

CURRENT AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS IN HERITAGE STUDIES FROM “RETROTOPIA” TO “PROSPECTIVE”

LAURENT SÉBASTIEN FOURNIER

In the article, the author starts from the different approaches between heritage studies on the one hand and disciplinary heritage approaches on the other hand to consider current and future developments in the field of intangible cultural heritage. In the play between critical studies and broader studies, there are risks of regression as well as opportunities for progress. To underpin his analysis, he refers to his experience of development processes in the field of cultural heritage and to some recent research in France on the institutional functioning of UNESCO in the field of intangible cultural heritage. He then focuses on the notions of “retrotopia” (Bauman, 2017) and “prospective” (Godet, 2004), which seem to him to be suitable for triggering a fundamental anthropological reflection on the future of cultural heritage research. At the end, he draws some conclusions about the possibilities of progress – or, conversely, regression – in intangible cultural heritage.

Keywords: heritage studies, tradition, UNESCO, retrotopia, prospective

Autor z upoštevanjem trenutnega in prihodnjega položaja nesnovne kulturne dediščine, tematizira razlike med raziskavami dediščine in med disciplinarnimi pristopi k dediščini. V razmerju med kritičnimi in širšimi raziskavami dediščine opaza tveganje k regresiji, a tudi priložnosti za napredek. Pri podkrepitvi analize se opira na lastne izkušnje pri raziskovanju procesov razvoja kulturne dediščine in na nekatere nedavne raziskave institucionalnega delovanja Unesca na področju nesovne kulturne dediščine v Franciji. V nadaljevanju tematizira pojma »retrotopija« (Bauman, 2017) in »perspektivnost« (Godet, 2004), ki sta po njegovem mnenju primerna za temeljni antropološki premislek o prihodnosti študija dediščine. V sklepu povzema možnosti napredka – ali, nasprotno, regresije – nesovne kulturne dediščine.

Ključne besede: raziskave dediščine, tradicija, UNESCO, retrotopija, perspektiva

In this article, I base my analysis on this difference in approaches between heritage studies on the one hand and disciplinary heritage approaches on the other to consider current and future developments in intangible cultural heritage. I show that, in the game between critical studies and more comprehensive studies, there are both risks of regression and possibilities for progress. To support my analysis, I refer to my experience in cultural heritage development processes and to some recent surveys carried out in France on the institutional functioning of UNESCO in intangible cultural heritage. I then focus on the notions of “retrotopia” (Bauman, 2017) and “prospective” (Godet, 2004), which seem to me likely to fuel a fundamental anthropological reflection on the future of heritage studies. I draw some conclusions about the possibilities of progress—or, conversely, regression—in intangible cultural heritage.

Since 2003, the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage has led to a new examination of a set of social and cultural practices traditionally falling within the expertise of ethnology and anthropology. In France, as in other

European countries, these practices—tales and oral forms of expression, rituals and festivals, traditional games, craftsmanship, knowledge related to nature and the universe, and so on—had been identified as early as the nineteenth century by folklorists (Belmont, 1995) and then incorporated into the field of “popular arts and traditions” (Rivière, 1989) before joining “national ethnologies” (Christophe et al., 2009). Thus, the content of intangible cultural heritage preceded its institutional consideration by UNESCO, which raises the following question: what are the consequences of the heritagization of social and cultural practices traditionally studied by ethnologists? These consequences are numerous; they concern ethnologists themselves, cultural institutions, and the communities to which the intangible cultural heritage elements belong.

For example, an important consequence of the emergence of the category of intangible cultural heritage and the proliferation of heritage objects has been the development of heritage studies, which in recent years has become a new independent field of study. From the perspective of heritage studies, various academic disciplines can be mobilized to better understand what characterizes contemporary heritage development processes. Cultural heritage is therefore at the center of an interdisciplinary approach. This type of approach complements more traditional disciplinary approaches, which use cultural heritage to feed their own fundamental reflections. Thus, historians working on cultural heritage use heritage to better understand contemporary representations of time, anthropologists interested in cultural heritage use it to better understand human relationships to cultural diversity, and sociologists studying cultural heritage are interested in this subject to better study social stratification or museum audiences.

In this article, I base my analysis on this difference in approaches between heritage studies on the one hand and disciplinary heritage approaches on the other to consider current and future developments in intangible cultural heritage. I show that, in the game between critical studies and more comprehensive studies, there are both risks of regression and possibilities for progress. To support my analysis, I refer to my experience in cultural heritage development processes and to some recent surveys carried out in France on the institutional functioning of UNESCO in intangible cultural heritage. I then focus on the notions of “retrotopia” (Bauman, 2017) and “prospective” (Godet, 2004), which seem to me likely to fuel a fundamental anthropological reflection on the future of heritage studies. I draw some conclusions about the possibilities of progress—or, conversely, regression—in intangible cultural heritage.

THE INVENTORY OF INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE: A VIEW FROM FRANCE

In ratifying the 2003 convention, France, like any state party to UNESCO, committed itself to carrying out a national inventory of intangible cultural heritage on its territory, which

was implemented by the Ministry of Culture's Mission for Ethnology starting in 2008 in the form of a methodological seminar (Bortolotto, 2011), and then by the Department for the Steering of Research and Scientific Policy of the same ministry from 2010 onward with systematization of the collection of inventory sheets on the national territory. The activity of the national inventory, by creating numerous research partnerships between the Ministry of Culture and researchers, cultural institutions, and associations, has thus been carrying out an effective transfer of institutional conceptions of intangible cultural heritage to civil society for ten years. In Provence in southeastern France, where I have carried out my fieldwork since 2005, the work of the inventory was first concerned with methodology, with the goal of increasing the participation of what UNESCO identifies as communities and tradition-bearers. Several seminars held jointly by the Ministry of Culture and National Research Center (CNRS) in Aix-en-Provence made possible fruitful meetings between university researchers, cultural professionals, and actors in the field.

These seminars have always met with some success, without necessarily attracting many ethnologists and academic anthropologists, who are more involved in the anti-culturalist critique of the notion of cultural heritage. Between 2005 and 2015, several ethnologists thus insisted on methodological and epistemological problems being linked to the notion of intangible cultural heritage (Tauschek, 2010; Bromberger, 2014; Palumbo, 2020). They pointed out in particular the risks of instrumentalization, folklorization, and reinforcement of cultural stereotypes, as well as the problems inherent in the drafting of "files" and in the institutional promotion of cultural heritage. However, ministerial policy had to pursue its ambitions despite these theoretical criticisms in order to achieve the concrete agenda of the inventory.

Starting in 2017 in Provence, several inventory sheets were drawn up on various regional festive practices: cart festivals in the northwest part of the Bouches-du-Rhône district, Christmas traditions, the Nice carnival, the lemon festival in Menton, the green olive festival in the village of Mouriès, and the vine and wine festivals of the Rhône Valley have thus given rise to some field surveys by teams of researchers specializing in regional ethnology. These inventory sheets concerning festive practices were added to those that had already been carried out in 2012 on various traditional practices in the region. At the same time, other files have been produced in the associative milieu by activists trained in inventory methods. These supplementary files concern technical knowhow linked to *boutis* (Marseille embroidery) or to the art of navigation at sea, for example. A few additional files have also been produced by the Salagon Museum, a public museum specializing in ethnobotanics that has produced files on the cultivation and medicinal uses of certain plants and on the herbalism practices in Haute-Provence.¹ Finally, in 2018, two elements concerning the territory of Provence were added to UNESCO's Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. On the one hand, it is the knowhow related to

¹ See: <http://www.musee-de-salagon.com/accueil.html> (consulted on June 30, 2021).

perfume in Pays de Grasse in the Alpes-Maritimes district, and on the other hand the art of dry stone construction, a multinational file for which the French partners are based in Provence. Several other fact sheets are currently being drafted, which gives an idea of the intensity of the work related to the intangible cultural heritage inventory in southern France.

All these projects and initiatives for the recognition and enhancement of intangible cultural heritage have contributed to increasing the awareness of the cultural importance of practices that were previously mainly understood in terms of tradition or folklore in Provence, and in general in all the regions of Mediterranean France.² Yet—and this is an issue that has rarely been questioned—the recognition of intangible cultural heritage has not necessarily been directly useful for ethnology and anthropology. Even if the inventories have largely mobilized the methods of these disciplines, and even if certain researchers in ethnology (of which I myself am a part) are involved in the production of the inventory files, many heritage actors have gone directly from the study of traditions to that of intangible cultural heritage without recognizing the role played by ethnology and anthropology in this paradigm shift. Thus, for the past ten years, associative activists or researchers from other disciplines have been able to become “experts” in intangible cultural heritage without training in ethnology, which contributes to strengthening the autonomous field of heritage studies but raises questions regarding the status of ethnology as a support discipline for these studies.

For the majority of the audience, to tell the truth, ethnology (like anthropology) is still synonymous today in France with exoticism and distant lands. It is not really perceived as relevant when it comes to investigating at home—that is to say, in Europe. Moreover, because the inventory is carried out by the Ministry of Culture, it is institutionally distinct from academic ethnology, which is practiced at the universities and in academic research units. In many cases, the intangible cultural heritage inventory is carried out in France by cultural professionals that work in the various regional *ethnopôles*, but who are not necessarily trained in ethnology.³ Finally, because academic ethnologists are often critical or not very interested in cultural heritage, everything converges to empower the intangible cultural heritage sector and separate it from academic ethnology. An invisible “UNESCO effect” in the field has therefore been to gradually marginalize the ethnological heritage and

² Concerning Occitania (southwestern France), the CIRDOC (*Centre Interrégional de Développement de l'Occitan*) has been a privileged interlocutor of the Ministry of Culture, as have the Universities of Montpellier and Toulouse through the training that they have carried out for several years in Carcassonne at the ethnological research and documentation center founded by Daniel Fabre. In Aquitaine (the Atlantic part of southwestern France), the InOc (*Institut Occitan Aquitaine*) played an important role with the University of Pau and the Pays de l'Adour by developing the PCI Lab website (<https://www.pci-lab.fr/>, consulted on June 30, 2021), which distributes the files of the French national inventory of intangible cultural heritage to the general public.

³ In France, the network of *ethnopôles* is made up of a dozen institutions labeled by the Ministry of Culture, which, in terms of research, information, and cultural activity, operate at both the local and national levels.

ethnology of cultural heritage, in the sense of the scientific study of folklore and popular arts and traditions. Instead, heritage studies are promoted as a new interdisciplinary field of studies, which is much more concerned with the institutional processes of heritagization than with the concrete social and cultural practices encompassed by the notion of heritage.

THEORIES AND PRACTICES OF CULTURAL HERITAGE

The foregoing considerations encourage repositioning ethnology and anthropology within the study of the practices covered by the notion of cultural heritage because these disciplines remain essential to fully understand the symbolic constructions and interpretations that are currently associated with these practices. From an anthropological perspective, the heritagization processes are interesting to study in themselves because they open up to the analysis of representations of time and to that of the public administration of culture. However, they do not replace the ethnography of concrete practices observable in the field, which sometimes says something other than work focused on institutions and institutional processes. In this regard, I consider it important to revitalize the ethnology of heritage by relaunching field surveys focusing on practices rather than being concerned only with the processes of the institutionalization of heritage.

This proposal takes note of the fact that the notions of time and culture have entered into crisis since the end of the twentieth century, as evidenced by various theories developed by the human and social sciences. By introducing the notion of the regime of historicity, the French historian François Hartog (2003) insists that each society is characterized by a specific relationship to temporality. Traditional societies, according to this author, were guided by their past in the form of a *historia magistra vitae*, which made them attentive to glorious examples from ancestors. The past, from this perspective, set an example for the present, which strove to be worthy of it through “ancestor worship.” With modernity, the perspective changes radically and turns into futurism. Christian eschatology and Marxist eschatology have in common that they are oriented toward an ideal that is conjugated in the future, in the form of the last judgment for the former and the last revolution for the latter. For Hartog, contemporary societies have entered a new regime of historicity, which he calls “presentism” and which no longer trusts either the past or the future. This crisis of time, since the end of the twentieth century, has been marked by mistrust of a past that has become impossible to cope with since the mass killings of the two world wars, and by an equally great mistrust related to the risks of environmental destruction to come. Caught between a duty of memory and a principle of precaution, contemporary man would thus be drawn back to his own present, forced to adopt the latter as the point of view from which time shines, according to a new perspective that disarticulates both its fields of experience and its horizons of expectation. The notion of retrotopia, proposed by the German sociologist Zygmunt Bauman (2017), complements that of presentism by being characterized as

the advent of a form of retrograde aspiration and as the desire to return to a past more or less mythologized by evading the most pressing questions of the present and the future, from a globally regressive perspective.

For its part, the notion of culture has been widely criticized by anthropologists that have rebelled against its supposed essentialism. Critics of the notion of culture are old. They have long aimed at reducing the stereotype defended by the culturalists of the culture and personality school from the beginning of the twentieth century and the drifts linked to collective psychology. At the end of the twentieth century, these criticisms intensified to condemn the political manipulations to which the notion of culture was the subject. According to the French political scientist Jean-François Bayart (1996), culturalism postulates an old and stabilized corpus of beliefs, closed in on themselves and corresponding to specific political communities. There is therefore a risk that cultures function as isolates, entities that are separated from each other and refuse interactions with surrounding groups. The notion of culture would thus favor nationalisms and identity discourse; it would have no value from the point of view of anthropological analysis. For their part, contemporary specialists in folklore and cultural studies wish to keep the notion of culture as their analytical scope, but they join anthropologists in criticizing its instrumentalization. According to Dorothy Noyes (2016: 411–413), culture is what we feed people so that they avoid realizing their subordinate position and revolting in times of economic crisis. Like other slogan-concepts of modernity, such as folklore, nation, people, heritage, diversity, resilience, or sustainability, culture would have an ambiguous effect, both mobilizing and immobilizing. These concepts, while stimulating analysis and attracting activists, are also said to be means of controlling behavior and placing a fig leaf that distracts and at the same time attracts attention.

How can one see clearly through these criticisms? It seems that critically focusing attention on the institutional concepts and processes that make use of it carries a significant risk of being cut off from the ground. A viable alternative then consists in questioning the actors in the field about the very concepts that underpin the anthropological approach. How are notions of folklore, tradition (cf. Isnart, Testa, 2020), cultural identity, and heritage experienced in the field? The reflexive turn that has characterized anthropology in recent decades (Ghasarian, 2002) has no reason to exclude actors that are confronted in the field with the same notions, and therefore with the same questions, as anthropologists. Of course, regionalist activists and regional culture and cultural heritage professionals will not all have the same level of theoretical knowledge of these questions, and they will undoubtedly answer them unevenly. However, at least leaving them the possibility of expressing their thoughts about this seems to be a minimum condition for practicing anthropology in an ethical fashion, which considers informants to be persons fully responsible for their words and actions. Thus, the notions of presentism and retrotopy, which are often presented as explanations of certain contemporary tendencies to crisis or disorder, can also be considered as starting points for investigating vernacular representations of temporality

today. The heritagization processes, by this account, are only a pretext; they invite one to an anthropology of the diversity of the representations of time, itself accessible by a precise ethnography of the social and cultural practices constituting what was called folklore in the nineteenth century and which is called intangible cultural heritage today.

CULTURAL HERITAGE AND PROSPECTIVE

This proposal, which consists of refocusing ethnographic fieldwork on the practices covered by the notion of cultural heritage, without necessarily excluding the anthropological analysis of the discourses that accompany the processes of heritagization, seems useful in order not to confuse the level of the objects studied and the plan for the study of these same objects. Part of the recent anthropological production concerning cultural heritage seems to have replaced the knowledge of practices initially qualified as “folk” by an entire series of abstract considerations that concern the study of these practices, taken in the second degree as the study of heritage institutions. This work can quite suitably be carried out by historians or sociologists of culture, even by economists or legal experts, who benefit from sufficient distance to interpret the progressive transformations of folklore into ethnological heritage, and then into intangible cultural heritage. However, such considerations belong to the field of institutional analysis, possibly to that of critical analysis, but not to that of empirical ethnography, which normally has its own set of accepted methods and prefers to proceed by induction.⁴

The fieldwork that I have carried out in southern France over the past twenty years tends rather to note the existence of multiple modalities of concrete existence of heritage objects, in perpetual transformation. In Provence, like elsewhere, civil society is led with each generation to grasp new concepts that appear, such as that of intangible cultural heritage after 2003. However, what the actors perceive are first of all concrete and localized practices that they associate with the idea of past time, even though their representations of temporality have changed. What I mean here is that the scientific views concerning local social practices do little to alter the general public’s ideas. Traditional tales, festivals and games, craftsmanship, and medical formulations based on local herbs constitute a relatively old corpus that is relatively unaffected by the transformations of a scholarly nomenclature that first identified them as folklore, then as elements of art and popular tradition, then as ethnological heritage, and finally as intangible cultural heritage. What has changed, no doubt, is the way of representing the time spent from the new points of view of presentism or retrotopy. Cultural heritage, on this account, introduces a dimension that tradition ignored: it postulates a break with the past rather than a continuity. Therefore, the representations

⁴ There are, however, good counterexamples, proceeding by induction and proposing an “ethnography of heritage institutions” (Bortolotto, 2013; Hafstein, 2014).

associated with traditional or folk practices are reinterpreted from the point of view of the present, in a freer manner than with the notion of tradition. However, it takes quite a long time for these reinterpretations to take place. In almost twenty years, since 2003, I have observed that the penetration of the notion of intangible cultural heritage into the Provençal cultural landscape was far from being completed, even if it is starting to spread. The risk of criticism, by delaying the penetration of new ideas, is that the general public prefers the comfort of old ideas to them. Intangible cultural heritage therefore seems to be able to constitute an effective way of getting out of the folklorist or traditionalist discourse.

The foregoing elements lead to a preference for contemporary heritage building processes over the backwardness of traditions and identity exclusivity. Regarding intangible cultural heritage, Valdimar Hafstein (2014) clearly explained the fears of dispossession aroused by this new notion, accused of seeking to govern the vernacular. These fears, which concern the definition of the community and the issue of popular sovereignty, consider that, by giving a representative voice to the bearers of traditions, intangible cultural heritage risks eliminating local multi-vocality. It is therefore significant that these fears are shared by the most critical anthropologists and by the most populist actors in the field, who reject UNESCO's stranglehold on their traditions. To escape from this polarization situation,⁵ I believe it is necessary to reaffirm that heritage is not limited to what institutions make of it. Even UNESCO's action, with all its good will, is limited by the fact that it emanates from a cultural administration made up of states parties and not of communities or individuals. As an administration, it is much more interested in institutional and legal aspects than in the very content of the cultural practices it administers. As an organization bringing countries together at an international level, it puts the national rights of its members ahead of minority rights and claims for cultural diversity within each country. So why seem surprised at its shortcomings? On the other hand, at the local level, the cultural policies promoted by UNESCO give rise to reinterpretations capable of re-semanticizing traditional and folkloric expressions. The heritagization processes then play an important role in territorial foresight by recalling the importance of the concrete practices contained in the notion of cultural heritage. Contrary to popular belief, these practices are not unilaterally associated with conservatism; many examples of creative transformations of folklore bear witness to the contrary.

THE FUTURE OF CULTURAL HERITAGE

By distinguishing between practices covered by the notion of cultural heritage and institutional cultural heritage development practices, it is possible to develop a prospective and synthetic approach to the heritage of a given territory. Here I give a quick overview of the

⁵ I refer here to the Italian situation, which was analyzed very well by Lia Giancristofaro (2020).

usefulness of this type of approach, both because cultural heritage can take part in general territorial forecasting and because specialized foresight on cultural heritage can be of interest for the anthropological study of a territory thus questioned. I therefore consider that a description of the future of cultural heritage over time, carried out at the regional level, remains a first-rate ethnographic tool for understanding the historical recompositions and reconfigurations of the relationship that a given society has with its own cultural practices.

What is prospective? As a “science of man to come,” it is a foresight. It is not a technique of divination, but a rational approach of possible or impossible scenarios concerning the future of a given system, starting from the determination of major trends and promising facts (Godet, 2004). This approach, by identifying variables and proposing extrapolations from the analysis of data available at a given point in time, is often applied as a strategic decision aid, but it can also be used for other purposes of more fundamental knowledge. By relying on more or less long-term horizons, foresight has an ambition similar to that of anthropology in that it supposes a global approach of the existing, which is interested in a multiplicity of themes without deciding a priori which theme is more important than others.⁶ In the scenario method, which is central in prospective approaches, each variable of the system studied is associated with indicators of motor skills or dependence that attempt to predict the importance of the variable in the system. Prospective, as an approach to predicting the future of systems, has been applied in fields as diverse as demography, energy production, sociological analysis, and town planning. As a reasoned approach of the future, it has taken on new importance in the context of the rise of the concept of sustainable development, and it is applied at the territorial level from the perspective of biodiversity management.⁷

Although the prospective approach is well known to economists and managers, and even to sociologists, it is not one of the tools and methods commonly deployed by ethnologists and anthropologists. However, in terms of heritage and heritage-making processes, there is every reason to believe that it could be of some use to them. Indeed, like the notion of prospective, that of heritage concerns representations of temporality. More precisely, heritagizations are a way for contemporary societies to project into the future representations from a past from that they feel cut off from (Davallon, 2000). Thus, heritage gives rise to cultural enhancement projects that are turned toward the future, unlike traditions, which only concern the relationship of societies to their past. From an empirical point of view, anthropological questioning concerning heritage therefore lends itself particularly well to a prospective approach, in the sense that it involves analyzing the development of territorial actions concerning heritage—in other words, studying the concrete methods of implantation of heritage projects.

⁶ This conforms to the classic definition of “total social fact,” through which “all kinds of institutions are expressed simultaneously and all of a sudden” (Mauss, 1950: 147) without knowing which one commands the others.

⁷ This is the meaning of the Agenda 21 action plan adopted following the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro (1992).

In southern France, ethnographic surveys concerning the practices covered by the notion of heritage have led to observation of various valuation methods among heritage-bearers. Although some actors remain focused on the old notions of folklore and tradition, in recent years others have been embracing the new notion of intangible cultural heritage. Surveys also show that civil society—the community in UNESCO’s terminology—is today more sensitive to the notion of heritage than to that of ethnology. It therefore seems that the progression of intangible cultural heritage is accompanied by a regression of ethnological sensitivity, which should be able to be compensated for by devoting more ethnological research to this situation. Thus, the rise of the notion of intangible cultural heritage, far from justifying the withdrawal of critical anthropology, requires instead that critical anthropology increase its activity. In the absence of field surveys and anthropological analyses concerning the practices covered by the notion of heritage and the processes that lead to their heritagization or their recognition as folklore or traditions, there is a risk that the actors of civil society will follow the easiest path, which consists of reproducing identically the backward-looking interpretations that they are most familiar with. In forward-looking terms, therefore, the success of intangible cultural heritage can be interpreted as a culturalist regression by critical anthropologists, but at the same time it constitutes an important progression compared to classical traditionalism.

More specifically, the prospective approach refocuses debates on the future of cultural heritage and on content for which the names have changed over time but which, on the whole, remains constant. Of course, field surveys show that, despite the claims of continuity asserted by their organizers, local Provençal festivals have changed considerably since the first descriptions were made at the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century. However, they constitute a regional common fund, known to historians, and which will undoubtedly continue (Gasnault et al., 2010). Although some evolutions will be inevitable, the basis of the different evolutionary scenarios is the same because it is anchored in the past. In terms of cultural heritage, the prospective approach therefore consists above all in finding a horizon of interpretation that goes beyond the critical point of view of anthropology. The aim is then to spark creativity in the field, and to practice anthropological criticism in a constructive way. Rather than condemning traditional festivals or traditional knowhow a priori for their backwardness, anthropology should warn those working in the field against traditionalist backward trends and work to open up the field of cultural heritage to more creative initiatives. The exercise then consists of adapting existing means to the ends pursued; that is, using cultural heritage policies to advance anthropology, rather than constantly accusing them of being a regressive force.

CONCLUSION

In this article I wanted to show that the recent development of the notion of intangible cultural heritage implied the coexistence of different logics: the emerging thematic logic, specific to heritage studies, is thus added to the specific logics of the various academic disciplines interested in cultural heritage. In addition, the complex notions of heritage and intangible cultural heritage have connotations and refer to specific conceptions of temporality, themselves in touch with more general tendencies indicated by the theoretical concepts of presentism or retrotopia. In the current context, and despite all the work of ethnologists and anthropologists, the notion of heritage remains very external to the field because it postulates a break with the past and a desire to project oneself toward the future. These characteristics are difficult to understand by those working in the field, who often remain prisoners of a conservative and backward-looking logic associated with the notion of tradition. Therefore, I suggest that it is important today to develop a forward-looking and constructive approach to cultural heritage, to better take into account the specificities of this notion. Entering into this dynamic is an increasingly imperative need to neutralize critical polarizations, avoid regression toward conservatism, and really put cultural heritage at the service of the development of territories with a prospective aim.

REFERENCES

- Bauman, Zygmunt. 2017. *Rétrotopie*. Paris: Premier Parallèle.
- Bayart, Jean-François. 1996. *L'illusion identitaire*. Paris: Fayard.
- Belmont, Nicole, ed. 1995. *Aux sources de l'ethnologie française: L'Académie celtique*. Paris: CTHS.
- Bortolotto, Chiara, ed. 2011. *Le patrimoine culturel immatériel: Enjeux d'une nouvelle catégorie*. Paris: MSH. <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.editionsmssh.3545>.
- Bortolotto, Chiara. 2013. L'Unesco comme arène de traduction: La fabrique globale du patrimoine immatériel. *Gradhiva* 18 (18): 50–73. <https://doi.org/10.4000/gradhiva.2708>.
- Boyer, Marc. 2009. *L'hiver dans le Midi: L'invention de la Côte d'Azur (XVIIIe-XXIe siècle)*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Bromberger, Christian. 2014. Le patrimoine immatériel, entre ambiguïté et overdose. *L'Homme* 209: 143–51. <https://doi.org/10.4000/lhomme.23513>.
- Chiva, Isac. 1990. Le patrimoine ethnologique: L'exemple de la France. In *Encyclopaediae Universalis: Symposium 24*, 229–241.
- Christophe, Jacqueline, Denis-Michel Boëll, and Régis Meyran, eds. 2009. *Du folklore à l'ethnologie*. Paris: MSH.
- Davallon, Jean. 2000. *L'exposition à l'œuvre: Stratégies de communication et médiation symbolique*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Gasnault, François et al., eds. 2010. *Récits de fête en Provence au XIXe siècle*. Milan: Silvana Editoriale.
- Ghasarian, Christian, ed. 2002. *De l'ethnographie à l'anthropologie réflexive*. Paris: Armand Colin.

- Giancristofaro, Lia. 2020. *Populisme et polarisations: Notes théoriques sur le folklore dans les institutions politiques*. Turin: L'Harmattan.
- Godet, Michel. 2004. *Manuel de prospective stratégique*. 2 Vols. Paris: Dunod.
- Hafstein, Valdimar. 2014. Protection as Dispossession: Government in the Vernacular. In *Cultural Heritage in Transit: Intangible Rights as Human Rights*, ed. Deborah Kapchan. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 25–57. <https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812209464.25>.
- Hartog, François. 2003. *Régimes d'historicité: Présentisme et expériences du temps*. Paris: Seuil.
- Isnart, Cyril, and Alessandro Testa. 2020. Ethnology's Hot Notions?: A Discussion Forum, on How to Return to "Tradition" Today. *Ethnologia Europaea* 50 (1): 89–108. <https://doi.org/10.16995/ee.1998>.
- Mauss, Marcel. 1950. *Sociologie et anthropologie*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Noyes, Dorothy. 2016. *Humble Theory: Folklore's Grasp on Social Life*. Indiana University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1zx0bs>.
- Palumbo, Berardino, 2020, Ce que la Sicile fait à l'anthropologie du patrimoine. In *Bérose: Encyclopédie internationale des histoires de l'anthropologie*. <http://www.berose.fr/article1809.html>.
- Rivière, Georges Henri. 1989. *Cours de muséologie: Textes et témoignages*. Paris: Dunod.
- Tauschek, Markus. 2010. *Wertschöpfung aus Tradition: Der Karneval von Binche und die Konstituierung kulturellen Erbes*. Münster: Lit.

SODOBNI IN PRIHODNJI RAZVOJI V RAZISKAVAH DEDIŠČINE OD »RETROTOPIJE« DO »PERSPEKTIVE«

V članku je avtorjeva analiza zasnovana na razločkih med pristopi v raziskavah dediščine in disciplinarnimi pristopi k dediščini, da bi pokazal na sedanji in prihodnji razvoj nesnovne kulturne dediščine. To pokaže z medigro kritičnih raziskav in širših raziskav nesnovne kulturne dediščine, ki oboje tvegajo regresijo in imajo možnosti za napredek. Podpora analizi so avtorjeve izkušnje s procesi razvoja kulturne dediščine in nekatere nedavne raziskave institucionalnega delovanja Unesca na področju nesnovne kulturne dediščine v Franciji. V nadaljevanju tematizira pojma »retrotopija« (Bauman 2017) in »perspektivnost« (Godet 2004), ki sta po njegovem mnenju usmerila temeljni antropološki premislek o prihodnosti raziskav dediščine. V sklepu povzema možnosti napredka – ali, nasprotno, regresije – nesnovne kulturne dediščine.

Članek želi razgrniti, da nedavni razvoj pojma nesnovna kulturna dediščina implicira sožitje različnih logik: najprej nastajajoče tematske logike, značilne za raziskave dediščine, nato pa še specifičnih logik različnih akademskih disciplin, ki jih zanima kulturna dediščina. Poleg tega imajo kompleksni pojmi dediščina in nesnovna kulturna dediščina različne konotacije in se nanašajo na specifične koncepte časovnosti, ki so sami v stiku s splošnimi težnjami, kakor jih kažejo teoretični koncepti prezentizma ali retrotopije. V sedanjem kontekstu in kljub obsežnemu in intenzivnemu delu etnologov in antropologov pa pojem dediščina praviloma ostaja zunaj tega

področja, saj predpostavlja prelom s preteklostjo in željo po projekciji v prihodnost. Te značilnosti težko razumejo tisti, ki delajo na tem področju in ki pogosto ostajajo ujetniki konservativne in v preteklost zagledane logike, povezane s pojmom tradicije. Po avtorjevem mnenju je danes pomembno razviti v prihodnost usmerjen in konstruktiven pristop do kulturne dediščine. Za vstop v to dinamiko pa so vse bolj nujni potreba po nevtralizaciji kritične polarizacije, izogibanje nazadovanju h konservativnosti in resnična postavitve kulturne dediščine v korist razvoja območja s perspektivnimi cilji.

Prof. Dr. Laurent Sébastien Fournier, Aix-Marseille University, laurent.fournier@univ-amu.fr