

Editors' Introduction

In the editorial article published in the *International Journal of Heritage Studies* in late 2012, addressing the creation of the Association of Critical Heritage Studies in that same year, Laurajane Smith stresses that for scholars invested in the new, “critical” paradigm of studying heritage the resolute focus on cultural dimensions is crucial. Heritage is “primarily a cultural phenomenon, and not something simply subject to technical and policy debate” (535; emphasis added). It is a “political act” embedded in specific political contexts and dynamics and subject to particular power relations, as the manifesto of the newly formed association emphasized. Many methodological and analytical consequences resulted from this repositioning of heritage. Its foundational corollary was the need to critically question the formation of what Smith called the “Authorized Heritage Discourse” (AHD), the dominant, patently Eurocentric discourse that shapes the “matter” of heritage studies and the “international value and legitimacy of heritage itself,” frequently obscuring its political (and social and cultural) causes, uses, and consequences—as well as its various connections to configurations of identity and personal and interpersonal relations among its actors—and valuing instead “technical” appreciations and economic rationales and interests. In many ways, heritage is a political resource, contentious and consequential, begging for a constant reflection on its definition—from an exclusively material delineation to one more attentive to “the complexities of the cultural activities” it mediates—as well as on its uses and implications (537, 540).

Echoing and extending these ideas in a widely cited 2013 article, “Clarifying the Critical in Critical Heritage Studies,” Tim Winter describes the dominant contemporary directions in the field as “bringing a critical perspective to bear upon the socio-political complexities that enmesh heritage” and “tackling the thorny issues those in the conservation profession are often reluctant to acknowledge,” while offering his aspirational definition of the “critical” perspective on heritage as aimed at “better understanding [of] the various ways in which heritage now has a stake in, and can act as a positive enabler for, the complex, multi-vector challenges that face us today, such as cultural and environmental sustainability, economic inequalities, conflict resolution, social cohesion and

the future of cities, to name a few” (533). The dynamically evolving objectives and the expansive scope of scholarly work that falls under the umbrella of critical heritage studies are well represented in this issue of *Portuguese Literary and Cultural Studies*, which addresses itself not only to the geocultural territories that coincide with the historical reach of the Portuguese Empire but also to the diasporic heritage practices of Portuguese-speaking immigrant communities in other parts of the world, in this case represented by the United States.

The idea of organizing an issue of *PLCS* around the topic of Lusophone heritage(s) arose in the context of Miguel Bandeira Jerónimo’s appointment as Hélio and Amélia Pedroso/Luso-American Foundation Endowed Chair in Portuguese Studies at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth in Spring 2019, when he co-organized (with Anna M. Klobucka and Walter Rossa) a state-of-the-art conference on “Heritages(s) of Portuguese Influence: Histories, Spaces, Texts, and Objects” on April 5, 2019. As editors of the volume that grew out of the conference, we are grateful to all of the participants for their brilliant presentations, several of which form the core of this issue, as well as to all of the sponsors whose support made the conference and its satellite events possible: the Hélio and Amélia Pedroso/Luso-American Foundation Endowment and the Center for the Portuguese Studies and Culture and the Department of Portuguese at UMass Dartmouth; the PhD program in Heritages of Portuguese Influence and the UNESCO Chair in Intercultural Dialogue in Heritages of Portuguese Influence at the University of Coimbra; Camões, I.P.; the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation; and the Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia, through the funded research project “The worlds of (under)development: processes and legacies of the Portuguese colonial empire in a comparative perspective (1945-1975)” (PTDC/HAR-HIS/31906/2017 | POCI-01-0145-FEDER-031906).

Although most articles in this volume reference extended timelines, often spanning several centuries, they are arranged here in a roughly chronological order, following Jerónimo and Rossa’s introductory article, which surveys the history of heritagization in “spaces of Portuguese influence” during the late colonial period and the first decades after decolonization. Arguing that “the study of the historical intersections between trajectories of decolonization, heritage discourses and repertoires, and international and local dynamics is crucial to a much-needed critical history of heritagization,” Jerónimo and Rossa lay out this process’s main temporal and epistemic markers and identify its leading dynamics and challenges, producing a concise prospective framing for the more focused and detailed analyses that follow.

A period of more than a century within the temporal span of Portugal's so-called Third Empire (from the independence of Brazil in 1822 to decolonization) is surveyed in Joana Brites's article on the establishment and evolution of colonial public works services, which details their evolving organization and the politics inflecting their development, beginning with the original legal decree that addressed this matter in 1869 and ending with the demise of the Estado Novo regime in 1974. While Pedro Schacht Pereira's contribution also considers the *longue durée* of the Portuguese empire, his medium is that of intellectual history, more specifically an archeological excavation of the historical roots and building blocks of the still-influential doctrine of Lusotropicalism, which buttressed Portugal's colonial claims in the twentieth century and continues to haunt the Lusophone postcolony as arguably the most pervasive ideological legacy of the imperial era.

The focus on material heritage, albeit from a perspective that is keenly attentive to the political and symbolic dimensions of heritage building, returns in Walter Rossa's likewise *longue durée* examination of the city of Goa, from its designation as the center of the Portuguese Estado da Índia in the 1530s and its consequent urban development; its decline and decay over several centuries; and the inclusion of its "churches and convents" in UNESCO's World Heritage List in 1986, two and a half decades after Goa's decolonization and incorporation into the Republic of India. The heritage-building process is also the subject of Márcia Chuva's article on the evolution and the present state of cultural heritage policies and the uses of the past in Brazil. Following a detailed description of the presence of Brazilian objects in UNESCO's lists of World Heritage and Heritage of Humanity, both material and intangible, and an assessment of the heritage policies implemented by Brazil's National Historical and Artistic Heritage Institute, Chuva takes up as her case study the heritagization of the Ruins of São Miguel das Missões, an arena on which distinct paradigms of heritage definition and preservation can be observed to coexist and compete.

The expansive and problematizing view of what counts as "heritage" that this issue seeks to foster is borne out by Abel Djassi Amado's examination of the Cabo Verde branch of União Nacional, the political party supporting the Estado Novo dictatorial regime. The complex and intricate process of establishing the branch in the second half of the 1930s offers the opportunity to examine the articulation of regional political ideas and ideologies in the context of the competing interests of nativism and what Amado dubs as "metropolitanism," as well as the

clash between different sectors of local elites (representing, respectively, Praia and Mindelo). Moving closer to our twenty-first-century present, the following two articles concern themselves with the memorialization of imperial history in contemporary Portugal. Elsa Peralta demonstrates that major public representations of the nation's collective identity remain dependent on the memory of the Portuguese empire, with the casting of Portugal as the modern-world pioneer of cultural dialogue on a global scale having become a core feature of the country's contemporary brand image. For her part, Inês Beleza Barreiros examines the political forces at work in evolving conceptualizations of the "heritage of Portuguese influence," arguing that earlier Portuguese concepts of heritagization (such as "World's Luso Heritage," "Portuguese Origin," "Portuguese World Art," and "Portuguese Heritage around the World") have often erased the colonial violence inherent in the scattering of this heritage around the world and has promoted instead the construction of an aestheticized and sanitized vision of Portugal's imperial past.

Outside of the state-sponsored and academic spheres where formal processes of heritagization are developed and conceptualized lie the many creative uses to which twentieth- and twenty-first-century Lusophone artists have put the remnants of the Portuguese empire. In her contribution to this issue, Ana Balona de Oliveira surveys a wide spectrum of works by African and Portuguese artists, whose birth dates range from 1958 to 1983, examining them as ethico-political interventions that appropriate and disrupt sculptural, architectural, and linguistic structures left behind by the empire and its history in order to confront systemic coloniality in the postcolonial present and to imagine decolonized futures. Similarly, albeit with reference to a different art form, Mirian Tavares considers the ways in which several cinematographers from former Portuguese colonies in Africa (Mozambique, Cabo Verde, and Guinea-Bissau) "inhabit the ruins" of colonialism, facing the past "não numa atitude de lamentação, mas sim numa postura de reconstrução, ou melhor, de adaptação e mudança, de transformação."

The final two articles in the volume situate their inquiries in immaterial heritage building by Portuguese-speaking communities on the East Coast of the United States, more specifically in New York and New Jersey. Kimberly DaCosta Holton explores the evolution of fado performance in New Jersey following the closing of Newark's last *casa de fado*, which led to the hybridization of performance spaces and audiences as well as to the emergence of a more heterogeneous collective of fado performers and *aficionados*, setting her discussion

against the background of a history of ethnic tensions in Newark's Ironbound neighborhood. In the second article, which centers on a comparative analysis of the annual celebrations of the Portugal Day in Newark in June and Brazilian Day in New York City in September, Krista Brune reflects on how the two main Lusophone diasporic communities in the New York metropolitan area articulate their respective forms of community, collective memory, and embodied culture through these festivals.

The two reviews that complement the article section reinforce the diversified and expanded understanding of "heritages of Portuguese influence" pursued throughout this issue. Daniel da Silva's review of Rui Vieira Nery's history of fado stresses the always already multicultural and multiracial roots and developmental pathways of this quintessentially Portuguese musical art form. Carmen Ramos Villar reviews Alberto Peña Rodríguez's history of the Portuguese American press as a revealing study of political and cultural community building in the diaspora. All in all, we hope that this volume of *PLCS* contributes to the ongoing developments and debates in the field of Lusophone critical heritage studies in ways that are at the same time constructive and deconstructive but that, in any case, expand the field's boundaries and productively complicate the paradigms governing its concerns, definitions, and policies.

MIGUEL BANDEIRA JERÓNIMO is Associate Professor of History at the University of Coimbra (Portugal).

ANNA M. KLOBUCKA is Commonwealth Professor of Portuguese and Women's and Gender Studies at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth.

WALTER ROSSA is Professor in the Department of Architecture at the University of Coimbra.