Introduction : Heritage Practices in Africa

Introduction:
Heritage Practices in Africa

Taku Iida
National Museum of Ethnology

As the World Heritage movement has been popularized by the mass media in the second half of the last century, certain aspects of cultural studies and art history have been incorporated into heritage studies (Harvey 2001), a field that has also branched into areas of tourism studies, sociology, and economics. Despite this interdisciplinary environment, the voices of cultural anthropologists remain a minority. However, it is important to recognize their potential to make a significant contribution to the heritage field as analysts of integrative cultural phenomena.

This introductory essay reviews recent movements concerning the topic of heritage, both internationally authorized and unofficial cultural assets. In doing so, it aims to underline the importance of integrating heritage with contemporary cultural practices and, by examining case studies from several African countries, to raise the profile of new perspectives and practices of cultural heritage in Africa today.

1. The Relational and Systemic Nature of Cultural Phenomena

In the 1980s, it was said that cultural anthropologists lost the right to lead or monopolize the discourse regarding culture (Clifford 1988). However, the anthropological way of thinking should still be regarded as an effective approach to analyze various aspects of a culture by exploring the topic within a variety of social, geographical, and historical contexts. For this reason, anthropologists may be acknowledged as "analysts of integrative cultural phenomena," but should not be privileged as cultural "experts."

Anthropologists' contribution to the field of heritage studies offers a potentially valuable resource as it can assist in articulating the processes behind cultural phenomena. Such phenomena have often tended to be oversimplified, particularly by the mass media, journalists, and TV editors, who often reduce the term "culture" to merely a label describing the creative arts, such as paintings, sculptures, music, and performances.

Therefore, if we adhere to this configuration of the term "culture," the concept becomes associated with a collection of works produced by artists or experts. In reality, however, culture is not limited to narrow definitions. In the 1970s, cultural anthropologists were accustomed to defining culture as a complex entity, comprising language, bodily techniques, subsistence technologies, the economy, social relations, beliefs, myths, and so on (Kluckhohn and Kelly 1945; Tylor 1958).

Although this functionalist definition became outdated because of the challenges of "liquid modernity" whereby components of culture were observed to be changing too rapidly before people became accustomed to them (Giddens 1991; Bauman 2000), culture was and still is, according to anthropological perspectives, something maintained and recreated by ordinary people through their daily lives and practices.

Even in cultural studies that have stressed the role of power and resistance, culture is regarded as relative to and contingent upon people's political orientation and negotiation with those considered outside of that specific culture (Hall 2007). The relational and systematic aspects of culture or, in other words, cultural products and processes, should therefore be considered when we engage with the topic of culture in our daily lives.

The same is true for cultural heritage. The public still tends to view cultural heritage as representative of "great works" and tends to appreciate it only from its outward appearance (Nielsen 2011). Since the mid-1990s, however, its meaning has been undergoing rapid redefinition. The term "heritage" is now beginning to imply not only authoritative physical objects, but also intangible cultural products related to human practices. The interactive process of "heritage-making" is summarized in the following sections.

Music is a good example of this. It is not merely a certain sound, note, tune, or even piece, but a process produced by one or many instruments and actors, including players, composers, producers, and consumers (Small 1998). It is an organic web of objects and people acting around a tune that forms the core of its essence. "Safeguarding" this kind of heritage not only entails preserving musical scores and recorded sources, but also concerns the continuation of the processes surrounding its production.

In recent years, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), which has promoted the World Heritage brand, has popularized a new form of heritage under the term "Intangible Cultural Heritage." However, this movement has been criticized for fossilizing and fragmenting aspects of culture. By referring to it as Intangible Cultural Heritage, it has been argued that this process of intended safeguarding results in the opposite effect, cutting up the web of objects and practices (Stefano 2012). The discourse regarding heritage, therefore, is in a process of radical redefinition and change.

In this context, anthropologists can play an essential part in reminding the public that heritage consists of organic ties between objects, practices, and people, forming a complex web of relations that feed into their daily lives and individual and collective identity. How such heritage objects and practices are organized and reorganized with respect to people is a matter for further anthropological inquiry. As Raymond Williams says, cultural heritage "can never be reduced to its artifacts while it is being lived" (Williams 1960: 343; quoted in Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1995). For this reason, this volume deals with what will be termed "heritage practices" rather than with cultural heritage as a concept.

2. Primary Versus Secondary Heirs

Today, more than ever, the shift of focus from physical objects to intangible practices requires increasing reflection and deeper engagement. For example, if UNESCO designates a residential building as a World Heritage site, it would become difficult to change its physical appearance even when residents require modernization or refurbishment. When something is officially designated as heritage, there are imposed limits and restrictions that infringe on the proprietors' rights. From the proprietors' perspective, however, it is important to maintain and improve (sometimes making changes in a manner undesirable to others) to features of the property to suit everyday demands and requirements. If the proprietors' needs are to be fully respected, authorities may run into difficulties as they may be unable to perform their duty to preserve heritage *in situ*.

This example shows the multiple levels of heritage, with the local often at odds with, and competing against, the universal. Therefore, the value of heritage at the local level—as it is perceived by proprietors, residents, caretakers, and other individuals or organizations directly concerned with it—does not necessarily correspond to its value as perceived by those at the universal level, who traditionally regard heritage as a common property of all humankind. For the purposes of this volume, the former type of people who engage with heritage at the local level will be called the "primary heirs," whereas the latter who respect its universal value will be called the "secondary heirs."

It is important to stress, however, that primary and secondary heirs are not mutually exclusive categories, but represent the extreme poles of a spectrum. Nevertheless, making a heuristic distinction between primary and secondary heirs can highlight the way that heritage not only cuts across boundaries at different geographical levels, but also has multiple uses.

For secondary heirs, heritage is often interpreted as illustrative of the great achievements of humanity and is principally valued for its epistemological or esthetic qualities. For primary heirs, however, the value tends to be more multifaceted. For example, a heritage building might also be used as a residence or a community hall; however, the necessity of this building for the continuation of contemporary life and festivals is often an aspect outside of the secondary heirs' valuation. In the 1990s, the "cultural landscape" concept coined by UNESCO highlighted the fact that heritage is characterized by places where local people perform all manner of human activities over time.

Despite operating at multiple levels, conventional heritage practices have historically privileged the valuations of secondary heirs, particularly in the case of archeological heritage. After World War II, the World Heritage movement was limited to the conservation of physical monuments, which were considered to be edifying historical works for mutual public benefit. At that time, it may be seen that conflicts between primary (local) and secondary (universal) heirs were rare. However, in the 21st century, when the concept of cultural heritage gained popularity and diversity, it was met with increasing challenges to balance the demands of the local and the universal.

3. From Materiality to Communities: The World Heritage Case

A consideration of the origins of the World Heritage model can provide a good tool to highlight conventional materially-based classifications of heritage. Categorized into natural and cultural resources, World Heritage has traditionally been concerned with two types of heritage: natural reserves and historical monuments.[1] The ecological values of the former were championed by environmentalists, while the historical and esthetic qualities of the latter were canonized by archeologists or art historians. In both cases, the ideal values were those identified by authorized or "expert" voices. Under this definition, people were led to believe that heritage was something that could and should not change, implying that in the past, ephemeral things such as oral traditions and music were not regarded as heritage (Isar 2011).[2]

Attachment to preserving monuments forever *in situ* is said to have been derived from the intensive project of nation-state building, which gained momentum in the late 19th century to the beginning of the 20th century, such as John Muir's pioneering activity to establish US National Parks (Meyer 1997; Dunlap 1999; Tsing 2005). Citizens' lobbying thus empowered national symbols, and these symbols, in turn, unified the nation's citizens. In this cyclic process, people and the government shared mutual goals.

In addition to the National Park movement in the USA, European and Japanese governments began to designate important historical monuments, such as the British Ancient Monuments Protection Act in 1882, the French Law for the Conservation of Historical Monuments in 1887, and the Japanese Law for the Preservation of Old Shrines and Temples in 1897. Thereafter, the US government implemented its Antiquities Act in 1906. Cultural heritage thus served as a symbol of eternity to inculcate a fixed concept of unified national identity. At that time, many Western countries were hotbeds of conservation activities, with the industrial revolution's impact of radical modernization ironically drawing people's attention to the past.

Thus, so-called modernity was believed to be a faultless project, which was simultaneously accompanied by growth in the heritage movement. In the first instance, people began to recognize the value of heritage as rapid changes in their lives gained momentum. In the second, the promotion of natural sciences encouraged people to objectify heritage and view it in relation to their general history. These popular trends connected with the mission of nation-state building converged into a stream of heritage-making. During this period, there was little conflict between people and national authorities or specialists, such as archeologists and art historians, who were seen as public servants acting in the interests of both the state government and its people.

It is unclear exactly when the breakdown between the people and the nation-state began, but it is believed to have been before the 1990s. In 1972, when the Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage (The World Heritage Convention) was adopted in the UNESCO General Assembly, there were very few signs that hinted at such a breakdown. Thus, for one or two decades after its adoption, the process of making the World Heritage List moved ahead with minimal conflict between primary and secondary heirs.

In 1993, the revised version of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention proposed the term "Cultural Landscapes" for inclusion in the World Heritage List. According to the Guidelines, Cultural Landscapes are formed "under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of *successive* social, economic, and cultural forces, both external and internal" (emphasis added). This statement, which describes the changeable, fluctuating essence of Cultural Landscapes, highlighted heritage as defined by a process, rather than a product of cultural practices (see also Silverman 2015). This refashioned concept of heritage modified the relationship between primary heirs and national/ international agencies.

In 1994, the World Heritage Committee launched the Global Strategy for a Representative, Balanced, and Credible World Heritage List. This new vision aimed to further expand the definition of heritage to cover the full spectrum of cultural and natural heritage to balance the geographical biases of inscriptions weighted in favor of Western countries. The specialists involved in the report recommended focusing on "living cultures,"[3] which were envisaged to include both "intangible" and "tangible" heritage. From the perspective of African countries, which are historically poorly represented on the World Heritage List, the Global Strategy proposed to widen opportunities for the inclusion of every day, intangible cultural practices, and traditions as universally important cultural heritage. The launch of the Global Strategy initiated a comprehensive shift in the institutional focus of heritage from tangible to intangible, from universal to local, from historical to living, from monuments to practices, from eternal to ephemeral, and from products to processes. This movement aimed to encourage an increased understanding of valuing the perspectives of local primary heirs.

For the first time, in 1997, the nomination process for the inscription on the World Heritage List required collaboration with, and full approval of, local communities.[4] In 2007, enhancing the participation of local communities was included as one of the Strategic Objectives (5 Cs) of World Heritage along with Credibility, Conservation, Capacity-building, and Communication (World Heritage Committee 2007). All these events drew attention to the increasing trend of acknowledging the importance of engagement and dialog with primary heirs.

4. Impacts of Intangible Cultural Heritage

Currently, the World Heritage Committee has finally acknowledged that local practices should be considered, especially in the case of "heritage in the making," as identified in Cultural Landscapes. However, in the text of the Convention there remains a clause that threatens to undermine the "community centered" approach. Article 1 stipulates that any candidates for the World Heritage List should possess "outstanding universal value." However, as will be discussed in this volume, this is a criterion that is not necessarily relevant to primary heirs.

In this regard, the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH Convention) may be considered more appropriate. This Convention was adopted in

the UNESCO General Assembly of 2003 and went into effect in 2006. The major difference from the World Heritage Convention is that the ICH Convention covers "the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills—as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith (Article 2)." Such a statement therefore logically requires the dismissal of universal values because "intangible heritage," which by definition lacks a stable form, produces its value only for those who continually engage with and appreciate it. The ICH Convention leaves the estimation of relational value (rather than universal) to the responsibility of state parties, who collect information from communities and groups with whom it is concerned.

According to the Convention, cultural heritage is defined (as described above) as the intangible things "that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage (Article 2)." The ICH Convention thus sought to revolutionize and remedy the two deficits of the World Heritage Convention: a neglect of primary heirs, and an undervaluation of the practices that are foundationally important in linking together the physical and non-physical components of heritage.

If cultural heritage is not confined to monuments or objects and is something that does not need to fulfill one or more criteria of universal value, can one potentially term any cultural phenomenon as heritage? Yes, as far as the people with whom it is concerned value it as such. Based on this understanding, it may be possible to propose a tentative revision of the definition of heritage as the cultural products that were created in the past, and/or have been repeatedly used over time, as well as bodily sources, such as knowledge, memory, and body techniques, which are associated with the production of these products.

Although the author's view may exactly differ from the authorized UNESCO definition, there are certain intended benefits of rewording the definition of cultural heritage, which will be discussed in further detail ahead. In this process, it will become clear that not only does heritage require input from anthropology, but that the development of anthropological knowledge is also contingent upon a deeper understanding of heritage.

5. Heritage as the Past Living in the Present

The only difference between the two words "heritage" and "phenomenon" is whether the speaker (or the writer) is conscious that something in the present has recourse to the past (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1995). For those who do not possess this consciousness of the past, the phenomenon would simply remain a part of everyday experience. The word "heritage" therefore implies an encounter between the past and present and, more significantly, somebody's consciousness and recognition of this encounter.

This encounter, however, is not symmetrical: The past can influence the present— just as the legacy of the dead can affect living people's behavior—but the reverse cannot occur. This is because there is a temporal gap between sending and receiving, which results in a one-way intervention in the past (Lowenthal 1985). However, it is common for people in the present to select and modify the past to channel it. Concern about this

process is apparent in the discussion of collective memory (French 2012). Many monographs on this matter have also been published in African studies (Werbner 1998; Cole 2001; Lambek 2002; Coombes 2003), some of which directly address heritage studies (Antheier and Isar 2011).

The first effect of reconfiguring cultural phenomena as heritage is that it highlights the focus on the past by those living in the present. Indeed, the meaning of the past for the present differs in different societies. On the one hand, there are societies that are comparatively isolated, where everyday life makes significant reference to the past, or where they undertake practices that directly engage with preceding generations. In this case, the past essentially lives on in "customary" behaviors that dominate the everyday lives of the people (Iida this volume). On the other hand, there are societies with a high degree of freedom in their behaviors, where creative individuals appropriate the customs and practices of former generations. For example, some artists become inspired by traditional crafts and paintings (Kawaguchi 2008), while others produce stories and performances to strengthen their group identity (Umino 2008), and some create touristic events by imitating traditional festivals (Yoshida this volume). However, neither type of society operates in independent spheres. Moreover, all types are commonly faced with the same external cultural pressures, which may be pro- or anti-UNESCO. This can be seen particularly in African societies, where colonial and post-colonial powers were historically dominant, establishing external standards that converge with, and diverge from, local ones in a complex way (Yoshida and Mack 2008).

The second effect of engaging with heritage through anthropology draws attention to the political processes involved in its formation. In many postmodern or "supermodern" examples, an awareness of the past is typically informed by the preceding cultural movement. When one gains an understanding of this trend, it is possible to see the numerous political frictions that occur on many levels. People who live in the present, who are directly connected to a particular heritage (i.e., as primary heirs), form a group or community to preserve their heritage (although the boundaries of said communities are not necessarily clearly defined; see Hirai 2015). The co-members of these communities can be said to be those who actively participate in upholding these shared values and/or collaborate in these cultural practices. For this reason, people are faced with two kinds of politics at both the internal and external levels (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996; Rowlands 2002).

Internally, the members within the group can hold different opinions and disputes about what constitutes their heritage, and how it should be selectively transmitted and memorialized. At an external level, the primary heirs often aim to legitimize their heritage and must negotiate with outsiders who have historically paid closer attention to universal rather than local values (Bendix 2009). Heritage is thus a product of political and practical negotiation, in the same way that culture has been depicted in cultural studies (Hall 1980).

It is the past and politics, therefore, that need to be closely considered when we address concepts of heritage. Indeed, some cultural phenomena have at times been observed without consideration of their relationship to the past and politics, and have

thus been improperly labeled "heritage." Although it is important to respect multiple forms of authorized/non-authorized, conventional/unconventional types of heritage, it is also important to be aware that any cultural phenomenon, whether it has an old tradition or not, has the potential to be heritage, but it must be transmitted to the next generation, politicized, and handed down over time with reference to the past to gain heritage status.

Despite the inherently political nature of their traditions, many people choose to identify with them as heritage rather than as isolated cultural phenomena. The most important reason is that through conversion and elevation to heritage status, this process can solidify and strengthen social ties with those who are seen to share the same basic values and appreciation of this phenomenon. Cultural heritage is, therefore, an important means for people to harness collective action in a globalizing world where the formation of culture is met with a fractious and politicized process.

In the anthropologists' field, although heritage has been considered a significant component of their work, they often do not share the overall mission as UNESCO and other cultural authorities to encourage people to share in and celebrate a universal standard of World Heritage value. They are traditionally more conscious of the contributions and values that have been preserved by local and particularistic cultural traditions. Modern anthropologists often perceive their role as that of recording and describing people's diverse cultures and circumstances; in identifying key issues, they look at how it is possible to achieve a future to overcome such challenges together. While some anthropologists might be opposed to the views of local people, recommendations for future action are often judged according to their perceived effects over the long term. The anthropological task, whether academic or practical, is to broaden the possibilities of people, particularly raising awareness of historically marginalized voices and considering how humanity can survive and thrive in a rapidly globalizing world.

6. Content of This Volume

Seven of the eleven papers that contributed to this volume were presented in the symposium "Can Cultural Heritage Forge Communities? Efforts in Africa," which was held at the National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka, Japan on May 27–28, 2013 (Table 1). For several reasons, I could not include all the papers presented on this occasion. Instead, I included three papers presented on another occasion of the Fifth Biennial Conference of the Association of Critical Heritage Studies (ACHS2020), hosted online by the University College of London, where Thomas Laely and I organized a curated session titled "Local Values of Heritage in Africa: Swinging between the Universal and Local, as Well as the Tangible and Intangible" on August 26, 2020 (Table 2). All the chapters focus on sub-Saharan African cases, including Madagascar. In this region, where people often lack financial wealth, it is typical to find that, on the one hand, international authorities are actively encouraging heritage activities, while on the other, local people lack the resources and/or willpower to pursue these cultural initiatives to support "traditional" practices, rather than heritage authorized or consented to itself.

Table 1 Papers presented in the Symposium in Osaka on May 27–28, 2013

(May 27, 2013)

Allen F. Roberts (University of California, Los Angeles)*
  Visual Citizenship in Senegal: Contemporary Contests of Cultural Heritage
Itsushi Kawase (National Museum of Ethnology)
  Formation and Rediscovery of Cultural Identity through Ethnographic Films: A Case from Ethiopia
John Mack (University of East Anglia)*
  Burial Communities and the Undermining of Royalty
Kenji Yoshida (National Museum of Ethnology)*
  Creating Festivals, Revitalizing Communities: Ongoing Cultural Movements in Zambia
Mary Jo Arnoldi (National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution)*
  The Community Speaks with Many Voices: Representing African Cultural Heritage in the Museum

(May 28, 2013)

Oussouby Sacko (Kyoto Seika University)*
  Critical Changes in Djenné Community after Its Nomination as World Heritage
Katsuhiko Keida (Kumamoto University)*
  Cultural Heritages, Sacred Places and Living Spaces: The Mijikenda Kaya Forests Case of the Kenyan Coast in East Africa
Chantal Radimilahy (Université d'Antananarivo)
  Intangible Heritage, Memories and Local Communities: Madagascar Case
Taku Iida (National Museum of Ethnology)*
  From Decoration to the Ethnic Symbol: Zafimaniry Relief Pattern in Madagascar

Presenters marked with "*" are contributors to this volume

Table 2 Papers presented in ACHS 2020 on August 26, 2020

Taku Iida (National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka)*
  Re-embedding Museum Objects into Local Communicative Networks
Thomas Laely (University of Zurich)*
  Tangible vs Intangible? What West-Tanzanian Kihaya Calabash Lids Tell on Intangible Cultural Heritage
Abiti Adebo Nelson (University of Western Cape and Uganda National Museum)
  Tribal Crafts and Arts in the Museum versus Knowledge Systems Surviving among the Communities in Uganda
Kiyoshi Umeya (Kobe University)
  Local Practices around the Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi
Jacqueline Grigo (University of Zurich)*
  Traditional Medicine as Local Heritage: Conditions and Politics of Knowledge transfer
Ryo Nakamura (Fukuoka University)*
  Local Belief at a Hidden Heritage Site on Kilwa Island in Tanzania
Keiya Hanabuchi (Health Sciences University of Hokkaido)
  Historical monument and Nostalgia of Comorian Diaspora
Katsuhiko Keida (Kumamoto University)*
  A Sacred World Heritage or A Big Homestead? "The Mijikenda Kaya Forests" along the Kenyan Coast as Problematic Spaces

Presenters marked with "*" are contributors to this volume

All contributors are specialists in African studies, but not necessarily in heritage studies. Some argue for heritage designated by UNESCO, while others focus on a less recognized kind. Despite such differences, however, all chapters provide significant insights into general heritage studies. To demonstrate this clearly, I will summarize the chapters and specify their contributions to heritage studies.

The chapters in Part I "Refurbishment of UNESCO Heritage" concern the increasing emphasis on people being directly responsible for the maintenance of existing World Heritage sites, as well as cultural practices in the UNESCO Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. In all cases, the inscription of sites and practices in the UNESCO list has brought about a significant change in local practices. This section deals with the ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani in Tanzania, the old towns of Djenné in Mali, Kaya Forests and related practices in Kenya, and carving production in Madagascar.

Analyzing the case of Kilwa Kisiwani, Ryo Nakamura argues that archeological sites have local values recognized by inhabitants, although they are invisible to culture practitioners or tourists. In the Djenné case, Oussouby Sacko questions the enforcement of "historical" methods of restoration and reliance upon traditional materials for the sake of heritage conservation. A monument of super-human size like a town cannot be maintained without appropriation of people's everyday activities, and Sacko's analysis is relevant at this point. In both cases, developing a firmer understanding of people's contemporary needs, as well as their knowledge and practice to preserve (or safeguard) the heritage, seems to be a necessary solution to resolve the problem.

Katsuhiko Keida, who conducts his research on the sites of both World Heritage (Sacred Mijikenda Kaya forests) and UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage (Traditions and practices associated with the Kayas in the sacred forests of the Mijikenda), argues that the authorities have failed to demonstrate adequate sensitivity to the forest as a "sacred" place, which became a center of local politics due to the inscription on the two Heritage Lists. In the following chapter of the Zafimaniry woodcarving knowledge designated as a UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2003, Taku Iida explains how a part of a lifestyle which used to be indispensable to survive in an inaccessible and remote area of Madagascar, was transformed into a politically and economically influential icon and heritage practice. Both chapters illustrate the necessity of careful examination of the local context in safeguarding intangible culture. In consideration of all the four chapters in this section, we can say that intentional maintenance of culture, whether tangible or intangible, requires a deep understanding of the local society and history with professionals' help and primary heirs' collaboration.

All four chapters in Part I focus on dissonance between inter-/national interests and local realities, which has been demonstrated theoretically (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996) and empirically. The latter was especially achieved by anthropologists in both tangible (Brumann and Berliner 2016) and intangible heritage (Foster and Gilman 2015). Because heritagization is a type of global valorization and utilization of local resources, adjustment is essential. If the adjustment is not smooth, "the creation of heritage is also the creation of heritage conflicts" (Meskell 2015). In this context, the four chapters might

be regarded as showing no more than phenomena in a general current. The reason for my emphasis on such critics is twofold. First, an ethnographic description of a particular phenomenon is an urgent issue to improve the miscommunication between the inter-/national and the local, especially in cases of UNESCO heritage that keep growing in number. For World Heritage sites and Intangible Cultural Heritage elements, numerous follow-up projects have been conducted after their inscriptions into the UNESCO lists. Nevertheless, the number of primary heirs for one site or element is generally so large that secondary heirs cannot organize such a large project to cover all their ideas in a limited period. Ethnographic descriptions are, as the contributors show in this book, expected to fill this lack of information. Second, the four contributors' ethnographic strategy focusing on primary heirs' practices is a promising—possibly the best—way to elucidate the local realities. Tangible sites and monuments as well as Intangible Cultural Heritage draw attention to their forms and appearance: landscapes, rituals, statues, or carvings. Professional practitioners (secondary heirs) often tend to make their reports based on visual data and unavoidably focus less on invisible and in-real-sense intangible data on social (Sacko), religious (Nakamura), political (Keida), and economic (Iida and Sacko) practices. Given this kind of bias in global interests, ethnographers with fewer limitations are expected to mitigate the inter/national-local dissonance, which consequently provides both theoretical and descriptive insights.

Part II "Globalizing Local Culture" discusses external politics that often particularly affect primary heirs. Briefly, Jacqueline Grigo's chapter on traditional medicine in Ivory Coast seems to focus more on the local context, similar to Part I. However, while the chapters in Part I consciously consider international heritage schemes, Grigo considers the impacts of researchers and medical companies (secondary heirs) who prevent indigenous healers from maintaining their knowledge. Although the significant external factor in her case is not heritagization, but the global knowledge system, expansion of individuals' activities forces primary heirs to be conscious of the openness and secrecy of their culture. Ivorian people could model themselves after the Chinese government's heritage strategies, where the latter intentionally and successfully inscribed their traditional medicine in the UNESCO Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanities in 2020. However, the Chinese government has a much greater financial capability than that of Ivory Coast. Both primary and secondary heirs will have to consider the Ivorian or African course of capacity-building.

Similarly, Allen F. Roberts discusses portraits of a religious leader Sheikh Amadu Bamba as Senegalese autogenic communal symbols, or "visual citizenship" in his term, which is copied and monetarily transacted among people with the help of external digital actors. According to Roberts, Senegalese visual citizenship, which was once extinguished by French colonization of the visual economy, is now exposed to re-colonization by Chinese digital companies. While the consequential similarity between colonialism and global capitalism is an interesting issue, let us focus on the issue of heritage. Copying, transmitting, and sharing of images contributes to the maintenance of community bonds, and this can be an alternative model of heritage irrelevant to the conventional perceptions of "authenticity" in tangible and intangible heritage.

Unlike traditional medicine, digital images and related practices do not seem to be inscribed in UNESCO's list. However, the ethnographic approach to cultural heritage has mutually influenced those of tourism, popular culture, and folklore (Meskell 2015). Roberts's chapter is also a respectable contribution to heritage studies. Imagine that you find myriads of postcards, picture books, key holders, and fridge magnets of World Heritage monuments whenever you visit there, or discover diverse national treasures whenever you visit national museums. Digital copying of images is already an important heritage practice that strengthens and amplifies personal affection for collective symbols. Interestingly, Sheikh Amadu Bamba's worshippers do not exactly correspond to Senegalese nationalities. Unlike World Heritage and Intangible Cultural Heritage, digital products circulate regardless of the nation-state's intentions. Although this movement would not have developed without the global distribution of Photoshop technology, it is not a global but a grassroots movement. In this regard, digital citizenship adapts itself to, and appropriates resources from, global circumstances, similar to traditional medicine.

The inseparability of local culture and global human activities is also the case with Mary Jo Arnoldi's article, which is based on her experience of curating two exhibitions on Africa in the USA at the National Museum of Natural History of the Smithsonian Institute in Washington D.C. She shows that while it was nearly impossible to fulfill all expectations and meet the demands of the "many voices" of the public, she is still committed to long term communication with all groups and communities who express connection to the work on display. She thus reinforces the concept of the exhibition as a process rather than a product (see also Silverman 2015), mirroring the revised definition and understanding of cultural heritage. This project demonstrated that while anthropologists are generally considered secondary heirs, they can nonetheless collaborate with primary heirs, making important contributions to support heritage as a practice that enables people to socially connect with objects, historical records, places, performances, and traditions.

As we have seen, there are many issues regarding cultural heritage and culture. However, these issues are not something to be avoided by withdrawing claims or reclaims from the arena. The support is for people or primary heirs, because many authorities begin to recognize the necessity of people's activities as a motive to safeguard cultural heritage, as well as to promote human abilities. In general terms, culture can be said to be a scaffold for the socially vulnerable to get even with the mainstream, resulting in human diversity against the monolithic industrial world. However, this possibility of "culture for the socially vulnerable" is demonstrated in three chapters in Part III, "The Past in the Present, Present in the Future," together with optimistic perspectives.

Laely reviews the heritagization of *Bushingantahe*, Burundian local juridical authority. Because the notion of culture includes every type of custom, people may naturally claim their customary political system as cultural heritage, as is the case with the Oromo *Gada* system in Ethiopia, which was inscribed in the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity in 2016. Although *Bushingantahe* is not inscribed in any of the UNESCO lists, Laely illustrates its role at both the local and national levels. Cultural heritage is so deeply embedded in the global context that it must

change its form inevitably, as was shown in Part II. Laely's historical vision goes further, however, to suggest that an even political system of the socially vulnerable must be "detoxicated" into a cultural one to survive in the modern settings.

John Mack reviews two burials of African rulers Asantehene (King) Prempeh I, who resisted colonial powers in Ghana, and Ranavalona III, who were exiled from Madagascar and died in Algiers. Both rulers were deprived of their titles by European colonists, but Prempeh I finally restored his title in part as a local chief. Ranavalona III was, in contrast, not successful in regaining her right to take charge of royal rituals, thus influencing her power over the subjects. From the viewpoint of heritage studies, it is interesting that the two cases also show a contrast in the meaning of the past for the present. In the successful case of Prempeh I's dynasty, many royal rituals were formed as messages from the king or the royal family to the subjects, because a ritual is analogous to formalized performative language (Connerton 1989: 57−58).[5] In a sense, it is quite similar to the 19th-century ceremony to commemorate national events. However, the rituals were not merely one-way communications. Through repetitive and synergetic rituals with the King, the subjects not only contributed to the reinforcement of the royal power but also promoted their mutual communications to form a ritual community. In contrast, in Madagascar, because of colonial intervention, a cyclic relationship in which people maintained ritual practices and the authority strengthened their domination was cut off. Instead, Malagasy people vitalized their burial and reburial practices, thereby recreating a sense of community without royal blessings. In both cases, one successful and the other unsuccessful in the reorganization of royal rituals, social practices were generated around the burial and gave rise to a sense of identity between people who were not historically members of the same community. Even if one cannot say that there are heritage forging communities, communities formed through practices may define heritage for their own utility.

The cyclic relationship between ritual practices and people's sense of community also explains modern phenomena. In the concluding chapter, Kenji Yoshida explores the case of festivals in Zambia that started in the 1980s and the 1990s. However, the focus here is not on the "invention of tradition" (Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983) but rather on active cultural movements, whose process seems considerably similar to what Mack described as local practices against colonial intervention. Although Yoshida does not conceal his reliance on people's power to strengthen their identities, he is also cautious in establishing a narrow identity or nationality. Cultural theory should, it seems to me, contribute not to exposing the inauthenticity but to forming open-minded cultural movements. This is not only an African issue, but also concerns the whole world. Domestication of culture and heritage seems, I dare say, a key to the future of humanity and its diversity.

Heritage management from the primary heirs' perspective is not merely an issue of human rights, but also of local empowerment and a dynamic way of maintaining human diversity. To make it work efficiently, we still have many issues to solve, such as internal conflict or global inequality. However, we do not have to withdraw claims or reclaims around these issues, as reconsideration of heritage can easily link them. Discussion of

cultural heritage obviously promotes our understanding of cultural others and the behavior of modern communities, more than history, esthetics, and material preservation.

Notes

1) Prior to inscription on the List, historical monuments (cultural heritage) are evaluated by the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), while natural parks (natural heritage) are assessed by the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN). Intermediate types of heritage (mixed heritage) are evaluated by both institutions, but this type is not clearly defined in the Convention.

2) Before the European and American authorities, the Japanese national government had already identified intangible cultural assets for conservation in 1950 (Miyata 2013). The Japanese system provided UNESCO with an important model for the concept of intangible heritage, although UNESCO added some essential modifications to it.

3) See Report on the Expert Meeting for the Global Strategy and thematic studies for a representative World Heritage List (UNESCO Headquarters, June 20−22, 1994, http://whc. unesco.org/archive/global94.htm). Almost at the same time, the notion of "living heritage" was also proposed as a concept in museum studies (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998: 19−21). In this case, intangible contexts (cultural practices and social networks) within which movable objects were sourced were reappraised and emphasized as culturally important.

4) This criterion is stated in Article 41 of the 1997 version of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (http://whc.unesco.org/archive/opguide97. pdf) and was still valid in the 2013 version (Article 61; http://whc.unesco.org/archive/ opguide13-en.pdf).

5) Concerning the communicative character of rituals, we have a classic anthropological work that analyzed the formation and formalization of a royal ritual of circumcision in Madagascar (Bloch 1986). In this work, Bloch focused on a ritual, circumcision, which used to be familial before the 18th century, tailored as royal in 19th, and turned familial again in the 20th century. In Bloch's observation, the ritual process of circumcision in the 20th century was almost the same as that in the 18th. However, throughout the centuries, Malagasy beliefs, including circumcision and its symbolism, came to the fore in anti-Protestant movements during colonialization, and in the protest against urban elites just after independence (Bloch 1986: 155; 163). This historical fact is, therefore, an evidence that rituals can be a community symbol or cultural heritage to manipulate for political purposes.

References

Antheier, H. and Y. R. Isar (eds.)
    2011 *Heritage, Memory and Identity* (The Cultures and Globalization Series 4). London: SAGE.
Bauman, Z.
    2000 *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bendix, R.

    2009   Heritage between Economy and Politics: An Assessment from the Perspective of Cultural Anthropology. In L. Smith and N. Akagawa (eds.) *Intangible Heritage*, pp. 253−269. London: Routledge.

Bloch, M.

    1986   *From Blessing to Violence: History and Ideology in the Circumcision Ritual of the Merina of Madagascar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brumann, C. and D. Berliner (eds.)

    2016   *World Heritage on the Ground: Ethnographic Perspectives*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Clifford, J.

    1988   *The Predicament of Culture: Twenty-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Cole, J.

    2001   *Forget Colonialism?: Sacrifice and the Art of Memory in Madagascar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Connerton, P.

    1989   *How Societies Remember*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Coombes, A. E.

    2003   *History after Apartheid: Visual Culture and Public Memory in a Democratic South Africa*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Dunlap, T. R.

    1999   *Nature and the English Diaspora: Environment and History in the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Foster, M. D. and L. Gilman (eds.)

    2015   *UNESCO on the Ground: Local Perspectives on Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

French, B. M.

    2012   The Semiotics of Collective Memories. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41: 337−353.

Giddens, A.

    1991   *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Hall, S.

    1980   Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms. *Media, Culture, and Society* 2(1): 57−72.

    2007   Cultural Studies and the Centre: Some Problematics and Problems. In the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham (ed.) *Culture, Media, Language* (Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972−1979), pp. 15−47. London: Hutchinson.

Harvey, D. C.

    2001   Heritage Pasts and Heritage Presents: Temporality, Meaning and the Scape of Heritage Studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 7(4): 319−338.

Hirai, K (ed.)

    2015   *Social Movements and the Production of Knowledge: Body, Practice, and Society in*

East Asia (Senri Ethnological Studies 91). Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.

Hobsbawm, E. and T. Ranger (eds.)
 1983 *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Isar, Y. R.
 2011 UNESCO and Heritage: Global Doctrine, Global Practice. In H. Anheier and Y. R. Isar (eds.) *Heritage, Memory and Identity*, pp. 39–52. London: SAGE Publications.

Kawaguchi, Y.
 2008 Covering Heritages, Erasing Locals: Passing on History to the Next Generation. In K. Yoshida and J. Mack (eds.) *Preserving the Cultural Heritage of Africa: Crisis or Renaissance?* pp. 129–139. Woodbridge: James Currey.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B.
 1995 Theorizing Heritage. *Ethnomusicology* 39(3): 367–380.
 1998 *Destination Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kluckhohn, C. and W. H. Kelly
 1945 The Concept of Culture. In R. Linton (ed.) *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*, pp. 78–106. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lambek, M. J.
 2002 *The Weight of the Past: Living with History in Mahajanga, Madagascar*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lowenthal, D.
 1985 *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meskell, L.
 2015 Introduction: Globalizing Heritage. In L. Meskell (ed.) *Global Heritage: A Reader*, pp. 1–21. West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.

Meyer, J. M.
 1997 Gifford Pinchot, John Muir, and the Boundaries of Politics in American Thought. *Polity* 30(2): 267–284.

Miyata, S.
 2013 Intangible Cultural Heritage Policy in Japan. In L. Arizpe and C. Amescua (eds.) *Anthropological Perspectives on Intangible Cultural Heritage*, pp. 83–101. Cham: Springer.

Nielsen, B.
 2011 UNESCO and the 'Right' Kind of Culture: Bureaucratic Production and Articulation. *Critique of Anthropology* 31(4): 273–292.

Rowlands, M.
 2002 Heritage and Cultural Property. In V. Buchli (ed.) *The Material Culture Reader*, pp. 105–133. Oxford: Berg.

Silverman, R. A. (ed.)
 2015 *Museum as Process: Translating Local and Global Knowledges*. London: Routledge.

Small, C.
 1998 *Musicking: The Meaning of Performing and Listening*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.

Stefano, M. L.
  2012 Reconfiguring the Framework: Adopting an Ecomuseological Approach for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage. In M. L. Stefano, P. Davis, and G. Corsane (eds.) *Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage*, pp. 223−238. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.

Tsing, A. L.
  2005 *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tunbridge, J. E. and G. J. Ashworth
  1996 *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. New York: John Willey & Sons.

Tylor, E. B.
  1958 *The Origins of Culture*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.

Umino, R.
  2008 A Backyard (Hi)story: Doing Geskiedenis among Griqua People in South Africa. In K. Yoshida and J. Mack (eds.) *Preserving the Cultural Heritage of Africa: Crisis or Renaissance?* pp. 27−42. Woodbridge: James Currey.

Werbner, R. (ed.)
  1998 *Memory and the Postcolony: African Anthropology and the Critique of Power*. London: Zed Books.

Williams, R.
  1960 *Culture and Society, 1790−1950*. New York: Anchor Books.

World Heritage Committee
  2007 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage Thirty First Session. WHC-07/31.COM/13B; http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2007/whc07−31com-13be.pdf (viewed on 30 September 2015)

Yoshida, K. and J. Mack (eds.)
  2008 *Preserving the Cultural Heritage of Africa: Crisis or Renaissance?* Suffolk: James Currey.