CHAPTER 1

Culture and Space in Iberian Anthropology

SHARON R. ROSEMAN AND SHAWN S. PARKHURST

How are people’s politics forged through attending museums or plays about the past? What are the processes through which folk material and expressive culture become essentialized as typical markers of particular nations, regions, and time periods—including in colonized spaces? How did the distinction between the geographical North and South emerge as such a key symbolic division in different parts of Europe? How did the idea of Empire impact the development of explanatory frameworks in fields such as anthropology in former colonial powers such as Portugal? How do dictatorships and other forms of authoritarian government organize ordinary citizens to transmit new cultural idioms to their counterparts? What part do irony and ambivalent nostalgia play in memory and cultural politics? How can regions and nations gradually be delineated in part through the circulation of accounts of localities? What can struggles over the control of religious sites tell us about social differentiation and politics in particular locales and regions? How do the homes of people living in political exile become part of counter-spaces created as part of the reconstitution of everyday life? How do seemingly well-defined spaces for everyday socializing such as public cafés become sites for acts of “ex-centric” political resistance?

These are the kinds of questions that drive this dynamic collection of essays. The contributors are all concerned with the role played by struggles to define the cultural meanings attached to physical spaces in the formation of people’s subjectivities. The settings for their examinations of the interplay of space, culture, and power are particular periods and geographical locations in nineteenth-, twentieth- and twenty-first-
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century Iberia. We denominate our spatial field of interest as Iberia to provide a useful intellectual disruption, to challenge our readers from the outset to question easy assumptions about combined spatial and cultural meanings, especially those inculcated by nation-state institutions.

This book takes up a number of debates that are currently at the forefront of theoretical discussions in anthropology and a number of its sister fields: how to depict and explain the workings of power in different contexts, particularly in modern states during periods of authoritarian rule and as part of global fields of influence (e.g., Verdery 1991; Wolf 2001); how to bring together examinations of meaning and of materiality (e.g., Donham 1999; Lem 1999; Maddox 1993; Trouillot 1995); and how to illustrate the impacts of people’s lived experiences of space and time in the face of critical challenges to stable mappings (e.g., Appadurai 1992; Clifford 1997; Donnan and Wilson 1999; Fernandez and Huber 2001; Gupta and Ferguson 1997; Low and Lawrence-Zúñiga 2003; Ong 1999). As with the postsocialist societies of central and eastern Europe, Iberian spaces provide an important focus for considering these sorts of questions between the late nineteenth and early twenty-first centuries (e.g., Berdahl 1999). In this ongoing historical period, the legacies of colonialism retain a grim profile; struggles for national self-determination within and beyond the borders of the Iberian Peninsula continue apace; struggles for hegemony—at times leading to war—among those with widely ranging political ideologies (e.g., monarchism, republicanism, liberalism, socialism, anarchism, communism, fascism, and neoliberalism) fluctuate in combined and uneven forms. The dictatorships of Primo de Rivera, Salazar, and Franco, as well as the periods prior to and following them, are the subject of a rich body of recent studies in various disciplinary specialties. The present collection of essays fits into this recent reengagement by providing anthropological considerations on the making of culture and space by those who lived through the last century and a half in Iberian contexts.

RESPATIALIZING ANTHROPOLOGY

Over the past few decades, geographical theory has come to have a renewed influence on anthropology and other fields (e.g., Appadurai 1988; Birdwell-Pheasant and Lawrence-Zúñiga 1999; Buchli 2002; Caldeira 2000; Christian 1972; Darby 2000; Herzfeld 1991; Redfield
Drawing on a series of rich cases that all relate to the Iberian Peninsula, the authors of this volume demonstrate that questions about space, mappings, and texts are also about social identities and power. They focus largely on the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, a period marked by a drive toward grandiose ideological conceptualizations that affected the production of ideas about modern geographical space (Lefebvre 1991 [1974]). The authors are interested in the links between this historical context and the emergence both of specific intellectual traditions, and of everyday discourses and practices. This collection thereby explores the making-of-conflicted-spaces in Portugal and Spain, and in foreign sites impacted by Iberian-origin exile or colonial settlement. The essays in this book compel readers to consider exactly how people’s political identifications have been forged through cultural struggles over the uses and meanings of physical spaces, whether these are in Barcelona, Bilbao, villages in the Alto Douro of Portugal or in Galician Spain, Malacca, the countryside lying on the edge of Ávila (the “City of the Saints”), in Spain, or Catalans’ wartime London.

All of the contributors to this book work from the premise that spatial specificity contributes enormously to our understanding of the relations between power and culture. At roughly the same time that different modalities of power were being added to the agenda of cultural analysis, the question of spatial relations was raised as one that both political-economic and more culturalist styles of anthropology had neglected while intensifying their emphasis on historical process. Geographers had begun looking at human space as highly plastic and power-laden in the 1970s, and came to have an influence on anthropologists in the 1990s. David Harvey had played a role in geography closely analogous to Eric Wolf’s in anthropology, by bringing Marxist political economy into geographical analysis and by “spatializing” Marx (Harvey 1973, 1982). Other geographers criticized Harvey’s emphasis on Marx’s model of capitalism for treating modern space as fully colonized by capital (echoing the many anthropologists who viewed various “modernized” cultures as having their own logics despite their long contact with capitalism). Geographer Edward Soja broke important conceptual ground by drawing on Michel Foucault and the Marxist Henri Lefebvre as resources for “reasserting space” in a social theory that challenged the “historical” emphasis he viewed as dominating social
thought since the late nineteenth century. Foucault had characterized the late twentieth century as “the epoch of space”: “the epoch of juxtaposition, the epoch of the side-by-side, of the dispersed” (Foucault 1986:22). Soja claimed that the postmodern capitalism of the late twentieth century revealed space to be not simply an inert context for, or reflection of, society, but rather both a “social product . . . and a shaping force (or medium) in social life” (Soja 1989:7). Other contemporary geographers, more interested in human spatial practices than in sweeping forces such as capitalism, have emphasized how cultural histories depend on spatial practices, and vice versa, with power relations always also in the mix: As Allan Pred puts it, “Through their participation in a multitude of practices and associated power relations, through their participation in a multitude of structuring processes, people make a plurality of histories and construct a plurality of human geographies” (Pred 1990:14). Feminist anthropology reevaluated how the division between “public” and “private” often encouraged stereotyped treatments of cross-cultural similarities and differences instead of probing understandings of gender, power, and subjectivity (e.g., see Lamphere 1997; Rosaldo 1980). The relative neglect of concrete space and place in much of the anthropology of the 1970s and 1980s was a likely influence on the acceptance of the public/private split within much feminist anthropology of the period. Whatever the historical reasons for the reassertion of space in social theory, this shift has taken place, as evidenced by the role geographical questions have played—sometimes implicitly—in anthropology since the early 1990s (e.g., see Rodman 1992; Rotenberg and McDonogh 1993; Tsing 1993). In this spatially sensitive anthropology, power is a conceptual lynchpin; and while it can intersect with capital, it has more than a merely economic modality.

In 1997, Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson published their co-edited *Culture, power, place*, a collection of essays (expanded from a special issue of the journal *Cultural Anthropology* published in 1992) that consolidated themes and forms of analysis focused on spatial categories and presuppositions in anthropology (also see Alonso 1994; Appadurai 1988; Marcus 1995). In the book’s first and second chapters, the editors lay out their agenda as one of evaluating how “the renewed interest in theorizing space in postmodernist and feminist theory . . . forces us to reevaluate such central analytic concepts in anthropology as that of ‘culture’ and, by extension, the idea of ‘cultural difference’” (Gupta and
Culture and Space in Iberian Anthropology

Ferguson 1997:33). Culture areas and nations had served as concepts through which space, place, and culture took on an “assumed isomorphism” that has sometimes worked to silence questions about the culture of people living on frontiers, about cultural difference within nations and localities, and about the cultural constitution of postcolonial spaces (Gupta and Ferguson 1997:34–35). Most importantly, for Gupta and Ferguson, “spaces have always been hierarchically interconnected, instead of naturally disconnected” (Gupta and Ferguson 1997:35; italics in original), meaning that established notions of cultural change as stimulated mainly through exogenous contact had to be rethought. The upshot was that while capitalism and colonialism could still be viewed as dislocating particular societies, those societies were best viewed as always already “integrated” through power: one “spatial distribution of hierarchical power relations” (ibid.:36) often became another such distribution through preestablished, but shifting, articulations. Gupta and Ferguson argued, then, that power relations must always be included in attempts to reconceptualize space (also see Lomnitz-Adler 1992; Stewart 1996; Tsing 1993).

While a new sensitivity to questions of space has worked to disarticulate culture and space as concepts, sociocultural anthropologists generally understand that power must play a role in rearticulating them. It is important to emphasize, of course, that we need to relativize power, and examine how it might actually be more significant in some contexts than others. As Marshall Sahlins has recently stressed, an old anthropological lesson worth remembering is that culture is empowering to the species as a whole, and we would be ill-advised to reduce it to hegemony (Sahlins 2004:146). That said, an important recognition of the specific force of power informs key analyses of change through time in historical anthropology (e.g., Mintz 1985; O’Brien and Roseberry 1991; Sider 1986, 2003; Wolf 1982, 2001). Often influenced by theoretical debates taking place within and between political economy, poststructuralism, postmodernism, and feminism, most of the ethnographic treatments of culture in space published in the 1990s examine power relations carefully. In his historical ethnography of Mexican regions, for example, Lomnitz-Adler argues that “the various ‘cultural spaces’ within a regional culture can be analyzed in relation to the hierarchical organization of power in space” termed a “power region” (Lomnitz-Adler 1992:22). In her evocative and groundbreaking treatment of marginality,
Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing recounts how in the Meratus mountains of Indonesia “marginality is shaped” by “state rule, the formation of regional and ethnic identities, and gender differentiation” (Tsing 1993:5). Kathleen Stewart presents the “space on the side of the road” in West Virginia coal country as “‘occupied,’ exploited, and minoritized,” even as it offers room to maneuver free of the smooth hegemonic surface of an American cultural highway built for the hurtling vehicle of bourgeois social life (Stewart 1996:3, 205). Daphne Berdahl explicates the attachment of East German villagers to the memory of the Wall that had so effectively contained and oppressed them as in part a reaction to their post-wall domination by West Germany (Berdahl 1999:229).

SPACE, CULTURE, AND POWER: EXAMPLES FROM IBERIAN ANTHROPOLOGY

The anthropology of Spain and Portugal includes in-depth treatments of the dynamics of space, culture, and power ranging from some of the classic works of the mid-twentieth century to more recent publications. James Fernandez reminded us in 1988 that, as elsewhere in the world, figurative representations of Iberian areas such as Andalusia had through “metonymic misrepresentation” (Fernandez 1988:22) come to stand as stereotyped markers for broader spaces (i.e., “Spain”) and as symbols playing off against the heterogeneity of lived practice. On a related topic and at about the same time, João de Pina-Cabral called anthropologists of “the Mediterranean” to account, asking questions such as, “Are the Algarve mountaineers more like Moroccans than like minhotos?” (Pina-Cabral 1989a:399), while inviting readers to consider that “the notion of the Mediterranean Basin as a ‘culture area’ is more useful as a means of distancing Anglo-American scholars from the populations they study than as a way of making sense of the cultural homogeneities and differences that characterize the region” (ibid:399; also see Fernandez 1983b).

As already indicated, we strategically chose the term Iberia to define this collection in order to provide a broad, challenging starting point for an exploration of space and culture in various historical moments. Most often used today as a geographic term denoting the peninsula that incorporates the mainland areas of the countries of Spain and Portugal, the concept of Iberia is linked to the Latin Hiberus or Iberus that was used to refer to the river later known as the Ebro.
The term *Iberian*, deriving from the same root, was used to refer to ancient populations that lived in a portion of what is now part of the country of Spain and the language that they spoke (Real Academia Española 1992:802; see Ruiz and Molinos 1998). In his comprehensive ethnological works on Spain, in addressing the etymological and historical basis for the idea of Iberia, Julio Caro Baroja refers to use of the designation in the writings of authors from the classical period such as Herodotus and Polybius (e.g., Caro Baroja 1991). In *Los pueblos de la península ibérica*, Caro Baroja emphasizes that he is drawing closely on Adolf Schulten’s references to classical sources in his *Fontes Hispaniae Antiquae*, although he does not agree with all of Schulten’s arguments, specifically that the river Ebro was named after the people known as the Iberos and not vice versa (Caro Baroja 1991:130–31). Reminding us that there were other rivers in that region of Europe named Hiberus and that rivers were often personified in the Classical Period, Caro Baroja also notes that, as with other cultures affected by Hellenization, Íber was a son of Hercules in Greek mythology, along with his brother Kelitis: “The Hellenization of [core] concepts is something that serves to help us understand the [idea of] Iberian culture . . .” (ibid.:131).

Caro Baroja is interested in suggestions that the Iberians, who from the sixth century BC until the first century lived in the northeastern part of the Iberian Peninsula, were not only littoral but also seafaring peoples who had traveled to Sicily and the African continent, sometimes apparently even working as mercenaries for the Greeks (ibid.:131–32; Ruiz and Molinos 1998). Of course numerous peoples occupied different areas of the peninsula through the centuries; our intention here is to briefly trace aspects of the legacy of the Iberian concept rather than provide an overview of the movements of the Carthaginians, Lusitanians, Visigoths, Muslim populations, and so on. Two very different recent treatments of the historical legacy of “the peoples of Spain” discourse include work by Carrie Douglass and Susana Narotzky. Douglass’s book is an in-depth symbolic analysis of the bullfighting cycle in Spain, in which she argues that differing, often vigorously expressed, reactions to bullfighting can signify people’s views on both “the place of ‘Spain’ in Europe” (Douglass 1997:7) and the relationship among the “many Spains” (ibid.). Narotzky (2001), in contrast, argues for a more materialist approach in which the political economy of spatial specificities are always
at the forefront of inquiry. Her critical reading of Caro Baroja’s “peoples of Spain” includes the point that his approach relies on “a tautological vision of history” (ibid:12) which allows for various essentialisms and omissions, including a minimizing of the impact of Islam in Spain (ibid.).

The later emergence of mixed populations that came to be designated as Celtiberians, and the continuing struggles over territorial control and cultural domination throughout the Iberian Peninsula, associated islands, and colonized lands led to the emergence of new terminologies deriving from the root *Hiberus*, including that of Iberoamericans (Real Academia Española 1992:802). In both Portuguese and Spanish, a link is also made between the terms *Iberia* and *Hispania* (e.g., Machado 1967:1247). Although their focus is clearly on providing what constitutes an important, rigorous synthesis of the archaeological findings relating to the Iberian populations living from the sixth century BC until Romanization, Arturo Ruiz and Manuel Molinos are careful to contextualize what they are doing by providing an initial framing discussion of the politically charged and sometimes shifting uses of both archaeological data as well as core denominations. They comment, for example, that “[p]ortrayed by some, because of their strong autochthonous tradition, as a model of ‘the Hispanic,’ or by others as the fountainhead of the various peoples of Spain, the Iberians have ranged through the history of Spain in the past century as contemporary parties to the historical debate that led to the civil war in 1936” (Ruiz and Molinos 1998:1).

The idea of shifting “Iberian” spaces relating to ancient population movements, political struggles, and texts does not of course provide us with unambiguous connotations in the early twenty-first century; however, we contend that with the term’s use, the cultural meanings of various spaces are opened up to consideration. Using Iberia, rather than solely the denominations of political states such as Spain and Portugal, or a “Hispania” always too readily conflated with “Spain,” can create a useful intellectual counterpoint to assumed meanings. By referring to Iberia, we point to the peninsula and places in the world relevant to it such as former colonies, island spaces such as the Azores and Mallorca, the locations of political exiles, and even border countries situated on the peninsula such as the Principality of Andorra (e.g., Comas d’Argemir and Pujadas 1997). The term *Iberia* can also serve to point to the ongoing dynamics of struggles for national as well as regional rights and
identities within contemporary Spain and Portugal. Indeed, a recent edition of one dictionary of the Spanish language refers to the term “iberismo,” defining it as not only relating to the “study of the history and culture of the Iberos” (Moliner 1999:1) but as sometimes used to refer to “a doctrine favouring the union of Spain and Portugal or an increased integration between these two countries” (ibid.). While we are by no means using Iberia in this explicit sense, we do hope that employing the multifaceted concept to frame this volume will highlight the constant struggles over the contours and meanings of both geographical and political mappings. One very recent example of this is of course Catalonia’s reform of its statute of autonomy in 2005 and the highly negative tone of the reactions to this proposal not only in the Spanish parliament but in the Spanish mass media, the military, the Church, and the business community, just as other stateless nations such as Galicia and Euskal Herria also work toward revised arrangements with the Spanish state. Moreover, debate in Catalonia over modifications to crucial aspects of the statute text forced by the Spanish parliament points to the continuing saliency of historical referents and the “Iberianness of the issues at stake,” “at least on the Catalan left” (DiGiacomo 2006). As Susan DiGiacomo explains, the leftist Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya party chose to recommend a “no” in the referendum (for very different reasons than those driving the right-wing Partido Popular party), having come to the conclusion that “since there was apparently no negotiating with the state, even under a government of the left, ‘l’autonomia que ens cal és la de Portugal’—the autonomy we need is the one Portugal has, a reference to 1640, when Catalans won an important battle but lost the war that resulted in Portugal regaining its status as an independent state” (ibid.). Additional good examples of similar struggles over mappings are the current debates over the future shape and direction of the European Union in the context of rejections of the new European Constitution through processes such as the referendum in France in 2005, and very public discussions about applications of countries such as Turkey to be part of the EU’s ongoing enlargement.

Anthropologists’ interventions into public and academic debates about nationalities within Spanish borders and struggles for territorial, linguistic, and other political rights have been among the most relevant contributions to the study of space and culture. Indeed, this area of inquiry has been a research focus for a number of the contributors to
this volume (for example, DiGiacomo 1986, 1999, 2001; Pi-Sunyer 1985a, 1985b, 1995; Roseman 1995, 1997; Urla 1988, 1993, 1995). The tensions between the central government of the Spanish state and the various parts of the country it has governed in recent centuries did not of course begin with the repressions of the Franco years. Some have argued that the liberal regimes of Spain’s nineteenth and early twentieth centuries did not succeed in their efforts to “forge a nation-state” (Smith and Mar-Molinero 1996:3), in contrast to developments in other Western European states such as France. In response to claims for the right to self-determination after the end of the Franco dictatorship, the 1978 Spanish Constitution allowed for the creation of Autonomous Community levels of government. In this process, the Basque Country, Catalonia, and Galicia were recognized to be “historic nations”; accordingly, these three areas, or parts of them, were the first to be granted Autonomous Community status within the new democracy. Subsequently, other regions established their own Autonomous Community jurisdictions, ranging greatly in size of territory and population as well as in the ideological and historical referents for autonomy. Today, there are seventeen Comunidades Autónomas within the Spanish polity. Despite Portugal’s smaller size, greater ethnic homogeneity, and increased political centralization relative to Spain, the country is considered by many historians, geographers, and anthropologists to harbor important regional differences and felt regional identities. One common way of discussing broad divisions within Portugal has been to focus on north/south or (related) Atlantic/Mediterranean dichotomies (e.g., Brettell 1979, 1990; Brogger and Gilmore 1997; Dias 1963, 1964; Mattoso 1991; O’Neill 1995; Ribeiro 1991 [1945]) based in climatological, ecological, topographical, economic, social, political, and religious patterns. Another way has been to focus on named subareas with “historically legitimated categories of social identity and actual sociocultural unity” (Pina-Cabral 1989b:12), such as the Minho and Trás-os-Montes in the northern part of the country, or the Algarve in the south (Bastos 1988, 1993). This work is similar to the by now classic twentieth-century ethnological works by Julio Caro Baroja; Caro Baroja is known for his close attention to the Basque Country and also for his numerous volumes charting the “peoples” who occupied various geographical regions within both Spain and Portugal through prehistoric and historic periods (e.g., Caro Baroja 1946, 1973, 1991). Since the publication of
his first overviews of Iberian space during the Franco regime in the 1940s, Caro Baroja’s method of ethnological comparison has solidified the idea of arranging discussions of cultural, social, and linguistic variation within a framework of geographical blocs. Over the many years of his writing career, he employed a range of such frameworks, including that of the “south,” “east,” “center,” “west,” and “north” of the peninsula in “ancient times” as well as what he termed in the 1940s “the contemporary regions” such as: “the provinces of Vascongada and Navarra” to “the central meseta: Old Castille and the ancient Castilianized provinces of the Reign of León” (Caro Baroja 1946). It was authors such as Caro Baroja who laid the groundwork for the continued discussions over the last several decades not only of the “lusitano” connection between Galicia and Portugal but distinctions such as the “área atlántica” (the Atlantic area), the “área pirenaica” (the area of the Pyrenees), the “zona central” (the central zone) and “los pueblos del sur” (the people of the south) (Caro Baroja 1991). As Rodríguez Campos (2002a) has emphasized, the Mediterranean/Atlantic distinction became important ideologically at the end of the nineteenth and in the first few decades of the twentieth century in the writings of prominent intellectuals such as José Ortega y Gasset (1964 [1914]), Vicente Risco (1920, 1980 [1930]), and Victoriano García Martí (1933). In many ways, the Portuguese historian Joaquim Pedro Oliveira Martins can be considered a forerunner of studies that attempted to link an overall “Iberian civilization,” conceived of as a “superorganism” (Oliveira Martins 1930 [1880]), to important regional differentiation in terms of cultural practice (Oliveira Martins 1879, 1880).

As with Spain, while much of the more recent anthropological field studies in Portugal have dealt with specific settlements (Brito 1996; O’Neill 1987; Almeida 1996), there are also older studies that deal with larger spaces such as parishes, “lands,” districts, or even entire provinces and “regions” (see Leal 2000:27–61; Medeiros 1998), as well as recent studies that focus on the same, with an emphasis on the parish level (Brettell 1986; Cutileiro 1971; Leal 1994; Pina-Cabral 1986; Silva 1998; Sobral 1999; Wall 1998). In this, the Portuguese literature has much in common with many of the classic works in the anthropology of Spain (e.g., Lisón Tolosana 1983 [1979], 1987 [1979]).

It is important to remember that much of the ethnographic work of the last several decades of the twentieth century attended closely to
the level of the “local,” whether it involved studies of rural or urban spaces. Julian Pitt-Rivers’s emphasis on the “boundaries of the community”—on the ways in which patron saints, ballads, collective nicknames, and other means of ascribing insider/outsider identities to people—in Andalusian agro-towns is echoed in many ethnographies of towns, villages, and urban neighborhoods in Portugal and Spain (e.g., Brandes 1975; Brito 1996; Cordeiro 1997; Freeman 1970; Gilmore 1987; Kavanagh 1994a, 1994b; Lisón Tolosana 1973; Maddox 1993; Pina-Cabral 1986; Press 1979; Riegelhaupt 1973; Tenorio 1982). The local importance of boundaries and borders is also highlighted in ethnographic work focusing on Iberian crossroads and intersections. Christian, for example, remarks on the “gravitation of apparitions and shrines towards boundaries” (Christian 1972:73; also see Lisón Tolosana 1979[1979]:127).

Boundedness and spatial as well as social exclusion are important concepts in studies of divided populations and the consequences of social isolation and xenophobia in urban Iberia, as Teresa San Román (1976) and her colleagues demonstrated thirty years ago in their ambitious study of social life in nucleated settlements occupied largely by Romani families [in Castilian, gitano; in English translation, Gypsy] in the greater Madrid area. Some of these settlements, such as Barrio de la Celsa situated on the highway between the towns of Villaverde and Vallecas, were characterized by the poor and makeshift quality of the dwellings known as chabolas or shacks (ibid.:38–41). Several decades later, San Román provides an important challenge to our ideas about space and sociality in her detailed analyses of the reality of the “transterritorial community” (San Román 1996:12) of Romani people with “diffused identities” (ibid.) living in Spain. In her recent theoretical volume on racism, antiracism, anti-antiracism, and “alterofobia,” she argues incisively that in the context of Spain “it took the arrival of immigrants from Africa and people’s celebration, with varying degrees of shame, of the quincentenaries for there to be a renewed preoccupation with the ‘other.’ For some anthropologists, ‘the reencountered subject,’ in my view” (San Román 1996:59). She then turns to an even more direct comment on assumptions about spatiality and (social) distance reflecting on how she has long

protested against the temerity and impertinence that was implied in calling the 500,000 Gypsies [Roma] of the Spanish state ‘an exotic
theme.’ I have repeated many times and will continue to do so: culturally, Gypsies are not much further from me and those around me than the community of “gente guapa” (pretty people) of the Mediterranean. Politically I am, clearly, much closer . . . (ibid.)

In a recent book charting the emergence of “landscapes of inequality” (Suárez-Navaz 2004:79) in the case of Senegalese and other immigrants from Africa settling in the Andalusian province of Granada, Liliana Suárez-Navaz provides an important ethnographic account rooted in “a consideration of the global political economy underlining the rebordering of the Mediterranean” (ibid.:221). She demonstrates the dialectical construction of shifting social identities in a context in which the “racialization of class relations” (ibid.:222) is occurring alongside forms of individual and collective resistance on the part of immigrants. In this penetrating examination, Suárez-Navaz analyzes how processes of “sociospatial segmentation” (ibid.:78) carried over from prior forms of socioeconomic hierarchy in rural Andalusia were recast in the 1990s, as “security and control of local spaces became the dominant idiom for reorganizing the place of immigrants in the [Alfaya] valley” (ibid.:89).

In her analysis of the Basque korrika ritual, Teresa del Valle (1994) addresses how physical borderlands can become the focus for resistance. The korrika is a relay footrace of 2,080 kilometers in length that was initiated in 1980 as a way to support the Basque language movement as well as to mark the territory of Euskal Herria on both sides of the French/Spanish border in the western Pyrenees. Del Valle demonstrates that this movement through physical space is underpinned by not just a celebration of Basque unity but also by an “atemporality” and an explicit “symbolic attempt . . . to abolish the border” (del Valle 1994:xxvii, 71; also see Douglass 1978; Fernandez 1983b; Gómez-Ibáñez 1975; González Reboredo and Fernández de Rota 1990). In their study of Andorra as a “border” country, Dolors Comas d’Argemir and Joan Josep Pujadas remind their readers that although “frontier spaces” are often considered from the outside to be spaces characterized by “transition and liminality,” “[f]or those who live on borders, these are not [like] a wall of separation but a bridge over which a community of interests is established and system for living is organized” (Comas d’Argemir and Pujadas 1997:39).

Some of the most penetrating work in the ethnographic corpus on Iberia attending to the making of culture and power through space
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deals with ongoing processes of charged boundary making and contestations over ritual and “tradition.” William Christian, for example, has produced a series of important studies demonstrating that a full understanding of Catholicism in Spain requires research into the appearance of the divine in the natural landscape and the human politics connected with such sightings (e.g., Christian 1972, 1996). Accounts of the emergence and continuity of rural shrines “often involve tension between town and landscape” (Christian 1996:302). In addition, “[t]he divine will repeatedly foils attempts by clergy and civil authorities to capture images. . . . Images return mysteriously to their place of origin; shrine building materials move at night; a half-constructed shrine collapses if it is not in the right place” (ibid.). For the contours of social relations—whether they are between laypeople and the hierarchy of the Catholic church, people from particular locales or neighborhoods, kin and neighbors of the same socioeconomic class, workers and employers, or activists in social movements and state officials—are often reinforced, parodied, or contested outright via struggles over space and culture (e.g., Brettell 1990; Cátedra 1992; Kaplan 1993; Kasmir 1996; Roseman 1996, 2003; Sanchis 1983). Manuel Delgado Ruiz makes a related argument in his book on iconoclasticism and anticlericalism in Spain, where he suggests that, in addition to the existing analyses of the political framework bearing on the anticlerical actions during the Spanish Civil War (1936–39), it is crucial to provide a detailed historical understanding of the broad social and symbolic context for violence against symbols of the sacred within Spanish Catholicism. He argues that there are important links between a pattern of violence (both verbal and physical) against non-Catholic religious communities—both within Spain and in colonized areas—and the abundance of blasphemic, iconoclastic, and anticlerical practices directed at God, the saints, and sacred locations linked to Catholicism. According to Delgado Ruiz, iconoclasticism has an ongoing relationship with iconophilism, but in moments such as the Civil War, the “very same violence that has been feeding the system” can take on “the task of annihilating it” (Delgado Ruiz 2001:173). He suggests that one of the aspects that must be considered in such an analysis relates to “a topographic logic” (ibid.:46) whereby a “willingness to erase the sacred can be observed in the painstaking action taken with regard to toponymy. Place names are, in effect, another of the strategies related to territorialization” (ibid.:48; also see Delgado Ruiz 2002, 2003).
Another key area of research on space and culture in Iberia deals with kinship, property, inheritance patterns, and house form. A portion of this literature highlights commonalities between Portugal and Spain, with multigenerational households and impartible inheritance being associated with parts of the “north” and neolocal postmarital residence, nuclear family households, and partible inheritance being associated with the “south” of the peninsula, as well as with urban areas (on this issue, see the papers in Douglass 1988). The prevalence of uxorilocality and female preferential inheritance among peasant and fishing households has been associated with male labor migration in northern coastal Portugal and coastal Galicia (e.g., Brettell 1986; Cole 1991; Lisón Tolosana 1983 [1979]), with natolocality, single mothers, and unmarried cohabitation significant among those with lower-class status (e.g., Cutileiro 1971; Dias 1963; Kelley 1991; O’Neill 1984, 1987; Parkhurst 2003; Pina-Cabral 2003). Recent research has taken up a theme prevalent in the early ethnology and folklore of the peninsula (e.g., Dias 1984 [1953]; Risco 1933) by returning to the topic of household architecture. In this new work, the commitment to incorporating historical depth into anthropology has been combined with a renewed attention to spatiality, even at the most microscopic level. Caroline Brettell, for example, has traced how the *casa* (house) of one family in Viana do Castelo (northwestern Portugal) has durably served to symbolize the integration “of a well-to-do and respected peasant family” through various generations due to its architectural design, which conditioned the “processes of consolidation and exclusion” leading to its social meaning (Brettell 1999:66). This theme is found in accounts from other parts of the peninsula, including Ruth Behar’s (1986) “archaeology of the house” in central León, Spain, wherein a system of partible inheritance may result in dwellings being “sliced down the middle” (Behar 1986:62; also see Fernandez 1990; Fernández de Rota y Monter 1984). Fernandez and Fernandez (1988:136) consider how a long-standing commitment “to accommodate all one’s descendants under one roof” in Asturias has led to two generations of the same family frequently living in high-rise buildings on separate floors, a pattern also found in other parts of the peninsula, including Catalonia and Galicia. Denise Lawrence-Zúñiga (1999) explores how formal changes in the new housing being erected in places such as Vila Branca (southern Portugal) both coincide with and serve to transform family members’ access to privacy and patterns of sociability.
In an influential ethnography of a European elite, Gary McDonogh (1986) demonstrates that one can observe the relations among the powerful families of Barcelona and between elite individuals and other city residents by attending to the design and use of the Cementiri Vell (Old Cemetery) and the Gran Teatre del Liceu (the opera house). Whereas in both the cemetery and the opera house, “class membership and boundaries are clearly demarcated” (McDonogh 1986:166), “the interaction of living Barcelonins at the opera has also made it an arena in which boundaries are crossed by acts of violence that spring from social and economic inequality” (ibid.). In one of the most important European studies of the “politics of tradition,” Richard Maddox (1993) examines how one cannot study the hegemonic uses of the past in the Andalusian town of Aracena without taking into account the intersections between everyday spaces in the town and the “complex cultural space” (Maddox 1993:8) of “El Castillo,” the latter including the archaeological remains of a fortress standing on a hilltop (monte) as well as “the monte itself, the church, and the most popular of the town’s lay religious brotherhoods” (Maddox 1993:8; for an important related study of “tradition” in Andalusia see Collier 1997). In Portugal, Kimberly Holton demonstrates how during Lisbon’s stint as Cultural Capital of Europe during 1994 the city’s half-reconstructed avenues, plazas, and performance venues exposed “the costs of modernity, the tenuousness of liberty, and the scars of underdevelopment” for the country (Holton 1998:191). Analyzing Portugal’s Expo ’98, Timothy Sieber reveals a spatial concretization of different perspectives on Portuguese history and culture. The dominant perspective—on Portuguese history as the work of home-grown “Discoverers” such as Vasco da Gama, or on “Portuguese music” as superior to an emigrant, (national) working-class, or (international) Lusophone sound—can be successfully read, argues Sieber, from “the exclusion of local immigrant communities and associations in the Expo” (Sieber 2001:574), and from the fact that “Expo’s ten performance venues for music were segregated by type of music” (Sieber 2002:170). While officialized, prestigious arts occupied raised stages, emigrant and working-class musics were relegated to lower, informal spaces (ibid.:172). 7

Iberia has served as an anthropological proving ground for the spatial analysis of gender relations. Stanley Brandes’s (1980) analysis of “metaphors of masculinity” in 1970s Andalusia provided us with key
insights into space and gender within Iberia by exploring the intense social life of men in bars (also see Driessen 1983; Gilmore 1991; McDonogh 2003), as well as how gender relations are symbolically both affirmed and reversed in the physical space of olive groves at harvest time (Brandes 1980:137–56; also see Brandes 1987). In his recent engagement with the production of “hegemonic masculinities” in Pardais, a village in Portugal’s Alentejo region, Miguel Vale de Almeida complements the Andalusian examples by reminding us that among male workers one needs to consider the “time-space of work and that of domestic life” (Almeida 1997:149), as well as the “compulsory” (ibid.) café where “drinking, smoking, talking, competing, playing and arguing—are coercive activities” (ibid.:150) that mark off a specific social time (Almeida 1996:89).

In counterpoint to Vale de Almeida’s findings, however, Joyce Riegelhaupt had earlier demonstrated that, despite formal legal restrictions focused on women and the “appearance” of women’s social subordination in the Portugal of the 1960s, women in São João das Lampas parish, near Lisbon, in fact played key political and economic roles. Their relative power resulted from these women’s prominent positioning in public space and their consequent ability to cultivate strategic cross-household and cross-community networks (Riegelhaupt 1967). A highly significant book by del Valle interprets the contested politics of space and gender in the Basque cities of Bilbao and Donostia (or San Sebastián) by recounting how the association Independent Women (Mujeres Independientes) advocates reclamation of Donostia’s urban space, partly through the substitution of place names chosen to honor aristocrats, saints, military leaders, and politicians with those commemorating the contributions of workers, non-Basque heroines such as Mother Teresa of Calcutta, and different kinds of plant life (del Valle 1997).

The anthropology of Iberian contexts has also attended extensively to movement through space and the interconnections between locales that accompany processes such as permanent and temporary migration, transhumance, pilgrimage, tourism, and the delineation of parklands (e.g., Brandes 1975; Brettell 1982, 1986, 2003a, 2003b; H. C. Buechler 1987; J-M. Buechler 1975; Buechler and Buechler 1984; Crain 1996, 1997; Douglass 1975; Freeman 1979; Frey 1998; Greenwood 1977; Klimt 1989, 2000a, 200b; Leeds 1987; Fernandez 1978; Mintz 1978; Nogués Pedregal 1996; Pi-Sunyer 1973, 1977; Rodríguez
 Campos 2002b). As Caroline Brettell has pointed out, although it was clear to herself and George Gmelch (1986) in the late 1970s that “return migration” was as important to study as emigration, the significance of “an ideology of return” was not widely recognized in anthropology at that time (Brettell 1998:81). Determining the impacts of such ideological underpinnings on demographic patterns across space and time became an integral aspect of much of the ethnographic work on Portugal and Spain (e.g., Brettell 1986; Douglass 1971; Gilmore 1980; Greenwood 1976; Hansen 1977; Harding 1984; Klimt 2000a; O’Neill 1984, 1987). Through his close comparison of life in the village of Ramosierra in the province of Soria and parish of San Martín in the capital city of Madrid, Michael Kenny’s (1966 [1961]) treatment of “rural” and “urban” spaces in Castile had demonstrated that ongoing contacts between rural and urban people as well as a regular migration of people from villages to Madrid and other cities resulted in a number of commonalities. As relevant was the existence of “two parallel channels linking town and country . . . the one set up by the official State and Church structures, the other established by patronage” (ibid.:236). However, he also identified some important points for drawing both contrasts and comparisons such as the following: “The sense of coexistence—strong in the village parish, weak in the city parish—has a permanent static quality. It is based on a constant, territorial relationship. The sense of loyalty, on the other hand, is based on a variable, social relationship and is an abstract sentiment” (ibid.: 235). Kenny’s astute observations on the complexity of urban and rural spatiality are also paralleled in studies such as Ignasi Terradas Saborit’s (1979, 1987) historical anthropology of class and culture in the industrial colonies that operated in Catalonia in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in support of the growing textile trade. When these colonies emerge in the nineteenth century, in L’Ametlla de Merola, the subject of Terradas Saborit’s detailed illustrative case study, as in other colonies, the wider context is the link between the “de-urbanization of industry” (Terradas Saborit 1979:56) and the “privatization of public functions” (ibid.) that were not being provided by the state. In one article Terradas Saborit argues that one of the most significant aspects of the mid-nineteenth century establishment of such colonies was the fact that, although some of the workers lived full-time in these organized social spaces, many others, “and especially women and youth . . . came and went from the
outside” (Terradas Saborit 1987:78); as rural peasants from settlements in the vicinity, these workers not only practiced a multioccupational livelihood but, in Kenny’s terms, participated in more than one arrangement of both coexistence and loyalty. It was only in the 1990s that generalized anthropological paradigms had caught up to such innovations that had emerged out of empirical “area studies”; at this time the need for cautious analysis of both the cultural and socioeconomic impacts of population movements finally received due attention in the field as a whole (e.g., Clifford 1997; Ong 1999; Schiller, Basch, and Blanc-Szanton 1992). In a recent book, Holton makes an intricate argument that there has been a substantial recasting of significant spaces in Portugal, and that understanding popular aesthetic practices requires a comprehension of this shift. While during the Salazar regime the national level overshadowed all other spatial registers, in the years following the dictatorship a dialectical “glocality” has arisen as the spatial preoccupation of the epoch. There is increasing cultural concentration on promoting the identities of village, town, and city neighborhood, not as synecdoches of the nation, but as entities that bypass much national bureaucratic regulation in reaching into diasporic Portuguese communities across the globe. The spatial dialectic informs the most intimate of social practices, such as folkloric dance, a highly sensual means of cultural transmission (Holton 2006:51). Anticipating the paradigmatic shift in anthropology that led to books such as Holton’s, in his pioneering treatments of change and continuity in rural Asturias James Fernandez (e.g., 1986) had long been developing a theoretically innovative way to write about space, culture, and movement. Fernandez introduced “the notion of semantic space” (Fernandez 1986:137). This “organizes our experiences, which may be quite other, by a spatial metaphor” (ibid.). For Fernandez, experiences of movement in physical space have cultural entailments in that they can be accessed through the very “territoriality of words” (ibid.): “[I]f one wishes to become real friends with an Asturian one has to walk the paths and byways of Asturias”; at the same time, “[t]o know Asturias, one is told, is to learn the Asturian names associated with the peaks where the chamois hide or the river pools where the trout lie” (Fernandez 1986:137–38; also see Delgado Ruiz 1999 on movement and urban space).

In this collection of essays, we take up a number of these themes that have been introduced in earlier writings on Iberia. In order to
highlight them, the volume is divided into four sections: Colonial Spaces and National Identities; Fascism, Cultural Spaces, and Memory Politics; Regionality and Space; and Cultural Politics and the Global. For each of these sections, we provide a brief introduction to the theme and outline some key interconnections among the various contributions that are grouped together under it. The volume concludes with a final word (for now) from James Fernandez, where he takes up this volume’s engagement with the highly charged politics being played out in diverse Iberian cultural sites at the present time as well as in the past. In all the sections of this book, we aim to emphasize how space and culture continue to be recast in an era characterized by both global “flows” and a renewed concern with political borders. Overall, these essays on culture and space in Iberian contexts bring to the forefront the importance of anthropologists keeping in mind histories of empire, colonialism, and other forms of hegemony as well as people’s resistances to oppression, struggles for political self-determination, and formulations of new cultural strategies over time.

Notes

1. We agree with Patricia Yaeger (1996:5) that it is not sufficient to circumscribe “places” as meaningful, human-made locations that are easily distinguished from other physical spaces: “In a global economy where multiple places converge in a single space, where the space/place binary becomes porous and provisional, we need to destabilize the organicism and integrity that place-centered analysis sometimes assumes, to recognize within a transnational economy the strange effects that happen in the margins between ‘space’ and ‘place.’ ”

2. Throughout this volume, all translations into English from other languages is that of the contributors, unless otherwise indicated.

3. These include: Andalucía, Aragón, Asturias, Canarias, Cantabria, Castilla y León, Castilla-La Mancha, Cataluña, Comunidad de Madrid, Comunidad Valenciana, Extremadura, Galicia, Islas Baleares, Navarra, País Vasco, La Rioja, Región de Murcia. There are also two contested “autonomous cities” in African territories that continue to have a colonized status as Spanish enclaves: Ciudad Autónoma de Ceuta and Ciudad Autónoma de Melilla.

4. For an instructive critique of Dias (an anthropologist) and Ribeiro (a geographer), early proponents of this kind of geocultural division within Portugal, see Leal (1999).

5. Brettell, Pina-Cabral, and Wall focus on the level of the parish, largely because of the spatial organization of social life in northwestern Portugal,
commonly known as “the world of the parishes,” as opposed to the “world of the villages” found in the northeast, where Brito and O’Neill worked. Sobral also focuses on the parish, but his field site lies outside of “the world of the parishes.” Leal’s spatial focus moves between that of parish, set of parishes, and island in the Açores. While Silva and Wall are both sociologists, their work is heavily influenced by anthropological theory and method.

6. Compare with the impact that state policies can have on the creation of border “wars” between neighboring communities, over both land and sea resources (Meltzoff 1995:31). Also see Sahlins (1989) on the Catalan communities living in the borderland of the eastern Pyrenees.
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