Nationalism and tourism have long mobilised heritage in the making and marketing of identities. This article examines the social production of the Pousadas de Portugal – a state-owned chain of tourist accommodations operating since 1942 that embodies an idea of national identity – shedding light on the official and intellectual reconfigurations of narratives about the nation's past and its culture. It argues that, from displaying national heritage, the Pousadas have become heritage themselves through a process of renationalisation grounded in longstanding meanings and representations.
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The modern understanding of the past as a dynamic and negotiated, political and social construct has substantiated insights into heritage as a process of selecting, forgetting, enhancing and appropriating history that validates and comforts present narratives about cultural and national identities. As Lowenthal reasoned, heritage became 'the chief focus of patriotism and a prime lure of tourism' (1998, p.xiii). Material heritage, and architecture in particular, has been assigned the role of catalyst in such constructions of the past due to the sense of continuity and verifiability that its tangibility bestows on physical spaces that are socially, symbolically and sensorially experienced. Its production is thus a symptom of society's nexus with its past, which must be examined for the way discursive and material narratives interplay.
When the Portuguese State created the *Pousadas de Portugal* in 1939 for middle-class travellers to experience the *nationscape*, leisure and nationalism were assembled in the production of spaces that embodied an idea of national identity and mapped a tour through its natural and cultural values. Expanded ever since, by the end of 2010, this chain of hotels encompassed 42 establishments increasingly built within historic fabrics and, until recently, located in rural space. Throughout its life, the *Pousadas* therefore construed a catalogue of different representations of history and tradition that display transformations in the understanding of heritage, and thus allow an examination of the past's representation within reconfigurations of national identity. The research carried out was framed by tourism and heritage studies, but engaged with the wider issues of national identity, culture, and social distinction. It comprised documental and bibliographical analysis, and anthropological fieldwork amongst the network's producers and users. The leading purpose was to 'spatialize' representations and experiences of the past in the *Pousadas*, borrowing Setha Low's (1996) term for the physical and conceptual location of social relations and practices in particular spaces.

Aiming to discuss the transformations in the understanding of the past through the social production of *Pousadas* as places of heritage, this article focuses special attention on the ideological, cultural, social, technological and economic factors that supported their physical creation. Recapitulating different moments in the history of the *Pousadas*, it analyses how processes of folk culture objectification (cf. Handler, 1988), of popular culture (re)invention (cf. Storey, 2003), of history's domestication (cf. Lowenthal, 1985), and popularization (cf. de Groot, 2009), participated in an ongoing construction of Portugal's national identity. The main argument is that by being systematically updated within an official, intellectual and social framework, the *Pousadas* combine different representations of nationhood, from the more civic
dispositions to the more ethno-cultural constructions (cf. A. Smith, 1991), and offer places for a quotidian experience of nationalism (cf. Edensor, 2002). This all-embracing production transformed the *Pousadas* from displaying, to becoming heritage when the privatisation of their management incited movements towards the renationalisation of the network in a 'symbolic inversion' (Prats, 1997) of its representations and meanings.

**Nationalist Pousadas: objectifying folk culture**

Based on the work of the major Portuguese historians, Sobral (2003) reasoned that the Portuguese national identity depicts conceptual negotiations between modernist and primordialist perspectives on nationalism. Agreeing with Mattoso (2001), the author stated that Portugal is an unquestionable entity, the territorial and collective awareness of which can be tracked to the Middle Age. Indeed, if national identities comprise a sense of collectiveness and historical continuity, an acknowledgement of a shared name, language and territory; these are not essential features, but the result of meanings and representations of a nation construed throughout time. Both authors agree on the crucial moments that built up a sense of Portugueseness. From the outset, up to the fourteenth century, feudal disputes and wars between Christians and Moors inspired loyalties beyond the local spheres to which the establishment of a single language, coin and arms, e.g., provided a symbolic national referent. The popular contestation to a Spanish integration during the 1383-85 monarchy crisis and the 1580-1640 Iberian union evinced such referent to uphold a feeling of distinctiveness that is one expression of national consciousness. In between, Portugal had set out on the maritime expansion, bringing together nobles and commoners, rural and urban populations, in an imperial enterprise that not only became the golden age of the national history, as strengthened the self-representation of Portuguese in face of the Others.
However, it was only in the nineteenth century that the political and intellectual elites objectified a social perception of collectiveness and distinctiveness in the production of a national history, idiosyncrasies and traditions, diffusing a version of national identity within the state's mnemonic apparatus, and its educational and economic systems. In the quest for testimonies of the nation's antiquity and prestigious genealogy, the Romantic elites found in history and art a vehicle to extol the greatness of Portugal and the authenticity of its culture. Threatened in their integrity by the early nineteenth century's wars, national monuments gained ground as expressions of nationhood, and the architectonic style of the Discoveries – Manuelino – became the paradigm of national art (Maia, 2012). National anxieties with Portuguese identity grew however in intensity when the last monarchy crisis and the British Ultimatum (1898) exacerbated a discourse of national decadence (Cabral, 1991). Voicing such anxieties, the intellectuals and bourgeoisie set on a quest for cultural and artistic nationalisation, founding in popular traditions and the rural culture the basis for an 'ethno-genealogical' narrative of the nation, in Smith's (1991) terms. Folk culture then became a moral and aesthetic national heritage to be preserved and carried out by the Portuguese people and State (Leal, 2000). In short, though the territorial and historical roots of Portugal's national identity are grounded in pre-modern cultural affinities; as an ideological movement that institutionalises the political and cultural overlapping of the nation, Portuguese nationalism is accepted as a nineteenth century phenomenon.

These bonds between national identity, history and folk culture were later tightened– by the Estado Novo (New State), the Portuguese dictatorship established in 1933 who assumed the role as the helmsman of national resurgence (Rosas, 2007). Considered an imperative of national history, the Estado Novo's official nationalism was spatialised by two major state institutions. On the one hand, considered as tangible
proof of antiquity, architectural heritage was restored according to the official history by the Directorate-General of Buildings and National Monuments (DGEMN). On the other hand, the National Secretariat of Propaganda (SPN/SNI) carried out a 'policy for the spirit' in order to nationalise the Portuguese lifestyle into the folk culture imaginary. Monumental history and rural tradition were not separated though, because folk culture was a lesson and a form of popular history that sanctioned its ideological construction as a source of knowledge (Melo, 2001). Folk repertoires were de-contextualised from original settings and re-socialised as objects of a national culture that confirmed a Portuguese identity and allowed the nation to be thought of as a natural and bounded entity with a cultural property. This 'objectification' (Handler, 1988) endorsed the new ideological order and sought its social reproduction by bringing together art and cultural production, and staging the nation for both internal and external recognition. Artists and intellectuals were inspired by the official nationalism to project folk culture in national art and culture; urban middle-classes would accordingly redefine their consumption and practices, leading the people to re-evaluate and rediscover their folk cultural inheritance (cf. Alves, 2013).

Inaugurated by the SPN in 1942, the Pousadas substantiated the Estado Novo's nationalisation and cultural objectification projects in the realm of tourism. All over Europe, tourism had stopped being an exclusive practice of the elites to be seen for its civilisational benefits in cultural and social terms. Portugal was no exception. In the early century, tourism was institutionalised and national destinations were marketed. By the 1930s, the State had developed transports infrastructures, homologated laws, and added tourism surplus to the public account (Brito, 2003). Still, until the 1940s, investments were moderated by political instability, wars and, mostly, a State that copied with a financial crisis, but for which policy preceded economy in the
establishment a social order (Lains and Silva, 2005). Tourism was less an economic activity than a sort of 'marketing agency' that selected and classified items of a symbolic repertoire inspiring the sense of national inclusiveness and distinctiveness (Löfgren, 1989).

The incorporation of tourism in the SPN in 1940 confirms how thin the line was between tourism, propaganda, and national identity. This intertwining was not exclusive to Portugal; the case of Spain particularly resembles. In the two countries, the institutionalisation of tourism within the propaganda apparatus preceded major international exhibitions – the Ibero-American in Seville and the International Exhibition in Barcelona (1929) and the Portuguese World in Lisbon (1940) – and both the Portuguese SPN and the Spanish National Tourism Board (PNT) stood out in the tourism sector as marketing agencies and hotel businesses intended to promote the nation. Therein lay the affinities between the Pousadas and the Spanish Paradores and Albergues de Carretera. Created in 1928, these latter meant to solve the tourist accommodation problem for the forthcoming visitors by offering different types of hotels to distinct classes of tourists and practices of tourism: the Paradores installed in historical buildings for upper-class tourists and the Albergues built along the country's main routes for middle-class motorised travellers (Fúster, 1991).

Surely, investments in the Portuguese tourism sector are inseparable from the expectations aroused by the neighbouring country's developments. Indeed, the hotel industry became a national concern by the 1930s as suggested by the Model Hotel competition held by the newspaper Notícias Ilustrado (1933) and the presentation of a Pousadas concept in the First National Congress of Tourism (1936). These proposals illustrate the intended course for tourism to be a rural small scale activity featuring the nation's cultural and natural resources (Pina, 1988). However, they were only put to
practice by the Celebration Plan of the Double Centenary of the Nation's Foundation and Restoration (1940), which main attraction – the Portuguese World Exhibition – staged history and folk culture to teach the Portuguese about being Portuguese. In line, the *Pousadas* were meant to endow the Portuguese people with material spaces that simultaneously reported and supported the official imaginary of national identity, invoking the intertwined policies of memory and identity in the commemoration of the nation (cf. Gillis 1994).

Figures 1 and 2. *Pousada de São Brás de Alportel*: main entrance and dining-room (photos by the author, 2009).

Idealised as a façade of nationhood, from the site to the service provided, including the design of the buildings, the *Pousadas* offered an experience of *Portugueseness* through three dimensions that aimed to guide the tourism industry toward the honesty, authenticity and good-taste of Portuguese folk hospitality and material culture. With regard to location, the *Pousadas* were settled along the country's main routes, in privileged sites that gazed on natural surroundings and rural lifestyle. Distanced from any villages, they kept away from images of poverty and stagnation to reify an Arcadian and picturesque landscape as a symbol of the nation's integrity, continuity and *genius loci*. The bonds between people, history and geography in the formulation of national identities are undeniable, as nations are bounded entities and spatial constructs, but only
by converting productive land into symbolic sites, namely through tourism, do landscapes mark and commoditise a national identity (cf. Edensor, 2002). On this account, each *Pousada* was envisaged as a regional postcard meant to lodge a sort of pilgrims of the nation. As a whole, they added a tour through folk culture to the SPN's historical and folkloric tourism circuits, where monuments and festivities could already be appreciated (Melo, 2001).

On a second dimension, this tour offered the experience of Portugal's rural domesticity, set amongst folk hospitality and gastronomy until today (P. Prista, 1996). The taste of regional cuisine, the traditional garb of the locally employed staff, as well as the wildflowers and rural implements used in the decor, were meant to provide travellers with a class-structured intimacy; at the same time they guaranteed the experience of a 'banal nationalism', insofar as national identity could be consumed and reproduced through quotidian practices wrapped in a non-explicit flag of nationhood (cf. Billig, 1995). The way nationalism studies evade addressing the nation's quotidian construction has been criticised for trivialising practices that are in fact powerful elements of national identities (Edensor 2002), and the *Pousadas* seem to confirm it.

The centrality of the panoramic dining rooms in the designs of the *Pousadas* reveals how landscape and domesticity articulated with a third dimension of the folk culture objectification: the production of material space. Ever since the late nineteenth century special attention was given to the historical and vernacular buildings in the quest for a symbolic repertoire of nationhood (Maia, 2012). The house, in particular, gathered artists and intellectuals around a debate on national culture set on the Portuguese tradition and rurality (Leal, 2000). It was a polysemic and controversial debate, and not the single expression of artists and intellectuals' interest in the vernacular world, but one particular architect turned out to excel in theory and design.
practices. Influenced by Anglo-Saxon Romanticism, Raul Lino studied the Portuguese houses proposing an alliance between tradition, modern requirements and landscape as guidelines to the renationalisation of domestic architecture, and the moral and aesthetic education of the Portuguese's taste (Ribeiro, 1994). His work was not a methodological handbook, but Lino's pedagogic and nationalist vision suited the Estado Novo's ideology, oftentimes being prescriptively adopted by the official production of space in domestic or rural settings (Fernandez, 1988). The Portuguese House lexicon created out of Lino's work is quite explicit in the Pousadas, both in the simplicity of formal and functional compositions, and the cladding of the buildings with eaves and tiles, porches and stonework, chimneys and whitewash.

Nonetheless, modernity and historicism had a place in the Pousadas, bearing in mind that there are negotiations within the social production of space, as it involves different actors and their particular interests and power (cf. Low, 1996). In Portugal, the Modern Movement may have been constrained by the Estado Novo's conservative rhetoric and secluding policy, but the intense campaign of Public Works also became an opportunity for architects to experiment other models and aesthetics (Fernandez, 1988). This diversity has even supported some researchers' reasoning of the Portuguese first modernism as the adoption of technology as a cultural standard with no theoretical basis (e.g. Tostões, 2004). But really, there was no consensus inside the regime and, depending on particular leaders, technicians and institutions, formal monumentality and eclectic revivalisms coexisted with rational designs and culturalist approaches (Almeida, 1998). Some authors have re-examined the Pousadas in light of these aesthetic dialogues, stressing, for instance, the inspiration of modernist rationality in the formal simplicity of its buildings (e.g. Lobo, 2006). Such revisions are, however, guided by formal analysis and lose track of the Pousadas as an ideological programme. There
was, after all, a significant difference between the *Pousadas* and the *Albergues*; the former being à priori part of a symbolic landscape construed by the official nationalism. While the *Albergues* were designed by liberal professionals who won a public competition for a model typology of cheap and easily built modern inns to reproduce all over the country (Diez-Pastor, 2003); the *Pousadas* were designed within the State apparatus, differed in face of the settings, and subdued modern requirements to a folklorist aesthetic and rural lifestyle. Indeed, if traditional dwellings embodied other European nationalisms of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (cf. Lowenthal, 1985); in Portugal, the *Estado Novo*’s recurrent analogy between the house and the homeland seems to have gone further as folk culture assembled several items of Löfgren's (1989) check-list of nationhood, from the Portuguese character to Portugal's landscape.

**Regionalist and historic Pousadas: disputing modalities of representing the past**

The establishment of a new European order after World War II had consequences in the *Estado Novo* political, economic and cultural performance. Gradually, the State compromised with the European capitalism, setting out on an industrialisation process and moderate privatisation of economic activities, which witnessed an unhesitatingly growth till 1974 (Lains and Silva, 2005). Forced to draw nearer to the United Nations’ social democracy principles, Portugal also opened up to modern thoughts and practices, namely in the tourism and cultural sectors. All over Europe, geopolitical stability, economic growth and technological progresses had encouraged the emergence of new tourism destinations and products, and the funding, regulation and professionalisation of the sector. In Portugal, better infrastructures and decolonisation's curtailing of exotic sunny destinations actually increased tourism demand, moving it away from the original propaganda's frame of reference and upgrading its role in social and economic life.
(Pina, 1988). Not surprisingly, the official nationalism's rural rhetoric weakened, undermining the SPN's folk culture objectification in the eve of its first Secretary exoneration in 1950 (cf. Rosas, 2007). Intellectual and artistic elites then acquired power and knowledge to defy the official nationalism and stoke the cultural war over the bonds between folk culture and national identity (Leal, 2000).

As a category, popular culture has always been an invention of the intellectuals; a dynamic process of assigning and communicating meanings that updates practices of social distinction (Storey, 2003). These intellectuals operate within the State's apparatus and institutions, but hold individual and professional agency. When the Plan for New Pousadas of SNI was launched in 1954, the Portuguese cultural disputes and compromises between modalities of representing the nation came to light. The Estado Novo's official nationalism was forced into a dialogue with the modern conceptions of tourism, architecture, and popular culture. In a new outline of the programme, the Pousadas were then set out to promote regional tourism according to the local natural, historic and cultural attractions. Responding to modern leisure requirements, the new buildings were larger, losing a domestic scale, and its formal and functional designs, though still oriented towards a national symbolic imaginary, revealed multiple ways of representing the nation's past and culture.

Despite the ambitious plan never fully being materialised, 12 new Pousadas recomposed the network in thematic series along the country's routes, borders, coastline, popular and monumental settings. The buildings show the Estado Novo's perseverance in the production of the nation's representational spaces, but also its wider and disputed representations, both outside and inside the State's apparatus, confirming the variety of public departments' positioning towards the spacialisation of modern, traditional and historic values (cf. Almeida, 1998). The Pousadas built in association with the regime's
major works, like the hydroelectric dams, were mostly designed by the State's technicians evincing influences of the Portuguese House lexicon. The *Pousadas* installed in monumental settings were assigned to the conservative intervention of DGEMN. However, other establishments' plans were awarded to young modernist architects with new approaches to an architecture referenced to a cultural entourage. Such diversity in the *Pousadas*’ material production and authorship reveals coexisting modalities of representing Portuguese national identity, but also the emergence of new meanings and values in its enunciation.

Figure 3. Regional *Pousada* of Valença: courtyard and esplanade (photo by the author, 2009). Figure 4. Historic *Pousada* of Évora: dining-room in the cloister (photo by the author, 2008).

On the one hand, since the mid-1940s, architects had been questioning the International Style and the Portuguese House’s detachment from reality in a quest for a political and social disciplinary project that pursued a humanised production of space (Tostões,
Some of these second *Pousadas* were designed accordingly in tactile interpretations of the rural vernacular construction materials, techniques, forms and habits that aimed to reconfigure cultural landscapes, akin to the 'critical regionalism' of Kenneth Frampton. Like the first *Pousadas*, architectural plans intertwined with interior design. However, they differ in that they did not aestheticise folk culture, but used local materials and techniques to produce modern spaces. Popular culture became a theme for high culture, as *Pousadas'* aesthetic dispositions and modes of appropriation maintained their material settings within the domain of art, guaranteeing cultural and intellectual distinctions between local people and guests, and their social capital (cf. Storey, 2003).

On the other hand, while allowing the de-objectification of folk culture, the State re-established its authority over the national past through the construction of historical monuments as 'visual metaphors' (Gonçalves, 1996) of the nation's antiquity and glory. Their restoration provided scenic resources that rescued the past from oblivion, making the past accessible through the representation and exhibition of its testimonies. And through DGEMN's ideological campaign, the State had been engraving the official history of the nation's foundation and glorious times in architectural supports which tangibility sanctioned claims of authenticity and insured its social reproduction (Tomé, 2001). After all, as Lowenthal (1985) reasoned, the past is an artefact of the present that selects history's particular features and meanings, enhances its collective virtues and forgets unwanted memories, through heritage's identification, exhibition and protection.

The integration of restored monuments in the *Pousadas* network is inseparable from the successful experience of the *Pousada* in Óbidos castle, planned in 1946. In a joint effort, DGEMN and SNI produced a picturesque medieval village out of the ruins of Óbidos castle, installing within the walls a *Pousada* that was an image of official nationalism's dual representation of the national past. As a series, however, the Historic
Pousadas were only formalised when history became the unifying past of the Estado Novo's moral resurgence rhetoric, after the wilting of folk culture in the post-war period. By then, DGEMN had begun adopting the European theoretical and methodological precepts for their interventions, advocating functional rehabilitation, valuing new periods of history, and assuming modernity in structural reinforcements and hygiene improvements (Tomé, 2002). The second series of Pousadas thereby left references to folk culture, with even furniture and decoration being designed to produce an eclectic historic revival.

The idea of Pousadas in monuments can however be fully understood recalling the Spanish Paradores, created as hotels in historic buildings that guaranteed the conservation of heritage and stimulated local development by the accommodation of upper-class culture-motivated tourists (Fúster, 1991). A similar disjunction within the Pousadas' social and cultural project emerged with the Óbidos experience and was later formalised by the Historic series. Converted into a national icon and tourism destination, Óbidos lured the political and artistic elites, who found in its Pousada a space for distinctive socialisation practices (cf. M. Prista, 2013). According to McCracken (1988), objects from the past allow the consumption of idealised meanings that are dislocated in time. When these objects have a natural patina, like architectural heritage or historic relics, their meanings address the aristocratic elite, and their consumption sanctions the social status and taste of the new consuming individuals. In line with this, the Historic Pousadas evoked a social distinction within the network grounded in a relation between different cultural repertoires and their privileged holders that associated the middle-class guest with popular culture and the upper-class guest with monumental history.
As Portugal became an increasingly desired destination, new products and infrastructures were created, and tourism was regulated and professionalized. By the 1960s, Portuguese tourism was a competitive activity that significantly contributed to the national income, arousing intellectual and political debates on the benefits and prejudices of quality versus mass practices (Brito, 2003). National development plans started accounting tourism (1965) and pinpointing it as a strategic sector entitled with its own Secretary of State (1968). However, the *Estado Novo* was struggling with the social, economic and political crisis triggered by decolonisation and capitalism (Mattoso, 1994), loosening ideological control over the tourism and culture sectors. Urban issues, social conflicts and cultural differences became the intellectuals' chief concerns; and, at the twilight of the Modern Movement, a cleavage between the new sociological and ecological interests, and the capitalist production of architecture grew architects apart (Fernandez, 1988). When the Carnation Revolution overthrew the dictatorship, establishing the democratic regime (1974), the State strove with new territorial and economic configurations and focused on political and social issues. To the post revolutionary struggle, tourism was irrelevant. Despite being promoted through fairs and marketing strategies, in practice, its development policies were put aside, leaving the *Pousadas* with the assignment of imaging the quality tourism aspired by the State (Pina, 1988).

It is not an overstatement to say that, between the 1960s and the 1980s, national investment in the *Pousadas* declined. Although new plans were designed (1966, 1973, 1980), they were programmatic and not ideological. Still, the network was extended with 14 new establishments that confirmed previous trends: references to the Portuguese House lexicon faded, restored monuments were the preferential settings, and accommodations were enlarged and modernised. In the course of events, though,
Pousadas were ascribed with two new values. In a symbolic dimension, nation-related meanings endowed the Pousadas with a cultural capital that was appropriated by local powers and populations in claims of local identities and strategies for social and economic developments. Every place claimed to hold the required national values in a 'fever' to hold a local Pousada (Pina, 1988). In a material dimension, the commissioning of the Pousadas design plans to liberal professionals caught between the modernist rationality and the postmodern plural paradigm, resulted in the physical production of a new heritage that accepted restoration's subjectivity, and conceived historic sites as physical and cultural living organisms. In one particular Pousada, installed in the monastery of Santa Marinha da Costa, the renowned Portuguese architect Fernando Távora proposed a 'continue-innovating' methodology that, informed by solid historical research, assembled archaeological findings, restoration of historic elements, modern construction of architectural archetypes, and the creative building of an imagined expansion of the monastery. Távora's project attempted to surpass heritage policies' paradox of fabricating time continuity through preservation practices that instead produced a rupture between past and present times (cf. Guillaume, 1980/2003). By doing so, he voiced an understanding of heritage as an intellectual and contemporary construction of the past, enforcing architects' authority in the realm of restoration and heritage's production in the realm of contemporary architecture.

Pousadas in heritage: history, tradition and modernity

The Pousadas' new symbolic and material dimensions were instrumental in the next expansion plan, outlined in 1989 and put into action during the 1990s by the National Company of Tourism (ENATUR), created in 1976. History's hegemony, tourism's promotion and quality tourism labelling, however, only became the Pousadas' official
outlines in face of a new economic, social and political order, established after the post revolutionary period and stressed after Portugal joined the European Economic Community in 1986. If decolonisation altered Portuguese import/export balance and caused the sudden return of unemployed dislodged populations; if socialist ideology increased public spending and political instability, with adverse consequences on the public accounts; Portugal's sequent integration in EEC raised economic and political expectations with significant impacts. On the one hand, although Portuguese national unity was unquestionable, it started managing new scales of identification, as political and administrative reconfigurations brought to the forefront a sense of regional and European identities (Cabral, 1991). On the other hand, Portugal's adhesion to the EEC increased its economic dependency and intensified migration flows, aggravating rural desertification, but also enabled the country to be eligible for the European financial incentives (cf. Mattoso, 1994).

These transformations supported new official policies for regional development, and tourism, which had been an insufficient yet constant surplus, along with emigrants' remittances, became a strategic sector. Human resource qualification, urban rehabilitation, craftwork and cultural promotion were some of the measures undertaken to fight the countryside's de-ruralisation and desertification (Silva, 2009). They promised the revitalisation of the economy of rural space and upheld local claims of cultural identities by reviving the 'middle landscape' (Tuan, 1974) where wilderness and traditional lifestyles vied for the authenticity of a national landscape. Locating these authenticity sites, interventions in the rural space converted marginal places into tourism destinations, encouraging the formalization of 'cultural economies' (Dicks, 2003) through the exhibition and commoditisation of culture for consumption practices. If, as Lowenthal (1985) reasoned, heritage is a symptom of social anxieties about
identity issues that discloses how societies relate to their past; Greg Richards is right to 
assert, 'history has become a commodity called heritage' (1996, p. 265) in a time when 
culture is consumed as a product, rather than a process. Holding the State's symbolic 
power, the Pousadas played a significant role in these processes; the network's legal 
framework having been converted into a private-law entity in order to guarantee 
eligibility for European funds.

The social and economic contexts, the new understandings and uses of heritage, 
and the network's juridical reconfigurations help to clarify the 1990s Pousadas' new 
outlines. They were re-presented as a chain and brand of tourism accommodations in 
historic buildings for travellers interested in the nation's natural and cultural heritage. 
Although far from the initial nationalistic purposes, the bonds between tourism, culture 
and nation were not discarded. On the contrary, following the World Tourism 
Organisation precepts, tourism was construed as a mode of asserting and promoting a 
modern nation, and Portugal's cultural diversity was taken as a distinctiveness that 
suited both tourism and identity interests. However, the terms of the Pousadas' re-
presentation disclose a spatial differentiation between historic and traditional heritage 
repertoires and their modes of production, requiring further explanation.

Modern improvements in transportation, communication, incomes and labour 
rights led to what Urry (1990) called the 'democratization of travel', driving the middle 
classes to the countryside and drawing them to tourism practices formerly exclusive to 
the elites (cf. Silva, 2009). This drift towards the rural space cannot be dissociated from 
the outgrowth of leisure practices and its effect on the commoditisation of culture. 
Tourists longing for an escape from modern urban life, set off on a quest for alternative 
forms of tourism that respected natural environments and local societies, and enabled 
positive interactions between hosts and guests (cf. Smith & Eadington, 1992). The
*Pousadas* provided such practices, offering quiet and distinctive accommodations for travellers looking for cultural enrichment and experiences of nationhood. All over Europe, culture and heritage had become popular attractions, and, in Spain, the 1990s were also a period of significant growth in the production and consumption of the historic *Paradores* (Vadillo, 2001). Examining alternative forms of tourism, however, Butler (1992) reasoned that these actually disguise class prejudices by distinguishing culture-motivated travellers from recreational tourists without unbiased analysis of their social and economic local impacts.

The *Pousadas* inaugurated during the 1990s imply that such a distinction can also be made in the referents and modes of appropriation of culture, despite or due to heritage understandings having matched monumental and social history, high and popular culture, material and intangible legacies. What these new *Pousadas* proposed was an all-embracing heritage attraction where tradition could be sensorially experienced in the quotidian practices of inhabiting a place of monumental history, designed and displayed through the lens of modernity. Such dispositions reflect broader economic, social and cultural configurations. Namely, monuments size and modern extensions enabled the spacial and functional updating of the *Pousadas*, capitalising its units within the contemporary and competitive hotel industry. Also, rurality and tradition were no longer the distinctive offerings of *Pousadas*, as they had been de-authorized to symbolise the nation in view of its locally constructed meanings, leaving to history the role of assembling a collective memory and a national past (cf. Leal, 2010). Furthermore, understandings of heritage were not only stretched and subordinated to the subjectivity of its production; its boundaries were attenuated as authenticity and truth became as real as its interpretation and representation, admitting
creative and artistic interventions (Lowenthal, 1998). ENATUR's conduction of the
Pousadas' expansion plan seems to have acknowledged such developments.


Following up on Távora's Pousada, most of the 17 new buildings were designed by
commission from renowned Portuguese architects who produced heritage as a sum of
different times, including the present. The Pousadas became a journey through
Portuguese historical and contemporary architecture, set out to provide an experience of
heritage in which authenticity was sanctioned by history's legacies, despite the
acknowledgement of its staged exhibition and modern transformation. Inside, objects of
ethnography and history were anachronistically displayed along with contemporary and
sacred art in a museum-like exhibition; traditional cuisine was enhanced by chefs; and
professionalised service was customized to ensure the Pousadas' hospitality ideal.
Through the identification, detachment and exhibition of historical and ethnographic
artefacts, heritage endowed history with a second life, rescuing the past from obsolescence by evincing the end of its original production and allowing its representation (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998). But, as Crang argued, 'preserved buildings are not seen so much as sites for interpretive practices as façades that represent an appearance of "pastness"' (1996, pp. 415-416).

This 'pastness' was furthermore mediated by values of art and authorship, endowing Pousadas with a new distinctive feature that created a more sophisticated sort of modern national Grand Tour experience, thought as an educational well-organised itinerary for upper class tourists longing for cultural ego-enhancement (cf. Craik, 1997). History and modernity updated the Pousadas' distinctiveness by evoking new aesthetic dispositions in the understanding of heritage, and refreshing social classes' classificatory struggles through cultural consumptions (cf. Bourdieu, 1979). However, the pre-eminent value of art, implicit in this actualisation, suggests something more. Controlling the production and communication of culture, the new cultural intermediaries of the 1980s transposed postmodern ambivalence and reflexivity into their meanings, becoming agents that formulate culture, rather than reproduce the dominant classes’ taste (cf. Bovone, 1997). This favoured architecture coming into vogue after the postmodern aesthetic and theoretical pluralism shifted its modern social and political project towards a more symbolic and self-reflexive production (cf. Nesbitt, 1996).

Analysing the international survey on national identity conducted in 2003, both Leal (2010) and Sobral (2010) agreed that the Portuguese represent the nation through the twin lenses of the ethno-cultural and the civic dimensions of nationalism, in an emotional bond that enhances its most symbolic features. Looking further into what triggers this Portuguese emotion, the two authors underlined the prominent role of history and personalities in the nation's pride; the latter including not only sports and
literary personas, but also contemporary artists. If history stands for Portugal's past glories, architects for instance embody the Portuguese national genius today. It is this past and present enhancement of the nation's achievements that ENATUR's *Pousadas* spatialise by assembling the three dimensions Prats (1997) reasoned were capable of representing an identity and congregating collective meanings: the 'nature' of the middle landscape surroundings, the 'history' of the monumental glorious times, and the 'creative inspiration' of those who display it in modern times and terms.

**Contemporary Pousadas: privatisation and renationalisation**

In the nexus between tourism and culture, several authors found grounds to study contemporary identity issues. The chief role of tourism in the marking and commoditisation of cultural identities in a globalising world has brought destinations alike. In this 'culture of tourism', Craik (1997) considered culture to be a privileged resource and product through which destinations withstood consumer society's competitiveness and placed the local within the global. It is quite bizarre, for instance, how recent Portuguese Governments have set tourism as the 'nation's calling' in their political Programmes, filling the blank left by decolonisation and reconfiguring the meaning of an imagined historically open to the world nation. But if tourism offers a foundation for the performance of identities, then its practices and representations must equally be seen as constituent parts of the latter. After all, like the past and heritage, authenticity is also understood as a social construct of modernity, with outcomes in the intellectual revaluation of categories of culture, its production and consumption. Indeed, with cultural democratisation, not only did mass and commercial culture become objects of intellectual interest; but culture itself entered into the economic logic of capitalism (cf. Storey, 2003).
When, in the 1980s, all over Europe, neoliberal States rethought their leading role in national life, culture and art followed other economic activities and were subjugated to the market rationale (Boorsma, Hemel, & Wielen, 1998). ENATUR's juridical reconfiguration in the 1990s was a step towards this liberal model, but only in 2003 was the Pousadas' social capital partially privatised and its management leased to the private tourism corporation, Grupo Pestana Pousadas (GPP). The truth is that increasing interest in heritage had led to a multiplication of repertoires, actors and narratives involved in the production of the past, which had outgrown traditional institutions, leading to a 'de-nationalisation' of memory (Gillis, 1994). De Groot (2009) refers to this process as the 'popularisation of history'; a making of history into an object of consumption, fashion and knowledge by leisure, media and marketing professionals, beyond the State and historians' intervention, that reconfigures the practices and meanings through which a society interprets, communicates and objectifies its past.

The bonds between the Pousadas and its nation-related meanings were thereby not dissolved with privatisation. On the contrary, the GPP strengthened a thread of continuity by invoking the network's longstanding association with popular tradition, monumental history, and hospitality in the marketing of the phrase 'since 1942'. Nevertheless, the Pousadas underwent new transformations. From the outset, folk culture and rural domesticity vanished from material displays and nearly all the earliest modern and modernist Pousadas were sold. GPP justified this choice in a profit-oriented policy and the inadequacy of 18 buildings to meet modern guests' demands and aspirations, recalling that tourism, like heritage, and space, mediates social production and social construction (cf. Richards, 1996; Prats, 1997; Low, 1996). However, this de-ruralisation of the Pousadas was a part of a larger delocalisation process. Along with material settings, GPP restructured the Pousadas service and product into the
professionalised, rationalised and democratised tourism industry. Hospitality is now provided by qualified professionals; pricing and marketing policies have expanded the Pousadas' target-audience; new products are offered to satisfy modern health and ecological concerns; and provisions and household services have been outsourced. No longer framed by nationalist or national development purposes, the social and economic bonds between the Pousadas and their places perished.

At the same time, modernity was incorporated in the six new Pousadas' not only as a mode of displaying history, but also as a period from the past. Lowenthal (1998) showed how heritage has ceased looking back to a frozen past and has moved forward into celebrating personal and collective legacies, glorious and trivial pasts, overwhelming history in a sort of act of faith that revokes proof and universality, now including every imaginable thing. In fact, in 2000, the international community updated the restoration dogma with The Charter of Krakow, transferring the value of heritage from history to the domains of memory, and enhancing cultural diversity through a conception of heritage as a social and organic construction of values within each community. This enlargement of heritage is quite explicit in the GPP's Historic Pousadas, which now include nineteenth and twentieth century domestic, hospital and industrial buildings located in urban settings, and far away from the historical moments that marked the foundation of a national consciousness (cf. Mattoso, 2001). Such typologies suit the needs of space optimisation, guaranteeing the Pousadas' profitability; but they also shed light on heritage's incorporation of modernity as time and space referents to the extent that they anticipate the past of the future in the display of heritages-to-be. Even in the interior design, though following ENATUR's museum-like exhibition of art and artefacts, the new Pousadas now display kitsch emulations of relics and crafts, and de-contextualised original architectural elements, expressing the
absence of obsolescence in today's understanding of heritage, and the aesthetic and symbolic values of objects that were once subject to cultural prejudice, such as industrial production and mass culture.


Economic and symbolic capitals are, however, commonly conceived to oppose each other and GPP's reconfiguration of the *Pousadas* is recognizably profit-oriented. As Prats (1997) reasoned, whilst a social and political construct, heritage is also the product of negotiations between different actors' interests, visions and powers, sometimes resulting in 'symbolic inversions' of its meanings. Recent developments in *Pousadas* seem to confirm this, as from mapping the nation's traditions and history, they themselves were converted into an item of heritage and identity by a process of renationalisation. The privatisation of the *Pousadas* generated a feeling of loss amongst the public, who criticised the collective deprivation of national heritage and the implicit disregard for public interests. GPP's new corporate policies were accused of subordinating symbolic values to economic interests and trivialising a tourism product with a special place in the Portuguese imaginary. The disposal of several *Pousadas* was
even considered a threat to the network's integrity. Confirming that heritage is a 'rhetoric of loss' that rescues the past through the exhibition of its own perishing (Gonçalves, 1996), the Pousadas ended up being submitted to a process of heritagisation.

On the one hand, all the Pousadas were listed in the state's architectural heritage index. This listing included the already alienated buildings and extended the monument's history and value to include its modern rehabilitation, constructing a sense of wholeness that echoes the Pousadas' social representation as a specifically Portuguese hotel typology. Beyond the authority of history's tangibility and the authenticity of traditions, each Pousada now stands for its concept, adding a spot to a national 'recreational geography' (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998), where a sense of Portugueseness can be consumed without the disrupting constrains of social reality or physical degradation.

On the other hand, some nationalist and regionalist Pousadas were classified and protected by law in an official acknowledgement of heritage and history's new pasts. Temporal and political distance from the Portuguese dictatorship and revolutionary period, along with history's epistemological revision, have led to a revaluation of the Estado Novo's ideologies and achievements that seem to be objectified in the rewriting of art and architectural history. Concerning the Pousadas, their original ideological framework is now subordinated in favour of a more formal analysis that highlights innovative functional configurations and cultural concerns in a theoretical and methodological rapprochement of regionalist and nationalist architecture (e.g. Lobo, 2006). Modernist Pousadas, built during the 1950s' cultural wars over cultural identity, on the other hand, are nowadays emblems of the idiosyncratic Portuguese dialogue between modernity and tradition in the production of architecture.
(cf. Tostões, 1997). This revision is not a stranger to postmodern pluralism and reflexive paradigms, but because 'every act of recognition alters survivals from the past' (Lowenthal, 1985, p. 263), these Pousadas' listing as national heritage suggests a reformatting of the twentieth century Portuguese architecture, clothing it with a sense of continuity that encompasses different phenomenon in a single chapter of the past, and redraws it in the image of a modern sensibility to tradition. In the end, the Pousadas, like people, seem to have social lives shaped by commoditisation and de-commoditisation processes that continuously reconfigure their values and meanings in a culturally significant way.

Final remarks

In summary, the Pousadas were a national, nationalist and nationalising tourism programme bounded by the Estado Novo's objectification of folk culture that reconfigurations in the national past's understanding and uses has led to a private-corporate model which commoditises heritage in response to postmodern cultural democratisation and history's popularisation. The Pousadas' development discloses how tradition, history and modernity are displayed and updated to make the past intelligible and meaningful in different presents, capable of inspiring a sense of belonging, continuity and pride, and thus asserting it as a political, intellectual and social construction. Heritage therefore relates to formal and processual (re)inventions of the past; its symbolic efficiency depending on individual enunciations and the social ascribing of meanings (cf. Prats, 1997). This view accounts for the Pousadas' recent process of renationalisation. Despite participating in a broader enlargement of heritage's times, spaces and actors; privatisation, delocalisation and modernisation threatened the longstanding nation-related meanings that compiled several indexes for representing the
past, not engraving one particular narrative, but an all-embracing sense of Portugueseness that made it possible for the Pousadas to be construed an item of national heritage.

In fact, the production of heritage is mainly a 'rhetoric of loss' enunciated by the intellectual and the official disputing authority over the past, which re-presents and appropriates the past's meanings through 'visual metaphors' and 'discursive allegories' (Gonçalves, 1996). As places where tourism and nationalism interplay, the Pousadas spatialise a national identity in objectifications of history and tradition and the mapping of a cultural geography. However, this only partially explains the terms that led to the Pousadas' renationalisation, as space is multifaceted and nationhood is also experienced and reproduced in more sensory and embodied ways (cf. Edendor, 2002). In the 'geographical matrix' of national identity, the Pousadas are not just iconic sites exhibiting objects of ethnography, history and art, although their tangibility tends to be proof of the authentic culture and past displayed. They provide spaces where quotidian practices take place, organising objects, behaviours and routines for the embodied performance of more banal forms of nationhood. The way the Pousadas' guests socialise, what they eat or choose to wear, are informed by a national habitus, in addition to other scales of identification, including social representations of what an experience of the nation's culture and past should be. It is by assembling both formal and quotidian nationalism that the Pousadas provide places for the consumption and reproduction of a national identity; an identity that, after all, is most positively represented in symbolic features of the past and present, these being either history or creative accomplishments (cf. Leal, 2010; Sobral, 2010).
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Notes

1. Literal translation could be Inns of Portugal. However, Pousada is a distinct and exclusive legal category of tourism accommodation.

2. Created in 1933, the SPN was reformulated in 1944 and renamed National Secretariat of Information, Popular Culture, and Tourism (SNI).
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