



Ethnologia Europaea

Journal of European Ethnology

41:2 2011

Museum Tusulanum Press

Ethnologia Europaea

Journal of European Ethnology

Volume 41:2
2011

Copyright © 2011 Ethnologia Europaea, Copenhagen
Printed in Sweden by Grahns Tryckeri AB, Lund 2011
Cover and layout Pernille Sys Hansen
Cover photo Peter Jan Margry, September 2010
At the end of the Santiago trail to Finisterra, "Land's End", pilgrims
leave their clothes as a ritual of finishing their journey.
ISBN 978 87 635 3877 0
ISSN 0425 4597

This journal is published with the support of the Nordic board
for periodicals in the humanities and social sciences.

Museum Tusulanum Press
University of Copenhagen
Njalsgade 126
DK-2300 Copenhagen S
www.mtp.dk

CONTENTS

Peter Jan Margry

Civil Religion in Europe. Silent Marches, Pilgrim Treks and Processes of Mediatization 5

Mats Lindqvist

Colonizing Latvia? A Piece of Swedishness in the Forests of Talsi 24

Luís Silva

Beneath the Surface of the Heritage Enterprise. Governmentality and Cultural Representation of Rural Architecture in Portugal 39

Katrin Amelang, Violetta Anastasiadou-Christophidou, Costas S. Constantinou, Anna Johansson, Susanne Lundin and Stefan Beck

Learning to Eat Strawberries in a Disciplined Way. Normalization Practices Following Organ Transplantation 54

Anna Malewska-Szalygin

Postsocialism as a Diagnostic Tool. Common-Sense Concepts of Power and State in Southern Poland 71

BENEATH THE SURFACE OF THE HERITAGE ENTERPRISE

Governmentality and Cultural Representation of Rural Architecture in Portugal

Luís Silva

This article focuses on the construction of heritage in rural Portugal. Drawing on anthropological fieldwork in the village of Castelo Rodrigo, it analyses the extensive protection and exhibition of domestic architecture in the framework of a State-led local development programme. By bringing in the messiness of daily practices, the article goes beyond neat theoretical formulations in the study of heritage such as Foucault's theory of "governmentality" and Kirshenblatt-Gimblett's notion of "second life as heritage". It argues that the "conduct of conduct" is actually nowhere near as effective as its theoretical formulation might have us believe, and the second life as heritage suffocates the first life of houses as social habitats for the village population.

Keywords: architectural heritage, "governmentality", "second life as heritage", second homes, Portugal

This text provides an analysis of the contemporary construction of cultural heritage in rural areas. The main aim is to find out what happens when houses that are being lived in are converted into heritage. Who constructs built heritage, how is it constructed and why? What impact does the construction of heritage have on the social context? And how is the protection of housing as heritage reconciled with people's need to live in the buildings? Pursuing these questions in rural Portugal, the article delves beneath the surface of the heritage enterprise into the untidy details of how things actually work out on the ground. Hence, it will contribute to clarifying the problematic transformation of private and family properties into public heritage, and also to giving an account of the power relations that characterise

these processes (Graham, Ashworth & Tunbridge 2000; Gravari-Barbas 2005; Herzfeld 1991; Macleod 2010).

My discussion is grounded on anthropological fieldwork conducted in the first half of 2009 in the rural village of Castelo Rodrigo.¹ Ideas of historical conservation emerged here as early as 1922; at that time, the ruins of the castle and of fortress walls as well as the *Manueline*² pillory were accorded official protection status as a "national monument". Subsequently, in 1961, the church of Rocamadour was accorded official protection status as a "building of public interest".³ More recently, in 1995, historical conservation was extended to the entire urban environment within and around the fortress walls. Changes were then made to privately-owned archi-

ecture on the facades and roofs, in patterns that prefigure a re-traditionalisation. Moreover, the urban fabric became subject to the exigencies of historical conservation.

This article shows that both the intervention on private buildings and the exigencies of historical conservation are intrinsically problematic since historic conservationists and most residents have rather different views on housing and thus different portfolios of intervention in the buildings.⁴ It is a clear example of how individuals and social groups struggle to manage and control space, in order to pursue their particular interests (Lefebvre [1974]1991, [1972]1976). Nowadays, almost all residents feel proud to live in a classified village, which is “clean, pretty and restored.” They reproduce the rhetoric of historical conservation when it suits them to do so. For example, they argue that the State or the municipal government should restore all buildings located in the old town centre because of their historical value, that is, “because they are very old.” Yet they resist this official appropriation of their living spaces, particularly their own homes, and adamantly criticise the rhetoric of historical conservation when it runs counter to their interests.

The Setting and the Context

The village of Castelo Rodrigo is part of the municipality of Figueira de Castelo Rodrigo, some 70 kilometres from the city of Guarda in eastern Portugal. The administrative centre of the *freguesia* (parish) that bears its name is a walled village situated at the top of a hill, at about 820 metres above sea level.

Castelo Rodrigo is in various ways an example of the socioeconomic transformation that rural areas of Portugal have been undergoing during the last sixty years. For a start, there has been a decline in the number of people living off primary sector economic activities, particularly agriculture, as well as a consequent exodus to major cities in Portugal, and farther afield to other countries such as Mozambique, France and Germany. Although exact figures are unavailable for Castelo Rodrigo, the inhabitants remember that the village where “there had not been enough houses for everyone and many people had

lived in barns” in the mid-twentieth century, had become “very depopulated and had turned into a pile of ruins” by the early 1970s. In the 1970s, the village experienced a temporary population growth due (principally) to the arrival of *retornado* families who returned to Portugal after the independence of the former Portuguese colonies in Africa, particularly Mozambique. During the following years exodus was once again the order of the day for the village.

In the 1990s, the decline in economic activity in Castelo Rodrigo began to be combated. Some independent individuals, as well as the local government and the municipal government, started to earn money by receiving a growing number of tourists in search of cultural tourism experiences.⁵ The first tourism business was set up by Lurdes Saraiva, a former primary-school teacher in her sixties, shortly after she moved into her mother’s house. She started the business in partnership with a younger sister, also a school teacher. In 1993, they began to offer accommodation services in a “traditional” house in the village; the house is the result of the extension and adaptation of an old stone house and a barn. The initiative was preceded and followed by other initiatives, both public and private, aiming to take advantage of the economic value of heritage (Bendix 2009; Graham, Ashworth & Tunbridge 2000: 17, 20–22; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998). Since 2002, the tourism industry has begun to modestly flourish in the village, both in terms of demand and supply.⁶

At present, tourism is the principal economic activity for six (9 percent) permanent residents – most of them recent internal migrants – and also up to ten individuals who do not live in the village, including three tourist entrepreneurs. Most of the employed population work in services, public administration and commerce in Figueira de Castelo Rodrigo, some two kilometres from the village; the others work in the ceramics factory near Castelo Rodrigo, construction, transport, agriculture, and also at the archaeological park of Foz Côa, classified as a World Heritage Site by Unesco in 1998.

In general, the residents have a positive view of tourism and tourists, particularly because they provide extra income to some people – albeit seasonally

and usually falling short of expectations and wishes. However, they complain about sacrificing their own interests, particularly in relation to their homes, in favour of the interests of the tourism sector.

Political Power and Rural Architecture

The municipal government of Figueira de Castelo Rodrigo has played a leading role in developing cultural tourism in the village. This role commenced in the early 1990s, when the municipal government promoted the preservation of the fortress walls and of the castle – which includes the ruins of the palace of Cristóvão de Moura (1538–1613)⁷ – in partnership with the national body in charge of these monuments. The project of the municipal political leaders would have a decisive impetus in 1995 with the integration of Castelo Rodrigo into a national programme, entitled *Programa de Recuperação de Aldeias Históricas de Portugal* (Recovery Programme for the Historic Villages of Portugal).

This programme forms part of rural development policies that have been promoting the growth of tourism in the rural areas of Portugal and other developed countries since the early 1990s (Abram & Waldren 1998; Jenkins, Hall & Troughton 1998; OECD 1994; Silva 2009a). Indeed, it sought to increase cultural tourism in twelve rural villages adversely affected by the de-ruralisation process. The aim was to preserve historic built heritage and, above all, use it as a lever of social and economic development though its tourist commoditisation. This comprises not only elements of military and religious architecture, such as castles and churches, but also elements of folk architecture, such as houses and barns (Silva 2009b).

Designed by the national government and the Commission for the Development and Coordination of the Central Region, the Historic Villages of Portugal programme was implemented – with European Union Funding – between 1995 and 2006, in cooperation with the historic conservation agencies (the former Portuguese Institute of Architectural Heritage and the former General Board of National Buildings and Monuments⁸), the National Institute for the Advantageous Use of Workers' Free Time, municipalities, and private actors.

The village of Castelo Rodrigo entered the programme because it met the criteria of “the existence of classified architectural heritage” and “historic and cultural interest.” Presented by the municipal government to the coordinating body, the Commission for the Development and Coordination of the Central Region, the application was based on the village plan designed by a team of architects from the city of Oporto, whose leader designed the “memorial of the ruins” in the castle and palace. The village plan identified what work was to be done in the village and in the built environment, private buildings included. The ultimate goal was to display them for tourism, in a process that John Urry would describe as “designing for the gaze” (Urry 1999: 220). In his view, “architects and architectural practices are of major importance in shaping the contemporary tourist gaze” (ibid.: 220).⁹ In the village of Castelo Rodrigo this can be clearly observed.

The built environment was put on display for tourists by architects, both the architects that designed the village plan and those working for historic conservation bodies. Almost all building projects were subject to tensions and power relations, particularly the church of Rocamadour and the public lighting.¹⁰ But the most contentious ones were those related to houses, which are the object of study in this text. To further understand the situation, it is important to look back in time and to move away from Castelo Rodrigo.

Interest in rural folk architecture emerged in the late nineteenth century, in a context marked by the impact of industrialisation on architecture, as well as by practices of national identity building (Lowenthal 1985, 1998; Samuel 1994). As shown by several authors (Leal 2000; Sobral 2004), in Portugal, as in other European countries, forms of rural architecture were converted into emblems of national identity, not only among the intellectuals who were debating the nation from the late nineteenth century until the 1970s, but also within the political regime of the *Estado Novo* (New State) dictatorship (1927–1974). For example, housing was one of the main criteria for measuring the *portugalidade* (Portugueseness) of the villages that competed in the *Aldeia mais por-*

tuguesa de Portugal (Most Portuguese Village) competition launched by the dictatorial regime in 1938.

There has been renewed interest in forms of rural architecture during the last thirty years, but in a different context. The aim is to promote cultural tourism, understood as a lever of socioeconomic development. In Portugal, as in other European countries, governments at all administrative levels have invested money to capitalise on forms of rural architecture, no longer understood as symbols of the nation, but rather of the place, of local heritage and culture (cf. Lindknud 1998; Rautenberg 2003). Here one witnesses a shift from heritage produced to trigger national identity to heritage produced for tourist consumption and economic profit (Rowan & Baram 2004). In Portugal, this can be visibly observed in the accommodation sector officially known as *Turismo no Espaço Rural* (Tourism in the Rural Space); this is a type of small-scale and familial tourist accommodation that includes agro-tourism (Silva 2009a, 2010). But it can also be seen in many political programmes that rehabilitate buildings and even entire villages for tourism in rural villages of the interior. This is the case, for example, of the *Villages of Saudade* in Minho, the *Villages of Xystus* in the central region, the *Water Villages* in Alentejo, and the *Historic Villages of Portugal* in the central region, which includes Castelo Rodrigo.

Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett's theorisation of heritage provides a useful tool to better understand the process. In her point of view, heritage practices endow objects, buildings, sites, technologies and ways of life with a "second life as heritage", a life "as exhibits of themselves". Having exhausted the initial function – the first life – they acquire new functions and values, or they are reborn as displays of what they once were. Moreover, the "rebirth" is intimately related to tourism, for tourism makes economically viable "as representations of themselves" buildings and practices that "can no longer sustain themselves as they formerly did" (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998: 149–151).

In this theoretical formulation, the two lives of buildings, objects and practices converted into heritage follow each other. This is the case, for example,

of material culture displayed in museums, as well as of derelict buildings converted into tourist accommodations. However, there are cases in which the second life of buildings and practices is concurrent with the first life. This applies, for example, to private architecture in Castelo Rodrigo – the houses serve simultaneously as homes for the village population and as representations of themselves, having both a first life as social habitats and a second life as heritage. It is the co-occurrence of first and second life in the same objects that I want to explore here.

The Two Lives of Housing

From the nineteenth until the mid-twentieth century in Castelo Rodrigo, domestic architecture tended to be built from local materials such as granite stone and mortar, often with rocky outcrops at the base; some houses were built into the fortress walls. Terraces were constructed over these, which obstructed the surrounding thoroughfare. As in other borderland rural villages in the central and northern regions of Portugal, the houses used to have two floors – the ground floor and the first floor. Typically, the ground floor was used for keeping animals or for the installation of the winepress and cellar, which not all residents possessed, particularly not the poorest among them. In some cases, there was also a bunk where single male children slept, while females slept in the bedroom. In addition, there was an "ashtray" where the ashes of the fireplace on the first floor were laid and thereafter used as fertiliser. The first floor also had a kitchen and one or two bedrooms. The doors and windows were made of wood and the roofs were supported by wooden beams, without slabs of reinforced concrete. To increase insulation, the more affluent owners tended to cover the stonework of the facades with mortar and whitewash, unlike the poor, who kept them uncovered.

Things started to change in the first decades of the twentieth century with the use of industrial or mass-produced materials, such as brick, concrete and aluminium, and the widespread use of whitewash and ink paints. The use of industrial materials on buildings became commonplace in the 1970s and 1980s. This was the result of action by various

groups of individuals then linked to the village: the *retornado* families; those who settled to work at the ceramics factory and other craftspeople; those who had immigrated, principally to France, and had built a home in the village with the money earned there; and those who lived continuously in Castelo Rodrigo.

They all invested in improving the living conditions of the old stone houses where they were born and lived – houses that were usually small, dark and with few rooms, separated by small partitions made of straw and clay. They had no electricity, running water or bathrooms;¹¹ in addition, the interior walls were blackened by smoke from the fireplace which the crudely-built chimney did not properly expel. This type of construction was not confined to the most modest homes; it was equally present in the homes of “rich people”, the main landowners, and the church. Therefore, many owners have added one floor of brick and reinforced concrete to the old stone houses; they have also replaced the old wooden doors and windows of the facade with new ones made from aluminium and iron; and they have transformed the ground floors into garages, bedrooms or storage rooms. Some of the poorer residents have built their houses by vertically expanding old barns, while some of the more affluent have expanded them horizontally by combining them with adjoining buildings.

In most cases, the houses were constructed in stages, according to the economic power of the owners: first the kitchen, then the bedrooms and the bathroom. The inhabitants of that period remember that “it was a time when everyone was building the houses in whatever way they could.” Modern materials represented novelty and were cheaper than traditional ones; the inhabitants of that period recall that “it was cheaper to make a brick wall than to make a stone wall,” as it is today. To sum up, the owners have been renovating and building their houses according to various factors, such as physical and social requirements, conceptions of home and domestic space, aesthetic preferences and budget constraints. Nevertheless, not all homeowners in Castelo Rodrigo have invested in the physical maintenance and

improvement of their houses; many left them to fall into ruin since they left the village and do not intend to return.

The municipal government of Figueira de Castelo Rodrigo began trying to control the built environment of the village of Castelo Rodrigo in the 1940s. At that time, it banned the whitewashing of facades and all works not authorised by the municipal technical services and by the national historic conservation body. The main aim was to prevent the eruption of “modernity” into the village, in defence of the prestigious brand of the past. But neither the municipal government nor the historic conservationists could make residents comply with the rules, largely because of lack of control and means. The residents of the time remember that “nobody attached importance to the works carried out in the village, neither the municipal government, nor the [former] Portuguese Institute of Architectural Heritage.” The only procedure that the municipal government saw complied with by most residents was the disguising of “modernity”, through the placement of small granite stones on the facades of buildings. This includes not only homes but also storerooms and garages that residents were building inside and outside the fortress walls.

The first application to integrate Castelo Rodrigo in the Historic Villages of Portugal programme was rejected by those in charge not only because of the advanced state of ruin of most buildings, but also because of the “modern” appearance of many others. The application was approved only when the architects who designed the village plan requested an appeal and claimed that it was an excellent opportunity to correct the situation of “ruin and contamination”. Since this decision of approval, both the historic conservation organisations and the municipal government have had more means and motivation at their disposal to control the built environment. This has drastically changed the evolutionary picture of domestic architecture in the village, thereby creating friction between house owners and historic conservation bodies, because the houses started to embody two different lives – a first life as social habitats for the village population and a second life as heritage.

Following a common trend in the study of heritage (Bendix & Hafstein 2009; De Cesari 2010; Hodges 2009; Smith 2004, 2006), the process could be described as a governmental practice, along the lines set out by Michel Foucault (1991, [1994]2002). For the author, the modern government of populations – “governmentality” – is exerted through “technologies” of power, that is, practices inspired and justified by one or more scientific rationales, according to contingent “strategies”. In his point of view, the exercise of power is a “conduct of conduct”, that is, an action that defines the possibilities for action of others (Foucault [1994]2002: 341).

Governmentality theory provides a useful framework to understand the case of Castelo Rodrigo, at least part of it. In this sense, the strategy of the national government and of the municipal government was to rationalise the built environment in order to create a tourist destination. Architectural knowledge functions as a technology of government that help to determine the conduct of individuals with respect to architecture and the aesthetic characteristics of buildings in the village. It is this organisation of space that I wish to explore now. In the process, some limitations of governmentality theory in the study of heritage will be unveiled. In brief, governmentality fails to make space for resistance and contestation to expert knowledge, and for interference in the conduct and subversion as well (see also Smith 2004).

The village plan sought to restore the buildings and return them to an earlier, premodern state; it is a process that Matt Hodges would describe as “symbolic antiquation”, “through which artefacts are reconstructed as *simulacra* of an imagined former state” (Hodges 2009: 77; italics in the original). To this end, it proposed to restore the buildings and to correct the “architectural dissonances”, that is, to eliminate the new and spurious elements, such as brick and aluminium, which contaminated the prestigious and legitimate materials of the past, such as stone and wood.

Michel Rautenberg’s findings in the study of rural heritage in France explain the situation. Experts see vernacular architecture and industrial architecture

as two different and incompatible architectures; they believe there is a *rupture* between these two architectures, in the same way they perceive a *rupture* between a traditional world and the contemporary world. By contrast, house owners see a *historical continuity* between both architectures, and they regard them as being compatible (Rautenberg 2003: 93).

This is what happened, and continues to happen, in the village of Castelo Rodrigo. Theoretically, the plan of physical intervention in buildings envisaged the following operations: restoration of facades; restoration and standardisation of roofs; removal of “modern” impurities from the facades and roofs (television antennas, balconies, gutter pipes, clothes lines and shutters); placement of wooden doors and windows in the facades; discovery of the stonework in facades with good masonry finishes; and covering of the facades with plaster and whitewash or paint in situations in which “this proves to be the original state of the building.” In practice, however, things developed in a different way, for various reasons.

For a start, the work was carried out in stages and funds came to an end before the renovation of all buildings had been completed. The work began to be carried out on buildings situated on the two main streets of the village, independently of their uses and functions. Over time, 105 private buildings underwent work on their facades and roofs, both inhabited and uninhabited, of a total of around 130. Included here are around 65 houses. Less than half of the houses are permanently lived in, one third of the remainder are used only as holiday or second homes, and the rest remain abandoned. Most of them belong to local people, some resident in the village and others in other parts of the country and abroad. The others belong to urban dwellers and outsiders from nearby villages.

The village population comprises 62 permanent residents and about 40 temporary residents, a third of them over 65 years. While 69 percent of permanent residents claim to be from the village, the other 31 percent are internal migrants – over two-thirds of them settled in the 1970s, either due to marriage or for the purposes of local employment; the others settled in the 2000s to work in the tourism sector.

The temporary residents comprise villagers who live and work elsewhere in the country and abroad, particularly in France, as well as half a dozen of recent second home owners; most of these have no prior connection with the village.

Another problem which confronted architects in the implementation of the village plan was the existence of many buildings constructed entirely or partly of bricks and concrete. In these cases, if there was no demolition, the architects decided to cover the facades with plaster and orange-coloured paint, solely because the region is rich in clay. This was also the reason why the stonework of the facades was enhanced through the use of a mortar with an orange tone in the joints. Many residents criticise the use of this mortar because rainwater washes it away and, they say, it makes their homes more porous and wet because the sand is too small and allows infiltrations.

Moreover, there has been resistance from the village population. The first wave of resistance came from the owners of buildings located outside the fortress walls. The architects envisaged their total or partial demolition, as they were “modern” buildings constructed within the protection zone of the national monument; the protection zone extends to fifty metres, counted from the external limits of the artefact. But the owners prevented this action in order to keep their homes and garages. This was the case, for example, of a farming couple in their sixties, whose house had been built in the 1980s with brick and concrete. In a conversation near her home, the owner recalls experiencing a period of great anguish and despair:

Since my childhood I had dreamed of having a house. My husband and I had worked a lifetime to realise this dream. And then the architects wanted to demolish it. I am a very anxious woman and one day, after some sleepless nights, I took my husband's gun and asked him to teach me to shoot it... if they destroy my house, I'll kill them; fortunately, this never happened.

Another example is the report of a garage owner in

his late seventies, collected in one of our regular conservations near the fortress walls:

One day the mayor of the municipal council came to me, accompanied by the architect, and said it was necessary to demolish the garage. And I told him: “you can demolish the garage, but only if you build me another one within the village.” When he told me that this was not possible, I replied: “so I keep the garage.”

The only work that these owners have consented to do was to remove the small granite stones that they had placed on the facades of buildings to disguise their “modernity”. The residents, despite acknowledging that “the small stones do not look good in a historic village,” have some difficulty in perceiving how it is possible that the authorities now want to undo work that they had made compulsory in previous years. This is the case, for example, of a resident in his early seventies who owns a “modern” house in the old town centre:

One day the workers of the company which restored some buildings here for the Historic Villages of Portugal [programme] came to change the roof of my house (...), and put up scaffolding all around it. I approached them and said: “What are you doing?” They said: “What are we doing!? We are removing the small granite stones from the facades.” And then I told them: “What the hell!? I walked so much, with my wife and a son, to find these stones, and bring them here on a donkey, to paste on the facades because the municipal government forced me, and now you rip them out... I do not understand any of this.” I know that it looks better that way, but the public authorities cannot play with people.

Resistance was also the attitude of the owners of buildings located within the fortress walls, particularly at an earlier stage. Their resistance was not motivated by economic reasons since the municipal government was offering the project and covered the percentage of costs that the programme claimed to

be the responsibility of private actors, ranging between 10 and 25 percent. The house owners resisted for fear of harming their own particular interests. This was because the municipal government would only fund the work if the conditions set by the architects were fulfilled; otherwise the grant was not awarded or was removed.

Meanwhile, the works were being carried out according to negotiations and power relations among concerned parties, principally architects and homeowners. As Henri Lefebvre notes, “the architect cannot simply draw, and cannot fail to consult orally (by means of the word) other actors implicated in the production of space, above all the user” (Lefebvre [1972]1976: 16). In Castelo Rodrigo, “in order to avoid conflicts,” the architects and other professionals negotiated the details of the works in each particular case with the homeowners. In some cases, they had to forego their rules – and what they saw as the right conduct – in order to achieve the goal of restoring the built environment. This is what happened with the aesthetic image of the buildings. Influenced by the priest Canário Martins (1911–2005), the residents demanded the uncovering of the stonework of the facades in all buildings, including cases in which according to the architects the buildings should have been covered with plaster and whitewash or paint, as in the past. The residents’ attitude is associated with a change in the meaning of visible stonework – in the past it was associated with poverty; now, instead, it stood for affluence and good taste.

There were also house owners who were able to impose conditions that ran counter to the architects’ plan. For example, a man in his fifties, then a member of the local government, managed to prevent the demolition of a “modern” balcony in his house on the main street. Likewise, a man of the same age only authorised the works on his home – also on the main street – when the architects responded to his desire to raise it to the level of an adjacent small tower – which currently functions as its private garden – and to keep a skylight in the roof. Similarly, the brother of the then mayor of the local government was able to build an additional floor in his home and to keep small granite stones in the facades.

On the contrary, most residents have had to abide by the stipulations in the architects’ plan. Some have seen their intentions to make an additional floor in their homes or to raise the ceiling of rooms – often to accommodate their children’s families when they come to visit – rejected; others have seen “modern” additions to buildings being demolished, such as balconies; and others, finally, have not been allowed to open windows on the facades and to put skylights in roofs, even in cases where the entrance of light is very reduced.

Over time, however, some procedures adopted by experts in the display of architecture for tourism have been overturned by the residents, as they have proved to be harmful to their interests. For example, some residents reinstalled gutter pipes and clothes lines in the facades of their houses because they are useful for housing, the first life of domestic spaces as social habitats (see ill. 1). Others reinstalled television antennas or satellite dishes on rooftops because the cable television in the village works badly. Among those who can afford it, some have also replaced the wooden doors and windows on the facades with others made of aluminium – albeit of a type that looks like wood. It turns out that the wood placed at the expense of the programme is of poor quality and warps in a short time, not providing proper insulation. The residents tend to say that they were deceived by the contractor’s work, but they blame the municipal government for not carrying out proper monitoring and supervision of the works; and they justify their actions by saying that they want to better insulate their homes.

The architects and historic conservation bodies have some difficulty in justifying to the residents the need to use “traditional” materials in private buildings, while at the same time using “modern” ones in public spaces. For example, they applied iron and steel in the ruins of the castle and of the palace of Cristóvão de Moura, and also in the tourist office. Moreover, they placed an aluminium door on the mortuary house built in 2001 near the church of Rocamadour. They also placed aluminium windows at the headquarters of the Association for the Development of Tourism for the Historic Villages of



Ill. 1: Visible stonework and gutter pipes in the facades of houses in Castelo Rodrigo. (Photo: Luís Silva, 2009)

Portugal built in 2009 at the location of the former primary-school building outside the fortress walls. The architects acknowledge the possibility of using “modern” materials in private architecture, but only in specific cases and when the work is controlled by experts.

The bodies responsible for historic conservation in Castelo Rodrigo, namely the municipal council and the Institute for the Management of Architectural and Archaeological Heritage, have no supervisors, and they only act when someone is reported or when their officials notice something wrong. Cases of fines levied on offenders or embargoes on works have been rare. As the architect of the municipal council points out in an interview at his office in the city hall,

We know there are misappropriations of space in Castelo Rodrigo, but we do not want to enter into open conflict with the residents. We want to keep the spaces lived in, and we know that residents have their needs. In the village, the housing conditions are difficult because of bad weather and improper insulation.

Aside from prohibiting new constructions within and around the fortress walls, the historic conservation rules severely restrict changes to the size and aesthetics of buildings. They also prohibit the installation of skylights in the roofs, and advocate the use of wooden doors and windows on the facades. Moreover, they require that all construction projects are signed off by an architect, and are subject to the judgment of the Institute for the Management of

Architectural and Archaeological Heritage. This is because the village and buildings are considered heritage that should be protected like a historic monument. And of course there is also tourism.

Tourism is also part of the rhetorical tactics used by architects in promoting respect for the historic conservation rules among the residents. They try to dissuade the residents from “damaging the village’s tourist image” by carrying out inappropriate works on the buildings; they argue that by doing so residents adversely affect their own interests, because Castelo Rodrigo will no longer attract tourists. The tourist image of the village, which the tourist experience usually reiterates, as many tourists said to me during face-to-face interviews and informal conversations, is that of a “medieval village”, “rustic” and “typical”, as if it were suspended in a kind of a mythical past, “out of real time and place” (MacCannell [1976]1999: 41). Hence, the architects strive to promote a voluntary interruption of time and accordingly freeze private architecture in time.

The tourist entrepreneurs and recent second home owners approve the architectural protectionism. They say that “it is fine that people are not allowed to do what they want on houses because it is important to preserve the tradition and old lines of buildings.” Therefore, they adamantly criticise the villagers who do not respect the rules. This is the case, for instance, of a second home owner, a lawyer in his early seventies, who usually lives in the city of Oporto:

Many people in Castelo Rodrigo still have a Romanic conception of property law and think they can do whatever they want with the buildings, such as using aluminium on outward-facing doors and windows and keeping and putting up garages as well. We are not in Roman times anymore, but the truth is that people are spoiling our heritage.

In Kirshenblatt-Gimblett’s (1998) terms, largely this is because the second life of houses as exhibits of themselves serves the private interests of both tourist entrepreneurs and second home owners; indeed,

as noted above, the second life was the leitmotiv of their influx into the village arena. For the former, it is an opportunity to earn money from tourism, or to take economic advantage of “the value of exhibition” (ibid.: 151). For the latter, by contrast, it is an opportunity to realise the “dream of a second home” (Bendix & Löfgren 2008: 12) in the countryside in order to enjoy periods of leisure, and one simultaneously endowed with a second life as heritage in a prestigious heritage ensemble, such as a Historic Village of Portugal. This applies to children of residents who live and work in cities and to other affluent city dwellers as well. Moreover, they all normally live in bigger and better insulated houses – houses made of two or three adjoining buildings and, in many cases, equipped with “modern” heating equipment and double-glazed windows in the facades; with these windows, they subvert the same cultural representation of housing as heritage that they advocate.

By contrast, most permanent residents resist the official appropriation of their living spaces, and strive to continue transforming the houses according to the needs and possibilities of the present. In other words, they strive to defend their first life as social habitats for the village population. They even say that “we are no longer masters of our own homes, and we cannot change them except as they [the historic conservationists] want.” They recognise the importance of the tourist image and the need for architectural rules, but they object to how strict those rules are and thus contest the conduct of conduct.

To further understand the situation, we must take into account that most houses are still quite small; many houses also have rocky outcrops in the interior that make the situation worse. In addition, their internal design does not conform to the physical and social requirements of a modern family, such as the need for plenty of light and individual bedrooms. Few residents indeed can afford to expand them either upwards or sideways because the historic conservation rules are restrictive of changes in the size of buildings and, principally, the house prices are very high. In the course of fieldwork I met three young couples who went to live in other places, principally Figueira de Castelo Rodrigo, precisely for these reasons.

Here one witnesses more clearly how the second life as exhibits of themselves suffocates the first life of houses as social habitats for the village population. The proliferation of tourism businesses and, principally, the increased level of second home ownership are actually hindering the social reproduction of the village population because they have raised the price of housing to the extent that local people can no longer afford to buy houses and the younger ones move away to other areas. The influx of wealthier individuals into Castelo Rodrigo is evident in the words of one resident in his fifties: “this village never had so many rich people as nowadays: a couple of judges, a lawyer, and five doctors.”

These are the main reasons why many permanent residents contend that they had to sacrifice their housing conditions for the benefit of the official version of the past and a tourist image. The testimony of one resident in her early seventies illustrates the point:

I wanted to raise the ceiling of a bedroom by fifty centimetres, because we cannot stand up right. One day the architects and an engineer working for the Historic Villages of Portugal programme at the expense of the municipal government came to me, and I showed them the bedroom. Then, they told me: “you cannot do it because it is forbidden to change the appearance of the houses in order to preserve the history of the village and also because of tourism.” I was furious, and I replied: “people do not live *from* appearances; the village’s history is the history of the past, present and future residents; what you are doing is turning Castelo Rodrigo into a ghost village, just with tourist accommodations and second homes, where some individuals come to stay a few days twice a year.”

The words of this lady also give good reason to refer back to Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett’s (1998) formulation that in their second life as heritage, the buildings, objects and practices become representations of themselves. She says that “people do not live from appearances,” and then goes on to accuse the architects of “turning Castelo Rodrigo into a ghost

village.” Here the notion of second life seems particularly fruitful, for of course second life may also refer to the afterlife. Ghosts, and ghost villages, may be thought of as a form of afterlife – “appearances”. Perhaps better yet, ghosts are often conceived of in popular tradition to be caught between this life and the afterlife, between their first and second life, much as is the case with the houses in Castelo Rodrigo.

Conclusion

The aim of this article was to understand what happens when domestic architecture is converted into cultural heritage by public authorities, in order to create tourist destinations. In other words, it set out to provide an ethnographic case study of the untidy details of how things actually work out on the ground when the heritage enterprise touches a space that is being lived in, and how this affects the social context. Theoretically, it speaks directly to Michel Foucault’s (1991) theory of “governmentality” and to Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett’s (1998) notion of “second life as heritage”. The study focuses on the rural village of Castelo Rodrigo in eastern Portugal.

From the perspective of governmentality theory, here one could see heritage as an act of government that mobilises expert technologies to define architecture as an object of touristic consumption and therefore to determine the conduct of conduct. The village plan could be seen as a pedagogical and disciplinary tool that architects designed to help to create appropriate buildings for tourism. The rules for architecture and the aesthetic characteristics of buildings could also be seen as having a similar disciplinary function in the village.

However, from the outcomes of the research, it is evident that, although useful for the study of heritage, governmentality theory does not provide an exact account of how things actually work out on the ground. Here is rich ethnographic evidence that the conduct of conduct is actually nowhere near as effective as its theoretical formulation might have us believe. There is friction in the channels, interference in the conduct, contestation, dissent, resistance and subversion, as well as compromise. The agendas

of the central government do not translate neatly into the technologies of experts and local authorities, though translation does take place, nor do these effectively shape the everyday practices of residents, though they do have a considerable effect.

In Castelo Rodrigo, architecture has become a major arena for social conflict in which different types of power relations are played out: the public authorities which initiated the heritage-making process; the experts who intend to shape the conduct of individuals; the building companies; the legal owners and users of houses; and the tourist entrepreneurs. Depending on circumstances, they all make use of or withdraw their power relations in order to promote their particular and often divergent interests. Ultimately, it is this struggle that governmentality theory fails to make room for in the study of heritage, as Laurajane Smith (2004) aptly reports with respect to archaeological expertise and knowledge in postcolonial settler societies such as Australia and the United States of America.

The data from Castelo Rodrigo also adds nuance to Kirshenblatt-Gimblett's (1998) theorisation of heritage as the second life of objects, buildings and practices as representations of themselves. Here one witnesses that the second life as heritage is not solely attributed to "obsolete", "outmoded", "dead" and "defunct" objects, buildings and practices as the theoretical formulation indicates, for the houses serve simultaneously as homes for the village population and as representations of themselves, having both a first life as social habitats and a second life as heritage. As it has also become clear in the article, the co-occurrence of first and second life in the same buildings is cause of friction between individuals and social groups with different interests. In brief, the historic conservation advocates strive to defend the second life of houses as exhibits of themselves, while most residents strive to defend the first life of their homes as dynamic social habitats which they want to continue to transform according to the needs and possibilities of the present.

Moreover, in Castelo Rodrigo the second life actually suffocates the first life. First, it freezes buildings in time, whereas previously they had been con-

stantly changing. Consequently, most residents are unable to continue to make improvements to their small houses because of restrictive disciplinary measures. Second, and principally, it hinders the social reproduction of the village population because it has raised the price of houses – and other buildings – to the extent that local people can no longer afford to buy houses and the younger ones move away to other areas. In addition to planning policies that prohibit new construction within and around the fortress walls, this is the result of the influx of wealthier individuals into the village arena, looking for tourism businesses and, principally, for second homes, as is often the case in popular rural areas (cf. Sharpley & Sharpley 1997: 142).

The connexion between the second life as heritage and tourism is hardly surprising, for of course they are interdependent (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998: 151). It is also no big surprise that tourism has modest effects on the local economy, and falling short of expectations and wishes. Indeed, in Portugal the effective contribution of tourism in rural regeneration tends to be reduced (Cavaco 1995; Silva 2009a, 2010), as it is often the case in Western Europe, although some authors might have us believe the opposite (e.g., Greffe 1994; Timothy & Boyd 2003: 45–46, 171, 187). What is remarkable is the connexion between the second life as heritage and second homes, although some authors regard them as a form of tourism (Jaakson 1986; Sharpley & Sharpley 1997; Strapp 1988). In Castelo Rodrigo, the main appeal of the second home is its second life as heritage. In addition, the second life proved to be better suited for a second home than for a first home, for different reasons.

On the one hand, the physical and social requirements of a modern family such as the need for plenty of light and ample space are somehow not as important in second homes as in first homes, for of course people spend more time in a first home than in a second home, particularly those attributable to leisure pursuits – although a second home may become a first home over the course of time (Bendix & Löfgren 2008: 14); as a lady quoted above says, in Castelo Rodrigo most second home owners "come to

stay for a few days twice a year.” On the other hand, the second home owners overtly defend the cultural representation of houses as exhibits of themselves that attracts them. Normally, the appeal of vernacular architecture is also mirrored in the interior of houses, which the owners furnish with what they describe as “antique” and “rustic” objects, much like the facades.

The lesson we learn from Castelo Rodrigo may also help in understanding other places and heritage practices in general. The dissonant and contested nature of heritage (see Tunbridge & Ashworth 1996; Graham, Ashworth & Tunbridge 2000; Herzfeld 1991; Smith 2006) is particularly strong when it focuses on cultural resources that are being lived in and are deemed to be inalienable possessions by a segment of the owners and practitioners, and are seen as resources for tourism or collective memory by others. The same objects, buildings and practices then become a major arena for social tension and conflict between individuals and groups with different interests and points of view regarding their purposes.

With respect to housing, heritage advocates strive to create a fixed cultural representation of domestic architecture and thus to control architecture and the aesthetic characteristics of buildings. By contrast, most homeowners resist the official appropriation of their social habitats, for various reasons. First, the new set of rules and interdictions surrounding heritage changes their lifetime practices of building and transforming houses according to contingent circumstances. Second, they see it as an illegitimate interference in private domains, which runs counter to their particular interests, for the houses no longer provide appropriate living conditions as they once did. Third, they do not benefit significantly from heritage-making, and do not feel compensated by the corresponding constraints. Heritage practices normally do not improve the living conditions and livelihoods of ordinary people, since the work on the buildings tends to focus on facades and roofs, and the economic benefits of tourism accrue mainly to the more affluent and influential residents. Fourth, they may feel resentful of the fact that their place

has been taken over by wealthy outsiders looking for tourism businesses and second homes, and they have to move away because of high house prices and restrictive disciplinary measures.

Thus, there are good reasons to keep houses that are being lived in out of the heritage domains. On the one hand, the construction of heritage is likely to adversely affect the interests and even the welfare of local populations, particularly ordinary people (cf. Herzfeld 1991). On the other hand, it also adversely affects the first life of houses as social habitats for the local populations. As such, heritage status should be accorded solely to buildings whose initial functions are already dead or extinct. Otherwise, it is necessary to reconcile the protection of cultural heritage with the people’s need to live in the structure, and thereby give more importance to the social component than to the aesthetic component.

The case of Castelo Rodrigo can also be taken into account in the study of heritage (either “tangible” or “intangible”), as well as in culture theory. Here one sees clearly that we must delve beneath the surface of the cultural phenomena into the messiness of daily practices, in order to understand how things actually work out on the ground. Ethnographic case studies are not only particularly pertinent in revealing “the local specificity of a global heritage regime” (Bendix 2009: 255). They also allow us to base our theoretical discussions on strong empirical foundations and see the limitations of abstract formulations in understanding the “real world”.

Notes

- 1 The study was made possible by a *Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia* (Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology) research grant (SFRH/BPD/34229/2006). I thank this institution for its support. I also thank the anonymous *Ethnologia Europaea* reviewer for the productive comments and suggestions on a previous version of this article. Finally, I thank the inhabitants of Castelo Rodrigo for their indispensable contribution to this study.
- 2 The Manueline, or Portuguese late Gothic, is the ornate Portuguese style of architecture of the first decades of the sixteenth century, incorporating maritime elements and representations of the discoveries.
- 3 An artefact is considered to be of “public interest”

when its protection and enhancement represent a cultural value of national importance, but for which the system of protection for “national monuments” is considered disproportionate.

- 4 I began to explore the case of Castelo Rodrigo in a short paper recently published (Silva 2011) but the theoretical approach here is completely different.
- 5 The presence of tourists in the village dates back at least to the 1970s; on March 6, 1980, the local government “decided that effort would be made to ban begging from the foreigners who visit this parish.”
- 6 Since it opened in 2002, the tourist office has almost continuously registered a growing number of tourists annually. The historic maximum was reached in 2009 with 47,731 tourists, most of them Portuguese, followed by Spaniards due to geographical proximity; the great majority of tourists do not stay overnight in the village. With respect to supply, the local tourism industry comprises: two small tourist guesthouses, a café, a teahouse, a gourmet food store, a tourist office, and three shops selling antiques, handicrafts and local products located in the old town centre; in the outskirts, there is also a local shop, a restaurant, a camping and a leisure park with an outdoor pool.
- 7 The palace was built in the sixteenth century by the Marquis of Castelo Rodrigo, Cristóvão de Moura. Officially, the palace was burnt down by the inhabitants in the 1640s, after the Restoration of Portuguese Independence, because the Marquis had supported Castilian domination over the country. Explored by the municipal government, the ruin is now a pay to enter tourist attraction.
- 8 These two bodies disappeared in 2007 with the creation of the Institute for the Management of Architectural and Archaeological Heritage.
- 9 The “tourist gaze” describes the visual consumption of signs or symbols considered extraordinary from a culturally specific viewpoint and thus worthy of viewing (Urry [1990]2002). “Once people visit places outside capital cities and other major centres, what they find pleasurable are buildings which seem appropriate to a place and which mark that place off from others” (Urry 1999: 224).
- 10 For example, most inhabitants signed a petition against the replacement of old street lamps by modern ones, but they were not successful in achieving the purpose.
- 11 The village has had electricity since 1970, mains water since 1987 and sanitation since 1988.

References

Abram, S. & J. Waldren (eds.) 1998: *Anthropological Perspectives on Local Development*. London: Routledge.
 Bendix, R. 2009: Heritage between Economy and Politics: An

Assessment from the Perspective of Cultural Anthropology. In: L. Smith & N. Akagawa (eds.), *Intangible Heritage*. Oxon, New York: Routledge, pp. 253–269.
 Bendix, R. & O. Löfgren 2008: Double Homes, Double Lives? *Ethnologia Europaea* 37:1–2, 7–15.
 Bendix, R. & V. Hafstein 2009: Culture and Property: An Introduction. *Ethnologia Europaea* 39:2, 5–10.
 Cavaco, C. 1995: Tourism in Portugal: Diversity, Diffusion, and Regional and Local Development. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 86:1, 64–71.
 De Cesari, C. 2010: Creative Heritage: Palestinian Heritage NGOs and Defiant Arts of Government. *American Anthropologist* 112:4, 625–637.
 Foucault, M. 1991: Governmentality. In: G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 87–104.
 Foucault, M. (1994)2002: *Power (Essential Works of Foucault. 1954–1984, Vol. 3)*. J. Faubion (ed.), R. Hurley & others (trans.). London: Penguin Books.
 Graham, B., G. Ashworth & J. Tunbridge 2000: *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy*. London: Arnold Press.
 Gravari-Barbas, M. (ed.) 2005: *Habiter le patrimoine: Enjeux, approches, vécu*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.
 Greffe, E. 1994: Is Rural Tourism a Lever for Economic and Social Development? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 2:1, 22–40.
 Herzfeld, M. 1991: *A Place in History – Social and Monumental Time in a Cretan Town*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
 Hodges, M. 2009: Disciplining Memory: Heritage Tourism and the Temporalisation of the Built Environment in Rural France. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 15:1, 76–99.
 Jaakson, R. 1986: Second Home Domestic Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 13, 367–391.
 Jenkins, J., M. Hall & M. Troughton 1998: The Restructuring of Rural Economies: Rural Tourism and Recreation as a Government Response. In: R. Butler, C. Hall & J. Jenkins (eds.), *Tourism and Recreation in Rural Areas*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 43–65.
 Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. 1998: *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums, and Heritage*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.
 Leal, J. 2000: *Etnografias Portuguesas (1870–1970): Cultura Popular e Identidade Nacional*. Lisbon: Dom Quixote.
 Lefebvre, H. (1972)1976: *Espacio y Política: El Derecho a la Ciudad, II*. Barcelona: Ediciones Peninsula.
 Lefebvre, H. (1974)1991: *The Production of Space*. D. Nicholson-Smith (trans.). Oxford, Malden: Blackwell.
 Lindknud, C. 1998: When Opposite Worldviews Attract: A Case of Tourism and Local Development in Southern France. In: S. Abram & J. Waldren (eds.), *Anthropological*

- Perspectives on Local Development*. London: Routledge, pp. 141–159.
- Lowenthal, D. 1985: *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lowenthal, D. 1998: *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacCannell, D. (1976)1999: *The Tourist: A New Theory of Leisure Class*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.
- Macleod, D. 2010: Power, Culture and the Production of Heritage. In: D. Macleod & J. Carrier (eds.), *Tourism, Power and Culture: Anthropological Insights*. Bristol, Buffalo & Toronto: Channel View Publications, pp. 64–89.
- OECD 1994: *Tourism Strategies and Rural Development*. Paris: OECD.
- Rautenberg, M. 2003: *La Rupture Patrimoniale*. Paris: A la Croisée.
- Rowan, Y. & U. Baram 2004: Archaeology after Nationalism: Globalization and the Consumption of the Past. In: Y. Rowan & U. Baram (eds.), *Marketing Heritage: Archaeology and the Consumption of the Past*. Walnut Creek, Calif.: Altamira Press, pp. 3–26.
- Samuel, R. 1994: *Theatres of Memory. Volume 1: Past and Present in Contemporary Culture*. London & New York: Verso.
- Sharpley, R. & J. Sharpley 1997: *Rural Tourism: An Introduction*. Oxford: International Thomson Business Press.
- Silva, L. 2009a: *Casas no Campo: Etnografia do Turismo Rural em Portugal*. Lisbon: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais.
- Silva, L. 2009b: Heritage Building in the ‘Historic Villages of Portugal’: Social Processes, Practices and Agents. *Journal of Ethnology and Folkloristics* 3:2, 75–91.
- Silva, L. 2010: Perspectiva antropológica do turismo de habitação em Portugal. *Pasos: Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural* 8:1, 31–46, on-line http://www.pasosonline.org/Publicados/8110/PS0110_3.pdf. Accessed May 30, 2011.
- Silva, L. 2011: Folk Architecture Heritagization in Rural Portugal. In: X. Roigé & J. Frigolé (eds.), *Constructing Cultural and Natural Heritage: Parks, Museums and Rural Heritage*. Girona: Institut Català de Recerca en Patrimoni Cultural, pp. 135–145.
- Smith, L. 2004: *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*. New York: Routledge.
- Smith, L. 2006: *Uses of Heritage*. New York: Routledge.
- Sobral, J. 2004: O genuíno, o espúrio e a identidade local: Um estudo de caso das políticas de património em meio rural. *Etnográfica* 8:2, 243–271.
- Strapp, J. 1988: Resort Cycle and Second Homes. *Annals of Tourism Research* 15, 504–516.
- Timothy, D. & S. Boyd 2003: *Heritage Tourism*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Tunbridge, J. & G. Ashworth 1999: *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. Chichester, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Urry, J. 1999: Gazing on History. In: D. Boswell & J. Evans (eds.), *Representing the Nation: A Reader. Histories, Heritage and Museums*. London & New York: Routledge, pp. 208–232.
- Urry, J. (1990) 2002: *The Tourist Gaze*. 2nd edition. London: Sage.

Lúis Silva is a post-doctoral research fellow at the Centre for Research in Anthropology, Universidade Nova de Lisboa (CRIA/FCSH-UNL). His principal research interests include rural dynamics and the anthropology of tourism, focusing specifically on the making of heritage and tourism products in rural areas, as well as on the local impact of tourism and the heritage enterprise. He has published the book *Casas no Campo: Etnografia do Turismo Rural em Portugal* (Houses in the countryside: Ethnography of rural tourism in Portugal) (Lisboa: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, 2009). (luis.silva98@gmail.com)