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Abstract. Ibarra is a city in full development. Its foundation as a colonial city in 1606, in a valley already inhabited by important indigenous communities, with its subsequent but slow transition into a capitalist modernity, generated transformations and transitions on both ideological and material degrees. Thus, the city and its public space must be interpreted as a document or device, as the changes that have taken place convey a particular discourse. Ibarra sees itself as a localized city that mutates towards an emplaced society, which is shifting from its baroque and republican past towards a heterotopic present and future. This is a space that allows, by its own discursive logics, to create new spaces. This research aims to contribute with a new reading to the debates on Heritage and Identity in the digital era, and more importantly to establish distances in light of conservative or postmodernist discourses. Heritage is not a stationary space, nor is it Identity, and this is not just an antiquated narrative from a remote past. Both are devices that also in the Digital Age express goals and desires of a society. Information and Communication Technologies are a powerful device for the reproduction of these discourses, which are ultimately the spokespersons for structures of socio-cultural and socio-racial domination. The fact of living in this digital technological age does not make us immune to the resources and strategies of capitalist power, but more vulnerable to them.
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1 Introduction

1.1 The Epistemology of Cultural Studies

Since the French Revolution and the Industrial Revolution western societies have changed their baroque style to something less allegorical and authoritarian. Modernity was understood as a momentum of greater positivism, democracy and rationalism. The city acquired a different form, from being the birthplace of medieval villages, to a pole of indispensable development of society as a whole. The nobility went from living in castles to live in palaces. The bourgeoisie abandoned their home workshops to direct
their strategies in comfortable offices. Many farmers and artisans became workers as they left the fields and workshops to start working in factories.

In Latin America this transition was not so schematic, since our capitalist development had its particularities. The long period as a European colony and under the domination of a deeply feudal State, did not allow the emerging Creole elites to bet their capital on investments for the industrialization of the region. The result was a mixed economy where the safest capital was that of the land. This structural heteronomy of the region was the recurrent pattern that lasted until the 20th century. Our Andean and colonial past was gradually being forgotten, but without solving the deepest cultural problems.

In the 20th and 21st centuries, studies on culture seem to be more the rule rather than the exception \[1, 2\]; but an observation of this style could lead us to a simple characterization of the methods and not to a true understanding of the existing epistemological foundations. For this reason, it is necessary to observe the methods not as a set of procedures, but as guides for complex analysis. In this sense, we could understand that the sciences that study culture are not abstract frameworks of knowledge but strategies of cultural insertion. Now, to what extent can we understand what Modernity is? What Heritage is? And What Identity is? As all these categories can give us immediate and perceptible references. By Modernity we can refer to the Industrial Era. By Heritage, to the old houses built from the 16th to the 19th centuries. And by Identity to the clothes worn by our ancestral people. But that emphasis creates in us a simple approach to the immediately perceptible, without a solid sense of what those elements mean.

If we look at or listen to a work of art, for example, we not only perceive a physical or sound materiality, we are also victims of a discursive framework full of meanings. Culture is a fundamental part of the general understanding of the human and social, because it allows us not only to identify the concrete fact of material work, but also the multiple possibilities of meaning of human events. And this according to the philosopher Ernst Cassirer (1874–1945) \[3\] reveals not just sensations, but also new worlds. It reveals reality and life in a way that we do not believe we have ever seen them before. A song by Sappho or an ode by Pindar, the Vita Nuova by Dante or the sonnets by Petrarch, the songs from Sesenheim or the West–östlicher Divan by Goethe, the poems by Leopardi or Holderlin: any of these works give us much more than a series of floating and loose emotions that emerge before us to disappear right away again into the nothingness. All this “is” and “endures”; opening to our spirit knowledge that is not possible to grasp through abstract concepts and that, nevertheless, stands before us as the revelation of something new, hitherto ignored and unknown.

This in principle is an invitation to move away from the abstract character of all philosophy; the concepts in this case refer to a detailed observation and a penetrating interpretation. Culture, then, should also be understood as a social fact in the Durkheimian style. That is, culture must be treated as a thing. Everything is an object of knowledge that is not naturally penetrable to intelligence, everything from which we cannot give an adequate idea by a mental analysis, everything that the spirit cannot understand except on the condition of leaving of itself by way of observation and experimentation, progressively moving from the outermost and more accessible characters immediately to the less visible and deeper ones \[4\]. This, however, does not
precisely reflect a positivist bias, it is rather a procedure to decompose the different parts of a specific cultural phenomenon. The Pyramids of Giza, for example, comprise a particular history, materials, demography, workers, ideology, dominant groups, etc. All that marks a series of explanations that are not simply understood by the mind.

On the other hand, in the sense of interpretation, not all the components of a specific cultural case allow us to create a definite explanation. It is essential to understand that there are limits, and for this reason it is necessary to either culminate with research or innovate in methodology. Therefore, it is necessary to resort to the “verstehen” of the German idealist tradition. That means “sympathetic understanding” or “intuitive apprehension” [1]. Which leads to a different level of understanding of the cultural phenomenon. And according to the sociologist Max Weber (1864–1920), it is not only a matter of explaining the functioning of a political, economic or cultural process, but of understanding their ideological genesis [5].

In this way we have described two methodological variants, also known as two different traditions for the understanding of culture. On the one hand, the positivist tradition and on the other the idealist tradition. But we could simplify them as the methodology of observation-explanation and the methodology of apprehension-interpretation. The first one allows us to observe the materials, the institutions, the procedures. And the second, ideas, models and structures. With reference to the methodology of observation-explanation we can make a long description of the institutions that comprise the proposed triad of Modernity, Heritage and Identity. The State is a historical construction that attests to institutional changes and adaptations. The complex normative network of modern states allows us to visualize the interest of ruling groups with respect to the culture of nations. We know that the proliferation of institutions interested in heritage and identity has to do with a change in the domination strategy of the dominant classes [6]. The interest shifted from the territory to the population; the ancient aristocracies saw in the territory their source of wealth, while the bourgeoisie was interested in the population as a source of income.

The methodology of apprehension-interpretation, on the other hand, would allow us to explain why the power strategy has changed. It turns out that the limits and temporal classifications do not correspond with the genesis and evolution of thoughts and ideologies. Modern-rational thinking, in this case originates in the religious meditations of the Protestant Reformation [7]. Modernity would end being a product of a non-modern time; but at every time this would show a motivation for rupture with the antiquated or archaic. Such division of an eternal-religious time from the human-rational time, would simplify history for the new bourgeois society that, in this sense, would always seek the creation of a more “neutral” time and space. The origin of human cultures and its phases of development would be imprisoned in pre-modern times. The present, then, would be the time of citizen, who looks at culture from the privilege of development. Given this raison d’etre we should see more closely the functioning and the meaning of cities.

This study has two objectives; of explaining cultural categories such as Modernity, Heritage and Identity and interpreting its use in public space, taking as a backdrop the Ecuadorian city of Ibarra and its history. Cities are not only immobile and rigid spaces, but they are also able to tell us diverse and underground events and ideas. For this reason, it is necessary to understand the logic of the epistemology of cultural sciences,
the development of cities from a sociological perspective and the phenomenon of the public sphere. And also the processes of transformation of patrimonialist and racist discourses specifically in the case of the Northandean city of Ibarra.

We will emphasize that the Information and Communication Technologies are a powerful device for the reproduction of these discourses, which are ultimately the spokespersons for structures of socio-cultural and socio-racial dominance. Obviously, living in this technological age does not make us immune to the resources and strategies of the capitalist power.

2 Interpreting the City

The city is a social fact, and by this we mean that it is a sociological phenomenon. It is not necessary to make a historical recovery of the events that gave rise to cities, but its own existence marked a before and after in human civilization [8]. In effect, the term civitas expresses its importance to the extent that it represents a turning point in the human order. The city as an idea, for the ancient Greeks, meant a form of culture expressed through the political participation of its inhabitants. Later, the Romans, would convert the term citizen into a legal link of man with the republican order. That is, citizenship would change from being a way of acting in the world to a specific form of existing in the world. Machiavelli would explain this in a better way, as in his historical-political texts, at differentiating virtus civica from civic virtue [9].

As virtus civica are the actions, procedures and strategies that individuals use to lead, mobilize or represent human groups. While civic virtue are the basic set of rules of harmonious coexistence among men [10]. This at the end would end up being the two most important meanings of the concept of citizenship that in the western tradition the first meaning would be linked to the word politic. From philosophical-historical interpretations we must move onto sociological interpretations. For this is worth recognizing progressive-evolutionary theoretical models, which define the social transformation as a process from the commune to the society, and from the people to the city. This, too, from a socio-historical interpretation of the changes that occurred during the French Revolution and the Industrial Revolution [11, 12].

To have a more precise vision of this perspective, it is worth making a detailed reading of the proposal of the German sociologist Ferdinand Tönnies (1855–1936) who says that: “There is a contrast between a social order that - based on the consensus of the wills- rests in harmony and develops and ennobles through traditions, customs and religion, and an order that - based on the union of rational wills - rests on agreements and compromises, protected by political legislation and finds its ideological justification in public opinion” [13]. The author refers to two analytical categories: Community and Society. The first refers to a level of organization based on customary regulations and the second to a more formal and “positivist” type of organization. Being more precise, the Gemeinschaft, consists of a family life, with a predominantly rural village life, maintaining an ideological religious system. While the Gesellschaft consists of a city life, organized from a national legislation and whose ideological base is the public opinion [13].
The Gesellschaft, or Society, would therefore be the new field where the strategies of power would be articulated. And for that in the socio-historical context, the dominant society would change or mutate the dynastic space into the bureaucratic space. The technification of the State would generate a new space where citizens could participate without the rigid representation of the hereditary titles of nobility. As cities would empower individuals, and society in general, to the public sphere [14].

3 The Public Sphere

The public space, or the public sphere, is generally understood as the space of representations: the images, allegories, ornaments covering houses, institutions or buildings so that they could have a “presentable” character to society. In contrast to the private, which, instead, is the space of what is lacking, of hierarchies, of what cannot be shown to the public. The philosopher Hannah Arendt (1906–1975) finds two meanings: first, one referring to what can be exhibited to the presentable, appearances: “means that everything that appears in public can be seen and heard by everyone and has the widest possible publicity. For us, appearance – is something that others see and hear like us-constitutes reality. Compared to the reality that comes from seeing and hearing, even the greatest forces of intimate life – the passions of the heart, the thoughts of the mind, the delights of the senses - they carry an uncertain and dark existence until they are transformed, deindividualized, as it were, an adequate form for the public appearance” [15].

Here all cultural manifestations, whether ethnic or artistic acquire sense. Peoples or artists acquire notoriety as they appear in the public. But this appearance must have certain socio-cultural conditions of acceptance. Not everything that is done for the public is worthy. Since our sense of reality depends entirely on the appearance and, therefore, both, of the existence of a public sphere in which things emerge from the dark and sheltered existence, even the twilight that illuminates our private and intimate lives derives from the much stronger light of the public sphere; there, only what is considered appropriate, worthy of being seen or heard, is tolerated, so whatever is inappropriate becomes automatically a private matter [15].

The second meaning refers to the mundane, understood as a space for everyone. The world is not only the set of physical elements but also the space of sharing human experiences [16]: “the public term means the world itself, insofar as it is common to all of us and differentiated from our privately owned place in it. This world, however, is not identical to the earth or nature, like the limited space for the movement of men and the general condition of organic life. Rather it is related to the objects made by men, as well as to the affairs of those who inhabit together in this man-made world. Living together in the world means in essence that a world of things is among those who have it in common, just as at the table it is located among those who sit around; the world, like everything in between, unites and separates men at the same time” [15].

This sharing in the world allows for a human organization to exist. There are criteria that organize the world. Here we come across the quality of the plural. What is shared requires a plurality of points of view on common themes. The reality of the public sphere lies in the simultaneous presence of innumerable perspectives and aspects in which the common world is presented and for which it is not possible to invent a
common measure or denominator. The world as the meeting place for everyone, humans occupy different positions in it, since one cannot match more with the other than the position of two objects. Being seen and heard by others derives its meaning from the fact that everyone sees and hears from a different position [15]. The public sphere is the space of the community. It is what allows the individual to communicate with the community. And the commune, in this case, acquires identity. That is, it acquires visibility and recognition. But this visibility acquires a reality different from what could be accessed only with the opinion of an individual or a single group. In the public sphere, the community transits in a mundane dimension. Only where things can be seen by many in a variety of aspects and without changing their identity, so that those who gather around them know that they see the same in total diversity, only there truly and authentically appears a mundane reality [15].

Summarised, the public sphere has two characteristics, that of appearances and that of the mundane; in the first, culture, opinions, art must acquire a presentable character; and, in the second, society has a meeting point. The latter has been constituted as the visible characteristic of the Public Space, to the extent that it has allowed the development of Public Opinion.

By Public Sphere we understand a domain of our social life in which something like public opinion can be satisfied. In principle, access to the public sphere is open to all citizens. A portion of it is constituted in each conversation in which private persons meet in public. In this case they are acting not as professionals or business persons who conduct their private affairs, nor as legal partners who conduct themselves according to the legal regulations of a state bureaucracy and are obliged to obey. Citizens act as public when they deal with issues of general interest without being coerced; this ensures that they can coordinate and meet freely, and at the same time express and make their opinions freely public [14].

Finally, as we have seen, we are aware of the magnitude and limits of the public sphere, but we need to analyse the specific mechanism by which the instituted political and economic powers exercise their domination.

4 Devices

By devices we understand the technology that dominant groups use to subjectify society. “I will call the device literally anything that in any way has the ability to capture, guide, determine, intercept, model, control and ensure the gestures, behaviours, opinions and discourses of living beings” [17]. These are constituted by a network that interrelates to the discourses, procedures and ideologies that determine social functioning. In this sense, the devices can be official academic texts as well as digital technology. A concert of sacred music or a song of urban music, can operate as devices that relate to different elements and thus create a specific discursive frame. In summary: (a) the device is a heterogeneous set that includes virtually anything, both linguistic and non-linguistic: discourses, institutions, buildings, laws, police measures, philosophical propositions, etc. By itself the device is the network that is established between these elements. (b) The device always has a specific strategic function and is
always part of a power relationship. And (c) As such, it results from the crossing between power relations and relations of knowledge [17].

In this way, we could understand that the device is the knowledge that acts in the public space and that allows the transfer of the particular values of the ruling class. What for us is an objective or universal knowledge, in the public sphere acts as a mechanism of individualization of such knowledge. Thus, for us, the discussion about modernity, heritage and identity are devices that create specific objects and legitimize the power of emerging socio-economic groups. What is really valuable about this problem is that we can now identify the interests, strategies and controls that limit our possibilities of concrete freedom. For that we will have to look closely and in practice at these devices.

5 The Ibarrean Modernity, I: The Historic Centre, Between Patrimonialism and Heterotopia

By Ibarrean Modernity we refer to the process that forced the city to convert from Gemeinschaft to Gesellschaft [18]. The history of the city of Ibarra does not disappoint us in this regard. We could frame and fix two moments: a Colonial moment and its aftermath and another Republican moment. The first from the “foundation” from 1606 to 1830 and the second from 1830 to the present, that is, from when the village gradually acquired the image of city [19]. But being somewhat more rigorous and paying attention to the attentive gaze of historians [20], the city underwent an almost natural transformation. The terrible earthquake that occurred on the 16th of August of 1868 left the colonial city in ruins. This event forced the village to be reborn into a modern city [21].

An example to synthesize this idea is the so-called Hospital Antiguo San Vicente de Paul, today transformed into facilities of the Técnica del Norte University. Before the earthquake, this type of hospital did not exist, since the first hospitals were linked to the theocratic and christological precepts of religious charity and the terms of medical science were incipient or very rudimentary. The 17th, 18th and part of the 19th centuries were distinguished by this charitable emphasis, despite having scientific personalities such as Eugenio Espejo (1747–1795), who were more the exception rather than the rule. It would not be until the second half of the 19th century when the “national space” would be perceived with presidents Gabriel García Moreno (1821–1875) and Eloy Alfaro (1842–1912), who would modernize Ecuador and start an intellectual-positivist era of scientific cult far from the theocentric. On an international scale, the terms of modernity would increasingly be identified with bourgeois values and aesthetics, which apparently opposed the courtesan and colonial aesthetics. In principle, the cities and their main buildings were modified, such as power centres, prisons and hospitals. Little by little the medieval and colonial cities were disappearing or remaining on the periphery of modern-republican development. The entrance to the modernity of Ibarra was, to say the least: tragic.

The earthquake reduced the city to rubble, forcing the survivors to move to Santa María de la Esperanza for a period of four years. This forced the remodelling of the urban space towards modern-republican aesthetics and functionality, and with that the
construction of new houses and buildings. The reconstruction of the towns, ultimately of the city of Ibarra, took more time. In at least two instances, García Moreno simply moved the villagers to other more favourable places, despite the locals. He expanded the streets, built schools and churches. Though larger communities required the service of engineers, so the Danish architect and engineer Thomas Reed (1817–1878) and Modesto López -the only engineer of Ecuadorian nationality of that time- elaborated plans and models. For additional technical assistance García Moreno hastily sent seven students to Quito for a short course in construction, so they could help the engineers. García Moreno continued with the reconstruction of Ibarra, expanding its streets and bringing a supply of drinking water and began the construction of the new cathedral. One of his last acts as provincial administrator, was the delivery of money to poor families so that they could fix their houses, even though the housing needs remained unsatisfied [21].

In the 20th century, the transformation towards modernity would become much more precipitated. The city would abandon its localization to embrace the urban emplacement. The urban centre would no longer rule or order in a monopolized way the social system; this would have its own logic of development towards new precincts and neighbourhoods [19]. The city would acquire new spaces, or other spaces [22]. It is in this way that a kind of distancing from the past, from the traditional, begins to be generated. On the one hand, a certain nostalgia for what happened [23] and, on the other, a need to preserve with new forms or new strategies [24]. So, we face the discourse of patrimonialism, which in a few words seeks to reify the past [25]. Or to museify [26] the city [26], and specifically its historic centre.

By reviewing a thesis degree of the Tourism Major at the Técnica del Norte University, we can see how this discourse has permeated the university criteria. The discourse of patrimonialism would focus on the idea that authorities and citizens are not interested, nor do they value the history of the city [27]. That it is important to spread the culture and identity of cities [28]; build spaces (tourism) that encourage and rescue the history of the city [29]; and the care and preservation of heritage buildings [30]. However, within these discussions have emerged counter-discourses that have faced Patrimonialism. From art, we have wanted to empower citizens [31], so that they assume a more active and dynamic role. But also from the consumer society [32], where the new owners or tenants end up modifying not only the image of the historic centre [33], but also the use of heritage buildings transforming them into: bureaucratic offices, commercial offices, shops, bazaars, beauty centres, cafes, restaurants, hairdressers, etc. [32].

6 The Ibarrean Modernity, II: The Concealment of the “Other” or the Contempt of the Indigenous Past

It is not necessary to be very smart to detect in the Ibarrean society certain behaviours of racist overtones that can be described as remnants of a colonial past, still fully alive in the republican era. Although in the legal sphere racism has long since disappeared, and despite measures to mitigate its effects in the present, legislated by the government of the ‘Revolución Ciudadana’, it is evident that structural racism survives in the
behaviour of some Ibarrean mestizos. This is evidenced by afrodescendants and indigenous people when they are not treated in the same way in some shops, when they are openly distrusted, or when they have to endure even being observed with disdain by some mestizo people with a sense of superiority. [34] This has had a profound impact on the contemporary city, as can be seen, for example, in a study on the daily life of one of the markets of Ibarra: “some mestizo vendors manifest concealed racist attitudes towards Afrodescendants and indigenous people, such is expressed in certain preferences for the members of their cultural group: the given of the best meat in the case of groceries, allocation of special spaces when eating, the wearing of shoes without a proper plastic bag, among others”. The relations among mestizos, indigenous and afrodescendants, are very brief and they are limited to simple economic exchanges so they do not deepen the communication with the “other” [35].

Beyond other considerations, it appears as a sad historical reality the fact that has always been a city politically managed from a mestizo vision, often with more or less obvious desires for ‘racial whitening’. In fact, this should not surprise us too much, since History has been written from the societies and circles that have maintained socio-cultural, political and economic power. Attention has been mostly paid to the stories of Spaniards, chapetones, criollos and mestizos, while the subaltern narratives have remained marginalized. And although proposals for recognition and integration have been developed, there is still a significant space between official knowledge and marginalized knowledge [36].

Let’s see the local case: every 28th of September the city of Ibarra pompously celebrates its “foundation”. The memory refers to its creation in 1606, by representatives of the authorities of the fearsome colony, of the “noble Spanish Villa”, for commercial interests, on top of the indigenous village, Caranqui and Inca. With this celebration, the ancient past of the inhabitants of this land is hidden and concealed, the proto state of the Caranquis, which flourished between 500 and 1500 AD. A town which was built in the area of Zuleta with more than 150 tolas with diverse uses -adoratives, astronomical, funerary and residential- being also its capital; and in Socapamba, also in the current Ibarra, 60 more mounds [37], now abandoned and half crumbled between greenhouses. But perhaps the most paradigmatic cases of this abandonment, forgetfulness and contempt for the indigenous past within the current urban nucleus, is the Tola of the lower part of Caranqui, and the Inca Wasi. The tola, located on Calle Los Incas, next to Atahualpa Avenue -one of the few urban arteries with an indigenous name- was deliberately and unnecessarily amputated at one end for the construction for a water reservoir by the municipal water company EMAPA- I and on the other by the layout of a new opening street. Perhaps to try to alleviate these unjustifiable aggressions, later, busts of some leaders of the first peoples were placed on its summit. And the Inca Wasi -the house of the Inca-, is a monumental infrastructure, discovered in 2006, a construction similar to a pool made with carved stone that was a ceremonial centre where it is believed Atahualpa was crowned as leader of the Tahuantinsuyo. But, in spite of the historical importance, it has been practically abandoned for thirteen years. And this, despite the fact that currently in Ibarra Canton live more than 16,000 indigenous citizens, represented by 8.84% of the population, according to the 2010 Census.
On the other hand, as the historian Juan Carlos Morales points out [38], the origin of the name “White City” is not precisely what some ill-informed people believe, who think that history begins with a “foundation”, and dare to affirm that it was built “exclusively of whites”. The reality was quite different: the frequent outbreaks of malaria which was only eradicated in the first half of the 20th century forced to paint all houses with lime, as a recognized asepsis method against epidemics and diseases. Not very poetic, though historically true. Furthermore, it seems that it was only after 1911 with the publication of the novel Égloga Tragica by Gonzalo Zaldumbide (Quito, 1884–1965) when the city began to be called “White City”, which together with the phrase “the city you always return to”, are currently used as a the city slogan.

It is also significant to mention that the website of the Municipal Decentralized Autonomous Government of Ibarra [39], offers in the section “History”, texts dedicated to the main local historical events, and in an anonymous text, details the founding of a “Villa de Españoles”: In 1606 and quotes the writer Gabriel Cevallos García (1913–2004), who repeating obsolete concepts, points out the contrast between “the primitive man of the Andes, even the Incas “and the Spanish” founder of very high conditions”. Recognizes that the valley of Caranqui “houed a dense laborious population of Indians” and that 200 Spaniards “had established residences in the place” who asked the colonial authorities for the founding of a village, in which a place will be designated “for the ranches of the Indians who will come to serve the village” [40].

From an iconographic point of view, it was the local painter Rafael Troya (1845–1920) who was commissioned to graphically reproduce the “foundation” of Ibarra, during the commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the city in 1906, in an oil painting with a totally idealized look, with all the usual topics: a group of Creole Spaniards (mestizos in most cases), military and civilians, racially bleached to the extreme, including wigs, along with some friars, and in the background, four indigenous people taking a horse to a barn. Spaniards wearing an apparel more related to the Bourbon or Napoleonic fashion rather than with the period of the foundation, under Philip III of the House of Austria [41].

The earthquake of August 16, 1868 also brings out the serious unresolved tensions of this society and provokes “indigenophobic” interpretations of reality, even repeated uncritically a century and a half later. According to the story of Abelardo Moncayo Jijón (1848–1917) and reproduced on the official website of the DAG of Ibarra, “heartless people excited perhaps by hunger and misery, they took to steal and plunder. In the countryside, a large number of Indians shouting “Long live Atahualpa!” Set out to completely exterminate the white survivors [sic] to seize their property and lands” [42]. Also Cristóbal Tobar Subía (1881–1956), in his monograph Ibarra (1930), details the victims of the earthquake in Ibarra, reproducing a report of the 21st of August of 1868, addressed to the minister, where he cites only ecclesiastics and the deceased “of the families of Ibarra”, which counted to a few dozen, while omitting the nearly five thousand victims, “the people [who] are a lot” [43].

In the same municipal website, among the 37 “Illustrious men” [44], there is not a single indigenous person, nor any Afrodescendant; and among the 10 “Illustrious women” [45] there are no mestizos. Once again, a biased view of history has been imposed. At the same time, in the representative places of Ibarra, in the “Old Buildings” [46], there is no trace, for example, of the indigenous Tolas, the most
representative architectural legacy of the ancestral cultures of the area, nor in the “Places and traditional names” [47], nor in “Monuments” [48].

This situation of concealment, of premeditated “forgetting” is clearly shown in the urban street map of the city where we observe that of the approximately 530 existing streets, only 28 have a name related to the indigenous world, which represents a scarce 5.2% [49]. Worse yet in the case of the other large ethnic group present in the city, the Afrodescendants, the most marginalized one, of whom absolutely no name appears in any of the streets. Not a single one, despite representing more than 11,000 inhabitants of the city, this according to the 2010 Census. In fact, in all the years of republican life until the present, “there has not been an Ecuadorian Afrodescendant president, nor general, president of the congress, minister, ambassador or admiral; not because of a lack of trained elements, but because hierarchies have been systematically closed to the Afrodescendant» [50]. We can affirm, then, that the ethnic diversity of the province does not have a coherent representation in the local power structure and that neither globalization nor the expansion of Information and Communication Technologies have improved so far. A reality that was already reflected in studies such as the Imbabura Étnica book, written at the Técnica del Norte University [51].

7 Conclusion

The capitalist society increasingly creates more images of diversity and plurality that frequently do not coincide with the social reality. Such diversity is justified in the democratic times that we have had to live, at least in appearance. We are able to choose a number of products and merchandise within a rational framework of market economy. But we are not ready to reform, modify or transform this rational framework.

The possibilities of freedom, within different frameworks of political organization, are not objectives of a society immerse in the glamorous and splendid world of commerce and economic utility. Understanding that there are different modernities or identities is a waste of time and interest in the modern world. Well, we have revealed the strategy and the means that the dominant groups seek to legitimize the identity of our city and society. On the one hand, an interest in objectifying history to make it profitable for tourism. And, on the other, an interest in legitimizing a single part of history to unleash the destructive forces of capitalist urban development.

The media and the information and communication technologies have acted as accomplices of these (economic) intentions. However, we are faithful believers that the society as a whole and its subaltern groups can also make use of them, insofar as they themselves can envision freedom.
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