonial policies.

The first record was the craft of pan making in Goiabeiras (ES) in the year 2002. The Association of Pan Makers, who was already experiencing a process of particular organization characterized by family arrangements, and were facing threats of land loss of the plots where they explored the clay, having even ceded a part of it for the construction of a state water treatment plant, lived internal tensions in their political organization (Dias 2006) when they became interlocutors with state agents within the ritual performance to obtain the registration of their craft as Brazilian immaterial patrimony:

“During the period in which Berenícia was president of the APG [Associação of Paneleiras de Goiabeiras – Goiaberas’ Pan Makers Association], the group consolidated in the regional political context. It was Berenícia, as a representative of the Association, who gave the suggestion [of the local IPHAN] to the Minister of Culture, Francisco Welfort, when he was in Goiabeiras, in a letter / document requesting its inscription with the cultural patrimony by the National Institute of Historical and Artistic Patrimony. In 2002, clay pottery, made by women from Goiabeiras, was the first record inscribed in the Book of Knowledge” (Dias 2006: 132).

Like the pan makers from Vitoria (ES) the *baianas* of Salvador¹³ had the craft of *acarajé*¹⁴ of Salvador (BA) inscribed in the Book of Knowledge of IPHAN in 2005. The conflict was not internal to a specific association as observed with the pan makers, but a tension lived with another group of *baianas* that represented a dimension of the sacred (Protestantism) different and opposed to the Afro-Brazilian tradition:

¹³ *Baiana*, (fem. adj.) means a woman from the State of Bahia. It refers, in this context, to black women who sell street food, namely *acarajé*, thus relating to specific forms of popular culture. (TN)

¹⁴ *Acarajé* is a popular fried cake made of a paste of beans, fried in palm oil and filled with *Vatapá*, a paste of bread, shrimp, peanut and palm oil. Might include pepper, coriander and cummins and it is thought to be of Yoruba origin. It is also ‘saint food’ that is, an edible item in Afro Brazilian religious practices. (TN)

“When, in 2000, the registration of immaterial patrimony was instituted, the activity of the tray¹⁵ was in the midst of the controversy of evangelical vendors [...]. In 2001, a picturesque episode, but very striking – since a great diversity of *baianas* of the *acarajé* mentioned it in our conversations – seems to have precipitated the traditional *baianas* and those who supported them for a more energetic performance. The promoter Lícia Fábio [...] established the *Golden Acarajé* award for the best seller in Salvador, with voting through the internet. Surprisingly, the winner was the so-called *Blond of the Acarajé* [...], a street vendor with dyed hair, according to some saleswomen, with a little tray consecrated in a remote and unpopular neighborhood, which was also evangelical. It was the height of the visibility of the controversy with the evangelicals. The one who could least represent *acarajé*, because she wanted to look blond and modern and because she had a belief contrary to the roots of the delicacy, had been rewarded precisely because of the delicacy, of which she survived but that at the same time she disdained, in the opinion of the other *baianas* of the *acarajé*. Most of the *baianas* and others [...] remembered the indignation generated by the fact that the blonde had snatched the prize. After this episode, Abam, which has been in business since 1992, initially with objectives related to the benefits of social security for the vendors, reacted institutionally to controversy. He joined one of the Candomblé houses[...] listed by IPHAN, *Opô Afonjá*, and the CEEA (Center for Afro-Asian Studies) to apply for the registration of *acarajé*, a product representative of the Bahian crafts in the Book of Knowledge Registry. The request was made almost immediately after the registration was instituted in the year 2002, and there seemed to be a certain urgency, not only for the punctual indignation with the blessed evangelical prize, but much more probably because of the constant daily controversy with evangelicals giving precedence to another type of commercialization of *acarajé*, unrelated to the tradition of women” (Martini 2007: 238-239).

The record of the *Samba de Roda* in the Recôncavo Baiano in 2004 also presents ethnographic aspects of relations between the groups that are in the Association of Sambadores and Sambadeiras of the State of Bahia (ASSEBA) and the groups that are outside, that are those of the Bahian hinterland, as Silveira (2015) explained¹⁶. Patrimonial citizenship, in this case, only became effective when the group became part of the association and of its institutional and political dimension. However, in the hinterland, the groups continue to promote their festivals like that of Reis, establishing strong relations between spaces and people, outside patrimonial politics:

“The criticism constructed then is in relation to the type of patrimonialization that presents a harmonic ideological justification and in practice excludes groups in this process. However, for the groups of the *recôncavo* this process has benefited many

¹⁵ *Acarajé* is sold on trays. Each vendor has her own tray consecrated to a specific entity in a particular Candomblé House, with whom she shares her successes. (TN)

¹⁶ *Samba de Roda* is a specific form of Samba from the region called Reconcavo Baiano in the state of Bahia. Sambador (masc. adj.) Sambadora (fem.adj.) man and woman who do samba. (TN)

people, from the visibility of the samba to the care with the health issues of the masters. However, it is not a process free from contradictions and exclusions. Some groups from the Bahian hinterland end up being the margin of this whole process” (Silveira 2015: 07).

Finally, I would like to mention one last example of a registry that concerns the office of *capoeira* masters both in Brazil and in UNESCO. The particularity of this case is that a master of *capoeira* claimed that this cultural reference was equally African thus amplifying the notion of the myth of nationality:

“[...] during the registration process a renowned Bahian master disagreed with the recognition as cultural patrimony of Brazil, in that he wished that *capoeira* be registered as ‘Afro-Brazilian cultural heritage’, even though there was no legal instrument which would allow such prerogative. The master organized an event to discuss the matter, convening IPHAN representatives that were coordinating the registration process, *capoeiristas*, intellectuals and black leaders of Bahia. This fact reveals the complexity of patrimonialization processes and the variety of possible identifications and perceptions that *capoeira* can have. It also draws attention to a possible need to create instruments that are beyond the borders of national identities. *Capoeira* here, at the same time, marks and is marked by a discussion that goes beyond its practice. [...] How is it possible to maintain the discourse of diversity under homogenizing labels such as those of national patrimony and humanity? [...] complexity shows itself when we perceive that the formation of national identity can no longer be seen as singular and watertight, so that it has been perceived as multiple and taken up by new actors of varied forms, who have appropriated the culture, legitimizing it in search of policies of reparation and recognition” (Castro & Cid 2016: 185-197).

I think these examples are enough to demonstrate the elasticity of the actions of social and ethnic groups when interacting with patrimonial policies, whether negating them – as it happened with the Peoples of the Xingu and Gypsies of Trindade (Goiania state). The action in internal disputes or with the representatives of the nation-state exemplified by the Pan Makers and the *Baianas*, the claim of inclusion of *sambadeiro* groups of the hinterland of the Recôncavo Baiano, is a move to extend the patrimonial citizenship beyond the borders of the nation as it is the case with *Capoeira* and the Wajãpi. Patrimonial experiences already processed and those still in process invite us to observe caution both of epistemic and of practical nature so that we can listen to the voices of alterity that impute several senses to the complex game of cultural patrimony. Like the notion of culture, the notion of patrimony in the anthropological perspective is always slipping between our hands. Dealing with this is the permanent challenge of the anthropologist’s work.

References

- AGOSTINHO, Pedro. 1974. *Kuwarip: mito e ritual no alto Xingu*. São Paulo: EDUSP/EPU.
- ADORNO, Theodor W. 2002. *Indústria Cultural e Sociedade*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.
- ARANTES, Antônio A. 1996. “Introdução – Cultura e Cidadania”. In *Revista do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional*. Volume 24, Cidadania. Brasília: IPHAN.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. 1997. *Razões Práticas – sobre a teoria da ação*. Campinas: Papirus.
- CARDOSO DE OLIVEIRA, R. 2000. *O Trabalho do Antropólogo*. São Paulo: UNESP.
- CARVALHO, J. J. 2004. “Metamorfoses das tradições performáticas afro-brasileiras: de patrimônio cultura a indústria de entretenimento”. *Série Antropológica*. Brasília: UnB.
- CASTRO, M. B. & VIDAL, C. G.. 2016. “Processos de patrimonialização e internacionalização: algumas reflexões iniciais sobre o caso da capoeira entre o nacional e o global”. In CASTRO, M. B. & SANTOS, M. S. (eds.): *Relações raciais e políticas de patrimônio*, pp.183-199. Rio de Janeiro: Azougue Editorial.
- CHAUÍ, Marilena. 2006. *Cidade Cultural – o direito à cultura*. São Paulo: Fundação Perseu Abramo.
- COOMBE, R. J. & BAIRD, M. F. 2015. “The Limits of Heritage: Corporate Interests and Cultural Rights on Resource Frontiers”. In LOGAN, W., CRAITH, M. N. & KOCKEL, U. (eds.): *A Companion to Heritage Studies*, pp.337-355. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- DaMATTA, R. 1970. “Mito e antimito entre os Timbira”. In DaMATTA, R. (ed.): *Mito e Linguagem Social*. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro.
- _____. 1991. “Cidadania, a questão da cidadania num universo relacional”. In DaMATTA, R. (ed.): *A casa e a Rua*, pp.71-102. Rio de Janeiro: Guanabara Koogan S.A.
- DIAS, Carla. 2006. *Panela de Barro Preto: a tradição das panelas de Goiabeiras – Vitória-ES*. Rio de Janeiro: Mauad X/Facitec.
- EHRENREICH, Paul. 1948. “As tribos Karajá do Araguaia (Goiás)”. *Revista do Museu Paulista*, 2:72-77.
- EMIRBAYER, M. & MISCHÉ, A. 1998. “What Is Agency?”. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(4):962–1023
- FOUCAULT, Michel. 1979. *Microfísica do Poder*. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Graal.
- GALLOIS, Dominique T. 2006. *Patrimônio Cultural Imaterial e Povos Indígenas*. São Paulo: Iepé.
- GIDDENS, Anthony. 2009. *A Constituição da Sociedade*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- GONÇALVES, José R. S. 2007. *Antropologia dos objetos: coleções, museus e patrimônios*. Rio de Janeiro: Garamont.
- _____. 2009. “O patrimônio como categoria de pensamento”. In ABREU, R. & CHAGAS, M. (eds.): *Memória e Patrimônio: ensaios contemporâneos*, pp.25-33. Rio de Janeiro: Lamparina.
- HOLSTON, James. 2009. *Insurgent Citizenship - disjunctions of Democracy and Modernity in Brazil*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- LIMA FILHO, Manuel F. 2001. *O Desencanto do Oeste*. Goiânia: Editora da UCG.
- _____. 2009. “Da matéria ao sujeito: inquietação patrimonial brasileira”. *Revista de Antropologia*, 52(2):605-632.
- _____. 2010. “Espelhos patrimoniais em Ouro Preto: museus e passado afro-brasileiro”. *Tomo*, 1: 197-220.

- _____. 2012. “Entre campos: cultura material, relações sociais e patrimônio cultural”. In LIMA FILHO, M. & TAMASO, I. M. (eds.): *Antropologia e Patrimônio Cultural: trajetórias, conceitos e desafios*, pp.528-545. Goiânia: Cãnone Editorial.
- _____. 2013. “A casa, a santa e o rei: memórias afro-ouro-pretanas”. In AGOSTINI, C. (ed.): *Cultura Material e Arqueologia*, pp.12-34. Rio de Janeiro: Editora 7Letras.
- _____. 2015. “Nas trilhas das Rotxoo Karajá”. In SILVA, T. C. (ed.): *Ritxoko*, pp.49- 71. Goiânia: Cãnone Editorial.
- LIMA FILHO, M. & SILVA, T. C. 2012. “A Arte de saber fazer grafismos nas bonecas karajá”. *Horizontes Antropológicos*, 18(38):45-74.
- LONG, N. & PLOEG, J. V. 2011. “Heterogeneidade, ator e estrutura: para a reconstituição do conceito de estrutura”. In SCHNEIDER, S. & GAZOLLA, M.(eds.): *Os Atores do Desenvolvimento Rural: perspectivas teóricas e práticas sociais*, pp.21-48. Porto Alegre: UFRGS Editora.
- MAFRA, Clara. 2011. “A ‘arma da cultura’ e os ‘universalismos parciais’”. *Mana*, 17(3):607-624.
- MARTINI, G. T. 2007. *Baianas do Acarajé: A uniformização do típico em uma tradição culinária afro-brasileira*. Tese de Doutorado. Brasília: UNB.
- MELATTI, Julio C. 2016. Mito e história. (<http://www.juliomelatti.pro.br/mitos/m16historia.pdf>; acesso em 30/01/2016).
- MORRIS, Lydia. 2010. “Cidadania”. In SCOTT, J. (ed.): *Sociologia: conceitos-chave*, pp.41-43. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar editores.
- PECHINCHA, Mônica. 2006. *O Brasil no Discurso da Antropologia Nacional*. Goiânia: Cãnone Editorial.
- PEREIRA, E. & PACHECO, G. 2004. *Ile Omolu Oxum - cantigas e toques para os Orixás. (CD de cantigas sagradas afro-brasileiras)*. Rio de Janeiro: Museu Nacional, LACED.
- PEREIRA, Edmundo. *No prelo*. “Notas sobre representação fonográfica, ritual de gravação e tradição musical”. In LIMA FILHO, M., ABREU, R. & ATHIAS, R. (eds.): *Museus, Etnografias e Atores Sociais*.
- POMIAN, Krzysztof. 1997. “Coleção”. In *Enciclopédia Einaudi – Memória-História*, vol. 1, pp.51-86. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional.
- ROSALDO, Renato. 1997. “Cultural citizenship, Inequality, and Multiculturalism”. In FLORES, W. & BENMAYOR, R. (eds.): *Latino Cultural Citizenship: claiming identity, space, and right*, pp.27-38. Boston: Beacon Press.
- SAHLINS, Marshall. 1990. *Ilhas de História*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editores.
- _____. 2003. *Cultura e Razão Prática*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor.
- SILVA, Telma C. 2015. “Introdução”. In SILVA, T. C. (ed.): *Ritxoko*, pp.7-13. Goiânia: Cãnone Editorial.
- SILVEIRA, Marcus B. 2015. *Entre o Recôncavo e o Sertão da Bahia: ideologia do patrimônio e sambas de roda*. Qualificação de Mestrado. Goiânia: UFG.
- STONES, Rob. 2010. “Ação Social-Agência”. In SCOTT, J. (ed.): *Sociologia: conceitos-chave*, pp.13-17. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar editores.
- STRATHERN, Marilyn. 2006. *Gênero da Dádiva: problemas com as mulheres e problemas com a sociedade na Melanésia*. Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP.

- SPIVAK, C. Gayatri. 2012. *Pode o Subalterno Falar?*. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG.
- SVARLIEN, Oscar. 1987. "Cidadania". In MIRANDA, A. G. (ed.): *Dicionário de Ciências Sociais*, pp.177. Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Getulio Vargas.
- YÚDICE, George. 2006. *A Conveniência da Cultura, Usos da Cultura na Era Global*. Belo Horizonte: Editora da UFMG.
- WEBER, M. 1979. *Ensaio de Sociologia*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editores, 1979.