

## The (im)possibility of heritage: between social conflict and the place of the state

### *La (im)posibilidad del patrimonio: entre conflicto social y el lugar del Estado*

**Yura Serrano-Via**

FLACSO-Ecuador

[yserrano@flacso.edu.ec](mailto:yserrano@flacso.edu.ec)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2515-5001>

**Daniel Alejandro Vizuite-Sandoval**

FLACSO-Ecuador

[davizuite@flacso.edu.ec](mailto:davizuite@flacso.edu.ec)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2431-1746>

#### **Abstract**

*Approaching heritage governance involves an exercise in deep understanding of the dimensions involved there: the distribution of power, cultural practices, the economic dimension, social imaginaries and others. In this work we seek to respond what factors enable the democratic governance of sites with heritage declarations? From the application of the bibliographic review and field visits, information was collected that, from a qualitative strategy that combines structured observation and interviews, allowed to analyze the particularities and common experiences in two cases of archaeological heritage management in Ecuador: Ingapirca and Cerro de Hojas-Jaboncillo. The processing of social conflict, institutional trajectories and heritage appropriation processes are elements that lead to the findings of this work. The inquiry strategy involved designing a methodological tool and its application on the two mentioned sites to 30 local informants from different social groups.*

#### **Keywords**

*Governance, heritage management, archeology in Ecuador, cultural policies, social conflict.*

**Suggested citation:** Serrano-Via, Y., & Vizuite-Sandoval, D.A (2020). The (im)possibility of heritage: between social conflict and the place of the state. *Universitas*, 33, pp. 19-38.

## Resumen

Aproximarse a la gobernanza del patrimonio implica hacer un ejercicio de comprensión profunda de las dimensiones que intervienen allí: la distribución del poder, las prácticas culturales, la dimensión económica, imaginarios sociales y otros. En el presente trabajo se busca responder ¿qué factores posibilitan la gobernanza democrática de sitios con declaración patrimonial? A partir de la aplicación de la revisión bibliográfica y visitas de campo, se recolectó información que, desde de una estrategia cualitativa que combina observación estructurada y entrevistas, permitió analizar *las particularidades y experiencias comunes en dos casos de gestión del patrimonio arqueológico en Ecuador: Ingapirca y Cerro de Hojas-Jaboncillo*. El procesamiento del conflicto social, las trayectorias institucionales y los procesos de apropiación patrimonial son elementos que conducen los hallazgos de este trabajo. La estrategia de indagación implicó el diseño de una herramienta metodológica y su aplicación en los dos sitios mencionados a 30 informantes locales de diferentes grupos sociales.

## Palabras clave

Gobernanza, gestión patrimonial, arqueología en Ecuador, políticas culturales, conflicto social.

---

## Introduction and state of the art

In recent years, the discussion on heritage and its management has been revitalized both from research and from public administration (García, 2014). The emergence of interdisciplinary research agendas, new approaches or analytical objects, come from precisely from the concerns that arise from the experiences of management and the challenges that the public administration faces. A recurring aspect in the discussions is the questioning that actors from the social sphere such as communities, residents, and local managers make about the processes of patrimonialization and the place that these actors occupy in said processes. On a global scale, the discussion is part of the challenges to promote multilevel democratic governance and for Latin America, it is also situated in the debate of the construction of the plurinational State.

In Ecuador, the institutionalization of cultural policies has been a late, interrupted, and conflictual process. As shown by the creation, reform, and disappearance of countless institutions linked to heritage management throughout the 20th century. Since the approval of the Artistic Heritage Law in 1945, until the creation of the National Monumental Preservation Institu-

te (INPM) in 1970, more than 25 years have passed before the institutionality that promotes the implementation of the law can be generated. During this period, the “heritage policy” was to safeguard the monumental heritage.

Since the end of the seventies, a renewed impulse has been given to archaeological activity with the inclusion of content in universities and the creation of a specialized entity of the National Institute of Cultural Heritage-INPC, in 1979 (Salazar, 1994), but also from the funds of the oil boom and patronage. From that point onward, the processes of conservation, collection and exhibition were carried out by entities of diverse nature such as the House of Ecuadorian Culture, municipal and university museums and the Central Bank-BCE. The latter prevailed in management throughout the eighties and nineties due to the resources it allocated for the constitution and conservation of collections of objects, which favored interests linked to collecting.

In the Constituent Assembly of 1997, the debate on the interculturality of the country is introduced, a concept on which demands for the recognition and self-determination of peoples and nationalities will be generated and will be a ferment for processes of appropriation of territories, governance, and sites of heritage interest. As a result of an intense cycle of social mobilization at the beginning of the 2000s, it would begin to crystallize into a political proposal with popular roots. In 2007, state reform and regulation of social life began with the installation of the National Constituent Assembly. Here the discussions related to “interculturality” (Art. 21 of the CRE) and “cultural rights” (Art. 377), the inclusion of culture in the development regime (Art. 276), the creation of the National System of Culture (Art. 340), among others, were revitalized.

The renewed interest of the State in the heritage issue is evidenced not only in the constitutional discussion but also with a boost to the institutional framework of the sector. The creation of the Ministry of Culture in 2007, which meant the opening of a new cycle where a conceptual shift from “heritage” to “culture” is made, which modifies not only the management logic but also the existing debates, and therefore, the actors involved. During this period, the discussion on the different modalities of archaeological practice is also revitalized (Delgado, 2011). Here attributions to the Central Bank were withdrawn, the INPC was reformed on multiple occasions, instruments such as the SOS Heritage recovery program and the Ecuadorian Cultural Heritage Information System-SIPCE were created. The end of this stage and the opening of a new one, occurs with the approval of the Organic Law of Culture, in 2016, which seeks to articulate the National System of Culture and Heritage-SNCyP.

This research accounts for the findings of the field work carried out within the framework of the project “Design and implementation of the System of Archaeological and Paleontological Areas of Ecuador-SAAPE”, executed by the Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences -FLACSO- Ecuador headquarters and the National Institute of Cultural Heritage -INPC- between June 2018 and December 2019. One of the objectives of the project was to build a management model for the nascent SAAPE, for which the reflection on the trajectories of heritage management, the place of the State and the management of the conflict was taken as a starting point, as factors that make (im) possible democratic governance of heritage.

First of all, we approach heritage from a relational perspective and, therefore, we recognize its conflictive dimension. This dimension gives it the possibility of being constitutive and ordering of (certain) social relations, which must be approached as analytical objects to be verified instead of starting premises.

Second, we seek to identify the place that citizens, organizations, populations, and communities occupy in heritage management experiences and to account for the performative and changing nature of existing institutions and agreements.

The notions of community and territory are the third element considered in this work, from which we seek to identify the modes of relationship, negotiation, and conflict of the populations involved or excluded from heritage management, with an emphasis on the processes of “valorization” of heritage.

As a fourth element, underlying the previous ones, the tension that is generated between the heritage pieces and the management of the land. In Ecuador, the heritage is the property of all Ecuadorians, and therefore, the State is its custodian; however, material heritage exists on the ground, which is managed from private, state, community property, but also from land-use planning. This condition not only enables a dispute over competencies between the different levels of government but also between landowners and their activities.

The concept of governance, then, is guiding and transversal to this reflection. As stated by Jessop, governance “refers to coordination mechanisms and strategies in the face of complex reciprocal interdependence between agents, organizations, and operationally autonomous functional systems” (2016, p. 230).

This vision implies an overflow of the State as the only instance capable of ordering the political field —and specifically for the heritage case— and the entry on the scene of other multiple non-state actors such as the private sector or civil society (Prats, 2004). In this framework, a “democratic governance” corresponds to the dialogic or network type explained by Jessop

himself as continuous reflective self-organization based on networks, negotiation and deliberation oriented towards the definition and change of long-term consensual objectives, where, in addition of the distribution of formal power, social, economic and cultural practices and dynamics intervene, which displace monological, monolithic and hierarchical dynamics through “dialogical, plural and heterarchical” processes (Jessop, 2016).

## **Materials and methods**

For the analysis, the compilation of information and the contrast of the same with respect to the question about the factors that make possible (or not) the democratic governance of heritage; In the present work, a theoretical-analytical tool was developed that accounts for four specific dimensions that intervene in the governance process in the terms in which it has been defined. Power, cultural practices, economic circuits, and memory and imaginaries are the dimensions of analysis that were approached from a double methodological strategy: on the one hand, the ethnography applied in field trips to each place (observation and interviews) and, on the other hand, the bibliographic review related to the discussion and the cases.

Specifically, the tool seeks to support the structured observation technique. This approach is used to identify the most perceptible forms and mechanisms of social interaction and the conflicts it generates (Ragin, 2007). In addition, it offers the possibility of approaching the understanding of the links, considering them the effect of a permanent negotiation between social groups and what can be defined as their heritages. Observation allows complementing the use of different media, such as field diaries, work charts, and questionnaires, but its fundamental contribution lies in the ability to interact with actors in the present moment and go beyond the information directly reported by the actors (Echeverría, 2011).

In this article, it is interesting to make evident the elaboration and structure of the theoretical-analytical tool over the findings themselves, as a result of its application in order to reflect the investigative component of the FLACSO-INPC project. In this sense, the analytical dimensions are the result of internal interdisciplinary discussion and theoretical review. Subsequently, the construction of guiding questions, the selection of cases, and the application of tools were carried out.

Thus, dimensions are defined as such:

*Power:* It seeks to account for the field of forces constituted by social relations between actors with differential, unequal and hierarchically articulated position in a social order and oriented towards a collective horizon, where an actor or group of actors manage to impose their will despite the resistances of others. (Weber, 2005). It is essential to think about the social segments that are articulated, the way they do it, what differential functions they fulfill, what hierarchies pass through their members, and how their inequality results in differential access to socially produced goods or their ability to participate in the political field. Power can be observed in state institutions of various levels, social institutions, or through the control of resources (Weber, 2007).

*Cultural practices:* Heritage and its associated practices are approached, as a field that produces meanings for memory and identity processes (Kingman, 2004), in which specific materialities and cultural practices are articulated, to some spheres of construction of public meanings. Cultural practices are observed in the processes of heritagization of objects, rites or customs to which value is assigned both from the State through declarations, and from the citizenship through appropriations and uses in daily life, which makes the heritage “exists” beyond the “official state”. Cultural objects and practices correspond to the spheres of the world of life and daily experience and that, by inserting themselves by way of declarations and their value in heritage circuits, transform their meanings. From this, we can identify two levels: as a factor of social cohesion based on the activation of identity, and as an element that enhances local development processes through opportunities in the economy based on uses, appropriations, valuations, and enjoyment of those heritages.

*Economic circuits:* The division of labor, flows, circuits and hierarchical interconnection of territories traversed by social dynamics of production, circulation, and accumulation of goods and social values are observed (Granovetter, 1977). For the present research, it is interesting to ask about the place that heritage occupies in production, exchange, and consumption in the respective territorial contexts where they are ordered and characterized (Polanyi, 1975). Giving an account of the existing economic norms and institutions will make it possible to show the development horizon in terms of material satisfaction of living conditions, production of exchange value through heritage, and distribution of wealth of the inhabitants near heritage sites.

*Memory and Imaginaries:* It gives an account of the trajectories of the processes of identity, exchange, symbolic accumulation and projection of social aspirations and their relationship with the processes of heritagization

(Ariño, 2002). In contexts of inequality, populations are constantly mobilizing consensus devices, be they material or monumental objects or artifacts, practices or rituals, in the public sphere not only for the purposes of social cohesion and identity construction but as criteria of audibility, legitimacy, and ethnic and socioeconomic inclusion. In this perspective, the exercise of cultural rights implies not only access to and enjoyment of heritage but also the possibility of appropriation, transformation, and enhancement from specific social uses. Heritage, then, operates as ordering force of the dominant versions of the past as an identity substrate, a hegemonic form of memory selection and development resource (Durán, 2014).

## Questions, framework of the tool

**Table 1**  
**Questions by dimension**

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Orientated question</b>
Power	How is power organized and distributed at the site in relation to the archaeological site?
	How do the different state and social actors participate in the decision-making and organization of the archaeological site?
Cultural practices	In what way does the process of heritagization of an archaeological site affect social dynamics?
	To what extent is the heritagization process a factor of social cohesion?
	How do social actors participate, know, value, produce, and access their archaeological heritages or do they articulate them with other local heritages?
Economic circuits	What activities/actors participate in the material and symbolic accumulation in relation to the archaeological site?
	How do social actors imagine their relationship with the archaeological in terms of “development” imaginaries?
	Is it possible to identify processes of inequality, exclusion, or expropriation around archaeological sites?
Memories and imaginary	How do social actors exercise their right to heritage?
	How do they define their community and territorial identity and in what way does it incorporate the archaeological?
	Are there temporal limits in the heritagization processes that affect the imaginations of the social actors?

## Selected cases

- The selection of the cases where the tool was applied was determined by:
- The identification of sites with a heritage declaration with diverse management trajectories led by the State.
- The weighting of processes of social, political, and institutional conflict linked to heritage management.
- The previous collection of archaeological investigations and excavations.
- The interest of the institutional counterpart in expanding the knowledge about the contexts of sites with a heritage declaration.

## Tool application

The structured observation and the interviews were carried out according to the following details:

**Table 2**  
**Details of interviews by heritage site**

Heritage Site	Cantons	Interviews	Type of actor and number of interviewees
Cerro de Hojas Jaboncillo	Portoviejo	15	Institutional (7)
			Civil society/community (4)
			Private (4)
Ingapirca	Cañar, Tambo and Cuenca	13	Institutional (6)
			Civil society/community (3)
			Private (4)



## Analysis and results

### The Ingapirca case

#### *Power*

In terms of the distribution of power, a first factor is the high degree of social conflict brought about by ethnic tensions in the territories where the findings are located: “it is difficult to manage Indians and mestizos together because they have different aspirations and because of the racism” (Erspamer, 2010, p. 20). This is explained, in part, by inheritance from the long history of the colony and its dynamics of domination and production, which has progressively split over time. A second factor is the aggressive migration process that started early in the 1990s and its economic and generational implications (Velecela, 2015).

At the institutional level, Ingapirca was administered by various civic commissions, known as the “Castillo Commission”, dependent on the Central Bank of Ecuador between 1966 and 1985. As a result of the discussion of the 1998 constitution, an important shift in the management mode would occur. In 2001 the Ingapirca Institute of the Kañari People-IIPK was created, with the mission of managing the site by its “legitimate owners” in a context of intense mobilization and appropriation (symbolic and material) of the indigenous sector connected with the processes that were happening at a national scale. (Erspamer, 2010). For a former official of the site (personal interview, 2019), this new form of management generated tensions with the mestizo inhabitants, who, from the Parish Board, would press for the exit of the indigenous people administration. In 2005, through an appropriation of the site, the expulsion of said management mechanism (IIPK) would finally occur and management is entrusted to the INPC, which would be conditioned by the local Parish Board. In 2010, the existence of the IIPK was repealed and management was transferred to the INPC, which only in 2016, by action of the LOC, fully assumed the site as “Ingapirca Archaeological Center” —CAI— (INPC, 2011).

The main spaces of social and political influence are the Parish Board, the Municipality of Cañar, the zonal office, and the Central Plant of the INPC, the businesses surrounding the CAI and community leaders (especia-

lly Sisid and Cahuanapamba). There is evidence of a weakening of the pressure of the indigenous-communard sector — which also corresponds to the situation that historical organizations such as the TUCAYTA or the UPCCC are going through (Martínez, 2003) — which does not find a confluence in the interests of the different articulated spaces. It is necessary to mention that there are no consultative, deliberative or democratic mechanisms that allow establishing governance agreements and a common horizon among the different actors of the town regarding the management of the site, as stated by Velecela (2015, p. 97). The centrality in the management of the Archaeological Complex and the latent tension with the Parish Council and the surrounding communities, as detailed by the residents themselves, make it difficult to establish a virtuous dynamic for site management.

### *Cultural Practices*

The Archaeological Complex was used for several decades to reclaim and celebrate festivities such as the *Inti Raymi* and others linked to the indigenous tradition — especially from the process of heritagization in the seventies—. The communities in the area “took” the place to stage their rituals and mestizo sectors of the urban parish center converged on it. As recognized by several of the interviewed actors (CAI officials, parochial authorities, and merchants) this was the moment of greatest exposure of the communities and of the site itself. Likewise, the organization of these activities caused the different sectors to converge, but, given the tensions in recent years due to the dispute in the administration of the place, the celebration of the festivities moved to another place (Guantug-Cañar). Thus, a displacement is identified in the exercise of practices and exchanges that made social cohesion possible by using them to show the internal conflict.

Although the process of heritagization of the goods and archaeological finds over time has legitimized an identity claim (indigenous Cañari), and some ancestral practices (festive ritual); it is also possible to perceive a strategic use of these elements. That is to say, a specific, temporary, and situated activation of that ethos and not as an organically assimilated issue of cultural dynamics. To the question regarding the use of clothing or other ancestral practices beyond festivals, the responses of the interviewees were not detailed.

### *Economic circuits*

The economic-productive structure of the town and the economic circuits linked (and not) to the archaeological heritage require an articulated look. On the one hand, the territory where the Archaeological Complex is located is eminently rural. The activity that for many years generated income for the inhabitants was agriculture that, progressively, was complemented, and in cases displaced, by livestock for the production and trade of milk (Velecela, 2015). However, if something radically changed the economic (and social) situation of the place, it was the injection of remittances by relatives who emigrated abroad: more money circulating in the locality, access to goods and, to a lesser extent, factors of production. As far as it was investigated, the investment made from this source in the economic activity around the archaeological heritage (some cases of accommodations) was very discreet.

Regarding the economic activities linked to the circulation of visitors and tourists to the archaeological complex, it can be argued that it is still very limited and lacking in the expansion of the offer, as described by the local authorities and residents dedicated to tourist activity (personal interviews, 2019). There are several private businesses linked to the site (lodging and food) that represent almost exclusively the local offer. Outside of these and the personnel working at the CAI, there are no other sources of paid employment linked to the archaeological heritage activity of Ingapirca. The visit of tourists to the site is largely determined by the networks and agendas of tour operators domiciled in Cuenca, Quito, or Guayaquil.

### *Memory and Imaginaries*

Ingapirca —and the Cañar canton as a whole— constitutes to this day a territory of intense and complex identity reaffirmation. In this sense, archaeological heritage has been used to legitimize the escalation of a narrative of indigenous identity, struggle, and vindication. In this process, there have been and there are cases of communities that have articulated this way of looking at each other with demands and concrete actions in the public sphere (the same does not happen in all the communities that make up the parish). For example, the communities of Sisid and Cahuanapamba, as explained by the local leader, Felipe Chimborazo (personal interview, 2019) claim the right to manage not only Ingapirca, but also the sites of Culebrillas

and Paredones. Sites, these, of the Cañari culture that are part of the *Qhapac Ñan*. There are cases of a more elaborate degree of formation of memories and imaginaries that are not limited to the exclusive dispute of the Ingapirca complex.

When inquiring about the notion and imaginary of “development” present in the locality, perhaps the only consensus that exists among the different actors is that the CAI — under different conditions — can be an engine that generates development for the locality. This from both a productive-economic and institutional perspective. There are particularities from which each actor expresses a specific view of how a perspective of well-being and improvement/change of the local situation should be oriented: for the officials of the archaeological complex, this possibility passes through the reduction of conflict between the different actors; the provision of tourist infrastructure in the sector and; a better disposition of the resources captured by entering the site. For the communities, it is the possibility of distributing the income received by the CAI administration in the locality and the possibility of expanding or at least rotating the jobs provided by the CAI (guides).

For the inhabitants of the urban center, the “development” involves the expansion of the flow of tourists and the condition that they leave more foreign currency on the site. There is a discomfort that the large flows of international tourists managed by operators from Cuenca, Quito, or Guayaquil do not encourage local commerce, for which they are proposing a closer connection between the site and the urban center that motivates the consumption and circulation of foreign currency in the site.

## **The Cerro de Hojas-Jaboncillo case**

### *Power*

“Cerro de Hoja-Jaboncillo” is a heritage site located in the mountainous massif of the coastal province of Manabí. The heritage importance of this site is linked to the “pre-Hispanic society that inhabited the *Hojas Hills* and *Jaboncillo Hills*, identified as part of the *Manteña* culture” (INPC, s / a). In 2009, as a result of the interest expressed by the National Constituent Assembly, the government declared the mountainous massif as an Archaeological Park, realizing “a new state policy that wanted to recognize the cultural

importance of pre-Columbian heritage” (Lunnis, 2011, p. 147). This declaration was the beginning of a project that sought to determine the state of conservation of the structures located in the complex and the recovery of heritage in terms of conservation, production of knowledge, creation of tourist circuits that allow access and enjoyment of citizens (“value proposal”) and constitute a stimulus for the local economy. Once the rescue project, led by the Ciudad Alfaro Corporation since 2009, and by the provision of the Organic Law of Culture approved in 2016, the Cerro de Hoja Jaboncillo Complex was transferred to the administration of the INPC.

Institutional, social and private informants (personal interviews, 2018) agreed to point out as relevant for political decisions the owners of local businesses, mining entrepreneurs (quarries), and civic leaders articulated in the “Civic Board”. However, there are differences in the perception of the incidence of an emerging cohort of young leaders whose base of support is neighborhood representation and public officials with a long history in the fields of health and education. The generational differences of political leaders are evidenced both in the questions or support that are made to traditional figures within the same organizations, as in the appearance of new forms of collective action such as organized *barras*. According to the testimony of a guide on the site, “young people are more concerned with the soccer *barras* than with the civic council or the neighborhoods” (Personal interview, 2018).

### *Economic circuits*

Regarding the site, the intervention of “Ciudad Alfaro” involved the delimitation of the conservation area, the construction of administrative, museum, and research infrastructure. This process implied a strong implantation of the central State as an actor with decision-making capacity that, according to various guides, “meant that people left the site” (personal interview, 2018). This meant the change of several economic ties: local inhabitants who were subordinate to research, guidance or site administration work gained prestige while residents who were accustomed to using the vicinity of the site for agricultural activities and animal husbandry, or lucrative activities such as the search and sale of archaeological pieces or guided tours of the massif were aggrieved by their abrupt exclusion (personal interview, 2018). Most of the inhabitants of Picoazá are engaged in commercial activities, the main spaces are the food outlets located in the vicinity of the central park, the sale of household items or clothing in the streets and ware-

houses. People who do not carry out their economic activities in Picoazá normally travel to Portoviejo to carry out street sales of sweets, drinks, and lottery (Personal interview, 2018).

The economic relevance of the Archaeological Park is marginal and not very decisive in the locality. There have been several initiatives by the park administration itself to generate activities related to the visit and use of the facilities such as handicrafts made by residents or small natural products. However, it has not ended up crystallizing the interest of the population in it since it is not a secure source of income (except for the guidance). There is an expectation that the site will function as a tourist attraction that generates local employment, however, the private initiative that stimulates this activity is not identified: no private operators of tourist circuits or hotel infrastructure (private or community) that could provide support.

### *Cultural practices*

The daily life of Picoazá is marked by activities related to commerce and religious practices of Catholic origin. Especially relevant is the feast of Saint Peter and Saint Paul, celebrated in June of each year. This event is a staging of the meeting of two societies, black and white respectively, where, on behalf of the priestes is offered food, liquor and musical shows to the attendees. On the other hand, devotion to the “Virgin Mary of the Assumption” is expressed at every step. In the parish, there are numerous chapels or graffiti that represent it, built on the initiative of interested people who gain prestige in the parish for their contribution. According to an official of the site, “people are more aware of the Virgin than the history of the Manteño grandparents, that’s why they don’t come here (to the park)” (Personal interview, 2018). Sport also occupies an important place in the public life of the parish: young people organize themselves mainly in the *barras* of national league teams and support local soccer teams, such as San Pedro.

### *Memory and imaginaries*

The process of heritagization of the archaeological findings of the hill has not had a decisive influence on the internal social dynamics of the town or on its cultural practices. The use of the hill, from what could be recognized, does not have a direct link with the archaeological asset: before the excavations, the community came to the place for other purposes but not for an

identity claim in reference to an ancestral culture. According to a local resident, “since the government arrived, we have been left without a park and the children without mountains to play with” (Personal interview, 2018). Therefore, it cannot be recognized that the heritage archaeological asset influences in any direct way on internal social cohesion.

There are several identity processes that coexist with each other. The Catholic matrix, strongly rooted and recreated through the feast of Saint Peter and Saint Paul or the devotion to the Virgin of the Assumption are proof of this. However, the discourse of belonging to the Manteña culture has been revitalized since the creation of the Center: “since we have the museum, we know what our grandparents did”, a guide said (Personal interview, 2018). The imaginaries of the site have also been influenced by the practices linked to archaeological excavation. Certain people joined the collecting circuits through *huaquerismo* (robing archeological sites), an imaginary that would begin to be negatively valued from the Interpretation Center of the Park. For their part, the officials project an imaginary of the site as a source of local and national memory based on archaeological research, which demands from the local population the subordination of their local knowledge to the interests of researchers or their participation in associated activities to the operation of the site, in terms of provision of food, services, entertainment or crafts.

## Discussion and conclusions

In the first place, it can be concluded, through the cases reviewed, that a determining aspect to enable democratic governance of heritage is the recognition and processing of social conflict — which does not mean its annulment —. This cannot be made invisible from a perspective of institutional immobility, nor be omitted in any initiative that seeks to improve management and decision-making in these sites in a dialogical, pluralistic, and heterarchical manner, as proposed by Jessop (2016). Second, conflict, in turn, cannot be reduced to an exclusively ethnic character, since in heritage sites those of class or, other less visible, such as gender are also manifested. These represent a direct challenge both for the investigation of site dynamics and for the formulation of governance processes. On the other hand, it is possible to understand the process of heritagization also with a conflictive character: who determines what is heritage and what is not? What identities,

practices, and imaginaries are being legitimized with it? What happens with the claims of the communities and territories that fail to be recognized by the institutions? are some of the questions that invite us to make our gaze more complex in this sense.

Through the case of *Cerro de Hoja-Jaboncillo*, it is evident that it is not enough to guarantee the sustainability and provision of infrastructure through the State as the exclusive promoter of heritage sites, to ensure the democratic governance of heritage sites. The institutional deployment, the resources mobilized, the infrastructure generated has not been sufficient to intensify the ties of a population — such as that of Picoazá — with the findings, assets and official discourses of the heritage identified there.

This case also invites us to think about how the validity of the imaginary of the local inhabitant associated with folklore (still persistent), the weakness of civil organizations and the dispersion of collective action, the articulation of economic circuits based on precarious or poorly paid jobs and the vitality of practices associated with sports and religiosity, pave the way for the local population to distance themselves materially, symbolically and politically from the site, making it difficult for them to participate in daily activities and fully exercise their cultural rights. This shows that it is not about the “little interest” shown by the population to their link with that heritage, but that the appropriation processes exceed the problems of sustainability, infrastructure, and promotion of the archaeological activity of the site. It is a call for the problematization of heritage and cultural policy and the ways in which it is applied in various contexts. Can democratic governance be exercised in these contexts?

Ingapirca's archaeological heritage management experience, on the other hand, constitutes a crucial point for understanding the place of social conflict in heritage management. Aspects of an ethnic order put on the table, precisely, that the processes of heritagization are not a neutral issue and that, rather, the accumulated historical exclusion can be deepened from a vertical and solely institutional perspective. Facilitating the processing of latent social conflict also means democratizing the instances of management and deliberation regarding this and other archaeological complexes. The current institutional framework must empower the recognition of differentiated forms of organization for the management of sites and heritage assets that present conditions such as those set forth in Ingapirca. This does not imply that “solving” the problem of the administration of the site, solves the tension of the place. What it suggests is that instead of institutional respon-



ses that aim to concentrate management and make the conflict invisible, it is necessary to deploy mechanisms that use the Complex as a possibility of agreement and confluence rather than dispute. The case invites to complicate the responses at the central level in terms of modes of heritage management beyond standardized and linear figures (monological and monolithic) that do not recognize social tensions.

In the case of tangible heritage, there is a particularity. The Ecuadorian State recognizes community, public, and private ownership of land, competences by the level of government, and public ownership of pieces and heritage vestiges. Far from being a legal controversy over property, this concurrence of processes generates tensions, above all due to the various trajectories and perspectives that coexist in heritage management, which requires a case by case empirical verification, of the way in which they express and negotiate conflicts, articulate interests, allocate resources and decide relevant aspects in each site. It is not possible to carry out democratic management of heritage without considering land management. At the same time, land management for other purposes cannot ignore heritage as a relevant element in the life of the populations. For this reason, heritage management requires mutual acceptance between the involved actors to seek solutions to situations such as Ingapirca, where communities demand site administration by owning the land, or Jaboncillo, where the heritage site is threatened by mining carried out in the vicinity of the massif.

The process of construction and application of the analytical-methodological tool for fieldwork leaves several lessons such as the need to approach heritage management experiences from a complex approach that combines several analytical dimensions and is capable of capturing the testimonies of relevant informants belonging to various socially relevant groups in the life of the sites. The diversity in the sources allows the confrontation of versions as an exercise in triangulation. The number of informants as well as the conditions in which the interviews are applied must be controlled and carefully observed.

## **Support and acknowledgements**

To Valeria Coronel, Francisco Salazar, Daniela Balanzátegui, Lucía Durán, Christian Pino and José Marrero, members of the FLACSO-INPC project for the valuable exchanges during its development.

## Bibliography

- Ariño, A. (2002) La patrimonialización de la cultura y sus paradojas en la sociedad del riesgo. En J.M. García Blanco, y P. Navarro (Eds.), *¿Más allá de la modernidad? Las dimensiones de la información, la comunicación y sus nuevas tecnologías* (pp. 329-350). Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.
- Delgado, F. (2011). La arqueología ecuatoriana en el siglo XXI: entre la academia y la Arqueología Aplicada. En K. Enríquez (Ed.), *La arqueología y la antropología en Ecuador* (pp. 17-40). Corporación Editora Nacional.
- Durán, L. (2014). *La Ronda: olvidar el barrio, recordar la calle*. Quito
- Echeverría, J. (2011). *Glosario de Arqueología y temas afines (Tomo I)*. Instituto Nacional de Patrimonio Cultural.
- Erspamer, B. (2010). La Arqueología en el Ecuador: Investigando las Lecciones del Pasado y las Cuestiones del Presente. *Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection*. 976. <https://bit.ly/3a30z5K>
- García, Z. (2014). Espacios que construyen ciudadanía: La educación patrimonial en la gestión del patrimonio cultural desde América Latina. *Revista Americana Patrimonio*, 13, 172-180. <https://bit.ly/2DFnzfa>
- Granovetter, M. (1977) The strength of weak ties. In *Social networks* (pp. 347-367). Elsevier.
- Instituto Nacional de Patrimonio Cultural (2011). “Plan de gestión integral para la conservación y puesta en valor del Complejo Arqueológico Ingapirca – CAI-”. Ecuador.
- Instituto Nacional de Patrimonio Cultural (s/a). Historia del Proyecto Hojas-Jaboncillo. <https://bit.ly/33zcTJW>
- Jessop, B. (2016) *El Estado: pasado, presente y futuro*. Ediciones Catarata.
- Kingman, E. (2004). Patrimonio, políticas de la memoria e institucionalización de la cultura. *Íconos*, 20, 26-34. Flacso. <https://doi.org/10.17141/iconos.20.2004.66>
- Marcos, J. (2011). Las investigaciones arqueológicas en los cerros de Hojas y Jaboncillo. En S. Cabrera (Ed.), *Patrimonio cultural, memoria local y ciudadanía* (pp. 153-169). Corporación Editora Nacional. <https://bit.ly/3ftUEI8>
- Martínez-Valle, L. (2003) Capital social y desarrollo rural. *Íconos*, 16, 73-83. Flacso. <https://doi.org/10.17141/iconos.16.2003.525>
- Polanyi, K. [2007 (1975)]. *La gran transformación*. Quipu editorial.
- Prats, J. (2004), Gobernabilidad para el desarrollo. Propuesta de un marco conceptual y analítico. En C. Binetti y F. Carrillo-Flórez (Eds.), *¿Democracia*

- con desigualdad? Una mirada de Europa hacia América Latina* (pp. 3-33). Bogotá, Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo-Comisión Europea. <https://bit.ly/3gAd5fB>
- Lunniss, R. (2011). El Cerro Jaboncillo y el Patrimonio Arqueológico de Manabí. En S. Cabrera (Ed.), *Patrimonio cultural, memoria local y ciudadanía* (pp. 143-151). Corporación Editora Nacional. <https://bit.ly/3gBbK8m>
- Ragin, C. (2007). *La construcción de la investigación social*. Siglo del Hombre editores.
- Salazar, E. (1994). La Arqueología contemporánea en el Ecuador (1970-1993). *Procesos: Revista ecuatoriana de Historia*, 5, 5-27. <https://bit.ly/34FL9BE>
- Velecela, M. (2015), *Plan integral de gestión del complejo arqueológico de Inga-pirca y de sitios asociados*. Gráficas Hernández. <https://bit.ly/2C8tuZK>
- Weber, M. (2005) *Economía y sociedad*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Weber, M. (2007) *Sociología del poder. Los tipos de dominación*. Alianza Madrid.

Submission date: 2020/04/15; Acceptance date: 2020/08/05;

Publishing date: 2020/09/01

