University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

---

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

8-2014

Historic preservation in Quito, Ecuador : tangible and intangible heritage.

Meredith Alison Maple
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Part of the [History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Maple, Meredith Alison, "Historic preservation in Quito, Ecuador : tangible and intangible heritage." (2014). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 904.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/904>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN QUITO, ECUADOR:
TANGIBLE AND INTANGIBLE HERITAGE

By
Meredith Alison Maple
B.A., University of Louisville, 2012

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of the
College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Louisville
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Masters of Arts

Department of History
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

August 2014

Copyright 2014 by Meredith Alison Maple

All rights reserved

HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN QUITO, ECUADOR:
TANGIBLE AND INTANGIBLE HERITAGE

By

Meredith Alison Maple
B.A., University of Louisville, 2014

A Thesis Approved on

August 4, 2014

by the following Thesis Committee:

Christine Ehrick, Thesis Director

Daniel Vivian

Manuel Medina

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to my dad, Michael Maple, for never letting me settle.
And to the memory of my mom, Mary Maple.

“To live in hearts we leave behind is not to die.”—Thomas Campbell

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Lee Keeling for getting me through. Savannah Darr for going through before me. Jon Manly for being my partner in all things graduate school. Cory Eaves, Taylor Stokes, Marlowe Frymire, Samantha Smith, Leslie Dingeldein, and Karin Schubert for being true friends through the thick of it. My brothers Justin and Adam for supporting me endlessly. Andrey Astaiza for showing me Quito. Dr. Ehrick, Dr. Vivian, and Dr. Medina for reading this thing as many times as it takes. And Luisa Gagne-Hawes Maple for being the cutest niece there ever was.

ABSTRACT

HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN QUITO, ECUADOR: TANGIBLE AND INTANGIBLE HERITAGE

Meredith A. Maple

August 4, 2014

Historic preservation efforts in the colonial *centro histórico* of Quito, Ecuador span the past century. A more recent development in the world of heritage preservation is concern with the safeguarding of intangible heritage. This thesis looks at case studies from the *centro histórico* of Quito and seeks to identify what should come next for Quito in terms of historic preservation, the safeguarding of intangible heritage, and the creation of a constructive and inclusive tourism industry in the *centro histórico*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	viii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER I.....	31
CHAPTER II.....	58
CHAPTER III.....	78
CONCLUSION.....	118
REFERENCES.....	122
CURRICULUM VITA.....	130

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Objectives, needs, and means for safeguarding intangible heritage.....	86

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. 1903 Plano de la Ciudad de Quito.....	34
Figure 2. Interior of wall in San Agustín Church.....	38
Figure 3. Map of <i>centro histórico</i> showing the churches referenced in text.....	43
Figure 4. Pineapples and grapes carved in woodwork in San Agustín Church.....	44
Figure 5. La Catedral.....	45
Figure 6. La Merced Church.....	46
Figure 7. Santo Domingo Church.....	47
Figure 8. San Agustín Church.....	48
Figure 9. San Francisco Church.....	50
Figure 10. <i>Alfarje</i> ceiling in San Francisco Church.....	50
Figure 11. La Compañía Church.....	52
Figure 12. Arched entrance to La Ronda.....	93
Figure 13. La Ronda neighborhood street view.....	93
Figure 14. Plaque in San Francisco Plaza.....	102
Figure 15. Plaque on San Francisco Church.....	103
Figure 16. Streets of the <i>centro histórico</i> filled during Semana Santa.....	111
Figure 17. Semana Santa parade in the <i>centro histórico</i>	111

INTRODUCTION

Quito, Ecuador is a city of dramatic geography and multiple historical layers. The city sits at 2,850 meters (9,350 feet) on the slopes of the active Pichincha volcano in the Andes Mountains and in a seismically active zone. When Spanish colonizers built the city starting in the sixteenth century, they did so on land that had been home to the Quitu and Caras people for centuries, and on a site that since 1462 had been the northern capital of the Incan Empire until Spanish colonizers took control of the land in 1534. Construction of the city followed a grid pattern, common amongst all Spanish colonial cities, with a large plaza as the central point. The main church and government buildings sit on the central plaza, and the surrounding streets are filled with churches, monasteries, convents, government buildings, schools, private homes of wealthy residents, and businesses. This area, called the *centro histórico* (historic center), is considered one of the best-preserved colonial cities in the world.

In 1978, Quito's *centro histórico* was among the first group of sites to be designated World Heritage Sites by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage Program. Because Quito is such an important example of a colonial city, it is imperative to look at the history of the built environment in terms of more than just the colonial architecture, but to address things like the relationship between the colonizers and the Indigenous population as well as the

Indigenous influence on the built environment. Colonial cities are inherently full of overlapping layers of heritage and categories such as Indigenous, the colonized, and the colonizers all become intermingled overtime. This makes discussion of and distinction between the heritages of different groups both increasingly difficult and political.

The *hispanismo* movement that claimed a superior Hispanic race had come from Spain sparked the early historic preservation movement in Quito in the early twentieth century, long before the 1978 UNESCO nomination. It saw the Spanish architecture in the *centro histórico* as the core of the nation and therefore saw its preservation as essential. The history of preservation of the built environment of Quito spans an entire century of governments, leaders, development, natural disasters, and the evolution of historic preservation practices. Preservation policies in the *centro histórico* have certainly not finished evolving.

As the built environment is preserved, issues also arise regarding the safeguarding of what is sometimes called intangible heritage—“the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills—as well as the instruments, objects, artifacts and cultural spaces associated therewith—that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage.”¹ Especially as is related to Indigenous heritage, the safeguarding of intangible heritage commonly is overlooked in favor of focusing on preservation of the built environment. The preservation of the built environment is connected to tourism, and is thus seen as a more lucrative project.

---

¹ Ikechi Mgbeoji, “On the Shoulders of the ‘Other’ed’: Intellectual Property Rights in Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Persistence of Indigenous Peoples’ Texts and Inter-Texts in a Contextual World,” in *Intangible Cultural Heritage and Intellectual Property: Communities, Cultural Diversity and Sustainable Development*, ed. Toshiyuki Kono (Oregon: International Specialized Book Services, 2009), 206.

However, heritage tourism in itself poses many issues for preservationists of both tangible and intangible heritage.

With a complicated history spanning pre-Columbian life, colonization, and independence, the issues of preservation, tourism, and intangible heritage are all the more difficult and important to address in a city whose past and present are characterized by inequality between cultures and ethnicities. With an understanding of the history of the built environment of Quito, the history of historic preservation in Quito, intangible heritage, and heritage tourism, this thesis looks at some case studies from the *centro histórico* of Quito and seeks to identify what should come next for Quito in terms of historic preservation, the safeguarding of intangible heritage, and the creation of a constructive and inclusive tourism industry in the *centro histórico*. This thesis looks at Quito's *centro histórico* as a stage for how the issues of historic preservation, heritage tourism, and safeguarding of intangible heritage all interact.

The discussion of historic preservation of the *centro histórico* of Quito requires a multi-directional approach. The history of the built environment itself is explored in Chapter One. The history of historic preservation efforts that have been made within the *centro histórico* are examined in Chapter Two. Finally, the more modern problems that impact preservation of the *centro histórico*, such as heritage tourism and the safeguarding of intangible heritage, are evaluated in Chapter Three. Existing literature on these three topics is not easily divided up into sections, as many historians' discussions of the built environment also address the history of preservation, evaluations of preservation efforts also are often linked to issues of heritage tourism, and discussions of intangible heritage tend to relate back to historic preservation and heritage tourism. Because these divisions

are hard to make, some sources will be listed under more than one category, to allow for the breadth of their contribution to be addressed.

History of Quito's Built Environment

The literature on Quito's built environment that is most relevant to this thesis addresses issues such as Indigenous influence as well as Quito's elevation and location in a seismic zone. Historian Ernesto Capello, a native of Ecuador, has two works that contribute the most to the existing body of literature on the history of the built environment in Quito. His dissertation, published as *City Fragments: Space and Nostalgia in Modernizing Quito, 1885-1942*, provides a history of the early development of the city, as well as architectural works constructed by the Italian Durini family in the early twentieth century.² Capello's book *City at the Center of the World: Space, History, and Modernity in Quito*, offers a more detailed account of the Durini family's architectural works in Quito, as well as a chapter devoted to cartography and Quito's complicated mapping history.³

Centro Histórico de Quito: Problemática y Perspectivas (Historic Center of Quito: Challenges and Perspectives), a collection of essays edited by Fernando Carrión, et al, was published in 1990 by the Office of City Planning in Quito.⁴ Two essays from this book offer insight into the history of Quito's built environment. First, Ines del Pino and Hugo Yepes evaluate the effect of earthquakes on the *centro histórico* in their chapter

---

² Ernesto Capello, *City Fragments: Space and Nostalgia in Modernizing Quito, 1885-1942* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2005).

³ Ernesto Capello, *City at the Center of the World: Space, History, and Modernity in Quito* (Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2011).

⁴ Fernando Carrión, et al. ed., *Centro Histórico de Quito: Problemática y Perspectivas* (Quito: Dirección de Planificación, 1990).

“Apuntes para una Historia Sísmica de Quito” (Notes on the Seismic History of Quito).

They consider the most destructive earthquakes and the destruction suffered in the *centro histórico*.⁵ In “Arquitectura Monumental del Centro Histórico de Quito” (Monumental Architecture in the Historic Center of Quito), Alfonso Ortiz Crespo surveys the most important religious architecture in the *centro histórico*, providing information on the original architects of each church, the destruction wrought by earthquakes, and the subsequent alterations to the structures. While brief, the summaries provide some of the only available histories of construction in the *centro histórico*.⁶

Historian Jeremy Ravi Mumford specializes in Andean history and the history of Indigenous peoples in Latin America. His book *Vertical Empire: The General Resettlement of Indians in the Colonial Andes*, focuses on how colonization impacted Indigenous society by both destroying many features of it while preserving others.⁷ Mumford’s work offers insight into the ways that the physical layout of colonial cities served to aid in the colonization of Indigenous populations. His research also shows how the use of Indigenous laborers and artisans in colonial construction projects inadvertently preserved some Andean traditions in the ornamentation of the colonial buildings themselves. Axel Borsdorf’s article “The Latin American City and the Symbolic Impact of Built Environment,” published in the *GeoJournal* twenty years prior to Mumford’s book, makes an argument similar to part of Mumford’s, claiming that the construction

---

⁵ Ines del Pino and Hugo Yepes, “Apuntes para una Historia Sísmica de Quito,” in *Centro Histórico de Quito: Problemática y Perspectivas* ed. Fernando Carrión, et al. (Quito: Dirección de Planificación, 1990).

⁶ Alfonso Ortiz Crespo, “Arquitectura Monumental del Centro Histórico de Quito,” in *Centro Histórico de Quito: Problemática y Perspectivas* ed. Fernando Carrión, et al. (Quito: Dirección de Planificación, 1990).

⁷ Jeremy Ravi Mumford, *Vertical Empire: The General Resettlement of Indians in the Colonial Andes* (North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2012).

and the appearance of the colonial city actually served in itself as a tool for colonizing by imposing a Spanish and Catholic built environment on the population as well as by forcing that population to construct the buildings.⁸ However, Borsdorf does not address Indigenous agency in the same way Mumford does, which is indicative of the evolution of the way scholars have began addressing Indigenous histories in more recent years.

Valerie Fraser, an art historian whose specialty is Spanish art and architecture in colonial Latin America, published *The Architecture of Conquest: Building the Viceroyalty of Peru, 1535-1635* in 1990.⁹ Her book argues that while the architecture in Latin American colonial cities reflected traditional Spanish architecture, its purpose was different and had the unique intention of subjugating the Indigenous population whose forced labor was the primary method for construction. While helpful with regards to the history of colonial architecture in the region, Fraser's work is also problematic. Throughout her book, she contends that there is little to no evidence of Indigenous influence in the colonial architecture, and argues that Indigenous laborers were used exclusively for manual labor. But as is evidenced by the architecture itself, and in the work of many other scholars, this is simply untrue.

The source that best shows the flaws in Valerie Fraser's argument is Susan Verdi Webster's article "Masters of the Trade: Native Artisans, Guilds, and the Construction of Colonial Quito," published in the *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* in

---

⁸ Axel Borsdorf, "The Latin American City and the Symbolic Impact of Built Environment," *GeoJournal* 15 (1) (1987).

⁹ Valerie Fraser, *The Architecture of Conquest: Building in the Viceroyalty of Peru, 1535-1635* (United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

2009.¹⁰ It is no coincidence that Webster's article came twenty years after Fraser's, as scholars have more recently come to acknowledge and address Indigenous influence in colonial cities. Webster is an art historian who specializes in Iberian and Latin American material culture, specifically colonial Andean architecture. Webster's work is based on extensive research using church and archival records in Quito. She provides evidence of extensive Indigenous influence in design and method, as well as evidence of Indigenous artisans and craftsmen being employed as architects, designers, project overseers, etc.

Historian Robert C. Smith's work, published in 1955, focused on Baroque styles in Portugal, Spain, and their respective colonial cities. His article "Colonial Towns of Spanish and Portuguese America" in the *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, offers information on typical construction efforts in colonial cities.¹¹ Smith shows how the Laws of the Indies, instructions for colonization written by the King of Spain, called for specific designs, and how some cities never strayed from following those instructions. However, other cities, like Quito, had to adjust their techniques and stray from the prescribed design due to topographical variations, such as Quito's location on a slope and very high altitude.

Historian Oakah L. Jones 1994 book, published forty years after Robert C. Smith's work, *Guatemala in the Spanish Colonial Period*, offers further evidence of how the construction of colonial Quito strayed from the Laws of the Indies.¹² The first

---

¹⁰ Susan Verdi Webster, "Masters of the Trade: Native Artisans, Guilds, and the Construction of Colonial Quito," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 68 (1) (2009).

¹¹ Robert C. Smith, "Colonial Towns of Spanish and Portuguese America," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 14 (4) (1955).

¹² Oakah L. Jones, *Guatemala in the Spanish Colonial Period* (Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994).

colonial city built in Guatemala was surrounded by volcanoes, just like Quito; however, when the colonizers took note of the threatening volcanoes, they sought permission to move the colonial city to a safer location. Paul Ramírez and William B. Taylor's article, "Out of Tlatelolco's Ruins: Patronage, Devotion, and Natural Disaster at the Shrine of Our Lady of the Angels, 1745-1781," published recently in *The Hispanic American Historical Review*, also provides a comparative look at how natural disasters such as earthquakes were dealt with and responded to in Mexico City.¹³

Art historian Kelly Donahue-Wallace's book, *Art and Architecture of Viceregal Latin America, 1521-1821*, is a comprehensive work on art and architecture of the colonial period throughout Latin America.¹⁴ She addresses religious architecture and its evolution from the beginning of the colonial era to independence. Her work offers specific details on some of the religious architecture in Quito, as well as the history of various techniques used and themes found in colonial cities. An interview and tour of the *centro histórico* with Julio Rivas, the premier Art Historian in Quito, Ecuador, provided unique information about religious art and architecture not found in the other more traditional sources used.¹⁵ The interview with Rivas allowed for a deeper understanding of specific examples that are often omitted in texts that seek to cover a broad array of buildings within Quito or even within Latin American colonial cities in general.

Two rather dated sources, Benjamín Gento Sanz's "Colonial Art of Quito" and José Gabriel Navarro's "Ecuadorian Sculpture," offer overviews of the more significant

---

¹³ Paul Ramírez and William B. Taylor, "Out of Tlatelolco's Ruins: Patronage, Devotion and Natural Disaster at the Shrine of Our Lady of the Angels, 1745-1781," *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 93 (1) (2013).

¹⁴ Kelly Donahue-Wallace, *Art and Architecture of Viceregal Latin America, 1521-1821* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2008).

¹⁵ Julio Rivas, interview by Meredith Maple, Quito, Ecuador, 21 December 2013.

churches and sculptures in Quito.¹⁶ They also provide details about some of the Indigenous sculptors and artisans who were involved in work on various churches. Details of various monuments and churches that are key tourism destinations are offered in Mike Kariancolas' "Journey to the Center of the World" and in James Patrick Kiernan's "Quito: Beauty and History."¹⁷ Kenneth J. Andrien's *The Kingdom of Quito, 1690-1830: The State and Regional Development* and Kris Lane's *Quito 1599: City and Colony in Transition* both offer important information regarding the history of the city itself.¹⁸ While they do not contribute to the body of literature on the built environment, they provide the context for the time that colonial Quito was constructed. These sources all serve to create a base for the discussion of historic preservation and the safeguarding of intangible heritage in Quito.

History of Historic Preservation in Quito

Historic preservation is a field that is constantly changing. Historic preservation itself has been defined as "the act or process of applying measures to sustain the existing form, integrity, and material of a building or structure, and the existing form and vegetative cover of a site. It may include initial stabilization work, where necessary, as

---

¹⁶ Benjamín Gento Sanz, "Colonial Art of Quito," *The Americas* 2 (4) (1946); José Gabriel Navarro, "Ecuadorian Sculpture," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 3 (9) (1945).

¹⁷ Mike Karanicolas, "Journey to the Center of the World," *Hispanic* (March 2008); James Patrick Kiernan, "Quito: Beauty and History," *Americas* 56 (3) (2004).

¹⁸ Kenneth J. Andrien, *The Kingdom of Quito, 1690-1830: The State and Regional Development* (United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Kris Lane, *Quito 1599: City and Colony in Transition* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2002).

well as ongoing maintenance of the historic building materials.”¹⁹ In 1954, UNESCO began passing international conventions to protect world heritage. The first was the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict in 1954. This was followed by the 1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Property (more commonly known as the World Heritage Convention, the 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage, and the 2003 Convention for the Protection of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (which will be discussed further in later sections of this work). UNESCO’s 1972 World Heritage Convention “encourages the identification, protection, and preservation of cultural and natural heritage in the world that is considered to be of outstanding value to all humanity.”²⁰ A major development of the World Heritage Convention was the list of World Heritage Sites, which the *centro histórico* of Quito is listed on. The evolution of UNESCO’s world heritage policies discussed above offer a specific example of how the field of and the definition of historic preservation have changed in recent years.

Concern here is with the built environment within Quito, and the trajectory of the historic preservation movement there. Ernesto Capello’s dissertation, *City Fragments: Space and Nostalgia in Modernizing Quito, 1885-1942*, which contributes significantly to the body of literature on the history of Quito’s built environment, also offers a wealth of information related to historic preservation efforts in Quito in the early twentieth

---

¹⁹ William J. Murtagh, *Keeping Time: The History and Theory of Preservation in America* (New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2006), 5.

²⁰ Murtagh, *Keeping Time*, 147-8.

century.²¹ His discussion of the *hispanismo* movement in Quito is the most complete analysis available. *Centro Histórico de Quito: Problemática y Perspectivas*, the collection of essays mentioned above, includes a chapter titled “Transformaciones Urbanas en el Centro Histórico de Quito” (Urban Transformations in the Historic Center of Quito) written by Francisco Naranjo Lalama.²² In his chapter, Lalama evaluates the changes that took place between the 1930s and the 1980s, looking at socio-economic changes, as well as legislation and policy changes.

Fernando Carrión, one of the editors of *Centro Histórico de Quito: Problemática y Perspectivas*, also edited a book for UNESCO, titled *Centros Históricos de América Latina y el Caribe* (Historic Centers of Latin American and the Caribbean).²³ Monica Moreira Ortega’s chapter in the UNESCO book, “El Centro Histórico de Quito: Un Modelo Mixto de Gestión” (The Historic Center of Quito: A Joint Management Model), shows how preservation efforts in Quito have successfully bridged the gap between private and public institutions, creating an exemplary model for other Latin American cities to replicate in their preservation efforts.²⁴

In his work *Renovación de Centros Históricos en Grandes Ciudades Latinoamericanas: Repurcusiones Socioeconómicas, Urbanístico-Estructurales y Medioambientales-Urbanas* (Renovation of Historic Centers in Large Latin American

---

²¹ Capello, *City Fragments*.

²² Francisco Naranjo Lalama, “Transformaciones Urbanas en el Centro Histórico de Quito,” in *Centro Histórico de Quito: Problemática y Perspectivas*, ed. Fernando Carrión, et al. (Quito: Dirección de Planificación, 1990).

²³ Fernando Carrión, ed., *Centros Históricos de América Latina y el Caribe* (Paris: UNESCO, 2001).

²⁴ Monica Moreira Ortega, “El Centro Histórico de Quito: Un Modelo Mixto de Gestión,” in *Centros Históricos de América Latina y el Caribe*, ed. Fernando Carrión (Paris: UNESCO, 2001).

Cities: Socio-Economic Repercussions, Urban Structures and Urban Environments), historian Adrián Vergara Durán explains the role of a *centro histórico* in a Latin American city.²⁵ He not only offers an in depth definition of a *centro histórico*—“something more than a collection of buildings...[it has] special features which form a distinct area that integrates the past with a desired future”—but explains the importance of renovating them appropriately and provides guidelines and suggestions for their renovation.²⁶

Historian Joseph L. Scarpaci’s book *Plazas and Barrios: Heritage Tourism in the Latin American Centro Histórico*, looks at the historic centers of nine different Latin American cities, one of them being Quito.²⁷ His research includes a survey of every building in the *centro histórico* of Quito, as well as discussion of various measures that have been taken to preserve the architecture within the *centro histórico*. Like Adrián Vergara Durán, Scarpaci examines the important role of the *centro histórico* within Latin American cities and Latin American life.

Colón Cifuentes’ article “La Planificación de las Areas Patrimoniales de Quito” (Planning of the Heritage Areas of Quito) evaluates preservation legislation beginning with the 1942 Plan Regulador de Quito de Jones Ordiozola and ending with the 2005 Plan Bicentenario.²⁸ Cifuentes describes each plan and piece of legislation, explains what the intentions of each were, and how and/or if it was implemented. His summaries are

---

²⁵ Adrián Vergara Durán, *Renovación de Centros Históricos en Grandes Ciudades Latinoamericanas: Repurcusiones Socioeconómicas, Urbanístico-Estructurales y Medioambientales-Urbanas* (Colombia: Ediciones Uninorte, 2008).

²⁶ Ibid., 13.

²⁷ Joseph L. Scarpaci, *Plazas and Barrios: Heritage Tourism and Globalization in the Latin American Centro Histórico* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2005).

²⁸ Colón Cifuentes, “La Planificación de las Areas Patrimoniales de Quito,” *Centro-h* 1 (2008).

brief and presume the reader has access to or prior knowledge of most of the legislation he references, but as a summary piece, it offers an immense amount of information that is left out of most of the other sources that discuss historic preservation in Quito.

Eduardo Rojas is an expert on heritage preservation and urban rehabilitation. His book, *Old Cities, New Assets: Preserving Latin America's Urban Heritage*, is a collection of case studies from three Latin American cities, including Quito.²⁹ Rojas briefly evaluates the history of preservation efforts in Quito, and then looks more in depth at the successful joint efforts that have been made between the private and public sectors in Quito, specifically the partnership between the municipal government, Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo (Inter-American Bank of Development) and the Fundación Caspicara (a private preservation organization). He looks especially closely at what this has meant for the provision of low-income housing and efforts to avoid gentrification, which usually goes hand-in-hand with large-scale preservation efforts. He argues that the model developed in Quito, which is also seen in Mexico, is one of few successful models in Latin America. It is relevant to note that this study was published by the Inter-American Bank of Development, so it would be expected that the conclusions of the report would focus on the positive accomplishments of the partnership that the bank itself was a part of.

Geographers Rosemary D. Bromley and Gareth A. Jones worked together on several articles on preservation in Latin American cities. In “Conservation in Quito: Policies and Progress in the Historic Centre,” they look at preservation efforts since the

---

²⁹ Eduardo Rojas, *Old Cities, New Assets: Preserving Latin America's Urban Heritage* (Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank, 1999).

1970s.³⁰ Like Eduardo Rojas, they explore the connection of the private and public sectors, but they go into much more detail about the separate efforts, some successful and some unsuccessful, of the private and public sectors that preceded the effective joint efforts. In “The Relationship Between Urban Conservation Programmes and Property Renovation: Evidence from Quito, Ecuador,” Bromley and Jones evaluate how public and private programs effect private property owners regarding the restoration of their own homes or properties.³¹ Based off their research in Quito, they found that public and private programs successfully motivated some property owners to take on projects of their own. Bromley and Jones’ article “Identifying the Inner City in Latin America,” examines how the “inner city,” a concept usually studied in the context of the developed, Western world, looks different in Latin America.³² Discussion of preservation of “inner city” areas in the United States, especially in relation to urban renewal can be found in William J. Murtagh’s *Keeping Time: The History and Theory of Preservation in America*.³³ Bromley and Jones use Quito as an example of how severe poverty and poor living conditions are found within the *centro histórico*, despite the efforts and money put towards preserving the buildings therein, and despite its standing as a tourist destination. This is a complicated issue, as the avoidance of gentrification is considered a success in the realm of historic preservation, but the lack of gentrification and sustained presence of poverty and poor living conditions in the *centro histórico* poses an additional set of

---

³⁰ Rosemary D. Bromley and Gareth A. Jones, “Conservation in Quito: Policies and Progress in the Historic Centre,” *Third World Planning Review* 17 (1) (1995).

³¹ Rosemary D. Bromley and Gareth A. Jones, “The Relationship Between Urban Conservation Programmes and Property Renovation: Evidence form Quito, Ecuador,” *Cities* 13 (6) (1996).

³² Rosemary D. Bromley and Gareth A. Jones, “Identifying the Inner City in Latin America,” *The Geographical Journal* 162 (2) (1996).

³³ Murtagh, *Keeping Time*, chapters 5 & 8.

challenges for tourism.

Two primary sources that are particularly important for a complete history of historic preservation in Quito are the *Normas de Quito*, more often referred to as the Carta de Quito or the Quito Letter, and the *Conclusiones del Coloquio Sobre la Preservación de los Centros Históricos ante el Crecimiento de las Ciudades Contemporáneas* (Conclusions of the Colloquium on Preservation of Historic Cities and Their Growth into Contemporary Cities).³⁴ The Carta de Quito is the result of a meeting in Quito by the Organization of American States (OAS) in 1967, where they evaluated the needs of historic sites and areas in within Latin America. They identified problems that Latin American cities are faced with, as well as potential solutions. These solutions required efforts be made at the local, national, and international levels. The conclusion of the Colloquium, which was held by the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) in Quito in 1977, focused on what factors were hurting historic centers across Latin America. It offers less in the way of suggestions or solutions but serves as an evaluation of the problems that Latin American cities faced near the end of the twentieth century in regards to historic preservation.

Intangible Heritage and Heritage Tourism

Recently, historic preservation has come to incorporate intangible heritage. This thesis considers the challenges inherent in efforts to preserve intangible heritage, specifically as relates to Indigenous cultural traditions in Quito. In 2003, the UNESCO

---

³⁴ Organization of American States, *Normas de Quito* (Quito, 1967); International Council on Monuments and Sites, *Conclusiones del Coloquio Sobre la Preservación de los Centros Históricos ante el Crecimiento de las Ciudades Contemporáneas* (Quito, 1977).

Convention for the Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage defined intangible heritage as “the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, [and] skills that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage.”³⁵

Preservation organizations have only recently begun to deal with the topic head on. The literature on the topic is abundant and has already gone through many changes. Marie Louise Stig Sorensen and John Carman’s book, *Heritage Studies: Methods and Approaches*, explores the background of heritage itself, providing basic, yet important information regarding the evolution of concern for heritage and its preservation.³⁶

In 2007, Chiara Bortolotto wrote an article titled “From Objects to Processes: UNESCO’s ‘Intangible Cultural Heritage.’”³⁷ UNESCO began dealing with issues of heritage preservation in 1972, but did not address intangible heritage directly until 1993. In this article, Bortolotto examines the development of the concept of intangible heritage and how UNESCO has approached the idea, indirectly before 1993, and more directly thereafter, including the 2003 Convention for the Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage. Bortolotto also addresses issues of collective memory and authenticity, and offers insight into how UNESCO seeks to address those topics.

Anthropologist Peter Seitel edited *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment*.³⁸ The book is the result of the 1999 conference entitled “A Global Assessment of the 1989 *Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and*

---

³⁵ Mgbeoji, “On the Shoulders of the ‘Other’ed,” 206.

³⁶ Marie Louise Stig Sorensen and John Carman, eds., *Heritage Studies: Methods and Approaches* (New York: Routledge, 2009).

³⁷ Chiara Bortolotto, “From Objects to Processes: UNESCO’s ‘Intangible Cultural Heritage,’” *Journal of Museum Ethnography* 19 (2007).

³⁸ Peter Seitel, ed., *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment* (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, 2001).

Folklore: Local Empowerment and International Cooperation,” which was held at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington D.C. Several documents and chapters from Seitel’s book are of particular importance in the discussion of intangible heritage in Quito, beginning with the 1989 *Recommendation* that was the catalyst for the 1999 conference.³⁹ The *Recommendation* was the result of a 1989 UNESCO General Conference, which created a list of recommendations that were made to all UNESCO Member States regarding the safeguarding of folklore, or intangible heritage, as it is more commonly called today. This list includes a definition of folklore, and methods for the identification, conservation, preservation, dissemination, and protection of folklore, along with calls for international cooperation regarding the safeguarding of folklore. The shift from using the term “folklore” to “intangible heritage” is an example of how literature and discussion of the topic has changed in just the past twenty years. Not only is “intangible heritage” a much more encompassing term than “folklore”, but it also eliminates the association made between the word “folklore” and mythology and less civilized culture. While mythology and belief systems are certainly types of intangible heritage, they are only select elements, not the whole.

Noriko Aikawa, Director of UNESCO’s Intangible Heritage Unit, contributed a chapter to Peter Seitel’s book, “Action Undertaken by UNESCO for its Implementation,” that outlines what actions UNESCO had taken, as of the 1999 Conference, to implement

---

³⁹ UNESCO, *The 1989 Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, in *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment*, ed. Peter Seitel (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, 2001).

their own recommendations.⁴⁰ Before the 1999 Conference took place, there were regional seminars held in eight locations to ensure that the needs and interests of member states all over the world were represented. Anthony Seeger, of the Smithsonian Institution, contributed his “Summary Report on the Regional Seminars,” which evaluates and summarizes the goals of each regional seminar.⁴¹

Lyndel V. Prott, Chief of the International Standards Section at UNESCO’s Division of Cultural Heritage, supplied a useful chapter titled “Some Considerations on the Protection of the Intangible Heritage: Claims and Remedies.”⁴² Prott identifies various kinds of intangible heritage that could be in need of safeguarding and lays out what the objectives, needs, and means for a safeguarding project would look like for each kind. The Archives Manager at the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Islander Studies, Grace Koch, offered the chapter “Cultural Conservation: A Two-Way Consultation,” which addresses the protection of intangible heritage in audiovisual archives, but explains that ownership of that material is much more complicated.⁴³ While Koch’s chapter focuses on an Australian example, which revolves around heritage laws that are unique to Australia, her work shows that legal guidelines must be in place

---

⁴⁰ Norkio Aikawa, “Actions Undertaken by UNESCO for its Implementation,” in *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment*, ed. Peter Seitel (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, 2001).

⁴¹ Anthony Seeger, “Summary Report on the Regional Seminars,” in *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment*, ed. Peter Seitel (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, 2001).

⁴² Lyndel V. Prott, “Some Considerations on the Protection of the Intangible Heritage: Claims and Remedies,” in *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment*, ed. Peter Seitel (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, 2001).

⁴³ Grace Koch, “Cultural Conservation: A Two-Way Consultation,” in *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment*, ed. Peter Seitel (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, 2001).

regarding ownership of and access to safeguarded intangible heritage. Debate lies herein regarding who owns intangible heritage and what kind of legislation can actually protect the owners of the heritage and guarantee their rights to it. This will be addressed again when looking at Toshiyuki Kono's collection of essays, as well is in Chapter Three of this thesis.

Finally, Zulma Yugar provided a summary of the Latin American and Caribbean Regional Seminar that was held before the 1999 Conference, which shows that some concerns and needs are unique to the area, most of which are applicable to Quito.⁴⁴ The book closes with a Final Report on the 1999 Conference, which includes a particularly important Action Plan that calls for specific actions to be taken by governments of UNESCO Member States, many of which are particularly relevant for Quito.⁴⁵

Intangible Cultural Heritage and Intellectual Property: Communities, Cultural Diversity and Sustainable Development, edited by Toshiyuki Kono and published in 2009, offers the most contemporary collection of essays on the safeguarding and ownership of intangible heritage.⁴⁶ As was mentioned previously, the field of intangible heritage is a new one, so the problems within the field, especially that of ownership of heritage, are still being debated constantly. Toshiyuki Kono's "Convention for the

---

⁴⁴ Zulma Yugar, "Reporte Seminario Regional Sobre la Aplicación de la Recomendación Sobre la Salvaguardia de la Cultura Tradicional y Popular de America Latina y el Caribe," in *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment*, ed. Peter Seitel (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, 2001).

⁴⁵ *Final Conference Report on a Global Assessment of the 1989 Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore: Local Empowerment and International Cooperation*, in *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment*, ed. Peter Seitel (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, 2001).

⁴⁶ Toshiyuki Kono, ed., *Intangible Cultural Heritage and Intellectual Property: Communities, Cultural Diversity and Sustainable Development* (Oregon: International Specialized Book Services, 2009).

Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage: Unresolved Issues and Unanswered Questions,” provides an overview of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention, addresses the shortcomings of the convention, and opens a discussion on the heritage of communities and how communities might seek to safeguard and make use of their intangible heritage.⁴⁷ Wend B. Wendland’s “Managing Intellectual Property Options When Documenting, Recording and Digitizing Intangible Cultural Heritage,” looks at the issues that arise through different safeguarding measures for intangible heritage.⁴⁸ Wendland investigates issues regarding relationships between Indigenous communities and museums, intellectual property rights, and misappropriation, and provides a discussion of the World Intellectual Property Organization.

Kono’s collection includes many essays that address ownership of intangible heritage. Branislav Hazucha and Toshiyuki Kono evaluate how communities can be the owners of intangible heritage in “Conceptualization of Community as a Holder of Intangible Heritage.”⁴⁹ They also explore how cultural traditions in particular can be considered the property of a specific community. Kono defines communities as “networks of peoples whose sense of identity or connectedness emerges from a shared

---

⁴⁷ Toshiyuki Kono, “Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage: Unresolved Issues and Unanswered Questions,” in *Intangible Cultural Heritage and Intellectual Property: Communities, Cultural Diversity and Sustainable Development*, ed. Toshiyuki Kono (Oregon: International Specialized Book Services, 2009).

⁴⁸ Wend B. Wendland, “Managing Intellectual Property Options When Documenting, Recording and Digitizing Intangible Cultural Heritage,” in *Intangible Cultural Heritage and Intellectual Property: Communities, Cultural Diversity and Sustainable Development*, ed. Toshiyuki Kono (Oregon: International Specialized Book Services, 2009).

⁴⁹ Branislav Hazucha and Toshiyuki Kono, “Conceptualization of Community as a Holder of Intangible Cultural Heritage,” in *Intangible Cultural Heritage and Intellectual Property: Communities, Cultural Diversity and Sustainable Development*, ed. Toshiyuki Kono (Oregon: International Specialized Book Services, 2009).

historical relationship that is rooted in the practice and transmission of, or engagement with, their intangible cultural heritage.”⁵⁰ This definition is relatively vague and leaves a lot of room of interpretation and change. In Terri Janke’s “Indigenous Intangible Cultural Heritage and Ownership of Copyright,” Janke looks specifically at Indigenous groups and how those groups can claim ownership of their own heritage.⁵¹ She uses case studies from Australia to explain how Australian copyright and intellectual property laws can be both beneficial and detrimental for Indigenous groups seeking ownership of their heritage. Suggestions are offered for constructive measures and guidelines to ensure that Indigenous communities maintain the rights to and ownership of their intangible heritage. Shubha Chaudhuri builds off of the work of Janke, Hazucha, and Kono, further exploring ownership in “Who Is the ‘Holder’ of Intangible Cultural Heritage? Revisiting the Concept of Community from an Intangible Cultural Heritage Perspective.”⁵² Chaudhuri’s discussion goes one step further by looking at issues that arise between communities and outsiders who are involved in the safeguarding of intangible heritage, and the residual problems that arise through inappropriate use of the safeguarded heritage. These issues are further complicated by the inherent difficulty of defining and identifying who is a part of a given community and who is considered an outsider.

Ikechi Mgbeoji considers how issues of ownership and intellectual property rights

---

⁵⁰ Kono, “Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage,” 32.

⁵¹ Terri Janke, “Indigenous Intangible Cultural Heritage and Ownership of Copyright,” in *Intangible Cultural Heritage and Intellectual Property: Communities, Cultural Diversity and Sustainable Development*, ed. Toshiyuki Kono (Oregon: International Specialized Book Services, 2009).

⁵² Shubha Chaudhuri, “Who Is the ‘Holder’ of Intangible Cultural Heritage? Revisiting the Concept of Community from an Intangible Cultural Heritage Perspective,” in *Intangible Cultural Heritage and Intellectual Property: Communities, Cultural Diversity and Sustainable Development*, ed. Toshiyuki Kono (Oregon: International Specialized Book Services, 2009).

are particularly unique and complicated in post-colonial settings. In “On the Shoulders of the ‘Other’ed”: Intellectual Property Rights in Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Persistence of Indigenous Peoples’ Texts and Inter-Texts in a Contextual World,” Mgbeoji explains the typical European understanding of authorship and ownership, and explores the issues that arise by applying those understandings in non-European settings, using a case study of intangible heritage ownership in Nigeria.⁵³ The primary difference identified by Mgbeoji is that for Indigenous populations, the community as author and owner is primary, whereas the European understanding of ownership and authorship is attached to individuals. He explains that in the Indigenous communal setting, individuals serve as “agents or custodians, as well as interpretive voices, of communal cultural heritage,” but not as the owners or authors themselves.

Mgbeoji would find fault with Grace Koch’s work related to Indigenous groups in Australia because of her assertion that there needs to be legislation put in place to protect the owners of intangible heritage. This is because Mgbeoji argues that intangible cultural heritage of Indigenous groups cannot be placed in “the straitjacket of Western-inspired intellectual property rights” because many Indigenous groups have institutions, leaders, and guidelines that they choose to follow that do not have a place within, nor are recognized by “Eurocentric norms and legal rules.”⁵⁴ This is an important side of the debate that has been omitted from nearly all of the literature on the topic. The norms of the Indigenous communities who are considered owners of their intangible heritage cannot simply be looked over when it comes to passing legislation that impacts them. Additionally, while both Koch and Mgbeoji’s works offer important insight into ways to

---

⁵³ Mgbeoji, “On the Shoulders of the ‘Other’ed.”

⁵⁴ Ibid., 220.

deal with intangible heritage of Indigenous groups, it is important to consider how Indigenous communities and their traditions differ greatly across the world. This offers some explanation of why Mgbeoji and Koch have different perspectives as they are dealing with different parts of the world, and also serves as a reminder that Indigenous communities in Quito have unique sets of circumstances that differ from those of Nigeria or Australia.

Consideration of literature on historic preservation and the safeguarding of intangible heritage provides a background to lead into a discussion of heritage tourism. Heritage tourism is linked directly with historic preservation and safeguarding of intangible heritage because those two actions provide the heritage that the tourism industry needs to offer tourists for consumption. However, tensions exist in figuring out how preservation and the tourism industry can operate together in a mutually beneficial way, despite not always having shared goals. George S. Smith, Phyllis Mauch Messenger, and Hilary A. Soderland's book, *Heritage Values in Contemporary Society*, is a collection of essays that addresses how conceptions and treatment of heritage have evolved in a modern context, namely how to balance heritage values with the needs of contemporary society.⁵⁵ Ian Baxter's chapter, "Global Heritage Tourism: The Value of Experiencing the Past," evaluates the development of heritage tourism and uses empirical research to examine what engages heritage tourists.⁵⁶ In Roy Eugene Graham's chapter, "The Protection of Heritage Values while Utilizing World Heritage Sites for the Benefit

---

⁵⁵ George S. Smith, et al., *Heritage Values in Contemporary Society* (California: Left Coast Press, 2010).

⁵⁶ Ian Baxter, "Global Heritage Tourism: The Value of Experiencing the Past," in *Heritage Values in Contemporary Society*, eds. George S. Smith, et al. (California: Left Coast Press, 2010).

of the Community,” he considers the ways in which heritage tourism can benefit the communities associated with the heritage sites, instead of just benefiting the tourism industry itself.⁵⁷

Dallen J. Timothy and Gyan P. Nyaupane’s explain in their book *Cultural Heritage and Tourism in the Developing World: A Regional Perspective* that heritage tourism “relies on living and built elements of culture and refers to the use of the tangible and intangible past as a tourism resource.” They propose that heritage tourism used to focus on the heritage “of the privileged” but now has “widespread acknowledgment and acceptance of everyday landscapes that depict the lives of ordinary people” and thus some parts of the heritage tourism industry have a unique set of challenges in the developing world as they seek to tell the stories of a more diverse group of people who have previously been unincorporated.⁵⁸ Additional challenges for heritage tourism in the developing world are addressed in Leslie-Ann Jordan and David T. Duval’s chapter, “Heritage Management and Tourism in the Caribbean,” where they assess the current practices in the Caribbean regarding the maintenance of built, natural, and cultural heritage.⁵⁹ In Regina Schlüter’s chapter, “Heritage Tourism in Latin America: Can Turbulent Times Be Overcome?,” she tackles yet another challenge unique to the developing world when she evaluates the impact of instability on the development of the

---

⁵⁷ Roy Eugene Graham, “The Protection of Heritage Values while Utilizing World Heritage Sites for the Benefit of the Community,” in *Heritage Values in Contemporary Society*, eds. George S. Smith, et al. (California: Left Coast Press, 2010).

⁵⁸ Dallen J. Timothy and Gyan P. Nyaupane eds., *Cultural Heritage and Tourism in the Developing World: A Regional Perspective* (New York: Routledge, 2009).

⁵⁹ Leslie-Ann Jordan and David T. Duval, “Heritage Management and Tourism in the Caribbean,” in *Cultural Heritage and Tourism in the Developing World: A Regional Perspective*, eds., Dallen J. Timothy and Gyan P. Nyaupane (New York: Routledge, 2009).

heritage tourism industry in Latin America.⁶⁰

In *Consuming Tradition, Manufacturing Heritage: Global Norms and Urban Forms in the Age of Tourism*, editor Nezar AlSayyad explores the idea of manufacturing and consuming heritage.⁶¹ With a demand for heritage tourism, there always exists the potential for heritage to be created for the tourist to consume, in place of authentic heritages, which AlSayyad warns results in directed obedience instead of exploration. Paul Oliver's chapter in AlSayyad's book, "Re-Presenting and Representing the Vernacular: The Open-Air Museum," looks at open-air museums, starting with Henry Ford's early attempts at developing one in the United States.⁶² Oliver offers an important discussion of how open-air museums provide visitors with an experience that is essentially unguided, as an open-air museum, or a part of a city that is a museum in itself, cannot easily offer a pre-planned or structured experience like a traditional museum can. This is particularly relevant to the *centro histórico* of Quito, which can easily be defined as an open-air museum.

Joseph L. Scarpaci's *Plazas and Barrios: Heritage Tourism and Globalization in the Latin American Centro Histórico*, addressed previously, provides not only information on the built environment of Quito and historic preservation efforts therein, but also addresses heritage tourism in the Latin American *centro histórico* and in Quito's

---

⁶⁰ Regina Schlüter, "Heritage Tourism in Latin America: Can Turbulent Times Be Overcome?," in *Cultural Heritage and Tourism in the Developing World: A Regional Perspective*, eds., Dallen J. Timothy and Gyan P. Nyaupane (New York: Routledge, 2009).

⁶¹ Nezar AlSayyad, ed., *Consuming Tradition, Manufacturing Heritage: Global Norms and Urban Forms in the Age of Tourism* (New York: Routledge, 2001).

⁶² Paul Oliver, "Re-Presenting and Representing the Vernacular: The Open-Air Museum," in *Consuming Tradition, Manufacturing Heritage: Global Norms and Urban Forms in the Age of Tourism*, ed. Nezar AlSayyad (New York: Routledge, 2001).

centro histórico specifically.⁶³ Scarpaci's book discusses how different historic districts in Latin America have sought to preserve their built heritage within an environment of new economic incentives related to tourism that impact policy-making. In Scarpaci's later article, "Globalization Tourists and Heritage Tourists in American Culture: The Case of Latin American Historic Districts," he further examines heritage tourism trends.⁶⁴ In this article, he opens a discussion on whose memories and whose landscapes are actually being preserved in Latin American historic districts. These questions are not easily answered because there are standing debates regarding whose stories should be presented—the colonizers, the colonized, the Indigenous population the preceded colonization and survives to this day, or the mestizo population that developed during and after colonization? This provides important background for the case studies that are explored in Chapter Three of this thesis.

Literature on specific examples of the safeguarding, or lack thereof, of intangible heritage in Quito's *centro histórico* are few and far between because the field is so new and thus research is still being conducted. But a handful of articles offer insight into various issues that have arisen in Quito, particularly those related to gentrification. Veronica Crossa's "Disruption, yet Community Reconstitution: Subverting the Privatization of Latin American Plazas" investigates problems that have arisen as street vendors, most of whom Crossa identifies as Indigenous, have been evicted from public plazas in efforts to make those spaces more tourist friendly.⁶⁵ Crossa uses the example of

---

⁶³ Scarpaci, *Plazas and Barrios*.

⁶⁴ Joseph L. Scarpaci, "Globalization Tourists and Heritage Tourists in American Culture: The Case of Latin American Historic Districts," *Material Culture* 39 (2007).

⁶⁵ Veronica Crossa, "Disruption, yet Community Reconstitution: Subverting the Privatization of Latin American Plazas," *GeoJournal* 77 (2012).

Programa de Rescate (Rescue Program) in Mexico that sought to modernize the urban plazas, and in doing so, removed all of the vendors. Those vendors had developed communities in that public space over many decades, and in removing them from the plazas, the government destroyed communities and disrupted the vendors' primary means of earning incomes. In "The Contest for the City Centre: Street Traders versus Buildings," Gareth A. Jones and Ann Varley discuss the same process of eliminating street vendors from public spaces in historic districts.⁶⁶ They explain the argument that has been made regarding street vendors taking away from the landscape and impeding the visibility of historic architecture and tourism destinations. The authors conclude that the use of public space in historic centers by its traditional occupants—an example of intangible heritage—has become the victim of preservation and heritage tourism guided policies in many historic districts in Latin America.

Another source that addresses intangible heritage falling victim to the efforts of preservation and gentrification is Lucía Durán, José Rodríguez, and Luis López' project titled, *La Ronda: Esos Otros Patrimonios* (La Ronda: The Other Heritages).⁶⁷ Their work provides a case study of a neighborhood called La Ronda in Quito's *centro histórico*. The small neighborhood was renovated and made into a pristine tourist destination by one of Quito's government preservation organizations, Fondo de Salvamento Patrimonial de Quito (Fund for Preservation of the Historic City Center) (FONSAL). The renovation of the neighborhood resulted in the eviction of the neighborhood's residents along with their stories and traditions—their intangible heritage—in order to preserve the architecture of

---

⁶⁶ Gareth A. Jones and Ann Varley, "The Conquest for the City Centre: Street Traders versus Buildings," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 13 (1) (1994).

⁶⁷ Lucía Durán, et al., *La Ronda: Esos Otros Patrimonios* (Quito: INTERCULTURAS, 2012).

elite homes from the colonial period and present them as such. The book provides a brief history of the neighborhood and of the renovation projects that took place there, as well as interviews with dozens of former residents. The renovation of La Ronda and the book itself furnish an example of a poorly executed tourism-based preservation project, as well as an example of how a community's intangible heritage has been preserved in the aftermath of a destructive project.

Alan Middleton presented his paper, "Trivialising Culture, Social Conflict and Heritage Tourism in Quito," at the 2007 International Seminar on Heritage Tourism.⁶⁸ In his paper, Middleton explores the complex history of the Indigenous populations in Quito. He addresses the ways in which the ugly history of exploitation and oppression has been sanitized to present a more pleasant story of Quito's history that ignores the tensions that are still present. Middleton discusses the eviction of street vendors from Quito's *centro histórico*, and also looks at the presentation of Indigenous heritage by an Indigenous dance troupe, as well as the display of intangible heritage during Semana Santa (Holy Week). Middleton is concerned not only with potentially inaccurate presentations of heritage, but also with the prospect of tourists misunderstanding the heritage that is presented to them. Most importantly, Middleton argues that the complicated and ugly history of oppression should not be overlooked. Rather, "the city should be honest about this history and celebrate the Indigenous struggle for land and dignity."⁶⁹

Because literature on tourism and Semana Santa in Quito is unavailable outside of

---

⁶⁸ Alan Middleton, "Trivialising Culture, Social Conflict and Heritage Tourism in Quito," paper presented at the International Seminar on Heritage Tourism (2007).

⁶⁹ Ibid., 12.

Middleton's work, to fully understand the issues that arise in the presentation of cultural heritage through events such as Semana Santa, where parades and rituals take place in public spaces and have become events that bring in tourists, literature on similar events in different settings are helpful. Ruben George Oliven's article, "The Production and Consumption of Culture in Brazil," addresses concerns surrounding the celebration of Carnival.⁷⁰ Oliven discusses the commodification of heritage that has transpired as Carnival has developed into an event that brings masses of tourists from around the world. In Claude F. Jacobs' article, "Folk for Whom? Tourist Guidebooks, Local Color, and the Spiritual Churches of New Orleans," he examines the role that the tourism industry, guidebooks in particular, play in misrepresenting community heritage.⁷¹ Jacobs' work suggests that the problems of commodification and misrepresentation of heritage can be dealt with constructively, and that the solution does not have to mean that events such as Semana Santa and Carnival should be closed off to tourists, nor should they be altered for easier tourist consumption.

The body of literature consulted for this thesis is wide, covering the history of the city of Quito, Quito's built environment, the history of preservation policies and initiatives, and the complex topics of Indigenous heritage, intangible heritage, and heritage tourism. While there is an abundance of literature available on preservation, intangible heritage, and heritage tourism, works that tie these topics directly to Quito's *centro histórico* are not abundant. After examining the history of Quito in Chapter One

---

⁷⁰ Ruben George Oliven, "The Production and Consumption of Culture in Brazil," *Latin American Perspectives* 11 (1) (1984).

⁷¹ Claude F. Jacobs, "Folk for Whom? Tourist Guidebooks, Local Color, and the Spiritual Churches of New Orleans," *The Journal of American Folklore* 114 (453) (2001).

and the history of preservation in Chapter Two, Chapter Three seeks to pull the available literature on these complex topics together and apply it to Quito's *centro histórico*, using the *centro histórico* as a stage for how the issues of historic preservation, the safeguarding of intangible heritage and heritage tourism are all intrinsically linked.

CHAPTER I
COLONIAL QUITO:
SPANISH CONTROL AND INDIGENOUS WORK

The colonization of Quito, Ecuador was a unique effort on the part of the Spanish colonizers and produced a city that exemplifies the traditional aspects of the Spanish American colonial city while showcasing Indigenous influence. The location of Quito in the Andes Mountains on the slopes of Pichincha, an active volcano, and in an area often affected by seismic activity, posed unique and unfamiliar challenges for the Spanish colonizers, as they tended to choose flat sites for the construction of colonial cities.¹ Despite the unique location of Quito, colonizers used Indigenous labor to construct a city that fit traditional grid patterns in its own way. They filled it with conventional colonial buildings, most importantly, an abundance of enormous churches. They did this on land that had been home to the Quitu and Caras people since before the Common Era and was a stronghold of the Incan Empire from 1462 until the Spanish took control in 1534.²

Traditional Spanish American colonial cities were built on a grid that expanded

---

¹ An example of this is seen in the moving of the capital of Peru from the city of Cuzco, which was at an extremely high elevation on uneven terrain, to the new city of Lima on flat coastal land.

² International Council on Monuments and Sites, *Advisory Body Evaluation*, (June 7, 1978), [www://whc.unesco.org/archive/advisory_body_evaluation/002.pdf](http://whc.unesco.org/archive/advisory_body_evaluation/002.pdf); Crespo, “Arquitectura Monumental del Centro Histórico de Quito,” 153.

out evenly in all directions from a large central plaza.³ In Philip II of Spain's *Ordenanzas sobre descubrimiento nuevo y población* (*Ordinances on the Discovery and Population of Towns*), more commonly called the Laws of the Indies, he ordered the city "should be laid out on a grid pattern with a large central plaza surrounded by a series of streets running at right angles to each other" with everything laid out orderly and with good proportion.⁴ The Laws of the Indies also instructed colonizers not to select sites that were too low or high or that were on "irregular terrain" that might interfere with the grid plan. For this reason, Cuzco was deemed unfit for the capital of Peru, and a new capital was built in Lima. However, Quito serves as an exception to these rules, sitting on the side of a volcano and at an elevation of 2,850 meters (9,350 feet).⁵

Colonizers decided to build on this less than traditional site for many reasons. It was the former northern capital of the Incan Empire and had been established for one hundred years.⁶ Spanish colonizers found this part of the Incan Empire running incredibly efficiently with "sophisticated irrigation systems," roads, bridges, and temples.⁷ Colonizer Sebastián Benalcázar also saw the military advantages that Quito's location offered, being accessible only by way of traversing steep and dangerous mountains.⁸ The remains of the Incan city supplied foundations for the new colonial city, such as the palace of Huayana Capac, which served as the foundation for San Francisco Church. This was because the palace was already elevated as the Laws of the Indies instructed the first church should be, in order to have "greater authority." This also fit in with the tradition of

---

³ Mumford, *Vertical Empire*, 46.

⁴ Fraser, *The Architecture of Conquest*, 37-8.

⁵ Smith, "Colonial Towns of Spanish and Portuguese America," 5.

⁶ Kiernan, "Quito: Beauty and History," 6.

⁷ Fraser, *The Architecture of Conquest*, 8-9.

⁸ Ernest Capello, *City at the Center of the World*, 6-7.

building churches on top of important places associated with the Indigenous community, to further destroy their connections with non-Spanish and non-Catholic culture.⁹

Colonizers even used remains from the former city in the construction of the first buildings, such as stones from the Incan Temple of the Sun being used to construct parts of the San Francisco Church.

Taking into account the benefits of the remains of the well-established Incan city and its military advantages, colonizers went to work imposing their grid plan on Quito. Their traditional grid “morphed to conform to the rough terrain and was interrupted in numerous places by rushing creeks.”¹⁰ The grid could not continue to expand evenly to the east and west as it was positioned in a valley between mountains, so it was forced to expand much further north and south. Replicating the Incan city, the Spanish elites were centered around the central plaza and then stretched northward, and the Indigenous population stretched south as opposed to areas surrounding the city.¹¹ A map from 1903 shows Quito centered on the central plaza (**Figure 1**).¹² The map shows how the city expanded out to the east and west, but stopped abruptly. While the map does not include areas to the north and south of the city center, the streets extending north and southward from the central plaza continue for miles. Furthermore, the map shows where those streets that extended east and west ended until the late twentieth century. The map also

---

⁹ Fraser, *The Architecture of Conquest*, 64-5.

¹⁰ Capello, *City at the Center of the World*, 7.

¹¹ Ibid., 7.

¹² “Prior to the 1750s, imperial decrees limited the availability of maps of American territories, as frequent assaults from marauding pirates and competing European powers made securing cartographic knowledge a necessary part of governance.” While Dutch cartographers began producing maps of American cities in the 1800s, it was not until 1903 that Ecuadorian geographers began producing maps using new cartographic techniques acquired from foreign scientists. A more extensive discussion of the cartographic history of Quito is available in Ernesto Capello, *City Fragments*, 67-107.

shows how some streets were laid diagonally, contrary to the Laws of the Indies' instructions to build streets that run at right angles to one another.

Figure 1. 1903 Plano de la Ciudad de Quito.

The use of the grid pattern enforced a social order in Spanish America. During the colonial era, the central plaza housed the main church as well as the *cabildo* (government building), and the surrounding blocks contained the homes of the most prominent citizens. The closer a person lived to the central plaza, the more important they were. Homes further from the central plaza were occupied by merchants, artisans, and *mestizos* (persons of mixed European and Indigenous descent).¹³ Historians James Lockhart and Stuart Schwartz described this as the nucleated city with “a better-developed center and a more provisional edge,” which allowed for continual outgrowth without losing any

¹³ Ibid., 5.

stability at the center of the city.¹⁴ The Spanish believed that this arrangement displayed the values of their culture that they felt were most important.¹⁵ They also believed that the structure of the city could play an active role in forcing their culture on native populations, not only through rules and customs, but by the focus on new government buildings and churches.¹⁶ Ordinance 137 from the Laws of the Indies reads:

...when the Indians see [the buildings] they will be filled with wonder and will realize that the Spaniards are settling there permanently... They will consequently fear the Spaniards so much that they will not dare to offend them and will respect them and desire their friendship.¹⁷

Most importantly, the Indigenous population built the new city, so their first interaction with the newly imposed powers was labor, often forced, on construction of churches.¹⁸ Fitting with tradition, Quito has a large central plaza bordered by a cathedral, the Archbishop's Palace, the Presidential Palace, and the *cabildo*, the center of Spanish government. In addition to colonial homes being constructed on the surrounding streets, the largest construction projects were churches branching out in every direction from the central plaza, a typical feature of colonial cities. Church records offer some of the only construction records from this time period. Luckily, those churches provide some of the most important examples of colonial architecture and tradition.

Quito's churches, like all of its buildings, have suffered dramatically from earthquakes. The most damaging earthquakes occurred in 1575, 1587, 1660, 1662, 1755, 1859 and 1922, with the 1575 and 1660 earthquakes being caused by eruptions of the

---

¹⁴ James Lockhart and Stuart Schwartz, *Early Latin America: A History of Spanish America and Brazil* (United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 67-8.

¹⁵ Mumford, *Vertical Empire*, 47.

¹⁶ Fraser, *The Architecture of Conquest*, 50.

¹⁷ Donahue-Wallace, *Art and Architecture of Viceregal Latin America*, 75.

¹⁸ Fraser, *The Architecture of Conquest*, 82.

Pichincha volcano.¹⁹ The Spanish stuck it out in Quito despite earthquakes and volcanoes, because they had the benefit of building on the remains of the elaborate preexisting Incan city, and venturing far from Quito would also result in the loss of the large native population that was available for labor. However, in other colonial cities, such as Guatemala City, Spanish colonizers were not prepared to deal with damages caused by natural disasters if they were avoidable. The *audiencia* (colonial government officials) in Guatemala City in the late 1700s appealed to King Carlos III of Spain to allow them to move away from the Agua and Fuego volcanoes, to a new city on a plain or in a valley.²⁰ The king obliged after recognizing the “desolation” of the city and the “horrible ravages” it had suffered from earthquakes caused by surrounding volcanoes. In 1775, he permitted the establishment of Nueva Guatemala de Asunción, modern day Guatemala City.²¹ Permission to move to a new location also likely related to the belief held by many at the time that earthquakes were a form of divine punishment.²²

Because the Spanish decided to maintain the city of Quito in its original location, they had to make some adjustments to their construction techniques to deal with the seismic activity in the city, because unlike floods or epidemics, earthquakes struck without warning and were impossible to manage.²³ Adaptations would come after the city had suffered devastation from earthquakes and was setting to work on the reconstruction of damaged buildings. For instance, in the early eighteenth century Gothic vaults were found to offer superior support during earthquakes than the traditional Classical arches,

---

¹⁹ Pino and Yepes, “Apuntes para una Historia Sismica de Quito,” 70-71.

²⁰ Jones, *Guatemala in the Spanish Colonial*, 133.

²¹ Ibid., 137.

²² Ramírez and Taylor, “Out of Tlatelolco’s Ruins,” 54-55.

²³ Ibid., 54.

so as reconstruction efforts were made on various churches after damages caused by seismic activity in the following centuries, those Classical arches were replaced.²⁴

Another unique construction technique used in Quiteñan construction was found in the church of San Agustín during recent renovations. **Figure 2** shows the interior of a wall in San Agustín church. Large hollow clay bulbs were placed inside of walls because the hollow bulbs made the walls lighter and increased their ability to move with the earth during seismic activity, making buildings less likely to collapse.²⁵ It is unclear whether this construction technique was used by native *maestros* (masters) Francisco Morocho and Antonio Guzmán who worked on the construction of the church starting in 1602, or if this method was begun when Gothic vaults were added to the church in the 1800s after an earthquake.²⁶

---

²⁴ Fraser, *The Architecture of Conquest*, 133.

²⁵ Julio Rivas, interview by Meredith Maple, Quito, Ecuador, December 21, 2013.

²⁶ Webster, “Master of the Trade,” 16; Crespo, “Arquitectura Monumental del Centro Histórico de Quito,” 158.

Figure 2. Interior of wall in San Agustín Church.

The majority of construction in Quito took place in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as the Spanish presence in Quito grew.²⁷ In the city center more than twenty churches and monasteries look down over two-story colonial homes that traditionally have red tile roofs, tall wooden doors, painted windows, and balconies. Behind the street-facing façades of most colonial homes and buildings, there are large open-air patios.²⁸ The traditional Spanish and Moorish patios are also often blocked from public view by shops or storefronts.²⁹ Secular buildings have architectural elements that set them apart from churches, namely the lintelled entrances, as opposed to arched entrances. Lintelled entrances feature a rectangular piece of stone placed horizontally above a doorway. Secular buildings are also likely to have elaborate and less traditional

---

²⁷ Webster, “Master of the Trade,” 11-12.

²⁸ Kiernan, “Quito: Beauty and History,” 7.

²⁹ Smith, “Colonial Towns of Spanish and Portuguese America,” 6.

decoration. Valerie Fraser gives the example of a colonial home in the city center of Quito that is decorated with goat heads and bearded men, two features that would never be found on a church or religious building.³⁰

Before exploring the churches themselves, it is important to understand the role of the Indigenous population during construction. Under the force of Spanish officials, Indigenous hands built the city and everything inside.³¹ A portion of that Indigenous population was often living within the city on otherwise undeveloped lots in *bohios* or *ranchos* (huts). But as work was completed on churches and their presence was not needed as consistently for nearby construction, the Spanish government evicted them by claiming they were squatting on city “gardens” that the government was ready to develop.³² While some Indigenous labor was contracted to native *maestros*, these contracts do not negate the fact that the labor was forced, as those *maestros* would not have had any real choice as to whether they accepted the contracts, nor would they be able to find many, if any, alternative options for work in colonial Quito. *Canteros* (stonemasons) cut stones for walls; *albañileros* (bricklayers) used those stones to construct foundations and walls; carpenters created confessionals, pulpits, choir boxes, doors, window frames, and the scaffolding needed for construction; and *ensambladores* (assemblers) assembled altarscreens for the churches.³³ Construction of churches in Quito served as some of the Indigenous populations’ first encounter with the Spanish powers, introduced them to the new religion to which they were being converted, and taught them

---

³⁰ Fraser, *The Architecture of Conquest*, 136.

³¹ Webster, “Masters of Trade,” 11.

³² Fraser, *The Architecture of Conquest*, 75.

³³ Donahue-Wallace, *Art and Architecture of Viceregal Latin America*, 102.

new construction techniques with new materials.³⁴ Fraser also explains that “the church is central to any discussion of architectural style in the early colonial period” because it was imposed as the central force in colonial cities. Not only were churches the largest and most elaborate buildings; they represented the Spanish conquerors’ spiritual and cultural ideas that were forced upon Indigenous populations.³⁵ Façades of churches enjoyed large arches with columns, pilasters, and entablatures. These were typical features of churches constructed during the Colonial Era in Latin America.³⁶ While the construction of churches was at the behest of local priests throughout the sixteenth century, by the seventeenth century it was royal officials who began commissioning the work.³⁷

The Spanish also saw the value in training natives to meet their construction needs. The Colegio de San Andres (Saint Andres College) was established in 1549 and served to turn natives into laborers skilled in European techniques and art used on construction projects throughout the city.³⁸ The Colegio de San Andres established the Escuela Quiteña (Quito School) of art that blended Spanish and Indigenous traditions. While general architecture remained relatively uninfluenced by the natives doing the constructing, details reminiscent of Indigenous iconography can be seen in decorative elements of the church.³⁹ While Fraser argues that the native influence was minimal, the development of the Escuela Quiteña suggests otherwise. This is best represented in La Compañía, a Jesuit church that is known for its interior that is entirely covered in gold

---

³⁴ Fraser, *The Architecture of Conquest*, 167.

³⁵ Ibid., 121.

³⁶ Ibid., 123.

³⁷ Ibid., 162.

³⁸ Ibid., 97.

³⁹ Ibid., 6.

and is full of both traditional Spanish and Indigenous design.⁴⁰

Susan Webster, who has worked extensively in the various archives in Quito, has uncovered records showing that while the majority of work done by natives was limited to labor in “extracting, manufacturing, and providing the necessary materials—stone, wood, bricks, mortar, etc.—[and] construction of the buildings themselves,” natives are also listed in account books as *maestros* (masters), *oficiales* (journeymen), and *peones* (laborers). Some are even listed as *maestros de obra* (construction foremen).⁴¹ Webster found native *maestros* to be listed on forty separate construction projects in the seventeenth century alone.⁴² This research calls Fraser’s claims of limited native influence in colonial construction into question. While native *maestros* may have been schooled in European techniques, when put in charge of designing and constructing, native *maestros* would have surely developed buildings that reflected Indigenous traditions as well as European ones, as displayed by the Escuela Quiteña discussed above.

Quito’s city center, now known as the *centro histórico* (historic center), contains six churches of particular importance. Five of them form a cross across the city center with La Catedral in the center, positioned on the central plaza, now known as Plaza de la Independencia (Independence Plaza) or Plaza Grande. La Merced Church is to the north, Santo Domingo Church to the south, San Agustín Church to the east and San Francisco Church to the west (**Figure 3**). La Compañía is the sixth church. It sits next to La Catedral just off the Plaza Grande. These churches were modeled after sixteenth century Spanish cathedrals, often having three aisles, side chapels, rectangular plans with

---

⁴⁰ Capello, *City at the Center of the World*, 8.

⁴¹ Webster, “Masters of Trade,” 11-13.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 16.

inscribed crosses composed of nave and transept, domed crossings and corner towers, and/or small projecting apses.⁴³ The churches each reflect many stages of colonial influence and architecture as they were constantly altered and rebuilt in response to earthquakes. They also all share one theme in particular: ornate wood and stone carvings as well as paintings of grapes and pineapples (**Figure 4**). According to Julio Rivas, professor of art history in Quito, this was unique to the New World, because it represented the body and soul in new terms. The grapes represented the soul, a European idea, but the pineapples represented the body, a unique idea that came out of the conquest period upon the discovery that citrus fruits prevented scurvy, thus allowing for successful sea voyages to the Americas.⁴⁴

---

⁴³ Donahue-Wallace, *Art and Architecture of Viceregal Latin America*, 101.

⁴⁴ Julio Rivas, interview by Meredith Maple, Quito, Ecuador, December 21, 2013.

Figure 3. Map of *centro histórico* showing the churches referenced in text.

Figure 4. Pineapples and grapes carved in woodwork in San Agustín Church.

La Catedral, which sits on the Plaza Grande, was constructed between 1562 and 1565 under the direction of Pedro Rodríguez de Aguayo in traditional Spanish form with elaborate arches and bell towers (**Figure 5**). Bishop Alonso de la Peña y Montenegro had it reconstructed after the 1660 earthquake, and then again after the 1797 earthquake. By this time, the reconstruction was commissioned by Bishop Cuero y Caicedo and President Carondelet. They appointed Spanish military engineer Antonio García to reconstruct the church in a Neo-Classical style.⁴⁵

---

⁴⁵ Crespo, “Arquitectura Monumental del Centro Histórico de Quito,” 154.

Figure 5. La Catedral.

The Order of Mercy began construction of La Merced Church in 1546 with funds donated by Gonzalo Pizarro, half-brother of Francisco Pizarro (**Figure 6**). Native *maestro* Juan Bilatuña was contracted to design the interior wooden vaults and paneling, called *artesonado*, of the church in 1662.⁴⁶ After suffering severe damage from multiple earthquakes, the mestizo architect José Jaime Ortiz, rebuilt the church in 1700. It copied La Compañía, a Jesuit church that most clearly demonstrates the Escuela Quiteña.⁴⁷ Upon Ortiz's death, mestizo bricklayer Joseph Landa was made the *maestro de obra* (construction foreman) on the project and he completed the construction in 1715.⁴⁸ A chapel connected to La Merced was developed in 1609 and survived the earthquakes that severely damaged the rest of the church. Its construction was contracted to native

---

⁴⁶ Webster, "Masters of the Trade," 16.

⁴⁷ Crespo, "Arquitectura Monumental del Centro Histórico de Quito," 162; Damián Bayón and Murillo Marx, *History of South American Colonial Art and Architecture: Spanish South America and Brazil* (New York: Rizolli International Publications, 1989), 136.

⁴⁸ Webster, "Masters of the Trade," 16.

bricklayers Diego Ventura de Santiago and Juan Ventura. While the Venturas were given general instructions for the appearance of the chapel, they were responsible for both the design and construction. It comes as no surprise that the only portion of the church complex to survive the subsequent earthquakes was the one designed and constructed by native *maestros*.⁴⁹ A cross in front of the church reads *bajo la cruz, pero libre* (under the cross, but free) a quote of José Mejía Lequerica, an eighteenth century mestizo politician.

Figure 6. La Merced Church.

Spanish architect Francisco Becerra was in Quito between 1580 and 1583. During this time he designed Santo Domingo Church (**Figure 7**). The construction of the church stopped upon his departure in 1583. It was not picked back up until 1595 and was then consistently worked on until 1650. A later cloister was added between 1650 and 1700 and a refectory in 1688.⁵⁰ The church was altered in the early nineteenth century and had many Neo-Gothic attributes added to it, because in the eighteenth century Gothic style

---

⁴⁹ Ibid., 18-19.

⁵⁰ Crespo, "Arquitectura Monumental del Centro Histórico de Quito," 156-157.

vaults had been discovered to hold up to earthquakes much more effectively than Classical arches.⁵¹

Figure 7. Santo Domingo Church.

Francisco Becerra also designed San Agustín Church, inside of which independence from Spain was proclaimed in 1809.⁵² Becerra's work on the church stopped when he left in 1583, just as it did on Santo Domingo (**Figure 8**).⁵³ Starting in 1602, native *maestros* Francisco Morocho and Antonio de Guzmán went to work on the primary chapel,⁵⁴ but in 1606 the project was taken over by Spanish architect Juan del Corral who completed the church in 1669. However, the church was severely damaged in the nineteenth century by an earthquake, and at this time, many of the Classical arches were replaced with Gothic vaults. The unique construction method discussed previously that used hollow clay bulbs inside of the walls to make them lighter and better able to

---

⁵¹ Fraser, *The Architecture of Conquest*, 133.

⁵² Bayón and Marx, *History of South American Colonial Art and Architecture*, 140.

⁵³ Crespo, "Arquitectura Monumental del Centro Histórico de Quito," 158.

⁵⁴ Webster, "Masters of the Trade," 16.

withstand seismic activity was used in the construction of San Agustín at an unknown date. Inside of the church there are elaborate frescos painted by Miguel de Santiago in 1650 to represent the life and death of Saint Augustine.⁵⁵ Miguel de Santiago is considered one of the best colonial painters in Quito. He was not born into an elite family, but adopted his name from his guardian, Hernando de Santiago. His paintings in the church provide an example of how traditional European paintings were interpreted in the Americas. His frescos were based off European engravings, but he altered them to fit the Ecuadorian landscape that he was surrounded by.⁵⁶

Figure 8. San Agustín Church.

Construction of San Francisco Church began by 1535 under direction of the Franciscans on the remains of the Incan Palace of Huayana Capac (**Figure 9**). Stones from the Incan Temple of the Sun were also used in the early stages of the church's construction. Original plans were completed in 1580. Francisco Benítez added a cloister

---

⁵⁵ Crespo, "Arquitectura Monumental del Centro Histórico de Quito," 158.

⁵⁶ Bayón and Marx, *History of South American Colonial Art and Architecture*, 117.

with elaborate woodwork in 1605, and between 1650 and 1700, Antonio Rodríguez added an additional cloister and chapel. The entrance to the church is split into three bays with a central arch that has Doric columns on either side. This pattern of an arch and columns is replicated on the second story where the arch sits over a large window, allowing for sunlight to enter and light the altar.⁵⁷ San Francisco Church has an *alfarje* ceiling that is supported by Gothic vaults. *Alfarje* ceilings were derived from Moorish techniques learned by Spanish architects during the Islamic occupation of Spain (**Figure 10**). These ceilings are made up of elaborately carved and painted pieces of wood that interlock like puzzle pieces.⁵⁸ The Colegio de San Andres, the school that trained Indigenous craftsmen and artists was located on the San Francisco campus.⁵⁹

Figure 9. San Francisco Church.

---

⁵⁷ Fraser, *The Architecture of Conquest*, 127-130.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 133.

⁵⁹ Donahue-Wallace, *Art and Architecture of Viceregal Latin America*, 115.

Figure 10. Alfarje ceiling in San Francisco Church.

La Compañía is a Jesuit church said to be a “fundamental testimony to American architecture of Baroque style” due to the blending of Spanish, Indigenous, and Moorish architectural features. **(Figure 11).**⁶⁰ Construction began in 1605 under various directors, including Francisco Ayerdi, José Gutiérrez, Venancio Gandolfi, and Padre Sánchez.⁶¹ Spanish-Italian architect Marcus Guerra completed the elaborate stone façade in 1636. The church was modeled after the Jesuit Order’s main church, Il Gesù, in Rome, and was approved of by Roman authorities.⁶² The church went through many phases of construction until the Jesuits were expelled from Quito and the rest of Spanish America

⁶⁰ Crespo, “Arquitectura Monumental del Centro Histórico de Quito,” 159-160.

⁶¹ Sanz, “Colonial Art of Quito,” 457.

⁶² Donahue-Wallace, *Art and Architecture of Viceregal Latin America*, 173.

in 1767.⁶³ The King of Spain expelled the Jesuits because of their allegiance to the Pope over the King, and because he feared the power they wielded through ministering to the Indigenous masses. The Jesuits had extreme wealth in terms of landholdings, so after their expulsion, their properties were split up among the government and the remaining religious orders.⁶⁴ Similar to San Francisco Church, La Compañía also has an *alfarje* ceiling. It is covered and protected by a barrel vault and is the first example of a barrel vault being used to cover and protect an *alfarje* style ceiling. Almost the entirety of the interior of La Compañía is painted in gold, a technique associated with the Escuela Quiteña, which often made use of gold leaf. In Juan de Velasco's 1789 description of Quito, *Historia del Reino de Quito en la América meridional* (History of the Kingdom of Quito in South America), he described La Compañía as:

...only comparable to the rarest and best structures in Europe...the best of all is the church that belonged to the Jesuits. Foreign writers describe its magnificence and the ornaments of all its principal altars and the silver plate as excessive and superfluous richness.⁶⁵

---

⁶³ Crespo, "Arquitectura Monumental del Centro Histórico de Quito," 159-160.

⁶⁴ Donahue-Wallace, *Art and Architecture of Viceregal Latin America*, 176.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 177.

Figure 11. La Compañía Church.

The interior and exterior of the church are incredibly ornate: “virtually every surface of the façade bears sculptural ornaments, from the reliefs located on pedestals and friezes, to the carved shafts of the columns and pilasters.”⁶⁶ The native woodworker Manuel Chili, nicknamed Caspicara, carved the elaborate wood sculptures inside La Compañía. Caspicara was born in the middle of the seventeenth century and was trained by Don Bernardo de Legarda, who was known for his sculptures that featured realistic clothing and use of color. Caspicara perfected his teacher’s technique, and became known for his ability to make sculptures appear life like, anatomically correct, and fluid. His sculptures are also found in other churches across Quito, including in La Catedral and in San Francisco Church.⁶⁷ For this work, he has been venerated as “the greatest genius of all Quiteño sculptors”.⁶⁸ Caspicara’s trainer Don Bernardo de Legarda was a mestizo

---

⁶⁶ Ibid., 175.

⁶⁷ Navarro, “Ecuadorian Sculpture,” 212-213.

⁶⁸ Sanz, “Colonial Art of Quito,” 459.

artist who also worked on the gilding of the altarpieces in La Compañía. Legarda is also known for his work on the main altar in San Francisco Church and in La Merced.

In her research, Susan Webster found extensive evidence of native *maestros* in addition to those mentioned. Those who Webster identifies as native *maestros* have all been identified as Indian in some form of documentation regarding their work or were documented members of established indigenous artisan groups. A few of those *maestros* even earned the title of “Don” after being appointed to positions within the government. Some examples of those *maestros* are Juan Benitez Cañar, Don Francisco Tipán, Juan Anqui, Felipe Yndio, and Lorenzo Aulis. Juan Benitez Cañar worked in the early seventeenth century to design and construct altarpieces. His first documented work was commissioned in 1615, and his most important documented works include four altarpieces in San Agustín Church, three in Santo Domingo Church, one in San Francisco Church, and one in La Merced Church.⁶⁹ Juan Benitez Cañar was also appointed the Deputy General of the Monastery of San Francisco in 1617.⁷⁰

Don Francisco Tipán was elected by the *audiencia* (Spanish government officials) as the head of the sculptors’ and carpenters’ guilds beginning in 1670.⁷¹ He was commissioned to design and construct the primary entrance to La Merced Church, which has since been reconstructed; the main altarpiece in La Compañía Church, which has since been replaced, although some of his work was relocated to the lateral walls of the church; and the main altarpiece and niches in San Francisco Church, of which the

---

⁶⁹ Webster, “Masters of the Trade,” 20.

⁷⁰ Bayón and Marx, *History of South American Colonial Art and Architecture*, 89.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 22.

altarpiece has been replaced but the niches remain.⁷² The Spanish Juan Bautista Arias commissioned Juan Anqui to build his “two-story house and construct corridors, arches, fireplaces, stairways, a patio, a fountain and other elements” in 1582.⁷³ Felipe Ynido and his son were contracted to design and build the Spanish Diego de Niebla’s personal residence near Quito’s Plaza Grande in 1598. And Brother Marcos Guerra, an architect himself, commissioned Lorenzo Aulis to design the entrance to the Jesuit College in 1664.⁷⁴

Aside from the monumental churches that color the *centro histórico*, there are a handful of post-colonial architectural works that stand out. Large-scale construction projects in the *centro histórico* were very few and far between in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. After the 1868 earthquake, efforts were made to fix damaged colonial buildings, limiting any new construction projects.⁷⁵ By the end of the nineteenth century, the City Beautiful movement had led to some cleanup and modernization efforts related to colonial structures. It also led to the construction of the Teatro Nacional Sucre, a national theater in the city center, on property that was formerly home to a slaughterhouse. The theater is Neo-Classical in style, and its architects made use of the original arches and columns from the slaughterhouse that preceded it. While construction began in 1879, the theater was not completed until 1922, over forty years later.⁷⁶

Following independence from Spain, new European immigrants began influencing the appearance of the city. The Swiss-Italian Durini family of architects

---

⁷² Ibid., 23-24.

⁷³ Ibid., 17.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 17.

⁷⁵ Capello, *City Fragments*, 211.

⁷⁶ Capello, *City at the Center of the World*, 120.

began to impact architecture in Quito upon their arrival to the city in 1902, nearly a century after independence. Lorenzo Durini and his son Francisco were responsible for three important features of the *centro histórico* that remain today, as well as dozens of projects across the city. Lorenzo Durini noted the visible influence of “anonymous Indigenous craftsmen” on colonial churches, and sought to incorporate those features in with traditional colonial styles of architecture, as well as modern Italian styles.⁷⁷ His son Francisco wanted to design buildings that would seamlessly integrate into the extant buildings in the *centro histórico*, while making use of “more elaborate and imaginative ornamentation.”⁷⁸

Both Durinis were able to bring their ideas to fruition in the construction of the Banco del Pichincha (Pichincha Bank) and the Círculo Militar (a reception hall for the military and government). The Banco del Pichincha, constructed in 1920, sits next to La Compañía Church, and in order to have the new bank fit in with the surrounding architecture, the Durinis used the same stone as was used on La Compañía, and included baroque ornamentation on the façade to reflect its neighbor. The bank features a granite, marble, and stone central staircase, and iron windows and grating, created by local craftsmen. The Durinis used local artisans and materials as often as possible to help with their desired seamless integration of the new architecture with the old.⁷⁹

The government commissioned the Círculo Militar to host receptions and military balls in 1926; construction was completed ten years later in 1936. The Durinis used stone that resembled the neighboring colonial-era buildings, but also included modern glass

---

⁷⁷ Ibid., 125.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 136.

⁷⁹ Capello, *City Fragments*, 234.

cupolas and a Neo-Classical stone and marble central staircase.⁸⁰ On the façade of the building, the Durinis incorporated Andean condors, a symbol of Ecuadorian independence from Spain. These condors, a nationalist symbol, carved into the same stone used by the Spanish colonizers, and in the same style as the ornamentation on colonial churches showed a true blending of colonial history and modern nationalist sentiments.⁸¹

The third feature of the *centro histórico* provided by the Durinis is the monument in the Plaza de la Independencia. While plans for a monument began in 1888, the actual work was not officially approved and bankrolled until 1906, in preparation for the 1909 Centennial of Ecuador's initial declaration of Independence from Spain.⁸² A central column extends upward with a "winged victory" atop it. A Spanish lion is seen at the bottom of the monument, limping away having been shot with an arrow by an Ecuadorian condor.⁸³ The base of the monument is covered in plaques engraved with names of heroes from the 1809 fight for independence. Towering over the Carondelet Palace, which house the Spanish *audiencia*, the Archbishop's Palace, and La Catedral, the monument and the rededication of the plaza as Plaza de la Independencia, shows how the *centro histórico* of Quito has a long and complicated history from pre-Columbian to post-colonial times.

The six grand churches discussed above, combined with other colonial constructions, and a few post-colonial works, earned Quito the name of "Ecuador's Spain" by the 1920s, as the colonial buildings in the *centro histórico* remained, for the most part, as they had looked at the end of the Colonial Era, with post-colonial additions

---

⁸⁰ Ibid., 232-233.

⁸¹ Capello, *City at the Center of the World*, 139.

⁸² Ibid., 127.

⁸³ Capello, *City Fragments*, 135.

integrating inconspicuously into the colonial façade of the *centro*. They show the evolution of techniques from Classical arched to Gothic vaulted ceilings in response to recurrent earthquakes, the evolution of Spanish architecture over the course of three centuries, and the influence of the work of native *maestros*. As a result, Quito has an incredibly traditional colonial *centro histórico*, full of native influence, located in a setting uncharacteristic of traditional Spanish colonial cities.

CHAPTER II

HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN QUITO: A CHRONOLOGICAL EVALUATION

Historic preservation, as defined in the introduction, is “the act or process of applying measures to sustain the existing form, integrity, and material of a building or structure.”¹ The history of these practices in Quito, Ecuador is best explained through a chronology. Historic preservation methods and practices have changed greatly since their beginnings in the 1880s. These early roots came out of a movement adhered to by art historian José Gabriel Navarro called *hispanismo*. The *hispanismo* movement believed there was a pure and superior Hispanic race that spread from Spain civilizing the populations of its former colonies and territories. This translates into preservation because Navarro believed that this meant the Spanish colonial *centro histórico* in Quito was the “metaphorical core of the nation.”² Navarro argued that the Spanish *centro* was a living museum, and thus needed to be preserved. He also argued that preservation of the *centro* would promote tourism.

Historian Adrián Vergara Durán helps provide a framework for what exactly a *centro histórico* is, writing that a *centro histórico* “should be something more than a collection of buildings”; it has “special features which form a distinct area that integrates

---

¹ Murtagh, *Keeping Time*, 5.

² Capello, *City Fragments*, 256-7.

the past with a desired future.”³ The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization’s (UNESCO) 1977 definition of a *centro histórico* adds that they are “strongly conditioned by a physical structure stemming from the past,” but are recognizably “representative of the evolution of a people,” not just an integration of the past, present, and future.⁴ Unlike Navarro’s conception of the *centro histórico*, both Durán and UNESCO’s understandings of the *centro histórico* focus on evolution and the future, as opposed to a specifically Spanish history that ignores the Indigenous and mestizo histories that the *centro* also encapsulates.

As discussed in the previous chapter, Indigenous influence in Quiteña architecture is often ignored or dismissed as irrelevant, despite its prevalence and its importance. Navarro’s *hispanismo*-motivated attitude towards preservation certainly set the tone for this understanding. In Ernesto Capello’s dissertation, titled *City Fragments: Space and Nostalgia in Modernizing Quito, 1885-1942*, he analyzes Navarro and the *hispanismo* movement:

Navarro’s main argument, reiterated in numerous books, articles, and speeches claimed that colonial Quito represented an artistic center.... He attributed this phenomenon to the quickness with which Quito’s inhabitants were able to absorb the teachings of European artists, especially the able sculptors who developed the polychromatic sculpture for which Quito was famous.... he located the core of Quito’s artistic heritage in its Spanish roots by highlighting the role of Franciscan artisan schools and the influence of Spanish construction practices. He thus emphasized Spanish and Moroccan styles prevalent in Quito’s colonial monuments.... The influence of Indigenous artistic traditions in features such as the gold leafing adorning San Francisco’s interior columns he dismissed as minimal and incidental.... He exaggerated this aspect to support a view of Spain as a civilizing force.⁵

---

³ Durán, *Renovación de Centros Históricos en Grandes Ciudades Latinoamericanas*, 13.

⁴ Scarpaci, *Plazas and Barrios*, 10.

⁵ Capello, *City Fragments*, 259-60.

By dismissing the role of Indigenous artisans and influence, a serious problem ensues regarding the selection of what aspects of the city's heritage are worthy of preservation: the colonizers and/or the colonized. Building off of Navarro's work, the heritage of the colonizers far outranks the heritage of the colonized, as he saw the Spanish as heroic and civilizing, and the native Indigenous population as uncultured and uncivilized. Here began the issue of exactly whose heritage *is* being preserved in Quito and whose heritage *should* be preserved in Quito. This is an important issue to keep in mind as the history of preservation in Quito is evaluated. It will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

From the 1880s to the 1920s preservation efforts revolved around beautification of the city, focusing on grand historic buildings, monuments, and parks. The beautification efforts took the form of "modernizing facelifts on the aging structures of the colonial city center" and "preserving horizontal continuity, requiring whitewashed or painted facades in sensible colors, and round corners."⁶ But because the conservative government that was in place by the 1930s was intent on moving Quito's elites to new construction projects in the northern suburbs, leaving the city center for migrants looking for work, the government's focus switched from beautification to city planning due to issues with infrastructure and worries about future growth of the city.⁷ Quito suffered an economic crisis during the Great Depression in the 1930s when the currency exchange rate changed, leading to significant inflation. This led to increased migration from the countryside to the city center, as people searched for work. The population in the city center was approximately 100,000 in 1930, but by 1950 the population was 209,932,

---

⁶ Ibid., 213.

⁷ Ibid., 108-9.

having more than doubled in only twenty years.⁸

By 1935, the national government of Ecuador identified the *centro histórico* as an “architectural relic,” which meant they could no longer focus on northern growth while leaving the *centro histórico* behind, and also ensured that focus was on preservation, as opposed to modernization.⁹ By the 1940s, the government decided to devise a plan to deal with the growth of the city. While the primary purpose of the plan was to deal with issues of space, the government was intent on addressing the issue of preserving the *centro histórico*. The city hired Uruguayan architect Guillermo Jones Ordiozola in 1942 to author the Plan Regulador (Master Plan). After three years of research, the new Plan Regulador for Quito was instituted in 1945, identifying historic areas for the first time. While it served to protect individual monuments, it did not further any conservation or preservation goals of the *centro histórico* as a whole.¹⁰ The implementation of the Plan Regulador, also known as Plan Jones Ordiozola, was accompanied by the 1945 Artistic Heritage Act, which further promoted protection of individual monuments, but also failed to reach outside the scope of monuments.¹¹

The 1950s were characterized by modernization efforts to continue to deal with the increasing population and the transformation of the *centro histórico* into a commercial district.¹² And in 1960, the population of the *centro histórico* was 350,000, more than triple the number from 1930.¹³ By the 1960s, Latin American countries were beginning to address the issue of historic preservation head on as interest in Spanish

---

⁸ Lalama, “Transformaciones Urbanas en el Centro Histórico de Quito,” 170.

⁹ Capello, *City Fragments*, 270-1.

¹⁰ Cifuentes, “La Planificación de las Areas Patrimoniales de Quito,” 101.

¹¹ Rojas, *Old Cities, New Assets*, 91.

¹² Lalama, “Transformaciones Urbanas en el Centro Histórico de Quito,” 171.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 174.

American historic districts began increasing. In 1966 a law was passed in Quito that recognized the *centro histórico* by “creating a special commission with power to administer all construction permits for demolition, restoration and repair work within the delimited area.”¹⁴ The following year, the Organization of American States (OAS) held a conference in Quito to initiate an “international effort” for preservation in Latin America. Quito was chosen as an ideal locale for the conference because many other Latin American city centers had deteriorated in the early twentieth century as they transformed into lower-income neighborhoods or were dramatically altered under modernization programs. Quito was seen as a unique “architectural jewel” because its grand historic architecture had not faced the same plight as many other cities due to early historic preservation efforts, so it served as an ideal setting to discuss the future of historic preservation in Latin American cities.¹⁵ The result of the 1967 conference was the *Normas de Quito*, also known as the *Carta de Quito* (Quito Letter). This document served to show how legislation and urban planning were inherent parts of historic preservation in historic districts. Joseph Scarpaci, professor of geography and expert on the Latin American *centro histórico*, wrote that the *Carta de Quito* “strengthened historic preservation throughout Latin America” and “sent a message to all nations to address planning concerns of historic districts, and to capture the social histories of those places.”¹⁶

Because the *Carta de Quito* has served as the impetus for historic preservation in Latin America, and because it came out of a conference held in Quito, it deserves further

---

¹⁴ Bromley and Jones, “Conservation in Quito,” 44.

¹⁵ Rojas, *Old Cities, New Assets*, 9-10 & Capello, *City Fragments*, 271-72.

¹⁶ Scarpaci, *Plazas and Barrios*, 9-10.

evaluation here. The introduction to the *Carta de Quito* explained:

The accelerated process of impoverishment that most American countries are suffering from has resulted in the neglect of their rich arts, which has created a demand for the adoption of emergency measures, both nationally and internationally. The practical effectiveness of those measures will depend, ultimately, on the formulation of a systematic plan for the revaluation of heritage in terms of socio-economic development.¹⁷

The *Carta* blamed accelerated destruction on a lack of protectionist measures (measures which would actively protect and preserve existing structures rather than simply prevent their demolition or replacement) and a lack of official policies and effective practices.

Because archaeological, historical, and artistic monuments are part of the economic wealth of the country, the document stated, measures for their preservation should be included in city development plans. The *Carta* said that protectionist policies had to extend to the areas surrounding monuments, as monuments are products of their environment, and because surrounding areas will be impacted by tourism and/or use of the preserved monument. Technical training was also called for expressly: “enhancement of a monument is a highly technical process and its official treatment should be entrusted to a specialized unit”; and “technical collaboration of experts in various disciplines is absolutely essential. Their successful coordination will largely determine the outcome of a project.”¹⁸ Additionally, the *Carta de Quito* suggested the use of tax exemptions to incentivize private citizens and institutions to preserve and restore buildings in accordance with regulations that were to be instituted by the government.¹⁹

In 1969, the 1966 commission was given additional political strength, and concern with the *centro histórico* switched from being related to social and economic

---

¹⁷ Organization of American States, *Normas de Quito*.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

problems to concern with the city's historic character.²⁰ By 1971 municipal ordinances were passed specifying the boundaries of the *centro histórico*, classifying monuments, and regulating new development.²¹ The 1971 Ordinance regulated the height and materials used in new construction and created some procedures for how to deal with existing historic structures in the area.²²

In 1972, UNESCO established the World Heritage Program.²³ UNESCO defines heritage as “our legacy from the past, what we live with today, and what we pass on to future generations.”²⁴ Durán offers further insight: “heritage is understood today not only as a collection of monuments,” but also as a mechanism that “integrates environments...customs and lifestyles of the past” with the present.²⁵ In March of 1977, UNESCO held the Colloquium on Historic Preservation and the Growth of Historic Centers in Contemporary Cities. The Colloquium took place in Quito and focused on problems facing historic centers in Latin America. The conclusion of the Colloquium held that:

Historic Centers are affected acutely as they are subject to multiple stresses and pressures, internal and external, that cause their gradual abandonment by certain social sectors and lead to the transformation of property uses that affect not only housing but also the monuments themselves and their degradation.²⁶

The conclusion showed that conservation and preservation efforts in historic districts needed to also focus on the well-being of the inhabitants, revitalizing the built

---

²⁰ Bromley and Jones, “Conservation in Quito,” 44.

²¹ Rojas, *Old Cities, New Assets*, 91.

²² Lamala, “Transformaciones Urbanas en el Centro Histórico de Quito,” 176.

²³ Capello, *City Fragments*, 271-2.

²⁴ “World Heritage,” UNESCO, accessed September 26, 2012, <http://www.whc.uneseco.org/en/about/>.

²⁵ Durán, *Renovación de Centros Históricos en Grandes Ciudades Latinoamericanas*, 13.

²⁶ International Council on Monuments and Sites, *Conclusiones del Coloquio*.

environment and the living environment at the same time. It called for policies and programs relating to housing that maintained “residential heritage” and said there was a “need for extensive awareness of the cultural value of the social and living character of historic centers.”²⁷

Ecuador created its own heritage-centered institution that same year, the Instituto Nacional de Patrimonio Cultural (National Institute of Cultural Heritage) (INPC).²⁸ The following year the Cultural Heritage Act declared the *centro histórico* a part of Ecuador’s cultural heritage, and Quito’s *centro histórico* was declared the first World Heritage Site by UNESCO.²⁹ UNESCO defines World Heritage Sites as sites of cultural and natural heritage “considered to be of outstanding value to humanity.” Such sites “belong to all the peoples of the world, irrespective of the territory on which they are located.”³⁰ While UNESCO’s declaration promoted tourism in Quito and promoted preservation of the *centro histórico*, it provided little in the way of monetary support, an issue that Quito, and other Latin American cities would have to begin to tackle in order to move preservation outside of legislation and into reality.

Because Quito was among the earliest designated World Heritage Sites, the lengthy nomination and review processes in place today did not yet exist. Thus, the nomination form for Quito is very simple. It consists of a page long, French language history of the city that recognizes the sites considered relevant to world heritage. The brief statement notes that a settlement existed at Quito “several millennia before Christ

---

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Bromley and Jones, “Conservation in Quito,” 44.

²⁹ Rojas, *Old Cities, New Assets*, 91.

³⁰ “World Heritage,” UNESCO, accessed September 26, 2012, <http://www.whc.uneseco.org/en/about/>.

and the beginning of our era” and that the Incans founded the city in the fifteenth century, however, the focus is on Spanish, colonial and religious structures. The nomination adds that what remains in the city was erected by Sebastián Benalcázar in 1534 under Spanish rule, which ignores the remains of the Incan city that still exist, such as the foundation of San Francisco Church. The document explains that under the Spaniards, Quito became an economic, cultural, and academic center, which sparked the construction of many churches, convents, colleges, and universities, of which it specifically identifies only four buildings: San Francisco Church, described as “one of the oldest [Christian] religious buildings in Hispanic America”; La Merced Church; La Catedral de Quito; and San Agustín Church.³¹ Although a late 1990s Consejo Metropolitano de Quito (Metropolitan Council of Quito) evaluation of historic buildings in the *centro histórico* identified 4,186 buildings that were of historic importance (95% of the buildings in the *centro histórico*).³² Needless to say, more than four buildings are of historic significance, including many that are not churches.

The nomination also describes the Escuela Quiteña (Quito School) of art that developed in the sixteenth century, as traditional Spanish Baroque art influenced by Indigenous art in Quito. The churches in Quito, the nomination adds, display architecture and artwork from the Escuela Quiteña:

---

³¹ International Council on Monuments and Sites, *Advisory Body Evaluation*, (7 June 1978), [www://whc.unesco.org/archive/advisory_body_evaluation/002.pdf](http://whc.unesco.org/archive/advisory_body_evaluation/002.pdf).

³² Ortega, “El Centro Histórico de Quito,” 261.

These churches and convents contain polychrome statues, paintings and church furniture, of extreme richness, which are the masterpieces of Baroque art. Indeed, Quito, crossroads of influence, brought, at the end of the 16th century, artists who created an original and rich art, [a] fusion between the Hispanic and Indian culture. They formed an artistic movement called “School of Quito.”³³

However, La Compañía, the single most prominent example, is not mentioned in the nomination. The 1978 nomination explained that the major problem in the city was the dense population in its colonial core. The paper points out that few changes have occurred to civil and religious buildings and houses. This allowed for their preservation but left many of them in poor condition. The nomination also states that many plans have been devised for restoration and preservation since 1943, the most important of which have been discussed above.³⁴

In 1979, a law was passed that required the INPC to prepare an inventory of all historic buildings in the *centro histórico*. Theoretically those buildings would then be protected by the INPC. However, by the end of the 1970s, it was clear that real progress was not being made. Publically owned buildings were in disrepair, poor management resulted in unfinished projects and bad investments, and a lack of qualified staff meant that potentially effective policies simply were not being implemented appropriately, if at all.³⁵ A new Quito Plan was written in 1981 that identified the *centro histórico* as a preservation district and offered a set of recommendations for actions that needed to be

---

³³ “Ces églises et couvents renferment statues polychromes, peintures et mobilier d’église, d’une extrême richesse, qui sont des chefs-d’œuvres de l’art baroque. En effet, Quito, carrefour d’influences, a attiré, dès la fin du 16e siècle, des artistes qui y créèrent un art original et riche, fusion entre la culture hispanique et la culture indienne. Ils formèrent un courant artistique nommé “Ecole de Quito”. International Council on Monuments and Sites, *Advisory Body Evaluation*.

³⁴ International Council on Monuments and Sites, *Advisory Body Evaluation*.

³⁵ Bromley and Jones, “Conservation in Quito,” 44-45.

taken quickly to address the failures of the previous decade.³⁶ The 1981 plan called for the identification, classification, and inventorying of sites, neighborhoods, and monuments in the *centro histórico*; giving incentives for the residents to be involved in preservation efforts; addressing issues of overuse; stabilizing the existing population; and prioritizing investments.³⁷ The 1977 Colloquium on Historic Preservation echoes through the 1981 Plan. In 1984, the INPC delegated control of the *centro histórico* to the municipal government of Quito, and away from the national government by creating the Comisión del Centro Histórico (Commission of the Historic Center).³⁸ This was a direct result of the 1981 Plan, which had also called for including the municipal government in plans alongside national and international institutions.³⁹

Following an earthquake in March of 1987, the Fondo de Salvamento Patrimonial de Quito (Fund for Preservation of the Historic City Center) (FONSAL) was founded in December of the same year to address the issue of funding for needed preservation efforts in the *centro histórico*.⁴⁰ FONSAL was “a municipally-administered agency financed with provincial taxes and charged with protecting and restoring the artistic, religious and cultural assets of Quito.”⁴¹ The 1987 earthquake had shown just how vulnerable the historic structures in the *centro histórico* were, which accounts for the rapid creation of FONSAL.⁴² Rosemary Bromley and Gareth Jones’ evaluation of the impact of the earthquake on preservation policy in Quito states, “from a policy viewpoint, the

---

³⁶ Ortega, “El Centro Histórico de Quito,” 253.

³⁷ Cifuentes, “La Planificación de las Áreas Patrimoniales de Quito” 106.

³⁸ Ortega, “El Centro Histórico de Quito,” 254.

³⁹ Cifuentes, “La Planificación de las Áreas Patrimoniales de Quito,” 106.

⁴⁰ Bromley and Jones, “Conservation in Quito,” 46.

⁴¹ Rojas, *Old Cities, New Assets*, 83.

⁴² Ortega, “El Centro Histórico de Quito,” 255.

earthquake damage to Quito's famously beautiful churches was used as a catalyst for attracting international finance and technical support."⁴³ Since 1541, Ecuador has experienced ninety-eight earthquakes. The earthquakes of 1587, 1662, 1755, 1859, and 1922 hit the *centro histórico* the hardest and earthquakes in 1859 and 1868 did the most damage to religious architecture.⁴⁴

In 1988, the Fundación Caspicara (Caspicara Foundation) was founded as a private entity meant to fund raise and work on restoration projects and was named after the Native artist of the same name.⁴⁵ Fundación Caspicara worked not only with other institutions within Quito, but created partnerships with national and international institutions.⁴⁶ Rodrigo Paz became Mayor of Quito in 1988 and instituted "significant institutional change" by appointing an academic specialist on urban issues as his Director of Planning and expanding the municipal planning department to include a team in charge of "formulating a new master plan for the city, with a particular concern for the historic center."⁴⁷ This plan would be the Plan Maestro de las áreas históricas de Quito (Master Plan for the historic areas of Quito).⁴⁸

In 1992, the Historic Center Development Plan was completed.⁴⁹ This plan gave the Comisión del Centro Histórico "considerable power to control change to the built environment." Municipal Ordinance 2956, passed in 1992, ensured the Comisión del Centro Histórico legally had more control over how private property owners could

---

⁴³ Bromley and Jones, "Conservation in Quito," 46.

⁴⁴ Carrión, *Centro Histórico de Quito*, 67.

⁴⁵ Bromley and Jones, "Conservation in Quito," 46-7.

⁴⁶ Cifuentes, "La Planificación de las Areas Patrimoniales de Quito," 107.

⁴⁷ Bromley and Jones, "Conservation in Quito," 45 & 47.

⁴⁸ Ortega, "El Centro Histórico de Quito," 254.

⁴⁹ Rojas, *Old Cities, New Assets*, 91.

modify buildings in the *centro histórico*:

[It] extended public control to all buildings in the delimited areas, and increased the size of the bond which property owners undertaking renovation [were] obliged to place with the planning department...all proposals for renovation [were to be] submitted to the commission for the historic center and, once approved, periodic inspections [were to be] carried out.⁵⁰

This law increased FONSAL's role in preservation of the *centro histórico*, making FONSAL the "key agent in conservation" instead of simply the manager of a program that delegated work to the INPC, an agency dependent upon the Ministry of Education and Culture.⁵¹

1993 brought the Ley de Regimen para el Distrito Metropolitano de Quito (Law Regimen for the Metropolitan District of Quito), which divided Quito into twelve metropolitan zones and decentralized governance of Quito. This established the *centro histórico* as its own zone with its own governing body called the Administración de la Zona Centro (Administration of the Central Zone).⁵² The new Administración de la Zona Centro allowed for more emphasis to be placed on preservation efforts. 1994 marked the establishment of the semi-public Empresa del Centro Histórico (Corporation for Development of the Historic Center) (ECH) an institution that would enact the program entitled Rehabilitación del Centro Histórico de Quito (Rehabilitation of the Historic Center of Quito).⁵³ This public/private partnership between the municipal government, Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo (Inter-American Bank of Development) and the

---

⁵⁰ Bromley and Jones, "Conservation in Quito," 47.

⁵¹ Ibid., 49-50.

⁵² Ortega, "El Centro Histórico de Quito," 254.

⁵³ Rojas, *Old Cities, New Assets*, 91 & Ortega, "El Centro Histórico de Quito," 255.

Fundación Caspicara was governed by private law.⁵⁴ Working as a real estate promoter and developer and promoting rehabilitation of the *centro histórico* without concern for turning a profit, the ECH has two specific goals: to “generate more adequate conditions to reactivate the economy in the 72-block core of the Historic Center” and to “promote urban renewal of the Historic Center with a human dimension in order to achieve a better quality of life that will benefit all residents and users involved in the process.”⁵⁵

The ECH was established with multilateral support to execute investments in partnerships with the private sector. This enabled Quito to expedite the rehabilitation process by creating an environment conducive to private investment. Improvements were made in public areas; parking and traffic control; flagship buildings were rehabilitated for public uses; and private buildings were restored in partnership with local owners and investors. To remove the remaining constraints on private investment, the municipality started to regulate street vending and open-air markets, and improved street cleaning and public safety.⁵⁶

By 1997, the government of Quito had successfully bridged the gap between private and public investors and the ECH saw partnerships developed with private investors to finance projects.⁵⁷

A unique aspect of the ECH that make it stand out from other preservation oriented organizations have been its programs to provide affordable housing and promote small business growth in the *centro histórico*.⁵⁸ In order to avoid the typical patterns of gentrification that occur when cities or neighborhoods see large-scale preservation efforts, the ECH works to retain its existing resident population. In order to do this, they have to minimize “any adverse impact on poor households in the historic area” so they

---

⁵⁴ Ortega, “El Centro Histórico de Quito,” 254.

⁵⁵ Scarpaci, *Plazas and Barrios*, 81.

⁵⁶ Rojas, *Old Cities, New Assets*, 84.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 91.

⁵⁸ Scarpaci, *Plazas and Barrios*, 81.

have implemented an “ambitious low-cost housing program that involves rehabilitation of residential buildings.”⁵⁹ Not only were these programs adopted by the ECH, they have already proven successful: “In one renovated building, the program succeeded in retaining 75% of the original occupants by working with the community and strictly controlling costs, and with financial assistance from the central government in the form of direct subsidies.”⁶⁰ In 2005 another plan, Plan Estratégico del Distrito Metropolitano (Strategic Plan of the Metropolitan District), reaffirmed the commitment of the government to preserve the historic center.⁶¹ The plan included a project that facilitates small size entrepreneurs to invest in the *centro histórico*; a project that supports groups who want to preserve customs and traditions of historic areas; and the addition of cultural heritage education at all school levels.⁶²

Successful preservation movements require the involvement of all social actors: public institutions, “civil society organizations concerned with preservation, private investors and developers, and residents themselves...” Eduardo Rojas explains that this can only occur if there is a balance between the interests of each party, the interests of historic preservation, and the interest of profitability.⁶³ Joseph Scarpaci identifies Ecuador as a preservation success story alongside Mexico here:

Mexico and Ecuador are pioneers in the historic preservation realm. There is a relatively smooth coordination among municipal, provincial, national, and international agencies concerned with historic preservation. Unlike Colombia (where the private sector prevails in historic preservation), Cuba (a latecomer to proactive conservation), and Argentina and Uruguay (where the relative lack of extant colonial architecture has evoked a

---

⁵⁹ Rojas, *Old Cities, New Assets*, 84 & 92.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 16-7.

⁶¹ Ortega, “El Centro Histórico de Quito,” 256.

⁶² Ibid., 266.

⁶³ Rojas, *Old Cities, New Assets*, 4.

passive policy response to historic preservation in the capital cities), the Mexican and Ecuadorian governments have steadily supported heritage preservation.⁶⁴

The Metropolitan District of Quito published the Plan Metropolitano de Desarrollo 2012-2022 (Metropolitan Development Plan) in January 2012. This Plan provides insight into the current attitude toward and policies for historic preservation in Quito. The plan is broad, with seven axes of strategy including developing a sustainable Quito, and creating a Quito that is accessible to disabled citizens. Most important for the purposes of this work, axis six is aimed at developing, sustaining, and making use of an “ancient, historic, cultural, and diverse Quito.”⁶⁵ The summary of this axis is as follows:

Quito is a world heritage site, and thus has a history, a tradition, ancient and modern cultures, which account for its diversity and richness. So in this axis, challenges are established to strengthen a diverse Quiteñan identity, and to ensure an active cultural life that allows for constant recreation and use of the elements of tangible and intangible heritage.⁶⁶

Out of the twenty-two policies listed under this axis, almost half of them relate back to preservation of both tangible and intangible heritage in the *centro histórico*. Most notable in regards to historic preservation of the built environment are the final two policies, which call for the “Improvement of housing development and of living conditions of the residential areas of the *centro histórico* of Quito” and the “Substantiation, protection, and recovery of urban heritage—architecture in accordance with the urban image of heritage areas.”⁶⁷ More specific calls for the care of and

---

⁶⁴ Scarpaci, *Plazas and Barrios*, 111.

⁶⁵ Guarderas, et al., “Plan Metropolitano de Desarrollo 2012-2022,” (Quito: Distrito Metropolitano de Quito, 2012), 23.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 23.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 42.

preservation of the *centro histórico* can be found in the layout of strategic objectives, programs, and 2022 goals. One of the objectives is to “Conserve, protect, maintain, and promote material cultural heritage (built heritage).” Four programs are identified to deal with this objective, and specific goals of each program to be obtained by 2022 are noted. First is the Revitalization of Public Space and Pedestrianization of the *Centro Histórico*, with a goal of increasing the revitalized parts of the *centro histórico* by 35 percent. Second is the Heritage Inventory, with a goal of inventorying all of the heritage sites and verifying and evaluating each of them periodically. Third is the Recovery of Heritage Buildings, with a goal of increasing the number of recovered and protected heritage buildings by 35 percent. Fourth is the Archaeological Program of the Metropolitan District of Quito, with a goal of enforcing a new policy of research, intervention, and maintenance of all archaeological sites within the metropolitan district.⁶⁸

The previous chapter surveyed the history of Quito and the evolution of the city’s built environment, and thus far this chapter has served to provide a timeline of events in the history of historic preservation in Quito. It is now appropriate to look at the modern city of Quito to understand what remains and how and why it should be preserved, and what the Plan Metropolitano de Desarrollo 2012-2022 discussed above has to work with. The *centro histórico* in Quito is made up of seventy-two blocks covering 343 hectares.⁶⁹ As of the 1990 census the population of the *centro histórico* was 63,700 and as of 2010 the population was down to 40,000.⁷⁰ In the 1990s, Joseph Scarpaci surveyed every

---

⁶⁸ Ibid., 43.

⁶⁹ Ortega, “El Centro Histórico de Quito,” 271; Scarpaci, *Plazas and Barrios*, 81.

⁷⁰ Ortega, “El Centro Histórico de Quito,” 271.

exterior doorway in the *centro histórico*, a total of 3,894 doorways.⁷¹ He documented the land use of each surveyed property (all numbers are rounded): thirty were abandoned, under construction, or in demolition; thirty were parks, open spaces, plazas, or plazuelas; 100 were parking areas; 150 were institutional, housing nonprofit and civic activities; 220 were restaurants or small grocers; 770 were residential; and 2,597 were commercial.⁷² Quality of façades were also evaluated: three percent were poor (“buildings displayed unquestionable structural weaknesses such as missing balconies, exposed beams and rebar, cracked support columns, wide cracks, and abandoned rooms or floors, and a considerable amount of flaking plaster and paint”); twenty-eight percent were fair (“buildings showed no major structural flaws. In need of some minor repairs, the buildings’ exteriors revealed paint flaking and some missing plaster or whitewash. However, the façades suffered no apparent weaknesses”); and sixty-nine percent were good (“façades were in solid physical condition and were generally well maintained. They often had been recently painted or else were built with modern materials that gave them an edge against weathering, neglect, or both”).⁷³ And his final evaluation was of building height, of which the mean average in the *centro histórico* was 2.4 floors.⁷⁴

The concentration of retailers in the *centro histórico* are inexpensive, attracting hundreds of buses worth of traffic from all over highland Ecuador to the city center daily.⁷⁵ There are also significant urban functions still performed in the *centro*, such as “education and health provision, the presidential palace, and the bulk of the municipal

---

⁷¹ Scarpaci, *Plazas and Barrios*, 99.

⁷² Ibid., 105.

⁷³ Ibid., 112.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 114.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 109.

administration.”⁷⁶ Since the 1920s, elite families, the traditional population of the *centro*, have been migrating towards new residential areas, resulting in a new population moving in and dividing up buildings for residential and commercial uses.⁷⁷ The wealthy population is resistant to returning to the *centro* due to “the inconvenience and disamenity of life in the center as well as to the proliferation of street traders. These problems are compounded by the constraints on property transactions.”⁷⁸ This accounts partially to the decrease in population by over 20,000 over the course of twenty years. Along with wealthy migration out of the *centro* comes migration of business districts nearer to newer residential areas. While there are potentially negative outcomes associated with these migrations, such as less inclination for high-end retailers or wealthy property owners to invest in the area, there are also positive results in terms of historic preservation. This movement has protected the *centro histórico* from the “major destruction suffered by other Latin American cities, allowing the survival of the grid iron of streets and plazas, and low-rise buildings interspersed with colonial churches.”⁷⁹

The structure of Spanish American colonial cities and the architecture found within are representative of much more than a Spanish influence on an American city, or some hybrid architecture, as the built city itself represents a relationship based on exploitation and subjugation. Scarpaci explains, “Spanish colonizers subjugated the native people by building towering churches...the intentional display of architectural motifs as well as labor and building practices contributed to the religious, political, and

---

⁷⁶ Bromley and Jones, “Conservation in Quito,” 43.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 43.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 53.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 43.

economic conquest of Native Americans.”⁸⁰ He says the *centro histórico* was “imbued with a powerful combination of symbols, prestige, and power...a stamp of rationality and civility.”⁸¹

Because the colonial city center has remained so well preserved in its original form, it becomes difficult for that same city center to absorb the demands of modern urban life. The structures have been used for over 400 years and show stress; streets built before the days of cars struggle to accommodate them; vendors fill sidewalks, parks, plazas, and even the streets; buildings that have been divided up to serve as rental properties pose a real obstacle for redevelopment; and the infrastructure struggles to provide basic public services. Rojas says that despite the lovely exterior of the preserved *centro histórico*, he fears these issues, among others, will lead to “further deterioration of public spaces and buildings.”⁸²

Historic preservation in Quito has taken many forms over the past century. Early influences came out of the *hispanismo* movement and a focus on beautification. Concern with preservation of the *centro histórico* as a whole instead of emphasis centering on monumental architecture developed slowly. Institutions that allowed for collaborative efforts between government and private organizations stand out as the most effective in their preservation efforts, especially regarding historic preservation that did not result in gentrification. The rise of heritage tourism also provides an economic incentive for historic preservation and this will be discussed further in Chapter Three.

---

⁸⁰ Scarpaci, *Plazas and Barrios*, 39.

⁸¹ Ibid., 40.

⁸² Rojas, *Old Cities, New Assets*, 10.

CHAPTER III

INTANGIBLE HERITAGE AND HERITAGE TOURISM IN QUITO

Intangible Heritage

The UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention defines intangible heritage as:

The practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills—as well as the instruments, objects, artifacts and cultural spaces associated therewith—that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity.¹

Members of the 1997 Latin American Regional Seminar on UNESCO's Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore “recognized the importance of multiculturalism and stressed the significance of hybrid culture.”² Hybrid cultures tend to develop in urban areas where Indigenous, mestizo, and Creole populations interact, and thus are common in areas with a colonial past.³ A dated UNESCO definition of heritage said it “is our legacy from the past, what we live with

---

¹ Mgbeoji, “On the Shoulders of the ‘Other’ed,” 206.

² Seeger, “Summary Report on the Regional Seminars,” 38.

³ Aikawa, “Actions Undertaken by UNESCO for its Implementation,” 14.

today, and what we pass on to future generations.”⁴ This definition omits the processes that go along with heritage—the *how* and *why*, as opposed to the *what*. The importance of how and why legacies were formed and how and why we have what we do today cannot be overstated.

Intangible heritage in the *centro histórico* of Quito, Ecuador is a difficult and important topic to grapple with. As can be seen in the previous chapter, the history of preservation in Quito and in the *centro histórico* has focused on the preservation of built, tangible heritage—churches, homes, government buildings, and so forth. This built heritage, however, is not cordoned off from human life, but rather, it is part of an active, living city, and has been for half a millenium. The history of Quito is a complicated story of colonization; the architecture has more significance than can be grasped by simply walking down the street; and the people carry stories and traditions with them that reflect even pre-Columbian life. These are all things that make up the intangible heritage of the *centro histórico*.

Before beginning to tackle this complicated idea, two clarifications need to be made. First, a theme of this chapter is Indigenous heritage. Indigenous heritage is a broad term that encompasses a vast history of various groups of people. For the purposes of this piece, Indigenous heritage references the heritage of those people “which, having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing in those territories.”⁵ This definition of Indigenous peoples, used by Ikechi Mgbeoji in his work on intangible heritage of Indigenous populations, comes from the United Nations.

---

⁴ Sorensen and Carman, *Heritage Studies*, 12.

⁵ Mgbeoji, “On the Shoulders of the ‘Other’ed,” 203.

Using this definition allows for a more comprehensive understanding of Indigenous heritage, because it only requires a continuity with a pre-colonial past, as well as an identification as being separate from the larger modern society. Thus, Indigenous heritage, as discussed in this work, does not reference some pre-Columbian way of life that has been preserved perfectly over time, but rather, the heritage of a population that has changed over time, has room to include mestizos, but still claims its roots in a population that predates Colonialism.

Second, the language used in discussions of intangible and tangible heritage tends to be interchangeable, but for the purposes of this work, a distinction should be made between “preservation” and “safeguarding.” “Preservation” suggests the maintenance of something as it exists now or has existed in the past, whereas “safeguarding” suggests the protection of something from further or future harm. Because intangible heritage is always developing and changing, the concept that it should be maintained as it exists now or has existed in the past is contrary to its very nature, unlike tangible heritage, which is mostly static, and thus should be preserved.

The safeguarding of intangible heritage faces many hurdles. One of the most powerful and deleterious characterizations is that it opposes modernization. The concepts of safeguarding intangible heritage, and of modernization “are usually seen as mutually exclusive and incompatible.”⁶ The 1997 Latin American Regional Seminar identified a list of problems that countries in the region faced in pursuing the safeguarding of intangible heritage, including “the absence of folklore in state cultural policies and funding initiatives; the marginalization of cultural policy in general in the national

---

⁶ Timothy and Nyaupane, *Cultural Heritage and Tourism in the Developing World*, 248-9.

projects of countries in the region; [and] the indifference of the mass media to traditional culture in most countries.”⁷

It is imperative that the safeguarding of intangible heritage receive more attention and that it be better understood because it “reflects the fact that traditional knowledge, cultural expressions and practices play an important role in everyday life among diverse communities all around the world.”⁸ This is all the more important at this time in history, as the threats to intangible heritage are rapidly increasing at the hands of modernization and globalization. Intangible heritage of Indigenous populations has already suffered severely at the hands of colonization, as Africanist Ikechi Mgbeoji explains: “the most subtle but potent assault on the colonized was the deterioration of their intangible heritage brought about by the forces of empire.”⁹ In contrast to Africa, most of Latin America has been free from direct colonial rule for nearly two centuries. Nevertheless, the legacies of colonialism, such as the oppression of Indigenous peoples and their culture, has persisted to the present. The heritage of hybrid cultures and the Indigenous heritage that *has* survived are constantly threatened by the processes that result in the deterioration, disappearance, and destruction of intangible heritage. Toshiyuki Kono, an expert consulted in the drafting of the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage, explains, “economic development accompanied with...modernization, industrialization, urbanization, migration and globalization, takes its toll. Intangible cultural heritage, slowly, but steadily, withers.”¹⁰

In the context of Ecuador, consistent efforts have been made to safeguard two

---

⁷ Yugar, “Reporte Seminario Regional,” 232.

⁸ Kono, “Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage, 7.

⁹ Mgbeoji, “On the Shoulders of the ‘Other’ed,” 208.

¹⁰ Kono, “Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage,” 7.

important examples of intangible heritage: Indigenous languages and communal ownership of land. When President Rafael Correa instituted a new constitution in 2008, the Indigenous organization CONAIE (Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador) fought to have Kichwa, the most commonly spoken Indigenous language in Ecuador, recognized alongside Spanish as the official languages of the country. The Constituent Assembly voted against the addition of Kichwa at first, but after eleven days of organized protest and debate, on July 24, 2008, the assembly added the following to the 2008 Constitution:

Spanish is the official language of Ecuador; Spanish, Kichwa and Shuar are official languages for intercultural relationships. Other ancestral languages are for official use for Indigenous peoples in the areas they inhabit and on the terms that the law stipulates. The state will respect and will stimulate their conservation and use.¹¹

The inclusion of the word “conservation” here is important as it shows that legal protection and recognition of Indigenous languages are an important factor in the safeguarding of them. Additionally, “other ancestral languages” leaves room for languages other than Kechwa and Shuar to be included in this list, since there are over twenty recognized Indigenous languages spoken across Ecuador.

The practice of communal land ownership in Ecuador dates to the Incan Empire and is often called Incan agrarian communism. This is not to be confused with modern communism, as it was based on an agrarian system where “man submitted to nature” rather than forcing nature (and land) to submit to him.¹² Recognition of communal land ownership is a deeply complicated issue in Ecuador, and the fight for the safeguarding of

---

¹¹ Marc Becker, *Pachakutik: Indigenous Movements and Electoral Politics in Ecuador* (Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2011), 146-7.

¹² José Carlos Mariátegui, *Seven Interpretative Essays on Peruvian Reality* (Peru, 1928), “Essay Three: The Problem of Land.”

this practice, an example of intangible heritage, has been a long and arduous one that began in the 1930s and continues to the present and is seen in the form of agrarian reform efforts made by an array of Indigenous organizations. A discussion of these efforts must be prefaced with an understanding of the agrarian system that the organizations seek to reform in order to legally return to Indigenous communal ownership practices. During colonization in Ecuador, the Spanish colonizers used the *encomienda* system.

Encomiendas were essentially land grants given to a Spanish colonizer, which included Indigenous persons whom the colonizer was to teach Spanish, convert to Catholicism, and generally protect, all while receiving unpaid and forced labor from them. Moving forward to post-independence Ecuador, the agrarian system is characterized by *haciendas* and *huasipungo*. *Haciendas* are large estates that are owned by the wealthy elite. The land is often taken from Indigenous families through legal measures and in the wake of natural disasters resulting in those Indigenous persons entering into contracts to work on the *hacienda* in exchange for a small salary and access to resources to feed their families.¹³ The system of contracted Indigenous labor is called *huasipungo*. It ties families to *haciendas*, resulting in a system of indentured servitude where the Indigenous laborers become so indebted to the *hacienda* that they are even considered in the value of the land and are sold along with it.¹⁴

Within this framework, first, organizations had to fight for Indigenous populations

---

¹³ Marc Becker, *Indians and Leftists in the Making of Ecuador's Modern Indigenous Movements* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008), 8.

¹⁴ Deborah J. Yashar, *Contesting Citizenship in Latin America: The Rise of Indigenous Movements and the Postliberal Challenge* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 92; Melina Selverston-Scher, *Ethnopolitics in Ecuador: Indigenous Rights and the Strengthening of Democracy* (Florida: North-South Center Press, 2001), 76; Becker, *Indians and Leftists*, 8.

to simply have the right to land. The fight for legal communal ownership of land is now a secondary fight. Indigenous movements across the twentieth century took many forms, faced conflict and often violence, won reform laws, lost reform laws, and fought a long and steady battle for land rights. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, the accomplishments are still not all too visible. However, what is perfectly clear is that through organizations like CONAIE, Indigenous Ecuadorians have placed themselves in a prominent position in political discourse and have proven that they will not be ignored. While the battle to safeguard this practice of communal ownership of land is far from over, the movements that have surrounded it show in important avenue present in Quito and all of Ecuador of Indigenous groups to actively work towards safeguarding their own intangible heritage.

An important question present in the discussion of intangible heritage, is the question of *who*? Whose heritage is being safeguarded and for whom is it being safeguarded? Based specifically upon the examples of language and communal land ownership discussed above, the answer to this question would be those communities that speak Indigenous languages and those Indigenous communities that seek to return to the tradition of communal land ownership. Toshiyuki Kono argues that communities are “networks of people whose sense of identity or connectedness emerges from a shared historical relationship that is rooted in the practice and transmission of, or engagement with, their [intangible heritage].”¹⁵ This answers the question of whose heritage should be safeguarded more broadly: the communities whose identity is interconnected with their intangible heritage. While Kono’s definition of community is what this thesis will work

---

¹⁵ Kono, “Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage,” 32.

with, the complexities of the concept of community should not be understated: within the modern city, members of a given community may not live in close proximity with one another; members of various communities might have a historical relationship with the same intangible heritage and thus all consider themselves the owners of that heritage; some communities may not be recognized by the government, just as some communities might not recognize the government itself, causing issues if and when legislation comes into play. Going back to the questions posed above, for whom is it being safeguarded, has an equally complicated answer. The first part of the answer is that it should be safeguarded for posterity's sake, so that all future generations have access to those histories that are not preserved in physical form. Secondly, it should be safeguarded for those who are connected to the heritage, as recognition of their importance, and as recognition of the value of their histories. Third, it should be safeguarded to provide an improved understanding of history.

Understanding *what* intangible heritage is, *why* it should be safeguarded, and *whom* it belongs to, leads to the more pressing question of *how* should it be safeguarded? The Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention offers answers to these questions. It calls for safeguarding through “the identification, documentation, research, preservation, protection, promotion, enhancement, transmission, particularly through formal and non-formal education, as well as the revitalization of the various aspects of such heritage.”¹⁶ Lyndel V. Prott dissects the processes of safeguarding various types of intangible heritage, and although his work predates the Convention, he seems to follow the guidelines of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention (**Table 1**).

---

¹⁶ Hazucha and Kono, “Conceptualization of Community as a Holder of Intangible Cultural Heritage,” 154.

Preservation of:	Oral history	Traditional skills related to tangible cultural heritage (e.g. all the skills associated with vernacular architectures).
Objective:	To maintain living oral tradition by addition of modern historical items and repetition of existing histories.	To maintain the stock of skills for restoration, maintenance, and replacement of tangible heritage created by traditional skills.
Needs:	To support traditional oral historians and encourage imitation by the young.	To ensure handing on skills and the survival of tools and raw materials.
Means:	To encourage participation in education; to record; to encourage respect for.	Support of senior craftsmen to ensure survival; training schemes to ensure passing on; mandatory use in government-owned properties; education programs to enhance appreciation. ¹⁷

Table 1. Objectives, needs, and means for safeguarding intangible heritage.

The 1997 Latin American Regional Seminar created a list of recommendations for Latin American governments to better enable the safeguarding of intangible heritage. The list recommends those governments “guarantee conditions necessary for the creation or maintenance of sites for expression of tradition; promote laws to protect and incentives to support traditional culture and folklore; [and include] traditional culture and folklore in the education system.”¹⁸ These recommendations serve not only to better protect intangible heritage, but also create the need for intangible heritage to be safeguarded so that it *can* be included in education programming.

Intangible heritage is most easily safeguarded through audiovisual archives, but Grace Koch and many other experts have stressed the importance of the dissemination of the materials held in those archives: “dissemination of this material and its control in

¹⁷ Prott, “Some Considerations on the Protection of the Intangible Heritage,” 105-6.

¹⁸ Yugar, “Reporte Seminario Regional,” 233.

culturally acceptable ways are...important for enriching Indigenous knowledge, educating the wider community, and promoting research.”¹⁹ UNESCO’s 1989 *Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore* (Folklore being the outmoded, inaccurate, and less-encompassing term for intangible heritage) also stresses the importance of dissemination of material and recommends that governments:

Encourage the organization of national, regional and international events...and support the dissemination and publication of their materials, papers and other results; encourage a broader coverage of folklore material in national and regional press; support existing units and the creation of new units for the production of educational materials...and encourage their use in schools, folklore museums, national and international festivals and exhibitions; [and] ensure the availability of adequate information on folklore through documentation centers, libraries, museums, archives, as well as through special folklore bulletins and periodicals.²⁰

Experts across the field of heritage preservation agree that members of the community being dealt with should be key actors in safeguarding their intangible heritage. This ensures that the intangible heritage is respected and it makes recognition of the communities to which the heritage belongs become inherent.²¹ It also allows for the traditional owners of the intangible heritage—those communities defined by Toshiyuki Kono—to influence accessibility and use of the material if it is placed in the hands of another institution.²² The World Intellectual Property Organization’s Creative Heritage Project aims to empower self-preservation (or safeguarding), and has a training program that provides museum staff, as well as Indigenous and local communities with “hands-on training in documentary techniques and archival skills necessary for community-based

---

¹⁹ Koch, “Cultural Conservation,” 159.

²⁰ UNESCO, *The 1989 Recommendation*, 10.

²¹ Hazucha and Kono, “Conceptualization of Community,” 152.

²² Koch, “Cultural Conservation,” 160.

cultural conservation.”²³ The Smithsonian conference on UNESCO’s 1989 *Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore* emphasized the importance of “maintaining community access to materials after they have been officially documented,” which would serve to ensure that the materials are not made private or held at institutions outside the reach of those who own the heritage.²⁴ Lyndel V. Prott explains that communities being active players in the safeguarding of their own heritage is important for reasons beyond respect and ownership, but because intangible heritage “is not static; it develops,” and thus, the remaining members of the community must be empowered and able to continue to safeguard their intangible heritage as it evolves and changes over time.²⁵

This concept of heritage ownership is complex. Branislav Hazucha and Toshiyuki Kono explain that because a community interacts so closely with its own heritage there is an implied “belonging” of the heritage and traditions to the community that it is so closely tied to. This belonging or ownership is justified by the idea that heritage is inherited: “cultural traditions are deemed to be created by ancestors of the community members. They are passed down from one generation to another.”²⁶ The act of passing down something implies the transferring of ownership. However, this implication of ownership and inheritance is not always respected, especially when there is no legislation in place to support the concept of ownership of heritage, additionally, the concept of

---

²³ Wendland, “Managing Intellectual Property Options When Documenting, Recording and Digitizing Intangible Cultural Heritage,” 88.

²⁴ *Final Conference Report on A Global Assessment of the 1989 Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*, 298.

²⁵ Prott, “Some Considerations on the Protection of the Intangible Heritage,” 108.

²⁶ Hazucha and Kono, “Conceptualization of Community as a Holder of Intangible Cultural Heritage,” 147-148.

ownership of something as abstract as intangible heritage is innately complex and fraught with a multitude of potential legal, political, economic, and social conflicts. Terri Janke addresses issues of ownership using Australian case studies, but her evaluations are relevant to cases elsewhere. She explains that each individual state should adopt measures to recognize ownership of heritage because intellectual property rights and copyright laws do not fully cover the problems that arise when talking about communal ownership. This is particularly important in the case of community owned heritage that is documented by someone outside of that community. The outsider doing the documenting might try to claim copyright because they created or authored the physical manifestation of a previously undocumented heritage.²⁷ Shubha Chaudhuri suggests that the best way to address issues of communities as owners of their heritage is not to implement laws or strict policies, but rather to take a “soft” approach that includes supporting documentation and archiving, acknowledging and attributing material to the community it came from, and educating the public regarding a community’s heritage instead of banning the dissemination of it.²⁸ Quito’s Plan Metropolitano de Desarrollo 2012-2022 (Metropolitan Development Plan) seeks to address issues of communal ownership.

In January 2012, the Metropolitan District of Quito published the Plan Metropolitano de Desarrollo 2012-2022. The plan is broad, with seven axes of strategy including developing a sustainable Quito, and creating a Quito that is accessible to disabled citizens. Most important for the purposes of this work, axis six is aimed at developing, sustaining, and making use of an “ancient, historic, cultural, and diverse

---

²⁷ Janke, “Indigenous Intangible Cultural Heritage and Ownership of Copyright,” 160 & 164.

²⁸ Chaudhuri, “Who Is the ‘Holder’ of Intangible Cultural Heritage,” 199.

Quito.”²⁹ The summary of this axis calls for the development of “an active cultural life that allows for constant recreation and use of the elements of [Quito’s] tangible and intangible heritage.”³⁰

Many of the policies listed under this axis related to the preservation of tangible heritage and were discussed in the previous chapter. But there are additional policies related to the safeguarding of intangible heritage included in the Plan Metropolitano de Desarrollo:

Promotion and management of knowledge about cultural practices, beliefs and ancestral knowledge; strengthening research, dissemination and construction of the intangible heritage of the Metropolitan District of Quito through active citizen participation; [and] generating programs and projects designed to recover the value of socio-cultural use of public spaces and/or heritage assets to construct cultural belonging.³¹

The Plan identified four programs that seek to promote intangible heritage by “articulating inclusive cultural management through the promotion and recovery of the history of each neighborhood, their legends, knowledge, traditions, games, music, religious festivals, ancestral festivals, etc.”³² These policies and programs work to conceive of heritage “not only as a consecrated masterpiece of the past to be venerated and preserved, but also as a symbolic and living space to be appropriated by local communities who are the bearers of a collective and active memory.”³³ UNESCO has implored communities to “take control of their heritage and make it their own through unceasing reanimation and reshaping.”³⁴ This is something that the Plan Metropolitano de

---

²⁹ Guarderas, “Plan Metropolitano de Desarrollo 2012-2022,” 23.

³⁰ Ibid., 23.

³¹ Ibid., 42.

³² Ibid., 43.

³³ Bortolotto, “From Objects to Processes,” 21.

³⁴ Ibid., 26.

Desarrollo 2012-2022 aims to do by addressing issues of communal sharing of ideas and culture, accessibility to, and acknowledgement and safeguarding of a wide array of extant cultures and heritages in Quito.

While a line seems to be drawn between tangible heritage being presented inside of museums and through the preservation of historic built environments, and intangible heritage existing in audiovisual archives and ethereally, Bortolotto suggests that this line is not as hard and fast as it was once understood to be. The Smithsonian National Museum of the American Indian is used as an example of an institution that exhibits tangible heritage in a traditional manner, but also serves as a locale for “socio-cultural programmes to sustain and promote the creativity of Indigenous communities.”³⁵ Thus, embracing intangible heritage can actually open doors for museums to take a more active role in the safeguarding of living cultures. Because UNESCO so desires for communities to be active participants in the safeguarding of their own heritage, and experts agree that this is the best practice, it seems that ultimately they are calling for a partnership between community and museum, which is one of the standing goals of museums as it is.

Quito has the resources for these types of partnerships in its many museums, but where the task becomes more difficult is in figuring out how to deal with intangible heritage outside of the museum. While many of Quito’s museums are located inside of beautiful historic colonial buildings in the *centro histórico*, this question still remains: how can intangible heritage be represented outside of museums and historic buildings, and instead, from the street, for the person staring up at the colonial masterpieces that color the *centro histórico*, for the person resting in the plazas and parks that sprinkle the

---

³⁵ Ibid., 28.

centro histórico? This challenge is just as important as figuring out how to fund preservation and safeguarding projects. Because without the city's entire heritage, both tangible and intangible, being preserved, safeguarded, and displayed or disseminated, of what importance is a perfectly preserved building that exemplifies the Escuela Quiteña, for instance? If the relevant stories of the Indigenous struggle under colonization, the resulting hybrid school of art, and the shared authorship are not present, the value of that building is lessened.

La Ronda Case Study

A small neighborhood named La Ronda within Quito's *centro histórico* provides a concrete example of how intangible heritage has been dealt with alongside the preservation of tangible heritage in Quito. The neighborhood enjoys excellent examples of Spanish colonial architecture. In the 1980s, the neighborhood developed a reputation for prostitution and drug use. While there was some validity to this reputation, a vibrant community also existed within La Ronda, full of small businesses, restaurants, artisans, offices, and, most importantly, diverse families of migrants from all over the country. In 2000, after decades of neglect at the hands of the government, plans were developing to restore La Ronda, which sits just a few blocks from the Presidential Carondelet Palace.³⁶

In 2005, FONSAL (Fund for Preservation of the Historic Center) went to work on the restoration of La Ronda. This began with the purchasing of as many of the large colonial buildings in the neighborhood as possible, and then promptly evicting all of the residents. The interiors and exteriors of all the buildings along the two-block stretch were renovated and turned into restaurants, small shops, and hotels. Filled with properly

---

³⁶ Durán, *La Ronda*, 11.

restored colonial architecture, the resulting tourist destination is breathtaking (**Figures 12 and 13**). But there is a catch, of course. This came at the cost of all those who were living in La Ronda prior to 2005. La Ronda is now devoid of the intangible heritage that the mestizo community who lived there carried with them. This case study shows how at times, historic preservation of the built environment can be directly at odds with the safeguarding of intangible heritage.

Figure 12. Arched entrance to La Ronda.

Figure 13. La Ronda neighborhood street view.

In 2011, INTERCULTURAS Gestión Cultural para el Desarrollo (Cultural Management for Development) began a project with the assistance of Fundación Holcim Ecuador (Ecuadorean Holcim Foundation) and Museo de la Ciudad (The City Museum). The project and resulting book is called *La Ronda: Esos Otros Patrimonios* (La Ronda: The Other Heritages). The groups sought to “put value in the other voices, other heritages, and other memories of the neighborhood.”³⁷ They used interviews, forums, and audiovisual archival material to investigate the history of the “other heritages”—the intangible heritage—that existed beyond the architecture, the streetscape, and the neighborhood’s bad reputation. The research was developed into a book, which the authors described as “an exercise of memory, a debate about the history of the neighborhood, made up of questions asked about what was once an inhabited neighborhood and is now a street visited by tourists.”³⁸

Upon publication of the book, the Museo de la Ciudad developed an exhibition to go along with it. The exhibit included a room designed to look like the pre-restoration La Ronda, complete with broken windows, indicative of the sports leagues that were abundant in the area. The references to sports show the complex heritage of a mestizo population that incorporated European sports culture into their own cultural life. Stations dotted the walls where visitors could listen to interviews and testimonials of former residents of the neighborhood. A separate room housed documents about the proposed restoration, the reactions of the residents, and all of the politics that followed. A living room modeled after photos from a former residence in the neighborhood was set up to encourage community engagement and conversation about heritage and the history of La

---

³⁷ Ibid., 11.

³⁸ Ibid., 12.

Ronda. At the exit of the exhibit, a wall was covered with post-it notes where guests were encouraged to write what exactly makes them Quiteñan, and a museum employee interviewed visitors about the exhibit, inquired about their feelings about the changes made in La Ronda and elsewhere in Quito, and asked if visitors had experienced or knew of any comparable situations.

The project and the book serve many purposes. Most importantly, they served as a method to safeguard the intangible heritage of La Ronda, while showing how the restoration of La Ronda was a successful, yet severely flawed example of preservation efforts in the *centro histórico*. The interviews are organized into various topics, beginning with the recording of stories and memories of life in La Ronda, and then expanding to reactions to the changes implemented by FONSAL, reflections on the current state of the neighborhood, and hopes for its future.

The ideas and words of former residents of La Ronda best illustrate the failures of the project at preserving the complex heritage of the neighborhood that lies outside of the architecture. Danilo Segarra lamented that no one who visits La Ronda has any way of knowing the stories of the people who occupied those buildings, and he blames this on the city being more concerned with commercial interests than with the humans and traditional culture that existed in the neighborhood. Luis López commended the efforts at preserving the architecture, but went on to explain that the people—the most important part of the neighborhood—were lost in the process. Abel Segarra argued that “La Ronda is dying: there is only nightlife now,” while Juan Choez took it one step further explaining that the neighborhood of La Ronda does not even exist anymore. Almost all of the interviewees commented on the crime rate, which continued to increase because

while the prostitution and drug deals might have been kicked out with the community, alcohol has become a pervasive problem and noise levels insure that no families occupy the few available apartments in the neighborhood.

The obvious question that remains, is how could this have all been done better? First, and most importantly, the occupants of a historic neighborhood should not be permanently evicted to allow for preservation unless under extenuating circumstances that leave no alternate options, which was certainly not the case in La Ronda. In other parts of the *centro histórico*, Empresa del Centro Histórico (ECH) and other organizations have successfully avoided gentrification and the displacement of current residents, which should have been avoided in La Ronda as well. As for the presentation of intangible heritage, amidst all of the renovations and developments for new restaurants and shops, an exhibition space could have been included to present the intangible heritage that INTERCULTURAS was able to preserve. Of course it cannot be expected that every time a neighborhood is renovated, a museum go along with it, but the method in which La Ronda was vacated and then reconfigured as a tourist destination is certainly not the route to be followed in future projects in the *centro histórico* or in any other historic neighborhood. There is potential for a living neighborhood to exist concomitantly with tourism, and the focus should be on creating a healthy balance between the two.

Heritage Tourism

La Ronda was restored and renovated to create a tourist district. The demands for such districts are growing rapidly with the advent of heritage tourism. The main tool for hooking tourists is the advertisement of historic buildings and/or neighborhoods,

museums, and natural wonders.³⁹ Regina Schlüter, an expert on tourism and environmental economics, argues that when “living cultural manifestations of the past” are added to the array of traditional tourist locales, the attraction of those destinations increases markedly.⁴⁰ Which living cultural manifestations should be present is another issue in itself that will be dealt with later in the chapter, in regards to the presence of street vendors and visible poverty in the *centro histórico*. Heritage tourism as an industry is growing quickly, faster than any other type of tourism, and its growth is seen mostly in the developing world.⁴¹ However, this does not mean that the attractions or infrastructure are necessarily developing at the same speed as the industry itself.

There are many serious challenges faced by the heritage tourism industry in the developing world, and those challenges are much different than those faced by wealthier nations. One important challenge is poverty, as “heritage conservation is afforded a low priority in countries and regions where the majority of the population struggles to survive.”⁴² While there are promises of heritage tourism’s profitability, it is hard to justify the allocation of funds when there are citizens with dire needs that could immediately benefit from governmental assistance. The tourism industry also reacts to every whisper of instability, health scares, or natural disasters, as well as crime rates, which are publicized in travel advisories.⁴³ In the developing world all of these issues tend to come up on a regular basis.

Those countries that wish to embrace the potential blessings of heritage tourism,

---

³⁹ Baxter, “Global Heritage Tourism,” 247.

⁴⁰ Schlüter, “Heritage Tourism in Latin America,” 211.

⁴¹ Timothy and Nyaupane, *Cultural Heritage and Tourism in the Developing World*, 3.

⁴² Ibid., 248.

⁴³ Schlüter, “Heritage Tourism in Latin America,” 211.

face many problems in their attempts to preserve and safeguard their tangible and intangible heritage. These include financial constraints when it comes to public funding for preservation, which is scarce even in the most developed nations; occupancy and ownership of historic buildings by private residents; the destruction of heritage under colonialism; improper conservation due to lack of funds and/or education; modernization and new development taking precedent over conservation and preservation; lack of cooperation between government agencies and private businesses and organizations in the tourism industry; and lack of awareness or will from residents.⁴⁴

In addition to the challenges faced by the industry itself, threats of heritage tourism to the intangible and tangible heritage that sustains the industry exist. Historic cities in the developing world were not built, nor have they been maintained, to handle heritage tourism, and thus are physically threatened by overuse.⁴⁵ Nezar AlSayyad, author of *Consuming Tradition, Manufacturing Heritage*, argues, “Much of the tourism industry demonstrates no real concern for the cultural dimensions of place or territory. Rather, the challenge is to package, image, and transform traditions, rituals, and ‘ways of life’ into saleable products.”⁴⁶ This practice puts intangible heritage, in particular, at a real risk of commodification and destruction. The 1997 Latin American Regional Seminar on UNESCO’s *1989 Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore* expressed concern “about tourism, which, most felt, brought both advantages and disadvantages to carriers of traditional culture and folklore and to the

---

⁴⁴ Timothy and Nyaupane, *Cultural Heritage and Tourism in the Developing World*, 21-31.

⁴⁵ Schlüter, “Heritage Tourism in Latin America,” 210.

⁴⁶ AlSayyad, *Consuming Tradition, Manufacturing Heritage*, 17-8.

intangible heritage as a whole.”⁴⁷ Indigenous organizations such as CONAIE, which was discussed previously in reference to Indigenous languages and agrarian reform, offer an important avenue for Indigenous populations to actively work against the commodification and destruction of their intangible heritage.

Dallen Timothy and Gyan Nyaupane seek to offer solutions to the challenges and threats of heritage tourism in their book *Cultural Heritage and Tourism in the Developing World*. They argue that tourism should be viewed as an “important potential tool for poverty alleviation and community economic development.”⁴⁸ But the nuances of spending money to make money, and of the protection of heritage are not lost on Timothy and Nyaupane. They explain that the link between actual heritage and tourism, in reality, is very weak, and they suggest that the solution to this problem is improved interpretations of heritage. They specify that interpretation needs to be undertaken by the communities to which the heritage belongs, not by outsiders. Interpretation includes “context-specific truths, Indigenous voices, emotional responses, deeper meanings and understandings, and ownership by the people who own the heritage.” Timothy and Nyaupane argue that these interpretations should result in the creation of “greater appreciation, awareness, understanding, self-fulfillment, and enjoyment for visitors.”⁴⁹

Timothy and Nyaupane show how the opportunity for beneficial heritage tourism is real, and they offer solutions to the problems consistently found within heritage tourism. First, information has to be disseminated to potential tourists. Second, authentic and good quality tourism products and historically accurate and well-interpreted sites

---

⁴⁷ Seeger, “Summary Report on the Regional Seminars,” 37.

⁴⁸ Timothy and Nyaupane, *Cultural Heritage and Tourism in the Developing World*, 3.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 249.

have to be made available. Third, sites have to be preserved and managed in a way that will not prove destructive, which means the tourism industry has to work with professionals in the fields of conservation and preservation. Fourth, financing has to come from within the tourist industry and not from public funds because sites have to be preserved and maintained for tourism to continue and increase. Thus the brunt of the costs associated with that maintenance should be held by the profiting industry—a confusing point due to tourism serving to both potentially destruct and potentially fund the preservation and safeguarding of tangible and intangible heritage. And fifth, the local community which claims ownership of the heritage should be the most active parties in tourism planning and site and heritage management, and should be awarded profits from the success of the tourism industry that can be invested into the local community.⁵⁰

This model could work if applied in full to the *centro histórico* in Quito. Some parts have certainly already been put into action. For instance, the *centro histórico* is still an active business district, so between tourist and local traffic, the city buses, trucks, and cars that made their way through the city every day toward the end of the twentieth century, were causing environmental hazards, visible deterioration to the exteriors of historic buildings, and vibrations that threatened the stability of colonial structures. So in the 1990s, diesel powered bus routes were relegated to outside the *centro histórico*, and electric trolleys guided by overhead rails were introduced throughout the *centro histórico*.⁵¹ This shows how city planners have worked with conservation and preservation experts to develop a solution to a unique problem that developed alongside of increased tourism in Quito.

---

⁵⁰ Ibid., 34.

⁵¹ Scarpaci, *Plazas and Barrios*, 81.

Another aspect of Timothy and Nyaupane's model that has at least been attempted in Quito are well-interpreted sites. FONSAL has placed informational plaques on most of the historic buildings in the *centro histórico*. The plaques are in both Spanish and English, making it clear that the intention is to both appeal to tourists interested in the history of the built environment, as well as to engage residents in the history that surrounds them. The plaques, however, are understandably very brief. A select few recognize a less obvious history, while most of them just give some basic facts. Two plaques can be found at San Francisco church and in the plaza that sits in front of it (**Figures 14 and 15**). These two plaques provide some examples of the problems with the plaques: the Spanish texts have been poorly translated and thus are not up to par with what is expected of a tourism-oriented organization; the authors seem to have been unsure about what information is most important and engaging; unlike in a museum text panel, the language is not simple and prior knowledge of the religious history of Quito is expected.

Figure 14. Plaque in San Francisco Plaza.

Text on plaque reads: During Pre-Hispanic times, this open space already existed, at the foot of the palace of the Quitus lords, later reconstructed by the Incas—the Capac Huasi—in the heights of El Placer. Here is where the main market place of the Andean Equatorial zone operated. A part of this parcel had been destined to the Inca Lords, and the public objective of this square predominated, which the Spaniards, most of whom were coming from Mexico, called it a tianquéz, since they found it already converted into a market place. This name did not prosper, because soon it became known as the San Francisco Square. Here was one of the water fountains of the aqueduct that the Incas had begun to build to bring water from the Pichincha, and which was later finished by the priests. The Quito City Council built a large water fountain as the main terminal for the water distribution system. At the end of the Colonial period the market place was moved to the Plaza Grande (Independence Sq.), but President García Moreno returned it to this same place until President Eloy Alfaro built the Santa Clara market. Throughout the XX Century, this square has been the largest public space for local gatherings, as well as for national civic, political and religious concentrations.

Figure 15. Plaque on San Francisco Church.

Text on plaque reads: The Monastery of San Francisco, dedicated to St Paul, was among the first religious edifices built in the city of Quito. The Chapel of San Buenaventura forms part of this important architectural complex, whose origins go back to the first century after the establishment of the Seraphic Order in Ecuador. The chapel, built on the magnificent Franciscan atrium, is adjacent to the main church with its imposing stone façade and to another smaller one to the left, known from the middle of the XVIII century as the Chapel of Cantuña. Subject to changes in the history of the Order, it belonged originally to the Spanish Brotherhood of Veracruz, a type of devout association set up, like its European peers, to foster religious feeling and the practice of pious acts among the believers of the parish. When the brotherhood disappeared, around the middle the XVII century, the Franciscans converted it into the Chapel of the San Buenaventura School; a school founded for the training of choristers. In 1868, following the earthquake suffered by the city of Quito that year, the Franciscans transferred the rights of use of the chapel to the Daughters of Charity of St Vincent de Paul, under whose care it remains today. The architectural history of the chapel shows that this site underwent profound aesthetic modifications, which radically changed the colonial era design and decoration.

In terms of dissemination of tourist materials, Quito has a mixed availability of information. The city's website offers an extensive array of information for tourists, however, it is all in Spanish. Within the *centro histórico*, however, the availability of information is limited. There are bus tours almost every hour with stops all over the *centro histórico*, and they are very popular, costing around fifteen U.S. dollars. However, once inside the city center, while there are many places that have tourist information and brochures of tourist activities, finding something as simple as a map of historic places is impossible. Tourists must either pre-arrange for a tour guide, take a bus tour, or make their way through the *centro histórico* on their own. With additional guidance and promotion of materials that could be sold by various vendors, as well as the ability to find a tour guide once inside the *centro histórico*, Quito would be well on its way to establishing an environment with heritage tourism that benefits the city, the tourism industry, and the residents of the *centro histórico*. Although the problem remains of who would undertake these projects of material creation and promotion, especially if there is no direct financial gain for doing so. A potential solution would be for government institutions such as FONSAL to take on this task, as it would promote tourism within the city that would ultimately offer financial gain to a wide array of local businesses, restaurants, and tourist destinations. This would also be a fitting task for FONSAL to take on, as in 1994 they included encouraging tourism in their plans for preservation of the *centro histórico*.

With an understanding of intangible heritage and its safeguarding, and of heritage tourism, focus can now be directed to specific case studies in Quito that reflect the city's concern with these topics. These case studies each also address the issues of safeguarding

Indigenous and mestizo heritage, as well as protecting, respecting, and engaging the Indigenous population itself. First, the presence and eviction of Indigenous street vendors in the *centro histórico* will be addressed. An Indigenous dance troupe that performs in the *centro histórico* will then be discussed along with the annual celebration of Semana Santa (Holy Week) in the city.

Street Vendors in the *Centro Histórico* Case Study

Indigenous street vendors in the *centro histórico* are an example of a living manifestation of intangible heritage. But their presence has been threatened by preservation policies and promotion of heritage tourism. An important feature of the Latin American *centro histórico* is the plaza. In Quito there are plazas sprinkled across the *centro histórico*, the most important being the Plaza de la Independencia, or Plaza Grande that is framed by the Presidential Palace, the Archbishop's Palace, La Catedral, and a modern government building. Plazas serve as community centers where a variety of people interact and serve various functions. "Street vendors, Indigenous artisans, businesspeople, state authorities, tourists, and residents overlap in both harmonious and conflicting ways...[and] affirm many aspects of public cultures, material and nonmaterial."⁵² Renovation and preservation projects have resulted in the destruction of the role of the plaza as this shared space.⁵³

In 1994, FONSAL added encouraging tourism to its preservation plans for the *centro histórico*. Part of their plan was getting rid of street vendors in the *centro histórico* and in the Plaza Grande, the majority of whom are Indigenous and travel from outside of

---

⁵² Crossa, "Disruption, yet Community Reconstitution," 173.

⁵³ Jones and Varley, "The Conquest for the City Centre," 41.

the *centro histórico* to sell goods on a daily basis, in order to appeal to the elite interpretation of history that tends to go along with tourism. The city sought to modernize in order to appeal to tourists, and street vendors were “identified as the main barrier to the modernisation of the city.”⁵⁴ The need to eliminate street vendors was justified by the argument that they physically obstructed the views of the churches and colonial architecture that tourists were visiting the city to see, and that they “dirtied the sidewalks” and “lowered the cultural tone of the area.”⁵⁵ The language used here is inherently prejudiced, suggesting that both Indigenous peoples and those of a lower socio-economic class are less cultured. Additionally, the claim that the vendors dirty the sidewalks is certainly linked with the presence of actual trash produced and littered in the streets as a result of their vending operations, but it also suggests that the people themselves are dirtying the landscape.

The Plan for the Modernization and Ordering of Popular Commerce in Quito was developed to deal with the tourism potential of the *centro histórico*. On top of wanting to eliminate street vendors from the city’s sidewalks, the Plan failed to even take into consideration the possibility that those vendors could be a benefit to tourism, nor that they might want to partake in or profit off the tourism industry.⁵⁶ It is obvious that those street vendors would have something to gain from the increase of tourist foot traffic through the *centro histórico*, but this was ignored as the tourism industry seeks to offer tourists an environment that is “safe, friendly and welcoming.” The role of the Indigenous population, some of whom are street vendors, in protest and resistance in

---

⁵⁴ Middleton, “Trivialising Culture, Social Conflict and Heritage Tourism in Quito,” 2-3.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 3-5.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 4.

public spaces like the Plaza Grande in Quito, has given them a reputation of an “angry culture of resistance” that could potentially scare tourists.⁵⁷ Indigenous organizations in Ecuador have regularly had to resort to political protests in the *centro histórico* in order to be incorporated into the mainstream political dialogue.

Thus, rather than have tourists interact with Indigenous people on the streets, the city and the tourism industry prefers to present Indigenous heritage as a fabricated “harmonious past and present.”⁵⁸ This false representation of Indigenous heritage is particularly problematic within the *centro histórico*, as “unpaid Indigenous labour was used to accumulate the wealth that allowed the church, governments and private individuals to create the buildings and the spaces that the tourists enjoy.”⁵⁹ The Indigenous population has been “mistreated over centuries by landowning elites, despised by the middle and upper classes and excluded from the benefits of a developing society.”⁶⁰

This policy of elimination of Indigenous street vendors from plazas is not unique to Quito. As early as the 1970s, there were organized efforts in Puebla, Mexico to remove street vendors from the city’s plazas. The vendors organized and protested after two vendors died during a forced eviction from a public plaza in 1973, but ultimately, preservation-based and tourism-influenced policy succeeded at removing vendors from the plazas in Puebla.⁶¹ In Mexico City, Programa Rescate (Rescue Program), “sought to

---

⁵⁷ Ibid., 5-6.

⁵⁸ Jones and Varley, “The Conquest for the City Centre,” 41.

⁵⁹ Middleton, “Trivialising Culture, Social Conflict and Heritage Tourism,” 1.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 11.

⁶¹ Jones and Varley, “The Conquest for the City Centre,” 32.

revamp the built environment by altering the character of public spaces” in 2000.⁶²

Programa Rescate saw plazas as “void space” that needed to be improved.⁶³ This concept entirely undermined the fact that plazas are critically important spaces for street vendors, not only economically, but because they serve as a community space for “kin networks” that have developed over time.⁶⁴ Thus, these policies of eliminating Indigenous vendors and poor people from public space and plazas in Latin America severely impacts both economic practices and community and social networks. It involves no stretch of the imagination to identify these policies as prejudicial towards Indigenous populations, as well as problematic for accurate presentations of Indigenous heritage and life in the *centro histórico*.

Indigenous Heritage and Semana Santa in the *Centro Histórico* Case Studies

Alan Middleton has analyzed the presentation of Indigenous heritage and local culture in Quito in his paper “Trivialising Culture, Social Conflict and Heritage Tourism in Quito,” presented at the 2007 International Seminar on Heritage Tourism in Amsterdam. He addressed the performances of an Indigenous dance troupe called Ballet Jacchigua, as well as the celebration of Semana Santa (Holy Week) in the *centro histórico*. Middleton finds both of these events problematic with regard to true representation and appreciation of heritage. While understanding his perspective, it is important to consider the complexities of preserving and presenting intangible and Indigenous heritage, as has been discussed previously.

Ballet Jacchigua, Ecuador’s National Folkloric Ballet, is made up of

---

⁶² Crossa, “Disruption, yet Community Reconstitution,” 168.

⁶³ Ibid., 175.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 180.

approximately 350 Indigenous dancers and musicians. The dance troupe performs for tourists in the Plaza de San Francisco, and, according to their own website, they seek to present the “collective memory of a diverse nation” through dance. Middleton’s frustrations with the ballet come from a few different directions. First, he finds it problematic that the troupe is presenting a story of national unity in a location that has witnessed exploitation of the Indigenous population for centuries, as well as mass Indigenous protests and uprisings. Second, he finds fault with the name of the ballet, as *jacchigua* is Kichwa word for the celebration that take places after the harvest, which is characterized by the landed elite allowing the Indigenous laborers to celebrate but then return to their role as subordinates who are tied to the land and the landowners. Third, there are parts of the dance that are categorically inaccurate, and even offensive to practitioners of Indigenous religions. For instance, at one point in the troupe’s typical routine, a dancer is “disguised as a shaman and dressed in a tiger skin, which would never happen in real life.” Not only does this slight the real tradition, but it is also a clear example of how the presentation of Indigenous heritage is altered to fit into the stereotypical ideas held by tourists and non-Indigenous white and mestizo Quiteños.⁶⁵

Middleton ends his critique of the Ballet Jacchigua explaining that it is “a trivial presentation of Andean culture which has neither historical substance nor anthropological justification.”⁶⁶ While his critique is certainly a valid one, there is a more pertinent underlying question here. No presentation of Indigenous heritage for tourist consumption is going to be perfect, and that has to be accepted and expected, so at what point can

---

⁶⁵ Middleton, “Trivialising Culture, Social Conflict and Heritage Tourism,” 6-7.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 8.

something be considered an acceptable representation of Indigenous heritage? While the inaccurate representation of a shaman, an incredibly important figure in Indigenous heritage, clearly crosses the line of acceptability, does the entire Ballet Jacchigua cross that line? It seems that the presentation of Indigenous heritage in a contested space like the *centro histórico* is a significant example of Quito dealing with intangible and Indigenous heritage. Similarly, the employment of over three hundred Indigenous dancers and musicians is an example of incorporation of the Indigenous community, and provides that community with the opportunity to own their traditions and to benefit from the tourism industry. While there are certainly necessary improvements to be made, a sound argument exists for the success of Ballet Jacchigua with regards to the safeguarding of intangible and Indigenous heritage, and regarding issues surrounding ownership of heritage.

Semana Santa presents an even more complicated case study of the presentation of local tradition and intangible heritage. The week following Palm Sunday in Quito is filled with parades and rituals that come from the colonial period, and incorporate pre-Columbian, colonial, Catholic, Indigenous, and modern traditions. Tourists watch as the streets are flooded with Quiteños “walking bare footed in their purple capes [with their] faces covered in hoods that rise up into a point a metre above their heads; others flagellating their naked torsos with a variety of types of whips, carrying heavy crosses and wearing crowns of thorns that lacerate their heads” (**Figures 16 and 17**).⁶⁷

---

⁶⁷ Ibid., 9.

Figure 16. Streets of the *centro histórico* filled during Semana Santa.

Figure 17. Semana Santa parade in the *centro histórico*.

Middleton sees this as a ritual, five hundred years in the making, being “converted into a spectacle for tourists whose connection to it may be no more than voyeurism.”⁶⁸ Part of his argument is hard to dispute, considering that tourism *is*, in many senses, an act of voyeurism, and because most tourists are not partaking in or watching the ritual out of a place of religious reverence. But the prospect that the entire ritual, consisting of an estimated 100,000 participants annually, has been converted into something meant for tourists is misguided. While tourist presence may encourage the growth of the processions, it does not encourage the altering or commodification of the tradition.

Middleton also identifies the “sado-masochistic message” of the processions as problematic, suggesting that it leads tourists to reduce Indigenous culture to a barbaric “dark past,” placing the Indigenous population as “outside the elite world and/or at the bottom of the socio-economic structure.”⁶⁹ This would be the mistake of the tourist, as these traditions are entirely Catholic and European, and while it is possible that a tourist could walk away having misinterpreted and severely misunderstood the nature, historicity, and tradition of Semana Santa, that potential is not an excuse to argue against Semana Santa as a successful presentation of tradition. Middleton fears that it creates a relationship between the tourists and the participants that “confirms the ‘happy innocence’ of the Indian and the superiority of the traveler.”⁷⁰ While there is no arguing that some tourists might have that experience, that is the problem of the tourist, not the tradition. If the presentation of heritage is determined by how the tourist *might* consume that heritage, then it would be easier to just give up altogether. It is impossible to ensure

---

⁶⁸ Ibid., 9.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 9-10.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 10.

that every visitor to a museum, attendee of a play, or onlooker at a parade will walk away having understood the intended message, and that is an acceptable reality, if for no other reason, than because there simply is no way to control a person's thoughts or interpretations. Semana Santa is an example of a living tradition that takes place within a living city. Participants benefit in their own personal ways, the city benefits from increased traffic and tourism, and tourists benefit by experiencing heritage that exists outside of architecture and museums.

Perhaps concern is better placed in relation to how the tourism industry handles events like Semana Santa, rather than with the potentially uninformed voyeurism that is inherent in tourism. Looking at the Brazilian Carnival, blame has been placed both on the government and on the tourism industry for transforming Carnival "into an article of consumption."⁷¹ The problem identified in this case is the media and tourism industry portraying a tradition inaccurately or in a simplified manner. The problem is not with the tradition itself, the public display of the tradition, nor with the tourist gaze. In a similar analysis of tourism related to Mardi Gras and other tourist attractions in New Orleans, the blame is also placed on the tourism industry:

Whatever the nature of the tourist experience, it is shaped in large part by symbols and meanings supplied by the tourism industry. Consequently, it is through symbols and meanings that tourists develop a particular perspective, or way of looking at people, places, and things, that is fundamentally different from the way nontourists see them.⁷²

Because the tourism industry plays such a decisive role in constructing the tourist's perception of an event, attention should be directed at the representation of Semana Santa within the tourism industry, instead of being directed at the event itself.

---

⁷¹ Oliven, "The Production and Consumption of Culture in Brazil," 111.

⁷² Jacobs, "Folk for Whom?," 311.

Looking at the *centro histórico* of Quito with the concepts of intangible heritage and heritage tourism in mind, as well as the complicated reality of presenting Indigenous heritage, the future of historic preservation gains a few more dimensions. As can be seen in the 2012-2022 Plan for the Metropolitan District of Quito, the city is aware of the need for the preservation of both tangible and intangible heritage. But how can the goals of the Plan be brought to fruition? And how can it be done in a way that is conducive to increased and improved heritage tourism? Concern with intangible heritage in Quito centers mostly on the Indigenous population, of the formerly colonized and their descendants, while the tangible built environment appears to be the heritage of the colonizer. This is an oversimplification, as Indigenous craftsmen influenced the appearance of buildings across the *centro histórico*. But the story of Indigenous labor and influence is not inherently obvious or visible.

Making this intangible heritage available for consumption by tourists is incredibly difficult. Outside of being a difficult task in and of itself, the tourism industry and the city planners have opted for the commodification, simplification, and sanitization of Indigenous culture. In his work on globalization and tourism in the Latin American *centro histórico*, Joseph Scarpaci identified a group of tourists who “seek out the cultural landscape and icons that represent historical periods, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and distinct periods of art and architecture etched into the cityscapes of towns and cities.”⁷³ These are the tourists who are visiting places like the *centro histórico*, and thus the tourist industry aims to transform and improve those spaces to increase tourism. But as we can see from the elimination of Indigenous street vendors from plazas in Quito, Puebla, and

---

⁷³ Scarpaci, “Globalization Tourists and Heritage Tourists in American Culture,” 1.

Mexico City, these transformations do not just affect buildings, but also of the “character of public space.”⁷⁴

Scarpaci explains that the *centro histórico* gives Quiteñians the opportunity to “create national identity.” But in focusing on buildings and monuments as the representation of that heritage, alternative heritages and memories are easily left out of the conversation about what to do in the *centro histórico* with regard to tourism.⁷⁵

Indigenous populations deserve a place at the table when it comes to tourism, as tourism is “increasingly viewed not simply as a force for the creation of a stereotypical image of a marginalised people, but a means by which those peoples aspire to economic and political power for self-advancement, and as a place of dialogue between and within differing world views.”⁷⁶

Outside of the problem of commodification and simplification of heritage, and the potential for Indigenous involvement in the tourism industry, exists the problem of the complex history behind the built environment itself. As Scarpaci argues, “historic corners of the Latin American city do not require extensive historical contexts so that the visitor can interpret them. Garrisons, ramparts, cathedrals, plazas, and barrios unfold as one walks through them at a pedestrian-friendly pace.”⁷⁷ This is true in part: a story does unfold naturally, and a historical context is not *required* for tourists to interpret the *centro histórico*. However, that does not mean that a historical context should *not* be provided. While a narrative may unfold naturally, without the historical context of how the city was

---

⁷⁴ Crossa, “Disruption, yet Community Reconstitution,” 174.

⁷⁵ Scarpaci, “Globalization Tourists and Heritage Tourists in American Culture,” 6.

⁷⁶ Chris Ryan, “Tourist-Host Nexus—Research Considerations” in *Indigenous Tourism: The Commodification and Management of Culture*, ed. Chris Ryan et al. (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2005), 4.

⁷⁷ Scarpaci, “Globalization Tourists and Heritage Tourists in American Culture,” 12.

built and by whom, and what has transpired within its public spaces, the narrative that unfolds is simply inaccurate, because “the beauty of Quito is a physical manifestation of the exploitation of the Indigenous population over half a millennium.”⁷⁸ The presentation of the built environment in Quito without a full historical context, “results in a cultural message that airbrushes out the colonial and post-colonial repression of a society and economy that has been part of the world’s political economy for more than 500 years. Also lost, is the culture of Indigenous resistance.”⁷⁹

The safeguarding of intangible heritage, Indigenous heritage, and heritage tourism are all three very complex topics, and discussing those topics in the context of Quito is all the more difficult. The city was built by forced Indigenous labor, the Indigenous population was exploited under Spanish colonizers, and inequality between the elite and the Indigenous in Quito today is different, but still present. This means that the heritage of the city, both tangible and intangible, has difficult histories intertwined at every turn. Presentation of those histories has often been skirted, in favor of a more pleasant and sanitized story that is easily consumed by tourists. By failing to present an accurate history, the heritage of those persons that is being omitted is inevitably let fall to the wayside when it comes to safeguarding intangible heritage. Additionally, it results in the Indigenous population, whose story is the most difficult to tell, almost being left out of the tourism industry altogether. In order to develop a constructive tourism industry in Quito, it is imperative that the Indigenous population be better incorporated. And for the tourism industry to include Indigenous heritage, measures must be taken to safeguard Quito’s intangible heritage.

---

⁷⁸ Middleton, “Trivialising Culture, Social Conflict and Heritage Tourism,” 1.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 1.

Heritage tourism, historic preservation, safeguarding of intangible heritage, and Indigenous heritage are inextricably linked in the context of Quito, and developing a model for what needs to come next for Quito requires an understanding of each of these concepts. Alan Middleton addressed all of these issues in his paper “Trivialising Culture, Social Conflict and Heritage Tourism in Quito.” He offered the simple suggestion that maybe just being honest about Quito’s past and acknowledging the complex and diverse history, both tangible and intangible, would be the best route for improving heritage tourism, and addressing the issues surrounding Indigenous heritage:

If, as the Strategic Plan for Tourism argues, Quito’s position as a Cultural Heritage Site of Humanity ought to be city’s central tourism product and the basic element of its promotion, why is it necessary to hide the Indigenous contribution to this heritage? That the grand houses, churches and other monuments were made possible by the enforced labour and inhumane treatment of Indigenous peoples is clearly part of that heritage... The city should be honest about this history and celebrate the Indigenous struggle for land and dignity. This would provide it with its ‘unique selling point’ as an important world destination and the ‘Cultural Capital of the Andes.’⁸⁰

Middleton’s suggestion is the clearest and most obvious solution for the problems addressed in this chapter. Albeit, as this chapter has shown, the implementation would be much more complicated than Middleton’s words might suggest, but if the actions of the tourism industry reflected his suggestion, Quito would find itself on the right path towards a tourism industry that not only safeguards and presents intangible heritage while promoting and preserving tangible heritage, but that also deals with Indigenous heritage in an honest and beneficial way.

---

⁸⁰ Ibid., 12.

CONCLUSION

Colonial Quito, constructed in a unique location for a colonial city, houses an array of religious architecture, colonial homes, and government buildings. The colonial architecture has been preserved incredibly well, and almost all of the construction that has taken place in the city's *centro histórico* since colonization has been modeled after the traditional buildings that are present from early colonial times. Indigenous labor, forced by the Spanish colonizers, is responsible for the construction that took place throughout the Colonial Era. Indigenous influence is apparent in ornamentation, building methods, and in archival records. While the topographical setting of Quito on the slopes of Pichincha volcano in the Andes Mountains and in an area subject to frequent earthquakes is unfitting for a colonial city, Quito and its architecture provide an example of a traditional colonial city.

Since the early twentieth century there have been consistent historic preservation efforts made across the city. This preservation has focused on the built heritage within the *centro histórico*. The preservation movement began with the *hispanismo* movement, adhered to by José Gabriel Navarro, who believed the Spanish had spread a superior race across their colonies and felt that the architecture in the *centro histórico* needed to be preserved as a testament to the Spanish colonizers. As the country of Ecuador and its economic system developed over the twentieth century, there was significant migration from the countryside to the city center, which created a need for preservation and

modernization in order to deal with the increased population and changing needs of the city. By the 1970s, UNESCO developed the World Heritage Program, and Quito's *centro histórico* was in the first group of sites to be named a World Heritage Site. This greatly pushed the preservation movement forward. Joint efforts between private and public institutions have been a trademark of preservation efforts in Quito, which has been identified as a model for other Latin American cities to follow.

At the end of the twentieth century the preservation movement across the globe became concerned with the concept of intangible heritage and figuring out ways to safeguard that heritage. In Quito, this became particularly relevant because of the Indigenous and mestizo heritage that has consistently been either sanitized or ignored. While the need for and methods of safeguarding intangible heritage have been pretty well established, putting those methods into practice has not been an easy process. At the same time, the heritage tourism industry has been booming, creating a demand for consumable heritage in historic areas like Quito's *centro histórico*. What is necessary now is the development of a tourism industry and tourist destinations that incorporate intangible and tangible heritage, benefit the historically oppressed and exploited Indigenous population, and that avoid gentrification of the *centro histórico*.

There is an abundance of museums in the *centro histórico* that seek to tell the stories that the colonial architecture alone does not tell, but it is important to figure out a way to tell these complicated stories outside of museums as well. FONSAI and the city of Quito have made an effort to do this by putting information plaques on buildings across the *centro histórico*. As chapter three shows, those plaques often fail to accomplish the goal of sharing the most important history that is left untold by the

structures themselves. The lack of information available for tourists adds to this problem, as there are no options for guide-led tours once a tourist finds themselves within the *centro histórico*, information for self-guided tours is almost nonexistent and the abundance of information provided on the internet is only available in Spanish. Bus tours or pre-planned tour guides are the only real option. The issue of money plays an important role here, as the tourism industry doesn't stand to profit very much off of materials and measures that promote self-guided tours, but there are other options for agencies to provide tour guides from within the *centro histórico* or for materials to be published and sold by various vendors already working in the area.

Historic preservation efforts in Quito have been tremendously successful in terms of the built heritage in the *centro histórico*, so the focus now is to ensure that mistakes such as what happened in the neighborhood of La Ronda are not repeated, and that attention is also given to issues of intangible heritage, especially as the heritage tourism industry continues to grow. The Plan Metropolitano de Desarrollo 2012-2022 offers insight into the current state of historic preservation and hopes for its future in Quito. The needs identified here and in Chapter Three of this thesis are addressed in the Plan. The Plan identifies four programs that are intended to address historic preservation needs through an increased percentage of revitalized areas of within the *centro histórico*, a better inventory of heritage sites and better evaluations of those inventoried sites, an increased percentage of recovered and protected historic buildings, and an improved archaeological program to identify, research, and maintain archaeological sites. All of these programs seek to improve the face of historic preservation in the *centro histórico*, and if implemented through continued joint partnerships between private and public

historic preservation institutions, the future of historic preservation in the *centro histórico* looks promising. The Plan also seeks to address issues of intangible heritage through better research and dissemination of local histories, even acknowledging community ownership of heritage.

Goals are identified for what progress should be made by 2022, but as Chapter Three shows, engaging communities and tourists with intangible heritage is not an easy task. Likewise, while creating partnerships or shared goals between the government, preservation organizations, Indigenous communities, and the tourism industry in order to develop a constructive tourism industry is of the utmost importance, it is also very difficult. However, there is no better place for this task to be accomplished, and this is evidenced in two ways. First, considering that Quito has developed a model for historic preservation built out of joint efforts between private and public institutions, and one that has avoided gentrification (in most cases), there is no reason to doubt the city's capability of creating a similar model that addresses issues of intangible heritage, engages Indigenous heritage, and works to develop a better tourism industry. Second, the Plan Metropolitano de Desarrollo 2012-2022 shows that policy makers in Quito are well aware of the need for better safeguarding of intangible heritage and community engagement with that heritage. The future of preservation and safeguarding of both tangible and intangible heritage in Quito looks bright. While there are many changes that must be made to the tourism industry there, initiatives created through constructive relationships between the tourism industry, private and public institutions, and the communities present in the *centro histórico*, there is very real potential for a new heritage tourism model to be developed in Quito.

REFERENCES

- Aikawa, Noriko. "Actions Undertaken by UNESCO for its Implementation." In *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment*, edited by Peter Seitel, 13-19. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, 2001.
- AlSayyad, Nezar, ed. *Consuming Tradition, Manufacturing Heritage: Global Norms and Urban Forms in the Age of Tourism*. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Andrien, Kenneth J. *The Kingdom of Quito, 1690-1830: The State and Regional Development*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Baxter, Ian. "Global Heritage Tourism: The Value of Experiencing the Past." In *Heritage Values in Contemporary Society*, edited by George S. Smith, Mauch Messenger, and Hilary A. Soderland, 241-254. California: Left Coast Press, 2010.
- Bayón, Damián and Murillo Marx. *History of South American Colonial Art and Architecture: Spanish South America and Brazil*. New York: Rizolli International Publications, 1989.
- Becker, Marc. *Indians and Leftists in the Making of Ecuador's Modern Indigenous Movements*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2008.
- Becker, Marc. *Pachakutik: Indigenous Movements and Electoral Politics in Ecuador*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2011.
- Benavides, O. Hugo. *Making Ecuadorian Histories: Four Centuries of Defining Power*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004.
- Borsdorf, Axel. "The Latin American City and the Symbolic Impact of Built Environment." *GeoJournal* 15 (1) (1987): 57-62.
- Bortolotto, Chiara. "From Objects to Processes: UNESCO's 'Intangible Cultural Heritage.'" *Journal of Museum Ethnography* 19 (2007): 21-33.
- Bromley, Rosemary D. and Gareth A. Jones. "Conservation in Quito: Policies and Progress in the Historic Centre." *Third World Planning Review* 17 (1) (1995): 41-60.

- Bromley, Rosemary D. and Gareth A. Jones. "Identifying the Inner City in Latin America." *The Geographical Journal* 162 (2) (1996): 179-190.
- Bromley, Rosemary D. and Gareth A. Jones. "The Relationship Between Urban Conservation Programmes and Property Renovation: Evidence from Quito, Ecuador." *Cities* 13 (6) (1996): 373-85.
- Capello, Ernesto. *City at the Center of the World: Space, History, and Modernity in Quito*. Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2011.
- Capello, Ernesto. *City Fragments: Space and Nostalgia in Modernizing Quito, 1885-1942*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2005.
- Carrión, Fernando, ed. *Centros históricos de América Latina y el Caribe*. Paris: UNESCO, 2001.
- Carrión, Fernando, et al. ed. *Centro histórico de Quito: problemática y perspectivas*. Quito: Dirección de Planificación, 1990.
- Chaudhuri, Shuba. "Who Is the 'Holder' of Intangible Cultural Heritage? Revisiting the Concept of Community from an Intangible Cultural Heritage Perspective." In *Intangible Cultural Heritage and Intellectual Property: Communities, Cultural Diversity and Sustainable Development*, edited by Toshiyuki Kono, 189-198. Oregon: International Specialized Book Services, 2009.
- Cifuentes, Colón. "La planificación de las áreas patrimoniales de Quito." *Centro-h* 1 (2008): 101-114.
- Crespo, Alfonso Ortiz. "Arquitectura monumental del centro histórico de Quito." In *Centro histórico de Quito: problemática y perspectivas*, edited by Fernando Carrión et al, 141-164. Quito: Dirección de Planificación, 1990.
- Crossa, Veronica. "Disruption, yet Community Reconstitution: Subverting the Privatization of Latin American Plazas." *GeoJournal* 77 (2012): 167-183.
- Donahue-Wallace, Kelly. *Art and Architecture of Viceroyal Latin America, 1521-1821*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2008.
- Durán, Adrián Vergara. *Renovación de centros históricos en grandes ciudades Latinoamericanas: repurcusiones socioeconómicas, urbanístico-estructurales y medioambientales-urbanas*. Colombia: Ediciones Uninorte, 2008.
- Durán, Lucía, José Rodríguez, and Luis López. *La ronda: esos otros patrimonios*. Quito: INTERCULTURAS, 2012.

- Fausto, Carlos and Michael Heckenberger. *Time and Memory in Indigenous Amazonia: Anthropological Perspectives*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2007.
- Final Conference Report on A Global Assessment of the 1989 Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore: Local Empowerment and International Cooperation*. In *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment*, edited by Peter Seitel, 263-306. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, 2001.
- Fitch, James Marston. *Historic Preservation: Curatorial Management of the Built World*. United States: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1982.
- Fraser, Valerie. *The Architecture of Conquest: Building in the Viceroyalty of Peru, 1535-1635*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Graham, Roy Eugene. "The Protection of Heritage Values while Utilizing World Heritage Sites for the Benefit of the Community." In *Heritage Values in Contemporary Society*, edited by George S. Smith, Mauch Messenger, and Hilary A. Soderland, 267-278. California: Left Coast Press, 2010.
- Guarderas, Augusto Barrera, Nathalia Novillo Rameiz, and the members of the Consejo Metropolitano de Planificación. "Plan metropolitano de desarrollo 2012-2022." Quito: Distrito Metropolitano de Quito, 2012.
- Hardoy, Jorge Enrique, and Mario R dos Santos. *El centro histórico de Quito: introducción al problema de su preservación y desarrollo*. Quito: Banco Central del Ecuador, 1984.
- Hazucha, Branislav, and Toshiyuki Kono. "Conceptualization of Community as a Holder of Intangible Cultural Heritage." In *Intangible Cultural Heritage and Intellectual Property: Communities, Cultural Diversity and Sustainable Development*, edited by Toshiyuki Kono, 145-158. Oregon: International Specialized Book Services, 2009.
- Instituto Nacional de Patrimonio Cultural (Ecuador). *La preservación y promoción del patrimonio cultural del Ecuador*. Quito: Instituto Nacional de Patrimonio Cultural, 1990.
- Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Paris: UNESCO, 2011.
- International Council on Monuments and Sites. *Advisory Body Evaluation*. 7 June 1978. [www.://whc.unesco.org/archive/advisory_body_evaluation/002.pdf](http://whc.unesco.org/archive/advisory_body_evaluation/002.pdf).

- International Council on Monuments and Sites. *Carta internacional para la conservación de ciudades históricas y áreas urbanas históricas*. Washington D.C., 1987.
- International Council on Monuments and Sites. *Conclusiones del coloquio sobre la preservación de los centros históricos ante el crecimiento de las ciudades contemporáneas*. Quito, 1977.
- Izurieta-Varea, Jaime. "View from Quito." *The Architectural Review* 214 (1281) (2003): 30-31.
- Jacobs, Claude F. "Folk for Whom? Tourist Guidebooks, Local Color, and the Spiritual Churches of New Orleans." *The Journal of American Folklore* 114 (453) (2001): 309-330.
- Janke, Terri. "Indigenous Intangible Cultural Heritage and Ownership of Copyright." In *Intangible Cultural Heritage and Intellectual Property: Communities, Cultural Diversity and Sustainable Development*, edited by Toshiyuki Kono, 159-188. Oregon: International Specialized Book Services, 2009.
- Jones, Gareth A. and Ann Varley. "The Conquest for the City Centre: Street Traders versus Buildings." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 13 (1) (1994): 27-44.
- Jones, Oakah L. *Guatemala in the Spanish Colonial Period*. Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994.
- Jordan, Leslie-Ann and David T. Duval. "Heritage Management and Tourism in the Caribbean." In *Cultural Heritage and Tourism in the Developing World: A Regional Perspective*, edited by Dallen J. Timothy and Gyan P. Nyaupane, 186-208. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Karanicolas, Mike. "Journey to the Center of the World." *Hispanic* (March 2008): 16-18.
- Kiernan, James Patrick. "Quito: Beauty and History." *Americas* 56 (3) (2004): 6-7.
- Koch, Grace. "Cultural Conservation: A Two-Way Consultation." In *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment*, edited by Peter Seitel, 159-165. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, 2001.
- Kono, Toshiyuki. "Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage: Unresolved Issues and Unanswered Questions." In *Intangible Cultural Heritage and Intellectual Property: Communities, Cultural Diversity and Sustainable Development*, edited by Toshiyuki Kono, 3-42. Oregon: International Specialized Book Services, 2009.

- Kono, Toshiyuki, ed. *Intangible Cultural Heritage and Intellectual Property: Communities, Cultural Diversity and Sustainable Development*. Oregon: International Specialized Book Services, 2009.
- Lalama, Francisco Naranjo. "Transformaciones urbanas en el centro histórico de Quito." In *Centro histórico de Quito: problemática y perspectivas*, edited by Fernando Carrión et al., 167-186. Quito: Dirección de Planificación, 1990.
- Lane, Kris. *Quito 1599: City and Colony in Transition*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2002.
- Larson, Brooke. *Trials of Nation Making: Liberalism, Race, and Ethnicity in the Andes, 1810-1910*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Leask, Anna and Alan Fyall. *Managing World Heritage Sites*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2006.
- Lockhart, James and Stuart Schwartz. *Early Latin America: A History of Spanish America and Brazil*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Lutz, Christopher H. *Santiago De Guatemala, 1541-1773: City, Caste, and the Colonial Experience*. Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994.
- Mariátegui, José Carlos. *Seven Interpretative Essays on Peruvian Reality*. Peru: 1928.
- Mgbeoji, Ikechi. "On the Shoulders of the 'Other'ed': Intellectual Property Rights in Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Persistence of Indigenous Peoples' Texts and Inter-Texts in a Contextual World." In *Intangible Cultural Heritage and Intellectual Property: Communities, Cultural Diversity and Sustainable Development*, edited by Toshiyuki Kono, 203-222. Oregon: International Specialized Book Services, 2009.
- Middleton, Alan. "Trivialising Culture, Social Conflict and Heritage Tourism in Quito." Paper presented at the International Seminar on Heritage Tourism, CEDLA, Amsterdam, 14-16 June 2007.
- Mumford, Jeremy Ravi. *Vertical Empire: The General Resettlement of Indians in the Colonial Andes*. North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2012.
- Murtagh, William J. *Keeping Time: The History and Theory of Preservation in America*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2006.
- Navarro, José Gabriel. "Ecuadorian Sculpture." *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 3 (9) (1945): 209-213.

- O'Bannon, Patrick W. "Where is the History in Historic Districts—Some Concluding Thoughts." *The Public Historian* 32, no. 4 (Fall 2010): 69-75.
- O'Connor, Erin. *Gender, Indian, Nation: The Contradictions of Making Ecuador, 1830-1925*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2007.
- Olivén, Rubén George. "The Production and Consumption of Culture in Brazil." *Latin American Perspectives* 11 (1) (1984): 103-115.
- Oliver, Paul. "Re-Presenting and Representing the Vernacular: The Open-Air Museum." In *Consuming Tradition, Manufacturing Heritage: Global Norms and Urban Forms in the Age of Tourism*, edited by Nezar AlSayyad, 191-211. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Organization of American States. *Normas de Quito*. Quito, 1967.
- Ortega, Monica Moreira. "El centro histórico de Quito: un modelo mixto de gestión." In *Centros históricos de América Latina y el Caribe*, edited by Fernando Carrión, 253-274. Paris: UNESCO, 2001.
- Page, Max. "Preservation: Of What? For Whom? A Critical Look at Historical Significance by Michael A. Tomlan," *The Public Historian* 22, no. 3 (Summer 2000): 157-9.
- Pino, Inés del and Hugo Yepes. "Apuntes para una historia sísmica de Quito." In *Centro histórico de Quito: problemática y perspectivas*, edited by Fernando Carrión, et al., 67-100. Quito: Dirección de Planificación, 1990.
- Prott, Lyndel V. "Some Considerations on the Protection of the Intangible Heritage: Claims and Remedies." In *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment*, edited by Peter Seitel, 104-110. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, 2001.
- Ramírez, Paul, and William B. Taylor. "Out of Tlatelolco's Ruins: Patronage, Devotion, and Natural Disaster at the Shrine of Our Lady of the Angels, 1745-1781." *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 93 (1) (2013): 33-65.
- Rivas, Julio. Interview by Meredith Maple. Personal interview. Quito, Ecuador, December 21, 2013.
- Rojas, Eduardo. *Old Cities, New Assets: Preserving Latin America's Urban Heritage*. Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank, 1999.
- Ruiz-Ballesteros, Esteban and Macarena Hernández-Ramírez. "Tourism that Empowers?: Commodification and Appropriation in Ecuador's Turismo Comunitario." *Critique of Anthropology* 30 (2010): 201-229.

- Ryan, Chris. "Tourist-Host Nexus—Research Considerations." In *Indigenous Tourism: The Commodification and Management of Culture*, edited by Chris Ryan and Michelle Aicken, 1-11. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2005.
- Sanz, Benjamín Gento. "Colonial Art of Quito." *The Americas* 2 (4) (1946): 454-460.
- Scarpaci, Joseph L. "Globalization Tourists and Heritage Tourists in American Culture: The Case of Latin American Historic Districts." *Material Culture* 39 (2007): 1-16.
- Scarpaci, Joseph L. *Plazas and Barrios: Heritage Tourism and Globalization in the Latin American Centro Histórico*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2005.
- Schlüter, Regina. "Heritage Tourism in Latin America: Can Turbulent Times Be Overcome." In *Cultural Heritage and Tourism in the Developing World: A regional Perspective*, edited by Dallen J. Timothy and Gyan P. Nyaupane, 209-223. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Seeger, Anthony. "Summary Report on the Regional Seminars." In *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment*, edited by Peter Seitel, 36-41. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, 2001.
- Seitel, Peter, ed. *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment*. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, 2001.
- Seleverston-Scher, Melina. *Ethnopolitics in Ecuador: Indigenous Rights and the Strengthening of Democracy*. Florida: North-South Center Press, 2001.
- Smith, George S., Phyllis Mauch Messenger, and Hilary A. Soderland, eds. *Heritage Values in Contemporary Society*. California: Left Coast Press, 2010.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books Ltd., 1999.
- Smith, Robert C. "Colonial Towns of Spanish and Portuguese America." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 14 (4) (1955): 3-12.
- Sorensen, Marie Louise Stig and John Carman, eds. *Heritage Studies: Methods and Approaches*. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Timothy, Dallen J. and Gyan P. Nyaupane, eds. *Cultural Heritage and Tourism in the Developing World: A Regional Perspective*. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Tomlan, Michael A., ed. *Preservation of What, for Whom? A Critical Look at Historical Significance*. New York: National Council for Preservation Education, 1998.

- UNESCO. *The 1989 Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore*. In *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment*, edited by Peter Seitel, 8-12. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, 2001.
- Webster, Susan Verdi. "Masters of the Trade: Native Artisans, Guilds, and the Construction of Colonial Quito." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 68 (1) (2009): 10-29.
- Wendland, Wend B. "Managing Intellectual Property Options When Documenting, Recording and Digitizing Intangible Cultural Heritage." In *Intangible Cultural Heritage and Intellectual Property: Communities, Cultural Diversity and Sustainable Development*, edited by Toshiyuki Kono, 77-100. Oregon: International Specialized Book Services, 2009.
- Williams, Norman, Edmund H. Kellog, and Frank B. Gilbert, eds. *Readings in Historic Preservation: Why? What? How?* New Jersey: Center for Urban Policy Research, 1983.
- Yashar, Deborah J. *Contesting Citizenship in Latin America: The Rise of Indigenous Movements and the Postliberal Challenge*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Yugar, Zulma. "Reporte seminario regional sobre la aplicación de la recomendación sobre la salvaguardia de la cultura tradicional y popular de America Latina y el Caribe." In *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment*, edited by Peter Seitel, 228-233. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, 2001.

CURRICULUM VITA

NAME: Meredith Alison Maple

ADDRESS: 127 N Keats Avenue
Louisville, KY 40206

DOB: Louisville, Kentucky – October 20, 1987

EDUCATION:

B.A., History/Political Science
University of Louisville
2006-2012

Graduate Certificate in Latin American and Latino Studies
University of Louisville
2013-2014

M.A., History
University of Louisville
2012-2014

POSITIONS HELD:

National Education Learning Facilitator, Humana, 2014-Present

Graduate Teaching Assistant, University of Louisville History Department,
Louisville, KY, 2012-2014

Education Intern, Frazier History Museum, Louisville, KY, Summer 2013

Collections Intern, The Brennan House Historic Home and Gardens and
Preservation Louisville, LLC, Louisville, KY, Spring 2012

Collections Intern, University of Louisville Photographic Archives, Louisville,
KY, 2012-2013

Collections Intern, University of Louisville Archives and Special Collections,
Louisville, KY, Fall 2012-2013

PROJECTS:

Podcast
Digital History, University of Louisville
Fall 2013

Omeka Online Exhibit
Digital History, University of Louisville
Fall 2013

Chickasaw Park, Louisville, Kentucky
National Register of Historic Places Nomination
Intro to Historic Preservation, University of Louisville
Spring 2013

The Louisville Leader Digital Collection and Crowdsourcing Project
University of Louisville Archives and Special Collections
Fall 2012-Spring 2013

Simmons Bible College Digital Collection
University of Louisville Archives and Special Collections
Fall 2012

Sadieville Historic District, Sadieville, Kentucky
National Register of Historic Places Nomination
Historic Preservation Fieldwork
Spring 2012