

Resilient Heritages: The Difficult Memory of the Military Dictatorship in Brazil

MARIA LETICIA MAZZUCCHI FERREIRA¹

DARLAN DE MAMMAN MARCHI²

FEDERAL UNIVERSITY OF PELOTAS, RS, BRAZIL

leticiamazzucchi@gmail.com

darlanmarchi@gmail.com

1. In this article we discuss the patrimonialization processes of two locations linked to the last civic-military dictatorship in Brazil: Dopinha and Ilha do Presídio. Both of them refer to the state violence and terror that marked the “anos de chumbo” (“years of lead”) in the country and whose memory work, even almost six decades post the 1964 military coup, finds great difficulty in being fully performed. The article derives from an investigation carried out between the years of 2018 and 2020, respectively, in the cities of Porto Alegre and Guaíba, in the state of Rio Grande do Sul, where the two objects analyzed are located. In addition to their geographical proximity, stationed less than 20 kilometers apart, they were location sites for violent events associated with the most reactive period of the military regime established in the country in 1964. There is a record, in the former Dopinha, of it being one of the first operating clandestine centers of repression, functioning on a property located in central Porto Alegre and whose property is, to this day, in private hands. Ilha do Presídio, on the other hand, refers to the set of buildings that are part of the old complex built in 1853 to serve as a gunpowder deposit for the imperial government, which was converted into a prison in the 1950s and started to receive political prisoners from 1966 onwards, ending its activities in 1983.
2. The trajectory of these places is inscribed in a political and social context that dramatically marked the history of Brazil and whose memorial and heritage records still encounter resistance and dissonances, especially from the year 2019 onwards with the accession of Jair Bolsonaro to President of the Republic and the countless attacks that have been carried out to the memory of the sufferings and aftereffects caused by the military dic-

1 Professor at Federal University of Pelotas, Rs, Brazil.

2 Professor at Federal University of Pelotas, Rs, Brazil.

tatorship, which has driven dystopian movements that both deny the existence of crimes such as torture in the aforementioned regime and publicly call for military intervention in the country.

3. We seek to analyze the two cases – Dopinha and Ilha do Presídio – based on notions of patrimonialization processes, difficult heritage, and memory agency, with the aim of analyzing the fragility of the patrimonial device in a scenario of precariousness or near absence of memory policies related to the period in question and the resilient ways in which collectives appropriate these places, to what we consider to be performative heritage.

1. “The past as a limited resource”?

4. Defining heritage in the contemporary scenario has become an increasingly complex operation of understanding which objects, which statements, which claims it represents, which “authorized speeches” (Smith, 2011) build it, aiming to make it hegemonic, eliminating the possibility of it being dissent? In view of this plurality and diversity of uses of the past, or of the past that is brought to light by the issues of the present, more and more the debate raised by Arjun Appadurai (1981) about the past as a limited resource, governed by socially constructed rules, seems pertinent.
5. Recognizing the plural character of heritage and the impossibility of translating it into a single discursive resource also implies seeking the trajectory of this concept, even if emphasizing that it is a Western perspective and, in certain respects, Europeanizing. Even though we already have many essential analyzes on the history of heritage (Leniaud, 2002; Poulot, 2006; Choay, 1992), which allows us to understand it as one of the results (and paradox) of the French revolutionary process, it is important to highlight the statement made by Françoise Choay about a founding process of heritage, which is the advent of the historical monument that mimics intentional monuments with memorial functions. Traces of the past as elements that articulate the idea of nation become an object of preservation, nostalgia and resources for the sense of nationality, elements that define and enshrine the nineteenth century as the “patrimonial moment” (Poulot, 2006), in which the conceptual bases of conservation and restoration are defined as intervention practices in what is elected as “something to stay”, the nexus

between the past and the present, the modernity of heritage that irreversibly advances in the centuries to follow.

6. From this “heritage in stone and lime”, an expression used by Cecília Londres da Fonseca (2003) in her reflection on the concept of heritage based on its material expression, a notion that largely presided the trajectory of the heritage field in Brazil, we now move to an expansion of the concept and the object: from material to immaterial, tangible to intangible.
7. The nineteenth century brings us to a framework for defining heritage and its symbolic and ideological functions, but it is in the twentieth century that new approaches, arising from an expansion of the conceptual, historical, and social field, expand the diversity of objects covered by it, notably by the conviction that such a word, by definition, reflects our relationship to time. In this sense, the 1970s were fundamental for the constitution of a line of reflection that pointed to the non-dissociation of heritage from its social uses and meanings. The adoption of new museological paradigms discussed at the Round Table in Santiago in Chile (*Mesa redonda sobre el desarrollo y la importancia de los museos en el mundo moderno*) in 1972 introduces the theme of museum responsibility in its context, making it a potential instrument of social change (Cruz and Souza, 2020), as well as the UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, in the same year, which brought the ethical discussion of heritage as a value that transcends its origin, subject to universalizing regulatory frameworks, introducing the idea of nature in the heritage field and adopting the term cultural as a tool to indicate the inclusion of other forms of expression of the past that acquire meaning and significance within social groups (Moitinho, 2014).
8. Both events open a new horizon in which cultural manifestations, practiced and passed on within social groups, play a relevant role in understanding the uses of the past in the present. We then have the foreshadowing of what will formally be designated as intangible heritage by the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, in 2003. The category Intangible Cultural Heritage challenges the field of heritage originally founded on an “object regime” (Bortolotto, 2014; 4), and expands, through normative instruments and a new perception of the patrimonial fact, the universe of elements potentially destined to activate social references, identities, shared knowledge, living memories. Associated with

the idea of a democratization of heritage by breaking with the eurocentric logic and enabling different States, societies, groups to identify and elect their heritage elements, the ICH was also, in turn, an opening to other ways of understanding and designating heritage in contemporaneity. Thus, it is associated with heritage ideas such as the “overflow” of its formal frameworks and its regulation only by the State, to practices and forms located more within social fabrics, as pointed out by Jean-Louis Tornatore (2007).

9. It is not the object of this article to discuss the ICH and the patrimonial regime that was derived from it. We are interested in thinking of it as a wide angle from which other senses and other semantic constructions are articulated that currently place it as a polysemic concept. Other classifications appear as attempts to frame or define new ways of experiencing or even identifying heritage. We are particularly interested in those that approach the object of this article, which is the patrimonialization of places of suffering.

2. “Heritage that hurts”: patrimonialization of places of suffering

10. In the article “Heritage that hurts: Interpretation in a postmodern world”, David Uzzel and Roy Ballantyn (2007) develop the idea that emotional and affective factors, associated with individual or collective memories, actively impact the interpretation that subjects make about heritage or, more specifically, on some types of heritage, such as those that, by definition, are associated with collective suffering, for instance battlefields.
11. The action of identifying, classifying and giving visibility to collective traumatic processes that marked the XX century generated, in turn, the need to propose semantic categories that account for these traits, hence “difficult inheritances”, “uncomfortable heritages” (Prats, 2007) that act as keys, in the same composition of words to indicate inheritance and transmission accompanied by a negation: difficult, uncomfortable, unwanted for what they represent and what they can potentially bring as conflicts around memory, as can be clearly evidenced in the article presented by (2012) regarding the “patrimonial spaces of the civil war in Spain”. Also important is the discussion proposed by Sophie Wahnich about the Auschwitz concentration camp as a “negative heritage”, that is, a heritage that does not adapt

to the institutional lexicon, such as the application of the embarrassing criterion VI used by UNESCO in the process that defined the camp as a world heritage: “be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance.” (Wahnich, 2011; 49) The patrimonialization, as Wahnich states, is of the “negative that inhabits societies”, therefore destined to be declined, rejected by conscience, hence one of the fundamental reasons for remaining as faithful as possible to the horror that built it.

12. Another category that becomes operational in the two cases studied is that of “sensitive heritage”, heuristic category that allows understanding of the emotional charge in certain assets, in an association between tangible and intangible, and in circumstances in which the classificatory modalities used to define heritage do not present themselves as sufficient (ICOMOS, 2011; UNESCO, 2018). The category of sensitive heritage acts as an interpretative key in the process of registration of the small municipality of Bento Rodrigues, “an ancient settlement originated in the 17th century due to gold extraction, surrounded by mountains and located to the north of the municipality of Mariana, Minas Gerais” (Castriota, 2019) and that on November 5, 2015 was devastated by waves of mining tailings resulting from the collapse of the Fundão Dam in Mariana. The mud traveled over 600 km leaving a trail of destruction of human and animal lives, brutally impacting the environment. As stated by Leonardo Castriota, the remains of Bento Rodrigues, in the same way as can be observed in relation to other places of suffering, the criteria that determine whether something is “heritageable” or not cannot be applied without restrictions, as values such as authenticity or even exceptionality are not compatible with what was left of a bucolic landscape engulfed by mud. However, what in fact remains in Bento Rodrigues are the memories, the long-term records of individual trajectories, its location as a “site of sensitive memory” and its capacity to evoke a tragedy that could have been avoided.

13. Uncomfortable, negative, painful, difficult to see, sensitive, such heritages, however, are configured within a wide spectrum of narrative and representational forms. Heritage, understood here as public memory, is associated with what Jay Winter (2007) points out as commemorative patterns for the victims of the 20th century wars and, in the French case, the Franco-Prussian war of 1870. Nonetheless, the outbreak of the 1914 war and its destructive power reconfigured the relationship with the patrimo-

nial object, establishing the idea of a memorial landscape composed of battlefields, a landscape to which the mourning rituals brokered by communities and quickly assumed by public authorities will be added. The movement of patrimonialization of the vestiges of the war begins even before its end, which allows us to think of a paradoxical dynamic that emerges from the destruction: trenches, ruins, wreckage not fitting the definition of historical monuments, are transfigured into testimonies of suffering and destruction (Viltart, 2014; Theodosiou, 2012).

14. The forms of ritualization of memory and the constitution of a heritage associated with collective suffering were accentuated and acquired new contours and functions in the post-second world war. Populations destroyed by bombings, devastation of historical landscapes and memorials, use of weapons hitherto unknown and with enormous destructive potential, there are countless biases through which one can think of the world convulsed in 1945. However, it is the advent of the Shoah and the heritage associated with it which will become an example of what we understand as social trauma, introducing a new type of crime represented by the concept of genocide and establishing the victim-memorial regime (Michel, 2015) that allows to establish a common thread of similarities, while safeguarding the differences, between the various genocidal processes of the 20th and 21st centuries.

15. The cultural heritage in this world “among wreckage” is manifested in the search for recovering plundered and trafficked elements (works of art, documents, bibliographic collections, museum collections), establishing plans for restoration or reconstruction of destroyed historical centers (such as Dresden and Warsaw), and establishing international regulatory standards applicable to times of conflict and peace. Alongside this, other memorial searches and patrimonial demands erupt in the public scenario: that of concentration camp survivors who broker the registration, through monuments, plaques, occupations and musealizations, of places where they experienced the horror, places of suffering and death of millions of Jews, along with hundreds of thousands of other victims of Nazism. The memorial protagonism of the survivors of the camps was fundamental to the memory of the Shoah, particularly in the most important of the death camps – Auschwitz. The trajectory of the Auschwitz-Birkenau National Museum, from 1947 to the mid-1990s, reflects the systematic struggle carried out by ex-prisoners for the representation of Jewish extermination, facing the various

attempts of invisibility and memorial disputes that settled along with the patrimonial project. Auschwitz's candidacy process for world heritage makes it known, through the numerous documents that make up the dossier, the controversies and conflicts that have arisen between the heritage site and the local government (municipality of Oswiecim), as well as with the Polish government and segments of the Catholic Church.

16. The memory and heritage associated with the Shoah constitute an archetypal example of traumatic memory and inspire, through the commemorative forms associated with it, celebrations of other painful memories, making it possible to extend to other similar crimes the genocide statute defined in 1948 in the sphere of law and international justice (Chevalier, 2016).
17. In Brazil, although several actions and initiatives have been bringing the indigenous issue and the memory of slavery to the public debate through legal and cultural instruments, such as museums, there are few effective results in a nation marked by great social inequalities. With regard to the memory of the last dictatorial period and human rights transgressions, the greater are the difficulties for this memory to leave interest groups (victims, family members, intellectuals, militants) and consolidate itself as a shared memory, as we present here.
18. In Brazil, since the enactment of the 1988 Constitution, demands from organized civil society organisations have contributed to a public debate about the violence of the colonial past, which is responsible for inequality and structural racism in Brazil. These demands of the Black and indigenous movements have resulted in legal instruments of social and cultural nature, such as the recognition of indigenous and quilombola territories, quota policies for access to higher education, strengthening of identity elements such as languages and cultural manifestations through legal instruments. As an example of these cases, we have the registration of the intangible heritage of several knowledges, traditions and celebrations, as well as museums such as the Memorial of Indigenous Peoples in Brasilia, created in 1987, and the Afro-Brazil Museum founded in 2004 in São Paulo. And, more recently, in 2017, the inscription of Cais do Valongo, in Rio de Janeiro, the main port of entry and trade of enslaved people coming from Africa in the nineteenth century, on the World Heritage List.

19. However, there are few effective results in a nation marked by great social inequalities, seeing as such social and cultural policies are not given continuity by the public powers and do not materialize in improvements to the lives of these traditional populations, since today we still witness the need for the indigenous people to fight for the maintenance of their lands constantly attacked by illegal mining and agribusiness, for example, as well as the high rates of police violence against the young black population in the urban peripheries of Brazil.
20. Thus, if it has not yet been possible to constitute homogeneous memory policies regarding the colonial past, with regard to the memory of the last dictatorial period and the transgressions of human rights in the second half of the 20th century, the greater the difficulties are for this memory to emerge from the interest groups (victims, family members, intellectuals, activists) and to consolidate itself as a shared memory, as we present below.

3. The difficult memory of the last civic-military dictatorship in Brazil (1964-1985)

21. The construction of a public memory of the 1964 military coup and the implementation of a dictatorial regime that lasted more than 20 years in the country are still precarious in terms of devices such as museums, memorials, identification and protection of places associated with the crimes committed by the State, as well as the recognition of compensatory rights to those victimized by the repressive apparatus³. The establishment of some public mechanisms with the objective of breaking the silence of the State regarding the dictatorship is quite late in view of the neighboring countries of the so-called Southern Cone, but it also represented an important breakthrough given the opacity that covered (and still covers) this past and its sequelae. Such mechanisms have already been the subject of exhaustive
- 3 The Amnesty Commission was created by the Ministry of Justice in 2001, derived from the Amnesty Law that came into force in the country in 1979. The Commission's main objective is to analyze and judge the requests for recognition of the compensatory right to people who have, demonstrably, been victims of the authoritarian regime. Since 2019, this Commission has been rejecting requests and indicating the suspension of benefits for hundreds of amnestied. As announced in the media, the current president, among numerous measures of a clearly denial character in relation to the dictatorship, signals the end of this Commission in 2022.

debates and extensive academic production (Santos, 2021; Soares, Quinalha, 2011; Carneiro, 2009; Weichert, 2014), which is why we will focus on those that present, in fundamentals and prescriptions, a clear connection with the theme of memory and heritage associated with the dictatorship.

22. Since the 1990s, some actions, especially in the field of justice, have been important for the creation of a culture of memory, albeit with little capillarity in the Brazilian social fabric. In 1996, the first National Human Rights Plan was launched, which in its third edition in 2010 brought the theme of memory and truth, paving the way for the creation of the National Truth Commission (CNV) by Law 12528/2011, instituted on May 16, 2012, and in force until 2014. In the CNV's Report (2014), particularly the Conclusions and Recommendations of volume 1 refer to memory, indicating the adoption of measures, by the government, to preserve the memory of serious violations of rights occurring in the period between 1946-1988. The measures indicated in the Report aimed at the public preservation, restoration and indication of memory sites, the installation of a Memory Museum in Brasília, the removal of honors granted to individuals associated with human rights violations in the period in question, and the change of the name of public spaces that mention the processes of violence, either through proper names or events (CNV, 2014).
23. The recommendations of the CNV resonated in some sectors, such as financial reparations for those affected by the state of exception and violence that took place in the country, especially from 1964 onwards. Also in regard to scientific research, it is important to highlight the projects developed in the fields of Resistance Archeology and Forensic Archeology, interdisciplinary research that enabled the identification of clandestine places where bodies of victims of State terror were buried, as well as the reconstitution of spaces that hosted incarceration, interrogation and torture centers during the most reactive years of the last military dictatorship.
24. In the state of Rio Grande do Sul, some initiatives in the academic sphere were fundamental to the object of our research, such as the projects Dictatorship Cartographies (Cartografias da Ditadura) and Paths of Dictatorship (Caminhos da Ditadura), actions carried out between 2013 and 2014. In addition, the Memory Marks: Justice and Human Rights Movement Project (Projeto Marcas da Memória: Movimento de Justiça e Direitos Humanos - MJDH), linked to the municipal power of Porto Alegre, created

in 2016, and the Carlos de Ré Committee for Truth and Justice collective (Comitê Carlos de Ré da Verdade e da Justiça), formed in 2012, were fundamental for the demarcation of 36 sites related to repression and resistance in Porto Alegre.

25. These initiatives occurred in line with the work of the National Truth Commission in Rio Grande do Sul that listed 39 places associated with systematic torture practices of the State such as prisons, police stations and army units. Among these places we highlight the Ilha do Presídio (or Ilha das Pedras Brancas) and the Dopinha, which can be understood within the context of a structured network of places that operated in different Brazilian states and that served as the scene for certain human rights violations by security agencies and aimed at the repression of political opponents during the dictatorship in Brazil.
26. However, unlike other centers and structures of imprisonment and torture at the moments of greatest repression and closure of the regime, Dopinha and Ilha do Presídio already served these purposes of torture and repression, even in the first years of the military coup. Due to the death of Sergeant Manoel Raimundo Soares in 1966, as we will see later, these spaces gained visibility in the press, including the creation of a Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry by the Legislative Assembly of Rio Grande do Sul in 1967, which culminated with the closing of the torture center that would become known as Dopinha and the prosecution of military police officers⁴.

4. “The spirit of the place” or “the presence of absence”: Ilha do Presídio and Dopinha FEITO ACIMA

27. The two places to which this article refers, each in its own way, are located in places of considerable beauty, which contrasts with the "spirit of the place": Ilha do Presídio, or Ilha das Pedras Brancas, as it is also known, is located on the Guaíba River, and it has been linked to the municipality of Guaíba since 2012. The landscape that can be seen from the boat that takes you to the site is of great beauty due to the white stones, the exuberant

4 Legislative Assembly of Rio Grande do Sul. Report of the CPI that investigated the death of Army Sergeant Manoel Raymundo Soares. Available at: <http://www2.al.rs.gov.br/biblioteca/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=dNwh7ggKohg%3d&tabid=6492>. Acesso em 11/12/2021.

vegetation, the fauna composed mainly of migrating birds that use the trees and the ruins of the old buildings as shelter. The only sounds that populate this little “lost paradise” are the singing of birds and the noise of the boat's engine in the water.

28. The building known as Dopinha, on the other hand, is located in one of the most valued neighborhoods in the city of Porto Alegre and features architectural beauty that blends details in *art nouveau* and other styles, which characterizes the typical eclecticism of the constructions of the early 20th century. The constructive details indicate the owner's social class and, at the moment, the pastel shade with which it is covered gives an aristocratic air to the mansion.
 29. The two places would be “lovely to look at”, inert scenarios amidst the lake and the busy daily life of a city like Porto Alegre, were it not for what is revealed as phantasmagoria, a scream of horror, the “spirit of the place”: both of them hosted, during the last civic-military dictatorship, repressive operations that involved imprisonment, interrogations, torture and death.
 30. By evoking, here, the “Spirit of the place” we refer to the Québec Declaration (2008) which defines it as the “essence of life, social and spiritual” of a place, with a dynamic character, combining the tangible with the intangible. The spirit of the place in the two scenarios mentioned above is what makes them, in the heritage logic, as “negative heritage”.
 31. The buildings that make up the Ilha do Presídio are from 1857 and were designed to serve as a gunpowder deposit for military use. In the 1940s, when the warehouse was deactivated, an animal research laboratory was installed there, and in the 1950s the buildings were adapted to become a prison that accommodated minor offenders and mentally ill people considered to be disturbers of public order. After the military coup in 1964, a detention center for political prisoners was installed on the island.
 32. Its location outside the urban center and isolated in the middle of a lake, made it a favorable place for the countless abuses and violence committed by public agents against subversives, as the opposed to the regime were classified. The buildings housed units of the III Army, Military Police and the Department of Political and Social Order-DOPS⁵, a structure linked
- 5 The creation of DOPS dates back to 1924. Its active use as an agency to combat crimes of order, political and social nature appears in two moments, both of them exceptional to the democratic State: the Estado Novo (1937-1945) and the last Civic-Military

to the State Public Security Secretariat, operating from 1964 to 1982 and responsible for the police intelligence service and the violence with which it acted in an almost always clandestine manner. Between 1965 and 1973, more than one hundred political prisoners were sent to the island, the vast majority of which were young activists from student movements and clandestine organizations that resisted the dictatorship (IPHAE, 2014).

33. One episode in particular made Ilha do Presídio an emblematic place for repression in Rio Grande do Sul: the “Hands Tied Case” as the death of sergeant Manoel Raimundo Soares on March 11, 1966 became nationally known. Detained in Porto Alegre, Manoel Raimundo, political militant of the resistance, was included in the police information records as a subversive, which justified his arbitrary arrest, the torture he was subjected to for long periods and his death, in circumstances that, due to the characteristics, did not match the two causes of death commonly pointed out by the political police: suicide and resistance to arrest. Manoel Raimundo's body was found adrift in the waters of the Guaíba River with his hands tied behind his back. Although the State never formally admitted it, the conclusion later reached is that “due to the torturer's mistake”, in one of the torture sessions carried out on the boat that took him back to prison, the sergeant's body would have slipped, which justifies death by drowning. The descriptions of the terrible living conditions and the physical and psychological sufferings he was being subjected to in prison appear in the letters that, clandestinely and with the support of a network of solidarity made in prison, Manoel Raimundo manages to get to his wife. It was these letters that gave the case notoriety, since, as one of the judges responsible for judging the widow's indemnity claims, it could not be admitted “the maintenance by the State of a machine to transform love into death” (Comissão Cidadania e Direitos Humanos, 2014).

34. In addition to the “Hands Tied Case”, some other reports were added, such as that of Indio Vargas, a former prisoner who, through a literary work, describes the unhealthy and violent environment of the prison: “In winter, the intense cold dropped to zero degrees. The *Minuano* wind froze everything. The gloomy, wet dungeon made the cold even worse. The island is shaped like a gigantic whale, stranded in the middle of the Guaíba. At

Dictatorship (1964-1985).

both ends of the island there are huge stones superimposed by nature, in a work of sophisticated engineering.” (Vargas, 2005; 20)

35. The process of recording it as historic site began in 2012 by an indication made by the State Truth Commission and by the state governor at the time, Tarso Genro, which was taken for analysis and instruction at the Institute of Historical and Artistic Heritage (IPHAE), and the process was concluded in 2014. The arguments used for applying State tutelage through recording it as a historic site were based on the fact that it was “a site of undeniable historical value linked to memorable facts”, therefore, the protection of the site's integrity should be guaranteed, preventing alterations of any kind. The process emphasizes the character of a political prison, place of arbitrary violence committed by the government, and the judicial process of the “Hands Tied Case” was included, irrefutable proof of consent to the use of torture in political prisoners.
36. The recording as a historic site of the complex built, already largely in ruins in 2014, as well as the natural space of the island, including flora and fauna, could not stop the advance of the predatory action of time, nor the disregard of the public authorities with what was left as testimony of the prison and of those who left part of their lives there. In 2012, the island was ceded by the Government of the State of Rio Grande do Sul to the municipality of Guaíba, which prepared a project to rehabilitate the space aiming to provide activities associated with the Environment and Tourism. This project was the main motivation for the State Truth Commission to accelerate the recording request, preventing any changes.
37. Seven years after the end of the patrimonialization process, the island exists in a kind of oblivion and institutional abandonment, without investments that make it possible to formally qualify it as a place of memory. However, bypassing the public power and exhausting bureaucratic procedures, other projects were constituted over time as ways of requalifying the island. Immersive History classes, environmental education programs aimed at children and young people, shows such as those performed by the Theater Group “Ói nós aqui traveiz” with the play *Widows, performances on absence – Work in progress*. The performance begins on the boat that takes visitors and when they arrive, they are greeted by the figure of the character Sofia sitting on a rock. Sofia embodies the figure of the woman who lost her father, her husband and her two children, all killed by the

repressive apparatus of the dictatorship. The character moves by climbing up old chairs attached to her body, symbolizing the dead she carries with her. She leads a group of women who resist, fight for the right of knowing where the bodies of the men who disappeared or were killed by the dictatorship are.

38. The dramaturgical performance manages the memory of a space condemned to silence. It is what leads the viewer to look at the walls, the floors, to imagine a past that haunts the present. The “Widows” can be understood as the evocation of a woman, Elizabeth Chalupp Soares, the wife of Manoel Raimundo Soares, the two real characters of “a machine that transformed love into death”.

39. In the central district of the city of Porto Alegre, on Street Santo Antônio number 600, is the mansion that hosted one of the most violent clandestine structures of DOPS. As an upper-middle-class home, the house had been rented shortly after the 1964 coup under unclear circumstances, as the original owners had always argued that they were unaware of its use. Its location in the middle of a residential neighborhood and the fact that it has a strategic architectural plan, such as a side underground passage through which prisoners arrived, made it a privileged place for the functions it performed. Dopinha, a term that appears in some of the reports of former prisoners, short for DOPS, an agency that operated at the Police Palace, was part of a network of clandestine centers organized in a non-institutional way, in which investigation operations and “interrogations” were carried out under physical, psychological and, as in the “Hands Tied Case”, torture resulting in murder. Dopinha, as the operational arm of DOPS for torture, was created shortly after the 1964 coup, which places it as one of the first clandestine centers of this order in the country, and it was deactivated after the media repercussion of the “Hands Tied Case”, as recorded in the Report of the National Truth Commission (2014, vol.1; 792).

40. According to Raul Elwanger (2019), coordinator of the Carlos de Ré Committee for Truth and Justice collective:

It (Dopinha) is a very strange case, a point outside the normal curve of events. Clandestine, a mixture of military and civilian forces. Kidnappings, disappearances, torture...very mysterious. And the problem that in the period of intervener Amaral de Souza, in 1982, the DOPS archives were burned [...] they were officially burned in a public square, a photographer friend of mine was there and photographed. So Dopinha is very hidden, but it was the object of a

CPI in the Assembly⁶, because it happened before the AI5⁷. It is strange for two things: it is the only case that led to a CPI of this nature in Brazil, and it is a pioneering case, and there are assumptions that it was influenced by the French who used this system in Algeria. Generally, in these centers, people were not immediately murdered, they were there to be broken, to give information [...] So that was something kept by some crazy people here, very radicals, civilians, militaries, but it was not something army official [...] there are descriptions of people who went through there who said that the walls were smeared with blood and that there was always a lot of screaming. Everything suggests that the blood was not human and that the screams were recordings, and it was all part of this strategy of intimidation by horror and fear.

41. The process of patrimonialization and future transformation of Dopinha into the Ico Lisboa Memory Center (homage to political activist Luiz Eurico Tejera Lisboa, kidnapped and murdered in São Paulo in 1972, and clandestinely buried by the dictatorship) was initiated by the Carlos de Ré Committee in 2012, from some performances carried out by the Committee, such as *Escracho*, in which around 300 people stood in front of the mansion and, in the midst of music and speeches, the time of public memory of Dopinha was inaugurated. During the municipal administration of José Fortunatti, the opening ceremony of the mansion was held, empty and unused at the time. The moment symbolically marked the transmission of the property to the Carlos de Ré Committee to the Memory and Justice Movement, which from then on takes on the role of agent of the place's memory. As stated by Raul Elwanger (2019), from then on, administrative procedures were put in motion, in order to expropriate the building through an indemnifying action against the family who owns it, with the goal of getting its record as a historic site and for future memorial use. The Carlos de Ré collective carried out, with the permission of the owners, several memorial investment actions within the building. The expectation of the formal acquisition of the house by the public authorities lasted for more than two years, and did not obtain concrete results. Without the acquisition of the property by the State and without it being recorded as a historic site by the municipal heritage agency, the process is suspended and access to the house is vetoed by the owners, who started to live in the house.
42. In 2015, a metal sign indicating the history of the place is placed on the sidewalk in front of the building. This was an action of the project Memory Marks (*Marcas da Memória*) linked to the Amnesty Commission of

6 Parliamentary Inquiry Committee.

7 Institutional Act number 5.

the Ministry of Justice and, at the regional level, developed by the Movement for Justice and Human Rights of Rio Grande do Sul (MJDH) through an agreement with the Municipality of Porto Alegre. It had the inscriptions “First clandestine detention center in the Southern Cone. At number 600 Street Santo Antônio, a paramilitary structure operated for the kidnapping, interrogation, torture, and extermination of people ordered by the military regime in 1964. Major Luiz Carlos Menna Barreto commanded the terror practiced by 28 military, police, DOPS agents and civilians, until the body with the hands tied of Manoel Raimundo Soares, who endured 152 days of torture, including in the mansion, washed up in the Guaíba River. In 1966, with walls stained with blood, Dopinha was deactivated, and the crimes committed there went unpunished”. The plaque was repeatedly vandalized and covered with cement. At all times, there was a reaction from the collectives involved with the memory of the space, which resulted in the replacement of the plaque, the last of these episodes dating April 2021⁸.

43. In 2017, the presidency of the Special Commission on Political Deaths and Disappearances requested the National Institute of Historical and Artistic Heritage -IPHAN to make arrangements for the recording as a historic site of the property “Casarão nº 600, Street Santo Antônio, in Porto Alegre – Dopinha”, so the Memorial could be established. The process remains open.

5. Resilient heritages?

44. The two cases presented here question the consolidation (or not) of collective memory and the effectiveness of the patrimonialization processes developed by the government. In both, the central issue seems not to be exactly the operational forms of heritage, but its ability to organize the formation of a collective memory about what it seeks to represent. If we think of memory as a social fact, from the sociological perspective of Maurice Halbwachs (1925), it acts as an element of social cohesion and it is in the relationship with others that individual memory is consolidated. The references for this come from the belonging groups that provide the social frames of memory. However, if the concept of collective memory proposed

8 <https://prefeitura.poa.br/smds/noticias/placa-do-projeto-marcas-da-memoria-e-recolocada-no-antigo-dopinho>

by Halbwachs was not fully developed due to his disappearance as a victim of Nazism, the reflections left by him allowed us to think about how this memory migrates from the social to the individual and vice versa, by what mechanisms is it then transmitted, how does the capillarity of memory occur within social groups? The concept of sharing appears here as one of the keys to understanding this memorial flow, a perspective raised by anthropologist Joel Candau (2011) when thinking about levels of sharing, the metamemory being fundamental to understanding how we relate to the past through the belief that we share integrative memories of it. It is at the level of this metamemory that the claimed memories are placed, those that give meaning to the memory-identity binomial as the feeling of belonging and recognition. So, how to build collective memory or, in Candau's perspective, metamemory related to the processes of collective suffering, violence, degradation of human dignity and on which it is not evident to give meaning and formulate a narrative?

45. Although progress has been made, in regard to the necessary imposition of memory in the face of oblivion as a way of recovering the truth and enabling justice, there are always examples that call into question the ways in which memory can be reached, or better said, how to transform the act of forgetting into a narrative. In the cases presented, there are questions we must think about. One of them refers to the difficult conversion of remnants (buildings, objects, spaces) into traces, tracks, evidence. As Luba Jurgenson affirmed referring to the complex memorialization operation of the Soviet Gulags, “a trace is the product of a construction, as every trace is not yet a trace, but, on the contrary, every trace can be created where nothing remains” (Jurgenson, 2017; 131). The trace, the decodable clues, are the results of meanings constructed in a certain temporality and in a certain social, cultural, and mental context. They require memorial investment, which does not necessarily go through what we idealize as a memory policy. Traces are built by the memorial flow, by the action of sociotransmitters (Candau, 2011) in analogy to neurotransmitters that enable memory fixation, facilitate actions to identify and strengthen the trace. The ways in which a society manages to elaborate the memory of a traumatic past (Ferreira, Michelin, 2015) goes through the agency that develop collectives, social movements, political projects, commemorations, musealizations, stone inscriptions, art and so many other memorial expressions that are generated at a given moment. It is in the present and the present that dif-

ferent (and sometimes opposite and conflicting) demands for meaning from the past arise (Jelin, 2009), so understanding these dynamics is part of the process of constituting a memorial consciousness and, consequently, a broader understanding of heritage.

46. The patrimonialization of Ilha do Presídio and the “suspending and waiting regime” that involves Dopinha can be seen either as failed projects of memorialization and unfinished heritage, or, and this seems to us as a possibility to be followed, we can allow ourselves to find meaning of resilience in both spaces. The traces may be lost due to the inoperability of institutional preservation measures, but the traces are reinvented with each artistic celebration, each replacement of a plaque on the sidewalk, each symbolic presence of the dead due to transformations that bring the place to life, as are the experiences of environmental education carried out on Ilha do Presídio.
47. The notion of “negative heritage” proposed by Sophie Warnich brings us back to the constant problem of managing the past marked by suffering. How to manage the remnants of traumatic events? How to convert them into eloquent witnesses of suffering? How, based on them, to construct narratives that can establish states of empathy and identity? As Warnich (2011) states, the acts of preservation of these vestiges constitute actions to block the marks of time, to maintain as much as possible the integrity of places that affirm the existence of horror. It will be the process of instituting heritage value that becomes, therefore, a mediation, converting the traces into data capable of proposing recognition, thus completing the transmission throughout time.
48. The two cases addressed in this text are of negative heritages, officialized or not by the public authorities, the places that, according to Aleida Assmann (2011; 350), “[...] the virulence of an event that remains, like a past that does not fade away, that cannot keep its distance”. Ilha do Presídio and Dopinha, with their indefinitions in the scope of heritage policies, allow us to think about the weight of this past that they represent and that is still present in the daily silencing, in the practices of human rights violation, in the discourses of denial of the recent past of the dictatorship that emerge in the voices of political protagonists in Brazil today. The wound is still alive, so there is still no way to heal the scars.

Bibliography

APPADURAI Arjun, “The Past as a Scarce Resource”, *Man, New Series*, vol. 16, n° 2, 1981, p. 201-219.

ASSMANN Aleida, *Espaços da recordação: formas e transformações da memória cultural*, Campinas, SP Editora da Unicamp, 2011.

Bortolotto Chiara, “La problemática del patrimonio cultural inmaterial”, *Culturas, Revista de Gestión Cultural*, vol. 1, n° 1, 2014, p. 1-22.

CANDAU Joel, *Memória e Identidade*, São Paulo, Contexto, 2011.

CASTRIOTA Leonardo, “Lidando com um patrimônio sensível, O caso de Bento Rodrigues, Mariana MG”, *Arquitextos, Vitruvius*, ano 20, n° 230, 2019, <https://vitruvius.com.br/revistas/read/arquitextos/20.230/7423>

CHEVALIER Dominique, « Patrimonialisation des mémoires douloureuses : ancrages et mobilités, racines et rhizomes », *Autrepart - revue de sciences sociales au Sud*, vol. 2-3, n° 78-79, 2016, p. 235-255, <https://www.cairn.info/revue-autrepart-2016-2-page-235.htm>

CHOAY Françoise, *L'Allégorie du patrimoine*, Paris, Éd. Du Seuil, 1992.

COMISSÃO CIDADANIA E DIREITOS HUMANOS RS, *Subcomissão da Memória, Verdade e Justiça: Relatório Final*, 2017.

COMISSÃO NACIONAL DA VERDADE, *Relatório*, vol. I, 2014, p. 973.

CRUZ E SOUZA Luciana, “A Mesa Redonda de Santiago do Chile e o Desenvolvimento da América Latina: O papel dos Museus de Ciências e do Museu Integral”, *Museologia & Interdisciplinaridade*, vol. 9, n° 17, 2020, p. 64-80.

ELWANGER Raul, Entrevista realizada por Darlan de M., Marchi em 11.02.2019.

FERREIRA Maria Leticia, MICHELON Francisca, “Cicatrizes da memória: fotografias de desaparecidos políticos em acervos de museus”, *Estudos Ibero-Americanos*, vol. 1, n° 41, 2015, p. 79-97.

FONSECA Cecilia L., “Para além da pedra e cal: por uma concepção ampla de patrimônio cultural”, in ABREU Regina, CHAGAS Mario (dirs.), *Memória e patrimônio: ensaios contemporâneos*, Rio de Janeiro, DP&A, 2003, p. 56-76.

GÓMEZ CARDONA Gemma, “Conflictos contemporâneos, memoria y patrimonio mundial: una relación problemática. El caso de los espacios patrimoniales de la Guerra Civil Española”, *Actas del Primer Congreso Internacional de Buenas Prácticas en Patrimonio Mundial, Menorca-ES, Organización de las Ciudades del Patrimonio Mundial*, April 2012, p. 218-234.

ICOMOS, *Québec Declaration*, 2008,
https://www.icomos.org/quebec2008/quebec_declaration

_____, *Guidance on heritage impact assessment for cultural world heritage properties*, 2011.

Jelin Elizabeth, “Quiénes? ¿Cuándo? Para qué? Actores y escenarios de las memorias”, in Vinyes Ricard (dir.), *El Estado y la Memoria*, Barcelona, RBA Libros, 2009.

Jurgenson Luba, « Conserver l’héritage des systèmes répressifs : la mémoire des camps du Goulag », in Bérard Ewa, Jurgenson Luba (dirs.), *Une histoire sans traces ? le patrimoine matériel russe et la culture mémorielle actuelle*, Paris, Éditions Pétra, 2017.

Leniaud Jean-Michel, *Les archipels du passé, Le patrimoine et son histoire*, Paris, Fayard, 2002.

Michel Johann, *Devenir descendant d'esclave. Enquête sur les régimes mémoriels*, Rennes, Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2015.

MOITINHO Mario, “Definição Evolutiva de Sociomuseologia: proposta de reflexão”, *Cadernos do CEOM*, n° 41, 2014, p. 423-427.

POULOT Dominique, *Une histoire du patrimoine en Occident, XVIII^e-XXI^e siècles*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 2006.

PRATS Llorenç, *Concepto y gestión del patrimonio local, Quaderns-e de l'Institut Català d'Antropologia*, n° 9, 2007.

RIO GRANDE DO SUL, *Processo número 001273-11.00/14-3 referente ao tombamento da Ilha das Pedras Brancas (Ilha do Presídio)*, Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico do Estado do Rio Grande do Sul (IPHAE), 2014.

SEPÚLVEDA DOS SANTOS Myrian, “Memória e ditadura militar: lembrando as violações de direitos humanos”, *Tempo social*, t. 2, n° 33, p. 289-309.

SMITH Laurajane, “El espejo patrimonial. Ilusión narcisista o reflexiones múltiples?”, *Antípoda, Revista de Antropología y Arqueología*, n° 12, enero-junio 2011, p. 39-63.

SOARES Inês V., QUINALHA Renan, “Lugares de memória no cenário brasileiro da justiça de transição”, *Revista Internacional de Direito e Cidadania*, n° 10, 2011, p. 75-86.

THEODOSIOU Christina, « La mobilisation des morts : culte du souvenir et culture de guerre en France pendant la Grande Guerre », *Revue LISA*, vol. X, n° 1, 2012, p. 51-68.

TORNATORE Jean-Louis, *Les formes d'engagement dans l'activité patrimoniale : de quelques manières de s'accommoder au passé*, France, Hal Open Science 2007, fhalshs-0012299.

UNESCO, *L'interprétation des sites de mémoire*, 2018.

VARGAS Indio, *A guerrilheira: mistério e morte na Ilha do Presídio*, Porto Alegre, AGE editora, 2005.

Viltart Franck, « Naissance d'un patrimoine : les projets de classement des ruines, vestiges et souvenirs de guerre (1915-1918) », *In Situ. Revue des Patrimoines*, n° 23, 2014, <http://journals.openedition.org/insitu/10990>

WAHNICH Sophie, « L'impossible patrimoine négatif », *Les cahiers Irice*, vol. 1, n° 7, 2011, p. 47-62.

WEICHERT Marlon Alberto, “O relatório da Comissão Nacional da Verdade: conquistas e desafios”, *Projeto História*, vol. 1, n° 50, 2014, p. 86-137.

WINTER Jay, « The Generation of Memory: Reflections on the “Memory Boom » », *Archives & Social Studies: A Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, vol. 1, n° 0, 2007, p. 363-397.