

LANDSCAPE AND BUILDINGS CRAFTING NATIONAL HERITAGE

Barbara Cortizo de Aguiar
University of Texas at Austin

In this paper, I discuss the role of architecture and cultural landscape in our continent's national identity creation and nation-building processes. More specifically, I examine the creation of national heritage institutes in the United States and Brazil in the early 1900s to show how countries imagined their national identity through preservation endeavors and the built environment. As these processes might be understood through their territorial occupation, I argue that national heritage in the United States and Brazil were defined as landscapes and buildings, respectively. Looking at landscapes and buildings, I analyze how the National Park Service and the Serviço do Patrimônio Histórico Artístico Nacional were partially responsible for crafting the countries' national identities by preserving a mostly white aspect of their histories.

First, I explore the individual narrative of the National Park Service, seeking to understand how this agency defined the country's notion of national heritage. I present the first events of historic preservation in the United States and discuss the general image of place and identity derived from those endeavors. I discuss the establishment of the first national parks and how that led to creating a bureau to manage and preserve the United States' heritage. Second, I discuss the roles of historicism and architecture in shaping Brazilian national heritage from 1838 to 1938. I present the creation of the first memorialization offices in the nineteenth-century. Then, I show how this narrative changed in the twentieth century. Last, I argue that, by using architecture as a symbol of different historical periods in Brazil, it became a fundamental element in shaping the Brazilian heritage.

Governments and national institutions decide what aspects will be excluded from their narrative by acclaiming certain events and celebrating them as heritage. With this premise in mind, I seek to understand how two different countries created two different foundation myths that have since been used to define national identity and values. I look at national heritage studies by discussing celebration and erasure in national heritage narratives.

Keywords: National identity, national heritage, celebration, erasure.

INTRODUCTION

National heritage is related to the history of a nation and legacies from the past, considering patrimonial objects as both historicist and memorialization elements. Considering a nation is an imagined political community, national heritage would also be an abstraction, a curated selection of objects representing said community's identity. This abstraction allows for the continuity of the past, while simultaneously creating a rupture with it, and defining which memories could be erased from the official narrative. Within this construction and decision-making process on what to highlight and what to erase lies the self-proclaimed image of a country and how the country defines its national identity.

The notion of historic preservation in the Americas is still rooted in its colonial history and is deeply tied to European hegemonic influence. This influence has controlled which spaces and places are preserved, and how heritage designations validate specific histories. With time, what has started with the designation of monuments and the listing of historical objects and buildings has changed to encompass people, practices, and events. However, heritage-making and historic preservation in the Americas are still tied to a nineteenth-century discourse.

In this paper, I present memorialization processes in the Americas and study narratives of national heritage formation, aiming to explain how the concept of nation was imagined through the landscape and the built environment. I understand that by acclaiming certain events and celebrating them as national heritage, governments also decide what aspects to exclude from the national narrative.

Here, I highlight how different countries consider what events are part of their collective memory and which groups they celebrate and preserve. In sum, I debate whose memory these countries preserve, which groups are represented by this patrimony, and which groups were left out of the official narrative.

Heritage is the collection of one person or entity's assets that can be passed on to others. Collective heritage is an object or group of objects representing a community's identity and meant to remain for future generations. National heritage is a curated selection of objects representing a nation's identity. It is a subjective process of selecting, creating monuments, highlighting other elements, and silencing unwanted aspects of a country's past.

At the time both the National Park Service and Serviço do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional¹ were created, the terminology used to talk about heritage was *historical monument*. Nowadays, the United States keeps relating the preservation field to *historical* heritage while Brazil understands it as working with *cultural* heritage. Note the difference between the two countries and compare them with the national narratives they created in the early twentieth century: on the one hand, nature and wilderness; on the other hand, architecture and artistic expression.

THE UNITED STATES

Mid-nineteenth century United States had a particular interest in everything related to the founding fathers, a feeling that grew significantly after the Union won the Civil War. The interest in the history of the country's formation made its way to the preservation of objects and buildings. The first building restoration actions were triggered by a conservative desire to restore a moment in the past and to help define the country's identity. At that time, however, there was not yet an established disciplinary field of architectural preservation in the United States. In the nineteenth-century, people sought for different ways of expressing their relationship with the land and environment. The first historic preservation initiatives, alongside regional artists', architects', and landscape designer's works, helped develop and define the country's national identity.

The first nationwide preservation society, the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association of the Union, a non-governmental organization founded by Ann Pamela Cunningham in 1853, advocated for and carried out the first preservation enterprise in the United States. Mount Vernon, George Washington's homestead in the Hudson River Valley, was abandoned and in disrepair when Cunningham decided to advocate for its preservation. The farmhouse was preserved for its historical significance. It was in that vernacular stone house that George Washington lived during the Revolutionary War. Cunningham and her companions raised funds to purchase Mount Vernon, making up the first grassroots effort to protect a historic site.

Mount Vernon Ladies and other similar associations preserved buildings and sites related to the history and life of famous white men. Later, those buildings became the image of the national architectural heritage.² A second landmark in the history of architectural preservation in the United States is the restoration of Colonial Williamsburg (started in 1926), considered the country's most iconic preservation initiative. A significant event that established what was possible in historic preservation in the United States, dictating the aesthetics and methodology of architectural restoration, and legitimizing corporate organization's role in the field.³

The centrality of the Thirteen Colonies was not limited to architecture and other cultural manifestations. Considered by many as the United States' initial territory, the region was defined initially by two frontiers: the European Atlantic frontier to the east and the wild lands to the west. Starting in the late eighteenth century, the United States slowly and steadily tried to push its boundaries and conquer the western frontier.⁴

WILDERNESS AND THE SUBLIME TERRITORY

The westward expansion became a necessity for U.S. Americans as part of its process of evolution, of developing a U.S. American environment by disseminating the European germ throughout the continent. From the Appalachian to the Rocky Mountains and then to the Pacific Ocean. The United States shaped its current political geography by battling the Indigenous peoples, enslaving Africans, fighting the Mexicans, purchasing land, expanding the territory, crossing the continent, and colonizing the natural environment they called the wilderness. The national discourse held the Indigenous groups as simple, primitive people in a dialectic relationship with the complex Europeans. Native Americans were considered savages, a threat, and a danger to the colonists.

In *The Significance of the Frontier in American History* (1893), Frederick Jackson Turner states that the conquest of the frontier—its expansion to the west—makes up the first period of American history. Advancing the frontier and moving westward to reach the Pacific Ocean also meant reducing dependence on England, representing an enormous act of nationalism.⁵ By doing so, the United States became more American, and less European.

The wilderness masters the colonist. It finds him a European in dress, industries, tools, modes of travel, and thought. It takes him from the railroad car and puts him in the birch canoe. It strips off the garments of civilization, and arrays him in the hunting shirt and the moccasin. It puts him in the log cabin of the Cherokee and the Iroquois, and runs an Indian palisade around him . . . In short, at the frontier the environment is at first too strong for the man.⁶

Dialectically, alongside wilderness and nature, there is always an idea of civilization, a tension between the country and the city. William Cronon (1996) highlights several interpretations of nature and wilderness: moving from a dangerous, threatening place to a sublime, pristine landscape.⁷ The National Parks became the physical representation of the latter concept, the place one can encounter the wilderness at the cost of expropriating particular parts of the land, usually created on Native American reservations lands. The naming of natural elements, such as mountain ranges and valleys, also reflects this wilderness-civilization relationship.

One could also argue that, given the status of more-or-less pristine landscapes and of national parks among much of the American public, the Arapaho names applied to the various mountains connote a kind of "sacral" status assigned to those areas, and that the "exotic" Indian names have even contributed to the evolution of such a status among some of the contemporary public. The mountains have thus become, for a second time, a site linked to the past, the exotic, and the "Other," as they were for the Arapaho as well.⁸

During the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, claiming the western frontier was considered a right of the U.S. Americans. Conquering the wilderness was understood as an act of modernization and social evolution. Facing and overcoming the frontier forced the complex society to confront the wild, sublime, and daunting nature. This process also shaped the idea of the United States as a nation of composite nationality.⁹ The western frontier and the sublime landscape became powerful national symbols, and the wilderness became a sacred concept. Underwritten by the government, manifest destiny drove many people westward, following the myth of the frontier and expanding the country.

U.S. American expansionism was also triggered by a republican desire to augment the national territory and reach the Pacific coast, fulfilling old, colonial aspirations. Disguised as an Anglo-Saxon expansionist mission, manifest destiny was the perfect argument for bringing people and joining forces to expand the territory under a nationalist narrative, creating a new imperial power over a large tract of land. A strong and vast republic, with a growing population, bountiful and

beautiful natural resources, and a strong emerging economy able to negotiate with Europe and Asia from ports located on its own territory.¹⁰

Once that western frontier disappeared, U.S. American leaders started engaging with wilderness conservation activities and creating the national parks. Over time, the notion of the wilderness changed from the original garden to the frontier, the bold landscape, and into the sacred sublime—all of those images becoming a part of the national identity construction in the United States. Initially, the wilderness was something to be conquered, colonized; then, it changed into a commodity, a place where one would escape, or the place of recreation for wealthy tourists.¹¹

Reaching the western border and overcoming the old colonial frontier triggered the desire to protect the wild landscapes, protection, and permanence walking side by side. The initial landscape preservation endeavors in the United States focused on removing any trace of Indigenous communities from those areas, and creating an uninhabited wilderness. The National Parks became the physical representation of the sublime and pristine landscape in the United States; a place one can encounter the wilderness at the cost of enclosing land and dispossession, usually created on Native Americans' lands.¹²

PROTECTING THE UNITED STATES NATIONAL PARKS

The U.S. government, as a preservation agent, engaged in conserving the nation's natural features, especially in the western hinterlands. Known for its waterfalls, Yosemite became the nation's first State Park in 1864. A few years later, in 1872, the United States created what would be the world's first national park: Yellowstone National Park, comprised of lands in three different states. Moving west, conquering and grabbing land, and creating the national parks were essential parts of defining national identity in the United States, and strengthening the feeling of patriotism.

In 1906, the federal government passed the Antiquities Act, allowing the president to designate historic landmarks, structures, and objects in federal lands—thus, establishing the first national preservation legislation. Ten years later, the United States Department of Interior would create the National Park Service with the goal of establishing “an apparatus to handle sites too large for private protection or preservation.”¹³

This move created a national parks system, still without a central management office. Given the rising interest in the national parks, the Department of Interior commended the creation of a dedicated bureau for them. The idea began taking shape in 1911 with an unsuccessful bill and regained strength after the “See America First” campaign beginning in 1914.¹⁴ Establishing a National Park Service formalized a practice that had started forty years before. Little by little, every corner of the United States West had a national park, a constructed wilderness landscape to call their own. The federal government could publicize a national asset as a magnificent must-see natural site, reinforcing the mythology of the United States as nature's nation, and displaying the country's magnificence.¹⁵

As mentioned above, the Antiquities Act of 1906 gave the United States presidents the right to designate national monuments. When the National Park Service was created, there were eighteen national monuments and twelve national parks (Figure 1). Celebrating national parks and monuments in the western corner of the country was an apparent move to ratify those lands as part of the national territory. By doing so, the United States integrated the West into its national identity, calming the identity anxiety around the influx of Eastern and Southern Europeans at the turn of the century and creating a temporary solution to the North/South divide.



Figure 1: Location of National Parks (in black) and National Monuments (in gray) in the continental United States, established until 1916. At that time, there were other two national parks in Hawaii. Source: GoogleMaps 2022.

Established on August 25, 1916, by the Organic Act, the National Park Service was seen not only as the management bureau for parks and national monuments but was also a tool for educating the population on the values of those sites, as well as a tool for preserving them. The National Park Service is responsible for protecting one of the United States greatest assets. Along with the *See America First* campaign, the National Park Service forged the idea of the national parks as the quintessential American landscape and symbol of this country's character.¹⁶ This sentiment of recognition and belonging is still a part of present-day U.S. Americans' identity.

A third architectural preservation milestone following the Mount Vernon Ladies Association led by amateur preservationists and the restoration of Colonial Williamsburg, backed by trained professionals, is the Historic American Building Survey (HABS, created in 1933). The survey was the first federal initiative aiming at the preservation of Indigenous cultures, along with the country's natural resources and architectural heritage. HABS was an attempt to expand the National Park Service's actions of "preserving naturalistic western landscapes to include the cultural heritage of the east."¹⁷ The allure for a Colonial Revival architectural style grew with the independence centennial exhibitions. Sixty years after the celebrations, it seemed that the United States had finally overcome the manifest destiny call and decided to reclaim its colonial past.

BRAZIL

The arrival of the Portuguese court to Brazil in 1808 has traditionally been considered as the starting point for the former colony's modernization process. Modernization and development in the early nineteenth-century Brazil meant to civilize the land, transforming the country based on European standards. The presence of the Portuguese (1808-1822) and Imperial (1822-1889) courts in

Brazil allowed for the importation of cultural institutions, the creation of the first colleges,¹⁸ and several museums,¹⁹ institutes, and societies.

The nineteenth century also saw the emergence of historical and geographical institutes to build the past and systematize an official history. Emperor Pedro II and the Sociedade Auxiliadora da Indústria Nacional created the Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro (IHGB, the Brazilian Historic and Geographic Institute) in 1838.²⁰ The mission of the Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro is defined in the first article of its statute, which reads:

To collect, systematize, publish or to archive the necessary documents for the Brazilian History and Geography, to promote the knowledge of these two branches of science [...] to consolidate itself in the provinces of the Empire, in order to facilitate the proposed objectives; and to publish the *Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro*.²¹

The Sociedade Auxiliadora da Indústria Nacional intended to modernize the industry and develop the country under a capitalist, for-profit lens. It was tied to the imperial government and had a highly political agenda. IHGB focuses on producing symbolic representations and enjoying relative autonomy from the emperor. IHGB's project was to reconstruct Brazilian history based on a modern perspective. In her study of three scientific associations, Lilia Moritz Schwarcz (1989) states that Brazil's historical and geographical institutes selected moments in early Brazilian colonial history to establish a more substantial unifying project for the nation.²²

By the very end of the nineteenth century, Brazil abolished slavery (in 1888), became a republic (in 1889), and started encouraging people from other nations to immigrate to work in the plantations. As a republic, the country needed to revisit its values and identity; it was a time to create a new myth of foundation, redefining its image for national and international audiences.

A STYLE FOR THE NATION

In the late 1800s, studies in biology and health-related sciences had a high impact on the humanities, giving rise to a wide range of utopian urbanism theories, and leading the way to urban reform proposals and city beautification plans. In its interest to modernize, Latin America continued to perpetuate a colonial dynamic—this time, under cultural and scientific lenses—becoming the place for experimentation of European sanitarian and eugenic theories.²³

Brazil was no different. In the early 1900s, Oswaldo Cruz,²⁴ Brazil's most illustrious sanitary physician, and head of the Instituto Soroterápico Federal,²⁵ battled to vaccinate the poor and densified central region of Rio de Janeiro. In the first quarter of the twentieth-century, sanitation and city beautification plans dictated local and national politics in Brazil. Urban reformation plans served as the state's instrument for embellishing the cities—following a European idea of beauty, fighting physical and social diseases, eliminating viruses, expelling poverty, and whitening the population.²⁶

The country was at a time of social, urban, and political change amidst an age of cultural effervescence. The newfound republican values and social patterns stimulated the search for a national identity. Compare the selectivity of republican values in each country: the celebration of the founding fathers' memory and private associations advocating for architectural preservation in the United States, and the search for modernization and progress fostered by the States in Brazil. In architecture, the critique of the vast number of eclectic and revivalist buildings resulted in a new style: the neocolonial. The demolition of Morro do Castelo in Rio de Janeiro—the original site of the sixteenth century colonial town—in 1920 led the way for the 1922 Centennial Exhibition site with neocolonial buildings and, later, the Estado Novo's ministerial esplanade.²⁷ The neocolonial was also the style chosen for Brazilian pavilions at world fairs.

In the 1920s, intellectuals worried about the irreparable loss of colonial buildings and historical monuments, defending a preservation policy for urban areas. Parallel to that, José Mariano Filho—director of the Escola Nacional de Belas Artes—and Ricardo Severo, leaders of the neocolonial movement, defended Brazilian colonial art as the manifestation of the country's tradition.²⁸ Two groups fought to define architectural modernity in 1920s Brazil: the conservative modernists—represented by José Mariano Filho—and the vanguard ones led by Lucio Costa.²⁹ The latter group won this battle, defining the Brazilian modern style adopted by the front line of the government of President Getulio Vargas (in office from 1930-1945³⁰ and 1951-1954).

MEMORIALIZATION AND NATIONAL HERITAGE IN BRAZIL

The history of preservation in Brazil is usually constructed over a *rhetoric of loss* (loss due to decay or urban reform razing) and of legally protecting buildings, monuments, and collections.³¹ In 1923, fearing the loss of old buildings and monuments, José Mariano Filho proposed the creation of the *Inspetoria dos Monumentos Históricos dos Estados Unidos do Brasil* (the National Historical Monuments Inspectorate).³² Although not fully implemented, this project influenced the formation of regional offices of the *Inspetoria Nacional de Monumentos Históricos* in Minas Gerais (1926), in Bahia (1927), and in Pernambuco (1928).³³ It took a while for the Brazilian government to rethink Mariano Filho's proposition for an *Inspetoria Nacional*, which only became a reality during the Vargas regime in 1934.

The *Inspetoria Nacional de Monumentos Históricos* was closed down for political reasons and power disputes. Its works were limited to preservation actions in the city of Ouro Preto, which was nominated as a national monument in 1933. A second standing initiative was the creation of the *Museu Histórico Nacional*, directed by Gustavo Barroso. In 1937, the *Inspetoria Nacional* was replaced by the *Serviço do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional* (SPHAN). The creation of the SPHAN resulted from preoccupations with the loss of several colonial buildings and monuments, the need to legally protect the monuments, and the urge to create a narrative for the country's national image and identity through its artistic manifestations and historical events. It was also the result of a decade of internal debate on what should be considered Brazilian heritage: even by its connection with the Brazilian history or by having an exceptional national value of archaeological, ethnographic, bibliographic, or artistic representations.

The *Serviço do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional* was created through the *Decreto-Lei nº 25/1937*, which defined Brazilian historical and artistic heritage, established the national policy, and determined the way to protect it. The *Decreto-Lei nº 25/1937* established guidelines for safeguarding the national heritage and defined the legal protection instrument. Once listed, a cultural asset is legally protected in Brazil. The majority of the first Brazilian landmarks, listed in 1938, were colonial buildings from the sixteenth, the seventeenth, and the eighteenth centuries, from Minas Gerais, Bahia, and Pernambuco—coinciding with the provinces that once housed an *Inspetoria Nacional de Monumentos*. Of the 329 listings (see Table 1), 102 objects are located in the State of Rio de Janeiro (of which 88 of them in the capital city of Rio de Janeiro), 63 in Minas Gerais, 58 in Bahia, and 45 in the State of Pernambuco. This movement sanctified Baroque religious architecture as the first genuinely Brazilian cultural manifestation.

Heritage classification – 1938	Total
Cultural object (movable and fixed)	8
Collections	13
Natural heritage	2
Architectural ensemble	15
Rural ensemble	3
Urban ensemble	7
Building	91
Building and [its] collections	167
Urban equipment or infrastructure	13
Historic garden	3
Ruin	7

Table 1: Breakdown of national listings in Brazil, in 1938, by classification category (the type of legal protection). Source: Brasil 2015.

In the initial years, the Serviço do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional focused its action on cataloging Brazilian patrimony, with Lucio Costa as a fundamental stakeholder in this process. Costa dedicated most of his career to the SPHAN as the director of the *Divisão de Estudos e Tombamentos* from 1937 until his retirement in 1972. As part of his work as a consultant for the Serviço Nacional do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional, Costa traveled the country on survey expeditions, wrote several listing proposals, and defined restoration projects.

Disciple of José Mariano Filho at the Escola Nacional de Belas Artes, Lucio Costa's career was initially shaped under the neocolonial style. It was Mariano Filho who introduced Costa to traditional Brazilian architecture. Over time, Costa developed a more critical approach to the idea of tradition in architecture, took upon colonial architecture as the traditional Brazilian architecture, and created the narrative that, in Brazil, tradition and modernity walked side by side. Costa, however, was not the only modern architect involved with Brazilian heritage; every person working at SPHAN in its earliest years was a modernist—either an architect, an artist, or a writer. As part of his work as a consultant for the Serviço Nacional do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional, Costa and his team traveled the country extensively to build up the first national historic heritage survey catalog, wrote several listing proposals, and defined restoration projects. The modernist (re)shaped Brazil's past by defining what should be protected.

In Brazil, the government instated in 1930, deposing the first republican project, worked hard to recreate the country's image, and establish it on modern values. Architecture was in this battle's foreground and the means to tell a carefully curated version of the country's past. The country became a nation where modernity walked side-by-side with tradition, where the new republic celebrated its colonial past. The Federal State adopted modernist aesthetics for its new buildings, while some modernist architects nominated and listed national heritage objects and sites.

CONCLUSION

Two different narratives speak to the United States' identity: the Thirteen Colonies' past and the western hinterlands—constructed by private and public initiatives. We can translate these narratives as the landscape of New England and the wilderness. In the United States, the initial preservation endeavors were led

by private associations intended to safekeep places connected with the men considered to have founded the country. The first federal preservation initiatives were the demarcation and enclosure of the lands in the west of the country, creating national parks open to the public. The preservation movement arrived at the federal institutions a few decades later and had much to do with national and state legislation over land use.

The National Parks Service consolidated a myth of wilderness, a pristine nature that has never existed—there was never an untouched nature in the terms shown in and by the parks. Tailored under the notion of the sublime, the places of monumental natural spectacles, these magnificent parcels of enclosed land followed the dispossession of numerous Indigenous groups. Over one-hundred years later, US Americans still consider the national parks as one of the United States' most remarkable assets, and a national character-defining feature.

In the history of U.S. American national parks, the Indigenous peoples were not the only ethnic group erased from the landscape or left out of the official narrative. Initially, African Americans were intentionally excluded from the targeted demography of visitors to the national parks. In addition to the costly train rides to their location, hotels and campsites within national parks would host only white individuals. In Jim Crow's United States, hotels for the Black population existed only outside the parks' limits. Aside from the erasure of the presence of Indigenous peoples in the national parks, those places were targeted only to a specific demographic of U.S. Americans: white, middle- and upper-class people—the only ones with the right to access the national sublime, sacred landscape and enjoy it.³⁴

A similar process happened in Brazil. Eager to define and articulate its own identity, Brazil sought to deploy an art that would express its true characteristics, defining what were its national values and heritage during the early twentieth-century. The federal government created a national narrative of a modern country with deep roots in its past—as long as that past was Baroque and colonial. Backed by the government, modern architects managed to reach this goal by developing a local idiom influenced by artistic avant-gardes but rooted in traditional characteristics and local materials.³⁵

Modern architecture in Brazil became a translation of the new-established Brazilian national identity: bold and monumental buildings with new materials, displaying a new image. On top of that, the modernists achieved another goal: reinventing the Brazilian past by advocating for what should be considered the Brazilian heritage. Architecturally, that meant not being a copy of older styles—and, with this, the modern architects managed to demote the neocolonial and eclectic architecture, leaving them out of the national heritage pantheon in the years that followed the creation of the national heritage agency. Nevertheless, the buildings and places listed as a national heritage in Brazil received said title due to artistic expression or being related to prominent, historic people only. There is no mention of the people involved with their construction, nor how and who went about those places.

Brazilian history has been told from the arrival of the Portuguese to the American territory. This historical landmark is also present in the creation of two narratives of the Brazilian past: the institutional memorialization of the empire defended and propagated by the Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro and the celebration of the colonial past by the Serviço do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional. The initial listings followed the old architectural tradition of some states that had already identified, cataloged, and protected a series of historical objects. It was a way of officially ignoring the architecture of the nineteenth-century monarchies and beginning to tell a new story. Both memorialization processes celebrated the deeds and cultural achievements of white European people, leaving

African and Indigenous populations outside the official heritage/history narrative for decades, becoming recognized as elements of the country's construction only in the year 2000.

Both Brazil and the United States found a way of translating their republican national identity into representations of the built environment. On the one hand: the transformation of a natural landscape into public parks and the creation of a stylistic idiom suited the landscape and matched a conservative audience. On the other: the celebration of historic buildings and old towns that represented the most genuine expression of the past, in contrast to the new modern architecture promoted by a popular yet authoritarian government.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Fernando Lara and Mirka Benes for their feedback on early drafts of this paper, and my anonymous reviewer at the first version of this text. I would also like to thank the participants at the “[Post]Colonial Narratives” panel for the amazing conversation.

ENDNOTES

- 1 This is the original name of the Brazilian heritage institution. Currently, it is called Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional (IPHAN, Institute for the National Artistic and Historic Heritage).
- 2 Mason and Page, 2004, p.113.
- 3 For a detailed chronological account on the history of preservation in the United States, see Hosmer, 1965; 1981.
- 4 Mason and Page, *op cit.*; Schuyler, 2012; Hietala, 1985; Joy, 2014.
- 5 Turner, 1993.
- 6 Turner, *op cit.*, p. 61.
- 7 Cronon, 1996.
- 8 Cowell, 2004, p. 31.
- 9 Turner's composite nationality is made of white people only, resulting from various European immigration, starting from the British in the early 1600s. The Indigenous peoples only appear as *Indians*, as the savages, as a danger. There is no reference to African descendants being part of this country—the only references to them are when Turner uses the terms *slaves* or *slavery*. (Turner *op cit.*)
- 10 Vevier, 1960; Merk, 1963; Hietala, 1985; Johannsen, Haynes, and Morris, 1997; Joy *op cit.*; Cardinal-Pett ,2016.
- 11 Cronon *op cit.*; Spence, 1999.
- 12 Runte, 1987; Shaffer *op cit.*; Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014.
- 13 Tyler, Ligibel, and Tyler, 2009, p. 32.
- 14 Shaffer, 2001, pp. 95-97. See America First was an initiative by the Department of Interior focused on domestic tourism and based on showing idyllic images—photographs and motion films—of the national parks. The successful campaign was one of the critical elements advocating for establishing a separate bureau to manage the parks.
- 15 Carr 1998; Murtagh 1997; Runte *op cit.*; Shaffer *op cit.*
- 16 Shaffer *ibid.*
- 17 Historic American Buildings Survey *et al.*, 2008, p. 1.
- 18 Namely, the School of Medicine in Rio de Janeiro and Salvador (both founded in 1808) and the Law School of São Paulo and Olinda (both from 1827).
- 19 Museological organization in Brazil was triggered by a project of modernity, which had its origins at the end of the eighteenth-century, with the first natural history collections and botanical gardens, such as the Casa dos Pássaros (Rio de Janeiro, 1784), and the Horto D'el Rei (Olinda, 1798). The transfer of the Portuguese royal court to Brazil in 1808 was a milestone for museum imagination in the country, articulating a narrative of historical and ethnographic collections in three-dimensional spaces. (Chagas 2009).
- 20 The Sociedade Auxiliadora da Indústria Nacional (1820-1904) was a society tied to the agricultural elites, the rise of industry (initially, textile and ceramic plants), and the strengthening of commerce. (Wehling, 1989)
- 21 Cited in Wehling *op cit.*, p. 88. Note the importance given by the Institute to archival documents. Translations are mine unless otherwise noted.
- 22 Schwarcz, 1989, p. 41.
- 23 López-Durán, 2018.
- 24 Brazilian physician Oswaldo Cruz studied bacteriology at the Pasteur Institute, Paris. As head of the Instituto Soroterápico Federal (established in 1900), he was responsible for eradicating yellow fever and bubonic plague from Rio de Janeiro. The Institute lost its autonomy after the *Revolução de 1930* (see note 30).

- 25 Founded in 1900 to study, develop, and produce vaccines and sera to treat smallpox, malaria, and the plague. The Instituto Soroterápico Federal (Federal Serotherapeutic Institute) soon had scientists exploring the Brazilian backlands, researching tropical diseases, their causes, and ways to cure them.
- 26 For an anthropological study of early twentieth-century urban reforms in Rio de Janeiro and their impact on the lives of people living in poor, central areas, see Leu, 2020.
- 27 López-Durán, 2018.
- 28 Cantarelli, 2016.
- 29 López-Durán *op cit*.
- 30 The *Revolução de 1930* inaugurated the New Republic in Brazil. As one of the leaders of this revolution. Getulio Vargas was nominated head of this provisional government until the 1934 Constitutional Assembly declared him President. In 1937, intending to perpetuate his rule, Vargas instituted the Estado Novo, a semi-totalitarian dictatorship that ended in 1945.
- 31 Gonçalves, 1996.
- 32 Based on the French legislation of 1887, the creation of the Inspetoria dos Monumentos Históricos dos Estados Unidos do Brasil, proposed in Congress by Luís Cedro, aimed for the protection of the national historical monuments (Malhano 2002, 81 apud Cantarelli *op. cit.*, 29).
- 33 Gonçalves, 2007, pp. 26-27.
- 34 Shaffer *op cit*.
- 35 Cotrim, Aguiar and Lara, 2018.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, B. R. 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London; New York: Verso.
- Brasil, Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional. *Lista de Bens Tombados e Processos de Tombamento em Andamento*, updated in December, 2015. Available at <http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/ckfinder/arquivos/Lista%20Bens%20Tombados%20por%20Estado.pdf>
- Cantarelli, R. 2016. *Contra a conspiração da ignorância com a maldade: inspetoria de monumentos de Pernambuco*. Recife: Fundação Joaquim Nabuco, Editora Massangana.
- Cardinal-Pett, C. 2016. *A History of Architecture and Urbanism in the Americas*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Carr, E. 1998. *Wilderness by Design: Landscape Architecture and the National Park Service*. Lincoln, Neb: University of Nebraska Press.
- Chagas, M. S. 2009. *Imaginação Museal: Museu, Memória e Poder em Gustavo Barroso, Gilberto Freyre e Darcy Ribeiro*. Rio de Janeiro: MinC/IBRAM.
- Chagas, M. S., and Santos, M. S. 2002. "A vida social e política dos objetos de um museu." *Anais do Museu Histórico Nacional* 4: 195–220.
- Cotrim, M., Lara, F. L., Aguiar, B. C. "Architecture and the Public Sector: Image as Narrative in Brazilian Architecture." *Bitácora arquitetura* No. 38, 2018, 92-103.
- Cowell, A. 2004. "Arapaho Placenames in Colorado: Indigenous Mapping, White Remaking." *Names* 52 (1): 21–41.
- Cronon, W. 1996. "The Trouble with Wilderness: Or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature." *Environmental History* 1 (1): 7–28.
- Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne. 2014. *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Gonçalves, C. S. 2007. *Restauração arquitetônica: a experiência do SPHAN em São Paulo, 1937-1975*. São Paulo, SP, Brasil: Annablume.
- Gonçalves, J. R. S. 1996. *A retórica da perda: os discursos do patrimônio cultural no Brasil. Risco original*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora UFRJ.
- Hietala, T. R. 1985. *Manifest Design: Anxious Aggrandizement in Late Jacksonian America*. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press.
- Historic American Buildings Survey, et al. 2008. *American place: the Historic American Buildings Survey at seventy-five years*. Washington, D.C.: Historic American Buildings Survey.
- Hosmer, C. B. 1965. *Presence of the Past: A History of the Preservation Movement in the United States before Williamsburg*. New York: Putnam.
- Hosmer, C. B. 1981. *Preservation Comes of Age: From Williamsburg to the National Trust, 1926-1949*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Johannsen, R. W., Haynes, S. W., and Morris, C. 1997. *Manifest Destiny and Empire: American Antebellum Expansionism. The Walter Prescott Webb Memorial Lectures 31*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.
- Joy, M. S. 2013. *American Expansionism, 1783-1860: A Manifest Destiny? Seminar Studies in History*. London: Routledge.
- Lara, F. L. 2022. "One Step Back, Two Steps Forward: The Maneuvering of Brazilian Avant-Garde," *Journal of Architectural Education*, 55(4): 211-219.

- Lara, F. L., and Carranza, L. E. 2015. *Modern Architecture in Latin America: Art, Technology, and Utopia*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Leu, L. 2020. *Defiant Geographies: Race and Urban Space in 1920s Rio de Janeiro*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Lindgren, J. M. 2004. "A Spirit That Fires the Imagination": Historic Preservation and Cultural Regeneration in Virginia and New England, 1850-1950." In *Giving Preservation a History: Histories of Historic Preservation in the United States*, by Randall Mason and Randall Mason, 107-129. New York: Routledge.
- López-Durán, F. 2018. *Eugenics in the Garden: Transatlantic Architecture and the Crafting of Modernity*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Malhano, C. E. S. M. B. 2002. *Da materialização à Legitimação do passado: a monumentalidade como metáfora do Estado. 1920-1945*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Lucerna.
- Mariano Filho, José. 1923. "Os dez mandamentos do estilo neocolonial – aos jovens arquitetos," *Arquitetura no Brasil*, n. 21
- Mason, Randall, and Max Page. 2004. *Giving Preservation a History: Histories of Historic Preservation in the United States*. New York: Routledge.
- Merk, F. 1963. *Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History: A Reinterpretation*. New York: Knopf.
- Murtagh, W. J. 1997. *Keeping Time: The History and Theory of Preservation in America*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Piccarolo, G. 2020. *Architecture as Civil Commitment: Lucio Costa's Modernist Project for Brazil*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Quezado Deckker, Z. 2001. *Brazil Built: The Architecture of the Modern Movement in Brazil*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Runte, A. 1987. *National Parks: The American Experience*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Schuyler, D. 2012. *Sanctified Landscape: Writers, Artists, and the Hudson River Valley, 1820-1909*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Schwarz, L. K. M. 1989. *Os Guardiões da Nossa História Oficial: Os Institutos Históricos e Geográficos Brasileiros*. São Paulo: IDESP.
- Shaffer, M. S. 2001. *See America First: tourism and national identity, 1880-1940*. Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution.
- Spence, M. D. 1999. *Dispossessing the Wilderness: Indian Removal and the Making of the National Parks*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Turner, Frederick Jackson. 1993. "The Significance of the Frontier in American History (1893)." In *History, Frontier, and Section: Three Essays*, 59–91. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Tyler, N., Ligibel, T. J., and Tyler, I. R. Tyler. 2009. *Historic Preservation: An Introduction to Its History, Principles, and Practice*. New York and London: Norton.
- Vevier, C. 1960. "American Continentalism: An Idea of Expansion, 1845-1910." *The American Historical Review* 65(2): 323-35.
- Wehling, A. 1989. *Origens do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro. Ideias filosóficas e estruturas de poder no Segundo Reinado*. Rio de Janeiro: Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro.