

## **Correspondence between territories and identities: a heritage construction?**

Guest editors, Véronique Boyer (*CNRS, Mondes Américains*) and Emilie Stoll (*IRD, UMR PALOC*)

Recent literature underlines that present-day heritage field's stake lies in transforming of an ordinary into a remarkable good, in other words, its valorisation. An increasing number of studies show how social collectives and institutions 'manufacture' heritage across the world. These constructions are complex, and their meaning is unclear. Heritage elaboration and reappropriation may take diverse shapes, for example in museums or for tourism. Similarly, the different types of mediators and contractors (public institutions, NGOs or events) prompting heritage creation are not always central in its development. It seems that adopting the populations' views allows appropriating the heritage idea in multiple ways. Researchers face a broad range of singular situations, multiple conceptions of heritage, an intense flow of notions, interactions between many actors, and the setting-up of 'heritage communities' typified by ethnogenesis, administrative territories or AOC certification.

It seems possible to address in those terms the deployment of State territorial policies. These policies 'distinguish'. They try to increase the value of areas by conferring them a specific administrative status or assigning them to a particular use. Examples are natural parks, archaeological sites, Indian reservations, administrative districts, or industrial zones. They also grant these areas their own human and financial resources. In other words, the territorial mosaic observed on maps has a legal basis, real or desired. This basis is negotiated at different – local to international – levels, and by different actors such as people, third-sector, public institutions, private interests or professional organisations.

While 'thinking heritage' has turned into a leitmotif for various actors, we often note a strong link between the 'distinction' (or the promotion) of territories and institutional categories. These categories have a premise of 'identity', and combine notions such as 'authenticity', 'tradition' and 'indigenusness'. People deemed to bear certain identity attributes – like ethnicity for the Zulu, know-how for Beaujolais winemakers, or archaeological remains for the emerging Indians – are assigned a space labelled with a matching status – a Park, an AOC, an archaeological site. Spatial insertion and identity claims appear intertwined: the territory confirms the identity while identity legitimises the territory. And 'heritage development' aims at legitimising the correlation between identity and territory.

In this issue, we intend to look specifically at the implications stemming from this correlation imperative. Contributions will explore the sociological dynamics of identity and territorial heritage making through cases drawn from the Global South and the conditions of emergence of the analysed phenomena. The proposed articles will fit in one of the three following strands:

1 – Strategies of actors in heritage development. To gain recognition as actors whose action is 'legitimate' or 'worthy' of heritage, local populations and their intermediaries develop stories about their past and 'tradition' grounded in space and unquestionably unique. Translating, negotiating, and transforming heritage depends on their insertion in a local political field and on their dialogue – or absence of dialogue – with various external stakeholders, institutional or not. It aims to make their territorial claims undeniable, as well as to distinguish their living space from that of close neighbours that are not always foreigners.

2 – Territorial overlapping and competing identity claims. The identity positioning of populations is contradictory and conflicting in an increasing number of cases: the legal status of groups change while internal conflicts involving competing territorial claims weaken others. This issue aims to describe and define these strategies and positioning within the possibilities opened by the emergence of heritage as a field.

3 – Geometrically variable forms of indigenusness. The plea for indigenusness takes various forms: emphasis on an emotional link, anchoring to a place, or inclusion in a specific social network. The granting of autochthonous status is variable, negotiated through short-term alliances, and sometimes, denied. This is what the difference between ‘being here’ and ‘being from here’ refers to. In other words, how many generations does it take to be considered as a real ‘native’? And how does this reflect in the speech of heritage actors?

This thematic issue will explore the relationship at play between identity and territory around the concept of heritage. The approach will be interdisciplinary, across different geographical areas.

### **Procedure and schedule**

Proposals (not exceeding 1,000 signs including title) should be addressed to the journal **before December 25, 2016**

Authors will be informed in the course of January about the acceptance or the refusal of their proposal.

The articles selected have to be submitted by **May 31, 2017**.

Book reviews on the topic of this issue must be sent to the journal *Autrepart* before **September, 30, 2017**

Articles should be written in French or English. The title, abstract and keywords must be provided in both languages. The Drafting Committee accepts manuscripts written in Spanish and Portuguese, providing the author, upon selection of his or her manuscript for publication, assumes the costs related to the translation. The manuscripts will be submitted to two anonymous referees for approval. The Drafting Committee will send correction proposals to the author.

**Revue Autrepart** – 45 rue des Saints-Pères – 75006 Paris

<http://www.cairn.info/revue-autrepart.htm>

Merci d’envoyer vos messages à la revue à : [autrepart@ird.fr](mailto:autrepart@ird.fr) avec copie à [revue.autrepart@gmail.com](mailto:revue.autrepart@gmail.com)