

Gil-Manuel Hernández i Martí

The deterritorialization of cultural heritage in a globalized modernity

INTRODUCTION

The aim of the following essay is to deal synthetically with the deterritorialized quality acquired by cultural heritage in the transition from first modernity to globalized modernity. In order to do so, we will start by defining the concept of deterritorialization, which in our opinion describes the essence of the cultural condition of globalization.

Following this, a brief description of the main transformations undergone by cultural heritage in its evolution towards advanced modernity will be given. From there on, the body of the article will analyze the different signs which characterize the deterritorialization of culture, with special emphasis on the paradox of the reactive and compensatory processes of reterritorialization not being able, after all, to escape the context itself and the characteristic means of deterritorialization. This is why the three central manifestations of cultural deterritorialization are mentioned. These manifestations are homogenization, differentiation and, most especially, hybridization, as the concept of cultural heritage itself is historically constructed as a hybrid social product.

DETERRITORIALIZATION AS A CULTURAL CONDITION OF GLOBALIZATION

The development and extension of the processes of mediatization, migration and commodification which characterise globalized modernity produce a considerable intensification of deterritorialization, understood as a proliferation of translocalized cultural experiences (Hernández 2002). Deterritorialization, considered a central feature of globalization, implies the growing presence of social forms of contact and involvement

which go beyond the limits of a specific territory, a kind of “weighing of anchors” of social relations (Giddens 1990), which takes us to a closer involvement with the external, which generates closeness in distance, and to a relative distancing from what is close. The mediatic and communicative nets work as obvious vehicles of deterritorialization; therefore, the extension of the forms of deterritorialized social relation tends to generalize with the intensification of globalization, causing a profound transformation in the status of local environments, ever more conditioned by global dynamics.

Mediatization works as a preferential source of deterritorialization, while it becomes a catalyser of other sources of deterritorialization (migrations, tourism, vast shopping centres, and economical transformations). As Tomlinson points out (1999), mediatization is absolutely omnipresent in everyday contemporary cultural experiences, it therefore appears as clearly decisive in deterritorialized cultural experience.

The aforementioned experience implies opening up to the world and amplifying cultural horizons through the globalized mass media. This means that globalization transforms the relation between the places where we live and our cultural activities, experiences and identities. Paradoxically, deterritorialization also includes reterritorialized manifestations, which García Canclini (1990, p. 288) defines as “certain relative, partial territorial relocalizations of old and new symbolic productions”. According to the concept of glocalization proposed by Robertson (1992), deterritorialization and reterritorialization



constitute both sides of the same coin of cultural globalization. Deterritorialization speaks of the loss of the “natural” relation between culture and the social and geographic territories (García Canclini 1990), and describes a deep transformation of the link between our everyday cultural experiences and our configuration as preferably local beings (Tomlinson 1999). As Giddens (1990, p. 142) argues, “the very tissue of spatial experience alters, conjoining proximity and distance in ways that have few close parallels in prior ages”. Nevertheless, it is very important not to interpret the deterritorialization of localized cultural experiences as an impoverishment of cultural interaction, but as a transformation produced by the impact the growing cultural transnational connections have on the local realm, which means that deterritorialization generates a relativization and a transformation of local cultural experiences, whether it is from the local event itself or by the projection of symbolical shapes from the local event.

“Globalization transforms the relation between the places where we live and our cultural activities, experiences and identities”

In an intensely deterritorialized context, the globalization of everyday experiences makes it ever more difficult to maintain a stable sense of local cultural identity, including national identity, as our daily life entwines itself more and more with influences and experiences of remote origin. As especially Appadurai (1997), García Canclini (1999), Ianni (1998), Ribeiro (2003) and Tomlinson (1999) have pointed out, to understand the essence of deterritorialization intensified by the process of mediatization we must grant special importance to the alterations experienced by the work of imagination. This indeed constitutes one of the basic factors to understand the cultural distancing from the locality, which is implicit in deterritorialization. Through the process of a mediatic expansion of imagination, from their own local situation individuals can imagine other lives, become familiar with landscapes and cultural products alien to their locality, create new materials for the reelaboration of the local experience, develop transnational cultural links, take cultural diversity to the locality, reinterpret standardized cultural products or set the conditions for hybridization to take place. The work of imagination implies the combination of image, imaginary and imagined community. It also assumes a space of symbolical disputes and negotiations through which individuals and groups try to annex things global to their practices of modernity, especially through the junction of mediatization with the movement of people (Appadurai 1997).

Nevertheless, deterritorialization is neither totally new, nor totally uniform. Firstly, because before contemporary deterritorialization, local cultures were never pure or isolated cultures, alien to exogenous cultural influences. Secondly, because globalization and, therefore, also deterritorialization are asymmetrical and unequal, as the cultural experience created by globalization is complex and varied. There are, therefore, several ways (more or less intense, active or agreeable) to experiment cultural deterritorialization. All the world inhabitants and all social classes experiment deterritorialization, but they do it from differentiated or unequal conditions and contexts.

Deterritorialization becomes, therefore, a general cultural condition which derives from the dissemination of global modernity, whose existential implication affects more people than ever, deeply transforming their everyday lives. As we have already outlined, deterritorialization is inserted in the dialectic character of globalization, as, far from being a linear or univocal process, it causes contrary and reflexive mechanisms of reterritorialization. This is expressed in the anxious search for cultural diversity, for particularism, for the reinforcement of the local, which even resorts to deterritorialized media. The ambiguous or ambivalent character of deterritorialization must not be forgotten, as, while it generates benefits, it also produces evident costs such as feelings of existential vulnerability or of cultural rootlessness, especially if you consider that individuals have ties to a locality, and this locality remains important for them. As a consequence, deterritorialization does not mean the end of the locality at all, but its transformation into a more complex cultural space, characterized by varied manifestations, tendencies or cultural effects.

The manifestations of cultural deterritorialization are basically two: cultural homogenization and cultural heterogenization, which are but the cultural expressions of what Robertson (2000) calls the universalization of particularism and the particularization of universalism. This means that the particular can be universalized or projected to a global level and that the universal can be particularized and rooted with the local. Furthermore, both manifestations are dialectically related, in accordance with the glocalizing (and reflexive) dynamics of globalization, which advises against holding a conception of globalization as a mere uniformization or homogeneization of the world. We must, therefore, go beyond the debate which opposes homogenization to heterogenization in order to show that both tendencies imply each another. For this reason, we should emphasize the simultaneity, the reflexivity and the interpenetration of the global and the local, of the universal and the particular, of the homogeneous and the heterogeneous. From here on we can speak, firstly, of cultural homogenization, and, secondly, of the two manifestations of cultural heterogeneization, cultural differentiation and hybridization. From the mutual relation between homogenization, differentiation and hybridization derives a continuous flow of dialectical connections which delimit the glocalizing phenomenology of cultural deterritorialized experience.

“The manifestations of cultural deterritorialization are basically two: cultural homogenization and cultural heterogenization”

Cultural homogenization presents both an apocalyptic face (homogenization understood as an Americanization, Westernization or absolute marketization of world culture) and an integrated face (homogenization can also have a “beneficial” manifestation, and, after all, its limit is always the active reception of cultural

asset). As far as heterogenization is concerned, the differentiation appears as much in the different reception of standardized cultural products as in the assertion of one’s own cultural identity through diverse mechanisms (cultural patrimonialization, indigenisms, cultural nationalisms, fundamentalisms, formation of new transnational ethnical

communities or of new virtual communities which are also transnational). Finally, hybridization implies fusion, racial mixing, creolization, synthesis or symbiosis of diverse cultural plans which are not only affected by the global/local opposition, but that also by pairs such as traditional/modern, real/virtual or urban/rural. Notwithstanding, although there have been diverse manifestations of cultural homogenization and heterogenization in other periods of globalization, the increase of intensity, extension, speed, impact, infrastructures and of the institutional framework (Held *et al* 1999) of contemporary cultural globalization defines its differential character, which is especially visible in the mechanisms of deterritorialization. That is to say, these three manifestations of cultural deterritorialization are different from those that took place at other stages of globalization, due precisely to their extensive degree of deterritorialization, paradoxically visible in the fact, which we have already outlined, that reactive or compensatory mechanisms of reterritorialization have themselves to use deterritorialized media, an aspect which will be exemplarily expressed in the case of cultural heritage.

CULTURAL HERITAGE IN THE TRANSITION TOWARDS ADVANCED MODERNITY

Before dealing with the topic of deterritorialization of cultural heritage, the concept of cultural heritage must be defined. It could be described as a social construction, understood as a symbolic, subjective, processual and reflexive selection of cultural elements (from the past) which are recycled, adapted, refunctionalized, revitalized, reconstructed or reinvented in a context of modernity by means of mechanisms of mediation, conflict, dialogue and negotiation in which social agents participate. These cultural elements transform themselves into a selective representation which articulates itself through a discourse on heritage values, which is specified or fixed in the form of a valuable cultural asset which expresses the historical-cultural identity of a community, can be used for the legitimization of power structures and allows the reproduction of market mechanisms.

A concise account of the fundamental transformations undergone by cultural heritage in the last decades, emphasizing the progressive globalization and expansion will now be given. 1) From a heritage strictly identified with educated culture to a heritage which includes culture in the broadest sense of the word, moving from the concept of classical monument of the Western educated culture to the concept of cultural asset with all its social and geographical magnitude. 2) From a traditional, rural and pre-industrial heritage (typical of the conception of “national” heritage of the first modernity) to a heritage which includes modern, mediatic and urban forms derived from cultural dynamics of advanced modernity. 3) From movable and immovable cultural asset of a tangible character to immaterial and intangible cultural asset institutionally recognised at world level of late. 4) From a national heritage to a local and global heritage. This implies the expansion of heritage activating agents on behalf of diverse systems of belonging. If during a good part of modernity states and nationalist movements were the basic agents of patrimonialization, taking the nation as a referent of imagined community, they have later been joined by scholars and experts who, in the name of the scientific community, defend the preservation of cultural heritage for its documentary or informative value. In the last forty years they have been joined by the UNESCO, a supranational agent which

represents the generic community of humankind (World Heritage Sites), as well as by the civil society who independently from the state and by means of associations for the defence of heritage demand the activation of local heritages (local identities). Maybe we should add yet another agent: the companies who pursue an activation of cultural heritage for commercial interests (tourism, publicity), profit perspectives and consumer activities. 5) From a cultural heritage to a natural-cultural heritage, this includes the historico-artistic, archaeological, palaeontological, technico-scientific, ethnological and natural heritage and implies the assumption of the risks that threaten the environment (natural heritage) as well as of those that threaten past culture (cultural heritage).

It must be added that the changes in the intensity of cultural heritage are parallel to the changes in its extension, which are condensed in the literal globalization of patrimonialization of culture (Ariño 2002), especially if we consider that globalization, an irreversible process which appears in all aspects of social life, becomes one of the main agents of the transformations that affect the very substance of heritage, which extends its territories and has an influence on its national and local contexts, which in the end amplifies its social impact, as happens with ecological problems, which are transferred to social, political and economical realms. We are therefore witnessing a historical process of a dialectical nature, which transports heritage from origins which are local or related to the nation state towards clearly global dimensions, from which the local dimensions are reconfigured.

THE DETERRITORIALIZATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE: a paradox of globalized modernity

As has already been pointed out, contemporary culture is a highly mediatized culture, to the point that mediatization is the basis of cultural globalization. To the extent that cultural heritage, both national and global, is transmitted through diverse media to heterogeneous audiences who are located in very different places, the aforementioned media manage to create an emotional, moral or touristic identification between the exposed heritage asset and a complex mediatic community, which generates new opportunities for remote action over heritage.

In the last thirty years, with the creation of a worldwide heritage, the mass media (radio, television, magazines, newspapers and the Internet) have diffused it massively. This has had two main consequences: on the one hand, the launching of a local heritage asset (an example would be el *Misteri d'Elx* —The Mystery Play of Elx—, which expresses an *Elxana*, Valencian and Spanish identity at the same time) to a potentially universal expansion for consumer cultural demand, an actual consequence of the so-called cultural tourism. This way a local heritage asset reaches a global realm, and thus is transformed into global heritage. On the other hand, the local community where the promoted asset is located is superimposed by a globalizing community as big as the human community. This global community is institutionally represented by the UNESCO. As a consequence, the diffusion of a heritage asset through the mass media allows it to enter the conscience of uncountable individuals who live in distant contexts, and they will therefore be able to incorporate it into their own phenomenal world. Paradoxically, in order to allow identification between the members of the universal neighbourhood

and the local asset, through world heritage, a neutralization or expurgation of the asset's original functionality and interpretation will be required; this way it acquires a clearly deterritorialized status as far as the structure of its meaning and its range of values are concerned. Therefore, the Buddhas of Bamiyan will not be considered just "pagan" idols, nor the Mystery Play of Elx conceived as just the representation of a Catholic dogma, nor the square of Djemma-El-Fnaa in Marrakesh, Morocco, considered only as an important local market.



Besides, with the fundamental participation of the mass media, the local communities that own a certain cultural asset will be interested in seeking the recognition of international institutions, and especially if they achieve this recognition, the locality, represented by the asset, will acquire a transnational status, projecting the originally local asset as an asset for “everyone”, as a fully global asset. In this highly mediatic process local cultural heritage will inevitably experiment a process of deterritorialization or uprooting, in the sense of loss of local control; nevertheless, its direct ownership will always be local. By emphasizing its cultural value, uncountable distant eyes (alien and far from local) will be invited to take this heritage as their own and to consume it. Therefore, this heritage will become, at least potentially, an object for touristic and mediatic consumption and with time, besides this, it will be necessarily spectacularized for external consumption. This will accelerate its transformation, with the unfolding of a mass of infrastructures, publicity media, marketing resources, management, dispersion and popularization institutions, or diversified museums. Let us look at several examples to illustrate this:

1 The case of the Buddhas of Bamiyan in Afganistan. Their destruction by the Taliban regime generated a worldwide mobilization in which the UNESCO, the UN, the Islamic Conference, diverse governments and embassies, museums and cultural institutions were involved, and a mediatic stirring which generated, at a local level, a sensitisation towards the protection of external and geographically isolated asset, although not officially World Heritage Sites.

2 The subject of “the black man of Banyoles”. Initially a local problem, but with colonial resonances, in which a Haitian doctor who lived in Banyoles complained about the presence of a Bushman warrior whose mummified body had been displayed at the town museum since the end of the 19th century, became an international debate, in which several African countries, the OAU, the UNESCO and the UN were involved and which only abated when the body of the Bushman was finally withdrawn from the museum of Banyoles and buried in Botswana with great pomp and circumstance.

3 Most of the properties declared World Heritage Sites have several web pages on the Internet where they can be studied in certain depth. Similarly, other local heritage properties also try to project themselves through the Internet towards the global space to be internationally known and recognized, as is, for example, the case of the diverse carnival celebrations, the festival of San Fermín in Pamplona, the Valencian *Fallas*, the Sevillian Holy Week and even the “traditional” patron saint festivals which have been recovered of late in order to promote rural tourism. There is, in consequence, a growing relation between the appreciation of cultural heritage and the possibilities of the cyberspatial environment.

4 The relation between tourism and heritage. With the arrival and intensification of the tourist industry, local heritage properties become known world wide. Tourism implies an activity of cultural consumption clearly deterritorialized and highly mediaticized in which heritages are commercialized and spectacularized, while giving place to a new source of risk which threatens the touristically exploited heritage, creating the need of implementing a series of reflexive responses aimed at alleviating the risks. Thus, as local heritages are reappropriated by visiting

cultures, they are necessarily also reappropriated by the receiving local cultures, as their heritage asset has been irremissibly incorporated into the global touristic imaginary.

5 The link between publicity and cultural heritage. As publicity spreads homogeneous and global products, it also resorts to local, traditional and heritage elements, which helps it both to enter certain market spaces (from the perspective of a great transnational company) and to publicize the cultural idiosyncrasy of a region (from the perspective of their interest in promoting local tourism). In fact, “tradition”, i.e. cultural heritage, has become one of the main appeals of present day publicity. There are multiple examples of this in publicity for certain foods, which evoke for their promotion heritage elements of the past, such as rural tradition, noble culture, natural landscape, popular festivals or classical artistic heritage.

DETERRITORIALIZED HERITAGE: homogeneity and difference

As we have already pointed out, the deterritorialization of cultural heritage constitutes a remarkable paradox of advanced modernity: indeed, in spite of the fact that the patrimonialization of culture is an important aspect of cultural reterritorialization, it cannot avoid a deterritorialized context or deterritorialized media in order to take place. That is why, after observing the three basic manifestations of cultural deterritorialization in general terms (homogenization, differentiation and hybridization), we must now assess them within the deterritorialization of cultural heritage itself.

As far as homogenization is concerned, this can be seen in a series of lines which we will now refer to. Firstly, the World Heritage List must be mentioned, an official list started in 1978 by UNESCO, to which the places that are declared World Heritage Sites are added year after year. At present, there are more than seven hundred declared sites; however, in spite of including sites from all over the world, what clearly stands out is that Western cultural heritage or heritage linked with the Christian civilization is visibly predominant. Secondly, moreover, the concept of cultural heritage is itself a product of modern Western culture and, like the nationalist ideology to which it is closely linked, it has not stopped globalizing since the 19th century, which has generated a mimesis in the colonial territories that gained independence in the processes of decolonization in the 20th century. This is a profound example of the westernizing project which hides behind the cosmopolitan ideology of enlightened origin (Sebastià 2004), an ideology which underlies to a great extent the heritage projects of UNESCO. On the other hand, and in the third place, the asset included in the world list has formed a kind of common global culture, according to the definition proposed by Ortiz (1997), a culture of localized origins, assumed as universal due to its deterritorialization, despite consisting of the cultural diversity which stems from its components. In addition, and in the fourth place, since 1972, the year in which the Convention concerning the Preservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage adopted by the general conference of UNESCO decided to activate the concept of world heritage, a standardized category of what has to be understood as world heritage (both natural and cultural) has started to be diffused worldwide, with criteria approved by the countries who signed the Convention and with uniform categories into

which cultural heritage can be classified. That is so because international conventions and recommendations have a global scope and imply universalist homologated definitions of what is to be understood as heritage, to the point that in the last fifteen years UNESCO has also decided institutionally what is to be understood as popular and traditional culture, or as oral and immaterial culture. In the fifth place, there is a series of institutions and knowledgeable experts (techno-scientists) who, in addition to UNESCO, spread a homogeneous conception of what should be understood as heritage, and of

“We must add the sense of the relation between memory, territory and the quality of a meaningful life which underlies the associative heritage work”

how this heritage has to be studied and preserved. This is the case of institutions or institutional networks such as the European Council, the European Union, ICOM, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN or the Forum UNESCO University and Heritage). In relation with this, in the sixth place, there is a series of standardized patrimonialized formulas and categories which have spread all over the world: cultural asset, museum, eco-museum, theme park, biosphere reserve, natural park, national park, cultural space,

cultural landscape, palaeontological park, fauna and biosphere reserve, architectonic complex, archaeological park, historical urban centre, historical town or cultural park; to sum up, a set of formulas and instrumental categories which homogenise the definition, classification and management of cultural heritage throughout the world, as happens with the devices for management, conservation, protection, definition, evaluation, commercial exploitation and categorization of cultural heritage (v. A. 2001).

With respect to differentiation, it must be said that cultural patrimonialization is, currently, one of the main expressions of cultural differentiation and of the assertion of local cultures and identities. This is, to a great extent, the result of a reterritorializing effort against the reflexive perception of deterritorialization seen as a risk, even though, paradoxically, this reaction is expressed and asserted through the mass media. One of the most evident expressions of this differentiation is the revitalization of traditions, a phenomenon which is widely documented in the world (Boissevain 1999; Berger and Huntington 2002) and implies the re-adaptation of a series of cultural materials of traditional origin such as folk music, festivities, customs, trades, crafts, markets and fairs, among other expressions of traditional popular culture, to the cultural demands of advanced modernity.

Secondly, taking into account the empirical evidence of studies carried out in France, Canada and the Valencian Community, the work for the defence of heritage by civic organizations should be mentioned. It is a phenomenon which is related to a great associative effervescence of the last two decades, with the proliferation of local associations in defence of cultural heritage, working for the defence of cultural asset which is scarcely promoted by official policies, and for the sensitization, recovery and defence (by means of criticism, denunciation and demands) of specific cultural values.

These groups for the defence of heritage are extremely aware of the magnitude of economical development and growth, and of the uncontrolled and irreversible risks they can generate over cultural asset, such as degradation, abandonment, depersonalization of the way of living or speculative urban and industrial aggression. These associations therefore try to sensitize, create awareness, make demands, denounce, intervene, research and inform about local heritages. They also defend a global conception of heritage and culture (which implies restoring dignity to popular forms). To this we must add the sense of the relation between memory, territory and the quality of a meaningful life which underlies the associative heritage work which also insists on the practice of an active citizenship and a civic commitment, as they work for the common cultural good. Therefore, the associations for the defence of heritage work to present cultural heritage as an instrument in the struggle for quality of life, by means of a selection of valuable elements to build the identity and dignity of a community, following the line proposed by the so called post-modernizing values (Inglehart 1997). The aim, therefore, is the reinforcement of collective identity and its projection towards the future, providing the community with a historical sense.

CULTURAL HERITAGE: a zombie of modernity

Finally, hybridization as an expression of cultural deterritorialization which affects heritage must be dealt with more extensively. To begin with, it must be noted that the modern idea of cultural heritage already implies, to a great extent, a hybridization phenomenon: it is clear that several actors and cultural approaches intervene in its social construction and there is a merging of the cultured, the popular, the mass, the economic, the political, the identifying and the scientific. The very fact that heritage is being forged by re-adapting materials coming from cultural tradition (past) for diverse uses in modern society (present) implies a process of mixture, fusion and symbiosis which generates a cultural asset which is neither traditional in the narrowest sense (as this quality disappears in the processes of detraditionalization) nor a mere expression of present culture, even if it is the product of the anxieties and cultural programmes of society in advanced modernity. Patrimonializing culture implies, therefore, hybridization culture, mixing elements which have been rescued from the past with elements generated in the present, for its future endurance, so that cultural heritage can be transmitted from generation to generation. This particular mixture of past, present and future forms the hybrid and impure essence of heritage, where dead and living forms of culture, tradition and modernity, amnesia and anamnesis, enchantment and disenchantment, order and criticism are fused.

The concept of cultural heritage is paradoxical because, while it expresses the tragic and nostalgic awareness of the fracture implied in the longing for the past (Lowenthal 1993), it tries to overcome it, sublimate it and compensate it with the construction of a concept which, at the end of the day, becomes an imaginary representation socially constructed from the needs of the present. In some ways, and allowing the use of this image, cultural heritage appears before us as a zombie or a living dead. As we all know, zombies are hybrids of the dead and the living, beings who died but not completely, who remain in the ambiguous territory of catatonic life, of half-death. Cultural heritage behaves like a



Crani dibuixat (Drawn Skull)
Antoni Tàpies (2005)
paint and pencil on paper
64 x 50 cm

Tàpies

zombie, which may enjoy better or worse health, but whose energy is the product of a life injected by present agents who are, for diverse reasons, interested in rescuing fragments from the past. The heritage zombie, a hybrid which is as much the son of modernity as the Promethean monster of Frankenstein, enjoys, therefore, an artificial life. It is a life connected to the machine of present urges, a modern machine which, by means of diverse administrative, economic and technical devices, extracts rich fluids from the heritage zombie in the form of political-identity legitimization and potentially exploitable merchandising, but to which, on the other hand, it must regularly inject vital liquids, administered in a bureaucratic and rational way in order to keep it alive. Significantly, this strange hybridization of dead culture and cultural politics (cultural vivification) is what makes cultural heritage more attractive, and what grants it better health. In the same way as extinct beings or species can be cloned through technological means, ancient pieces of history can be recreated, cloned or resurrected through the patrimonialization of culture, conveniently filtered through the cultural needs of contemporaneity.

The hybridization at the core of cultural heritage produces the introduction of artificial memories, as happened to the anguished replicants in the film *Blade Runner*. They are not personal memories, but memories that have been implanted and incorporated through the institutional process of patrimonialization. Truly speaking, heritage does not correspond exactly to our memories, it is an artificially assembled historical memory which is inserted through the socializing mechanisms of culture, allowing the memories, the fragments of historical past, the possibility of being felt as personal experiences, so personal and social memory merge into a concentration where the denser fluids come basically from the work of the identities' imagination.

In its hybrid condition, heritage synthesizes modernity and tradition. It is true that the patrimonialization of culture is inseparable from modernism, understood as a discourse, an ideology and an identity at the service of the creative destruction of the present, and at the same time linked to the images of evolutionism and the great developist tales. Heritage is established as a product of the reflexive conscience of modernism and, as it succeeds and legitimizes the achievements of modernity, it generates a modernized vision, i.e. homologated and normalized, of past traditional culture, one of the reasons being that heritage can testify and reinforce the appropriateness of the project of modernity. This is the reason why cultural heritage is not only a modern creation but also a modernist one, embedded in the modern myth of the civilization process. Ironically, modernity also becomes a breeding place for new traditions, since, as its historicity increases, due to its dynamics of intensified change, the threshold of obsolescence diminishes and the area of what can potentially be patrimonialized increases dramatically.

In present times characterized by the increase of past territory and decrease of present territory, we find, nevertheless, the paradox that the hunger for anamnesis (of memory and recollections) can lead, in mercantitized, spectacularized and consumerist conditions, to a kind of assembling or hybridization of pasts which could result in the production of a kind of amnesia or amnesic memory. In other words, the inflation and saturation itself of cultural heritage can deactivate the initial pretence of anamnesis and find an amnesia which has the appearance of memory culture. This coexistence or fusion of amnesic and anamnestic memory leads to the combination of the late modern practices of *zapping* and *surfing* through the past with what could be called the speleology of memory. This

zapping presents an atomized treatment of the past, allowing us to pass from one to the other with hedonistic idleness, enjoying the television programmes on channels such as History Channel or Discovery Channel. On these channels, as well as in theme parks, shopping centres and tourist circuits we practise *surfing*, understood as the superficial approach to the past, a practice which allows us to slide over the smooth homologated board of the heritage fair through the most famous waves of history, without having to study their origins or the effects they generated.

This speleology of memory, an illusion of a deep knowledge of the past, is actually a task patiently undertaken by historical science, which still believes in great all-comprehensive chronicles, daily and frivolously undone by the mass media or the entertainment industry. This happens because the acceleration of historical change ultimately creates simultaneity of available pasts in a notoriously capitalist context. Therefore the past becomes a bazaar of consumable pasts in a continuous present, where the reenchantment inherent in the triumphant instrumental rationality merges with the expressive need of reenchantment by compensation, a need that can actually only be satisfied, as Ritzer would say (1999), through genuinely disenchanting mechanisms.

To complete the hybrid character of cultural heritage, the hotchpotch created between the legitimization of the established order and its critical potential must be referred to. A conception of heritage which pretends to be neutral and positive is imposed by institutions. The merchandized heritage is emphasized in the name of identity, wellbeing and tourism, and an uncritical vision of the past is generated, subject to the *status quo* and opposed to visions of heritage that insist on approaches that are critical or challenge past or present rule. In general, these critical approaches dissolve in the jungle of decontextualized culturalisms, and are systematically obliterated by the avalanche of strategies of identity exaltation or by well-intentioned developist discourses.

To this matrix of hybridizations (past and present, tradition and modernity, amnesia and anamnesis, real memory and artificial memory, enchantment and disenchantment, order and criticism) must be added the main hybridization of cultural deterritorialization: the one that takes place between heritages of diverse origin, or between local and global heritages, all this in the context of the same transnational reorganization of the local. Think, for example, of the proliferation of theme parks, where heritage elements coming from diverse cultures and civilizations, either metaphorically (reproductions) or metonymically (with real elements), are incorporated in a new space —generally a non-place following Augé's definition (1993)— and mixed to obtain a new cultural product aimed at touristic or leisure consumism, such as Port Aventura or Terra Mítica. Prats (1997), actually calls these cultural activations “hybrid activations”, as they play with the mixture of heritages for diverse identitary, social and touristic ends.

But heritage hybridization with a clear deterritorialized character does not end here; in fact, it can be found in other realms. That is the case of hybrid heritages of origin or in process (festivities, crafts, music, languages, fairs or clothing), subject to spectacularization or equalization processes or the so-called “cultural spaces”, recognised by UNESCO as an example of master pieces of oral or immaterial heritage and, precisely as a result of their declaration as such, they are inserted in modern tourist circuits; and therefore change their appearance and become a melting-pot of typical traditions (this is the case, for

example, of the peculiar cultural universe of the Djemma-el-Fnna square in Marrakech). The patrimonialization of cultural hybrids also derives from the impact of tourism and the mass media, as in the creation of external or global heritages which are subsequently reincorporated in other localities and inserted in their local culture, as happened with the exportation and local adaptation of the model of the Brazilian carnival, the Anglo-Saxon models of Christmas and Halloween or the Alcoian model of the Moors and Christians festivities which have spread throughout the Southeast of Spain.

Advanced modernity emphasizes the hybridization of heritages in other realms: in publicity, where commercial strategies and avant-garde designs merge with the evocation of traditional topics; as happens with a lot of the food publicity; in citizen vindication, where associations of “save the...” do not hesitate to introduce modern art exhibitions in traditional heritages in order to enhance the cultural value with the added value of contemporary and committed works of art; in the modern uses of heritage, which consist in celebrating festivals or creative events in heritage surroundings (a rock opera in a Roman theatre or an intercultural music festival in a heritage architectural surrounding); in the modern cybernetic creations based on heritage resources; or in the generation of museums and spaces where the real and the virtual, the strictly museum material and the commercial spectacular are mixed in an implosive way (as in the Old Harbour in Barcelona or in the City of Arts and Sciences in Valencia).

In conclusion, it may be suggested that at the core of the acute cultural deterritorialization which characterizes cultural globalization of advanced modernity, cultural heritage is fully affected by the characteristic expressions of deterritorialization (homogenization, differentiation and hybridization), and it is precisely this profound hybrid character that provides it with a greater complexity and introduces it into the conflicts derived from growing multiculturality II

■ Bibliography

- APPADURAI, A. (1997): *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions in Globalization*, Minnesota. University of Minnesota Press.
- ARIÑO, A. (2002): “La expansión del patrimonio cultural”, *Revista de Occidente*, 250, pp. 129-150.
- AUGÉ, M. (1993): *Non-places: An Introduction to the Anthropology of Supermodernity*, Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- BERGER, P.L. and Huntington, S.P. (eds.) (2002): *Many Globalizations: Cultural Diversity in the Contemporary World*, Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- BOISSEVAIN, J. (1999): “Notas sobre la renovación de las celebraciones populares públicas europeas”, *Arxius de Sociologia*, 3, pp. 53-67.
- GARCÍA CANCLINI, N. (1990): *Culturas híbridas: estrategias para entrar y salir de la modernidad*, Mexico. Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes/Grijalbo.
- GIDDENS, A. (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge. Polity Press.
- HELD, D., MCGREW, A. PERRATON, J. y GOLDBATT, D. (1999): *The Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*, Cambridge. Polity Press.
- HERNÁNDEZ, G.M. (2002): *La modernitat globalitzada. Anàlisi de l'entorn social*, València. Tirant lo Blanch.
- IANNI, O. (1998): *La sociedad global*, Mexico. Siglo XXI.
- INGLEHART, R. (1997): *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic and Political Change in 43 Societies*, Princeton. Princeton University Press.
- LOWENTHAL, D. (1993): *The Past is a Foreign Country*, Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- ORTIZ, R. (1997): *Mundialización y cultura*, Buenos Aires. Alianza.
- PRATS, L. (1997): *Antropología y patrimonio*, Barcelona. Ariel.
- RIBEIRO, G.L. (2003): *Postimperialismo. Cultura y política en el mundo contemporáneo*, Barcelona. Gedisa.
- RITZER, G. (1999): *Enchanting a Disenchanted World: Revolutionizing the Means of Consumption*, California-London-New Delhi. Pine Forge Press.
- ROBERTSON, R. (1992): *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*, London. Sage.
- (2000): “Globalización: tiempo-espacio y homogeneidad-heterogeneidad”, *Zona Abierta*, 92/93, pp. 213-241.
- SEBASTIÀ, J. (2004): *El parany cosmopolita. Una mirada a les arrels ideològiques de la globalització*, Catarroja-Barcelona-Palma. Afers.
- TOMLINSON, J. (1999): *Globalization and Culture*, Chicago. University of Chicago Press.
- V.A. (2001): *Informe mundial de la cultura. Diversitat cultural, conflicte i pluralisme*, Barcelona. Centre UNESCO de Catalunya.