

**University of Massachusetts Amherst**

---

**From the Selected Works of Matthew J. Hill**

---

2015

# Entrepreneurial Heritage: Historic Urban Landscapes and the Politics of 'Comprehensive Development' in Post-Soviet Cuba

Matthew J. Hill, *University of Massachusetts Amherst*

Maki Tanaka, *University of California - Berkeley*



Available at: [https://works.bepress.com/matthew\\_j\\_hill/10/](https://works.bepress.com/matthew_j_hill/10/)

## **Entrepreneurial Heritage: Historic Urban Landscapes and the Politics of ‘Comprehensive Development’ in Post-Soviet Cuba**

Forthcoming in Sophia Labadi and William Logan (eds.), *Urban Heritage, Development and Sustainability: International Frameworks, National and Local Governance*. Routledge Key Issues in Cultural Heritage Series (2015)

Hill, Matthew J. and Maki Tanaka.

This paper examines how the transformation in UNESCO’s policy towards urban conservation—from a narrow emphasis on architectural conservation to a broader focus on urban heritage management—plays out in the context of Old Havana, a UNESCO World Heritage site. In particular, we argue that this policy shift in the Cuban case gives rise to a new form of governance that encourages the creation of a new type of ‘socialist man’ (*hombre novísimo*) through the disciplining of and shaping the participation in cultural production of heritage. This new form of governance is particularly pronounced in the Cuban context given the centralization of power in a single, entrepreneurial sub-state actor, the Office of the City Historian of Havana (OHCH) that manages the territory and its population on behalf of the Cuban state. Moreover, given the fact that the state controls all of the patrimony in Cuba further accounts for the OHCH’s ability to govern and dispose of territory and population in ways that are complicated in liberal polities that must negotiate with the demands of private developers and property owners and institutionalized forms of public accountability. The Cuban case is particularly interesting then given the fact that historic centers like Old Havana play an increasingly important role in Cuba’s tourism-oriented development strategy together with the survival of quasi-socialist institutions in the post-Soviet period (cf. Colantio and Potter 2006). Francesco Bandarin and Ron van Oers’ recent book (2012), on the historic urban landscape testifies to the importance of the Old Havana case through a case study that depicts the Old Havana experiment in combining urban landscape conservation with a dynamic form of urban development that is officially known as ‘comprehensive development’ (*desarrollo integral*).

In developing our argument about the entrepreneurial nature of governance in Old Havana, we seek to contribute to recent discussions about heritage as a form of governmentality (de Cesari 2010) and the use of national culture as a resource for socioeconomic development (Scher 2010, Yúdice 2003). In Cuba, the commodification of built heritage as a resource coincides with the replacement of the former command economy with a post-Soviet service economy based on tourism and the competitive marketing of cultural goods, whether historic centers, beaches, cigars, rum, natural landscapes or even socialism itself. A primacy in the Cuban state development strategy then is increasingly given to culture, which comes to operate on social relations through its association with development, the economy and society (Keane 2005:149, cf. Scher 2011, Yúdice 2003, Hernandez-Reguant 2009). As Philip Scher has recently argued (2011), the growing reliance of Caribbean states on the commodification of cultural forms like Carnival as an economic development strategy increasingly subjects those forms and their practitioners to “cultural intervention” and “institutional oversight” by the state that he refers to as “biopower” (2011:9). In this paper, we explore a similar shift, focusing on the way in which Old Havana as a historic urban

landscape, when incorporated into dynamic urban heritage development processes, also becomes a site of biopolitical management of culture that we refer to below as 'entrepreneurial heritage'.<sup>i</sup>

We develop our argument in three parts. After first describing the shift from architectural conservation to historic urban landscape management in UNESCO's approach to historic cities, we then turn to the Cuban case, and describe a similar transformation in the orientation to urban conservation in the socialist and post-Soviet periods. We then move on to describe the creation of an entrepreneurial sub-state actor in Old Havana which represents a uniquely Cuban strategy for urban heritage management, combining urban conservation with processes of urban planning and tourism-oriented economic development. Finally, we examine how this new form of urban heritage management plays out on the ground with the participation of the state, the local community, and individuals who are increasingly drawn into the heritage tourism economy. In so doing, we develop the notion of 'entrepreneurial heritage' to describe the governmental aspects of the new heritage management regime in Old Havana, examining the way in which it organized urban space and conduct in keeping with UNESCO and state aesthetics of outstanding universal value.

### **From Architectural Conservation to Urban Landscape Management**

Historic Urban Landscape does not constitute a separate 'heritage category'. On the contrary, the concept is inscribed within the established concept of urban historic areas, while at the same time adding a new lens to the practice of urban conservation: a broader 'territorial' view of heritage, accompanied by a greater consideration of the social and economic functions of an historic city, an approach to managing change that tries to cope with modern developments, and finally, a re-evaluation of modern contributions to historic values. It is a tool to project the ideas of urban conservation in the twenty-first century.

--Bandarin and van Oers (2012:73).

The first international charter dedicated to the conservation of historic cities, i.e. the Venice Charter (1964), took the important step of expanding the field of conservation from museum objects to architectural monuments. Nevertheless its narrow focus on architectural conservation and prioritization of a self-contained idea of material authenticity overlooked the social context in which monuments gained significance. Moreover, its overwhelming focus on the restoration of 'ancient' buildings as carriers of the 'substance' of pastness gave monuments an inordinate priority over urban settings (Ruggles 2012:8; Weiss 2014:2, Ashworth 2011:6). The World Heritage Convention (1972) did a better job of defining historic cities not only as monuments, but also as groups of buildings that contained natural and cultural values (Ruggles 2012:9). Even so, it still defined those cities largely in static and aesthetic terms, and as territorially bounded. For instance, Article 1 of the World Heritage Convention defines the cultural heritage of historic cities as "architectural works" or "*groups of separate or connected buildings* which, because

of their architecture, homogeneity or place in the landscape, are of *outstanding universal value* from the view of history, art or science.”<sup>ii</sup> In this respect, it continued to present the city as a ‘historic center’ or ‘ensemble’ of buildings separated from the broader urban context, and defined by outstanding, exceptional, and unique cultural expressions considered in danger of disappearing (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2006:186).<sup>iii</sup>

The Washington Charter (1987) sought to improve upon these previous charters by addressing the fact that historic cities are comprised of more than collections of material artifacts. It moved to viewing historic urban areas as complex, inhabited communities and urban settings plagued by problems with automobile traffic, aging infrastructures, and processes of economic restructuring (Ruggles 2012:10; Bandarin and van Oers 2012:48). In this respect, it attempted to resituate the practices of architectural conservation within the broader purview of government policy focused on “local area renovation” and urban renewal (Ashworth 2011:10). Yet at the same time, the Washington Charter was still limited by its static view of social processes, dependency on sources of public funding, and an overreliance on a conservation plan and its implementation by the public sector (Bandarin and van Oers 2012:49).

The Vienna Memorandum (2005) and the subsequent UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (2011) sought to address these shortcomings by integrating ‘historic urban landscapes’ with dynamic processes of ‘social and economic’ or ‘sustainable’ development. By adopting the language of the ‘historic urban landscape’, the authors of these charters dramatically expanded the field of urban conservation by incorporating the broader urban context into its purview. This context now included: a site’s “topography, geomorphology, and natural features; its built environment, both historic and contemporary; its infrastructure above and below ground; its open spaces and gardens; its land use patterns and spatial organization; its visual relationships; and all other elements of the urban structure. It also includes social and cultural practices and values, economic processes and the intangible dimensions of heritage as related to diversity and identity” (Bandarin and van Oers 2012:212). This much expanded definition of the object of urban conservation, reconceptualized as ‘urban heritage management’, represents an important shift towards what Bandarin and van Oers call “*sustainable development* in the governance of historic cities, as well as a broader vision of the nature of urban heritage” (our italics, 2012: 63). Moreover, it takes a dynamic view of historic urban spaces, viewing change—social, economic and physical—as “a variable to be managed and understood, not just as a source of contrast [i.e. with a static, unchanging past]” (ibid.). The goal of urban heritage management then is no longer to preserve stasis, but the management of change itself.

The historic urban landscape approach (which we refer to as HUL) then reconceptualizes urban conservation (or urban heritage management) as a “moving target” characterized by “an increasingly complex management environment” where “changes can occur at different intervals and different levels and with different magnitudes” (Bandarin and van Oers 2012:143). As such, HUL complicates the challenges faced by the urban site manager by “expand[ing]...the territory under their surveillance, ... the number of stakeholders involved, and ... the type of attributes that carry meaning and value” (ibid.). The successful management of this landscape requires “the forging of new partnerships, better

institutional coordination, and more available resources, both technical and financial” (ibid.). Accordingly, the urban heritage manager must coordinate the activities of several actors. These include: *governments* that integrate urban heritage into national development policies; *local authorities* that prepare urban development plans; *public-private partnerships* (PPPs), where the private sector provides capital and the management know-how, and the *public sector* ensures that the public benefits; *international specialists* in sustainable development; and *national and international NGOs* that disseminate tools and best practices (Bandarin and van Oers 2012: 121,144).

In sum, HUL seeks to understand urban heritage as part of a “comprehensive system” that includes processes of urbanization, urban development, climate change, the shifting economies of cities, tourism and changing perceptions of the urban heritage values to be protected (Bandarin and van Oers 2013:75-111). Rather than try to control all of these variables, one could argue that it seeks to “graft an apparatus” on these processes, arranging them, harnessing their fluctuations, and establishing connections with other “elements of reality” in such a way that it compensates, prevents or cancels out the undesirable element of that reality (Foucault 2007:37). The HUL apparatus consists of a cluster of tools that allow such a modulated intervention. These include *regulatory systems* (e.g. ordinances, acts, decrees); *community engagement tools* (e.g. stakeholder analysis and mapping); *technical tools* (e.g. social and environmental impact assessments); and *financial tools* (e.g. development bank loans, micro-credit, finance mechanisms to support local enterprise) (Bandarin and van Oers 2012:144-45). Bandarin and van Oers emphasize that the variety of “geo-cultural, institutional and political environments” prevent them from specifying the exact mix of roles and responsibilities required for HUL implementation, and stress the interdependent nature of the policies and actions in the HUL toolkit. The HUL approach then treats urban heritage landscapes as “a field that doesn’t admit to control,” focusing instead on a series of “modulated interventions” into a field of “autonomous and mutually corrective decisions” (Collier 2009: 87).

## **From Architectural Conservation to Urban Heritage Management: The Cuban Case**

The shift from architectural conservation to urban heritage management took place in three stages in Old Havana. During a first stage (1963-1976), urban conservation efforts focused on the preservation of isolated monuments from the colonial period following the conservation principles the Venice Charter. An architect that Hill interviewed who was active on the National Monuments Commission (ca. 1963) during this period noted that the members of the Commission spent most of their time identifying, cataloguing, and studying historic buildings, and preventing them from being demolished due to their uninhabitable conditions. Given limited resources, the Commission carried out only a handful of restorations, focusing on monumental structures from the colonial period that were considered important because they were tied to an important historical figure or architectural style (López 2006). These included: the former palaces of the colonial governor and vice-governor (Palacios de los Capitanes Generales and Segundo Cabo), a military fortress (Fuerza Real), a monument to the founding of the city (El Templo), and a handful of palaces of former Spanish and Cuban nobility. All of these restorations were

dedicated to cultural functions such as museums, libraries, or centers of visual art. These efforts focused on the conservation of colonial architecture because it was the oldest, and considered most significant representative of Cuban national identity. Given the late date of independence in Cuba (1902) meant that Cuba also had nearly 100 additional years of colonial architecture compared to its other Latin American counterparts.

During a second period of conservation (1976-1993), conservation efforts shifted to a broader territorial scale with the passage of Cuba's first conservation laws and the support of centralized state financing. This shift in official policy towards urban conservation took place in response to the failure of the ten-million ton sugar harvest (1970), which resulted in the government's search for new sources of national unity and pride in continuity with its past and the celebration of its heritage (cf. Tanaka 2011:27). In response to these events, the government passed the first heritage protection laws (Nos. 1 and 2) in 1977, in the context of the broader administrative reorganization of the country, and established a registry of national landmarks and guidelines for their conservation and safeguarding (*Comisión* 1984:8, 18; Fornet Gil 1997). One year later, Cuba's National Monuments Commission passed Resolution No. 3, declaring Havana *intra muros* (the portion of Old Havana contained inside of the City's old defensive walls) to be "Cultural Patrimony of the Nation," while the Department of Monuments, a division of the Office of Cultural Patrimony (*Dirección de Patrimonio*), undertook the first comprehensive study of the Historic District and drafted a set of proposals for its restoration (Rigol Savio 1994; Capablanca 1983:6, Arjona 1986:104). The Cuban state also approved the first five year budget (1981–1986) of thirteen million pesos for the restoration and conservation of the Historic Center, an amount that would later be increased by an additional four million pesos in a second five year budget (1986–1991) (Melero Lazo 2001: 4). Following on these measures, UNESCO's World Heritage Committee added Old Havana and its system of defensive fortifications to the World Heritage List in 1982.

The attempt to restore an entire ensemble of 20 colonial and republican era buildings together with the public space of one of the Old Havana's five original squares, the Plaza Vieja, represented the first steps towards a comprehensive approach to urban conservation. This project, carried out under the auspices of the National Center for the Conservation, Restoration and Museology (CENCREM), created in 1980 with a one million dollar UNESCO loan, sought to restore the plaza's colonial-era buildings, mostly badly dilapidated tenement houses (known in Cuba as *solares*) for use as social housing (Plan Maestro 2008:8; Rigol 1994). The Plaza Vieja became a test case for this new 'integrated' restoration approach in the 1980s, which was subsequently extended to a broader plan of action for the entire historic center and incorporated into a proposed set of urban regulations for the old city in 1990 (Plan Maestro 2008:9).<sup>iv</sup> The shortcomings of this monumental approach in Old Havana included its overreliance on the drafting of numerous urban conservation plans and the limitations of centralized state financing. With 3,500 buildings, 40 per cent of which were classified as in danger of imminent collapse, the estimate of the actual restoration cost by some estimates exceeded US \$1 billion, far more than the roughly \$30 million pesos committed by the state in two five-year plans in the 1980s.<sup>v</sup> Moreover, the restoration was plagued by the "overlapping state and local authorities" involved in the restoration—the Institute of Physical Planning, the Office of

Cultural Patrimony, CENCREM, the Office of the City Historian of Havana (OHCH), and the municipal government (Hill 2004:37). These limitations came to a head in October 1993. In October of that year, due to a shortage of funds, an important eighteenth-century merchant's house, in the Plaza Vieja, the Colegio Santo Angel, suddenly collapsed in broad daylight while awaiting restoration (Hill 2007).

These events ushered in a third phase (1993-present) in which urban conservation policy shifted to the 'comprehensive' social, environmental, and economic development approach that is currently in force in Old Havana. Conservation on this scale required a shift to a 'sustainable' development model in which the Cuban government empowered a single juridical actor, the OHCH to carry out the restoration of the entire historic center on behalf of the Cuban people. This shift took place through the passage of Decree Law 143 (1993), which transformed the OHCH from a provincial cultural institution answerable to the local municipal government to a decentralized, 'entrepreneurial' state agency subordinated directly to the Cuban Council of State (the highest level of government in Cuba). Decree 143 granted the OHCH the legal power to redevelop state properties in the historic center for use as hotels, restaurants, museums and other commercial purposes, as well as to tax state companies in the area. This in turn enabled the OHCH to act as its own investor, and self-finance the rehabilitation of Old Havana. The focus then in this period moved to the sustainability (i.e. continuity) of the restoration process through the creation of new structures, specifically OHCH operated tourism and commercial real estate companies that could facilitate the generation of profits needed for further restoration.

The OHCH uses the term "comprehensive development" (*desarrollo integral*) to refer to the process of turning urban conservation into a sustainable development process. In an interview that Hill conducted with the Director of UNESCO's Regional Bureau of Culture for Latin America and the Caribbean about Old Havana, he emphasized that the lesson learned from the case of Old Havana was the need for such an integrated approach—the broader 'territorial' and dynamic view of heritage as an urban process that takes into account what Bandarin and van Oers refers to as the "social and economic functions" of the historic city (2012:73). Where Eusebio Leal, the City Historian and the head of OHCH, and the OHCH started with a focus on a number of individual conservation projects in the 1980s, the Director noted, they broadened the scope of their operations (after 1993), becoming more focused on the whole site, i.e. a 2 square kilometer area with 3,500 buildings in various stages of deterioration and a population of over 70,000 inhabitants (Van Hooff 2013). This entailed a shift from a narrow, object-oriented focus on conserving isolated monuments to a broader outcomes and process focus, in which the heritage manager works to align a greater range of people, institutions, processes and artifacts in a network or composition of forces. The key to this self-regulation is what Eusebio Leal has referred to as "sustaining the restoration and its economic demands with a productive structure ... guided by culture" (Hill 2004:31), or what Bandarin and van Oers refer to as "income generating development rooted in tradition" (2012:144). In both cases, culture and tradition play an important role in defining what counts as legitimate entrepreneurialism, and what doesn't.

## **Entrepreneurial Heritage**

In an influential article, Chiara de Cesari has talked about creative heritage as form of “nonstate governmentality” or “governmentality from below” that takes on the role of state building in the context of the weak Palestinian state (2010). In her analysis, artistic endeavors, like art biennales play the important role of helping Palestinians imagine and perform a future Palestinian state, by recruiting them to care for their heritage, and take on rehabilitation projects themselves. In the Cuban case, by contrast, where the one-party state (in particular, the OHCH) is a strong state, the performative aspect of heritage is more about generating a continuous stream of revenue, within the framework of “tradition,” a form of self-regulation that we refer to as *entrepreneurial heritage*. The OHCH encourages entrepreneurialism, inviting various stakeholders’ participation in the socio-economic development of the historic city, so long as it conforms to the egalitarian and aesthetic standards of the OHCH, as well as UNESCO.<sup>vi</sup> If it fails to fall in this category, it is not considered to be entrepreneurialism. In this respect, the heritage performed in Old Havana does not imagine the state, in a bottom-up fashion, so much as perpetuate the (post)socialist project through a more open field of heritage management.

What is entrepreneurial about this process is that the focus on crafting a present and possible future for socialism supersedes the emphasis on outstanding universal value and the monument-based, past-oriented approach that we would argue continues to operate through HUL—albeit with the freedom to adaptively reuse historic structures. In this new context, there is greater freedom to ‘fashion’ a useful heritage out of the available materials (relics, memories, histories) in order to address contemporary needs and to create a future for socialism (Ashworth 2011:11). While the OHCH remains committed to the conservation of architectural forms in keeping with UNESCO norms, it expands these activities in the context of a much broader domain of urban heritage management. In this new context, the OHCH seeks to regulate a more open field of entrepreneurial activity in which communities and individuals are taught to manage themselves through a politics of ‘self-care’ (Brown 2003). Part of this involves the creation of the conditions in which entrepreneurial activity can flourish as part of a necessary development strategy based on cultural heritage and tourism. This is why the OHCH as an urban heritage manager engages in a much broader range of social activities like the operation of a maternity hospital, a center for children with Down syndrome, and infrastructure projects related to the sewage system and the electrical grid.

## **Entrepreneurial Heritage of the OHCH**

Following the passage of Decree 143, the OHCH had to take charge of a much more complex management environment than existed in the 1980s, when conservation entities made plans for isolated buildings or small ensembles, and waited for government financing to carry them out—an approach which also had a relatively small impact on the historic center. By contrast, in the late socialist context, the OHCH suddenly had to generate its own revenues, attract tourists, care for an aging population, deal with nagging infrastructure problems, create sources of employment, collect taxes, address problems of security, and solve an outsized housing problem, with roughly half the population living in over 900



badly dilapidated tenements, many of which lacked private toilets or running water (cf. Nickel 1990). As a multi-faceted business enterprise, not only does the OHCH generate over \$100 million in gross revenues annually through its chain of branded hotels, restaurants, bars, museums and shops; it also runs social welfare and cultural programs for the residents and beyond. Recently, the OHCH has even been investing in the infrastructure of Old Havana, replacing old electricity, gas, and water pipes.<sup>vii</sup> The OHCH's scope of work is not limited to urban conservation, but extends to general governance of Old Havana.

The transformations that took place to the previously mentioned Plaza Vieja in the late 1990s, after the state placed the OHCH in charge of the restoration of Old Havana, illustrate the new emphasis on economic development through cultural heritage and tourism. In contrast to the previous attempt (in the 1980s) to restore the plaza, which sought to restore historic buildings for use as social housing, the OHCH (in the late 1990s) opted to integrate the plaza into a growing tourism network. This network was comprised of Old Havana's other main plazas (i.e. Catedral, Armas, and San Francisco) and their interconnecting streets, an area that the OHCH began to refer to as the '*kilometro de oro*' (Miracle Mile). To carry out this integration, the OHCH engaged in what Matt Hodges refers to as the "deworliding of artifacts from their local contexts and subsequent disclosure so that they can be consumed in the context of heritage tourism practices" (2011:91).

An excellent example of this type of deworliding is the OHCH's decision to remove an underground parking structure that was originally constructed in the center of the plaza in the early 1950s, a few years prior to the Cuban revolution. In the late 1990s, the OHCH demolished the underground garage, and above ground amphitheater. It made this decision both because the garage was considered to disrupt the traditional morphology of the plaza, and also due to its association with North American domination of Cuba during the republican period (1902-1959). The OHCH then covered the surface with polished paving stones and adorned it with a fountain. It then 'pedestrianized' the square by installing heavy metal chains at the four corners of the plaza, and cannon ball shaped bollards around the plaza's perimeter to prevent vehicular traffic.

### **Insert: Image of the Plaza Vieja**

Through this type of "disciplinary orchestration of a "tacit network of signs" the OHCH reaffirmed the traditional origins of the Plaza and Old Havana as one of Spain's last colonial possessions in the New World. In so doing, it also succeeded in creating a 'colonial nostalgia' (Bissell 2005) that attracted tourists and commercial investors to the plaza—like the international retail chains Paul & Shark, Benetton, Paco Valente, and Pepe Jeans. The changes also helped the OHCH broker UNDP funds from a number of international donors (Spain, Austria, Belgium, Japan) to restore the remaining colonial era buildings in the plaza for commercial, cultural, and a more limited social housing use. Ultimately, the commercial exploitation of the Plaza resulted in the OHCH needing to relocate over half of the plaza's original residents to replacement housing on the city's outskirts. At the same time, it accommodated a smaller group of residents in more spacious social housing units that combined with revenue generating commercial shops, hotels and restaurants (Fornet Gil 2011).

## **Entrepreneurial Heritage of the Community**

At the community level, entrepreneurial heritage consists of spontaneous activities by private individuals or civic groups, basically without state sponsorship. These activities arise in a community surrounded by heritage materials, which are likely to draw tourist attention. The activities may contribute to income generation, neighborhood revitalization (Brumann 2009), the articulation of a dominant group's identity (Hodges 2009), resistance to state planning agencies (Collins 2008), or even state-building (De Cesari 2010). In a country like Cuba where the state authority is strong and neighborhoods are organized into mechanisms of vigilance, such spontaneous activities at the community level may be hard to observe. As a government official who Adrian Hearn interviewed noted, the Cuban state doesn't support grassroots economic initiatives due to its "insecurity about local autonomy" and "economic self-sufficiency" (2008:52). The OHCH is an exception in this regard. Due to its decentralized system of administration, and autonomous financial management model, the OHCH is able to support "self-directed community projects" unlike other state entities (2008:91).

Hearn describes several such community development projects in Old Havana. Most of these involved Afro-Cuban religious groups that at least initially involved a community development orientation. In one such project, a santero used a community garden to teach neighborhood youth about Afro-Cuban cuisine and medicinal plants (2008a: 92). In another, a pair of local Afro-Cuban musicians established a weekly folkloric musical gathering in a tenement courtyard to showcase the talents of local rumba musicians and raise awareness about HIV and alcohol abuse (2008b:233). Yet Hearn notes that both projects ultimately got sidetracked by commercial interests that detracted from their original community development goals.

Another such community development project in Old Havana derived from a previously unrecognized form of heritage. The neighborhood project, known as Arte Corte (the "art of haircutting") was initiated by Gilberto Valladares, popularly known as "Papito," a charismatic community leader and barber with an artistic flair. Papito grew interested in the history of barbers and barbering techniques and devices, collecting old tools of the trade and other related objects, and eventually opening a private museum and salon. Papito also set out to train local youth, and had a vision of opening a barbering school to provide them with vocational skills and a means to generate income. Together with local hair stylists and artisans, Papito turned Santo Angel into a barbering heritage neighborhood, painting the facades of the buildings, and placing artistic expressions in the streets. They also hold events such as "el día del peluquero (the barber day)" whereby hairstylists from all over the island would join and demonstrate their professional skills. The spontaneity of this barrio and how they use the barbering heritage in order to invest in the local population represents a form of entrepreneurial heritage at the community level.

**Insert: Image of the Arte Corte Neighborhood**

The vibrancy of this project attracted the attention of the OHCH. Papito's voluntary activism fits with Eusebio Leal's long-expressed concern that the local residents of Old Havana learn and appreciate the value of their own heritage. The Havana Historian is recorded to have said: "I wish we had a hundred Papitos in Old Havana." The Arte Corte case study signals a shift from an architectural conservation approach to the built environment to a more open-ended heritage management approach. The latter entails a greater freedom to 'fashion' a heritage from available materials, like the local history of barbering and barbering implements, that can address the needs of community development. Rather than focusing strictly on the preservation of the built environment, the OHCH celebrates and manages community entrepreneurialism such as Papito's. The spontaneous transformation of public space in Old Havana is not penalized, but rather encouraged. In this manner, the OHCH promotes heritage-conscious subjects that act in accordance with the OHCH's vision. The OHCH, in fact, has provided assistance to the Arte Corte project by building a vocational school and a barbering-themed park in Santo Angel, placing its own logo on signs celebrating the project. While some might argue that the OHCH has coopted Papito's project, locals are quite proud to be recognized by the OHCH, and still call Arte Corte their own.

### **Entrepreneurial Heritage of the Individual**

Since 1993, when the financing of the restoration shifted from the centralized state to an integral development model, more and more residents have been drawn into the heritage tourism project (cf. Silverman 2002:883). The government's liberalization of self-employment laws under Raul Castro have brought hundreds if not thousands of new entrepreneurs to the Old City (cf. Hearn and Alfonso 2012). This includes artisans, book vendors, street artists, bicycle taxi drivers, musicians, folkloric groups, street vendors, and self-employed construction workers. The OHCH has itself supported this activity as a form of local economic development, and even begun renting space for massage parlors, flower shops, and boutiques to local entrepreneurs. Between 2005 and 2011, the number of entrepreneurs in Old Havana multiplied from 2,500 to over 6,000. On the days when OHCH opens to the public, employees are inundated with applications from residents seeking licenses to rent rooms, operate restaurants, or run galleries out of their homes. More recently, the OHCH has begun exploring the idea of renting space and equipment to private cooperatives of artisans like cobblers.

The explosion of entrepreneurial activity has challenged the OHCH's ability to regulate individual forms of entrepreneurial practice so that they remain in keeping with the heritage aesthetic and the selfless dictates of *desarrollo integral*. In this respect, it seeks to manage entrepreneurial activity through the licensing of entrepreneurs as a means of controlling how residents engage with capital and the past in Old Havana. Perhaps the most visible individuals of these are *costumbristas*, who display themselves in colorful period costumes in the tourist area. These individual entrepreneurs are licensed and heavily taxed by the OHCH, and practice their businesses under certain rules and close watch by the state.

### Insert: Image of the Costumbristas

In addition to the *costumbristas*, Bandarin and van Oers celebrate the carnival troop that regularly performs in Old Havana's main tourists plazas as an example of intangible heritage (2012:109). This group presents another example of 'folkloric' practice established through the OHCH's licensing as a way to enhance the tourism interface in this heritage site. While the carnival group regularly performs for tips, if an unlicensed Cuban were to ask a tourist for a "gift," he or she might be stopped by the tourist police. Individual heritage entrepreneurs like the *costumbristas* or the carnival group are perhaps most regulated by the state, as they must conduct their businesses within the (always changing and sometimes arbitrary) legal framework, or legally-defined categories of the OHCH. In many ways, this is a form of heavily managed capitalism, largely so that the state can keep a tight grip on the private sector (Corrales 2004). But within the heritage district of Old Havana, the OHCH encourages entrepreneurial heritage so long as it is conducted in a 'selfless' way, is in keeping with official heritage aesthetics, or community needs as in the Barrio Santo Angel, and ultimately enhances the tourist experience in Old Havana.

### Conclusion

The Cuban case illustrates the transition from a narrow approach to urban conservation focused on the preservation and transmission of an isolated group of monuments to a post-Soviet urban heritage management orientation, combining profit-making, planning, social development, community engagement and urban conservation in a single entrepreneurial sub-state agency—the OHCH. We suggest that this new form of urban heritage management coincides with a type of governmentality that we have called entrepreneurial heritage. This style of management seeks to draw buildings, communities, and individuals and their bodily practices into a dynamic, and transnational urban heritage landscape, largely on terms that are set by the OHCH itself. These terms include subordination to the logics of the OHCH's capture of tourism revenues (licensing, policing, taxation), deference to officially sanctioned heritage aesthetics, and obedience to the selfless dictates of the 'new' socialist man (Frederik 2006). At the same time, the emphasis on fashioning a 'usable' past out of the range of available materials has given rise to new forms of previously unrecognized heritage like the intangible practices of haircutting. Such forms of heritage are accepted so long as they further the broader goals of egalitarian economic development. While some might view the OHCH's disciplinary orchestration of a 'tacit network of antiquated signs' (Hodges 2009)—both at the level of buildings and bodily practices—as heavy-handed, they are viewed as an accepted trade-off to maintain Cuba's autonomy in the face of the Soviet collapse and the US economic embargo.

The Cuban case raises a larger set of issues about HUL itself, which we argue remains highly Eurocentric in its orientation towards urban conservation and its incorporation into dynamic urban development processes. When transplanted to poor, post-colonial countries like Cuba, the focus of urban heritage management shifts. Rather than integrating urban conservation with urban development, urban conservation itself becomes the primary

means of tourism-oriented, urban and economic development. This results in vast disparities in wealth, resources, and mobility between Cubans who work and reside in Old Havana, and the European and North American tourists who visit it in pursuit of ‘authentic’ historic cityscapes and an intensively marketed ‘colonial nostalgia.’ Such historic urban landscapes represent one of the few ways for Cuba to enter the global economy and to capture much-needed hard currency reserves. At the same time, the OHCH, on behalf of the state, tries to manage this economic opening by capturing the value of global capitalism and tourism flows through its network of newly minted hotels, restaurants, and museums—a new form of decentralized centralization.

This dependency on tourism gives rise to a host of contradictions that are not fully envisioned by HUL. Steven Gregory (2006) captures some of these contradictions with the metaphor of the “devil behind the mirror,” referring to the vagaries of uneven, tourism-based development in the neighboring Dominican Republic. In Cuba, this devil includes: spatial segregation between tourist and residential areas; racialization as blacks are excluded from working in hotels and more heavily policed in the increasingly ‘whitened’ Old Havana; some residential displacement, as former palaces converted into tenements are refurbished for commercial uses in an ever-expanding tourism zone; and an expansion of people working as ‘hustlers’ (*jineteros*) in the informal economy—selling cigars, acting as unofficial tour guides, seeking amorous relations with tourists and many other forms of feeding (*picando*) off the tourist sector. The OHCH seeks to regulate and manage this economic opening through licensing, providing jobs and employment, operating schools and hospitals, repairing the urban infrastructure, and ultimately defining what is appropriate conduct. But there are also inevitable costs for those who must increasingly work officially or informally within this disciplinary, urban heritage apparatus in order to ‘make ends meet’ (*resolviendo*).

One could argue that the situation in Old Havana isn’t HUL, or isn’t consistent with the HUL model, since it involves some displacement, top-down orchestration of heritage aesthetics, and consultations with the community that are more about legitimating projects that have been decided in advance. But alternatively, one could argue that HUL is truly only applicable in a narrow group of European cities due to its inability to fully grasp the range of informal urbanization processes and forms of economic dependency that characterize countries in the Global South like Cuba (cf. Weiss 2014). In such contexts, entrepreneurial heritage, whether demolishing a parking structure, sanctioning haircutting as official heritage, or licensing *costumbristas* serves the larger goal of maintaining Cuban exceptionalism in a post-socialist world, and reaffirming Cuba’s commitment to solidarity and the egalitarian values of socialism in a reconfigured world economy. Further research will be required to better understand the forms that urban heritage management takes in other ‘developing’ country contexts seeking to follow the HUL paradigm.

---

<sup>i</sup> As Pløger notes, it was through cities, and in particular, historic urban cores, that societies first developed ideas about how to discipline life through urban space beginning in the 1800s (2008:52). Moreover, governments, in seeking to control many of the social problems of cities—poverty, illness, lack of hygiene, poor housing—discovered that forms of biopolitics (surveillance,

---

registration, classification) made it possible to “clean, shape and order” cities and to create ‘healthy’ populations (ibid. 64).

ii Italics ours. See <http://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext/>.

iii In this respect, it continued to present the historic city as a ‘romanticized monumental place’ characterized by the sense of unchanging permanence that Herzfeld has called ‘monumental time’ in contrast to the ‘social time’ of lived, everyday practices and their related urban forms (Franquesa 2011:1027).

iv It also served as the basis of ongoing debates about the right level of population in Old Havana, with some planners arguing for the ability to accommodate the existing population through better distribution, and others arguing for the need to reduce population densities in order to provide adequate housing and use of the territory (ibid.).

v According to Jorge Pérez López, the official Cuban exchange rate was 1 US dollar to 1 Cuban peso in the 1980s, but the unofficial rate was 6 pesos to 1 US dollar (1995: 253)

vi This is similar to the situation in the ‘Levant’, where what often counts as heritage are Western (post)colonial discourses that emphasize sites like Petra, Jerash or Wadi Rum and the Western archaeologists and explorers (e.g. Lawrence of Arabia) who ‘discovered’ or ‘opened up’ these places (Jacobs 2010: 319). As Jacobs notes, these Western models are imbued with a sense of ‘colonial nostalgia’, “often found under imperialism, where people mourn the passing of what they themselves have transformed” (ibid. 318).

vii The OHCH is unique in this regard. As a near autonomous entity, created by the socialist state to facilitate entrepreneurship, it only reports to the Council of State. Such semi-autonomous status is unprecedented and singular in Cuba.

## Bibliography

Arjona, Marta. 1986. *Patrimonio Cultural e Identidad*. La Habana: Editorial Letras Cubanas.

Ashworth, Gregory. 2011. Preservation, conservation and heritage: approaches to the past in the present through the built environment. *Asian anthropology* 10 (1):1-18.

Bandarin, Francesco, and Ron van Oers. 2012. *The Historic Urban Landscape: Managing Heritage in an Urban Century*. 1 edition ed: Wiley.

Bandarin, Francesco, and Ron van Oers, eds. 2013. *Reconnecting the City: The Historic Urban Landscape Approach and the Future of Urban Heritage*. Oxford, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

Bissell, William Cunningham. 2005. Engaging Colonial Nostalgia. *Cultural Anthropology* 20(2):215-248.

Brown, Wendy. 2003. Neo-liberalism and the end of liberal democracy. *Theory & Event* 7 (1).

Brumann, Christoph. 2009. Outside the glass case: The social life of urban heritage in Kyoto. *American Ethnologist* 36 (2):276-299.

Capablanca, Enrique. 1983. *Habana Vieja. Anteproyecto de restauración*. Departamento de Monumentos. Dirección de Patrimonio Cultural. Ministerio de Cultura. Republica de Cuba.

Colantonio, Andrea, and Robert B. Potter. 2006. The Rise of Urban Tourism in Havana Since 1989. *Geography* 91 (1):23-33.

Collier, Stephen J. 2009. Topologies of Power: Foucault's Analysis of Political Government beyond 'Governmentality'. *Theory, Culture and Society* 26 (6):78-108.

Collins, John. 2008. "But What if I Should Need to Defecate in Your Neighborhood Madam?": Empire, Redemption, and the "Tradition of the Oppressed" in a Brazilian Heritage Site. *Cultural Anthropology: Journal of the Society for Cultural Anthropology*. 23 (2):279-328.

Comisión Provincial de Monumentos. 1984. *Principales legislaciones para la protección del patrimonio cultural*. I Simposio provincial de restauración y conservación de monumentos. Junio. Dirección Provincial de Cultura Poder Popular Ciudad Habana.

Corrales, Javier. 2004. The Gatekeeper State: Limited Economic Reforms and Regime Survival in Cuba, 1989-2002. *Latin American Research Review* 39 (2):35-65.

De Cesari, Chiara. 2010. Creative heritage: Palestinian heritage NGOs and defiant arts of government. *American Anthropologist* 112 (4):625-637.

Fornet Gil, Pablo. 2011. Twenty-five years of transformations in the historic center of Havana: A case study of the Plaza Vieja. *Facilities* 29 (7/8):303-312.

Fornet Gil, Pablo. 1997. Gobierno y territorio: Cuba en dos tiempos. *Revista Interamericana de Planificación* 39(14): 29-41.

Foucault, Michel. 2007. Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-78. Translated by G. Burchell. Edited by M. Senellart. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Franquesa, Jaume. 2011. "We've Lost Our Bearings": Place, Tourism, and the Limits of the "Mobility Turn". *Antipode* 43 (4):1012-1033.

Frederik, Laurie. 2006. Cuba's National Characters: Setting the Stage for the Hombre Novísimo. *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 10 (2).

Gregory, Steven. 2014. The devil behind the mirror: Globalization and politics in the Dominican Republic: Univ of California Press.

Hearn, Adrian H. 2008. Cuba: Religion, Social Capital, and Development. Raleigh: Duke University Press.

Hearn, Adrian H., and F.J. Alfonso. 2012. Havana: From local experiment to national reform. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 33 (2):226-240.

Hernandez-Reguant, Ariana. 2009. Cuba in the Special Period: Culture and Ideology in the 1990s: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hill, Matthew. 2004. Globalizing Havana: World Heritage and Urban Redevelopment in a Late Socialist City, *Anthropology*, University of Chicago, UMI.

Hill, Matthew J. . 2007. Reimagining Old Havana: World Heritage and the Production of Scale in Late Socialist Cuba. In *Deciphering the Global: Its Scales, Spaces and Subjects*, edited by S. Sassen. New York and London: Routledge.

Hodges, Matt. 2009. Disciplining Memory: Heritage Tourism and the Temporalisation of the Built Environment in Rural France. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 15 (1):76-99.

Horowitz, Irving Louis. 1995. Cuban Communism, 1959-1995, 8th edn. New Brunswick. NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Jacobs, Jessica. 2010. Re-branding the Levant: contested heritage and colonial modernities in Amman and Damascus. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change* 8 (4):316-326.

James, Jason. 2012. Preservation and national belonging in eastern Germany heritage fetishism and redeeming Germanness. In *Palgrave Macmillan memory studies*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire ; New York: Palgrave Macmillan,.



[http://www.fivecollege.eblib.com/EBLWeb/patron/?target=patron&extendedid=P\\_1016588\\_0](http://www.fivecollege.eblib.com/EBLWeb/patron/?target=patron&extendedid=P_1016588_0).

Keane, Michael 2005. Review of *The Expediency of Culture: Uses of Culture in the Global Era*. Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies 19 (1):149-152.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. 2006. World Heritage and Cultural Economics. In *Museum Frictions: Public Cultures/Global Transformations*, edited by I. Karp, C. Krantz, L. Szwaja and T. Ybarra-Frausto. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

López, Fernando. 2006. Personal Interview. May 30. Havana, Cuba.

Melero Lazo, Nelson. 2001. *Experiencia Cubana en la restauración del patrimonio arquitectónico*. Havana, Cuba: Centro Nacional de Conservación, Restauración y Museología.

Nickel, Annegret. 1990. El casco histórico de La Habana: La situación de vivienda y los conceptos de renovación urbana en La Habana. *Revista Geográfica*:75-90.

Plan Maestro, Oficina del Historiador. 2008. *Historia de una plaza en movimiento: del Parque Habana a la Plaza Vieja*. Havana, Cuba. Unpublished ms.

Ploger, John. 2008. Foucault's Dispositif and the City. *Planning Theory* 7 (1):51-70.

Rigol Savio, Isabel. 1994. "Rehabilitación de la Plaza Vieja de la Ciudad de la Habana." In *Rehabilitación Integral en Áreas o Sitios Históricos Latinoamericanos*. Ecuador: Abya-Yala.

Ruggles, D. Fairchild. 2012. *On location heritage cities and sites*. New York, NY: Springer,. <http://libproxy.smith.edu:2048/login?url=http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-1108-6>.

Scher, Philip W. 2011. Heritage Tourism in the Caribbean: The Politics of Culture after Neoliberalism. *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 30 (1):7-20.

Silverman, Helaine. 2002. Touring ancient times: the present and presented past in contemporary Peru. *American Anthropologist* 104 (3):881-902.

Tanaka, Maki. 2011. *Heritage Modern: Cityscape of the Late Socialist Political Economy in Trinidad, Cuba*, University of California, Berkeley.

Van Hooff, Herman. 2013. Personal Interview. Havana, Cuba. June 5.

Weiss, Lindsay Moira. 2014. Informal Settlements and Urban Heritage Landscapes in South Africa. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 14 (1):3-25.

Yudice, George. 2003. *The Expediency of Culture: Uses of Culture in the Global Era*. Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press.