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Summary

The writer discusses various strategies that heritage bureaucrats and heritage commodifiers, acting as the main agents in the field, present to justify the importance they are granted in the commemoration of national heritage.

Heritage bureaucrats and heritage commodifiers claim legitimacy from staging heritage activities that are recognized as such by the public in audience and for being legally authorized to do so. Both also resort to invectives and analogies to consolidate their position, or deny their competitors the right to be there.

Heritage commodifiers claim that their productions bring wealth to society. In turn, wealth secures political unity, social consensus, and meanings for all to share. Heritage, a property in the public ownership, can be made to profit as if it were private property - a patrimony, and cultural resources can be traded as commodities. Heritage brings wealth to commodifiers, to those who agree with the idea of making heritage pay, as they transform their investments into symbolic capital – the right to define reality in the field and in society, and to have others abide by their definitions.

Bureaucrats are entrusted with the management of the City's heritage resources because of their proven expertise in the field, and their commitment to the democratic process that managing the public wealth implies. Heritage bureaucrats create traditions, exemplary characters and meanings which they put on display as if they were fetishes. Failing to sustain their claim to effectiveness and efficiency, they revert to the field's most ancient tradition, and stage heritage celebrations as if they were religious commemorations.

The writer takes after Bourdieu, Weber and Balandier, amongst others, to define the true nature of heritage commemoration through practices and strategies. His main sources are official publications and heritage productions from Canadian Heritage organisations.
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Part I: Introduction
1. “Flanked, on one side, by a carpet store and a derelict real estate office, and on the other, by a forensics lab and a Thai restaurant (situated in the vicinity of a PIP printing outlet, an India Sweets and Spices mart, and a Hare Krishna temple), the Museum of Jurassic Technology presents the sort of anonymous looking face one might easily past right by. Which most days, would be as well since most days it is closed” (Weschler Mr Wilson’s Cabinet of Wonders 1996).

2. “A souvenir from a rare snowfall 9 years ago has become a family’s frozen-asset. When a 1.25 centimetre fell in February 1976, 14-year-old Jeffrey Shamus thought it would be cool to save a snowball in the family freezer. “I thought, ‘Save it until tomorrow’, or ‘Save it until next week and throw it at somebody’, said Shamus, now 33. ‘I certainly did not think’, “Save it in a time capsule and open it in 20 years”. But that’s what his mother Betty did, preserving the snowball in a peanut butter jar in the garage freezer. ‘I kind of save things’, she said.

Jeffrey now has children of his own. He takes more than cold comfort from his mother’s plan. ‘I would then take it and put it in my freezer’, he said, ‘and then give it to my kids’ “(Newspapers clipping - The Ottawa Citizen. Private Collection [1995]).
Chapter 1: Heritage – a definition

In illo tempore, some 25 years ago, when the museum profession came to be young again and its practitioners were being sent to teach the Nations, Heritage - “that trendy, emotion loaded word of the times”, was lightly pronounced to be on the way to obsolescence (Hudson 1977, 189).

Some 25 years later, when the field has grown old again and is given to repetitiveness, heritage endures, feeding on critics and on public support. As History, it is presented in heritage sites; as Culture, it sits with in museums with millions of objects; as the Past, it is displayed in mass media productions and in state sponsored ceremonies.

Heritage - collecting objects, joining conservation organisations, or visiting historic sites with the purpose of celebrating the past, has become a profitable way of spending time: “All at once heritage is everywhere ( ), in everything from galaxies to genes. It is the chief focus of patriotism and a prime lure of tourism… the whole world is busy lauding – or lamenting – some past, be it fact of fiction” (Lowenthal 1998, xiii).

Heritage is a juridical reality that, since the Roman Republic, had immigrated into the cultural field. It is a concept which, to be fully understood, relies upon the basic economic notions of gain and loss. Heritage is continuously under threat, and perpetually in the process of being salvaged.

Heritage is both natural and man-made heritage (UNESCO - Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 1972). It is made of “landscapes, natural history, buildings, artefacts, cultural traditions and the like which are either literally or metaphorically passed on from one generation to the other” (Prentice 1993, 5).

Heritage is made of ‘tangible things’ - movable or immovable property (structures, sites, areas, objects or documents), or ‘intangible things’ - values (attitudes, beliefs and tastes), behaviours (skills, games, dances and ceremonies) and speech (stories and narratives, songs, sayings and names), (Ontario 1990a, 23). Heritage can be anything to anyone.
Heritage has become, over the past decades, "more substantial, more secular and more social. (it has gone) from the elite and grand to the vernacular and everything; from the remote to the recent; and from the material to the intangible ( ) Heritage today all but defies definition. Overuse reduces the term to cant... Legacies so protean seem hopelessly amorphous" (Lowenthal 1998, 95, 14).

Heritage is first an inheritance - a property an individual is entitled to, following the death of a kin. It is everything that has been left from previous generations, and was deemed worthy to be passed onto the next one: "(it is part) of the wider process of devolution of rights between or within the generations, devolution continuing throughout an individual's life, involving him both as a giver and as a receiver, and entailing transfer inter vivos between the living (for various reasons), as well as the residuum at death' (Goody 1987, 851).

Heritage, the cultural reality, is a political duty not be shirked by anyone. Held in collective property, heritage is for all to enjoy, and for each to provide for. Personal inheritance blends into collective heritage - that of the family, the clan, the village, the nation, the country.

Held in usufruct, it is a patrimony to be transmitted, either intact or augmented, to descendants: 'it is not a question of expediency or feeling whether we shall preserve the buildings of past time or not. We have no right whatever to touch them. They are not ours. They belong partly to those who built them, and partly to all generations of mankind who are to follow us' (Ruskin [1903]; quoted in Boulting 1976, 16).

Heritage is a property whose owners are denied full benefits of ownership. Heritage calls for the heirs to make sacrifices protecting, augmenting, and searching for meanings in objects meant to remain forever as they once, originally, were.

Romans associated *patrimonium* with *pietas* – the respect that the sons, according to religion, owed to their fathers and forefathers. Heritage was a privilege that came with an obligation (a *munera*), calling, at the death of the head of the family, for the heirs to stage funeral ceremonies and games in celebration of the deceased.

Both in ancient and contemporary societies, heritage is a debt owed to the dead and to the yet to be born. It is an opportunity for the wealthy and the influent to make a public claim over their wealth and privileges that they be enjoyed forever. It is an opportunity for the
populace and its champions to threaten the rich with denying them proper recognition and enjoyment of their wealth and privileges.

Heritage is an exchange which takes place between the living and the dead, ancestors and descendants, predecessors and successors, rulers and followers. Heritage is the line that separates those who are knowledgeable about things past, present and future from those who beseech knowledge from them.

Heritage is a social act during which objects - material and immaterial, are presented to the public because they are valuable social, economic and cultural resources, or because they do become such the very moment they are presented to the public.

This dissertation is about heritage, and the benefits society is promised for preserving and presenting objects, artefacts and ideas said to have been left behind by ancestors for their descendants to enjoy. It is about the price the heirs, both public and producers of heritage ceremonies, have to pay to benefit from their inheritance.

It is about heritage, and the practices that producers of heritage presentations set into gear when staging the commemoration of national heritage. These practices are part of the experience that producers from commercial and political institutions are given to go through when acting as the most distinguished providers of heritage experiences to the public – citizens and customers.

This dissertation is about the different strategies that commercial producers and heritage bureaucrats put forward to justify, before the public, the privilege they hold of speaking in the name of society's ancestors. It is about official providers of heritage services, commodifiers and government employees, contractors or tenured civil servants – learned professionals who are said routinely to have compromised their integrity in the service of the Prince (Merchants Prince).

It is interested in institutional producers from state agencies (ministries and departments), cultural institutions (most of them State sponsored), cultural businesses (most of them State subsidized), mass media, volunteer associations (given Letters Patent by the State), and in any groups or individuals involved with groups that are subsidized, authorized or deal directly or indirectly with the State in their capacity of heritage producers.
This dissertation is about national heritage - elements coming together to form recurrent images of what makes up 'the nation'... by reminding us what kinds of people are important in the nation, what the nation's significant social stereotypes are, what the nation's principal 'issues' are and what the nation's 'symbolic complexes' are" (Horne 1986, 20).

It is about legitimacy in the heritage field - the right to produce activities celebrating national heritage, to define content and procedures and make the public abide by the ensuing moral and financial obligations. It is about power - the probability that a group of persons or an institution, will be able to carry out their will despite resistance from others. It is about authority, when heritage producers are given to do their business economically, either provided with a justification by the sheer weight of their being there or, when taken to task, by the strength of their arguments (the use of analogy) and the inevitable invectives.

It is interested in official producers, employees of these institutions, most of them academically trained, charged with the production of heritage presentations when - at a beginning of a project, before anyone from the public has been informed of what is being planned, or early, on a work day, before the first visitor comes in, are left to ponder by themselves the reasons why they are allowed to stand there, in authority. This dissertation is about the 'langue de bois' which is spoken in the field.

agents

In modern democracies, the rights and obligations held by Polity members are delegated to political representatives; it is part of their functions to promote the 'understanding, appreciation and proper use of heritage resources' (Canadian Parks Service 1991a, 15). In turn, they hand over to State employees the planning, organising and performing of heritage presentations.

State employees do share their prerogatives with producers from the private sector who have been encouraged or found interesting and profitable to enter the field and sell heritage services as commodities.

Specialists employed by State organisations and ministries are selected for their expertise in the practices of their trade - traces of which are found in the trade's instruments
(UNESCO Recommendations, and Museum Studies curricula), in institutional policies and in the clear understanding in the public of what an heritage production should be.

Commercial producers, are deemed knowledgeable in the same practices, and make the most of what is vested in the public domain. They wish to be known as risk takers and innovators but will soon fall back to more conservative positions when their investments fail to generate profits. Government producers, like their monuments, endure; commercial producers pass.

Both commercial and government producers abide by the orthodoxy of the field that wants that the needs of the public, visitors and non-visitors, be considered and satisfied.

Critical orthodoxy, as upheld by heritage educators mostly, wants producers and visitors to congregate and define the means and meanings of heritage together.

Reality wants that some one of the main institutional agents, exhibition producers and curators, mostly concerned with the making of a product, rarely meet with real visitors. Few institutions can afford the time and money needed for consultations. Those who can, operate within such structures that only few of their employees are directly involved with the public.

This dissertation was meant initially to be a reflection on the writer's experience as a project manager (exhibitions), with a Canadian heritage agency.

While his function was to serve the public, the writer could have gone through his career without ever dealing face to face with 'his' visitors.

By his functions, he was never required in an official capacity to communicate with individuals from the public, nor was he encouraged to seek from them comments that other services within the organization were paid to translate into (impersonal) statistics.

Nevertheless, the public did matter greatly to him. He had been given a mandate to provide services to the entire Canadian Nation, no less, and was never permitted to forget whom he was working for. The public rules in the heritage field.
The writer was thus expected to think respectfully of the public. Continuation of his employment depended on a clear commitment from him to the catering of its needs and expectations.

The writer was being employed because he was deemed capable of communicating efficiently and effectively with the public. He was to be fluent in educational theories [as recorded in Hein (1998, 17-39), 'didactic theories', 'stimulus responsive theories', and 'discovery oriented theories'] which he was deemed to have acquired previously in the company of scholars.

Having been trained properly, he was expected to be proficient in setting the stage for 'good expository knowledge' - better, for 'a learning experience' during which his clients, the visitors, would either be teaching themselves or be properly instructed in heritage matters.

He was supposed, after the many years spent learning, to be capable of recognizing the 'individual agenda' of his visitors (personal context); of identifying their virtual and actual 'visitation patterns' (social context), and selecting the proper staging techniques (physical context), after which to interact proficiently with the public (after Falk 1992).

He was going to learn from front-line informants, that commemoration was a social commerce, usually taking place between real people acting as equals (not necessarily because it is so, for heritage places are also monuments, but for the sake of being capable of receiving something profitable from the visitor when the opportunity presented itself; not necessarily because a trade will take place, but because being unprepared would make a producer a liability to his employers who must hold such a belief).

He was going to take into consideration the knowledge passed unto the present generation of producers by the organization's ancient practitioners and by the profession's trusted experts who had long been conducting research on visitors studies and program evaluation – Gilman (1916), on museum fatigue; Milton (1935) on the object attraction-power and holding-power; Wittlin (1949), on visitors preferences; Screven (1967) on the process of evaluation; Miles (1982) on learning as a creative process, and on conviviality and visitors psychology (as recorded in Hein 1998; 41-65).
Eventually, feedback from the public would come from his supervisors (ancients of the profession themselves), and other experts in the field – planners, historians, site managers, acting benevolently on the public’s behalf, and defending aggressively their prerogative to participate in the most bureaucratic of all processes: evaluation (front-end, formative and summative evaluation [as per Screven 1967]).

Front line interpreters, for instance, would have taught the writer what it really meant to be speaking to the public, communicating with the public, and providing a public service – all of this coming down mostly as not embarrassing the primary users of one’s productions that they keep their jobs and that they help him keep his.

The writer as heritage producer was expected to consider the public seriously and, as a consequence, was led to believe that the public considered him, at least in principle, a proficient and trustworthy professional. Wherever he turned, throughout the duration of a project, he understood that the interests of the public were not to be overlooked.

It came to him early in his career that while materially absent until inauguration day, the public was not only well represented at his desk, but was constantly an object of preoccupation, and that it was important for simply being absent. In practice, for heritage practitioners in search of legitimation, the public was to be as intimidating as heritage institutions were said to be to the public.

To a producer of heritage rituals, an interpreter of historical narratives, or a maker of enduring meanings, the visitor’s use of their productions could simply turn out to be an unpleasant quiproquo. Visitors to heritage sites can do with well-planned, well-researched presentations what Alice did with her deck of cards (Carroll [1982] Alice in Wonderland, chapter XII – Alice’s Evidence). On any day, to heritage producers, a benevolent reaction of the public to their productions could not be taken for granted – however remarkable their work had been judged before. The public is unpredictable and capricious.

“Each visitor learns in a different way and interprets information through the lens of previous knowledge, experience and beliefs; all visions personalize the museum’s message to conform to their own understanding and experience; every visitor arrives with an agenda and a set for expectations for what the museum visit will hold” (Falk 1992, 136-141).
“People make their own meaning out of experience appears to be a phenomenon of nature... (it is) common-sense knowledge that exposure to any set of phenomena leads people to different conclusions. All of us interpret nature and society differently. In short, if we take the position that it is possible for people to construct personal knowledge then we have to accept the idea that it is inevitable that they do so, regardless of our efforts to constrain them.” (Hein 1998, 34-35).

visiting public and agency

As much heritage producers are keen in providing themselves with the privilege to acquiesce, dispute or modify official practices and meanings, as much they are expected to reciprocate, and recognize similar privileges to the visiting and non-visiting public.

However controlling and deterministic institutional producers are made to appear by their critics, there is a chance that, in actual heritage communication, agency will prevail since human beings are “reasoning, intentional agents, aware of, and capable within, the social environment which they help to constitute through their action” (Giddens 1982, 29).

Social actors, indeed, must be considered “knowledgeable about the conditions of social reproduction in which their day-to-day activities are enmeshed. The reasons the people have for their actions ( ) are crucially involved with how those actions are sustained” (Giddens 1982, 29).

It is, thus, profitable to believe that heritage institutions “do not just work ‘behind the backs’ of the social actors who produce and reproduce them. Every competent member of every society knows (in the sense of both discursive and practical consciousness), a great deal about the institutions of that society; such knowledge is not incidental to the operation of society, but is necessarily involved in it” (Giddens 1982, 37).

Social agents make the social institutions, which make them. It is given both to individual working in heritage institutions and to the public, to deal with organizations in such a knowledgeable manner - at times despairing of ‘getting anything’ from them, at times finding amazingly easy to bend them to their personal needs.

Government or commercial producers that the writer wishes to discuss, operate within social structures - organizations. Organizations may be both constraining and enabling,
since their rules and regulations can be used to deprive individuals of what is rightfully theirs, or enable them 'to do something', or 'something different'. Institutional productions, formally or informally, are presented to the public to be evaluated, and the public, visitors or non-visitors, never fails to do so.

This dissertation does not deny 'agency' as understood by sociologists, but considers interesting and legitimate to be curious of 'the structure'. The writer believes that what heritage organisations strive for, (or what they are blamed for), is still a relevant, defining position in the heritage field.

As an officer acting from an institutional position (state employee or commodifier), the habitual heritage producer must be prepared to satisfy the needs of his employers – and be responsive to their stated preference for objectivity, lawful statements, all encompassing generalizations, and linear narratives.

As an employee of his patrons (the visitors), he must be prepared to provide the conditions for a personal, individual experience to take place, and stage cautiously presentations with “many entry points, no specific path, and no beginning and end; providing a wide range of active learning modes; presenting a range of points of view; enabling visitors to connect with objects through a range of activities and experiences referring to their life experiences; providing experiences and materials allowing visitors to experiment, conjecture and draw conclusions” (Hein 1998, 34).

Since institutions can be both constraining and enabling, the heritage agents working within organisations must be capable of understanding differing positions, and react to different demands from various competing groups.

Thus the heritage producer must come to terms with the brutal fact that, however oppressive or convivial he is perceived to be, it is very unlikely that he will ever be 'right', while never given the right to admit being wrong.

When he is called by both their clients from above and from below, employers and visitors:
(a) to take a stand on the nature of reality, "whether the reality they face is external to the individual – imposing itself on individual consciousness from without – or the product of individual consciousness, whether reality is of an objective nature, or the product of individual cognition, whether reality is a given 'out there' in the world, or the product of
individual consciousness, whether reality is of an objective nature, or the product of individual cognition, whether reality is a given ‘out there’ in the world, or the product of one’s mind”; (b) to define how understanding comes to human beings, “whether it is possible to identify and communicate the nature of knowledge as being hard, real and capable of being transmitted in tangible form, or whether knowledge is of a softer, more subjective, spiritual or even transcendental kind, based on experience and insight of a unique and essentially personal nature”, (c) to define the nature of human nature, “whether human beings respond in a mechanistic and even deterministic fashion to situations encountered in their external world – or whether they will take a more creative, volunteer attitude towards their environment… one where man is regarded as the creator of his environment, … the master as opposed to a marionette” (Burrel 1979, 2-3; on ontological, epistemological and ‘psychological’ positions) – heritage agents must face the fact that public and employers will expect from them a commitment to philosophical stands which will be contradictory.

He will be wise to learn the language of opposing positions (nominalism / realism; positivism / anti-positivism; voluntarism / determinism) in order to be understood when speaking to parties not necessarily sharing his respect for his structuralist employers, and his devotion to his constructivist visitors.

In truth, the heritage bureaucrat should be able to shift from one position to another as fast as his patrons want him to.

In this part of the introduction, the writer wanted to make the point that the ‘heritage (museum) experience’ is more than the ‘visitor experience’; that the heritage producer is as important to the commemoration process as the public is; and that, to its practitioners, heritage is better understood as an ambivalent concept.

Ambivalence being one of the reasons why heritage can be claimed to be profitable.

1.1: heritage found - the heritage experience as a profitable endeavour

The institutional heritage experience takes place in the proximity of objects said to be bearers of meanings. These objects are considered to be ‘resources’ since society and
Spending on heritage preservation and presentation is justified with promises of wealth, consensus, unity and meanings.

Materials and immaterials from the past are sources of information – "past cultural materials, have at least some power to inform us about that past… detailed accounts of the lifeways of past cultures, the structure and function of institutions and the processes that governed both stability and change" (Lipe 1984, 1).

Materials and immaterials from the past have associative, symbolic value: they are used to send "broadly integrative messages reminding the populace of long held belief systems, or historical events that evoke common origins or common experiences of what may be an internally heterogeneous society" (Lipe 1984, 1).

Being the recipient of a legacy, public or private, makes one different from others: heritage grants members of a family, a community, or a nation, distinctive traits that others – members of lesser important, different social groups, are bound to envy.

Materials and immaterials from the past display aesthetic value which, coupled with the power of cultural resources to symbolize and commemorate past culture, enhance their utilitarian and symbolic character.

Heritage resources serve present-day needs – their informative, associative and aesthetic value translating into economic value, once the heirs decide to pay to visit, own, or preserve cultural values. 'Having a heritage' solves a fundamental ontological question with the proposition that 'being is having': "I have, thus I am; I am what I own".

Efforts made in private to preserve objects from the past are to be recompensed with familiarity, reaffirmation, validation, identity, guidance, enrichment and escape for those who proceed to the experience properly (Lowenthal 1985, 36-75).

Investments made in heritage preserve the heirs from some of the unpleasantness of living in society, and from the despairing certainty, progressively acquired in the vicinity of enduring objects, that life is a "peau de chagrin" (Balzac The Wild Ass's Skin 1831).
Heritage promises consideration in society for individuals sharing with others an interest in
the past. In times of social change and economic reversals, it promises prosperity and
continuity. In times of cultural uncertainty, it provides sanctuary in nostalgic narratives
(Lowenthal 1998, XIII).

Conversely, heritage may become a quiet critique of how things are, and how they seem to
be shaping - a protestation against consumer's society, or a conservative denunciation of a
contemporary order which is incapable of fulfilling the promises of the past.

Heritage, - memory in contemporary societies, protests the " accélération de l'histoire. Au-
delà de la métaphore, il faut prendre la mesure de ce que l'expression signifie; un
basculement de plus en plus rapide dans un passé définitivement mort, la perception
globale de toute chose comme disparue - une rupture d'équilibre. L'arrachement de ce qui
restait encore de vécu dans la chaleur de la tradition, dans le mutisme de la coutume, dans
la répétition de l'ancstral, sous la poussée d'un sentiment historique de fond. L'accession
de quelque chose depuis toujours commencé. On ne parle tant de mémoire que parce qu'il
n'y en a plus " (Nora 1984, XVII).

Society's ability to preserve and present heritage resources depends on the existence of
certain societal institutions to become profitable. These institutions are either organisations
(government policies, laws and agencies, interest or avocational groups, educational
institutions, or businesses) - or instruments: " that kind of social institution or
instrumentality ( ) formed by materials such as books, TV and movie films, classes,
lectures, and museum displays that provide both technical and non-technical information
about cultural resources, their historic contexts, and how they can come to or can continue
to serve as resources if they are preserved " (Lipe 1984, 2).

These two types of institutions strive to create a public understanding, appreciation and
use of heritage resources.

Heritage will first appear to be what its instituted guardians decide it is. Instituted guardians
are both authors and authorities. Their narratives, their practices and their regulations
define, delimit, and divide into parts, what then is declared heritage.
As they appear to control the proper resources to do so, the guardians are in a position to make believe that there is a common, effective and efficient manner of 'making heritage'.

The world over, specialists seem to agree implicitly that there is one single frame of reference when defining who the proper agents of heritage should be, which purposes they should pursue, and which means and media they should prefer when 'making' heritage: "once you're in a museum, you know you're in a museum; if you've seen one, you have seen them all", once said the writer's uncle, (Lucien Lavoie Conversation in Plaisance, 1982).

**meanings**

Heritage guardians are in the business of providing meanings to the less clairvoyant and sagacious. Meanings come to the guardians, and from them, is passed onto the public: "the public are not assumed to be stupid, but they are 'being invited to relinquish the right in the verifiability of public truths per se' (Walsh 1992, 115).

Heritage guardians are in the business of seeking out reality. Reality comes to the public and the interpreters as layers of different meanings; manifest meanings – of which the subject is fully conscious, and which is related to the explicit aims of the action; latent meanings – of which the subject is only marginally, but may later become fully, aware, and which is related to other contexts of social action; and hidden meanings – of which the subject is completely unconscious, and which is related, wants Turner (1978, 246), to infantile (and possibly prenatal) experiences shared with other human beings. Manifest meanings is for all to see, hidden meanings for the more cunning to discover, and hidden meanings for a numble disciple to find as he seeks instructions from a master (Turner 1978, 246 on meanings; read Wright 1985, on trafficking in history; read Walsh 1992, on meaninglessness).

The heritage experience is granted as an answer to a need, individually felt, socially induced, which is to be satisfied once an individual - rational and reasonable, recognizes the benefits of learning about the past.
Meanings must be internalized, but are first transmitted by the 'ancestors', and their contemporary representatives, through objects operating as symbols. Meanings will be rarely transacted, for ancestors cannot be reached, and their gifts – as with any other gift, must be acknowledged and reciprocated, not negotiated, since it would be impolite to do so.

Altogether, knowledge is provided to the People; it comes ‘from above’ – gods, or ruling authorities – everyone involved in the process making believe that there is a superior ‘entity’, a repository of valuable knowledge, whose functions it is to satisfy needs provided they are properly enunciated. Heritage is profitable – but is it is such because profit comes "from above" to the (passive) recipient. Providence gives and may take away.

In the institutional framework, the actor, either public or heritage producers, does not appear as a capable person. References to the system stress the primacy of object over subject, of social structure over the purposeful, socially capable actor.

Society does exist. Society is interested in order, and heritage is instrumental in bringing order to society. Heritage as education is then an attempt to convince citizens that "knowledge and skill ( ) exist externally to and independent of the individual; that the social system exists; that its structures are undergoing rapid social change and that the individual has to acquire the relevant knowledge or skill in order to fit into (it)." (Jarvis 1985, 29).

Meanings may be acquiesced to, or they may be met with reluctance or resistance.

contentious field

To everyone in society, heritage resources are considered to be of great value. As such, they are actively sought and are competed for: "Rival claimants seem hell-bent on aggrandising their own heritage goods and virtues, to the exclusion or detriment of all others. Dispute about who should own and interpret heritage are endemic, tarnishing many legacies with acquisitive greed… Indeed, heritage stewardship is intrinsically possessive; only those pledged to their clients’ exclusive cause can be relied on as stewards… " (Lowenthal 1998, X).

To every competitor heritage must be serious business: "To control (a museum), means precisely to control the representation of a community and its highest values and truths. It
is also the power to define the relative standing of individuals within that community. Those who are best compared to others to perform its ritual are also those whose identities (social, sexual, racial, etc) the museum ritual most fully confirms. It is precisely for this reason that museums and museum practices can become objects of fierce struggle and impassioned debate" (Duncan 1995; quoted in Halpin 1997, 52).

The field is in the business of defining reality, and reality is a "scarce resource. Like any scarce resource it is there to be struggled over, allocated to various purposes and projects, endowed with given meanings and potentials, spent and conserved, rationalized and distributed. The fundamental form of power is the power to define, allocate, and display this resource. Once the blank canvas of the world is portrayed and featured, it is also pre-empted and restricted. Therefore (this canvas) is simultaneously the site of social conflict over the real " (Carey 1989; quoted in Leeds-Hurwitz 1993, 34).

dominants symbols and ambivalence

Heritage objects, material and immaterial, are society’s dominant symbols. As symbols, they are intended to bring cohesion within the many groups who hold different views on society. They manifest the “crucial values of the believing community, a nation, a tribe ( ) or any other types of group whose ultimate unity resides in its orientation towards transcendental and invisible powers” (Turner 1968, 2). They are ‘storehouses’ and ‘powerhouses’ – containers of “information about the major structural values of a culture”, which, as such, will be “regarded as authoritative, even as ultimately valid, axiomatic” (Turner 1968, 5).

As dominant symbols - “eternal objects, objects not actually of infinite duration but to which the category of time is not applicable, (they) are relatively fixed points in both the social and the cultural structures and ( ) constitute points of junction between ( ) two kinds of structure” (Turner 1978, 246).

Dominant symbols are to be found, in any given culture, organised around and spreading, traveling between two poles, one ideological and the other sensorial.

Heritage symbols situated next to the sensory pole refer to meanings that arouse desires and feelings; they are interested first in the crude and basic needs of human life, (the continuity of one’s group as the condition of one’s personal survival), and, in the control of
the proper means to satisfy these needs. Heritage symbols express, in a socially acceptable manner, the existence of some 'feral energies' to be domesticated into the service of social order.

Heritage symbols, set around the ideological pole, make manifest the more cohesive aspects of social relationships; they are associated with harmony, brotherhood and community (thus putting a check on more aggressive aspects of the concept - the possessive and exclusive in "our heritage", for instance), and with the more positive representations a social group claims to be its own when securing a place amongst civilised nations.

Symbols set around the ideological pole, "refer to components of the moral and social orders, to principles of social organisation, to kinds of corporate groupings, and to the norms and values inherent in structured relationships .... (At the sensory pole), signs are usually natural and physiological phenomena and processes" (Turner 1978, 247).

Heritage promises to reconcile opposites - continuity and change, for instance. In practice, heritage symbols are multivocal.

1.2: heritage lost and found - heritage as an ambiguous experience

Lexically, "heritage is capacious enough to accommodate wildly discrepant meanings ( ). It is "a nomadic term which travels easily, and puts downs roots - or bivouacs - in seemingly quite unpromising terrain" (Samuel 1994, 205).

Heritage is expected to reconcile what stands in ideologically opposite positions. The field, thus, is open to the Left and the Right, to the Community and the Marketplace, to the Sacred and the Profane, to the Public and to the Private. Symbols by definition are equivocal; the more they are, the greater profit is to be expected from them. Heritage then thrives in contradictions, turning the staging of adversarial positions and contradictory stands into a profitable endeavour.

Differences over heritage, according to Lowenthal, come in part from the expectations zealous defenders have that History will vouch for what is really a matter of belief (faith), in part from the repugnance historians have to agree to what heritage does to their work -
updating, enhancing and expunging it by consigning to ridicule and oblivion what has become unacceptable (after Lowenthal 1998, 148).

Heritage is good. "(Heritage) inks us with ancestors and offsprings", "promises continuity and some eternal life", "bonds neighbours and patriots", "promises community", "certifies identity, roots us in time-honoured ways" (Lowenthal 1998, 13). Heritage promises a sense of place.

Heritage is bad — "Miring us in the obsolete, the cult of heritage allegedly immures life within museums and monuments. Breeding xenophobic hate, it becomes a byword for bellicose discord. Debasing the 'true' past for greedy or chauvinist ends, heritage is accused of undermining historical truth with twisted myth. Exalting rooted faith over critical reason, it stymies social action and sanctions passive acceptance of preordained fate. With its benefits hyped and its perils exaggerated, heritage by its very nature excites partisan extremes. Ready recourse to patrimony fills many vital needs. But is also glamorizes narrow nationalism. Vainglory vindicates victors and solaces the vanquished, justifying jingoism and inflaming partisan zeal" (Lowenthal 1998, XIV).

Heritage divides as it is preoccupied with transferring to societies (nations) the privileges that law and traditions once granted to the first born. By birth, blood and soil, certain groups can claim priority over others for having kept (culturally, when not genetically), their heritage intact. Heritage divides because it is based on the ownership of material artefacts — forever insufficient to satisfy immaterial needs, forever the sources of discord between presumed heirs.

Heritage and history are ambiguously but necessarily associated. They are linked together, in the field, where 'heritage institutions' manage 'historic sites'. But heritage is not history; and the past is a foreign country ("despite advances in science and scholarship that tell us more than ever about former times, the past frustrates understanding; its events seem
unfathomable, its denizens inscrutable. However much we know about the past, we can never really know how it was for those who live back then” [Lowenthal 1998, XIV ].

Heritage though will turn to history to provide logic to some of its contradictions. Again, the knowledge of duality, and tolerance of opposing stands will be useful to the heritage producer as he finds in history facts to modify positions that have heritage stuck in a dead-end.

History proves, for heritage to take notice, that cultures and races are hybrids - cross-breeding being preferable to in-breeding, and that, since heritage is a social commerce, cultural objects are meant to be traded - as opposed to be preserved for one group to hold on to.

Heritage, then, can still be pronounced profitable to society. What has been a losing position to institutional providers turns into a gain to both society and authorities.

In this part of the introduction, the writer has presented heritage as a benefit granted by authorities ‘from above’. The less amenable connotations of the concept were considered, and tolerated, as being active principles in the presentation of heritage symbols. Heritage, thus, is deemed to be a gain to the entire Polity.

In the next part of this Introduction, the writer pursues the definition of heritage, and his review of heritage critics, with comments on those who hold the view that heritage is a gain to a few, and a loss to most of society.

1.3: heritage denied - the heritage experience as a loss to society

Heritage is staged under such a light that everyone in society is made to believe in the profits to be gained from it. Heritage resources, recognized as being valuable to society as a whole, will be found equally valuable by the many groups into which society is divided.

Investments made in the heritage of any of these specific groups will augment its value for both society and the investors. Precedence recognized to symbols of a specific group necessarily diminishes the value of other (lesser) symbols.
What is a contribution from one segment of society, once invested in, may take precedence over other specific heritage(s), and be declared most significant to society. Heritage symbols provide groups and individuals with a place in time. More important symbols translate into more prominent places in society.

To the public involved, the ‘heritage experience’ may mean the necessary expression of gratefulness for being assigned a place in society; it also means a display of deference towards those who occupy a significant position in society. "(Some) deserve heritage; it defines them and confirms their rule. Its loss or absence spells impotence" (Lowenthal 1998, 61; on heritage and medieval rulers).

The heritage experience, for the ruling class, is to be recognized as the main recipient of ancestral benevolence, and acknowledged as the source of society's common wealth. To heritage producers, it is to be busy celebrating the most powerful in the polity first.

Heritage producers are expected to serve the public, that is - their visitors, who are segments of the public, their institutions, which stand as representatives of the public, and their critics, who claim to be defending the public when it is denied the benefits of heritage. Part of that experience is to claim legitimacy despite being called duplicitous.

A whole strand of critical work posits the People (visitors and non-visitors) as the Alpha and the Omega of the heritage process. Everything, in a democracy, is destined by right to the People as the ultimate principle of authority. Everything should proceed from the People as the unadulterated source of knowledge. The People – elsewhere the Masses, insulted when coming to heritage places (Walsh 1992, 139), will rise one day and, with proper agency, be triumphant.

For the sake of this argument, heritage producers employed by cultural institutions, must be recognized an understanding of what is happening in the field. They have sought and occupied their position in that field fully aware that some social groups have more resources than others, that they are more likely to be their employers than those who have less, and that dominant groups would want them to believe and have others believe that heritage is universally profitable.

Since it is more likely that, at any time during the communication process, heritage producers will never know with certainty which public they are addressing – or to what
extent any of these publics is being addressed, heritage producers will be extremely cautious not to commit themselves entirely to anyone. They will neither celebrate too gloriously the most favoured party, nor shun the lesser ones, but will provide their important patrons with presentations that will cast them on their best legitimating selves, and will stage for the others an uplifting, if properly tempered, presentation of their past.

Heritage producers need to know what is being said about them – thus their keen interest in visitors' studies. Heritage producers do know that they will always appear to come short of their clients' expectations – thus their passing interests in the same.

Heritage producers have been given the function to speak to the public. In a democratic society, heritage producers are also expected to be speaking on behalf of the public. According to heritage (radical) critics, institutional producers cannot support the claim that they perform legitimately a public service since they are seen not speaking to the public.

radical critics

Wittlin (1970) wishes curators to stage their exhibitions as dialogue, suggesting under the same breath that monologue is the field's prevailing practice. Hudson (1975) quotes a source from the Victoria and Albert Museum, regretting the curators' habitual patronising, resentment, or even hate of their clients. Hudson explains their apparent lack of interest in the visitors by "a fear of appearing vulgar or common, (or of compromising) their status of serious scholars" (Hudson 1975, 2-3), when keeping company with the vulgar.

Commenting on ignorant out-of-town consultants, Walsh is indignant that "heritage ( ) not only insults the historian and the archaeologist, but also insults the consumer as well as the local community" (Walsh 1992, 139).

Merriman after Ames (1990), wishes museum institutions to become enablers "transferring skills to others and providing opportunities for them to present their own points of view within the institutional context" (Merriman 1991, 132) – in the process implying that the museum actually disables. Museums promise elevation onto the ranks of the cultured, but, in fact, museums exclude those who are not already fluent with their codes.
Museums are ambivalent: “The museum can be considered either as an ideological tool which reinforced the held conception of order, time and progress, or as tools of emancipation, representations of other places and other times which opened people’s eyes to a world other than their own” (Walsh 1992, 38).

Reform in the field means recruiting employees to reflect the broad composition of the community; sending them back to their community as emissaries of the institution; collecting materials and immaterials kept in the community to reflect cultural diversity; providing a stage for the community to display its history through its preferred means (oral, visual); devoluting the museum to the local people; and making consumers into producers (Merriman 1992, 131-140; and UNESCO Recommendation concerning the most Effective Means of Rendering Museums Accessible to Everyone 1960).

Reformation in the field means using the vernacular to speak to the people about ‘a world other than their own’.

Walsh (1992), concludes his work against heritage, advocating the devolution of the Temple’s cultic functions to the synagogues in the Diaspora (read Turner ‘From Temple to Meeting House’ 1979). To re/place the Museum, Walsh promotes the idea of the Ecomuseum where to celebrate locality and territories.

The Museum as a place should be ‘dispersed’ (“le musée éclaté”, in the original French – the museum exploding, the ‘explosion’ releasing a fundamental, creative energy), and its parts spread in various sites in a given territory where people and objects are put on display for themselves and their visitors. Reform comes to the Museum from outside; the institution finds redemption in the Other, elsewhere.

Institutions, according to radical critics, deprive people of the histories they justly deserve: “Throughout the period of (post-)modernity the power to control the timing of space, and therefore the manipulation of places has been in the hands of a relatively small group of individuals and institutions. Such organizations have the ability to decide what will and will not be preserved, and how it will be presented and interpreted for the public” (Walsh 1992, 149).

The heritage experience, to a radical critic, would mean discussing reasonably the existence of ideological constructs in the field, denouncing these publicly on a stage of their
own choosing (rarely the exhibition), and expecting the public and the producers, offered true consciousness, to renounce their ways.

But first, radical critics must proceed to a ritual of imprecations, and leave the adversary shameful, stunned - and hostile.

"Heritage is conceptualized as systemic, projecting a unified set of meanings which are impervious to challenge... In essence it is conservative, even when it takes on, or co-opts, popular themes. It brings the most disparate materials together under a single head. It is what one critic defines as a 'closed story', a fixed narrative that allows for neither subtext nor countereadings. Its biases are more or less consistent, its messages, coded, its meanings clear. Politics, culture and economics are all of a piece, reinforcing one another's influence, reciprocating one another's effect. (Heritage) is a bid for 'hegemony', a way of using knowledge in the service of power" (Samuel 1994, 243; on heritage critics).

Institutional producers show the people "what to do and how to do it, what to believe and how to believe it. Not necessarily" by direct exhortation, but also by the setting in gear of "ways of doing things and seeing the world (creating 'realities') that are in one way or the other supportive of the established order and the class interests that dominate it" (Horne 1986, 53).

Institutional producers help the dominant group define its world-view and create an environment that fosters consent. Oblivious of the ideological mechanisms they are subjected to, they profit from the system of rewards in place, and "rationalize their own domination as if it were freedom" (Habib 1996, 239).

Institutional producers, according to their radical critics, do cheat the public of a proper learning experience: their productions have been, over time, enduringly dull and uninformative.

Either "bland and uncritical" or overtly spectacular, they have been ideologically inspired: "The auratic display, where the 'beauty' or aesthetic quality of the object is intentionally the predominant characteristic of the display, is oppressive in its impressiveness; the medium consumes the message and the auratic display is itself a form of spectacle, suppressing the ability to interpret. The display is a sensual experience, usually for those with the expertise to name and therefore know the object" (Walsh 1992, 35).
Institutional productions as manifestations of public culture present a view of the world, which distracts “from thinking about fundamental questions of the human condition. The more we know, the less we know. And we are not invited to examine the basic assumptions of the social, economic, and moral order. On these there might be a significant silence, protected by (a) surface noise”, (Horne 1986, 21; writing on popular culture and the news).

Wallace - on historicide

Wallace wrote, less economically, of the ‘historicidal practices’ of American (open-air) museums presenting “a white / Anglo-Saxon / Protestant / capitalist version of American history which excludes an accurate analysis of past historical ambiguities, making it impossible for the public history audience to make intelligent choices about the future. (American open-air museums, specifically) have taught a filiopietistic consensus version of history which ignores minorities, ignores the commonplace experience of failure, and promotes a vision of the future based on a technocratic, corporate America where citizens have little role other than to consume each new technological wonder. Open-air museums promote consumerism and uncritical acceptance of technology” (Woods 1991, 78: on Wallace 1981-1989).

Schlereth wanted History to be non patriotic, non simple, non progressive, non consensual, non nostalgic and non venal (Schlereth 1980). With Wright (1985), Hewison (1987), and Lumley (1988), heritage became “le mal anglais”. Walsh (1992) wrote of heritage as a land laid to waste. While history ‘situates’ in place and in time, heritage dis/locates. Heritage was a losing proposition.

Walsh – on the heritage wasteland

In England, preservationism has been concerned, not necessarily “with the understanding of the past”, but rather with “the maintenance of historical surfaces” (Walsh 1992, 70). Heritage is a celebration of superficiality.

“A heritage would appear to be that which only seems to be ‘something’, an image, ( ), rather than a building or object which possesses a history, something which develops through historical process, that is, changes ( ). The emphasis on a mixed and matched
bricolage of ruling-class styles from a number of periods denies an appreciation of the
everyday past of the majority of the people” (Walsh 1992, 93).

Heritage is a commodity: “(it does not respond to a real) need or want (but rather is), in
part an artificial desire imposed on society by capital, which must perpetuate its existence
and expansion through the provision of superfluous consumables” (Walsh 1992, 116).

The heritage past, for the sake of being acceptable to most of potential clients, “(is
situated) in a past-plusperfect; commercial productions have successfully denied
difference, (presenting the history of the nation) as one which is continuous, exemplary,
and without discord” (Walsh 1992, 198).

Heritage denies community; heritage denies society. In a Neo-liberal / Neo-conservative
world, only the market remains. Heritage promotes a homogeneous identity which is little
more than “corporate identity based on tradition” (Walsh 1992, 128).

The heritage field is a wasteland. ‘Once’ people lived within ‘organic’ communities that
provided them with a sense of place; then industrialization and urbanization came,
Paradise was lost, and the world turned into a place of deprivation where the slashing
oblique (dis/embedment, dis/enfranchization, dis/tanciation, de/differentiation,
un/differentiation, dis/placement, dis/cardment, dis/respect), rules.

The past shown in heritage sites has ceased to be the business of the present: it is
finished, closed, set as an object to be bought when in need of securing social distinction,
and, eventually, be discarded. Members of contemporary societies have been distanced
“from the processes which affect their daily lives, the past has been promoted as
something which (is) no longer contingent upon (their) experiences of the world” (Walsh
1992,2).

Altogether, heritage to radical critics has been an instrument of “oppression, control,
segregation, intolerance, to a greater or lesser extent covert racism, boredom,
bureaucratization, social reproduction, the triumph of platitudes, moralism, the reification of
significant values” (Jarvis 1984, 79).
Samuel – on heritage as an English garden

Samuel disagrees, and considers that most of the critiques made since 1985 have been heritage baiting. Heritage critics – intellectuals, aesthetes of both Right and Left, purists, cultural studies professors, have been envious of heritage’s good fortune. Their hostility has been professionally self-interested (historians), or intellectually limiting. Heritage critics have ignored the reality of the field.

"Politically heritage ( ) draws on a nexus of different interests... It takes on quite different meanings in different national cultures, depending on the relationship of the state and civil society, the openness or otherwise of the public arena to initiatives which come from below or from the periphery" (Samuel 1994, 306).

"Ideologically, heritage is chameleon, being subject to startling reversals over comparatively short periods of time. Like conservation, with whose causes it is umbilically linked, it is incapable of remaining in a stationary state, but is constantly metamorphosing into something else ( ) Focusing on the 'strategies' of supposedly all-powerful and far-seeing elites, it cannot begin to address the great mass of pre-existing sentiment which underpins sea-changes in public attitudes and revolutions in public taste" (Samuel 1994, 307).

Contrary to what has been prophecized in radical critiques, the historical culture has been expanding “into all kinds of spheres that would have been thought unworthy of notice in the past” (Samuel 1994, 25). “The people” has returned to history as soon as it is defined as a social activity rather than a profession.

Agency is found both with the professional historian, and the many people who make history the result of ‘unofficial knowledge’.

History is neither « the work of the individual scholar, nor of rival schools of interpretation, but rather the ensemble of activities and practices in which ideas of history are embedded or a dialectic of past-present relations is rehearsed” (Samuel 1994, 8). Promiscuity allows heritage into the legitimate circle.
Heritage is granted legitimacy: "History has always been a hybrid form of knowledge, syncretizing past and present, memory and myth, the written record and the spoken word. Its subject matter is promiscuous" (Samuel 1994, 443).

History is an organic form of knowledge "whose resources (draw) not only on real-like experience but also fantasy and desire; not only on the chronological past of the documentary record, but also on the seamless one of tradition" (Samuel 1994, X).

Hybridizing should apply to the process out of which history is constructed. Heritage then become but one of the many ways through which societies make meanings of the past.

perspectives

Professional interpreters hired as makers of institutional productions must be aware of the plurality of perspectives from which realities from the past will be known.

The heritage experience to institutional producers must mean the development of a strong sense of place – the recognition that practitioners need to be fluent in the many "connections and disjunctures between professional and academic histories, and the complex amalgam of public and private common sense conceptions of the past" (Schwarz 1982, 95).

As such, they will acknowledge that the public may use their work either as a means of liberation or an instrument of alienation. Both are plausible outcome of any human endeavours.

However, the former may not be the part that all their publics, employers, visitors and critics, want institutional producers to play – at least, not all the time.

This dissertation examines the role of institutional producers as it is played according to its most traditional 'mise-en-scène'. It is a role, which is understood by all to be uncomfortable – the reasons given to claim legitimacy, to which we turn to now, proving that point.
1.4: legitimacy

This dissertation is about legitimacy in the heritage field - the right to produce activities celebrating national heritage, to define content and procedures, and make the public abide by the moral and financial obligations that follow.

It is specifically about two groups of producers, commodifiers and bureaucrats, pursuing their business while casting doubts over the rights of others to perform heritage liturgies. It is about power - the probability that a group of persons or an institution, will be able to carry out their will in the face of resistance from others.

Power, to endure, must be imposed forcibly or be made tolerable by being profitable to those who obey those in power. Power involves authority - which calls for voluntary obedience to those who exercise power because it is considered acceptable - legitimate. Legitimate power is power believed to be legitimate.

Traditionally, legitimacy is sanctioned by appeal to the general consent of the people governed (democratic theory), by appeal to justice, by appeal to the greater good promised to the greatest number (utilitarian theory), or by reference to the power one holds over others (might makes right theory). Legitimacy is also sanctioned power by the grace of God/gods (divine right theory).

Legitimacy "offers stability and order, not only in the narrow sense of preserving the status quo, (but also as) an adaptive capacity to cope with strains or changes in the environment... (It depends) on the ability of authorities to make convincing claims, arguments that they are acting in accordance with social norms. Hence questions of legitimacy revolve around procedural norms, procedural propriety, and the search for and sanctioning of procedural strays" (Ericson 1991, 7-8).

In Weberian sociology, legitimacy comes – as traditional legitimacy, which rests on an established belief in the handling of traditions, and the acceptance of those chosen to rule in accordance with the customs and practices within a tradition; as legal-rational authority, which rests on a belief in the legality of enacted rules, and of those achieving authority
under these rules (elected representatives and civil servants); as charismatic authority, which rests on the devotion to an exceptional individual or leader, and on the normative rules ordained by the individual (Jary and Jary 1991, 273).

Agents in the field are left with the production of heritage because they are willing to recognise the public as the source of their inspiration and their knowledge, and the reason of their existence.

Heritage producers are left with the production of heritage because they make a believable claim that heritage is profitable: heritage is all that society 'values and that survives as the living context, both natural and human, from which (it) derives sustenance, coherence and meaning' (Ontario 1990a, 18). If heritage does not profit every members in society, it can profit its more entreprising individuals. Wealth that commodifiers accumulate while selling their productions, they come to share with society - since society's wealth is the sum total of all individual wealth.

Heritage producers are left with the production of heritage activities because they are in a position to do so, and no one challenges them to it. The fact that groups are shown being busy staging heritage celebrations, is understood to be an indication that society agrees to the relevance of their productions: 'Societies, after all, choose to protect the objects and emblems of their collective pride; great scenic wonders, natural preserves, and game parks do not survive by accident... That they exist at all is a statement about the time in which they were established, and that they continue to survive is a clear indication that they are still regarded as having great public worth' ([American] Conservation Foundation 1985, 32).

Academics, bureaucrats and commodifiers share the field because they can convince the public to believe in the antiquity and in the power of their respective fetish: the 'Hidden Hand' of the Market, the compelling 'Rationality of Process', and the 'Liberating Effect of Knowledge'.

Commodifiers, bureaucrats and academics, all come bearing gifts - commodifiers entertain their political correspondents, their bank accountants and other merchants from the market with tales of potential profits - commodifiers rarely, if ever, put their case to academics and
to bureaucrats either for fear of being reminded of that episode in the Temple (Mt. 21:12), or for fear of acknowledging that there is indeed very little enduring profits in the business.

Bureaucrats provide commodifiers with good reputation by considering in their discourses wealth as being as important as unity, consensus and meanings.

Academics provide bureaucrats with one of their most compelling legitimating device – the analogy between heritage commemoration and religion, while academics and bureaucrats promise greedy commodifiers the discovery of magnificent treasures (1).

1.5: analogy and invective as legitimating devices

Legitimacy is sought in the field, sometimes through productions, sometimes through argumentation, and most of the time through invectives and analogies. Invectives dispense of arguing a point; analogies make that point economically.

In generous times, heritage is patrimony, and heritage objects, treasures to heritage commodifiers. To heritage bureaucrats, heritage objects are relics, and heritage celebrations are akin to religious ceremonies.

Analogy is the process through which knowledge is created by bringing together two situations separated by time and different in their components: "We speak of reasoning by analogy when on the basis on some similarity which we discern between two things... we infer some other similarity. Reasoning by analogy is a special case of inductive reasoning since we must be wary of the possibility that the further similarities, which are presupposed in our inference, may not actually obtain. Like all indicative inference reasoning by analogy is stepping from the known to the unknown. Clearly, then, analogical reasoning is not demonstrative or deductive" (Harré 1987, 89).

Analogy and invective are used liberally in the field: "The enclosed character of the historical discipline is nowhere more apparent than in the pages of the learned journals... academic rivals engage in gladiatorial combat, now circling one another warily, now moving in for the kill. In the seminars such conflicts serve the function of blood sports and are followed with bated breath" (Samuel 1994, 4).
In times of duress, the bureaucratic keepers of national treasures are called thieves, and market-oriented producers, disneyfiers.

Analogy is a creative and legitimate form of reasoning that builds upon what is conceived as running a chance of being universally understood and convincing (2,3,4,5).

Analogy simplifies complex issues: "(In sociological theory), there is no tangible object which you can observe or dissect. All there is to deal with is nebulous and wraith-like, forever changing its form as you understand more of it. ( ) Trying to grasp ideas in sociological theory is like eating candy floss in a wind - a constant effort to stop the material blowing away. Learning most other things (like facts) is relatively simple... a diet of facts is more like eating a toffee apple than a candy" (Brown 1981, 17).

The use of analogy is never satisfying since, in every case, two elements separated by time and structure can always be proven inadequate. Though they often hold true, analogies will break down at any point where logical pressure is applied.

Occasionally, the discourse about Heritage is conducted with the good help of analogies: The world has been "rejoicing in a newly popular faith: the cult of heritage - a self-conscious creed, whose shrines and icons daily multiply and whose praise suffuses public discourse... the creed of heritage (answering) needs for ritual devotion, especially where other formal faith has become perfunctory or mainly political. Like religious causes, heritage fosters exhilarating fealties...Once a dilettante pastime, the pursuit and defense of patrimonial legacies is now likened to the Crusades - bitter, protracted and ruthless" (Lowenthal 1998, 1; 2).

Most importantly, the Heritage discourse is instituted upon an analogy: "the social process of memorialization involves building an appropriate physical artefact that analogically links past community events with the present, establishing meaning for the collective memory, and thus enhancing community moral unity" (Gregory 1988, 216).

Through the analogy, the present is made to be similar to the past as the grid after which the present is interpreted is applied to past events: "the work of applying an analogy is involved with creative selection of aspects that appropriately fit with entirely new circumstances; therefore, history repeats itself only in the sense that the historian can strive creatively to demonstrate similarity. The analogy is objective only in the sense that its
constituent historical facts are generally agreed on; and the analogy is relative only in the sense that historical facts are selectively superimposed on presently existing circumstances to fulfill cogent mnemonic needs of the community" (Gregory 1988, 215; after Schwartz [1982, 1986]).

the religious analogy

Heritage producers, directly or quietly, seek or find legitimacy in the religious analogy (transcendence theory of legitimacy): “The entire vocabulary of religion is based upon the perception of analogies between the material and the spiritual worlds. Words which now bear an immaterial and spiritual significance were originally used to denote visible and tangible objects...The innermost secret of religion is still put into speech by means of the analogy of fatherhood” (Joyce 1908, 416).

As it is with political power sanctioned through the grace of God, so it is with practitioners referring to themselves as representatives of a greater power - clerics, priests or prophets: « That is, politics cannot be understood without recognising that the contours of acceptable wisdom ( ) are fundamentally shaped by a governing metaphysical-moral vision. The essence of this vision is surpassing conviction about what is « really real », the compelling sense of what constitutes ultimate and worthy power in a transcendent sense. Wisdom, influence, interests, intelligence, and political force ( ) must be understood to serve powers, principles, or purposes beyond themselves. Concern for these, as well as beliefs and behaviours thought to be appropriate to such concerns, are what human beings vaguely call « religion » (Stackhouse 1967, 409).

The smell of liturgical incense has been lingering for some time over the field. Schlereth has been reluctant to the exhibition of historic objects according to the practices of religious instruction (Schlereth 1980, 209). Sorensen has mocked convincingly the practitioners of a new heritage priesthood (Sorensen 1989, 66).

The author of « A Strategy for Conserving Ontario's Heritage » has written of heritage as if it were Divine Providence: « Ontario's heritage is a living resource. It is the basis for our identity, and our social and economic well being. It is a source of confidence in what we can achieve; as we come to understand it, we discover who we are and what we can do (heritage is) the foundation of liveability and continuity in the province » (Ontario 1990a, 27).
West denounced a conservative perception of history which fetishized “the artefact as 'Heritage', a hidden level of interpretation that forms its own kind of privileged knowledge, and created popular symbols of the nation in almost mystical forms” (West 1988, 52). Cameron had been conducting, over more than 25 years, an analogy between temple and museum (Cameron 1971, 1993, 1995). In his Great Museum (1984), Horne compared contemporary cultural mass tourism with medieval pilgrimages.

Repeatedly, in the past decades, references have been made to museum visitors living some higher experience transcending their everyday lives. Benefits from attending museums were said to parallel those gained from places of worship (Graburn, 1977; Annis 1986).

Museum writers were then inspired by Durkheimian sociologists such as - Warner (1961), Bellah (1967), and others - Ozouf (1976), MacCannel (1976), who were continued, lately, by Connerton (1989) after Bourdieu.

Heritage bureaucrats (Ontario 1990) were acknowledging a precept in Parsonian sociology (after Durkheim 1912), that wants the Cultural Subsystem to rule over all of the other subsystems in the Social Action System. Culture is fundamentally religious; as producers of society's collective representations and memory, heritage producers are instrumental in creating the “interrelated system of shared values, beliefs and symbols which is found in any collectivity; and the systems of motives, affects and ideas to be internalised through socialisation by each individual” (Cohen 1968: 102-103).

Machiavelli, long ago, had explained that: "ecclesiastical rulers ( ) are the only rulers who are secure and happy. (But because) they are ruled by a higher power, which human intelligence cannot grasp, I will say no more about them; for, since they have been built up and maintained by God, only a presumptuous and rash person would debate about them" (Machiavelli, The Prince, Chapter XI).

The smell of liturgical incense continues to hang over an increasingly secular field: “Musées archives, cimetières et collections, fêtes, anniversaires, traités, procès-verbaux, monuments, sanctuaires, associations, ce sont les buttes témoins d’un autre âge, des illusions d’éternité. D’où l’aspect nostalgique de ces entreprises de piété, pathétiques et glaciales. Ce sont les rituels d’une société sans rituel; des sacralités passagères dans une société qui désacralise ” (Nora 1984, XXIV).
1.6: argument

This dissertation is about commercial producers and government employees standing as the main producers of heritage services.

Bureaucrats, as the Polity’s official remembrancers, are entrusted with the management of heritage properties - their competence and expertise having earned them the privilege to display society's dominant symbols.

Commodifiers claim to be more useful to society than bureaucrats and government employees. Heritage under their stewardship brings wealth to society; wealth is accountable in profits, taxes and dues that make entrepreneurs and society wealthier.

Heritage is patrimony – a material or immaterial property that can be bought and sold legitimately as a commodity by its legal owner.

Heritage is a property handed over in the present by the past and the future. As such, it is revered with reverence societies owed to the sacred, and reverence must be transferred to those who take care of material and immaterial properties. Heritage celebration is akin to a religious ritual.

1.7: heritage and legitimacy - Bourdieu on capital

The main themes that have been introduced at this point - the existence of common practices in heritage, the state of perpetual conflict within the field, and the use of invective and analogy as legitimate devices, coalesce in the (analogical) notion of ‘capital’ defined by Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002). The writer’s own career as a teacher and as a museologist was enlightened by the reading of “L’amour de l’art” (1966), “Les héritiers” (1970), and “Méditations pascaliennes” (1997).

At some point during this research, it became clear to the writer that at least two of the main protagonists in his dissertation would find Bourdieu’s social theories quite agreeable
to their practices: radical critics being confirmed in the tragic nature of social life, bureaucrats finding in Bourdieu’s ‘soft determinism’ a promise that they could exercise some influence over society after all.

As a comment to Bourdieu’s ‘capital’ analogy, the writer is willing to believe that the more important the amount of capital accumulated by a producer in a given field, the more legitimate this producer is bound to appear. Legitimacy, in a field dedicated to collection and preservation (parsimony), is a matter of accumulating knowledge and objects.

*Part II of this dissertation relies upon Bourdieu to gain insight on the activities economic capitalists and cultural producers put into gear when considering heritage as a business proposition. Preserving and presenting heritage resources is profitable - it proceeds like an economic, though not necessarily as a commercial exchange.*

*Parts III, IV and V present an explanation of the heritage bureaucrat’s activities, as he is granted the power and function of a religious fetish in the field (after Bourdieu on political representation).*

*This dissertation presents a description of practices and strategies that the main producers of institutional heritage activities stage as they seek to establish their legitimacy in the field. It is a description of totems that commodifiers and bureaucrats have erected to stake their claims over the field.*

**capital**

Capital, according to Bourdieu, is the "energy of social physics" (1972, 242). Social space is structured in different markets where capitalists, owners of specific capitals, compete to satisfy their needs and interests. Groups in society constantly strive to accumulate, and whenever possible, to monopolize capital (Durand and Weill 1989, 192).

The dynamic of a social structure, according to Bourdieu, "is informed by the strategies that members of these groups seek to safeguard, or improve their position by converting the types of capital they hold into other, more accessible or more profitable types" (Wacquant 1987, 70; quoting Bourdieu 1971).
Capital is made of assets, resources, attributes, more generally powers, which are invested both in a specific field, and outside that field, in order that capitalists secure for themselves a more profitable, and a more promising position in society. Relations agents from any field entertain with one another are first geared towards acquiring capital. Agents, in society, are divided according to how much capital they own, and how important their respective capitals are. Social relations are akin to economic exchanges; they "are governed by the laws of interested calculation, competition or exploitation" (Bourdieu 1972, 172).

Capital comes as economic capital - the various factors of production, economic goods, revenues and the economic interest prevailing at a given time in a social group; social capital - encompassing the totality of the resources an individual calls upon when acting within a network of durable social relations (social capital is not limited to what is designated as 'connections', but includes the added value which membership in a close and influential group brings to capital already possessed); cultural capital - as it is 'incorporated' in its owners as a durable disposition of the body, as it is objectified, (in museum objects and heritage monuments) and as it is institutionalised in diplomas and credentials, for instance.

Capitals differ from one another according to the degree of their importance in a social group, to the profits they generate, to their social 'visibility' and to the price their management costs.

Capitals necessarily emigrate from their original field, or transform themselves into other types of capital. Cultural capital is meant to be invested in the cultural field; investing in cultural assets activates some kind of social commerce and generate some kind of economic profits. Cultural capital thus has become economic or social capital.

Competition between producers moves with capitalists moving into different fields. Capitalists coming to the cultural field will compete for - the making and stocking of cultural capital, the definition of procedures through which cultural capital is produced, and, finally, for the control (the ownership) of society's symbolic systems.
Symbolic capital

Symbolic capital is the sum total of all other capitals - once invested and profiting, and the end result of their transmutation, into authority, (reputation, expertise, prestige). It is the most valuable of all capitals.

Symbolic capital provides the capitalist the privilege of pointing the index finger at 'something' which, de facto and immediately, becomes reality: "a fourth form, symbolic capital, consists in the prestige and the social credit conferred by socially accepted or socially concealed uses of other types of capital... It is, to Bourdieu, 'capital denied, recognised as legitimate, that is, misrecognised as capital' " (Wacquant 1987, 69; quoting Bourdieu 1980, 200).

Symbolic capital is made manifest in the heritage field by the enactment of rituals, the display of privileges and the granting of awards and honours. Symbolic capital must be publicly shown, for it is through public display that its capitalists simultaneously acquire and make manifest their legitimacy in the field.

When operating within a specific field, owners of various capitals must be able to demonstrate their knowledge of the field and their willingness 'to play the game' (Bourdieu's analogy) for the same stakes and according to the same rules as other players seek and follow – namely the proper way of producing heritage activities of earlier paragraphs.

field

A field is made of hierarchies, stakes, rules, and specific positions of organization. It is a system of objective relations to be activated by players - competitors or associates, set in differentiated and socially defined positions. A field is largely independent - though not totally, from the physical existence of the agents gathered within its confines; it endures while individuals do not.
A field is simultaneously "a space of conflict and competition, the analogy here being with a battlefield, in which participants vie to establish monopoly over the species of capital effective in it... and the power to decree the hierarchy and 'conversion rates' between all forms of authority" (Wacquant 1987, 17).

Competing for resources means struggling over the legitimate representation of the social world, over the power to make people see and believe, over the possibility of transforming reality according to one's will and shaping structures of reference and meanings guiding the behaviour of community members.

**habitus**

Successful capitalists are given to 'teach' other individuals a habitus - "a system of lasting and transposable dispositions to perceive, ratiocinate, evaluate and act which is the incorporated product of socialization, that is, of one's integrated social experiences. Each class of social conditions engenders a type of habitus which tends to perpetuate these conditions by functioning as the principle of the generation and structuration of practices and representations" (Wacquant 1987, 76).

The habitus transmits from one generation to the next the ethos of groups and classes. "Individuals ( ) inherit a circumscribed set of class or group parameters within which they may live their lives ( ) Our capacity to make ourselves into different selves is a function of the ways in which social conditions have enabled us to be constituted cumulatively in the past – and all of these ways are manifestations of the 'habitus' which was to the disposition to act and think which was enshrined in the ethos of the group into which we were born " (Robbins 1991, 172).

Knowledge of the past is handed over either through inscribing practices (devices used for storing and retrieving information - archives for instance), or incorporating practices: "memory is sedimented in even the bodily postures of those living in particular societies. Incorporating practices are messages which are imparted by means of people's current bodily activity, the transmission only occurring when their bodies are co-present" (Urry 1996, 49; on Connerton 1989).
Agents in control of symbolic systems are the guardians of their society's representations. Their role is to proclaim what stands as orthodoxy in a given social group - the definition of events, characters, attitudes and narratives that are considered proper either because they do exist or because they have endured over time. People in the past are said to have thrived following lessons that are now being provided generously to contemporaries. These lessons are thus pronounced useful and necessary. Alternatively, agents controlling symbolic systems could preserve society against what is 'non orthodox', and 'non significant' - that is, against what is not.

Heritage agents display their status by claiming as part of their field of expertise, the various instruments of classification by which reality is given a name (nominated, delineated, defined). These are definitions and nomenclatures found, for instance, in museum catalogues, on panels, on labels and in official documents (Canadian Parks Service 1994a). To describe, according to bourdelian sociology, is to prescribe: "taxonomy ( ) at once divides and unifies - it legitimates unity in division, that is to say, hierarchy" (Bourdieu 1977, 165)- [toute vision est une division]. And, whoever stands at the centre of the field - where they are seen defining the practices through which heritage is known, must be considered legitimate because she/he stands ‘there’.

However, for symbolic capital to be, it must be simultaneously displayed for what it is, and strategically denied importance, as it is too profitable not to raise envy or suspicion. Symbolic capital must be mis/recognised as the self-serving endeavour it really is, in order that public recognition be granted; being legitimate is to be recognised by others while keeping one’s motivations for oneself.

Legitimisation

Legitimisation amounts to the creation of an illusion - it could be a mystification were it not for the fact that both the profiting and the profited agree to believe in that illusion, (either out of conviction, interest or greed), and to proceed into the game as interested and dedicated players.

The transformation of various capitals into symbolic capital takes place, according to Bourdieu, without the participants being fully aware of the real strategies that are enacted
in these fields. There is a fundamental mis/recognition [mé/connaissance] by participating agents, both of the set of objective relations established between positions, which the structure of the field is made of and, most of all, of the true nature of the relations between this structure and the structures of the economic and political fields prevailing in society (Wacquant 1987, 72).

However, as much as power cannot be coerced unto anyone without being detestable, as much legitimacy - the right to name reality, cannot be attained without reference to some absolute concepts intended and proven to carry adhesion.

Reference to concepts such as Rationality / Reason and Rational Management; Nature and Naturalization; Religion and Civic Religion / Nationalism, is part of a strategy, "the object of which is to transmute 'egoistic', private, particular interests into disinterested, collective, publicly available legitimate interests" (Bourdieu 1992, 40).

In the heritage field, these concepts are presented as authoritative, first for being embedded in things, in the evident 'materiality' of heritage artefacts and in the solemn pronouncements about their integrity: "in order to endure, any social hierarchy must have a material grounding, thus the symbolic systems that reinforce domination are always, to some degree, as if they had their foundations in reality (in things)" (Wacquant 1987, 76).

These, according to Bourdieu "are devoid of the natural necessity they profess and ascribe, of the material relations they legitimise, the gap between actuality and necessity being filled by symbolic violence" (Wacquant 1987, 76) - "the structure and the functions of culture cannot be deducted from any universal principle, either of physical, biological or spiritual nature, as they are not united by any type of internal relationship to the 'nature of things' or to the human nature' (Bourdieu 1970, 22).

From this, it must be inferred that legitimacy is a game bullies play and win either quietly or violently.

Everything material and immaterial is up for grabs since, ultimately, there is no absolute referent which is not historically produced - the very making of these referents being the "stake of constant objective and subjective, material and symbolic strife, as each group seeks to carry its vision of society in order to dissemble the objective underpinnings of its
efforts to protect or improve its position" (Wacquant 1987, 77). Referring to any philosophical system, if morally and intellectually appeasing, is indeed a mystification.

Quarreling amongst producers of heritage services, discloses the arbitrariness of the whole logic of legitimisation. Heritage activities breed violence at the symbolic level not only because heritage producers make their 'clients' feel and believe in what amounts to be something which is culturally arbitrary (namely that only one system of values and norms can be available, while others are left unmentioned), but with the intention of denying them the possibility of thinking and feeling differently.

symbolic violence

When heritage commemoration is used to celebrate the values of a few worthy individuals and to discredit alternative world views, when it stages the representation and the reproduction of social inequalities, it is violence perpetrated against those who cannot oppose, intellectually or otherwise, what is presented as an institution.

Commemorating the past is a legitimating activity for those who have the financial means, the social prominence and the technical knowledge to commission such an activity. The public staging of the past is a manifestation of power in the community. Commemoration is the production both of cultural and symbolic capital, the legitimisation of the authority of those who define the conditions under which order is to be maintained in society.

Analogy, in the legitimisation process, is the tool that turns an agent operating in the heritage field from someone who has capital for being right, into someone who is right because he has Capital - economic capital to acquire land, objects and labour; social capital to convince others into trading at a disadvantage; cultural capital as in the knowledge of procedures, access to human sources and the material references from which to 'acquire' knowledge. Symbolic capital is then, silence imposed unto others.

might makes right

As everywhere else, once the legitimating rights have been discussed and denied, it is might that makes right – but not necessarily so.
"There's little", writes Robbins, "that we can do as individuals, (as one finds in Bourdieu's positions) an element of fatalism or perhaps of reluctant cosmic conservatism. The urge to distinguish ourselves and to think by operating a principle of division cannot be 'essential' to the human condition for Bourdieu" (Robbins 1991, 175).

Still, works sociologists produce "aim to influence the ways in which people recognize their own societies (and) alter their perceptions and habits" (Robbins 1991, 174).

The idea of habitus suggests that humans inter-generationally create the conditions within which they are conditioned: "humans agents construct the mechanisms of social solidarity and collective thinking which enable their specific societies to cohere" (Robbins 1991, 174, on Bourdieu and Durkheim).

Bourdieu's theory of the dynamics of habitus: "demonstrates that social structures and identities must be understood not as static, typological, and hard-edged categories but rather as dynamic formations of organized dischronic complexity, poised between stability and change, whose edges are best construed (in terms of non-linear dynamics) as fuzzy, shifting fractal boundaries between complex attractors with relatively hard cores." (Shusterman 1992, 8; on Dykes).

Individuals in society then have first "a positive obligation to work (on bending) the culture which is particular to their circumstances and should not try to fabricate universal systems" (as opposed to taking care of one's 'garden' after Voltaire's Candide, and Samuel [1992]).

"By exposing the concealed social conditions, presuppositions, strategies, and illusio of certain elite social worlds (e.g. of art and academia), Bourdieu provides a tool of liberation for people laboring under their social spell of domination but who cannot, through their own experience know the inner, unarticulated, workings of these dominating social words" (Shusterman 1999, 12).

"Knowing is a kind of doing and, as such, should not be the basis for contriving social distinction. Scepticism should be a great social leveller" (Robbins 1991, 179).
Chapter 2: sources

In the last part of the introduction, the writer presents his methods of research and the sources from which he gathered information.

This work considers heritage as a practice defined first by officially instituted practitioners. Basic material came from four heritage institutions - the UNESCO (Canada is a strong supporter of the Organisation, and Canadian heritage would be silent were it not for the words pronounced in its Conventions and its Recommendations), the Canadian Parks Service (Parks Canada), the Ministry of Citizenship and Culture, Government of the Province of Ontario, and the Heritage Canada Foundation.

In Canada, these institutions are the field’s administrative and professional authority; they organize, regulate, define and direct that field. These institutions are deemed to operate according to some permanent, ahistorical framework to which they ultimately appeal when determining the proper procedures to 'make heritage'.

Heritage institutions are creatures of the written word, and most of what they produce proceeds from the written word. In the heritage field, the monument follows the document. In principio erat sermo.

written documents as main sources

This dissertation is established upon the study of some institutional foundational documents – international conventions, ministerial policies, annual reports, public consultation reports, and planning documents. These documents are translated for public use first into printed media - visitor’s leaflets, sites monographs, publicity leaflets, mass media advertisement, speeches, before being made into exhibitions.

These documents are meant to reflect reality from the field and society. More importantly, they define what reality should become – were reason to prevail.
UNESCO

The UNESCO has been the most influential cultural institution in the world since its creation in 1949. The Organisation reinvented, in 1972, the concept of Heritage in its Convention Concerning the Protection of Cultural and Natural World Heritage (UNESCO 1972).

The Canadian Parks Service and Environment Canada takes pride in being associated with United Nations initiatives. Most Canadian heritage institutions speak a language borrowed from UNESCO documents.

UNESCO’s Conventions and Recommendations relative to cultural property, historic areas and archaeological matters serve as matrices to various national official pronouncements: “UNESCO conventions is intended to set forth ideal policy objectives as defined by a consensus of the international community” (Ontario 1987, 32).

Canadian Parks Service (Parks Canada)

The Canadian Parks Service is Canada’s most important heritage agency. It is the legal steward to 223,000 sq. km of land divided in 38 National Parks and Reserves, 3 Marine Parks, and 792 Historic Sites - of which 132 are under Parks Canada management (6).

A government agency since 1998, it is subsidized by the Department of Canadian Heritage. Historic Sites have been visited by 9,614,427 Canadians and foreign visitors in 1996-1997. The Canadian Parks Service received 96.3$ million in government subsidies in 1996-1997.

Every four years, the Canadian Parks Service presents to the Canadian Parliament a State of the Parks Report. Reports from 1990 and 1994 have been used in this work.

Since 1964, the Canadian Parks Service (Parks Canada) has produced four Policy documents. The 1978 edition was submitted to a public review in 1991 (Canadian Parks Services Proposed Policy [CPS 1991a]), and presented to Parliament in 1994 as Guiding Principles and Operational Policies (CPS 1994a). The 1994 document is said to reflect the views of interested groups, other federal departments, Provincial and Federal Departments, Aboriginal People and of the public.

Between 1974 and 1985, the Service was envied for its financial means and its productions. Since then, it is also importance from the influence of its former employees who have found work in the heritage system throughout the country and abroad.

The writer has been employed by Parks Canada from 1974 to 1990 as an interpretive producer, an interpretation project manager, a national adviser on interpretation (National Parks), before working for the Department of National Defence as a museum director. He has produced exhibitions at Fort Chambly, Fort Témiscamingue and at Carillon (Ottawa River Canals System). He has visited sites in the five Federal Regions of Canada, and will be quoting from notes he took when visiting N.H.S. Lower Fort Garry and N.H.S. Upper Fort Garry (Winnipeg, Man).

**Government of Ontario**


The 1990 Report came after three years of public consultations, the presentation of 250 submissions, discussions with 35 provincial organizations representing 1800 local organizations, and a review of the Committee's conclusions by government ministries and agencies. It was intended to help drafting a revised version of the Provincial Heritage legislation. The revised legislation confirmed Heritage Ontario as the main official instrument to promote heritage matters in the Province.

Ontario documents are the most articulate of all institutional documents from the last decades. They have been consulted to represent the provincial - regional perspective in this work.
Their perspective is less normative than the Canadian Parks Service documents. They have been written by an author fluent in functionalist vocabulary – the lingua franca of government administration for more than forty years.

This writer has been the director of two military museums situated in Ontario, and was a consultant in the planning of the new Stephen Leacock Museum (Orillia, On).

_Heritage Canada Foundation_

The Heritage Canada Foundation has been, since its establishment in 1973, the largest private preservation organisation in Canada. "As a national and independent institution (its mandate is) to conserve, and encourage the conservation of, physical (built) and ethnological environment, (artefacts of multicultural, native and ethnic origins), to act as a national voice, maintains a country wide network of conservationists and to develop conservation techniques to be applied across Canada" (Heritage Canada Foundation, 1987; np).

Over the years, the Foundation has run three various programs which promoted community involvement and depended on government funding – the Area Conservation Program (1973-1978); the Main Street Program (1979-1994); the Heritage Regions Program (1988). All were meant to regenerate the economies of depressed areas through the restoration of their built environment.

The Foundation has provincial chapters throughout Canada, publishes the magazine “Heritage” and presents annual awards recognizing special contributors to the cause of heritage conservation. It promotes heritage in schools and in the media.

It has 2000 members whose membership allows them free access to National Trust Property in Great Britain and in Australia. The Heritage Canada Foundation owns property. It was founded with an endowment of the Federal Government. In fact, it is dedicated to the built heritage, and takes after British and American practices.

Publications of the Foundation have been consulted to represent local interests in Canada’s heritage. The writer quotes the Foundation’s _Strategic Plan_ (1987-1992), articles from its magazine, and various promotional pamphlets.
The writer has visited Perth, On., a project of urban restoration in which the Foundation has been involved. He is familiar with the Québec equivalent of Main Street Program (Rues principales).

**documents**

These documents were consulted with the reverence owed to instruments justifying the employment to thousands of employees (and volunteers), and inspiring the opinions of millions of their clients.

These documents are predicates. They are staged as logical demonstrations, building inference from what are proposals arranged into a formal argument depending on deduction or induction.

They are declarations, shedding light over what once was ‘darkness and chaos’; they speak the truth and seek to inspire trust.

They promise knowledge to those who read them, and moral and social progress to those who abide by them.

**knowledge**

These documents are productions of their milieu – a reflection of a given life-world which constructs knowledge as it attributes roles and relationships for all to emulate. They create and make manifest an organization’s culture, which is expected to spill over the rest of society.

They are a display of their makers’ belief in rationality of process, and in their capability of measuring, and predicting social reality.

They necessarily make references to more ancient ways of acquiring knowledge: inspiration and revelation. The language, and the tone, into which they are pronounced announce that knowledge is the consequence of being blessed with an understanding of more significant, transcendental designs.
All these documents evidently belong to a culture of written discourse (logos). They are rational pronouncements which, nevertheless, justify the myths of the modern tribe. These were once expressed in words, speech, stories, epic poems, fictions and fables, and now endure as Heritage (Samuel 1994, Lowenthal 1998).

Originating from a field where the truth is still spoken, they still display characteristics of ancient oral practices. Arguments in these documents are agonistically set, experiential, and additive and aggregative like ancient 'spoken' narratives were (Ong 1982, 313-317).

They are made to appear no less valid than if they were testimonies from those who have worked there, or demonstrations of logical processes by those who make a living of appearing rational and reasonable.

They belong, in purpose and in format, to the discourse of modern management – the world of operational plans and five-year planning exercises which is a modern manifestation of the 'éternel recommencement' of mythical time (Eliade 1969).

These documents are deemed to be valid – they are recognized the status of monuments in the Polity (they first came as Statutes). They acknowledge public input before being set in their final format, but will never be commented publicly after they have been proclaimed. Once instituted they are taken for granted – undisputed, habitual.

The writer has found in official documents the definitions after which heritage institutions wanted to be known. Meanings – information, from these documents were deemed to be self-evident.

The writer sought in academic works complementary material to explain official pronouncements, either as comments or as critiques. Academic works provided him with meanings that were 'latent' as compared to the clear evidence made public in official documents.

Critiques, predictably, were to come from radical humanist writers when discussing purposes, or constructivists when discussing practices (Burrell 1978).

Both commentators and critics are the products of their environment and professional interest; one may find appropriate the analogy between Gramsci (the inspiration of radical
critics) writing his Prison works, and the radical academic wishing his cabinet (Samuel 1992, 444) freedom to those imprisoned within the field.

Official documents are certainly the products of their times – the 1970s, when those in power in society were applying lessons learnt some thirty years from an academic world bent on structuralism and functionalism.

Depending where they stand, at any given time, some heritage designers will want to be realists (found in stimulus-responsive settings), heritage educators will find professional profit in being constructivists; heritage managers will be staunch systemists; curators will be inclined to positivism (factual sequences, series of artefacts).

Complementary material came from sociology and anthropology, economics and political sciences, theology and history of religions.

Research was done in monographs (Durkheim 1912; Warner 1953; MacCannel 1976), and in monographs as collections of articles (Karp 1992). Information was found in encyclopaedias (Sills 1976; Outhwaite 1994), in dictionaries and in handbooks, in professional magazines (Cameron 1971; MacDonald 1988a), and in academic journals (MacDonald 1995; Cameron 1993).

Supplementary data was collected in newspapers – editorials, editorial cartoons, and comic strips (bureaucracy was commented with quotes from the syndicated 'Dilbert'), along with graffiti and marginalia (comments on MacDonald 1992, 194; in the margins of the book kept at the University of Ottawa’s Library). These were intended to prove that concepts do travel between academic and ordinary worlds (7,8,9,10).

experience

The writer expected to bring to his research the experience he had acquired in his trade. Works which he produced have been quoted elsewhere. He could have used his experience to build a case study, but was taken aback when declined immediate access at the National Archives to some of his projects’ files, or when he found that his management files had been sent to the shredder unknown to anyone concerned (Canadian Parks Service 1989).
Pursuing a case study within the Canadian Parks Service, in any event, would have been awkward because of the researcher's status within the network; he would have felt to be prying upon co-workers business.

Attempts were made at conducting informal interviews with practitioners. They failed either because of the researcher's status of national consultant on interpretation, or his former function of producer of heritage presentations.

One interview concluded, profitably, in a rant against authorities in the field and against nosy, pompous academics — whose only claim to their salaries was their capacity to “se pisser dans la cervelle” (Hubert, Conversation in Chambly 1982). Another interview was intentionally misleading, and insulting to the interviewer, as he knew that the information being communicated to be untrue.

The researcher felt twice that he was a threat to the interviewee — made uneasy as to whether he should react as a representative of an organization or as a civil servant under examination by someone from the outside. Since communication is a trade, the interviewer felt that he had nothing but malaise to offer in return for valuable information from the interviewee.

The researcher was then confirmed that knowledge is a rare commodity, and that people in power are prolific on the profits to be gained from their rule, but quiet on the strategies (price) they pay to keep themselves in power.

When asked to comment on situations other than those pertaining to their immediate work environment, interviewees reverted immediately to the institutional script. The researcher went the same way.

conversations

There were, in compensation, numerous conversations, arguments over the specifics and the generics of the trade - most of the times at work. There were countless management meetings where the reality of the field was created, and many professional conferences where it was ignored.
Some of these daily conversations were Apollinian in character, others, Dionysian. They were instrumental in adding to the information previously gathered, changing the course of the research or challenging some recent findings.

The researcher was bringing to his work the experience he had acquired in the field. This experience had initially helped him define an hypothesis, and was supposed to grant him an advantage when explaining his field.

The writer had understood that he could become the object of his research. It was wishful thinking, however, that the researcher could be considered, in the various positions he occupied, some professional stranger or marginal native of participant-observation. The danger being that one can become very rapidly nothing but a stranger and a marginal to his informants when actually working with them.

Most of the researcher's time then was spent trying to translate into life-world language what had been read the night before in the cloistered space of a 'library carrel' (Samuel 1992, 444). His experience in the field did not transfer easily into dissertation form. Once set within the framework of a dissertation, life-world experience, however significant, when not replicated or integrated into a theoretical framework, appearing quickly anecdotal.

Some of the most important agents in the field are never discussed for what they actually do in their daily life-world. Still ideology repeatedly blames them for what they are — ignorant stooges of manipulative authorities, and what they fail to do.

Some workers, from stage electricians to reenactors, and cabinet makers, have yet to bring to their consciousness that what they accomplish with pride and pleasure is really detrimental to them and to society.

Still the researcher as author believes that his narrative is as credible as his sources were to him; that it could help the reader understand the reality of the field as it has for him; that it could engage some reader into changing his situation, and empower individuals in society to engage into action.

He considers the results of his research to be transferable — most of his sources have been transferred; dependable — as much as his sources claimed to be, and as much as writing
in a foreign language permitted; and ‘confirmable’ – as the many quotes in this document vouch for (Bryman 2001, 274-275).

**purposes**

This research was initiated to make sense of the many passing ideological changes that took place over the years in a field which has gone from Marxism to Market. The writer wanted for himself what he had provided both his patrons, public and employers: legitimacy.

He had wanted, initially, to learn the lingua franca of his field from those who practiced it. He had wished to compare his practice of the field with the mandarin spoken by those who, successively, as the wheel turned, had ruled over the field.

To the writer, knowledge has been emancipatory (once irony sets in); knowledge needs to be useful; knowledge will always be self-justified.

The writer wanted from his fluency in heritage making to provide him with a position in the field – if not a sense of place.

The proper way of doing things existed since some practitioners were being recompensed with titles, positions, awards, superior wages, tenure, if not a straight posture and a clean nose.

These enlightened individuals would endure in the event of personnel rationalization for the same reasons that the English country house survived over time. They spoke the language of the nation – they had become entitled ‘natives’, agents with a privileged access to the spirit of the place. The fetish makers could become fetishes themselves.

The writer understood that he had to discover the rules, and abide by them to become an authority. It made sense to believe that authority would come to him from those already in authority. The writer then was led to believe that there were individuals in society and in his field who were knowledgeable, and others who were ignorant.

To become knowledgeable, the ignorant had to be made conscious of his ignorance, forsake the experience that he could bring to the lesson, and become a disciple, a follower
To become knowledgeable, the ignorant had to be made conscious of his ignorance, forsake the experience that he could bring to the lesson, and become a disciple, a follower as befits a student of Heritage: he had to shape himself into 'obsequium' (Bourdieu 1984, 84; Bourdieu 1997, 207; Bourdieu 1972, 198).

The writer was prepared — for the sake of the argument, since reality is never that restrictive, to seek knowledge, 'elsewhere', 'out there', in some documents worthy of close examination (hermeneutics), in mysterious though authoritative pronouncements from a benevolent but elusive entity, or in sacred objects of the tribe from which to learn how to be one with the past and the future - Transcendence.

The writer did seek knowledge in lessons provided in a foreign country, in a foreign language, and in a format foreign to his daily practices. The price to pay for these lessons, and for a place in the field, was to condone some philosophical positions and forsake others.

Institutions in the heritage field, to both its immediate profit and long term detriment, abide by - realism in ontology: "The social world is external to individual cognition is a real world made up of hard, tangible and relatively immutable structures. Whether or not we label and perceive these structures, the realists maintain, they still exist as empirical entities...the social world exists independently of an individual's appreciation of it, The individual is seen as being born into and living within a social world which had a reality of its own. It is not something which the individual creates – it exists out there... ontologically it is prior to the existence and consciousness of any single human being" (Burrell 1979, 4), and positivism in epistemology: "We use positivist here to characterise epistemologies which seek to explain and predict what happens in the social world by searching for regularities and causal relationships between its constituent elements... Positivists accept that the growth of knowledge is essentially a cumulative process in which new insights are added to the existing stock of knowledge and false hypotheses eliminated" (Burrell 1979, 5).

Heritage institutions, officially, forsake radical criticism as an acceptable philosophical position - "radicalism is committed to a view of society which emphasises the importance of overthrowing or transcending the limitations of existing social arrangements – opposing modes of domination and deprivation, and promoting change, emancipation and potentiality" (Burrell 1979, 32), but they will be interested in keeping an eye over the fence where to fetch useful alternatives to present conditions when need be.
transcendence

Knowledge comes as a revelation to the writer and the field with the magical power attributed to analogy. Miles pronounces without demonstration analogy as being "perhaps the most fundamental methods of knowing of all" (Miles 1982, 34). The Canadian Parks Service uses the analogy of a ladder to demonstrate the different steps on the way to blissful knowledge and social behaviour, (11).

This chapter has been built upon analogical references to Indo-European / Christian theological trinity: Capital has been economic / social / cultural capital (after Bourdieu). Readings have been dominant / negotiated / oppositional readings (after Hall). Meanings have been evident / latent / hidden meanings (after Turner). Knowledge has been reflective of the life-world / scientific / inspirational knowledge. Knowledge has been self-justified / utilitarian / emancipatory knowledge. Triangulation is a recommended process to validate meanings.

Analogy, which the writer considers to be epistemological pivot of his work, vouches for continuity and change.

This dissertation, as it discusses museology - thus collection, is bound to reflect some of the most recurrent habituses of the field. It has been documented by a researcher collecting information as if he were collecting objects. These 'objects' have been found, as it is habitual in collection building, mostly at random.

These 'objects' are now presented in two different exhibitions spaces / chapters. They have been put together (constructed) into a linear narrative by someone who refers to himself as if he were an object.

'The writer', as objectively anonymous as other makers of heritage productions, built his case for the legitimacy of heritage institutions on two analogies (heritage is patrimony; heritage is a religious activity).

Knowledge does appear in the field 'by magic'; exhibitions are luminously linear and 'auratic'. Knowledge, consequently, appears in this work magically - as if coming 'out of the
box', the process of analogy bringing together different elements to reveal the unusual out of the habitual.

Knowledge is a revelation - "When, out of my delight in the beauty of the house of God – the loveliness of the many-coloured stones has called me away from external cares, and worthy of meditation has induced me to reflect, transferring that which is material to that which is immaterial, on the diversity of sacred virtues; then it seems to me that I see myself dwelling, as it were, in some strange region of the universe which neither exists entirely in the slime of the universe nor entirely in the purity of Heaven; in that, by the Grace of God, I can be transported from this inferior to the higher world in an anagogical manner" (Abbot Suger of Saint Denis [1140-1280] quoted in Duby 1966, 16).
Chapter 3:  envoi - the producer in a violent field

Still, the heritage field is a violent place where agents and clients are forever at a deficit as to what they should do. The field is literally a violent place where rationalising directors are threatened with their lives by redundant employees, and where redundant employees are threatened with their means of living by rationalising directors. Violence is no less terrible when agents in the field agree to live their professional life in obsequiousness.

It is a violent field also to those who entertain the belief that their work must change the way of the world, as they end up paying duties to the dominants and even to the dominated when the latter agree to be saved from political oppression. For behind the reputable fight against pretense, misrepresentation, dependency-creation and disabling ideology, lurks the possibility that the benevolent reformer himself may be capitalising on his generous benevolence.

The heritage field, as a reflection of society, is a place where heritage producers are seen pushing unremittingly their load uphill, where their greed is never to be extinguished, and where they are lashing at one another, knowing that what is despicable in the other is the spectacle of their own feral selves. It is a tragic place where the dominated are defined by what they have not and dominants are defined by what they have, and what they will be parted with, either voluntarily in order to acquire something they need, or involuntarily, because they cannot shield their properties from their neighbours' greed.

"All social destinies, positive or negative, consecration or infamy, are equally fatal - I mean, lethal, since they lock the persons they make distinctive within the limits they are assigned and are made to acknowledge. The true inheritor will act like one, and will be seized by his very inheritance - meaning that he will be vested into things, taken by the very things that he has taken hold of" (Bourdieu 1992, 6).

The world of heritage is a place where authorities speak in a 'wooden tongue', and where everyone else is silent. Heritage concludes inevitably in silence: "How do you like the Queen? said the Cat in a low voice. 'Not at all' said Alice, 'she's so extremely' - Just then she noticed that the Queen was close behind her, listening; so she went on - 'likely to win
that it's hardly worth while finishing the game'. The Queen smiled and passed on" (Carroll [1982], 80) (9).

It is a world the heritage practitioner may wish to leave as early as possible. Standing uneasy before those who keep orthodoxy in the field, and in society, he may long for a quieter place: "There is so much to be known. And even if we know it, who would really dare to judge, and more, to propose alternatives? Our real problem is not so much that we might lack requisite knowledge, but that the values from which we might build have ceased to exist in the public mind. The advocate, reformer, or myth maker faces an almost superhuman task; he must first of all unearth the very values which he will then attempt to develop, illustrate, enhance, and implement. Faced with this task, humility is the only possible response; and the most probable - although by no means the only possible, - behaviour is withdrawal into some private domain where the job to be done has more defined and attainable ends" (Keniston 1960, 109).

If the heritage producer as an *[honnête homme]* were to stay, he would remind himself daily of the lessons he has learnt from his practice and from the traditions of his trade - some of which he learnt from his mother when, early in life, she dressed him for Halloween, in U.S. sheriff, devil or clown costumes (12, 13, 14).

These lessons are provided, in traditional societies, to anyone who stands 'there', before authorities, (or speaks on their behalf), and faces the reality of power (Balandier 1980).

'There', the heritage producer is allowed to perform either the role of - the Courtier, proceeding in gravitas, speaking when called for, silent when told, and following the proper rituals; the Sorcerer, standing in the shadow of Power, scheming to overthrow the powerful, tolerated by the authorities, since expected to be useful, either as their most valid interlocutor when new ideas are needed, or as the most likely scapegoat, as power is perennially hungry for alternatives and exemplary victims to be regenerated; the Trickster, as Hermès of the Greeks , and Coyote of the North American Natives (1980), standing before the authorities, presenting them with a reflection of their own selves, cunning and conned. Shifty.

Wearing masks, playing roles, is part of the strategies and the practices of Heritage. Eminent practicians have had no fear to speak their lines after those of –
the courtier, subscribing dutifully to the language of property: [the ethics of representation is one of a number of] particular challenges museums will increasingly be forced to address. Within the interpretation offered by a museum, there needs to be made available not only the expert knowledge of its staff, but also alternative viewpoints - especially those of the cultures represented. In the past, museum interpretation has largely been based on the perspectives of scholars of western civilisation. This is unacceptable in a culturally pluralistic society such as Canada... A third challenge is to involve visitors more intimately in the process of interpretation, thereby helping them improve their own judgemental abilities. Conventionally, museums operate in a communicational mode... This is becoming unacceptable to leisure-seekers, who increasingly expect a participative role in shaping their experiences. This is evidenced in the newer types of museums…' (MacDonald and Alsford 1991, 309).

the sorcerer, entertaining evil thoughts, scratching everyone in authority with epistemological considerations: "The essays in this book turn to a theory of everyday life in order to define the main characteristics of a vernacular and informal sense of history which is certainly not exhausted by the stately display of tradition and national identity in which it finds such a forceful and loaded public expression. My argument does not seek to justify the national past by alluding to its popular basis in everyday consciousness. Neither is it my aim to suggest that the symbolism of the nation might in itself be rearticulated in a democratic or socialist direction " (Wright 1985, 5).

the trickster making a living on the authorities, (Disney, Ford and Rockefeller), caught in an enduring association with the object of his denunciations, but standing righteous before the powerful: "The museums should offer respect to historical actors where due, but stop short of inculcating an incapacitating awe. If their subjects were critic of their society, they should refuse to blunt the jagged edges of the original message. The museums should work to break down the distinctions between amateur and professional that stultify both. They should walk the difficult line between, on the one hand, fostering a definition of the present solely in terms of the past, and, on the other, disconnecting the past so thoroughly from the present that we forget that people in the past produced the matrix of constraints and possibilities within which we act in the present" (Wallace 1986a).

The writer's preference goes to the trickster. For the Trickster is a liar, and in a field where integrity is a moral condition, and predictability, a moral practice, there may be no greater
duty toward truth than lying - the intentional 'displacement' of accepted truths 'to see what happens' when it is done.

The Trickster stands at the confine of order and disorder, and brings the benefits of movement, change, and perspective; he operates at 'that place' where silence becomes speech, and speech, silence. The trickster embodies the ritual necessity of change, challenging authority in all its stiffness, clumsiness and limitations.

The Trickster, and the heritage producer, stands at the "focal point of all of the important contradictions which human reason is unable to bear alone: between identity and otherness, presence and absence, imagination and reality, the absolute and nothingness, power and fragility, life and death, eternity and transition. An irruption of the sacred into the world, of the miracle at the heart of day-to-day life, of the irrational in the centre of the city", (a place where members of a group can be) "drawn out of themselves, and become strangers to their own narrowly social condition" (Bonnefoy 1991: 460-1, on Dionysus, the Foreigner).

It is 'on the line between' that heritage practitioners see that the losses incurred by community members when sorting out their differences, be minimized. It is from this place, the crease where the trickster of old inhabits, that the writer as an interpreter would spin his tales, were he to stay.
At the beginning of this work, practices were defined as the usual way of performing the preservation and presentation of objects and events identified as significant to the national history; institutions referred to government agencies and non-government organisations which produced, within an authorized though loosely organized network of sites or museums, activities celebrating the national past; institutional practices were practices that had been regularly and continuously performed, had been sanctioned and maintained through corporative and social norms; institutionalization was understood as a "solidifying of relationships, [status, rewards and sanctions], over time in such a way that behaviour attached to each status role remains constant whoever is occupying it" (Craib 1992, 42), and involves not only the acceptance of certain activities as routine, but also the allocation of social resources to that end and the acknowledgment that resources so used are employed legitimately; national heritage was all that has been transmitted in a tangible or intangible form by the ancestors of a group inhabiting a defined territory and that had to be transmitted intact to their heirs; commemoration was a performance during which members of a community were informed or reminded of significant events through the public representation of material objects, artefacts and places, significant elements and personages selected from the past of the Nation and recorded by authorities for all to emulate.

In this work, the writer refers to 'heritage' as encompassing the productions that both museums (historical and anthropological museums), and heritage sites (parks and sites), present. These places are situated mainly in Canada, sometimes in the United States, in the United Kingdom and in France, either as real sites, or as 'virtual' sites created by writers commenting on practices in their field. Both virtual and real sites are consistently nationalistic; and both pretend to be universal, as academic works and managerial practices tend to be.
This dissertation is a description of practices and strategies that the main producers of institutional heritage activities stage as they seek to establish their legitimacy in the field. It is a description of ‘monuments’ that commodifiers and bureaucrats have erected to stake their claims over the field.

This dissertation is not about the customary visitors, and the promises they are made of wealth, cohesion, unity and meanings were they to abide by heritage. It is not about the rebuttal they must suffer when denied participation in the making of (national) heritage.

Visitors come into the process as they enter any place where heritage is presented. Visitors are parts of an equation made by users of heritage services, providers of these services, and by academic critics who cast themselves into the lead part - that of representatives of real society and citizens both said to be short changed in the process.

This dissertation takes after a different equation where producers of heritage services (commodifiers), government agents (bureaucrats), and their academic critics come together to justify their place in the field by providing a demonstration of the reasons that should keep them there.

The public (including the visitor) are necessarily part of the second equation as the recipient of all their producers’ attention. In this dissertation, the role played by critics has not been studied intentionally - they have evidently provided the format into which this work is presented, most of the illustration material, some of the arguments and are presented the final result for approval. Their claim to their normative role is not challenged. The usefulness of their pronouncements, their relevance, might be when considered as bringing results.

Were the field considered a place of competition, commodifiers, government agents and critics would be pitched one against the other, each one trying to convince adversaries and public that they are right and, conversely, that the others are wrong.

Agents involved in producing heritage services and criticizing the outcome would be putting their case before the public essentially with the purpose of discrediting their adversaries
and ultimately convincing their public patrons to recognize them a privileged position in the making of heritage.

In an oppositional field, where they may be either right or wrong, heritage commodifiers and government agents would be sitting at the Right of the ideological spectrum, while their critics and their flock would be at the Left. In a Bourdelian field, where groups come to barter, traders are neither right or wrong, but needy, and positions are constantly changing as old needs are satisfied, and new ones arise.

Inasmuch as there are such well identified agents as commodifiers, government employees and academic commentators interested in trading, there must be such a reality as a trading public.

The public, the multitude of publics, come to the field with a working knowledge of that field. And one must consider that in a Bourdelian field, the public and its active component - the visitor, are not passive agents whose main function is to be deprived institutionally of a role in the making of heritage.

Since individuals are promoted as being capable of participating in heritage business, either publicly or privately, individuals must also be recognized a more or less important role (depending on particular circumstances), sometimes by abstaining to play any role in the making of the field.

Individuals come to the field as members of some group; they integrate personal agendas into what they understand of a given situation, at a given time, as it is compared to what they have been habituated into.

One must consider that the positions in the field are constructed with the active (or non active) participation of all agents: institutional makers of heritage productions, their (academic) critics, norm makers and evaluators, and the public, visitors and non-visitors, active in both capacity.

As such, all of these capitalists must be considered capable of playing according to the rules in the field, for the same stakes, and for the satisfaction of their own needs.
The public has expectations to be met either when attending heritage activities as provided institutionally, or when not attending the said services - with all the consequences that its refusal entails for those who say no, those who are said no, and those who blame the service providers for their incompetence.

There is, in the Bourdelian marketplace, no definite, clear positions when trading is concluded as one has given some of its capital away (for instance, time and money for a visitor), and received some capital in exchange (social consideration, recognition of cultural capital for the government agent on site) which has necessarily changed the original configuration.

In the process, the members of the public are not necessarily loosing: while not participating in the definition of their Nation's heritage, they still have made agents acting in an official capacity perform for their benefits and enjoyment. And they may have refrained to applaud at the conclusion of the performance.

Official performances, as a rule, are never efficient and effective: what is sought when being staged is modified while on stage. The public necessarily is expected to call 'for more', and better. The academic critics - producers of knowledge about the field, will necessarily declare that the production has yet to reach proper standards, and will also call 'for more'. Heritage commodifiers will call for better conditions after which to ply their business, and make 'more'.

Requests from all three will be carried by bureaucrats to political authorities, and will be justified with intimations on public's discontent and dire consequences on their political fortune.

The different stands taken by heritage agents in the field - the authoritarian pronouncements of government agents, the mercantile motives of heritage commodifiers, the self righteousness and false naïveté of critics, and passive (attentisme) of the public - are too simplistic not be questioned.

These stands - defined in the words of opponents, are too assertive not to conceal 'less' as opposed to 'more'. They are bargaining positions from which a trader may expect a profit. They are tricks.
What is valid for heritage producers employed by government agencies must be acceptable for members of the public. The public - visitors and non visitors, must not be considered as having made it in the field despite the prevailing authorities, but as full time agents in the making of their own different presentations.

They may be minor partners in the trading of economic, social and cultural capitals, but partners still, and their modest participation - their refusal to participate, at times, make them more valuable.

In this perspective, there is a chance that anyone coming into the field, has ceased to be playing the role of the habitual victim. The institution of urban Ecomuseums (Montréal's Ecomusée du Fier-Monde), and the staging of exhibitions in Native Cultural Centres indicate that some agents in the field have decided to shift their position, play in the field as they play in society, and claim responsibility for their own narratives.

The writer has used the masculine without prejudice to the other gender. His work is entitled - 'The commemoration of the national heritage; institutional practices and legitimating strategies'.
Part II: the economic monument - legitimating economic producers
3. "Now if we don't have a job, we are unemployed. Before, we hunted and fished. This is one of the biggest tragedies in the world. We know so darned much, but we have to have progress. One component of progress is to establish an economy. Since we already have a culture, may we can use it to feed our kids. They key is to be real and not become Third World entertainers" (Gray "Native Encounters". The Globe and Mail 26 June 1996 ).

4. "To compete: to come together, agree, be suitable; to strive consciously or unconsciously for an objective; be in a state of rivalry - To hoard: to keep to oneself - To squander – to spend extravagantly " (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary 1991 ).

5. "Just as the surge Charybdis hurls to sea crashes and breaks upon its counter surge, so these shades dance and crash eternally – Here, too, I saw a nation of lost souls, far more than were above; they strained their chests against enormous weights, and with mad howls rolled them at one another. Then in haste they rolled them back one party shouting out: “Why do you hoard? ”, and the other: “Why do you waste” (Dante. Divina Commedia - Inferno, circa 1307 ).

6. "Potlatch: a most profitable way to spend what you have " (Sgt. P.Cane, Canadian Airborne Regiment, Petawawa 1994 ).
Introduction: heritage - the economic factor

Preserving and presenting material and immaterial elements from the Nation's heritage is an economic activity; it involves labour, material resources, processes and products. Heritage producers compete with capitalists from other fields for the "use of the space, energy, human time and attention (that their productions call for)" (Lipe 1984, 7).

Economic, in the substantive sense, is used as a synonym for material. It means - 'the arrangements for acquiring, producing or using material items or service for individual or community purposes'; in the formal sense, economic means to economize or to be economical - to choose among alternatives for the purpose of maximizing output, profit or gain in exchange or to minimize the cost of producing, something, within the context of material scarcity, relative to what the economist calls the demand" (Zeisel 1967, 173).

Heritage presentations are parts of a system - capitalism: "in which goods and services are produced (in) order to be sold as commodities in a more or less competitive market; in which production is organised by individual or collective 'capitalists' who advance the capital ( ) necessary for production and who are motivated in principle only by the pursuit of the maximum possible profit; and in which labour is itself a commodity that the capitalist is able to purchase at the price of salaries or wages" (Miller 1991, 4).

The UNESCO warns inattentive rulers that neglecting the preservation of cultural objects may cause social unrest and economic losses (UNESCO 1976, Considerations on Historic Areas). Conversely, it warns cultural capitalists that neglecting the economic factor in their procedures can be detrimental to society and to culture. Heritage producers are also the caretakers of the Nation's patrimony.

In Part III of this work, the writer discusses the importance given to the economic factor in heritage: "Museums are new leisure complexes and the main decisions which have to be taken in coming years are no longer ones of scholarship and acquisition but one of building, refurbishment, public relations, commercial endeavour, marketing, fundraising, business management and audience research" (Strong 1988, 20).
Due considerations must be given to heritage as an economic opportunity after the same logic that wants "a people's dynamic tradition (to be) the basis of self-confidence and self-promotion and a source of economic power" (Ontario 1990, 11).

Cultural productions are said to be instrumental in the making of a competent economy. Participating in the economy is a matter of survival for cultural producers: "our worth as institutions will be measured more by the degree to which we add to the economic well-being of our community than by the more intrinsic values we so often espouse, such as protecting our heritage and identity" (Tyler 1989, 19). Heritage producers are the caretakers of the Nation’s patrimony; they also are true capitalists.

Heritage producers need money "for display and exhibitions, for remedial and preventive conservation, for marketing, for staffing, for equipment, for building maintenance, for training, for shop supplies, for catering supplies, for research programs, for travel, for office supplies, for the hundred and one tasks which have to be carried out to meet the range of responsibility which comes with running museum" (Ambrose 1991a, 5).

For the past twenty years, it has been expected from heritage producers that they save and make money as well as "make knowledge" and "save" cultural assets. The need to make money came to cultural producers with the obligation to save money to balance national finances and to make amend for having spent the Nation’s wealth in wasteful enterprises. Throughout the 1980's, on the public stage and in their own trade magazines, cultural capitalists were reminded that they had been rich with someone else’s money. Guardians of the Nation’s treasures, they depended on society’s generosity to survive. Institutions created to display the Wealth of the Nation were impecunious. Their survival depended on lessons to be had from economic capitalists on how to do business while ‘doing heritage’.

The need to make money came also with the necessity to celebrate publicly and privately (in exhibitions and in managerial practices), a new political and economic creed: "The Royal Ontario Museum is Canada’s prominent museum, internationally recognized for its collections, scholarship and public exhibits. A new vision, designed to develop rich and exciting learning experiences for the people of Ontario and beyond, has recently been launched. This vision reflects the dynamic cultural environment, changing visitor needs, increased competition and the challenge to become more-self-sufficient. Join our team to help make history in setting a new standard for cultural business in Ontario" (Globe and Mail 1998: B34).
In Western democracies, there was a need to go through “a creative reworking of old themes in the context of new realities and imperatives” (Corner and Harvey 1991, 9): the ideas of neo-liberalism were to be corroborated - “to roll back the state and public sector, to reduce public spending, to minimize both public provision and public intervention in the market, and to return all profitable enterprises to the ownership and control of private shareholders through an extensive program of denationalization” (Corner and Harvey 1991, 2).

In Canada, Museums would need to become more entrepreneurial: entrepreneurs got “things done”: “they make their own luck and are vigorous individualists, they thrive on the excitement of competition and the stimulus of commerce. They are practical and positive, building industries, creating wealth, and providing jobs... (all) conditions for further individual independence, initiative, and ambition to ensure that one person’s initiative and ambition is not another person’s exploitation and suffering” (Corner and Harvey 1991, 8).

Once older “forms of deference and older hierarchies of taste and status” were rejected, the market was to be “the key location for identity formation. Freedom and independence derive not from civil rights but from choices exercised in the market. The sovereignty that matters is ( ) the sovereignty of the consumer within the market-place” (Corner and Harvey 1991, 11).

Cultural capitalists could even be made to declare that: “Markets are people and I can’t understand why ‘market economy’ in some ways is used as a pejorative term; serving people and serving communities is a good thing. People are in communities and they are also markets; it is the same blessed thing’ (Middleton, in Boylan 1992, 186); “The public service, and the social cause and the cause of business, can all benefit from market analysis and market strategy. There is nothing wrong with that. There is no reason why ( ) your national museum, could not be made more responsive to market forces and still remain a social service” (Lord, in Boylan 1992, 188).

Heritage producers were to be the keepers of society’s most significant symbols - money: “the common means to measure heterogeneities of human desires, of use values and of elements and processes ‘in nature ( ) the means whereby we all, in daily practice, value significant and very widespread aspects of our environment; the only well-understood and universal yardstick of value that we currently possess” (Harvey 1996, 151-2) (15).
Making money was to become professionally as necessary as instructing the masses: "new skills have been called on to maximise income, both revenue and capital. New arguments have had to be deployed to potential sources of funding and with these, a new professionalism has developed in income generation and fundraising ... the key notes have become cost-efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and value for money; museums have become more business-like" (Ambrose 1991a, 5).

Managing 'profit centres', museum directors were to be into "plural funding... commercial enterprises, that is the sale of merchandise, the payment of royalties and consultancies... sponsorship and fundraising and ... money taken at the door" (Strong 1988, 17).

Surely, "there was money" to be made out of the visiting crowd: "people who come to museums, as I said, are largely those with disposable income - our new job is to attract them to part with it... we need each of them to part with some of that income before they have left the building" (Strong 1988, 16).

Thankfully, "there was money" to be collected from patrons of the Arts, philanthropists, and sponsors: "In realities, commerce and culture are allies, not enemies. The most impressive artistic revolutions typically have come in societies that were wealthy for their time (Ancient Athens, Florence, 19th-century Paris..) Widespread commercial prosperity brings many buyers, which promotes the creative freedom of the artists... wealth helps generate a societal ethos of self-confidence. These feelings of power and strength influence the creative productions of an age, usually for the better" (Cowen 1999, E7).

Actually, the most daring among the wealth producers in society did take over where neo-liberal governments felt politically profitable to pass onto others their funding obligations. 'Old and new money' created institutions that carried their names into immortality, but did not want I could not care to pay the staff wages: "Museums as a whole have become pretty adept at begging... We raise some 20% of our running costs in this way. But we cannot get sponsorship money for staff" (Sir D. M. Wilson; quoted in Ambrose 1991a, 21-22).

The arrangement was to be convenient to both parties involved. Cultural producers needed money to maintain their position in the field; economic producers needed cultural
capitalists, to transform capital into reputation (greed into philanthropy). But neither could forget that they were being indebted to one another.

Economic capitalists staid in the field as long as tax privileges endured, or until they found a better investment elsewhere: in Canada, in 1997, out of $54.44-billion in individual philanthropic donations, 51% went to institutions listed under ‘religion’ as opposed to 3% to ‘culture and arts’ (Hampton 2000, R1).

Fortunately, there was money to be found into ‘going commercial’, and selling some piece of patrimony - the Canadian Parks Service sold some of its Wood Buffalo cattle to ‘create new parks’ (sic), and the London hosts of a Monet Exhibition (1999) were celebrated in North America for their moneymaking capabilities: “the nearly 170,000 advance tickets sold for the 12-week Exhibition at the Royal Academy may force it to stay open 24 hours a day.. The exhibition cost 1.8-million Pounds to put on. Organizers confidently predict ticket sales will wipe out the Academy’s 500,000 Pounds overdraft” (Reuters 1999: A10; on “Claude Money”).

Some cultural capitalists believed that ‘going commercial’ was a temporary measure, and became uneasy when told that they were failing the public trust when treating citizens like customers. All found peace of mind when explained that the “core product” (preservation and presentation) was to be free, while it was the ‘augmented product’ that would be paid for by the public.

Evidently, there was money to be ‘clawed back’ from heritage producers who had participated in the wasting of the City’s wealth. Money was to be made and saved by doing more with less: jobs descriptions were revised. Eventually, fewer employees came to be doing a lot less with fewer resources, but could still be made responsible for both past excesses and present failure to deliver heritage as expected.

_legitimacy_

Legitimacy comes to economic capitalists as they enter the heritage field, invest their specific capital in heritage productions, reinvest their profits in social and cultural capital, and are permitted, as a consequence, to define society’s core concepts. Legitimacy comes to economic capitalists as they occupy the field unopposed by cultural capitalists.
Economic capitalists make themselves useful as it is believed that their involvement in the field brings wealth to society.

*wealth*

In the following chapters, cultural capitalists agree that ‘Heritage represents wealth’ (UNESCO 1972, 4) - a stock of tangible and intangible assets that can be used to generate income. Wealth in the heritage field includes both the material objects that institutions collect and display as an embodiment of wealth, and the pleasures and the utilities generated by tangible goods and experiences.

Heritage thus can be treated as a patrimony - that which is capable of being inherited and vested in the private and exclusive ownership of an individual, the total mass of existing or potential rights and liabilities attached to a person for the satisfaction of that person’s economic needs.

Once the analogy between heritage and patrimony is accepted, heritage assets can be used to generate profits for either public or private investors. Specifically, cultural resources said to be national properties, may be treated as private properties – and be spent, or simply transformed by private concerns to augment either public or private wealth.

Through economic exchanges, wealth comes to society, to those investing in heritage assets, and to economic capitalists in society, to be shared according to their specific needs, merits, interests and investments.

Wealth comes as both cultural and economic capitalists, left to occupy the field, perform the same traditional practices, and get paid for it.

These activities are considered legitimate (they include trading cultural objects, setting cultural tourism programs, developing heritage buildings), and are shared by both agents.

Through these endeavours, wealth comes more considerably to heritage commodifiers and economic than to the public, the State or the habitual cultural capitalists.
Money, the economic capital paid by commodifiers to cultural capitalists to have access and property to their resources, soon devaluates as economic commodifiers and capitalists turn their newly acquired capital into significant social, cultural and symbolic capitals.

Pushing their competitors aside, they are given to define society’s core symbols (as home, community, property), to define proper solutions to the field’s incompetence (marketing and theme parking), to define the field’s significant analogy (heritage resources as treasures), and to celebrate economic capitalists for being society’s main exempla.

Wealth comes to society as the result of various economic exchanges. Wealth comes to society, and legitimacy comes to commercial producers as three types of economic exchanges are set into gear (Coderre 1988). Market exchange is the exchange of goods at prices based on supply and demand. Redistribution is the movement of goods up to an administrative centre and their reallocation downwards to the original donors and providers of resources. Reciprocity is the exchange of goods that takes place neither through market nor through administrative hierarchies.

Wealth comes to the heritage field, as political authorities, when inaugurating a heritage site, start a second round of mercantile exchanges where producers of the heritage product (stage people) leave the place to the providers of operational services.

When handing over a heritage site to a given segment of a population to enjoy, and consequently, to profit from it culturally and economically, the same authorities redistribute part of the taxpayers’ money to meritorious individuals - contractors, visitors, service providers, blessed with being in the ‘vicinity’ of special resources.

Constituents and visitors, when attending an inauguration ceremony pay back a gift that was handed over out of generosity by the rulers in the community: these rulers were once elected to a legislative assembly, reciprocated their constituents for their support by giving them a monument to remember them by, and be reminded that they will come calling again.

Wealth comes to society, and to the heritage field, as these economic exchanges are set on display as exceptional events proving conspicuously the productive, profitable effort that is set into gear each time an economic investment is made in a heritage resource.
Conspicuous display of a heritage resource brings greater wealth than any unassuming, discreet, non publicized trade would.

Displays connected with reciprocal exchanges can be as extravagant as a Millenium Potlatch can be. Redistributive displays, in the past, consisted of processions (Panathenees), state celebrations (the American Bicentennial), monuments and sites, and public buildings. Displays connected with mercantile exchanges are to be seen at heritage places, at the museum entrance, at the museum shop, and in newspapers articles announcing the acquisition of a work of art as both an economical and an expansive deed.

To the writer, heritage activities are still reciprocal and redistributive processes despite the stridently commercial pitch of the official discourse during the past years.

To a field engaged into promoting unity, cohesion, meanings – alternatively, community, nationalism, patriotism, a mercantile stand means that society in general would abide by the logic of the market place, that social relationships would be contractual, and values monetary, that profit would be the sole end of social commerce, and that someone’s gain could very well mean someone else’s loss.

Legitimacy thus comes to economic capitalists and heritage commodifiers as they proceed either to make and trade their own specific capital within the heritage field/market, or to take away their competitors’ capitals. Part of the legitimating process is to gain capital; part is to keep one’s gains from depreciation.

disrepute: legitimacy denied

Part of the legitimating process consists of being remembered for things achieved, while being absolved for things unbecoming. Part of it is to be remembered for keeping one’s good reputation intact while letting a competitor’s reputation be diminished.

Cultural capitalists secure a permanent profit margin by ‘shouting names’ (an equivalent to Bourdelian nomination) at their economic competitors.

Economic capitalists serving the heritage trade are like petty thieves of Old: “Do you believe in Robin Hood? I asked a minicab driver as we sped back through Sherwood Forest. “It’s good for business to believe in him’, he replied...I guess that explains why he
charged us 6.50 pounds for a journey that had previously cost 4 pounds. "Sorry mate, he said when I pointed this out, then he sped off. I can't say we found out if Robin Hood was 'for real', but this is for certain - there are still highway robbers in Sherwood Forest" (Tisdal 1999: 19; on Nottingham and 'The Prince of Schlock).

Patrons of the arts are mostly greedy: "(the business of the Canadian Cultural Property Export Review Board) is to certify the international market value of artworks offered for donation to public institutions, then to determine how big a tax credit the donor should get for his munificence... the practical working of the Board has all to do with greed. Prospective donors always want the biggest tax break they can get. Love of country, the desire to add weight to the cultural heft of the nation, delight in watching Canada build up its holdings of great international art - none of these considerations in my experience seem to figure anywhere in the equation" (Mays 1995, C5).

Donors are interested in receiving: "The Art Gallery of Toronto has received $1-million donation from Gluskin Sheff and Associates, a small Canadian investment company. In exchange for the generous donation, which will help pay for the installation costs of the 80 French masterpieces, the company will be mentioned in all material related to the show" (Canadian Museum Association, Museograme, May 1994).

Private entrepreneurs do not play according to the rules: "eager to capture a market share, (they) have moved away from the idea of the (museum) as a public institution, charged with long-term research and communication functions and instead developed the high-cost, short-term commercial heritage exhibition, resplendent with replicas, noises and smells, which visitors 'experience' from mobile cars" (Kavanagh 1990, X) (16-21).

Economic capitalists are pretentious and maladroit and, sometimes, ridiculously eager: "through her insatiable appetite for innovation, Marie Curie became the first woman to win the coveted Nobel prize. As a BMW dealer, her ability to innovate would have come in handy. For BMW dealers, innovation is a big part of what they sell. Through these finely crafted vehicles, BMW dealers consistently bring new ideas to Canadian drivers year after year" (Advertisement The Globe and Mail 23 August 1997: A7).

Over the centuries, economic matters have been associated with "the lower elements of human nature; with the lowest rank of feelings" (Kirszner 1976, 50; quoting Edgeworth [1881], and Bagehot [1889]); "the profane activity par excellence is economic activity. The
"attitude of calculation of utility is the antithesis of the respect for sacred objects" (Parsons 1937, 296; on Durkheim and the sacred):

'We did dream. We once had a notion of the potential nobility of this country, a vision of society which animated, even, if grudgingly at times, a sense of community and national purpose, moral obligations to others in the form of commitments to share and to promote greater equality and social justice. Responses to the challenges presented by such a vision included the construction of the welfare state, the quest for official bilingualism and various efforts to protect and promote Canadian sovereignty in the shadow of a dominant and, at times, insensitive southern neighbour.... But during the past decade, while [sovereignists] have adhered to their dream of an independent Quebec, there has been no corresponding vision to inspire Canadians outside Quebec. In response to the rapid emergence of the global economy, successive governments in Ottawa, at the behest of powerful economic interests which fail to understand that a nation must be defined by something more than just money and trade, have embarked on a series of ad hoc public-reform policy reforms and international economic agreements that have had the effect of undermining the institutions, priorities and values which had defined Canada' (Downey 1994, A7)

Commerce threatens the placid atmosphere of the field: “But these positive values - stewardship, scholarship, continuity, are under threat. The heritage, I contend, is indeed in danger but not from external threats... The danger is internal, the enemy is within, and it is carrying out a massive subversion of these very 'outstanding universal values' which I have tried briefly to describe. The danger to the heritage is the Heritage Industry” (Hewison 1989, 18).

Heritage is truly economy (conservation of resources); capitalism is wasteful: “Integral to the accumulation of capital is the repeated intentional destruction of the built environment. Integral too is the transformation of all signs of cohesion into rapidly changing fashions of costume, language and practice... The temporality of the market and of the commodities generates an experience of time as quantitative and as flowing in a single direction, an experience which each moment is different from the other by virtue of coming next, situated in a chronological succession of old and new, earlier and later ” (Connerton 1989, 64).

In the capitalizing game of derision, cultural capitalists from the heritage field are considered 'squanderers' by economic capitalists who are into making and saving money; economic capitalists are considered 'hoarders' who want capital to be spent in order that
heritage be gained. Both, however, are ultimately united by a mutual distrust, and a common load (Dante’s ‘enormous weights’): Money.

“Just as the surge Charybdis hurls to sea / crashes and breaks upon its countersurge / so these shades dance and crash eternally - Here too, I saw a nation of lost souls / far more than were above; they strained their chests / against enormous weights, and with mad owls rolled them at one another. Then in haste they rolled them back / one party shouting out: “Why do you hoard?” and the other: “Why do you waste?” (Dante [1949] Divine Comedy; Hell - Canto VII; 22-30).
Chapter 4: heritage and wealth - the provision of goods and services

Anything can be put up for sale; anything can be assigned a heritage status; anything with a heritage status can be sold, either a piece of the True Cross; a poster of the 'The Eternal Jew' Exhibition (Berlin 1938) - said to be worth at least $50,000, or "whatever the market says" by the owner of a memorabilia shop called Einstein Presents (Boasberg 1999, 9); or a former British Prime Minister's handbag auctioned on-line to raise money for a Charity ($150,000) (22-23).

Wealth comes to society as individuals and organizations are permitted to enter a trade with anyone interested in cultural resources (knowledge or material object), and be paid in money, services, goods, privileges, positions and status.

The heritage field is far from being reluctant to mercantile exchanges conducted in the same legal and legitimate manner as they are elsewhere - according to the market's rule of supply and demands.

The 'Hidden Hand' of the Market made the Kennedy children richer with $34.5-Million as they auctioned some of their father's memorabilia. Wealth, as promised by economic capitalists, came in hard cash, in social capital (media exposure), and in cultural capital (the family being in the business of politics, magazines publication, and myth maintenance).

Wealth came to the American People through the Internal Revenue Service which collected on its behalf 40% of the proceedings in capital tax. Capital came to the bidders who, while spending money to display their own wealth, showed their sense of history and patriotism, were acquiring celebrity status, and were telling the Present what should be considered significant in the Past.

Wealth came to everyone involved in the loan, to the Vatican, of the 'Jesus Boat' - a small First Century freighter raised from the Sea of Galilee. Wealth came to the Kibbutz who owns the artefact - in economic capital, as expectations of greater profits from the tourist trade once the boat is returned from Rome; in social capital, for the interest raised
internationally for the artefact; in cultural capital, as the object is linked to the birth of Christianity; in symbolic capital, as a symbolic element in the negotiations between the Holy See and Israel over the long historical contention between Jews and Christians.

Wealth can be denied; symbolic wealth is taken away from the owners of the previous artefact and from politicians as an Editorialist (National Post 1999a: B9) makes an analogy between the reluctance of the Kibbutzim authorities to loan the Boat with the reluctance of Russian authorities to return the Schliemann’s Trojan Trove.

4.1: the provision of professional services

Wealth comes to society as providers of goods and services who, either as cultural capitalists or economic capitalists, ply their trade in the heritage field.

Still presented by its most distinguished practitioners as an avocation of individuals dedicated by their station in life to knowledge and poverty, heritage is simply a way of earning a living.

Honoraria, salaries and wages are earned by professionals who are directly responsible for the making of heritage productions - engineers, architects, craftsmen, building contractors, historians, material culture specialists, archaeologists, conservators, exhibition designers, stage designers, actors, local politicians, building company owners, tour operators. Others provide services at the periphery of the field: craftsmen and souvenir makers seek and find new markets in old places; antiques dealers discover gold in the vile material left behind by previous generations; so do providers of hospitality services, mass media producers, and theme park owners.

In Toronto, in 1994, everyone seemed to have been ‘banking on the Barnes Exhibition at the Art Gallery of Ontario: “ (a party celebrating the opening of the Barnes Exhibition) ....with a guest list of 1,700 (is) responsible for sparking a string of others across the city’, says Yorkville hairstylist Mary Tripi. ‘People are rediscovering the fun of getting dressed up and going out and my clients tell me it’s all because of the Barnes’. She says business at her salon increased 35 percent during the week of gala parties (Kelly 1994, C14).
Wealth comes from investments made by political authorities and occasionally (very rarely) by private entrepreneurs in an heritage core product. Heritage, when denied, is considered a loss. Heritage, when given, is deemed a priori to be economically profitable. It is rarely evaluated - as an evaluation would mean justification of public investments to profit private concerns with little commitment to the public part of the deal.

Local people expect prosperity from the institution of a heritage site - rarely are they satisfied (read Mellor 1991, 103). Since heritage as a cultural resources comes from 'the past', and as an 'investment', comes from 'elsewhere' - political authorities operating at arm's length, it is to consultants and contractors from 'elsewhere', that governments turn to when 'investing in the local economy'.

The field attracts thieves and grave robbers (sometimes poor peasants 'discovering' their 'rich and varied' heritage). Traffickers and counterfeiters come along, with law enforcers in tow, help in regulating the flow of valued goods on the market, providing a stick to measure their economic value (insurance premiums and security contracts).

These are the villains in the morality play written in the UNESCO Treaties and Recommendations: they are instrumental in defining cultural assets as economically valuable properties (the illegal trade in cultural goods is said to exceed $1 Billion annually). Without traffickers and thieves catering to individual greed and personal need, the field would appear to be poorer.

Most of the previous agents are in the business of knowledge - knowledge of the past, knowledge of how to preserve and present heritage. All seem to believe that they are the owners of a very significant commodity - "In terms of product, museums (at the most fundamental level) are concerned with information, and by extension with the knowledge shaped from informational entities, and ultimately the wisdom acquired from extensive and experienced-enriched knowledge" (MacDonald 1991, 306); "information and experience ...have replaced commodities as the basis of wealth" (MacDonald 1987, 213). This knowledge can be sold on the market without buyers and sellers being criticized. Heritage professionals are legitimate economic capitalists.

Wealth should come to society with the guise of wages earned by heritage workers: "Heritage institutions require support from a large work force. In 1992-3, these institutions
provided about 10,000 full-time, 8,000 seasonal and 6,000 other jobs (including part-time)” (Statistics Canada 1995, 39).

Heritage is mostly a seasonal business - most of the front line workers come in late, in the spring, at the start of the tourist season, and leave early in the fall when the public which feeds them goes back home.

Some earn good wages as contractors (who are paid according to supply and demand, and leave after the expiration of a short contract); others are permanent employees - bureaucrats protected by a union negotiated contract or professionals enjoying in the Civil Service the privileges that society grants their profession.

Front-line jobs are poorly paid: seasonal employees are hired as interpreters, animators, guides. Some come to ply temporarily a trade that can be performed elsewhere (design, drama, security, teaching, haute cuisine/cooking); others are students, given a modest stipend ‘to do time’ in a socially controlled environment. These are sometimes re-enactors, playing the role of people at work, baking bread, repairing fishing nets, shooting muskets, and repeating their lines with taylorian dedication.

These are expected, as if it suited their station in life, to perform for the pleasure and instruction of visitors, gestures that once were a matter of life and death to the original performers. They play at either being guides or characters in what is appropriately called a sketch (of reality). They mimic work with the same conviction that military re-enactors display mimicking death on pleasant Sunday afternoons.

In general, heritage workers, despite their claim to bring wealth to society, have failed to earn wealth on their own merit: “low salaries plague the profession - the national average is around $30,000 (1987) per annum. If salaries are reflective of the value of an occupation to society, there is some concern over the public perception and support of museum work. With capital investments in museum buildings and collections in the billions of dollars, this poses a serious dilemma” (Thompson 1992, 73-4) (24).

As a rule, most positions occupied by heritage workers are ‘no future’ jobs, term positions with very little possibility of lateral or vertical promotion. Occupants of these positions even have to share the field with volunteers: "Full time employees were supported by the additional unpaid help of nearly 50,000 volunteers working an average of 6.5 hours per
month. Volunteers have become increasingly important in recent years. The number of volunteers rose 45% and the total number of hours volunteers worked rose 29% from 1988-89 to 1992-93” (Statistics Canada 1995, 39).

Work in heritage sites is either make believe work, or work as a leisure activity; working in heritage sites is thus paid the wages that leisure is paid in a society celebrating work as an ideology. Work performed in heritage sites is thus paid mostly in social, cultural and symbolic capital. On a stage where cultural capital is made, economic capital is mostly ‘spent’ by volunteers (trustees, Board directors, friends of the Museum). If persons of means and leisure do give away their time, pro bono, to an institution, heritage workers, either their employees or their attendants, are expected to do as much, and be paid, first, in heritage money (free time from exacting jobs, time to hoard cultural assets), and earn social prestige.

Most heritage producers are not allowed to sign their work. Most wear a uniform to work. The public reality of heritage is leisure: the social reality of heritage work, on the other hand, is domesticity. Heritage workers do not inhabit their own 'house'; they are in the service of society. What they buy and spend, they do on behalf of others. In return for their time and proper behaviour, they are given a roof, a livery, lines from a scenario, stage indications, and the privilege of being insolent in their masters' house.

4.2: cultural tourism

Wealth comes to the national community by way of private or public investments in cultural equipment: greater wealth comes to the Polity when these investments are paid back with money coming from elsewhere. Both the field and the Nation depend on the general belief that satisfaction to certain cultural needs (familiarity with the present, personal reaffirmation and validation, identity, guidance, enrichment, escape [Lowenthal 1985, 36-52]), cannot be found but in a foreign country - either in the past or 'abroad'.

Wealth comes to the heritage field as foreign visitors come and pay homage to the superior men and their gods who made the visited country worthy of admiration, curiosity and envy. With cultural tourism, local capitalists are spared the necessity to quarrel over a share of the loot; with tourism, it is someone else's wealth which is transferred into the Polity's treasure.
Heritage as tourism is mainly an export industry. Tourism brings to the City foreign gold without the necessity, as in the past, of waging war: "last fall's exhibition ' Van Gogh in Arles ' was a major success.. Van Gogh, who in his entire lifetime did not sell a single painting, drew more than 443,000 visitors to the Museum, more than half of them from outside the city. These out-of-towners spent more than $223 million while they were in New York" (The Metropolitan Museum of Art of New York; quoted in Scottish Museum Councils 1986, 74). Tourism is the ancient practice of looting perpetuated in a more polite way; cultural tourism thrives on properties that once were looted.

Heritage is tourism: "Museums, whether we like it or not, are part of the leisure industry. Our audience is tourist, wanting pleasure as well as profit, and our daily visitors are members of the new share-owning self-help democracy created by the Thatcher years" (Strong 1988, 18).

Heritage is tourism - if reluctantly: "where opportunities for material benefit exist, the Canadian Parks Service will link its strategies with the tourism strategies of other(s)... [in order to] build appreciation for heritage conservation (but also ensures) that the long term protection of Canada's heritage resources (is) maintained" (Canadian Parks Service 1991a, 16) - reluctance fading as soon as the investments in cultural tourism are recognized a profit rate of 1.5 to 2.5 in related economic transactions. Tourism is big business. In Canada, it is, annually, a $30-billion industry, employing more than 600,000 workers in some 60,000 related industries. Tourism holds "the promise of linking culture, heritage and identity together with economic development and job creation" (Statistics Canada 1995).

Heritage is cultural tourism. Tourism depends significantly on cultural producers for its core product. In Prince Edward Island cultural tourism is responsible for 20,000 jobs; the Province's 153,000 residents being visited by 1.2 million visitors who spend $290 million annually mostly to pay homage to the Island's national treasure - Anne of the Green Gables. (Nolen 1999, C9; on the 'Annekenstein' phenomenon).

Cultural tourists are those who will want to pay to get access to culture - the greater the fee, the greater the gain for both the exhibitor and the visitor: "Tourists interested in culture (are) more likely to have higher incomes and spend more money than the average tourist, spend time in an area, stay in a hotel or motel rather than with friends or relatives, and more likely to shop" (Lord 1993, 3; quoted in Wireman 1997, 21). Wealthy people are more
likely to be culturally affluent than not, while cultured people are more capable of acting as if they were wealthy, even when they are not.

Heritage depends on mass tourism to keep itself abreast with political sponsors; mass tourism defines heritage, for without the undistinguished crowd of local or foreign visitors, heritage would be of a lesser interest to political authorities.

Cultural tourism brings gold to local markets.

Residents of Savannah, GA, have struck gold twice - the years following the initial investments in the restoration of its built heritage (as tourism revenues jumped from $6-Million [1963] to $47-Million [1973]), and after the publication of Berendt’s novel 'Midnight in the Garden of Good and Evil' (1994): “The tourism industry rediscovered the town at about one minute past ‘Midnight’. Busloads of sightseers poured into the little streets to see the ‘crime scene’ and other sights described in the book. There was a downtown outlet called simply ‘The Book’. Gift shops, trafficking in trademarked ‘Midnight Collectibles’, T-shirts, coffee mugs, key chains, candles, and ‘collectors’ tins of key-lime short-bread cookies. Savannah, long on a slide into shabbiness became a big draw for outlanders, and, understandably, just about everybody in town rushed to cash in” (Mays 1998, C5; on saving Savannah’s dignity).

Wealth also comes to the owners of heritage resources, members of a national economy, when foreign investors, tourists of a different kind, are persuaded to invest in a given community for economic reasons, and for the quality of life it offers. Cultural resources, as components of a greater ensemble (the National Patrimony), play a role in attracting less transient investments to the National Economy. Savannah struck gold a third time with investments made by outlanders who came to retire in the city; land was developed, houses were built and money was spent locally.

To foreign investors, a City’s cultural riches are, in present times, a sign of the ancestors’ foresightedness, and an indication that some of their virtues have been passed into their descendants. The colourful presentations in the Guggenheim Museum fulfil the same function that Guild sponsored windows in Chartres once did; they vouch for the good state of affairs as a tradition in the City, and proclaim, like the corporate sponsors of the Barnes Exhibition (Toronto, Art Gallery of Ontario), that its citizens are willing to play according to ancient rules, both on the cultural and the economic fields: “The economic impact of the
Barnes on Toronto is clear, but the other and less visible effect this exhibit has had is that it is making us feel good about ourselves. It is saying that we can do things and do them well. Curators world wide have been highly complimentary about the way we’ve presented the exhibit. In the world of the Musée d’Orsay and the National Museum of Western Art in Tokyo, we can compete very successfully” (Kelly 1994, C15).

The display of heritage resources makes the statement that a community owns resources capable of satisfying more than the basic needs of its members (as it is with birds who announce their genetic capabilities with the display of their brilliant plumage).

Tourism brings wealth to society without the obligation of resorting to social/class wars - a need is filled by a product, money is made, wealth is generated and transformed into different capitals (especially cultural capital), for all traders to gain. In the process, the conflict between cultural capitalists and wealthy taxpayers fades into the background, the profit from cultural resources apparently being shared equitably - in proportion to risks taken and investments made.

tourism, and the making of symbolic capital

Wealth comes with a loss to the host community - not only as they, also, have to seek the satisfaction of their needs elsewhere, but as they have to pay for what they provide their visitors.

Citizens of Savannah realized that they lost their town once to cultural tourism when it was recognized that “there had been too many tourists, too many buses, the mood of tranquillity had been destroyed, and local people ( ) felt like apes in a zoo when they walked down the street and were gawked at by the tourists. The people who come to Savannah because of the book are in effect coming to Disneyland - a romantic fantasy world - and they don’t get the human message that Savannah really tells us” (Mays 1998, C5).

Citizens of Savannah lost it twice when newcomers to the place opposed the construction of a Museum of Modern Art after a Safdie design that clashed with their understanding of the ‘character’ of the place.
Tourists, on the other hand, are expected to lose capital - when leaving their country, as they acknowledge some cultural deficiency that must be filled at great expense elsewhere / when entering the visited country, as they pay tribute at the Money Exchange Office to the superior value of the local currency / when visiting heritage sites, where someone else's ancestors are celebrated, progressively becoming poorer as the result of paying and of recognizing their ignorance of all things local / when telling about their trips, back at home, before a bored audience.

The trade that sees money exchanged (time spent in a cultured country) for cultural knowledge is uneven. What cultural tourists pay for in money, while depending on the benevolence of strangers, are immaterial treasures - expectations of knowledge, pleasure, belonging and participation, all values that the owners ultimately gives away only as promises.

What tourists are sold is an opportunity “to engage in culturally meaningful ways of fitting leisure time, to break with everyday routine and seek novelty through cultural experiences, and to seek one's personal, cultural and national roots’ (Macdonald 1988b, 2-3); it is a sense of place, the certainty of becoming different for being away from home.

What they are handed over is a dilemma: "We are faced with two competing images of the tourist's experience - the wide-spread notion that tourism is a 'trivial, superficial, frivolous pursuit of vicarious, contrived experiences, a 'pseudo-event' and the notion that it "is an earnest quest for the authentic, the pilgrimage of modern man" (Cohen 1979, 179; quoted in Redfoot 1984, 293).

A tourist pays for an 'experience' in "anxiety over reality" on the one hand, and in 'unauthenticity', on the other: " (Tourists) see visions of great cities and wild regions; they are in the marts of commerce or amid the isles of the South; they gaze on Pompey's pillar or on the Andes; and nothing which meets them carries them either forward or backward, to any idea beyond itself. Nothing has a drift or a relation; nothing has a history or a promise. Everything stands by itself, and comes and goes as it turns, like the shifting scenes of a show, which leaves the spectator where he was" (Card. Newman [1959]; quoted in Eyles 1985, 81).

As a rule, tourists are welcome as long as they are seen capable of spending money: "the distinction between tourists and locals would seem an appropriate place to begin an
analysis. For example, prices may be set higher during the tourist season (when locals rarely attend) than at other times“ (Koppel 1986, 22). When their money runs out, tourists turn into foreigners soon to be invited to leave.

While a citizen is owed services for being a heir, the tourist owes money wherever he goes: “In a bid to tap deeper into its rich stream of non-resident revenue, the City of Venice overrun by 10 millions of visitors annually is saddling them with a ‘toilet tax’ - a surcharge on the price of using public lavatories ( ) When the tax was proposed, some also argued for a fee to enter St Mark’s Square...” (The National Post 1999b: B7).

Tourists are known to be incapable - of trading economic capital at par with the local capitalists: tourists do not know the real price/value of things; of establishing permanent relationships with their hosts: tourists are always in the process of leaving a place; of leaving behind an enduring testimony of their passage - but an enduring bad reputation, since tourists do not belong to the real time and place of the City (25,26).

Tourists are producers of economic, social, cultural and symbolic capital to be vested in their hosts. Once they enter the host country, tourists are looked at, and commented upon, as if they were cultural resources themselves. Tourists are also visited by their hosts; tourists are objects placed under the gaze of local inhabitants.

Local people, first visited as objects of curiosity, become an audience to which the instructional, inspirational spectacle of foreigners is provided. Local people, given the spectacle of people from afar, are presented with a ‘negative’ of what they are.

Cultural tourism is meant to foster understanding between the Nations, but the spectacle of someone else’s wealth, either the tourist’s or his hosts’, breeds envy and contempt (symbolic capital, both): “Due to the transitory and non repetitive nature of the relationship, the tourists do not have to take account of the effects of their present actions, hence there is neither a felt necessity nor an opportunity to create mutual trust. Consequently, such relationships are particularly open to deceit, exploitation and mistrust, since both tourists and nationals can escape the consequences of hostility and ‘dishonesty’ (Cohen 1984, 379).

This is why, in retaliation to being dispossessed, tourists recuperate time, dignity, composure by being “the disdainful tourists whom museums in return stereotype as unruly
visitors who arrive in busloads, lack interest in the quality experiences offered, are insensitive to the values museums try to preserve and simply spoil the museum for serious visitors" (MacDonald 1988b, 2). Heritage, as performed for cultural tourists, is once again a battlefield from which to bring loot 'home'.

4.3: running the shop, collecting treasures

Wealth comes to the heritage field as it does to local and national communities - from trading with outsiders. Legitimacy comes to economic capitalists as they are able to participate in the sale of images / simulacra of heritage objects that foreigners to the heritage institution (either museum, or a foreign town) wish to bring home. The selling of heritage commodities at the Shop (namely souvenirs) is made a necessity to heritage producers to ensure their survival. If heritage brings wealth to society - along with meanings, unity, and cohesion, heritage institutions need to reciprocate and prove their usefulness with similar productions. For want of being capable of proving their worth, on their own field, heritage producers must prove that they are capable economic capitalists.

Wealth comes to the field with the staging of lessons on society's most significant symbols. Legitimacy comes to economic capitalists as the Museum is treated as an extension of the Market. Symbolic capital comes to economic capitalists as trade - their main activity, is staged in heritage places.

In contemporary museums, shopping is part of the visitor's cultural experience; pride is taken from the profits made at the boutique, however unbecoming it is to ask payment for a service that every citizen seems to have already paid.

Wealth comes specifically to society as cultural producers turn themselves into shop owners, restaurateurs, banquet caterers, cafeteria managers, and [entremetteurs] who hosts cocktails for their bachelor clients: "the Smithsonian Institution in 1988 generated US$46 million in retail revenue, making it one of Washington's leading retailers, and its museum shops generated US$1000 per square foot compared with US$200 for most department stores" (Schouten 1993, 383). Wealth comes to the heritage field as heritage producers treat visitors as tourists - expecting to receive the 'gifts' that visitors normally bring to their hosts (entrance fees), and to be bought the 'gifts' tourists usually bring back home to prove they have been away (souvenirs).
Heritage managers demonstrate at the Shop their intelligence of capitalization and profit making - in economic capital (when selling commodities), in social capital (when selling reproductions of objects owned by other museums), and in cultural capital (when selling knowledge - books 'to be taken out' by avid students of their collections).

The Shop is instrumental in the institution reaching its communication / instruction goals: the Shop is the only place where, during a visit, the visitor can acquire something to show for some 'work' well done (salary / spoil / trophy). It is the last opportunity, before leaving, where he can 'deal' with museum personnel through the agency of an artefact. At the shop, the institutionally polite indifference to the other is challenged, visitors "seeking novelty, excitement, action or fun (may find that) a stop in the museum shop (is) just enough to say they have been there" (Macdonald 1988, B2).

The Shop and merchandising are as important for profits made in money (30%) as they are for the social and symbolic capitals they generate. Some museum directors are openly mercantile and create the instruments of their own survival. They comply to the request made by some of their Board members, firm believers in the survival of the fittest. Others, true curators by trade, want to reproduce for the visitors the excitement they personally felt when, entering Harrods for the first time, they were displayed the Meaning of Life.

The Shop returns the heritage institution to society as a market place: the heritage place is an introduction both to the Museum as an extension of the Market, and to the Market economy itself: "The recent trend for rare commodity markets to seek out investments for spare capital is reversing that relationship. Junk is rapidly being transferred into treasures by recapitalization from bloated economies. The $52 million recently paid for the Van Gogh is merely a symptom of the anticipated invasion of museum storehouses by the capital market" (MacDonald 1988a, 28).

The Shop indicates that a mercantile exchange is sought where, once, the public was politely spared its reality. At the Shop, a visitor becomes a client whose needs for knowledge and prestige can be satisfied immediately. At the Shop, the Citizen gives away some of his political prerogatives (mostly duties), but is immediately compensated when being recognized as a Maecenas. The Client may then imagine, for a moment, that he can pay back the dedicated museum keepers for services rendered, that he can leave a place with 'something' where everything is for keep, and that he can please a destitute State with a (small) contribution.
The Shop defines the institution's significance in society and in the field; it says that its wealth overflows from its exhibitions as if from a cornucopia, and that its cultural capital is indeed transformed into economic gains as if to compensate for what is 'wasted' away when on display (namely the potential of inspiring wonderment an object loses when exposed to everyone's constant glare).

While selling replicas, it reminds its patrons that the institution's originals are beyond their reach and means, and that value (authenticity), is vouched for, 'en creux', by the thousands of copies made for sale. While spreading reproductions through their occasional patrons, heritage capitalists create a name for their own institution, and make a display of its wealth.

money

To the visitor to a museum or a historic site, entering a significant perimeter is like entering in a foreign country: a tribute is owed and paid to the ancestors and to their representatives who, by function, live outside society. The tribute is paid in time and money. It is analogical to a religious sacrifice during which the sacrificant is made to give more than he receives, and receives something more that what he has given.

Either at the entrance door or at the Shop, Society as Economy is paid back some of the capital that heritage producers are deemed to have squandered. At the Shop, heritage producers give proper reverence to society's most significant symbol: money.

"Money - is value on display, and also a use value that is not fungible, that is permanent, transmissible, that is able to be the object of transactions and uses without deteriorating. At the same time, money is the means to procure other values which are fungible, transitory, goods for consumption and for gifts. No doubt since the most primitive societies, the talisman and its possessor have played this role of objects equally convertible by all, of which the possession conferred this role of objects equally convertible by all, of which the possession conferred to their holder a power which easily became a power of purchasing... (Mauss [1968]; volume 2: 110).

"Money - serves to communicate our wants, needs, desires as well as choices, preferences, and values,...(it is capable of reducing) a wondrous multidimensional ecosystemic world of use values, of human desires and needs as well as of subjective
meanings, to a common objective denominator which everyone can understand" (Harvey 1996, 151-2).

Money is the universal gauge; ‘it is the clear demonstration that form can be transformed into matter, and that a representation can become a thing. Money is the means by which something invisible becomes visible, the bank currency ensuring in society the preponderance of a system of representation, conventions or symbols, over any other objects or relationships’ (Moscovici 1988, 326).

Money is a means that has become a goal: ‘anything under the sun, people and their properties, seeks one purpose despite their divergences and antagonisms. Money becomes, for a while, is the crucible into which their reality is transmuted’ (Moscovici 1988, 357).

Everything, then, comes to have a price: value is recognized by the cost incurred - everyone involved in heritage matters - clients, producers, is made a social obligation to proceed to their own evaluation in money. It is for the money that they get and that they hand over that an individual and an institution are recognized some value.

The money which is received at the Shop, like the subsidies sent from the Minister’s Office, may be an offering, a sacrifice. It may come, altogether, as a gift to an institution/producers, a recompense to an institution/producer who have performed exceptionally in the field, a trade for services rendered or a salary granted an individual for services rendered according to a contract.

Legitimacy comes to economic capitalists as their main function - putting treasures together, becomes the founding analogy of the heritage field.

Wealth as symbolic capital comes to economic capitalists as they are confirmed in heritage publications that their traditional purpose for doing business - accumulating treasures, is one of the field’s defining analogy.
4.4 the legitimating analogy - treasures

Museums and banks are shown, on contemporary road signs, by an icon representing a Greek Temple. Since the 19th Century, the temple has served as a model for architects commissioned to build banks and museums.

Greek temples were places before which sacrifices were conducted and within which offerings were kept: "The statues and votive offerings (collected in Greek Temples) enshrined national customs, ideas, and memories, featured beauty and conspicuously demonstrated communal purchasing power to the satisfaction of every visitor to the temple. In an attractive guise, the temple collections performed the role of a bank and of a public treasury." (Wittlin 1970, 7).

In 18th Century England, visitors described the British Museum in terms befitting a treasure chest: "here I shall see what is nowhere else to be seen. The wonders of creation are deposited in this vast cabinet. Every country upon the globe has, perhaps, paid its richest tribute into this grand treasury. The sea has unlocked its stores. The internal parts of the earth has been robbed of their spoils. The most extraordinary production of art find their way into this repository, and the long ages of antiquity have largely contributed to the store" (Hutton; quoted in Hudson 1975, 8).

In Canada, the new National Archives building has been built as a reliquary: "The vaults are the literal and metaphorical treasury of the nation's memory... When the sun streams in through the glass walls, it hits the vault walls and the stainless-steel edges pick up the sun and glisten. This is the metaphor of the Archives as a showcase" (Boddy 1997, C7; on the Treasure House of the Nation).

Visitors to heritage places wear the analogy like a uniform is worn, and become treasures hunters - 'come and discover', reads the publicity, while heritage workers ensure despite their own many doubts that the discovery experience endures.

Treasure are accumulated over centuries or a lifetime; the most precious treasures are found, and the status they bring comes to their discoverers by happenstance. Once they are discovered, their value is a matter of maintenance and a matter of security — contrary to heritage objects, simple treasures, by definition, are reserved to the owner only.
Cultural resources are hoarded, inventoried, and evaluated. Their existence is made manifest in thesauruses (the Museum Curator's Accession Catalogue, the Travel Agent's Destinations Catalogue, or the Museum Shop's Sale pamphlets) equivalent to stock inventories, insurance lists and bank manifests: "as institutions, we hoard like squirrels, headed into an eternal winter. The prevailing attitude is the more we have, the more important we are" (Tyler 1989, 20).

Cultural institutions hoard collections: "a total of 650 collections were reported from 264 different institutions throughout Canada. About 33 million specimen lots are reported for all collections. Twenty two institutions hold more than 200,000 specimens lots and account for 85% of all Canadian collection holdings", (Gagnon, Conference Program: 'Seminar on Collections', Leicester 1996).

Cultural capitalists hoard functions: " (as employees of heritage institutions, they are expected to take) effective and active measures; adopt policies, set up services, develop scientific and technical studies, and research and work out methods; take appropriate legal, scientific, technical, administrative and financial measures necessary for the identification, protection, conservation, presentation, and rehabilitation of the (international) cultural and natural heritage" (UNESCO 1970, Article 1).

The Canadian Parks Service made a case for its economic usefulness by classifying its hoard according to the categories defining the National Wealth (the Nation's Treasure). The National Wealth is augmented by the share of the Nation's cultural capital that the Service manages: (1) its collections ("the Canadian Parks Service archaeological artefacts collections take up 35,000 cubic feet; curators take care of 365,000 historical artefacts, 26% of which being on display" [Government of Canada 1991d]); (2) its workforce: ("in 1983, 5,058 person-years, were assigned to Parks Canada: in 1989, the agency was granted, 768 person-years, 30% of which was to be employed at the National Headquarters and in Regional Offices" [Notes to the Minister 1984]); (3) and the assets it controls (the Canadian Parks Service property inventory comprised over 10,000 individual fixed assets estimated at $3 billion [replacement value] 86% of this value applying to modern facilities, (Government of Canada 1991d).

Treasures and thesauruses vouch for the power and the authority recognized in the hoarders; treasures and thesauruses are the tangible manifestation of symbolic capital. Figures display significance; the statistical column magically 'decides'. The compilation of treasures and thesauruses transmutes into authority, and inspires respect and silence - the
compilation of statistics, as the hoarding of objects in treasure chambers, giving greater credence as to what authorities in the heritage field consider to be reality.

Comparing heritage to patrimony and cultural resources to treasures leads to the establishment of a common set of philosophical premises shared by both economic and cultural capitalists.

wealth; the epistemological connection - selling experience

That reality which the cultural capitalists share with economic producers is both sensational and sensationalist: "Experience the joy - the sheer fun - of exploring our heritage. Bring the family, a friend or come by yourself. Stroll through the past, savour the present and glimpse what the future may hold. Our nation's treasures await you in the National Museums of Canada. Immerse yourself in the richness of fine works of art, explore the marvels of nature, admire the many facets of human development and share the excitement of scientific discoveries" (National Museums of Canada, Promotion Leaflet, 1986).

The treasure analogy unites cultural producers and economic producers under the same philosophical canopy - building their world on evidence and experience (on the objects, on the collection and on the trade of objects, for the sake of satisfying a 'need'), both producers grant legitimacy to one another on similar premises.

In the heritage field, the treasure keeper watches over 'evidence': "the history museum exists to recover and interpret ways of living and working through evidence derived from objects, oral testimony, music and sounds" [Kavanagh 1990, XII]]. Evidences are - facts or factual propositions supporting another factual proposition apply to what is plausible, credible, probable, and begs to become self-evident'. In law, evidence "demonstrates, makes clear or ascertains the truth of the very fact or point in issues ..and tends to produce conviction in the minds as to existence of a fact" (Black's Dictionary of Law 1991).

Both evidence and experience unfold into accumulation. Experience is an accumulation of knowledge, information, or skills: it refers to "something external and objective... constant and uninfluenced by the observer (posing as) a neutral arbiter of the truth or falsity of his hypotheses... objective reality (being) the source of all occurrences, (experience being)
something that exists before we do, and not something that our conscious activity creates" (Randall and Buchler 1971, 85).

Reality, as provided by all heritage producers, is handed down by authorities. It is cumulated into an ‘exciting experience’:

Experience:

“Every one of the Epcot pavilions is based on a standard formula as follows: An environmental experience, a special film experience, a food experience, a marketplace experience (boutiques and shops stocked with exotic crafts and arts), an artefact experience (exhibition areas with museums quality controls in each pavilion)” (MacDonald 1987, 3);

“The Museum must focus on its ‘core business’ – storytelling. “How will that work?” The Director explains: “In our new Discovery Gallery, there will be a reproduction skeleton in a pit of stone-like material. Instead of telling visitors what it’s like to go on a dig – they’ll dig” you watch all the Indiana Jones movies you like, but this will be an indelible experience” (Ross 1999, C2; on the ROM new Discovery Gallery).

“Only by following the exact route of the victims on their way to the gas chamber could visitors experience the ‘slap in the face’ needed to bring home the full horror of the camp” (Globe and Mail 1994, A6; on letting Auschwitz lie).

“We want to make you feel what it was like to be a slave, and what it was like to escape through the Underground Railroad” (Styron 1994, A25: quoting Disney’s chief imagineer promoting the project of a Theme park on the American Civil War).

" As a tie-in to the 1993 Confucius Cultural Festival, China opened an amusement park based on the precepts of the ancien philosopher. Liuyi Park (Qufu), boasts six sections: traditional rites, music, shooting, driving, reading and calculation... Visitors can drive cattle carts to recreate the experiences of Confucius in his travels. In the shooting section, visitors can ride on horseback in primitive forests to hunt. In the music section, visitors can enjoy ancient Chinese music. Confucius who lived between 551 and 470 BC is credited with establishing the philosophical basis of the traditional Chinese state “ (Kesterton The Globe and Mail 5 June 1993).
philosophical positions

The heritage field, where treasures are accumulated, and evidences displayed, is partial to empiricism, realism, determinism, and nomothetism. What is presented as a playful experience holds philosophical consequences that scientists, managers, and anyone interested in social order would recognize.

When stressing the importance given habitually to the material object, to proper procedures and to the (resource/ness) of cultural artefacts, heritage authorities unequivocally adopt a positivistic stand in their approach toward human affairs. When discussing the acquisition of knowledge about the world, whether it is (acquired) and transmitted in tangible forms, or whether it is of a more subjective transcendental kind, based on experience or insight of a unique personal nature, heritage practitioners will follow the natural sciences approach, considering that knowledge is to be found in experience (direct inspection, all ideas being traced back to experience), trying to explain and predict events by searching for regularities and casual relationships between constituent elements (Burrell 1979, 4). The growth of knowledge, like treasuring, is a cumulative process where new insights and discoveries are added to an existing stock, in the manner that new objects are added to museum collections.

When addressing the question of reality of the social world, whether it is external to the individual and imposes itself on individual consciousness from without, or whether it is a product of consciousness from within, heritage practitioners will be more inclined to represent the social world as if it were made of "hard tangible or relatively immutable structures" existing as empirical realities (Burrell 1979, 26), the social world having a reality of its own which is similar to reality in the natural world and which precedes the existence and consciousness of those who observe and interpret that reality. As in the natural world, objects of knowledge, both things and thoughts, exist independently of the observer's awareness, conception or perception of them.

When considering the nature of the relations that human beings entangle with their environment, whether they are responding in a mechanistic or deterministic fashion to situations (external circumstances), or whether they are capable of creating and controlling, modifying and interpreting that environment, heritage authorities welcome situations promoting the importance of voluntary factors, if only for the sake of political rectitude, but
expect much comfort from the propositions that "every event has a sufficient cause; that, at any given time, given the past, only one future ought to be possible and envisaged; that given knowledge of all antecedent conditions and all laws of nature, an agent should predict at any given time the precise subsequent history of the universe, denying the existence of chance, although conceding that ignorance of the laws or all relevant antecedent conditions could make certain events unexpected" (Audi, 1995; 'determinism').

When comparing their visitors to treasure hunters, and performing tasks mostly oriented towards acquiring (material) objects, heritage producers deliberately shun a subjectivist approach to social sciences. Heritage experience, but for the sake of strategy, cannot be a process of interaction between living organisms and environment, "the experiencing mind being not simply a mind but an active, selective, inquiring mind, (and experience being) not simply the world of fact, but that world investigated or actively exploited" (Randall and Buchler 1971, 88).

The traditional alternative to the empiricist and objectivist world-view, a constructivist world-view, fed either by radical humanism and critical theory, or by hermeneutics and phenomenology, is bound to appear, in a field occupied by commercial and bureaucratic producers, as nothing more than an alternative. It will be considered a manifestation of individualistic disorder, a threat to society, a muddle of words, by those who are waging the good fight against economic penury, social dissension, political unrest and intellectual meaninglessness.

Since heritage producers treat the social world as if it were an objective reality - an experience, they look for and interpret the regular relationships between its various elements. Such a perspective on reality gives them the moral fortitude to search for and define universal laws explaining and governing social reality. Moral certitude is found in the learnt regularity of numbers, and on the reassuring predictability of statistics.

Abiding by the treasure analogy, heritage producers will be logically inclined (if not highly motivated by self interest) in maintaining 'what is' or preaching what ought to be, namely the status quo - social order, consensus, social integration, solidarity, need satisfaction and actuality.

Irrespective of their stand in the field, they will feel attracted to a "philosophy of social engineering, as a basis of social change and will emphasize the importance of
understanding order, equilibrium and stability in society... (and be concerned) with the effective regulation and control of social affairs" (Burrell 1979, 26).

In the last pages, we have discussed how legitimacy comes to economic capitalists with their participation in the regular transactions in the field, and with the lessons they either sell to the field (on its very nature - treasure, wealth), or to society on the field's nature (the Museum as an extension of the Market).

The following chapter deals with the built heritage in the City, and with the role architects play as intermediaries between economic and cultural capitalists. In this chapter, economic capitalists come to the field not only as investors plying their trade, but as very necessary agents. While cultural capitalists could still deal as equal with entrepreneurs in the development of a heritage commodity, in built heritage, they depend on economic capitalists' good will to perform their duties. Legitimacy is granted by heritage architects eager to fill in the gap between commerce and culture.
Chapter 5: wealth and the built heritage - Main Street

Wealth comes to society as real estate owners, land developers, architects and engineers, elected representatives and officials get involved in the restoration of the City's built heritage. Economic capital is invested in salvaging cultural assets; economic capitalists employ cultural capitalists and demonstrate that money and culture contribute to define the City's specific character. Wealth comes to the City as preservationists teach developers how to add a plus value (culture) to their investment in built structures.

Since the 19th century, the built heritage has been the heritage of the Nation. Despite attempts by the UNESCO to break a restrictive pattern (1972), it is still promoted as being the only one worth consideration: "If the word 'heritage' once described something archival, something out of the mainstream, it is increasingly coming to mean ( ) the vernacular building, the neighbourhood streetscape...in fact the entire built environment" (Heritage Canada 1983, 5).

In England, the Country House stands is the very metaphor of the national heritage: "In the midst of (the British landscape) stands the country house, and (it is presented) as a hero which has survived the ravages of time and now stands on its heels not only as a record of its own endurance but also as an exhibition of the period treasures and touches of style which it has gathered on its way. Objectified history: the landscape as palimpsest and the country house as hero" (Bommes and Wright 1982, 292).

Romans from the first Century B.C. visited the replica of a mud hut built on the site where the City's Founder was believed to have lived. It was also pious to deposit the ashes of a citizen in a terra cotta urn made after the model of the Hut of the origins; the Hut symbolized the 'Ancient Ways' without which a Citizen could not comprehend the greatness of Rome. Christians have gone in pilgrimage to 'reconstructions according to heavenly vision' of the House of Nazareth since the 11th Century. Canadians visit their History by walking along a 'streetscape' at the Canadian Museum of Civilization.

Buildings survive the builder, the original occupants and their heirs. Buildings, private or public, are the stage of all capitalization: "One can think of few other arenas (than a house)
where our private lives and the needs of the political economy interact so clearly and openly... It is also a cultural artefact which is meaningful to people, and its meanings are both privately experienced and collectively determined" (Rokoff 1977, 93).

A house is the most important object to be owned by an individual. Its glorified public equivalents, the historic house and the historic neighbourhood (commercial or residential), are celebrated as the most significant objects in society. In the heritage field, the house comes both as a private property and a public symbol. Either private dwelling or community monument, the 'house' is first a matter of economic capital.

private property, public duty

In Canada, transactions concerning built elements meant to become national heritage are conducted principally between governments turning their place of business into monuments. Occasionally, Governments enter business with private owners; they do it with some reluctance - for fear of being accused of political patronage, for fear of being duped, or for fear of being caught in public litigation over property rights and the possibility of expropriation.

During these transactions, property rights are traded for money, real property, subsidies, investments, and promises of greater wealth (tourism value, resale value, job creations).

Since any private dwelling, as an eventual expression of its time and society, may be granted the status of national significance, most of what is actually Canada's built heritage is in private hands. Since most of Canada's built heritage can be treated as private property, it becomes acceptable for the proprietors, once their moral and legal obligations are fulfilled, 'to search for money in old buildings'.

The market value of privately or publicly owned buildings necessarily accrues once they are recognised a heritage status. Unremarkable structures, due to their vicinity to heritage monuments, appreciate and indifferent buildings, bought to create a buffer zone around a "site", are negotiated at a heritage price. Derelict structures happen to change owners often, profitably, once they are inscribed on the heritage register.

Money spent while taking care of an element of the National Heritage may be reimbursed partly to the owner, either in tax privileges, in subsidies, or in resale value when the
property is put up for sale: a heritage property rarely loses its value, its Heritage status translating in a plus value, whether the property is kept forever outside commerce, or it is to be sold later.

The mercantile value of a privately owned heritage property augments because of the rights the owner holds over society, either for being a direct descendant of the original proprietors (recognised cultural and social significance for deeds accomplished in the past), or for being the owner of an ancient property which he acquired with all rights (reputation) and duties appertaining.

The economic value of a heritage property remains despite changes in the owner's fortune, a poor state of repairs translating, when property changes hand, into greater charges for the buyer. A heritage property being costly to acquire, and to maintain, ultimately it will end, through resale, bequest (Trust), or expropriation (for unpaid taxes, for instance), in the hands of the wealthiest entity in the Land: the State.

What once was built with the labour of servants, indenture farmers, factory workers, will then be maintained by their descendants in the name of common heritage. The 'Ruskin Prescription', in which contemporaries are forbidden to spend 'their' patrimony, does translate into a real debt for a community that must support (directly or not), a collection of heritage houses, and the descendants of the original owners continuing to enjoy their privileges.

Heritage is an economic obligation paid in part or in total to past benefactors, or to their heirs, to the State and its rulers, and, finally, to those who have elected their professional domicile in the service of the State.

In the public opinion, the cost of heritage will always appear to be prohibitive, and the sacrifice of a heritage object will rarely be mourned for long. Political authorities are well advised to show first some reluctance towards any commitment of public money to the heritage black hole because it is the price to pay to enter immortality with Public funds.

Legitimacy is handed over to economic capitalists by architects, both cultural and economic capitalists, who claim to be more aware of - thus receptive to, the importance of money, private property and enterprise in the preservation and the preservation of the built heritage in the City.
In the heritage field, preserving the built heritage has been the business of Preservation organizations, and of architects who made a career of saving old buildings from decrepitude.

Architects enter the field with their own professional capital, with prestige gained by monuments makers of the past, and from monument restorers of the 19th Century. In Canada, the architect's importance in the heritage field accrued with the restoration of historic Properties and Neighbourhoods; the attribution of one of the Governor General's Awards for Architecture to heritage projects; the building of prestigious repositories for the national heritage; the creation of a 'Centre canadien d'architecture' (Montreal).

Architects claim to be the best intermediaries between culture and money, and want to promote, without falling from grace, that there is money in old buildings.

Architects wanted to be the most active amongst cultural capitalists in persuading economic investors that they were welcome in the field. In Canada, Heritage architects have broken allegedly the reluctance of promoters "(who may have been harbouring) doubts about the capacity of renovation projects to regenerate an adequate return on investment"; of civic officials "(who have persisted in their belief) that new constructions was the best way to fatten a community's tax purse"; of conservationists "critical of recycled buildings because of the inevitable modification to original design that accompanied many imaginative proposal for re-use" (Galt 1976, 32).

Architects can circumvent the "very real adversarial relationship (that had grown) between conservation and economic development", by teaching cultural and economic capitalists to understand the "mechanics of conservation and the appropriate techniques of capitalizing on existing assets" that the field goes by (Ontario 1987, 15).

Architects would cater to the needs of cultural capitalists by helping them in acknowledging a fundamental reality in the field: economic capitalists needed to be accommodated: "It is to the developer, therefore, whether in the public or private sector, that the preservationists should pitch their arguments, not simply by being critical, abusively or constructively, but by showing that intelligent cooperation can yield high dividends, financially and aesthetically."
Here again, the onus is on the preservationists to convince the developer that preservation is very often more lucrative than wholesale development" (Boulting 1976, 43).

Architects seek and find 'money' and 'magic' (for capitalization's sake) in old buildings: "We can only marvel at the universal good taste of eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. It can be understood in the comparatively leisurely building of Government House, Charlottetown or Halifax...but no one can explain...the masterly handling of masonry and buildings at Lower Fort Garry. That these buildings all have a stamp of competence and of their era, whether built in a colonial town or on the prairies of Manitoba, will always be, to us, a profound mystery" (The Beaver, June 1943, 26).

"For some reason that ought to depress the hell of every modern architects, these recycled buildings are, almost invariably, much more exciting, much more stimulating, much more happy-making than the latest models produced by today's architects using today's technology" (Galt 1976, 32; quoting the Chairman of the Boston Architecture Society);

Cultural capitalists could be persuaded to cooperate with realty developers in order to get the means of their principles. Economic capitalists could be persuaded to put up with the preservationists' prescriptions and proscriptions since these, in effect, validate their enterprises - making them more difficult to achieve, and augmenting their market value.

In Canada, the most vocal advocate for a profitable built heritage, has been the Heritage Canada Foundation (1973).

The Foundation is dedicated to "the preservation and demonstration of the nationally significant historical, architectural, natural and scenic heritage of Canada" (Heritage Canada Foundation, Mandate). The Foundation has been preoccupied mainly with urban heritage; its volunteer members (have helped) restoring and protecting historic buildings across Canada. Since its inception 27 years ago, the organization has preserved more than 70 properties, most of them houses, and assisted many communities in revitalizing their aged downtown cores. The Foundation, as a trust, is permitted by law to own and sell real property.

The Trust is known mostly for its 'Main Street Program' (1980) which encouraged the restoration of dilapidated commercial buildings situated 'downtown', at the core of Canadian cities: "there, were (to be found) the establishment buildings (which created) a
sense of stability and order - the community's most tangible links to society and history" (Berton 1983, 3).

The Trust came to the field as a solution to a threat to Canada's Heritage. Since the late 1960's, the collection of Canada's heritage buildings, situated in the city centre, was threatening depletion: "the vast majority of Canada's vintage buildings are concentrated in our central cores, (it is) imperative from a preservation point-of-view that Downtown Canada remain(s) economically healthy. When the traditional commercial centre deteriorates, institutions move out, residential areas become decrepit, and shops become rundown; ( ) it takes no more than the development of a single regional mall or new highway to draw significant business away from the traditional downtown area" (Heritage Canada 1983, VII).

The Trust was willing to assign blames: owners of downtown commercial properties were responsible for having let shopping 'centres' take their customers away from them; customers were also to blame for having forgotten where their loyalty should rest. Redemption was offered by professional architects from the 'Main Street Program' who came to the rescue, and suggested to restore business Downtown by restoring derelict shops: "restoring Main Street meant the return of customers, the revitalising of the social core and the revaluation of realty property. The Program's goals were to combine preservation technique with economic and social revitalisation of a community's commercial centre through gradual process of incremental change" (Stewart 1983, 2).

The Trust devised solutions: its "Main Street Program" was meant to be an exercise in consensus building: social animators, professional builders, political representatives, retailers and the local population were to work with the Program managers restoring ancient structures, celebrating the City's heritage and recreating a sense of community. Heritage architects were to vouch both for the cultural integrity of Main Street, and for the authenticity of the local heritage. When affordable, they were to hire other professionals (Art Historians and Material History Students) to complete the definition of significant events from the local heritage.

Under the Foundation's guidance, architects and heritage interpreters, government policy makers and legislators, investors and realty developers, local retailers and house buyers, were invited to come together and help one another in augmenting their respective capital.
Architects were to rehabilitate a quintessential element of social commerce - the mercantile exchange, "one of the oldest institutions of mankind" (MacDonald 1988a, 28). "Main Street" was to provide customers with the same entertaining 'buying experience' that the local shopping centre offered them. Merchants then would be creating "an ambience" where consumers and retailers could communicate through the "object". Commemoration of the Past on Main Street was to be closely associated with the commodity.

The prosperity of Main Street retailers thus depended on their willingness to pay cultural resources (advice), with economic capital. Economic recovery was meant to profit everyone - clients, consultants and public. It depended on the fair trade of economic and cultural capitals. Conversely, money invested by governments restoring downtown, and money left to shop owners by their regular clients meant the augmentation of National Wealth in economic terms, and in cultural assets.

That the "Main Street Program" succeeded, endured, morphed into tourism promotion, or simply failed, is irrelevant to our narrative: the lessons that came from the Shopping Centre went back to the Shopping Centre, and Malls still prosper for reasons of their own. Economic results were achieved, no doubt, despite the extreme discretion on the specifics, and the reluctance of the beneficiaries to discuss anything but mishaps.

Downtown was 'oldified' into a stage where the visitor/client could spend leisure time and, occasionally, spend some of his wealth in trendy boutiques and restaurants. Heritage producers were well served; architects found employment, local contractors were hired, store owners upgraded their properties before selling them as prime location, local authorities helped everyone to get 'in the money', and then cashed in fiscally. Everyone found an opportunity to lean on the others and generate the capitals needed.

More importantly, "there had been money in old buildings" (1976): "Within the past five years (1982-1987), the North American industry appearing to rehabilitate older buildings has doubled its share of the construction industry, and now surpasses new construction. (Building restoration) is worth $350-Billion (Canadian) annually to the GNP of the two countries (Canada and the United States of America). The impact of these developments on job creation is profound. The Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation has reported that for every million dollars spent on rehabilitating older buildings, almost sixty jobs are created" (Ontario 1987, 15).
The commodity discourse that had been used to legitimate Main Street could spread to the entire heritage field: "Business/progress and preservation/history in fact mix very well. Self identity, self-sufficiency and self-preservation are business and cultural objectives in small town Canada. Putting it all together, we have the potential to help small town Canada solidify its cultural identity through that powerful medium, the dollar, and of enhancing the community with two incentives, pride of place and economic strength. With virtually no conflicts" (Fulton 1986, 10).

Legitimacy comes to economic capitalists as their investment in built heritage buys them the right to define society’s core concepts.

**Main Street: making money and cultural capital**

The Canadian 'Main Street Program', was presented to heritage conscious Canadians at the time the Federal Government (Lib) was instituting a Foreign Investment Review Agency (1974). FIRA was to control the flow of foreign capital into the national economy. As a Federal agency, it was also expected to build a wall up against regional discontent with Central government.

Most of the buildings the Program helped restore are remembered as if they were Late Victorian structures (they were not, by far); they vaguely reminded the public of the "Days of John A. Macdonald". The Macdonald Era had seen the development of urban Canada, and the first attempts to free the Dominion from foreign economic influence (British and American). Macdonald is still revered for his National Economic Policy (1878) which imposed a tariff on most foreign manufactured goods and reduced customs duties on the importation of raw material and semi-processed products. The NEP, an icon of Canadian cultural History, is regarded as the instituting moment of Canadian Economic wealth.

In the company of federal civil servants standing fast against foreign economic and cultural hegemony, economic capitalists interested in 'Main Street' projects could then be persuaded that they were perpetuating ancestral resistance to foreign invaders (operating from the Shopping Centre), and were participating in the restoration of the Canadian Economy. They were displaying in their own windows the feasibility of national economic policies, acting locally as government representatives, shaping their Country's destiny
along with their own fortune. The restoration of Main Street from financial and cultural decay meant the restoration of Canada's economic and cultural independence.

Participating merchants had been handed over heritage as a moral and political tool with which to determine what was legitimate business. As such, they held an instrument of social pressure over members of the Community, since buying at the Shopping Mall (an American institution) meant endangering both continuity in Society (the Nation) and renaissance in Community (the Market).

Legitimacy came to economic capitalists from the past, through an analogy. Canada, wrote the Director of the 'Heritage Canada Foundation', had been discovered, explored and settled for commercial purposes. French and English merchants had built throughout the land a "street" lined up with 'stores' (later, the main Canadian cities) where they traded: "from the moment the First Europeans arrived, the country was a real estate proposition. Economic considerations were foremost in the minds of those who risked money charting and exploiting Canada's lands and waters. Whether it was for fish, furs, minerals, lumber, wheat, or oil, it was for the country's staples that Canada was developed" (Dalibard 1985, 3).

'Main Street', or its equivalent in institutional heritage areas (at Lower Fort Garry, Old Montreal and Old Québec where commerce came first), was the site Private Sector capitalists could claim as the place of Society's origins; this was where their (corporate) ancestors had first presided over Society's wealth.

As an extension of the analogy, the architects ruling at the Heritage Canada Foundation could also claim that what they were staging in the 'Downtown' area, as a private matter, was as legitimate as any other heritage event staged by the Government.

On Main Street, retailers and realty promoters, in the same manner as bona fide cultural capitalists, were bringing to the community a sense of place. ("in a world where our environment is increasingly commercialized, standardized, and trivialized, people are searching for neighbourhoods or communities or regions that have a personality, and identify a spirit, an imageability"), and a sense of continuity, ("in a world where the rate of change constantly increases..., our perception of time is disconnected and disrupted. People are therefore searching for temporal references such as they find in nature, history,
archaeology, traditions, historic buildings and artefacts" [Heritage Canada Foundation 1987]).

Economic capitalists were helping the community cash in on 'aesthetic gains' ("No reasonable artist would consider whitewashing his nation's store of paintings simply to provide new canvases for contemporary art. Likewise, our carefully-developed and intricately-detailed community should not be completely demolished [sic] to provide space for the shoe-box-shape architecture of a single generation"); on 'cultural gains' ("A nation without a culture (is) like a person without a memory. Our architecture provides a living history lesson, a tangible link to our past. To destroy the work of generations is to destroy our most visible sign of continuity"); and on 'social gains' ("old neighbourhoods are complex entities whose look, size and shape, and dynamics are frequently the result of generations of careful growth. Sudden demolition and the introduction of unsympathetic high-rises, highways, and parking lots can cause irreparable damage not only to a neighbourhood's look but also to its social fabric" [Heritage Canada 1983, III]).

Economic capitalists had been recognized the right (and the obligations) to perform functions reserved nominally to cultural producers.

The restructuring of (urban) space into preserved areas, by itself one of the last century's most significant cultural legacies, was mainly a part of a larger economic and social restructuring of post industrial economies. The development of Historic Neighbourhoods has been operating, until the early 1980s, to counteract the falling rate of profit on capital investment. The cycle of valorization and devalorization in land markets was then related to "the broader rhythm and periodicity of the national and international economy" (Smith 1986, 149), the falling rate of profit from the overproduction of manufactured goods creating a crisis in capitalism that only capital invested in the built environment could attenuate. (Beauregard 1986, 39; on gentrification in the U.S.A.).

Architects had fetched new Patrons; these were interested less in being associated with Traditions than profiting from a trend. They were the "bottom line" people who sought, for the sake of staying in business, immediate and greater profits from their investment. Sadly, "preservation's allies in the big business world have no principled concern for preservation...(they) have only the thinnest sense of being members of communities whose histories merit recalling. They see their country as an economy... Preservationists natural allies are environmentalists, tenants' organisations, civic rights groups (...), for historic
preservation is a reform movement; it goes against the grain of the dominant culture* (Wallace 1986b: 196, and 198).

What had been, in the 19th Century, a protest against the overbearing influence of economy and technology, and in this century, a reaction to mass consumption, and an attempt by local communities/economies to resist globalization (Guillaume 1980, 12), was ending in a deficit for society - the loss of cultural property to private owners, and for cultural capitalists - the necessary loss of professional integrity to the economic producers they serve.

Economic capitalists were still a dangerous group: (they lusted) for quick satisfaction and return, an instant and enclosed individualism, a profitably fast exploitation of resources, a borrowing from the future to solve current problems, and the consequent repeated subordination of public good to private gain* (Wallace 1987, 39). As architects and patrons, they would leave the built perimeter in the field as soon as the stock of repairable house diminished, as government funding disappeared and as acquisition of heritage buildings became prohibitive or, worse, as owning a piece of built heritage made the owner someone 'socially dated' (after Kelly 1987, 11). Money comes and goes; money went elsewhere.

In the trade, however, economic capitalists (as property owners), had secured more than a good investment for their money (despite the cost of living and maintaining a heritage property, or the depreciation factor for living under the constant gaze of their community as objects within display); they received social capital, bought cultural capital, and shared as economic capitalists the right to make money from their cultural assets, paying little presently, and leaving others to pay in the long run.

The loss incurred by cultural capitalists - waiting to be called on stage, being used as profitable tools, was greater than accounted for. Cultural capitalists, on their own, had proven themselves incapable of 'having things being done'. When they were, they paid the price in symbolic capital: they had to share with economic capitalists the right to define 'the Centre of the World' - Downtown, on the very site where the City had been established.

The Centre of the World: "the sacred point that stands apart from the homogeneity of general space" (Eliade and O'Sullivan 1987,166), is the place where the ancestors had decided to settle; it is thus the place where everything which is not ancient, original, authentic should be eradicated. It is the 'hearth of the real': ' the navel of the earth from
which created life receives its vitality, its periodic renewal, its proper organisation and its satisfying meaning" (Turner 1967, 25), the place where ancestors paid tribute to their Gods and from which they multiplied and inherited the Earth. Main Street merchants, real estate developers, investors of economic capital, were claiming the right to stage the symbols that make society. They had staked their claim at the Centre of Society.

Main Street: symbolic capital - defining the 'Centre of the world'

For Society, according to Shils (1975) has a Centre, and membership in society is constituted by a relationship to this central zone.

The Centre of Society "is a phenomenon of the realm of value and beliefs. It is the centre of the order of symbols, of values and beliefs, which govern the society. It is the centre because it is the ultimate and irreducible; and it is felt to be such by many who cannot give explicit articulation to its irreducibility. The central zone partakes of the nature of the sacred" (Shils 1975, 3).

The central value system is the central zone of society, "because it is espoused by the ruling authorities of the society" (Shils 1975, 4); its value system "legitimates the existing distribution of roles and rewards to persons possessing the appropriate qualities ( ); legitimates these distributions by praising the properties of those who occupy authoritative roles in the society, by stressing the legitimacy of their incumbency of those roles; ( ) and legitimates the smaller rewards received by those who live at various distances from the circles in which authority is exercised" (Shils 1975, 6).

The people shown to be closely connected with authority are thought "to possess a vital relationship to the centre, the locus of the sacred, the order which confer legitimacy" (Shils 1975, 8).

Control over the place where society stages its most significant symbols is understood as being control over society: "those who exercise authority through control of land have always been felt to enjoy a special status in relation to the core of the central value system. Those who live within given territorial boundaries, come to share in these properties, and thus become the objects of political sentiments. Residence within certain territorial
boundaries, and rule by common authority are the properties which define citizenship and establish its obligations and claims" (Shils 1975, 8).

Restored heritage properties, be they shops, farms, or keeps, are meant to be perceived as special places where occupants, (and visitors, by fleeting association), can pass from one level of reality to another, from the present to the past, from the socially indistinct to the socially meritorious, from the culturally irrelevant to the morally exemplary.

Heritage properties, as signs of conspicuous consumption, demonstrate the importance and significance of wealth in society. As a recompense for abiding by the order that society's rulers symbolically embody, meritorious members, during their lifetime, are given access to sufficient financial resources to live in a place 'next to their ancestors'.

Living in an historic area proclaims one's respect towards what the past has defined as "the basic goals that unite and give purpose and direction to the community". The ownership of built heritage illustrates the power wealth producers hold in society: "Whereas in the past one could achieve status through strength, wisdom, honour or holiness and each of these required different forms of energy irreducible to the other, in modern times wealth has become the measure of a person's standing on a uniform scale" (Csikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton 1981, 35).

The ownership of a heritage property in a historic district is a status symbol, and, as such, elicits from the less fortunate, if not compliance, at least attention towards the owner's will: "a person with status sets the standards and norms by which others will act, and in this way embodies the goals of a culture. Similarly, a thing with status also acts as a template embodying these goals because it will cause people who believe in its status to act accordingly toward it and its owner who possesses the status" (Csikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton 1981, 35).

Ultimately, it is to the owners of economic capital, individuals and societies, dedicated to its growth, to provide the conditions after which members of a community will display the signs that make them who they are. Moneychangers have a legitimate right to define in living symbols, what Home, Property and Community should be.
defining Home

Heritage is "all that society values and that survives as its living context" (Ontario 1990a, 19). The main feature of heritage is, appropriately, the house since it "contains everything. It (is) the source of everything. To this common ground which reflected the memory of the unity of life in the womb, man came in search of rest, tranquillity, and harmony" (Olivier 1977, 29). The house "is the principal locus for the embodying of the basic categories of the world - the taxonomies of people, things, and practices" (Bourdieu 1972, 89), "the basic schemes of perception, thought, and action are embodied in the home, which is privileged through being the location of the earliest learning processes. The house is thus a kind of book that is read by the body through its interactions" (Dovey 1985, 36).

The house is home: "some people think of home as an integral part of themselves. ... person and environment as mutually defining entities, home as embodying the essence of self and self-identity, home as an extension of self, home as analogous to inner self, or home as inseparable from self" (Hayward 1975, 7). Home expresses the "most profound form of ( ) attachment to a particular setting, in comparison with which all other associations with places have only a limited significance" (Relph 1976, 40). It is the central point from which one orients oneself and takes possession of the world. It is "an irreplaceable centre of significance" (Relph 1976, 39).

Home is connectedness, - [with people], "through the patterns of socio-cultural order and through the role of the home place in the symbolization and representation of identity; [with the place] first through the ways in which we put down roots and draw an indigenous sense of identity from each unique place; [with the past]: through having memory anchored in the forms of the home place and from the experience of familiarity and continuity that this engenders; [with the future]: when power and autonomy permit dreams and hopes to inform environmental change" (Dovey 1985, 43).

Home is also the place where "man's absolute and ineradicable need of private property" (Scruton 1990, 99) originates and is confirmed daily. A house is not a home until some rights of ownership, even limited, can be ascertained by those who live in it. Lessons given the public when admiring heritage houses owned by the wealthy have to do with economic capital being transmuted into the right to illustrate property as society's founding principles.
defining Property

When celebrating home in public or in private settings, heritage producers celebrate private property: "home is the place where private property accumulates and so over reaches itself, becoming transformed into something shared. (At home), there is no contract of distribution; sharing is simply the essence of family life. Here everything important is 'ours' (...) The family has its life in the home, and the home demands property for its establishment" (Scruton 1990, 101).

Ownership is the primary relation though which man and nature come together: it is a "first stage in the socialising of objects, and the condition of all higher institutions. It is necessarily a part of the process whereby man frees himself from the power of things, transforming resistant nature into compliant image; through property, man imbues his world with will, and begins therein to discover himself as a social being" (Scruton 1990, 99).

Property establishes society: "the institution of property enables man to see the world in terms of rights, responsibility and freedom. Through property an object ceases to be a mere inanimate thing, and becomes instead an object, the focus of rights and obligations". Once an object is recognized as being in individual ownership, "it is lifted out of mere 'thinghood' and rendered up to man. It bears now the imprint of human social relations, and reflects back to its owner a picture of himself as a social being. By instilling the world with the rights of ownership, man makes the world after his true social-self. He is now home, where before he was merely let loose" (Scruton 1990: 99 and 100).

Home teaches the necessity of private property, and heritage houses demonstrate the antiquity of the concept. Heritage teaches the virtuous necessity of patrimony. It can thus be said that the more property an individual is credited with, the easier it is for him to claim legitimacy - in any field.

defining Community

On Main Street, as in all gentrified neighbourhoods, the economic capitalist was left to define and recreate community - "a shared remembrance", "the association of reasonable human beings united in a peaceful sharing of things they cherish" (Ontario 1990a, 19), "a territorially bounded social system, or set of interlocking or integrated functional subsystems, (economic, political, religious, ethical, legal, socializing, reproductive etc)
serving a resident population, plus the material culture or physical plant through which the subsystems operate" [Bernard 1968, 163]).

Community is 'Communitas', first, a symbolic universe embracing of the souls, and the disposition of their hosting bodies. It is a space to be thought, "an absent present in civil society - a social space suspending the formality and the conflictuality characterising society, and standing for a ( ) duality of authentic human interactions and pragmatically ordered human resources" (Fraser 1987, 797). It is also communitas - localistic, customary, hierarchical, territorial and pragmatic (Fraser 1987, 795) a place where living is uneasy.

Community is loyalty, solidarity, localism, (patria), authority and legitimacy. It is what those who can control and own the defining symbols of community, say it is.

In Canada, as in the United States, the built structures of 'Main Street' referred to "Old Time, rural or agrarian, pastoral, anglo, Home and hearth, family". Built structures provided roots to contemporaries preoccupied with a collective loss to the "ills of urbanism, ethnicity, sexuality in a national preadolescence, a time of unsullied virtue developed out of a vulnerable innocence" (Francaviglia 1981, 155). They indicated that, in the past, merchants had been sitting at the core of their community, trading in benevolence and in 'futures'. Providing customers with reminiscences of that past was believed to help bringing back both business and gratitude to the contemporary store owners. Retailers, and heritage developers, when plying their trade in re-created settings, were also selling belongingness and consensus, harmony, love, we-feeling, or intimacy - "sentiments that are usually imputed to idealized preindustrial communities" (Bernard 1968, 163).

On Main Street, merchants were playing according to both the rules of social and economic commerce. They provided, on the one hand, a stage where face-to-face interaction, non-contractual association and informal collectivities were evoked. On the other, they traded commercially - dispassionately, as per the terms of a contract. The feeling of community was a play, a pleasant evocation of what should be - either the plus value to a product (buying designer clothes in a 17th Century house), or the product itself (entering a designer's boutique and buy clothes in order to visit a 17th Century house, and get a 'sense of the past').

Main Street merchants were promising [communitas reconducta]' a representation of community as it must have been once: when 'it' was organically operative; when the
physical plant was in good running order and served the people’s needs; when people were in good physical and mental health, and able to perform at least at minimal levels of efficiency; when a tolerable fit existed between community needs and institutions and groups serving them; when consensus over norms prevailed and “everyone knew what to expect of everyone else, and these expectations were fulfilled” (Bernard 1968, 163).

Clients of Main Street retailers, and retailers as the clients of heritage architects wanted to believe that it was socially profitable to stage a revival of the original community. They did so, despite common knowledge, and the very nature of their activities.

**Main Street** was staged to facilitate commerce, social and economic. But trade and community disagree with one another, each taking after different principles of organization, “a social mode (uniting) people with personal ties” and “an economic mode, (separating) people and things into distinct commodities. Each social relation is unique, personal, irreplaceable; each economic relation is a commodity: impersonal, impartially selected and interchangeable with all others, separating us from other people” (Brill 1980, 13).

Heritage producers helped in building on Main Street a stage where to oppose the individual and the private (inherent to the Marketplace), to the public and the social (in the Community). While Community was relegated to the past, other values were coming to the fore as reality. Privatization, as in private property and private enterprise, was celebrated in the shop as the ideological framework most propitious to all social endeavours. Individualism, as opposed to society, prevailed:

"the community is a fictitious body, composed of the individual persons who are considered as constituting as it were its members. The interest of the community then is the sum of the interests of the several members who compose it. It is vain to talk of the interest of the community, without understanding what is the interest of the individual. A thing is said to promote the interest, or to be for the interest, of an individual, when it tends to add to the sum total of his pleasures, or what comes to the same thing, to diminish the sum total of his pains" (Bentham [1948]; quoted in Solomon 1981, 442).

On Main Street, the Market was being introduced as the ideal, modern form of Community, “dealing in real exchanges and behaviour - a ‘private’ which is individual rather than corporate, but freed from state and class - a pragmatic community, not localistic ( ) and, as universal exchange, a pluralist, lay version of Communitas” (Fraser 1987, 806).
defining Nostalgia

To heritage, and all other economic capitalists, Community is a product, the commerce of which is also a risky business. It leads necessarily to their clients' disaffection once it is realized that the object they bought would not put an end to their enduring quest. Needs and satisfaction are ultimately the customer to experience; failure to experience satisfaction cannot be entirely imputed to the merchant - it rests mostly with the buyer. To alleviate their responsibility and check their clients' dissatisfaction, merchants added nostalgia to their package.

Nostalgia for the beginning of things is a permanent fixture of Mankind's 'collective memory'. Nostalgia sits at the core of heritage: "the ideas of organism, harmony, equilibrium, that of testimony, the image of paradise, (being) situated somewhere in our past, in the more traditional though equally mythical evocation of the Guide and the spiritual High Place, must be recognized as the true representations of heritage" (Lautman 1993, 93).

Nostalgia makes it believable that, 'long ago', men lived harmoniously together and with Nature; they were free of domination, inequality, scarcity, brutalizing labour, warfare, and the tortures of conscience. Then something happened (Christians understand that Adam and Eve sought knowledge meant exclusively for the Deity), a break took place, and Man's endless search for meanings began. Man was left with the knowledge of some state of original perfection of which he is reminded in the "inescapable cosiness" of heritage sites he creates (Hudson 1987, 126). Paradise Lost is reconstructed in his shamans' stories. Through their stories, community is represented to itself, comforted, regenerated and instructed of its destiny.

Nostalgia is the 'failure to make the difference between real history and a romantic construction of it' (Mellor 1991, 57). The reconstituted image of a place and time of endless peace and plenty helps in making life in History significant and bearable: "When the present seems an intrusion, the future looks safer through a medieval looking glass. Atop a modest escarpment in the ancient kingdom of Fife, Stuart Morris's home is his fortress against the vicissitudes of time... Morris lives in a time warp, though he prefers to call it a castle. (The son of the Laird and Lady of Balgonie) is restoring the Castle, funded
only by a few passing tourists and a booming business in offbeat medieval weddings" (Fraser, 1997, A10).

In nostalgic sites, myth blends with history: "(they are) places where we can briefly relive the golden age and be purged of historical guilt. The past is brought back in all its richness. There is no lesson to learn, no covenant to honour; we are charmed into a state of innocence and become part of the environment. History ceases to exist" (Jackson 1980, 100). Over there, "one finds expression of the desire to recover the essential condition, the condition that he would still obtain if all had gone as it should" (Partin 1987, 185). Nostalgia is the opportunity to grieve for all things past, all failed projects and, in anticipation, for one's own death.

Nostalgia is the main production of traditional heritage makers. In traditional heritage sites, narratives of better times and great achievement (wealth, unity, cohesion, meanings), bring contemporaries both solace and shame for their incapacity of upholding this heritage.

Nostalgia is also a blame put unto the visitor. In a mercantile exchange, it is a compensatory device for merchants failing to satisfy fully their customers; in a political exchange, it is a reminder to members of the community that they have failed their leaders.

Commerce between economic and cultural capitalists, in the heritage field, concludes with economic investors being richer in economic, cultural and symbolic capitals from their trade in cultural commodities.

Wealth has come to economic capitalists as they occupy the cultural field, trade resources that they own partially, and profit symbolically from their position as they dispense along with commodities, lessons on the core values in society.

Legitimacy comes to heritage capitalists as they are permitted to accumulate the wealth coming from their participation in the field's proceedings. Legitimacy will come to them as they are given the opportunity to deny cultural capitalists some of their capital, and offer to replace what has been taken away by something of their own making.
Chapter 6: wealth - heritage capitalists as the field's reeduers

Wealth comes to society in the guise of wages earned by heritage workers while working in the leisure business. Work performed in leisure is considered non vital - money spent in/for leisure activities is money that could have been invested in more profitable activities. Money saved on heritage salaries (wages paid in cultural and social capitals), could be money saved for more socially pressing needs. Wealth comes to society, in time of prosperity or not, as it is taken away from the heritage field, or as its occupants are made to repay the favour they are done for being 'kept' (as in a kept person) by their institutions in the field.

Denying money to the cultural field is thus a sign of social responsibility from the more responsible elements in society: "both governments can get a lot of mileage out of defunding art. 'We're going to spend this public money on something more worthwhile', we say... In the Anglo-Saxon countries, we have inherited the idea that art is a luxury product. So if government is pulling back from the larger public sphere in general, it seems with that kind of inheritance to make sense to suggest that it ought, especially, to pull back from the luxury areas" (Gopnik 1998, C1).

Wealth comes to society as cultural capitalists pay their debt by becoming wealth producers themselves, (in tourist attractions, or at the Museum shop), or by helping the wealth producers in society with the production of economic capital.

Heritage producers, in the past Century, did reimburse society by teaching industrialists and their workers lessons on how to make more money. Classics of the Museum field report with some pride (nostalgia? irony?) that 'liaison officers (were then sent from museums with objects) to factories and workshops which might benefit from loan collections as source materials for design patterns and colour schemes to be applied to contemporary arts and crafts, machine-produced or handmade" (Wittlin 1970, 152); "(museums then were used to instruct) the students and artisans of every branch of industry, in the high and acknowledged standards of form and colour, what the past has accomplished for them to imitate and excel" (Alexander 1979; 31).
Museum directors were then following an example set by the Victoria and Albert Museum - which had been created "to elevate the taste of British Manufacturers and consumers by showing them superior designs from around the world". Museum officials of the period abided by the "Anglo German belief that good design of domestic decorations reflected and inspired sound moral character... it aimed to improve the fitness and commercial competitiveness of British products. The early effort, meant to inspire higher thinking in design and manufacturing problems among artisanal specialists and to elevate public taste at large, was soon rewarded with more substantial results" (Advertising Supplement on 'A Grand Design; the Art of the Victoria and Albert Museum 1998'. 'Globe and Mail', 13 June 1998; 26).

Wealth nowadays still come from the same ancient objects as they are packaged as travelling exhibition and rented to foreign institutions (also 'visitors' who stay home). An exhibition, like the Grand Design; the Art of the Victoria and Albert Museum 1998, illustrates the artistic production of a given period, the original raison d'être of the Museum, and most interestingly using objects created to make money and putting then on display to make the point that as museums objects they still can do so.

making of a morally healthy workforce

Classics of the Museum field report with some In contemporary societies, cultural capitalists appear to pay their debt by offering to occupy the workers' leisure time with morally profitable activities.

Since the past century, expenses incurred on the presentation and preservation of cultural objects have been justified by their role in inculcating in the citizenry ‘the virtues of 'character’ - moral integrity, self-control, sober earnestness, industriousness: “(then and now), activities in work and leisure (were to be) ultimately constructive. Hard work improved the individual as well as society, (and) poetry, fiction, the visual arts, and related pursuits (were) legitimized not 'for art's sake', but for their moral, that is, economic utility" (Kasson 1978, 49).

A properly socialized worker remains a rare commodity; lessons taken in cultural institutions can translate into lessons on civic and economic values both workers and owners of the means of production are meant to profit from.
Contemporary apologists of the heritage institution follow in this 19th Century social reformers who wanted that "every opportunity (be given to the) people to employ their leisure time in healthy and stimulating surroundings (and) every attraction that counteracts the influence of the saloon and of the race-track (be) considered of great social importance" (Boas 1907, in Halpin 1997, 59).

Heritage producers still serve as tutors to the working classes - as they did, after the First World War, when American industrialists sought to enlist "the positive support, cooperation, and loyalty of their employees by bringing history to the Masses on their factory floors (in order to fight personnel) turnover, massive absenteeism, and unsatisfactory productivity" (Wallace 1981, 63).

Heritage activities must be accounted for as economic, profitable time; cultural capital is believed to be instrumental in keeping the work force physically healthy and members of society, morally acquiescent.

So preaches the UNESCO for whom - " (contemporary civilisation, and its) future evolution, rest upon ( ) the cultural traditions of the people of the world, their creative force and their social and economic development" (UNESCO 1968); "landscapes and sites are an important factor in the economic and social life of many countries, and are largely instrumental in ensuring the health of their inhabitants" (UNESCO 1962); "it is essential for man's equilibrium and development to preserve for him a fitting setting ( ) where he will remain in contact with nature and the evidences of civilization bequeathed by past generations" (UNESCO 1972); "the safeguarding of landscapes and sites, ( ) is necessary to the life of men for whom they represent a powerful physical, moral and spiritual regenerating influence" (UNESCO 1962); "the well-being of all peoples depends, inter alia, upon the existence of a favourable and stimulating environment, and the preservation of cultural property of all periods of history contributes directly to such an environment" (UNESCO 1968); "cultural property is ( ) an essential element in the personality of the peoples of the world" (UNESCO 1968), "and an expression of their ways of life and one of the corner-stone of their identity" (UNESCO 1976); "the significance and message of cultural property (must) become a part of the spirit of peoples who thereby may gain consciousness of their own dignity" (UNESCO 1968); "the knowledge of the civilization of Man, enriches the cultural life of all peoples and inspires mutual respect and appreciation among nations" (UNESCO 1970).
So believed Chinese authorities who wanted, in 1997, to teach their people to 'say no to drugs' (doing drugs being an economic crime). Modern Chinese authorities burnt ballots of haschish they had seized during police operations in front of a monument commemorating a similar [feu de joie] staged by a Chinese civil servant with the opium seized from British merchants in 1839. The ceremony was set a few months before the return of Hong Kong to Mainland China; it reminded the good people that, as in the old days, they needed still to 'to say no' to both dubious social practices and dangerous political ideas - the latter being as detrimental as the former (Mickleburg 1997, A18).

Museum institutions however anxious to participate in the making of economic wealth by providing moral lessons have yet to be recognized as serious partners to the wealth producers in society.

The debt heritage institutions owe to contemporary societies – and rulers, has yet to be paid since it is common knowledge that wealth cannot be found in the field: "In recent years, we have witnessed a slow attrition in our world of plenty ( ), funding freezes are now the norm, operating budgets have been eroded" (Tyler 1989, 18); "sadly, more and more museums are being forced to close their doors to the public altogether, or at the very least, to reduce their operations due to insufficient funding" (Addison 1993, 2).

Government and public spend their money elsewhere than in museums: "We are now living in an age where individuals ( ) have a bewildering choice of leisure activities to choose from. Attention spans are short, and money is tight ( ); compared with welfare, health care and economic development, the needs of cultural institutions are at the bottom of the list. So, when government budgets need to be cut, museums are a very vulnerable and convenient target" (Addison 1993, 3).

Visitation to heritage sites has plummeted; with visitors gone, money also went. Wealth that heritage capitalists have gathered is denied to them: heritage producers are incapable of informing or entertaining their clients. Most of traditional producers, in the museum sector especially, have failed to understand the new social reality as it is defined, in Europe and in North America, by Neo Liberals in power.

Legitimacy comes to economic capitalists, as marketing advisors are invited to assess the situation in the field, and are permitted, against little resistance, (1) to deny utility and competence to the traditional producers of heritage services; (2) to suggest alternatives
coming from outside the field (marketing strategies and the theme park spirit), and (3) to sell these alternatives for symbolic capital - the right to define what is wrong with the field, what should be right for it. From partners, economic capitalists become the main agents in the field the moment they can claim in a believable manner that they can save the field from economic and cultural bankruptcy.

**economic capitalists as the Field's redeemer**

Curators, as their institutions' main authorities over 'internal policies and tastes' have abused their privileges; interested mostly in conversing with their peers, and proving themselves as capable as their former teachers, they appeared to be standing unaccountable to anyone for their handling of resources society and their employers had given them to manage.

Curators have shown little interest in either 'attendance figures' (Addison 1986, 28), or in public's needs; they have overestimated both the public's level of knowledge, and its interest in their preferred media of communication. Education programs they have staged suggested "hard work and formality rather than a pleasurable, leisure activity" (Addison 1986, 30).

Curators seemed to believe that their position were secure as long as there were objects on the shelves to be preserved, and as long as an ignorant public would be knocking at their doors begging for knowledge and status: they had presumed "with calm self-assurance (that being there would) automatically guarantee both their survival and their popularity without any particular effort on their part" (Brunel 1986, 18).

The museum (heritage site), critics concluded, had been more "a mirror reflecting the taste of an intellectual or social elite than a window opened to meet the needs of a complex, pluralist society" (Brunel 1986, 17).

Museum professionals had been politically overcautious, intellectually obtuse, and socially irrelevant: "keeping up with the present and even forecasting the future, (was) a decidedly difficult task for hind sighted individuals working in hind sighted institutions. Consequently, we content ourselves with the social relevance of retrospective art exhibitions and technographic, technological, natural and scientific exhibitions presented primarily in the historical context. Indeed, we cling religiously to the exhibition medium as our only
legitimate vehicle of idea communication. Our emphasis is and always has been on the relevance of the past, it is safe and less controversial" (Tyler 1989, 20).

Incapable of providing "the knowledge society's members needed to survive and progress", heritage professionals had become irrelevant, if not the main threat to the survival of the field: "if museums fail to keep pace with a changing society, they may be perceived as redundant and be abandoned in favour of other types of information-providing institutions which had better adapted to the information Society" (MacDonald 1991, 306).

The situation was not news to writers in trade magazines who had regularly apprised their readers of how practitioners seem to have been chronically incapable of performing the common practices of their trade.

Heritage producers had been incompetent in generating economic capital (no revenues), social capital (no support from influential circles), and cultural capital (no proper knowledge about how things are done correctly). Under their management, heritage sites had become, "almost by definition, 'non-events... (places of) changelessness and boredom" (MacDonald 1991, 311).

The field needed to be saved from its own keepers. Traditionally, it had been the business of cultural capitalists to enforce their own discipline. In Canada of the Mid-Eighties, institutions who could afford them, called in experts 'from the other side of the table' to assess the situation: coming from 'abroad', marketing experts suggested a re-evaluation of "all [of the field's] operations from the ground up, including an examination of the very values (it) operate(d) under" (Addison 1993, 3).

Calling for external help meant either that traditional producers wanted it to be known that they were ready for radical changes, or more likely, that authorities in the field had found a way to make the most out of an embarrassing situation: traditional managers would not be reprimanded and proclaimed incompetent by their employees without expecting a profit from the exercise.

Wealth could come back to the field provided marketing experts were listened to. In Canada, in the Mid-Eighties, at the peak of the marketing fad, careers were saved by curators and bureaucrats chanting 'product, place, price' under the direction of 'excited' marketing consultants. The production of a relevant heritage commodity would "begin with
an analysis of the market, includes the planning of a programme to meet the organization’s objectives and the needs to be targeted market, using pricing, products, promotion and distribution techniques appropriate for the market” (Engel 1993, 16). Success in the field would be secured by "managing (various) ingredients in a manner consistent and compatible with the organization’s objectives, according to a procedure of analysis, planning, implementation and monitoring” (Duhaime 1993, 33).

Success would come easily since marketing and museum seemed to conceptually agreeable to one another: “marketing is a process that always involves exchange; the museum provides something (an exhibition, public exposure) and receives something from its publics (admission fees, a cash payment) in return. The exchange may involve items that are tangible (money information), intangible (spiritual uplift, satisfaction), or both” (Kelly 1993, 18).

Marketing would profit everyone: political patrons could finally expect fair returns on their investments; heritage managers could have a greater control over what was happening; heritage employees would be offered continuation of employment, redemption from incompetence, and participation in reforming the field; customers would be left “(to decide what) to claim today as (their) heritage” (Prentice 1993, XII).

Marketing would provide ambitious individuals in the field with a sure way to promotion; newly promoted administrators found in marketing a means to identify the employees to target during their next rationalization exercise; seasoned managers used marketing as a way to threaten ancient employees into compliance.

New names were to be given to the field’s features (its reality): performance, status, prospects, opportunities, competition, survival (as opposed to preservation), satisfaction, awareness, visitation rate, product heterogeneity, feelings of benefits, segmentation, motivations, preferences, behaviour, attitude analysis, visits specificness (sic).

Marketing experts were seen giving a bright new coat of colors to the whole landscape: "in 1994, when Pepsi-Cola beamed its logo onto the tower of the Anglican cathedral in Liverpool, the dean of the cathedral protested. That surprised the Pepsi people. They had already projected their brand onto famous sites all over Britain, including the Parliament buildings, and some notable castles, without serious opposition" (Fulford 1996, C1).
The new Code was chiselled unto public monuments (newspaper ads, in this case): "Vice President - Visitor Experience & Commercial Development at the Royal Ontario Museum: Meaningful visitor experiences rely on a seamless and integrated delivery team. Reporting to the Senior Vice President, the successful candidate will develop and implement organization strategies and entrepreneurial activities with a customer focus. In this role, you will oversee Museum Sales, Marketing, Retail Operations, Food and Beverage, Theatre and Performing Arts, Membership, Events and Host & Special Services. Your entrepreneurial savvy and your 10+ years experience in revenue-generation, exposure to volunteer management and marketing are ideal combinations for this exciting role" (Globe and Mail 1998, B34).

Heritage resources were commodities whose value depended on supply and demand; heritage objects were valued for their rarity, their uniqueness (as 'attractions').

Producers were into mission statements, goals, objectives, and strategies were to be devised to ensure their survival first - community making would follow much latter. The field was made of clients seeking a 'good deal' ('beneficial feelings', inspiration, pleasure/leisure, experience, 'a sense of history' [Prentice 1993: 225, 227]), and of producers acting as entrepreneurs or as representatives of shareholders/stakeholders, competing with one another for a share of the market.

A producer's status (legitimacy) depended on the client's satisfaction at the conclusion of an exchange. Success in the field was to be evaluated according to revenues collected at the door and at the Minister's office.

Heritage had become less of a public activity. The definition of Heritage, and of its components was to be left to the user's plebiscite; authenticity or integrity of heritage resources and meanings depended on what the customer had decided them to be: "'Right. Well, the point of our history - and I stress the our - will be to make our guests, those buying what is for the moment referred to as Quality Leisure, feel better' - 'Better. Meaning?' - 'Less ignorant' - 'Max, you missed the verb' - 'Which one?' - 'Feel. We want them to feel less ignorant. Whether they are or not is quite another matter, even outside our jurisdiction () So we don't threaten people. We don't insult their ignorance. We deal in what they already understand.' (Barnes 1998, 70-71).
Producers were to adjust their stock to their client's constantly changing needs. These were dependant on factors that would be out of their control - demographic, technological, and social. The field, as an extension of the Market, would respond to the success/non-success of a heritage commodity by either modifying the features of that commodity, its price, place, presentation and packaging, or by declaring it obsolete. Heritage objects, symbols however meaningful, had a limited 'shelf life'.

Originally dedicated to continuity, stability, conviviality, and community, (or to personal sense of balance, self regeneration and self respect), that field was becoming profitable because it was an unstable environment: "Capital accumulation, the ceaseless expansion of the commodity form through the market, requires the constant revolutionising of production, the ceaseless transformation of the innovative into the obsolescent..." (Connerton 1989, 64).

It had also become a never ending opportunity to redefine the heritage field. With the perpetually unsatisfied banging at the door, heritage producers could envisage employment forever.

Once efforts had been made to satisfy their needs, members of the public could neither shun institutional productions for being biased and elitist, nor could they turn heritage producers away when coming to beg for resources.

Once offered a stage where to demonstrate society's new ideological creed, provided with a scapegoat (heritage producers themselves) to pay in their stead for squandering public wealth, political authorities could not deny heritage producers a proper financial support.

Once welcomed into the field as investors and advisors (Trustees, consultants), wealth producers could not deny their hosts social commerce, nor could they turn down the challenge put to them to show their real worth when called to replace the State in funding cultural affairs.

Having acknowledged 'past errors', heritage producers had economic, social, cultural and symbolic vouchers to collect - and were invited to spend their newly acquired wealth in "keeping up with the Jones" at the theme park.
Theme parks were everything that historic sites and museums had failed to become. Wealth would come to the field provided heritage managers follow the example set by theme parks.

Once discredited as "ersatz, phony, trivial and worse" (MacDonald 1987, 210), theme parks were said to be serving in an efficient manner: "as contemporary museums and history parks, (and) fulfilling even better than museums their mandate"; "through the device of 'theming' and its short-hand stylizations of person, place and thing, an archive of collective memory and belief, symbol and archetype have merged. This is the 'bank' of popular culture from which much interest has been earned, both inside and beyond the business of entertainment. Museums of every kind can effectively draw on this account to prepare for the twenty-first century" (King 1991a, 6).

Theme parks were part of the tradition of the field: "The contemporary Grand Tour around the Global Village is a procession from theme park to theme park". The bloodlines of the 'new museum' were to be "as old and venerable" as "the theatre, science and trade exposition, history park, world's fair, as well as the museum itself, especially the science museum and heritage park" (King 1991a, 8).

Theme parks had been experimenting successfully with "multimedia presentations, visitor controls, elaborate marketing schemes and other features ( ), such as tour packages, people movers, heavy promotional campaigns, programmed activities, etc" (MacDonald 1987, 210). They had been developing "effective revenue generation features that provided vast capital resources which no traditional museum, with its reliance on government funding, can match" (MacDonald 1987, 210). They had been attracting visitors in drove. More Canadians had visited Disney's Orlando, in 1985, (4 million) than Canadian museums. Visitors to Disney's had stayed longer than the average visitor did in museums. Theme parks had created more jobs (in the U.K.), than museums had: "The rise in number of consultancies specializing in producing commercial heritage attractions, or in operating interpretive theatre programs (indicated) which way the wind was blowing" (MacDonald and Alsford 1995, 136).
Theme parks cared about their clients' individual and social needs (as opposed to the needs of their collections): "(in theme parks), greater importance is placed on information that is personally meaningful - that is, relevant to personal experience or throwing light on identity (either as an individual or a member of a community) - than that which is historically accurate in all its details. This is one of many reasons why theme parks presentations are highly selective in their historical 'memory', emphasizing evocation over accurate depiction, and addressing themes of popular culture" (MacDonald and Alsford 1988a, 28).

On the one hand, theme parks were offering predictability, solace and intellectual comfort - "a kind of stability in a world where the pace of change has accelerated at mind-bending rates. In the theme park, historic and cultural archetypes are set in place as a framework for reassurance, creating a zone safe from the barrage of change" (King 1991a, 8), and presented familiar themes: "the mechanistic, deterministic view of the doctrine of progress; pragmatism, applied science, the Protestant Ethic, materialism, collectivism, the Social Ethic, specialisation and centralisation" (MacDonald and Alsford 1995, 129).

On the other hand, they were having old ideas glitter anew with the use of technical innovations: "(theme parks recognized) that most visitors do not like to read extensive text, and North Americans are accustomed to obtaining information from television, computerised databases, and online services, (and have encouraged the ) use of photographs, audio-visual presentations, audio-tours, live interpreters, and interactive information kiosks in conjunction with displays of artefacts" (MacDonald 1995, 133).

"Most people's experiential knowledge today consists massively of electronic experience" (MacDonald 1987, 214), "over the years the television medium has shaped the nation's sense of pace and style and perhaps even restructured the national perception of space and time. Theme parks which move to the same rhythms are a response to these new perceptions as much as a reinforcement of them" (Hall 1976, 5).

Theme parks producers had practised both the old and the new, the stained-glass window makers of old being continued by their special effects producers: "the experiential, non-analytical approach to time, an attitude formed partly by television, (was) clearly expressed in the theme park. Colour (was) everywhere; light, sound, and music bombard(ed) the theme park visitor... the average five-hour visit to a park allow(ed) about one hour per theme, coincidentally, about the same block of time allotted to an evening television show" (Hall 1976, 5).
Theme parks had welcomed diversity: "culture is learned as a bundle of messages, each bundle comprising various types of information. Culture is expressed not only through objects, but also through processes, ideas, feelings, personalities, and so on. The media of preservation and access have to reflect this diversity" (MacDonald 1991, 307).

Theme parks had offered a ‘new vision’ for education and exhibition to be based not on a literal or historical perspective, but on archetypes and community consensus; “theme parks speak a new language: multi-sensory, entertainment-based, three dimensional, symbolic” (King 1981a, 62).

Critics of theme parks ( mainly of the Disney’s version ) were sent off to review their textbooks on cultural relativism: “any reconstruction of the past is simply an interpretation involving hypothesis and suitable subjectivity. It is not hard to criticize Disney’s glorification of American history, nor its portrayal of a promising future based on technological program. But museums too have promoted myths (the noble savage/the idyllic rural past). Culture includes both realities and myths, and people need to learn the value of both. Having a range of different types of institutions presenting various interpretations can be beneficial to society” (MacDonald 1995, 144).

Theme parks did not bother with collections - collections were becoming "something of a burden to museums. Most museum directors now feel like directors of geriatric hospitals whose budgets are devastated by patients whose survival for another day depends on expensive, high-technology support systems" (MacDonald 1987, 213; Director (ret), Canadian Museum of Civilization; on professional euthanasia practices).

Theme parks were successful; theme parks were privately managed. Museums should then be managed like private sector businesses: “heritage resources managers need(ed) to create the same kind of integrated network for their products and services for the public that private enterprises offers, but with more substantial and meaningful content” (MacDonald 1987, 216).

Wealth would come to the heritage field provided heritage producers capable of delivering “benefit, education and enjoyment” to all their publics - “Experience the joy, the sheer fun of exploring our heritage” (National Museums of Canada, Promotion Leaflet, 1986 ).
Wealth could come to heritage producers were they capable of convincing would be sponsors of the profitability of being associated with play considered as a heritage activity.

Play was the key alternative to the prevailing uninteresting, non competitive situation in the heritage field. The suggestion came almost as a challenge to the entire field - from eminent Museum directors in Canada. The Director of the Canadian Museum of Civilization promoted the Disney way after 1985; the Director of the Royal Ontario Museum was into 'story-telling' and 'theme-parking' until he was sent to look after new interests in 2000.

Play

Play, in the heritage field, is deemed a significant commodity; it translates into leisure and education. Play is a means of socialization. Games can be "used to teach the skills required for gaining a living, as well as inculcating the roles considered correct for an adult in society. In a broad sense, games provide individuals with models or simulations of cultural activities" (Hunter and Whitten 1976, 182).

Play is the value added to heritage. It is a legitimate educational activity. Play is to clients both an attraction and a distraction from the habitual seriousness of institutional productions. Play promises fun to children; play promises adults a return to the past, or childhood - a place of remembered for its experience of directness, immediacy, diversity, wholeness, fantasy and spontaneity.

Play provides an outlet to a child’s surplus of energy. Play prevents children from disturbing the peace: play is a policing device. Play comes as an undisturbing appendage to the main programs; it is not as valid, real or serious as the activities offered on the main floor. Play is 'work in progress'; it is an investment in the future.

Play is a celebration of the present. It is an opportunity to spend leisure as the recompense for work well done, in the past and in the present, in ensuring wealth, cohesion, unity and meanings to those associated with the community. Play is a civic duty.

Play is a display of civilization. Visiting a heritage place is being exposed to the most significant productions society can conjure. Since leisure was a privilege once reserved to elites given time to pursue their personal development, visiting heritage places is being confirmed an elite status: "we conduct business in order to have leisure (after Aristotle)."
Leisure in this sense is an ideal state to which the citizen can aspire, in which the living of a life of leisure is premised on minimizing necessities and ensuring that as much time as possible is free” (Tomlinson 1994, 329). A visit to a heritage place activates the civilization process: the main product to be expected from the Canadian Museum of Civilization is civilization.

producing play

Heritage producers had already been hard at work creating proper settings for play. Visitors come to the Ontario Science Centre (Toronto) attracted by its interactive displays (as busy, noisy and exciting as casino machines). The ROM treats the ‘MTV Generation’ to its exciting Media-Television Exhibition. Dolls and toys are used to recreate the life and times of a Canadian Prime Minister (N.H.S. Louis S. St-Laurent, Compton Qc); the career of a Father of the Confederation is staged after a Montreal Department Store’s Christmas Display (N.H.S. Georges-Etienne Cartier, Montreal).

Coming to the museum must then be as much fun as ‘playing’ either video games, games of chance, a dramatic role, or riding the rides at the Amusement Park. In heritage sites, visitors should be provided with opportunities, after Caillois (1961), to compete against virtual and actual adversaries, try their luck, and dress up and play roles.

The Canadian Museum of Civilization, thus, stages the equivalent of Amusement Park rides at its IMAX-OMNIMAX theatre; Parks Canada, hosts, at Fort Chambly, a Saint Louis Festival that visitors attend in period costumes; the Hull Casino offered a reward to anyone who could guess the exact number of Canada geese on a Riopelle on loan from the Musée du Québec; consultants from the Université de Montréal suggested to turn Fort Chambly into a playground fort. If the many books they published on their Treasures were to be believed, Museums considered ‘treasure hunting’ as the proper analogy to describe what their visitors would be doing.

Visiting a heritage site is play - a visit does not replicate any ordinary events in ordinary life; visiting a heritage site is not formal training for anything else but visiting other sites. Visiting is not a continuation of a ‘real life’ situation. Failing to visit does not have any dire consequences on the individual’s or the institution’s fate. Staging play, however, is hard work to heritage producers whose fate does depend on the crowds being interested.
Play is the producers' business. Modern heritage sites are made of 'places' - sets, where heritage producers staged themselves 'being at play' - when entertaining children and groups in meaningful activities, when presenting demonstrations and sketches, or when performing their heritage work.

The heritage site is a 'playground'; it is a tournament ground where heritage producers lead the good fight against ignorance, destitution, chaos, forgetfulness, and sometimes challenge their visitors to find their way out from the labyrinths where they have been set loose.

It is a casino where heritage producers gamble public wealth on chancy acquisitions / endless research programs, ambitious exhibitions, risky blockbusters, or bet their organization's future on a dubious analogy between museums and Disneyworld (MacDonald from the Canadian Museum of Civilization made his reputation doing so).

It is a theatre stage where they repeat lines from a well rehearsed script, celebrating society on cues, playing at being knowledgeable guides, wearing their livery as if their masters' existence depended on it, and putting on the grimaces of power and knowledge.

It is an amusement park where they get dizzy with all the machines they build, and with all the people they meet, with all the noise they make, with all the objects they show, will all the meanings they create - resurrecting the dead with intimidating 'deux ex machina', making history live again.

Wealth would come to heritage producers were they capable of convincing would be sponsors of the benefits of investing in play either with expectations of immediate profits (money, and public 'gratefulness'), or long term profits as they are provided with a stage where to associate play with their respective performance in society.

Symbolic capital comes to both sponsors as they are given play as a metaphor for what they consider a worthy world-view - every game recreating society in a closed field: "there are 'truthful correspondences between the worlds of nonplay and play... the materials of games are drawn from the sociocultural world and at the same time stand in figurative relations - metaphorical, analogical, symbolic - with it" (MacAlloon 1987, 475).
Games (as enacted on the floor, as displayed in exhibits or as promised in the site's publicity), may be an illustration of intellectual and moral values prevailing in a given culture. Games are instrumental in defining and fostering such values. Each game can provide a lesson which should be applicable, analogically, to real life situations - provided the players agree to step aside and enter the symbolic realm.

Games, for instance, can be used, metaphorically, to allude either to what political authorities expect from their constituents (socialization into proper behaviour, and compliance to arbitrary rules and decisions), or to what economic capitalists are daily involved in (competition, risk [venture capital], simulation [sales techniques] to satisfy a yearning to have more - for the sake of the game, and for Fortune's sake).

"The point of the game is for each player to have his superiority in a given area recognized. That is why the practice of (a competitive game) presupposes sustained attention, appropriate training, assiduous application, and the desire to win. It implies discipline and perseverance. It leaves the champion to his own devices, to evoke the best possible game of which he is capable, and it obliges him to play the game within the fixed limits, and according to the rules applied equally to all. So that in return the visitor's superiority will be beyond dispute... (competitive games celebrate) work, patience, experience, and qualifications... professionalization, application, and training" (Caillois 1961; 15, 17).

Games announce the world of heritage: "Once played, (a game) endures as a new-found creation of the mind, a treasure to be retained by the memory. It is transmitted, it becomes a tradition. It can be repeated at any time, whether it be 'child's play', or a game of chess, or at fixed intervals like a mystery. In this faculty of repetition lies one of the most essential qualities of play. It holds good not only of play as a whole but also of its inner structure. In nearly all the higher forms of play the elements of repetition and alternation (as in the refrain), are like the warp and woof of a fabric" (Huizinga 1955 [1938], 10)... "Behind every abstract expression there lie the boldest of metaphors, and every metaphor is a play upon words. Thus in giving expression to life man creates a second, poetic world alongside the world of nature" (Huizinga 1955 [1938] 4).

ambivalence and play

Wealth will come to heritage producers once they are capable of providing a festive experience to their visitors: "(Come and live the unique) 'Quebec Experience' - a world of
sensations appealing to all your senses, an emotion filled adventure presented in startling visual and sound effects [ ]. A spectacle during which history, sitting between reality and imagination, becomes real; a concept (sic) where technology and culture meet and provide the spectator with an entertaining and educational experience. A magical presentation that everyone must see, hear and experience. An unforgettable moment” (Quebec Experience-Promotional Leaflet 1994).

Heritage producers have repeatedly been promising playfulness; critics have steadily lamented either their failure, or their reluctance, to do so.

Play is an ambitious concept: it is the expression of symbolic activity, a mechanism of socialization and/or a form of communication. But play is also an ambivalent concept; it can be seen either as something useful to learning and to developmental processes, or as something trivial and non essential.

Games people play, according to Caillois, proceed after two different principles - a principle of amusement, and a principle of arbitrary and accepted constraint (Caillois 1961, 13): “games can be usefully placed along a continuum from ‘paidia’ (relatively unstructured, spontaneous, labile forms typified by many children’s games) to those of ‘ludus’ (more conventionalized, jural, and elaborated forms” (MacAlloon 1987, 477). The first principle leads to raucous [tohu bohus], the second sets the pace to a ritual: " [ludus] is complementary of [paidia], which it disciplines and enriches. it provides an occasion for training and normally leads to the acquisition of a special skill, a particular mastery of the operation of one or another contraption or the discovery of a satisfactory solution to problems of a more conventional type “ (Caillois 1961, 28). Play, as an ambiguous concept, generates ambivalent responses.

Economic capitalists, thus, may be hesitant to commit real money to assets they do not own.

Play is superfluous: “It is one of the characteristics of play that it does not create any wealth or work, production, object. This makes it different from work or from artistic creation. Once the game is over, everything can and must start all over again, without nothing new to show for the game, neither crops, nor manufactured goods, a masterpiece or capital” (Caillois 1961, 35).
Play is non-instrumental: "when a work ideology reigns what we fear most is leisure's promise of play. Praise of work does not engender praise of play. Since praise of work is the ruling sphere of contemporary man, this dim vision may well appear as irrelevant and irreverent, irrelevant to the profane world of the worker, irreverent of the magical god of the worker (Neale 1969, 15).

Political authorities may be interested in maintaining heritage as a device that diverts attention from their activities, but civic education (which is meant to secure meanings, unity, cohesion and wealth, enduringly), could not depend on an activity that participants can leave at their fancy. Play has little to do with what is at stakes in real life. Play is not serious.

Play is fun; immediate contentment puts an end to play, while heritage is meant to elicit renewed commitments and continued sacrifices. Heritage, the idea, and the practices of heritage presentation are contrary to the practice of play.

Play is an activity which is essentially free, while heritage is a moral obligation. Play is governed by rules which suspend the reality of 'ordinary' laws, heritage is the presentation of institutions as a set of problems solving rules. Play is make-believe, "it is accompanied by a special awareness of a second reality", while heritage is meant to be the representation of reality (Caillois 1961, 10).

Play to traditional heritage producers is a trick played on them. It is improper to a field dedicated to seriousness: play is not-reality - if not a reversal of reality. Marketing specialists needed to be denounced for suggesting that theme parks should be considered exemplary:

"Managers (read marketing specialists), are like scientists; there are good ones and those that aren't so good. And most museums simply did not have the financial resources to attract the best. It was noted that a great many museums were being run by bad used car salesmen. Many of these second-rate managers were simply applying basic management techniques gleaned from elementary texts designed for producers of consumer goods or service institutions" (Carpentier 1987, 9; formerly Director of Research at the Canadian Museum of Civilization);
"all management or decision-making responsibilities must be taken away from researchers, those absent-minded scholars who cannot even count the money they spend - and turned over to the new generation of know-it-alls, graduates of schools of administration and departments of communication... They have been unsparing in their efforts to turn museums away from their original functions and transform them into exactly that - 'anything at all' - day-care centres, amusement parks, theatres, restaurants, even discotheques. Zoos? Why, museums are zoos already, sheltering an endangered species of scholar... Yet there has been no significant increase in the number of new visitors, and regular audiences have dropped off" (Crépeau 1987, 9; former employee of the same institution).

Discredit came to marketing producers through a demeaning analogy - disneyfication: “the Ottawa Botanical Garden Society’s recent proposal to develop the site of the Central Experimental Farm, endangers the historic character of the Farm ... This development scheme could savage a national treasure and destroy a unique part of our heritage...Disney-land-on-the-Canal, here we come. Why destroy what is there only to install faux history? Why wreck real heritage components so that restaurants and other buildings can be built to support the operating costs of these new ‘heritage” elements as well as the rest of this development?” (Baeyer 1999, C4; on ‘Disneyland on the Canal’).

Marketing experts were like the barkers at the late 19th Century Amusement Parks (American): theme parks were to 20th Century heritage sites what amusement parks had been to 19th Century museums - a fascinating, thus dangerous alternative. What had been said of Amusement Parks by Social Reformers, late in the 19th Century, could apply to contemporary Heritage Reformers.

Heritage Reformers were planning to undermine order in the field and in society. They were promoting the individualistic, the ephemeral, the constantly changing and the irrational on a stage where the rational, the knowledgeable or the docile had been traditionally celebrated.

They were encouraging dissipation. Like 19th Century Amusement Parks, contemporary heritage sites had fostered "a lessened self-possession, a surrender of the intellect and emotions to powerfully influential forces under the control of those who promised only pleasure and pursued only profit" (Kasson 1978, 101).
They were promoting the presentation of things rare, unusual - an embarrassing regression to the Cabinet of Wonders. They seemed to be willing to do away with the traditional apparatus of heritage (labels, guides, catalogues and objects), that is, with the normal process of making knowledge (surveillance, recording, classification and evaluation); they were blurring the line between spectator and producer, and between object/reality and simulacra/replica. Spectators were made to believe that they could become the main agents in the field. Heritage Reformers, despite their conservative dress, were really pushers of Dionysian thoughts, subversive and wild.

*play, and the necessity of diversion*

Play, then, had been promised and toiled for by heritage producers, only to be denied to the public - for its own good, the good of the trade and those of the would be sponsors.

Play, however, is still a proposition that heritage producers could not refuse: wealth would not come to heritage producers unless they are capable of staging a festive celebration of society: "(festival) - total collective performance that celebrates a holistic unity of cosmic and social order, on the part of a relatively homogenized population of participants" (MacAlloon 1987, 366).

Celebration, however, meant failing the mandatory seriousness expected from heritage activities. More importantly, it also meant the possible 'inversion of social roles so that "many of the distinctions between social categories of persons - whether based on hierarchy, social categories, or age - may be temporarily subverted and dissolved in a playful spirit " (MacAlloon 1987, 366).

Wealth would not come to heritage producers, if they were incapable of diverting the attention of their people away from the rulers' failure to provide wealth, unity, cohesion and meanings.

Play is a 'divertissement' (*Pensees de Monsieur Pascal sur la religion* 1669-1670); it is a need that must be satisfied for fear that human beings be made to face reality: "nothing is so insufferable to man as to be completely at rest, without passions, without business, without diversion, without study. He then feels his nothingness, his forlornness, his insufficiency his dependence, his weakness, his emptiness. There will immediately arise
from the depth of his hearth weariness, gloom, sadness, fretfulness, vexation, despair “ (Pascal [1958], fragment 131).

Divertissement is a necessity for man, either commoner or king: “if (a king) be without what is called [divertissement], he is unhappy, and more unhappy than the least of his subjects who plays and diverts himself” (Pascal [1958], fragment 139).

“Hence it comes that play and the society of women, war, and high posts, are so sought after. Not that there is in fact any money in them, or that men imagine true bliss to consist in money won at play, or in the hare which they hunt; we would not take these as a gift. We do not seek that easy and peaceful lot which permits us to think of our unhappy condition, nor the dangers of war, nor the labour of office, but the bustle which averts these thoughts of ours and amuses us... The hare in itself would not screen us from the sight of death and calamities; but the chase which turns away our attention from these, does screen us” (Pascal [1958], fragment 139).

“So we are wrong in blaming men. Their error does not lie in seeking excitement, if they seek it only as a diversion; the evil is that they seek it as if the possession of the objects of their quest would make them really happy. In this respect it is right to call their quest a vain one. Hence in all this both the censurers and the censured do not understand man's true nature. And thus when we take the exception against them, if they replied - as they should do if they considered the matter thoroughly - that they sought in it only a violent and impetuous occupation which turned their thoughts from self, and that they therefore chose an attractive object to charm and ardently attract them, they would leave their opponents without a reply” (Pascal [1958], fragment 139).

Those who provide play, save the participants through divertissement (either noisy in theme parks or quiet in traditional museums), from personal experience of disorder, futility, meaninglessness, and set the conditions after which life in society is bearable.

Divertissement as diversion is the most important of all symbolic capital; whoever is capable to divert attention from reality is a step ahead of anyone entitled by all the capitals he owns to define reality. Divertissement, as a symbolic capital, is what is at stakes when economic capitalists and cultural capitalists compete for the wealth to be found in the heritage field.
According to game theory, and anthropology (Balandier 1980), three strategies are available to cultural capitalists when dealing with economic capitalists - they stand in opposition to them, and oppose any trespasser from outside the field; they can, after a brave stand, leave the field open to the newcomers once recognized their superiority; they can share the field, the resources of the field with any player interested in dealing with them, standing their ground where needed, retreating when necessary, entering a deal whenever profitable and possible.

Heritage producers have been very adept at shouting defiance at anyone who came into their field. Heritage producers have never received graciously the economic capital they needed to run the field as they wished; they have very rarely refused charity when handed down to them.

There is a tradition of mendicity in the field that endures; it comes with fear of being denied charity, (for the mendicant), and with the fear of being denied the opportunity to be seen doing charity (for the wealthy patrons).

But as much as heritage producers have been adept at threatening their patrons to put on the sorcerer’s mask (when fussing over a donation, and cussing the donor), as much they have been agreeable courtiers. As such, once required to become shopkeepers, they have complied and started to sell objects instead of keeping them as curators.

Quite naively, (or is it mendaciously), they believed that they could become like their tutors, the economic capitalists, without becoming subservient to them. The heritage producer as shopkeeper had already agreed that heritage productions were uninteresting - thus accepting that the whole field may also be obsolete, and that interest in his productions could not be rekindled - without seeking outside help. Surprisingly, (or is it intelligently), they made believe that becoming shopkeepers, and managers of heritage fairs would not be costly to the field in social capital - shopkeeping is a ‘petty trade’ [un petit métier] - and there is very little difference between a curator and a concierge, an exhibition designer and an interior decorator, a museum director and a maître d’hôtel, a shop manager and a souvenirs peddler. Remarkably, the people from the field did not feel the insult of being compared to domestics.
Wealth was coming to the field, but the field was not getting wealthier. Heritage producers, as they stood defining the field, were requested to disappear in order for the field to survive.

According to game theory, strategies of opposition/cooperation are more performative than strategies of either simple collaboration (complacency) or games of pure opposition (adversarial position): heritage producers might have been playing a game when they were the marketing experts as the redeemers of their own field.

Wealth comes to society as economic and cultural capitalists enter a trade capital to their mutual profit: “But I wonder whether an alternative strategy would be better?... Let them (the world of business) recognize themselves in our exhibitions. And when the business community recognize themselves in museums: their fortunes, their contribution to this civilization and so on, then there probably will be enough concern for them to be motivated to get closer to us, and probably produce some additional effects together with us” (Sola; quoted in Boylan 1992, 183).

Marketing advisers have been more than excellent promotional tools to the heritage field. As such, they came to help the field speak the ideology of the day, compete with other capitalists for available resources, and illustrate through the management of its own production what was expected from the rest of society.

Marketing people came to play the villains’ part in a production still controlled by their employers. Their brashness towards the field’s traditional occupants was expected, if not solicited for strategic purposes, and ultimately served well those who were being roughed up.

When playing at diminishing substantially the influence of the instituted cultural capitalists, in the field, marketing experts, in fact, were providing a demonstration of how poor their understanding of the process of capitalization was. On the other hand, Heritage capitalists were fighting fire with fire.

Were heritage productions to be managed (structures and purposes) as private enterprises, they could not be differentiated from any other economic production. Were the heritage field turned into an economic space, economic capitalists would be deprived of a
place where to 'launder' their money into more valuable cultural and symbolic capitals (social recognition, praise for generosity, civic gratitude and immortality as a plus-value).

In the heritage field, economic capitalists come in two groups - investors interested in making money out of a cultural capital, and wealth producers interested in transforming their economic capital into socially valuable wealth (symbolic capital). Both groups come to the field as promoters of the economic way of engaging in social commerce. The first group has short term interests; and needs a compliant field to profit from; the second group seeks long term profit, and needs a strong field where to trade in enduring values.

Producers of wealth in society can always crash into the field, and stage their own legitimating productions as a symbolic extension to their economic wealth - the Fords and the Duponts, in Hagley (Delaware) and in Dearborn (Michigan), do pay employees to celebrate their contribution to the material progress of their country.

However, symbolic capital, the right to be emulated and to be envied by contemporaries and descendants, cannot be bought. It is true that it is often paid for (philanthropy), but will ultimately be handed over as a gift by the main authorities in the field.

In the following chapter, legitimacy is discussed as the result of capitals being traded at par between economic producers and cultural producers. Heritage brings wealth to society as cultural producers will turn into cultural capital, occurrences that took place in the economic field, and make economic producers into legitimate cultural icons for society to emulate.

Heritage is patrimony, and the patrimony of a private economic concern, like the Hudson's Bay Company, can be consecrated National Heritage as it is at National Historic Site Lower Fort Garry.
Chapter 7: wealth - the making of a legitimate cultural capitalist: the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC) at National Historic Site Lower Fort Garry

In Canada, the Hudson’s Bay Company’s handling of its heritage resources, over the last Century, has been exemplary. The modern Company has been extremely proficient in transforming its cultural capital into economic, social and symbolic gains.

The Company, for instance, displayed its Collection of ‘historical relics, lore and souvenirs of its early history’ for the first time in 1922, at its Winnipeg Main Store. The Collection had been assembled since 1920, to commemorate the Company’s 250th Anniversary, and was made of artefacts either purchased from collectors, collected from its post managers or donated by former employees.

The Company then believed that showing its ‘historical material’ to clients and visiting public was a duty that it "owed to itself and to all Canadians. There was also a more practical side to having a major historical exhibit in a retail setting which [the promoters] described as "an enormous and direct advantage" to the Company’s business" (Coutts and Pettipas 1994, 13).

By 1926, the Collection had moved into the store’s new location, was arranged as a museum display, and was given appropriate objectives: 'to depict the history of the Hudson’s Bay Company, the life in the fur trade, the story of pioneer settlers and the customs dress, and industries of the aboriginal tribes (Couts and Pettipas 1994, 15).

Besides curious and clients, the Collection was then to benefit "newcomers [immigrants] and children who wish to learn something of the life and work of the country’s pioneers and of the Indians who originally inhabited this great land. For the ‘old-timers’, the exhibit would bring back memories of early struggles - for the Indians, the exhibit will serve to keep available examples of native handicraft - the product of a skill that is now almost a memory of the days of their forefathers" (Coutts and Pettipas 1994, 16). The displays were divided in themes - "early history, furs, Indians, life in the service, forts, posts and stores, fights
and wars, and settlement" which illustrated a progressive view of History (Couts and Pettipas 1994, 15).

In 1960, the Collection was loaned (permanent loan) to the Province of Manitoba. In 1961, Provincial authorities loaned the Collection 6000 artefacts to Parks Canada which displayed them in the 'Retail Store Building' of National Historic Site Lower Fort Garry: some 300 Indian and Inuit artefacts were shown in an Exhibition called The First Peoples. The Exhibition illustrated the artistic and technical skills of the Native People - "who were such an essential component of the success of the fur trade" (Ross 1987, 12-13).

In 1994, the Company donated its corporate Archives to the Provincial Archives of Manitoba and its Collection to the Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature. The Company was to ensure the "future care, management and interpretation of its gifts through the establishment of the HBC's History Foundation. The new Foundation will be funded through tax savings, estimated at approximately $23 million, which are expected to result from the donations. In addition to annual operating funds, the Foundation will give the museum $2 million to house the collection..." (Beaver 1994b, 3).

The cultural significance of the Collections was given through the proper habitual analogies: to the Manitoba's Provincial Archivist the HBC collection was comparable "to the holdings of the Vatican Library and many experts claim that it is the greatest and most complete corporate archive in existence, covering a period from the late seventeenth century to the present". Predictably, the Archives were "a rich hoard of treasure to scholars and history enthusiasts, but its true value may elude many who see it only as a dry-as-dust collection of old paper, journal and ledgers" (Beaver 1994a, 2).

Their symbolic significance was defined by the Company's Governor who reminded the Canadian public of the other gifts that the Company had presented to Canadians to be incorporated in the National Heritage - "the Lower Fort Garry and York Factory National Historic Sites and the 1970 replica of the 'Nonsuch', the ship whose voyage from England to Hudson Bay in 1668 led to the creation of the Company in 1670" (Beaver 1994b, 3).

Throughout the process, the Company had made sure to have its cultural properties validated by the proper authorities: a designer had come from the Victoria Memorial Museum (Ottawa) to set the 1926 Exhibition; curators from the Canadian Parks Service had kept the Collection in a National Historic Site; Provincial Archivists and museologists
had succeeded them in due time. Social capital had been accumulated from the public, former employees, native communities, and political authorities. The Company had the opportunity to give away three times the same collection to the public, and profited on each occasion.

'Goods are for giving. The rich man is rich so as to be able to give to the poor, say the Kabyles. This is an exemplary disclaimer; because giving is also a way of possessing (a gift which is not matched by a counter-gift creates a lasting bond, restricting the debtor's freedom and forcing him to adopt a peaceful, cooperative prudent attitude)... the endless reconversion of economic capital into symbolic capital, at the cost of wastage of social energy which is the condition for the permanence of domination, cannot succeed without the complicity of the whole group: the work of denial which is the source of social alchemy is, like magic, a collective undertaking. As Mauss puts it, the whole society pays itself in the false coin of its dream" (Bourdieu 1977, 195; quoted in Kett 1981, 211).

N.H.S. Lower Fort Garry

National Historic Site Lower Fort Garry is situated 30 kilometres, north of Winnipeg, Manitoba. NHS Lower Fort Garry commemorates the history of the Fur Trade in Western Canada and celebrates the success of a capitalist concern still in operation - the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC). The actual Fort was constructed, in 1831, to store the goods destined to the Company's hinterland trading posts. Shareholders of the Company were then, by virtue of a Royal Charter, "the True Lordes and Proprietors in freehold" of 15 million square miles of land extending from the Labrador to Vancouver Island.

Lower Fort Garry is presented to the public as a cultural artefact. It is "the largest remaining collection of fur trade buildings in North America" (Site Management Plan 1991, 2); "Lower Fort Garry is one of the oldest buildings of Manitoba... it is built of materials which will survive the older homesteads of the Red River Valley. When the last Victorian structure is demolished the Lower Fort will remain, and then and in the centuries to come, it will be to Manitobans a priceless relic of the white man's earliest days in the West" (Beaver 1935, 34-5) (27,28).

'Lower Fort Garry' was acquired from the HBC, not to celebrate the fur trade or colonial architecture, but to commemorate a political event that took place in 1875, in the Fort's vicinity - the signing of 'Treaty Number One' between the Dominion of Canada and South
Manitoba Natives. The Treaty was to provide the model for all aboriginal treaties in Western Canada; it was the first step into the institution of the Reservation System in Canada (1876).

A plaque since taken down gave the meaning to Indian Treaty Number One: "Here on 3rd August 1871, the Treaty was made between Wemyss M. Simpson, representing the Crown, and the Chippewa and Swampy Cree Indians whereby those tribes surrendered all their rights to the lands comprised within the boundaries of Manitoba as then existing. This agreement ended the restlessness of the natives and left the way clear for peaceful settlement" (Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, 1928). However, as late as 1991, Canadian Parks Service employees were still pondering what interpretation to be given to the "important role of native people" in the life of the Fort (Site Management Plan 1991, 4).

At Lower Fort Garry, the Canadian Parks Service commemorates a trade that opened the land to European civilisation, and celebrates the work of explorers, cartographers, traders, craftsmen, clerics and surveyors in the Company's pay who brought Civilization into the Wilderness. As representatives of the political authorities ruling over the Land, the Company's agents were the forerunners of contemporary Civil Servants (that is, the predecessors of the same employees who are being tasked now with their celebration). Visitors to Lower Fort Garry are told about the role played by Metropolitan entrepreneurs in the development of Canada.

capitalism

Explicitly, the Fort is a memorial to a successful capitalist venture. Implicitly, it is the quiet and forceful demonstration of the processes of capitalism, (rationality, management techniques, the exploitation of natural and human resources) as the necessary companions to British imperialism.

Lower Fort Garry celebrates the first incorporated merchandising company in the English speaking world (1670): "it is only a vast corporation, possessed of unlimited means, long experience, and immense facilities for transportation, that can hope to compete with this last great monopoly ...the trade which from a single department alone brings annually to the English market an average value of 150,000 Pounds in furs, and in the aggregate furnishes the world with three-fourths of its pelties, has presented the only means of
commercially benefiting the aboriginal tribes, or of turning to profitable account the inaccessible regions over which its operations extend" (Robinson 1879, 57).

Over the past 400 years, the Company has worn the many masks of capitalism - starting as a mercantile concern in the 17th Century, moving into real estate, financial speculation, railroad building, and finally diverting its investments into natural resources, transportation, insurance and communications in the 20th Century. The Company has thrived throughout its history, untested by the iron law of the Market, from privileges granted successively by the British Crown, the Foreign Office and Colonial politicians. In the Canadian Colony, the Metropolitan enterprise made good on cheap labour, on natural resources and, lastly, on the capital gained from commerce.

The Company operated through an extensive network of retail outlets and centres where the Natives came both as producers and as clients. Consumer's loyalty was ensured with the provision of goods that could be acquired from (or repaired by), no one else than Company employees.

The Company trained its own employees, and promoted them according to merit; it prefigured contemporary managerial practices with its emphasis on strategic planning, control, coordination and motivation of the work force. Whenever profitable or feasible, administrative, commercial and industrial activities were concentrated on a single location.

The Company practiced the division of time and labour - "the business of the post is transacted between the hours of nine in the morning and six in the evening with an interval of an hour between two and three o'clock for dinner, when the offices and stores are closed" (Robinson 1879, 97); "in an age in which time was money, and in which duration of labour had to be measured precisely for wage calculations, clocks and the meticulous system of timekeeping they represented served as instruments, like the imposing facades of Greek revivals banks and government buildings, to make a newly established social and economic order seem eternal and unchangeable" (Leone 1995, 128).

The Company introduced its customers to the use of currency and to credit: "the currency with which business was transacted… consisted chiefly of promissory notes, issued by the company, redeemable by bills of exchange granted at sixty day's sight on the Governor, Deputy governor and Committee in London. The notes were, however, readily redeemed in coin at Fort Garry, without deduction for discount, whenever presented" (Robinson 1879,
Money was to be, in the Western Plains also, the universal standard in human affairs: once it had been introduced, time and labour, competence, experience, social status as well as personal value could be measured according to one stick - a person's earnings.

rationality

The Company adopted, throughout North America (whenever possible), a standard pattern for its installations; the architectural layout of Lower Fort Garry consecrates Reason triumphant over Nature, and Disorder.

A HBC trading post was invariably a square enclosed by a palisade. The entrance of the post was shut by two gates, an inner and an outer one. The centre of the square was occupied by a house built for the trader and clerks: *the first view is of the residence of the chief trader in command... It is a long two-story stone building, with a broad piazza encircling it on three sides. A square plot of green sward surrounding it is fenced in with neat railing, and kept in extremely good order. A broad gravel walk leads from the gateway to the piazza. Huge shaded trees border it, and beds of waving and fragrant flowers load the business air with their perfume. In this building the mess of the chief and his subordinates is held. Its hospitalities are extended in good old English style* (Robinson, 1879, 74) (29).

The House at the Centre of Lower Fort Garry announced the pattern after which the Western Plains were settled: after the passing of the Dominion Lands Act (1872), interlocked fences were to expand across the Prairies, the Act introducing the Township System, a grid of 36-section townships starting at 95 degrees west longitude and 49 degrees latitude (in South East Manitoba), extending westward from Winnipeg to Edmonton, which broke the land into regular rectangles.

Visitors to NHS Lower Fort Garry are reminded of the capitalist practice of dividing land in discrete parts to facilitate evaluation, sale and exploitation - with little considerations to previous occupation, topographic conditions, or social needs. The surveyor's township grid as prefigured in the Fort itself, separated those who held ownership over the Land from those who did without. In Lower Fort Garry, fences within the Fort separated workers from managers, and the literate from the illiterate, the Metropolitan from the Colonial. The Fort's palisade delineated the civilised world from the "Wild". It set apart the sedentary
(who inhabited rectangular dwellings made of rare material capable of resisting the natural forces), from the nomad (who lived under circular structures better made to adapt to the environment).

Occupants of the Norman Cottage gazed upon their employees, made different by their station in life and demonstrating their difference by their location in space (seeing and being seen as a means of displaying power). Fences were meant to keep wild animals outside the Company's property; they also kept employees and visiting natives without - socially and physically. As it is with museums, having access to the perimeter was an indication of one's importance in the economic process.

Social order expressed the natural way of things. "The European male élites legitimated the structure of control over land, resources, and people by manipulating space, both physical and social. This manipulation - words, actions, and objects, into the landscape so that the capitalist social order would seem - and still seems - as natural as breathing" (Delle 1995, 107).

Heritage celebration at the National Historic Park thus indicates that evidence of civilisation in the past laid within the walls of the Fort; the Fort itself demonstrates that Civilisation's fight against Nature had been engineered and won by those who, in the 19th century and after, controlled economic capital.

Evidence of civilization - later, museum objects, came to Lower Fort Garry as commodities. Manufactured goods were the instruments through which the 'Natural World' was subdued to satisfy the ever changing needs of Man-in-society.

The description of a HBC store room by 'An American Traveller' (Robinson 1879) vouches for what must have appeared to the visitors, a Wunderkammer on its own right: "the trade-room, or the Indian-shop, bears a close resemblance to the store of civilisation. It contains every imaginable commodity likely to be required by the Indian. Upon its shelves are piled bales of cloth of all colours; in smaller divisions are placed balls of twine, scalping-knives, gun flints, ...and glass beads of all colours, sizes and descriptions. Drawers under the counter contain fish-hooks, needles, scissors, thimbles, red and yellow ochre and vermilion for painting faces and canoes. Upon the floor is strewn an assortment of tin and copper kettles...In the corners of the room stand trading-guns, kegs of powder and boxes of balls, while from the ceiling depend other articles of trades" (Robinson 1879, 85).
Lower Fort Garry as an artefact itself, as a receptacle of artefacts and as a stage where artefacts are demonstrated, is a celebration of 'homo faber' - man as a tool maker. To the Lower Fort Garry traders, Man had inherited the right and the obligation to bend Nature to his needs. Nature existed to serve the Heirs of the Divine Bequest, and "any form of 'progress' that made life easier and more pleasant was to be considered acceptable (Altman and Chalmers 1980, 18).

Man made objects, according to Arendt, "build a world of their own". Man made tools have erected a wall which separates Man from Nature: "it is as creator of objects that (Man) asserts himself as lord of creation, for his activity involves dominating and destroying what is there naturally" (Canovan 1974, 36).

Artefacts exhibited in heritage places confirm the taming of Nature, since the material with which they are made “is already a product of human hands which have removed it from its natural location, either killing a life process, or interrupting one of nature's slower processes” (Arendt 1965 141). Man made objects teach that an “element of violation and violence is present in all fabrication, and (that) homo faber, the creator of the human artifice, has always been a destroyer of nature... The experience of this violence is the most elemental experience of human strength and, therefore, the very opposite of the painful, exhausting effort experienced in sheer labour. It can provide self-assurance and satisfaction, and can even become a source of self-confidence throughout life” (Arendt 1965 141). Violence, that was forced unto Nature, can also be justified to entice other human beings into doing their share to build the common wealth.

Objects on display in N.H.S. Lower Fort Garry, are instruments. As such, they evoke the idea of 'process', both during their production and while being in use: “an object is always perceived in terms of its ability to transform into or elicit another object. Objects are thus viewed less in themselves than for their place in an exchange (or a ritual) which will be efficient and effective" (Miller 1991, 400);

“the implements and tools of homo faber, from which the most fundamental experience of instrumentality arises, determine all work and fabrication. Here it is indeed true that the end justifies the means; it does more, it produces and organizes them... Because of the end product, tools are designed and implements invented, and the same end product organizes the work process itself, decides about the needed specialists, the measure of co-operation,
the number of assistants, etc., During the work process, everything is judged in terms of suitability, and usefulness for the desired end, and for nothing else" (Arendt 1965, 153).

Objects on display, either in private or public places, are monuments to the idea of instrumentality, and a lesson in utilitarianism - "a view of the social world as consisting, ideally or factually, in a plurality of discrete, separate, rational individuals, each of whom is motivated, to all intents and purposes exclusively, by the pursuit of pleasure (or utility) and the avoidance of pain. On this view, the good society is one so organized as least to inhibit the individual in pursuit of his or her pleasures, one in which markets are as freely competitive as possible, and in which governments exist only so as to establish the legal framework within which such markets can freely function" (Miller 1991, 7).

Next to the heritage interpreter stand the industrial engineer and the rationalizing bureaucrat ready, as direct descendants of the original artisan, to teach the most significant lesson to be gotten from the Object: instrumentality, instrumental reason and the necessity of inventiveness as a tradition in itself:

work

The presentations at National Historic Site Lower Fort Garry celebrate work - and work's benefits: wealth and righteousness. Visitors to buildings, objects and demonstrations of tools and techniques are presented people at work.

To its Native customers and to some of its Canadian employees, the HBC presented itself both as an extremely complex system of roles and duties, to be fulfilled in the same manner across the Continent, and as an extremely simple entity, that of a society organised and structured solely for work: "every man knows his place and his work; the laws regulating their duties are clearly defined and well understood, and are enforced with a strictness and rigour truly military or naval. Hence the harmonious working of the whole extensive and complicated machinery, and the wonderful financial results of its operations" (Robinson 1879, 72).

The staged representations of work does not allude to the other meanings of work - labour, travail, toil, drudgery and grind; they are a celebration - a moral play. The display of ancient techniques is, by the quaintness of the objects on demonstration, makes a case, a contrario, for modern complex production systems and work organisation patterns. These
objects promote the idea that living in an organised society is better than living 'way back then'. What is on display, at Lower Fort Garry, is progress - to be understood as predetermined and inevitable. The old ways called for better ways, and the sacrifice made to facilitate their introduction was necessary.

These presentations, in the worlds of MacCannell, are the museumization of 'abstract, undifferentiated human labour', as it is presently experienced (MacCannell 1976; 6, 36).

A visit to a 'work display' provides 'modern man' with the opportunity of establishing a relationship with the modern 'social totality': "as a worker, the individual's relationship to his society is partial and limited... restricted to a single position among millions in the division of labour. As a (visitor stepping) out into the universal drama of modernity, the individual may attempt to grasp a moral witness of its masterpieces of virtue and viciousness" (MacCannell 1976, 7).

Visiting work on display is an act of worship to society: "in being presented as a valued object through a so-called 'leisure' activity, society is renewed in the heart of the individual in warm, open, unquestioned relations, characterized by a near absence of alienation when compared with other contemporary relationships. This is, of course, the kind of relationship of individual and society that social scientists and politicians think is necessary for a strong society, and they are probably correct in their belief" (MacCannell 1976, 55-6).

Visiting a 'working' heritage site is an act of worship to "the Economy" that giveth work and "the Economy" that taketh jobs away. Work creates society, as work is the sole reason for the HBC's Posts to exist; the loss of work, devastating to the identity of individuals, alienates them from society. The loss of work breaks society apart. Work displays "represent the past that worked, in the double sense of being a successful one for capital and one where 'idle' hands were busy" (West 1988, 60). They are a reprimand to those who do not work in the present, who seem to have decided not to work, or who object to the Present's works.

The entertaining choreography of people 'working' in historic sites is indirectly a celebration of the ethics of capitalism - methodical life planning, self control and self denial, to be instilled into the younger generations. Behind the costumed actors of heritage sites stand sovereign, allegorical characters who are summoned up from the Past to preach that Work is Man's normal condition and that the augmentation of one's patrimony, through
hard work, moderate consumption and parsimonious living, is a moral obligation which is owed to God, or to the Provident Entity.

According to Weber (The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism [1904-1905]), the early capitalists believed that Man had been created to serve God by vocational activities. Man had been granted time, personal talent, resources and opportunity to work and develop these resources in order that God's benevolence be made manifest with their use and the augmentation of these resources. The fruits of regulated diligence and thrift (growing profits and economic expansion), were to be considered signs of spiritual blessings.

This, the employers at the HBC understood very well: "More than one consideration, probably, contributed its weight in the selection of (natives of Scotland and the Orkneys) as the Company's working representatives, viz., their proverbial shrewdness and propensity for barter; their generally vigorous physique and love of adventurous life; a steady perseverance in the attainment of an end; close economy, and the giving and receiving of the last half-penny in trade; and above all, a certain Presbyterian honesty begotten of the Established Kirk" (Robinson 1879, 62).

Wealth, then, as well as all capitals to be generated from Heritage, is God given for the virtuous and the rich to display, and for all others to recognise and seek. Righteousness in the national community are made manifest by the treasures of cultural heritage and by the wealth that has been inherited from prosperous ancestors.

civilization

The walls of Lower Fort Garry (1871) today are a monument to the resilience of the early founders of society in (Western) Canada. Like other monuments that Provincial and Federal authorities 'have built' along the Red River, between Upper Fort Garry (NHS The Forks, Winnipeg), and Lower Fort Garry, they are a celebration of God's predilection for His (working) People.

The road between the two forts is lined up with historic markers expresses gratitude for the blessings brought down by the Divinity unto its righteous people. A Farm House, a Rectory, a Boarding School, the House and European garden of a retired army officer (in the service of the Company), a Mill, locks on the River, all celebrate the White Man's institutions, and
serve as an echo to the themes presented in the National Historic Site. The Red River "Via Sacra" makes the National Historic Park Lower Fort Garry the historic core of British and White Settlement in Western Canada.

The Fort, as a monument, separates the Barbarians from the Civilized. City dwellers, sitting secured and triumphant behind their walls, can celebrate the fruits of their labour, and teach civilization as the consequence of good capitalization of economic and cultural assets.

Lower Fort Garry is a monument to property – meaning, this instance, the Land and its resources, and the right to define the Nature of the relationship between Man and Nature, and between civilized societies and primitive tribes. That right, once the Company's monopoly and properties have been sold to the Canadian Dominion, was passed into all contemporary White Canadians. Along with the HBC's properties, Canadians inherited its Native customers as parts of the Country cultural heritage.

Wealth; cultural capital and property

Heritage and economy intersect at the concept of property: "Inheritance denotes the procedures which apply to the transmission of property, either material or immaterial, from person to person at death" (Mitchell 1967, 'inheritance'); both economic exchange and cultural commerce sit on the right of traders to own property. - "a right, either for a limited or unlimited duration, to dispose of a thing in every legal way, to possess it, to use it, and to exclude everyone else from interfering with that right" (Black's Law Dictionary 1991 - property).

Legitimacy comes to economic and cultural capitalists as they can secure in their respective field property rights over objects (material and immaterial) that they wish to keep or trade. Legitimacy comes from sharing the same process to gather wealth: cultural and economic capitalization follow the same pattern.

Cultural capital of heritage producers and economic capital of wealth producers are gathered either under peaceful conditions, when a good investment profits, or under violent conditions when they are snatched away (by deceit or force) from less capable traders. Neither the commercial nor the heritage exchange are necessarily conducted in fairness; both imply the possibility of one of the participants being a thief or a bully.
Legitimacy and property are intimately connected in heritage matters. The right to claim ownership over an object, in a capitalist environment, is concomitant to the possibility of denying others any right over the same property. It is a violent business in which even radical critics writing about heritage property participate when denouncing the historic capitalist: "la propriété, c'est le vol", (do they say after Proudhon), and establishing an analogy between the means of industrial production and the artefacts used in the production of cultural capital.

To radical critics, any heritage celebration of Capital and private property is flawed with illegitimate agents, manipulative techniques and immoral purposes. Pointedly, when heritage objects are considered commodities, citizens are said to be stolen of their (tax) money (which passes into the entrepreneurs' profit), and of their symbolic capital, the right to define what is exemplary in society (which goes the same way).

Heritage depends on material objects - if only for the fact that the more abundant the material signs of wealth, the more likely the existence of culture. Being represented on the heritage stage is function of the amount of capital that a given group can mobilize for that purpose. In a capitalist society, a group cannot sustain in a satisfactory manner its claim to having a culture once it is denied the right of property, or once it has defaulted in producing the material evidence to support having a culture (read Handler 1988).

Property rights are held by individuals under the guarantee of the Law of the Land. Property rights for political entities and sovereign Nations are defined, amongst other instruments, by treaties.

A commemorative plaque at N.H.S. Lower Fort Garry celebrates Indian Treaty Number One (1871). N.H.S. Lower Fort Garry, as a monument, commemorates a legal agreement that secured the White Man a peaceful settlement in the West. At N.H.S. Lower Fort Garry, Canadians celebrate the moment when 'they' took over the Land, peacefully and rightfully, with the legal consent of the then occupants. Lower Fort Garry is a celebration of right of full property.

Alternatively, Lower Fort Garry celebrates the White Man's victories in his wars against economic, social and political foes. Trophies from these wars (once) hung on the walls of
the Fort (the Hudson's Bay Collection) to serve as educational tools in the learning of his heritage.

Following a process initiated at Lower Fort Garry, in 1871, the trivialization, marginalization and exclusion of Canada's First Nations from both the national heritage and the national Community come from being denied a place in the Economy once their rights over Land had been 'traded away'. The disappearance of the Natives from Canadian History, and their silencing into the virtual reality of stereotypes is function either of property non existing or property denied.

capitalization - economic

*Treaty No.1* is the most significant historical event to have taken place at the Fort; its commemoration confirms the beliefs that the White Man ought to own the land since he proved himself to be more capable of treating it in a productive manner.

*Treaty No.1* was the first of eleven treaties by virtue of which Plains Natives relinquished their rights of prime occupancy (the land itself being vested in the Crown, as per British Law), in exchange of land reserve, government annuities, and relief and protection against hunger and disease.

Treaties dealt principally with property - the White Man making sure that by signing a document, all rights that Natives could claim would be extinguished and that, by toiling the land, all moral claims over a legally acquired property would also be extinguished: *"only the hard work and agricultural knowledge of Europeans invested the land with value...To the Indians the land was infinitely precious, the very basis of their existence. Yet if European Civilization was to prosper, the Indians had to be moved out of the way or so the Europeans of the time thought"* (Richardson 1987, 16).

The Natives at Lower Fort Garry had traded, in 1871, property rights against the means of their own survival and, unknown to them, Civilization. The Canadian Government had negotiated with its Amerindians the extinguishing of any title that they might have had over the land, and their exclusion from property. The titles Indians had over the land were considered usufructuary rights (in the same manner that ownership rights are considered in heritage field) - the right to use the land for such purposes as hunting and fishing. They
were considered to include either sovereignty or ownership in fee simple; the idea, proven during the Renaissance, that land occupied by Natives was *terra nullius*, endured.

During negotiations with Native Leaders, Government representatives made clear that Treaties were offered because they were a moral, not a legal obligation; treaties were, in fact, a means of avoiding conflict.

Having been denied ownership of the Land, Natives were thus being introduced to the idea of property, and to the importance of exclusive property. And property was a tool of civilization: "The mapping of Indian reserves functioned not only as an important adjunct to the orderly division of the Prairies but also provided a means by which native peoples could be introduced to Euro-Canadian values particularly where land ownership was concerned: A great stimulus will be given to the industrious Indian by giving him a tract of land and define its boundaries within which he may recognise his own estate. I know of no plan more calculated to discourage barbarous customs which tend to destroy individuality, or to induce the improvement and general cultivation of their reserves. The first and distinguishing principles of civilisation, no doubt, consist in the recognition and protection of individual property rights" (an agent of the Dominion Lands Survey, 1880; quoted in Murray 1989, 24).

Other losses followed that of right of property. In the years following the Treaty, by virtue of the Indian Act and afferent Regulations, the Natives lost the right to speak their language, to exercise cultural customs, (potlatch), to determine membership in a Native group, and to be ruled under traditional forms of (self) government.

In the trade, the Indians were supposed to have agreed to abandon their Indian/ess. Acculturation was the ultimate purpose, and the main 'capital' sought in Treaties was symbolic capital, the right, for the acquiring majority, to name the World as it pleases.

When the Indians appeared to resist changes brought the White Man - for lack of the proper means to do so (most treaties were never upheld, and the usual means of economic production were never available to Native groups), the White Man concluded that the efforts made to educate the Native had been in vain. He found convenient "to think that Natives were getting something for nothing ( ) Indians were by nature too ignorant, too indolent, too tradition-bound to make the leap into the modern world" (Francis 1992, 216).
Natives were then considered to be reneging on the moral contract they had passed with
the White Man. The work they did was deemed to be neither progressive, nor profitable.
Natives had proven themselves unworthy of property - since property is a residue of work.
Under Divine Rule, neither the animal nor the morally unworthy were to be recognized
property; conversely, individuals who did not know property needed to be civilized.

The Canadian Natives were one of the many detritus shoved aside, the World over, by the
White Man on his Righteous March to Progress in the 19th Century.

The Natives had been profitable as Warriors and as Fur Collectors in the White Man's
economy; they had made him rich by buying his wares. Once the Treaties had ensured that
they could make no claim over the Land, neither in Court, nor on the Battlefield, the
Natives had become economically useless. This is when, as they were set aside from the
mainstream of Economy/Society, that the Natives became the 'authentic Indian', to be
painted, photographed, and filmed by artists motivated by a sense of urgency in the face of
what was perceived as his impending disappearance. Given value once again, as an
endangered specie, the Indian was sent to be displayed, for the instruction and the
excitement of the crowd, in museum exhibitions and in circus acts.

By the treaties, the dispossessed Natives had been made wards of the Crown. The Queen,
their Mother, had vested them in the Patrimony of Her Canadian Crown. The Natives had
become parts of the White Man's patrimony, and were to serve him in that capacity.

Having alienated their patrimony, Natives were to become, once more, a valued asset to
be vested in the White Man's heritage. Once denied any economic utility, Amerindians
were to serve the White Man as a legitimating device - a counter image of himself, either
as the repugnant Savage or as the primordial Indian.

capitalization - cultural

To most of 19th Century historians, the Native was the Antagonist, a superstitious pagan or
a savage enemy. He was an obstacle to be overcome if colonisation was to succeed. To
early 20th-Century popular novelists, and cinematographers, he has been the Wild Indian,
brutal and savage. In contemporary politically incorrect representations, he is
unsophisticated, undisciplined and irresponsible. He is presently the best example of the
'culture of poverty' - lack of achievement, limited aspirations, fatalism, familism, low empathy, and dependence on / hostility to authority (Hale 1997, 75).

The Indian has been an enduring symbol of anarchy. He was during Renaissance, and earlier, a [sylvaticus], a savage: "these men may very well and truly be called wild because there is no poorer people in the world" (Jacques Cartier Voyages in Canada [1534]; quoted in Berkhofer 1979, 13), - wildness was an economic concept, and referred to what "was uncanny, unruly, raw, unpredictable, foreign, uncultured, and uncultivated. It included the unfamiliar as well as the unintelligible. Just as the wilderness was the background against which [medieval] society was delineated, so wildness in the widest sense was the background of God's lucid order of creation" (Berkhofer 1979, 14).

Wildness still connotes "desolation, as well as barbarous savagery and all else that goes with the 'primitive' condition, perhaps especially chaotic unpredictability and uncontrollability both of which are anathema to all of the organizing principles of our techno-culture. To be wild is to be ungovernable which means uncivilized" (Livingston 1994, 5)

Concurrently, long before the 18th Century, the Indian had also been the incarnation of the 'Good Savage', and was to deliver the lessons European Societies wanted to be given: "while savage Others are degraded as uncivilised for what they are said to lack, they are also idealized for lacking the burdens of civilization. Savage Others are admired for possessing natural or original human qualities: strength, freedom, spontaneity, expressiveness, innocence, spiritual purity" (Leone 1995, 24).

Corrupted by industrial society, 'Modern Man' was materialistic, selfish and acquisitive. He had become increasingly incapable of living in harmony with Nature: "We have developed a reality that is a nightmare. Look at any city, all concrete, no water, you can't see the sky, pollution. What kind of reality is that? Where are our heads? How could be so insensitive to our biological nature?" (Mohamed 1998: A1; quoting D. Cardinal - the Métis architect of the Canadian Museum of Civilization). Modern Man longed for moral regeneration: because it was 'closer to Nature', the Indian's Way was declared superior to his Way - "it was 'fundamentally spiritual', and concerned with the well-being of the group instead of the individual" (Francis 1992, 154).
The image of the 'Good Savage' - a burden to contemporary Natives, still contributes to the building of the White Man's symbolic capital: "(cultural values held) by our aboriginal people (sic), continue to emphasize the importance of living in harmony with nature, the benefits of close community life, and the fundamental meanings of interdependence, understanding and trust. Canadians of every origin have much to learn from these cultural values, particularly as they relate to sustaining relationships between people, their traditions and natural environment" (Government of Canada The Ties that Bind 1991).

The image of the 'Bad Indian' endures, fed by reports of alcoholism, addiction, violence, prostitution, unemployment, suicide and chronic criminality in Native reserves or in urban (Indian) slums: the once Wild Man, now Anomic Man, is currently presented in the media in a format that 17th Century Jesuits would have recognised.

The narratives that contemporary media spread of the vociferous Indian are about a situation where the Natives are denied the use of (real) valuable property and their share of the Land. The narratives that heritage sites provide, unfolding in spiritualistic concoctions, are about an aborigine from a non/historical past who confirms the White Man in his most precious privilege - defining reality - that is, turning 'real life' into 'experiences', in objects to be contemplated, and in lessons to be learnt.

The constructed representations of the Indian have been vested in the Canadian Heritage with such evidence that efforts made by official agencies to reverse a set pattern are bound to fail. There is too much at stake, namely the right of property and the right to use property, either cultural or economic, for change to happen without a radical makeover. The Native problem in Canadian society proceeds from the same logic that Bourdieu recognizes as the class problem in art museums. - the entire cultural and political landscape threatening to "collapse overnight" if the conceptual Native and its equivalents were to disappear.

Representations like these confirm the enduring efficiency of heritage in society: "The resentment and fear [caused by wildness] are real, and both of them have ancient and legitimate roots. They have been magnified, intensified and reinforced in our cultural tradition over a few thousand years, but I suspect that their origins long antedate our written [and perhaps even our oral tradition]" (Livingston 1994, 6).
As the deviant Others, standing in opposition to the values of society, the Natives cannot be incorporated easily into the project that authorities have devised for the community. They are condemned to be standing, unfairly but profitably, next to the Enemy of military and economic heritage, the Foreigner of political traditions, the Heathen of religious heritage, the Sexually Unmentionable of quiet families - next to any minority whose fate and function it is to be in disagreement with the accepted ways of the community.

Like these others, the Natives are left out of significant history ("the historic sites systems plan review revealed gaps in the system - industrial heritage, the history of Aboriginal peoples, women's history, and the history of cultural communities" [Canadian Parks Service, State of the Parks Report 1994]). Those who have fallen in the gaps of society are mostly defined as being deprived of property. Destitute, deviant or ignorant individuals are not given to define reality.

new perspectives

Native communities, as early as Treaty Number One itself, are said to have shown dissatisfaction with their political and economic status in the Dominion; First Nations from British Columbia never agreed to the terms of any treaty with the Queen of Canada.

The influence of Native communities has increased in the Canadian Polity with the creation of the Assembly of the First Nations, and the advent of Native radicalism (Warriors societies).

The traditional image of the Native - the softly racist Good Savage and its brutal alternative, has changed in the past thirty years. Canadians have acknowledged that the Native Question is a national priority.

During these past years, Native politicians and academic researchers joined force; their work influenced the "Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal People" (1997). Mass media followed, public opinion changed and new ideas came to be universally acceptable - Native communities are different. Native communities are economically poor. Native communities are culturally rich. Native communities must be involved in the business of the Polity.
Above all, the Native Question must be addressed because it costs too much to exclude Natives from Canadian society – that is, said curtly, it costs too much to try to exclude them, and fail.

Native communities have succeeded in bringing before the tribunals their Land claims. Financial compensations have been paid; new wealth has come into the market; old wealth has been redirected to new owners. Where resources are to be found, social commerce will take place.

Addressing the Native issue is a sure way for cultural agents in Non Native and Native communities to secure their institutions cultural and economic capitals.

Participating in the making of new, fairer narratives to celebrate a community whose demographic growth is more important than any other in Canada, may be appropriate both in terms of cultural and social capitalization.

First Nations leaders speak of their communities as having been deprived of their culture and of their Lands - the Land being the cornerstone of all social, cultural and economic life. While reluctant to return the Land to Natives, Non Native leaders may have settled for returning culture instead.

Culture creates identity; a clear knowledge of one's worth being part of the solutions to social problems that are extremely costly to the Canadian Government.

Cultural capitalists have been involved in the presentation, (construction), of Native culture, history and heritage, long before heritage consultants, the new missionaries, came to preach cultural empowerment in Native communities.

Since 1985, the main Canadian museums have been presenting their Native collections in a politically correct manner.

The architecture of the Canadian Museum of Civilization is a celebration of the First Nation in Canadian history – exhibits on Native culture dwarf the display on the White Man's history. Canadian Museums have made amend for their incorrect, biased narratives, and willingly wrote new politically correct texts.
Provincial museums have staged well meaning exhibitions, and let Native communities speak for themselves (Musée de la civilisation de Québec). Local museums have been hosts to commemorations celebrating peace between Native tribes and the King of France in 1701 (Musée de la Pointe-à-Callière, Montréal; Summer 2001).

Museums, cultural centres and heritage centres have been built or restored in Native communities in Québec (Odanak, Sept-Îles, Pointe-Bleue), catering to mostly European simulacra seekers, and to First Nations visitors. Distinguished museologists from Québec have been sent as emissaries to the Ak-Chin people to teach ecomuseology (Fuller 1992, 307-366).

These endeavours were meant to counter both Non-Native racist and Native radical views: profits could be expected were descendants of Europeans immigrants and Natives to live together in peace.

Native communities and cultural agents participated in these endeavours. Their validation was sought and, at times, found.

Native radical interpreters were leery of linking their attempt at ‘réappropriation culturelle’ and Native spirituality with mass tourism – leaving the gap between the search for meanings and the quest for fortune as wide as Non Natives cultural promoters had found it.

Museums that have yet to update their exhibitions are visited with a critical eye; their staff recognize their shortcomings, and lament the lack of funds to correct improprieties.

The Federal Government commissioned exhibitions on Native cultures that have toured Canada, Europe and First Nations Communities.

The Canadian Parks Service has conducted a review to cleanse its presentations of any incorrect references. Once corrections had been made, ‘Savages’ of old had become First Nations, and European settlers, imperialists of sorts.

These endeavours even when taking place on First Nations territories, were most certainly destined to Non Native consumption. Native radicals may have interpreted them as an expression of “white guilt, white fear, white insecurity, (and a manifestation of) the deep
anxiety that Non-Natives have about (their) place in North America and a deep need to legitimate (their) presence” in what they wrongly call their homeland (Francis 1992, 108).

These presentations belong to the victor still, part of his spoils being that he could make amend for past iniquities – win political credits for it, and consider the past, finished, closed. They would then be partly acts of reparation for past inequities.

German political authorities, Swiss bankers and museum curators, the world over, have performed rituals of closure in the past ten years. The German Chancellor went to Auschwitz, the Pope went to Jerusalem, the British Prime Minister went to Ireland. All went to apologise, and warned that ancient racist practices should have done their time.

Federal sponsors may have thought that both in Native and Non Native territories, these displays would prove the White Man’s new dispositions towards its minorities (multiculturalism), and that accusations of cultural genocide in Strasbourg (European Parliament) or in New York (United Nations) would stop.

Federal representatives may have hoped that the new definitions of Native culture, would facilitate their dealings when negotiating Land Claims with First Nations – first, by taking away an argument of acculturation from Native negotiators; second, by assigning Natives to certain positions (cultural traits, recurrent beliefs), to which they would be committed and which would make them predictable.

Museum visitors would then be presented anew with one of the traditional staples of the trade – the spectacle of the colourful, different Other (first introduced to the public in 1855, in London), for a while denied as a simulacra, a fabrication, now validated by Native cultural agents and their Non Native advisors.

Museums visitors were then not only provided with the spectacle of the field’s new open mindedness, but with their own political rectitude. Visiting an aboriginal production meant that they were immensely commendable as good citizens.

A price had to be paid. Non Native Museums had to return parts of their collections to Native communities; visitors of the major institutions had to be shared with new local museums. The unified voice coming from academia and institutions is now drowned by the contradictory voices coming non officially from more than 200 differing First Nations
(especially in the matters of studying "bones" – human remains of Natives found on First Nations territory).

Natives, in order ‘to have a culture’, have to prove publicly that they are as culturally significant as academics have pronounced them to be, and as forgiving as the public expects them to be.

This excludes the presentation of radical views that would appear to a well meaning visitor, impolite, vindictive or hostile. This would force a demonstration that some significant meanings worth the attention of the public, had survived either cultural genocide in the past, or cultural globalisation in the present.

Task Force on Museums and First Peoples

Many of these productions have been staged following the recommendations of 'The Task Force Report on Museums and First Peoples - Turning the Page: Forging New Partnerships Between Museums and First Peoples 1992" (First People 1992).

The Report presents the views of the Assembly of the First Nations and of the Canadian Museum Association (federal authorities) on how museums and Native communities should proceed to the presentation of Native culture. The Report came in the wake of the ‘Spirit Sings’ affair during which the Glenbow Museum (Calgary), and its then sponsor - Shell Canada, became the target of Native radicalism (Calgary Olympics 1988), (Muse 1988, volume 3).

The Report was a production of the who’s who in the Canadian museum field - Academe, National Parks, National and Provincial Museums (First People 1992, 12-16; submissions).

The Report, not unlike a treaty - pronounced a defeated party (the White Man), and a victor (the Native community). It regretted the “inequities that have characterized “the relationship between Native communities and museums in the past” (First People 1992, 7), and called for the invention of new narratives.
A blame was assigned, but Past was Past: "While there have been many efforts throughout Canada where co-operation has existed between indigenous communities and museums, the tensions and the clashes have provided the dynamic elements in the Museum and First Nations’ relationships. Identifying confrontation force hides more that it reveals. The real task is to identify the issues and the elements that create such a dynamic “ (Hill 1988, 2).

The Report set the table for a trade. It established respective positions, and called for mutual understanding: "an equal partnership involves mutual appreciation of the conceptual knowledge and approaches characteristics of First Peoples, and the empirical knowledge and approaches of academically-trained workers” (First People 1992, Principles: 7).

It addressed specific concerns - access to collection, interpretation, repatriation, training and funding of Native curators (First People 1992, 8-10), and provided the necessary ambivalence for new positions to be sought after. ‘Recommendations’ from the Report recognised the First Nations’ desire and authority “to speak for themselves” (First People 1992, Principles: 7). The second on ‘Principles’ wanted the Natives’ participation in the making of presentations in museums and historic sites.

Principles came with a touch of academic radicalism - “(Issues appear) as follows: the repossessing of their cultural heritage by the First Nations, the unhealthy colonial relationship between First Nations and museums with anthropological and ethnological collections and the politics surrounding the acceptance of contemporary Native art in terms of aesthetic judgements rather than ethnographic values “ (Hill 1988, 2).

The Report gave the Natives a strong position, and recognized a victorious party. Its ‘Principles’ were written in the imperative mode - “First Peoples and museums must accept the philosophy of co-management and co-responsibility as the ethical basis for principles and procedures pertaining to (aboriginal) collections” ( First Peoples 1992, 7 ).

Its 'Recommendations', however, were written in the conditional mode: “Museums should ensure that First Peoples are involved in the processes of planning, research, implementation, presentation and maintenance of all exhibitions, programs and/or projects that include Aboriginal cultures” (First Peoples 1992, 8).
The use of the conditional indicated the price to pay to have been invited as an equal partner to the field - that is, to have crashed into the field without warning, and showed how fractured it was. But it was less than evident that all members would want to comply.

Natives and museums could not implement the Report's recommendations without the support of political authorities, both Native and Non-Native. Governments were expected to be generous for fear of seeing a more difficult situation unfolding: "The Task Force consultations revealed a urgent need for additional funding for projects involving First Peoples in existing Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal museums. Funding is also required to assist First Peoples in establishing their own museums" (First Peoples 1992, 6).

On the one hand, 'museums' were positioning themselves with the 'dangerous and influent' Natives to pressure governments on doing the right thing, while Natives were finding in cultural institutions validation for their cultural and political claims.

On the other, both Natives and Museums alike were cast in their habitual role, that of beggars asking money from their political masters in order that they be able "to speak for themselves".

Their existence depended on proper government funding. Governments, conversely, were being threatened into being generous for fear of retaliations.

In this instance, Non Native institutions responded by being generous provided that their generosity fitted with their means and their interests. They found profit in giving away cultural wealth for more agreeable conditions at the bargaining table (on political rights and land titles, for example). At the same time, both parties managed to revert to very traditional positions.

Native claims listed in the Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, were met with silence – to be interpreted either as shameful or contemptuous, both very patrimonial in nature:

"Members of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples entertained the fantasy that their efforts would be a matter of great moment. They were righting the wrongs of centuries, and they were setting the political agenda of Canada, perhaps for the next generation, we are at the six-month anniversary of the publication of its report. And what
has been heard recently of it? Not a word. In the full flight of a federal election campaign, what has been heard about public policy and native people? Not a word. As for the ministers getting together this month to rewrite history, there is no evidence they have even thought of it. Within about 36 hours of its release, the 4,000 pages of the Report disappeared from public view with barely a gurgle, the Minister of Indian Affairs said "that it would be crazy to spend so much money on it and shelve it. And then, he shelved it" (Gray 1997; D1).

When taking the opportunity to speak publicly on their situation, Natives deny the White Man his traditional claim to cultural superiority. His wealth has been acquired dishonestly, his word is worthless: the White Man is poor with the destituteness of the Natives – his inheritance from the British Crown:

“Canada has not implemented our treaties, Canada has not been honourable, has not found a way to implement the status of our nationhood and as peoples within our treaties. Canada has not respected (its) own rule... Canada has continued not to deal with our issues... Canada claims that it is the champion of human rights. Canadians claim that they have the number one country here, but when you look at it, with the deplorable living conditions of our people, the homelessness of our people, the landlessness of our people... those are symptoms that not all is well and that Canada has to clean up its own backyard” (Coon Come, 2001, 21) – The White Man is polluted.

The White Man is the dishonest, violent, accursed son of Mother Earth: “My grandmother predicted the destruction of the land, and I have seen her predictions come sadly true... She was standing, looking out into a lake and she said - 'I've seen something eating trees in those mountains. I see our rivers flowing backwards and the very water that we drink we'll have to pay for'. I stood there in the early nineties in that spot and I looked into where she spoke to and it's all clear-cut. I stood in a spot where I now have seen where they made our rivers flow backwards in order to produce energy... and every spring they say we have to boil our water” (Coon Come 2001, 20; Genesis 4, 1-8). The White Man pollutes. It is part of both the Native's and the White Man's heritage to be a burden to one another.

Legitimacy then comes to economic capitalists not only as they enter the field to trade with cultural capitalists (through political authorities), but that they proceed to a trade as if they
We are giving as much as receiving; legitimacy comes to both capitalists as they share the same process of capitalization.

Wealth comes to society as cultural capitalists are provided with an opportunity to return favours received from economic capitalists.

Legitimacy comes to economic capitalists as heritage producers teach them, with lessons on sustainable development, how to keep their wealth.
Chapter 8: wealth, and cultural capitalists - capitalizing out of a deficit position

For the last three centuries, economic capitalists have been predicating growth, change and development, as the main values in society. In the past fifty years, Economic development has been understood as the main factor in social progress. Wealth has been economic wealth. Natural resources, inherited from the ancestors, have been put to immediate profit seemingly without regards for the successors. Development, set purely in economic (profit making) terms, has turned communities and groups into competitors whose main purpose is to survive the others' hostility.

In a spirit of fair trade/good partnerships, the cultural capitalists - probably interested in keeping the sources of funding opened, and certainly willing to gain capital from their competitors’ distressing situation, have agreed to repay the economic capitalists for services rendered when they had been offered redemption from incompetence.

It is now to the economic capitalists to be declared incompetent. They are said to be incompetent in either heritage or patrimony. Patrimony carries an obligation to maintain and augment inherited wealth. Heritage means that wealth needs a cultural component to endure and be significant. Economic capitalists have failed to be proficient stewards to the Earth’s resources. Basic needs for most of Humankind have gone non provided for.

*sustainable development*

Economic capitalists are offered Redemption through ‘Sustainable Development’. Invented in 1987, for the Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development (the Brundtland Report), Sustainable Development holds that economic development must be compatible with the long term maintenance of natural ecosystems and life support processes. Sustainable Development requires the careful management of land and resources, and the protection and preservation of the most important of all assets - individuals (the workforce), past (compliance to traditional rule), and ideas (legitimating narratives).
Lessons in the proper way of managing resources are to be taken not necessarily from the narration of past exemplary deeds, but from the example set by contemporary heritage producers when fulfilling their task: heritage producers use the past as a resource, and they 'keep it' while 'spending it': "development cannot be sustained without the conservation of assets, both natural and human. Resources must be conserved in order to ensure the welfare and orderly development of human societies" (Ontario 1990, 21).

Through Sustainable Development, cultural producers are given to define both the economic field, and their own. Heritage brings wealth to society, as economic producers are being instructed of their proper role by the heritage object. The heritage object "lies there available to be interpreted and reinterpreted; the knowledge it offers is all we have to guide us in the future. Science and technology may continue to revolutionize our lives, but memories and tradition will continue to frame our response" (Ontario 1987, 23).

Cultural capitalists would be teaching both the makers of economic wealth in society, and the commodifiers in their own field.

Sustainable Development came at the height of the funding crisis in the field. It was a concept which reinstated the heritage capitalist (bureaucrat) as the field's main interpreter. Heritage bureaucrats could become advocates to a 'balanced' type of development by integrating cultural factors in strategies designed to achieve economic development. To the government planners, strategies would need to be devised in the light of the historical, social, and cultural context of their society.

Heritage provides identity. In a situation of economic globalization, making identity the driving force of development - "placing progress within the context of a society's traditions and its capacity to build a shared future for its members" (Ontario 1990, 21), could be instrumental in bridging the gap between the trans/national culture of the employers, and the local, ethnic culture of the employees.

Participating in 'Cultural Sustainability', looking for endogenous roots of modernization models, seeking change within cultural continuity, and translating the process of ecodevelopment into a plurality of local, ecosystem-specific, culture-specific and site-specific solutions, could make the economic capitalist not only rich in economic, but in social and cultural capitals.
Once they consider growth in terms of general welfare, economic capitalists would be making penance for past failure, and be permitted to reintegrate the social system from which it was believed they had been morally and 'symbolically' excluded.

Economic entrepreneurs were to take into consideration the social cost of their greed. Abiding by the concept of social development and cultural sustainability would make them not only effective capitalists in the economic field but respected individuals in society, worthy of symbolic capitalization.

Heritage bureaucrats as the field's main regulators are changing their own cultural capital (how to go about performing heritage functions properly), into symbolic capital (how the whole society should go about using all of its resources).

Cultural capitalists are snatching symbolic capital away from the economic field; they are sitting at the Centre playing the role of the trickster, perturbing patterns, shouting names at the socially well established, and profiting financially from it.

What must be acknowledged is that cultural producers, despite their claim of being abused whenever they enter a trade with economic capitalists, are proficient players in the game. In a Bourdelian market, what is given must be reciprocated. What is celebrated as a gain, may come to be a loss, while capital changes hands constantly.

In the heritage field, what appears to be, may be an illusion, and what is given away also may ensure the donor a profit: "All my preaching is about avarice and such cursed sins, in order to make them give freely of their pennies - namely, to me ( ) For although I am myself a very vicious man, yet I can tell you a moral tale, which I am accustomed to preach for profit" (Chaucer Canterbury Tales: Pardoner's Tale - Prologue).

Wealth come to heritage producers as they stage their own destitution in the light of their competitors' wealth and greed. Trickery is part of the game, and vituperations such as Schlereth's on his fellow Americans' "longstanding tendency ...to look upon history not as a dimension, not as a context, not as a continuum along which (to) live and, in the words of the Psalmist, have (their) bearing, but instead as a thing, a commodity to be bought and sold in the marketplace like a piece of real estate" (Schlereth 1980, 217), are a capitalization strategy where the berator gets rich at the expense of the berated.
The reputation of being thieves attributed to commercial producers in the field is also the
doing of academic critics applying to a specific group their distrust of all capitalists; The
savaging of marketing consultants into carnival barkers comes from the same capitalists
who profit from what is discarded from the field. The redemption of the 'impure' through
sustainable development is offered by the same practitioners who celebrate willingly the
spirit of capitalism in Lower Fort Garry.

Wealth comes as a debit and a credit when the trickster preaches generosity and audacity
to economic capitalists, and cries destitution before the congregation: “Trick is dolos in
Homeric Greek, and the oldest known us of the term refers to a quite specific trick; baiting
a hook to catch a fish... no trickster had ever been credited with inventing a potato peeler...
a catechism, but trickster invents the fish trap” (Hyde 1998, 18).

Cultural capital and property rights

Tricks are played on economic capitalists; the first one being that they could find 'money in
heritage'. Indeed money can be made providing services and goods needed in the field.
Heritage thus is one of the many places where, for a time, entrepreneurs can invest.

Entrepreneurs are said that there is money in heritage, and that heritage is patrimony.
Neither is totally true. They field is heavily regulated, either by government authorities or by
its own traditions.

There is no money to be made in the heritage field that cannot be made more easily
elsewhere; the mercantile endeavours in the field follow two sets of principles - economic
and cultural, one too many to be profitable, and none guaranteeing a commodity a longer
life on the market. The heritage field is rich only with objects that are denied to the market;
it is poor with the necessity of asking other authorities, operating according to different
rules, the right to leave with a profit.

Entering the field as a provider of commodities means being 'employed' (contracted) by
non profit organizations which 'spend' money, and by the State which limits private gains
(revenue taxes). Entering the field as a collector means setting oneself to compete with the
State or State funded organizations for assets that only the State can ultimately afford.
Competing with the State may profit the heritage patron, 'for a while' - as long as he is
capable of pretending competitiveness or generosity by opening his collection to public
scrutiny or by promising it to the Public as a bequest. Holding his ground against the State or its representative is to celebrate the pervasive power of money, and its status as the Main Symbol in Society.

The financial cost of acquiring and maintaining heritage objects is part of their value (to the layman it may be the only indication of their value). That cost is meant to be prohibitive, either as an incentive to those who want to test their fortune against public wealth, or as a deterrent for those who are uncertain as to the value of their own wealth.

Having a private collector as a competitor profits the cultural capitalist as it is a rare opportunity to demonstrate 'his' wealth, and to belittle the hubris of anyone foolish enough to believe that private wealth and influence could survive one's lifetime without the State agreeing.

Competing as a heritage commodifier with State funded organizations makes the entrepreneur appear to be either generously adventurous, a profiteer and a squanderer, or greedy and destitute. In any case, the commodifier is bound to bankruptcy.

In each of the above, the matter of property comes to the fore. The capitalist who owns property rights over heritage assets has a free hand over the field. The capitalist who can enforce or deny property rights in general prevails over the previous; the capitalist who can define rights and property as concepts, rules. In the last two instances, it is the State and its representatives who tolerate the involvement of private entrepreneurs in the field.

The field needs money, either to operate or to signify importance. Money comes to the field through the State as taxes and to its agencies as other sources of revenues - copyrights, entrance fees or donations and bequests. Wealth comes to the heritage field where, in exchange of money, economic capitalists are recognized cultural significance. Wealth comes to heritage producers as economic capitalists enter the field seeking cultural capital and symbolic importance. At all times, economic capitalists are treated as tourists in the field: they are debtors.

Economic capitalists are played a trick when they are made to believe that heritage is patrimony, and that resources handed over by ancestors to their successors can be used for private gain under the same conditions as natural resources. Nobody in society can ensure for himself exclusive rights over assets given heritage status. Patrimony is private,
heritage is both private and public. Profits made on heritage investments are never clear. Heritage properties are found in the ownership of territorial public entities (national government), of non territorial entities (the Church, for instance), and of private entities, (individuals or corporations). But the rights these various owners hold are subject and limited by legislation(s) to ensure public, collective and private use and enjoyment.

Things animate and inanimate that constitute the national heritage are also claimed by those who have acquired a moral right over them for the 'work' they have put into it - the financial sacrifice they have made for their preservation (tax payers), the investments they have agreed to (heritage entrepreneurs), the intellectual efforts spent on their definition (academic experts).

Nobody, legally or morally, may enjoy the exclusive possession of a heritage object, that is, to forbid anyone else to use it, without the prospect of litigation or public reprobation. Profit from heritage resources must be shared with all the rightful owners - some of which are yet to be born.

Ownership of cultural properties can be vested neither exclusively in commercial producers who are given the right to enjoy them "for a certain duration only", nor in private owners who are denied by legislation the right to dispose of 'their' heritage assets as they wish (destruction/defacement); nor in the public who 'technically' holds the legal rights over society's cultural resources and is entitled to full enjoyment of its heritage.

Heritage is not patrimony. If it were, the trade between cultural and economic capitalists would be conducted at the three tables open to economic exchange - mercantile, redistributive and reciprocal. It is not, since money is the only economic asset that cultural capitalists seem to recognize. Economic capitalists are tolerated in the field provided they bring money and limit themselves to a mercantile exchange.

Cultural capitalists limit the access to the field to service providers and trinket traders exiting by the back door once their money is made. The main door is reserved to the wealth producers in society who are willing to pay cultural capitalists to be permitted to transform their gains into much coveted symbolic capital. Through the agency of political authorities, economic capitalists may force their way into the field; they may even force the field into adopting their ways of operating (world view). Still, they have to pay in good money to be acknowledged by the authorities - whose main functions it is - (a) to deny the
market property rights over resources that could be very profitable were they to be sold, and (b) to spend money accumulated by or collected from individuals that it be redistributed (reciprocity/redistribution) for everyone to have a share of the public wealth, and for the wealthy to enjoy their greater share peacefully.

Wealthy individuals and corporations are permitted to go on accumulating wealth as they please in the economic field. In return for sharing part of their profit with the rest of society, they are given recognition in society (symbolic capital) both for having accumulated wealth and for permitting public institutions to spend it 'in munera'.

Heritage is not about making money from society's patrimony; it is about spending private patrimonies that public wealth be augmented. As an economic activity, celebrating the Nation's heritage is a potlatch.
Conclusion: the potlatch - making cultural wealth out of economic capital

Commemorating the national heritage is an enduring potlatch during which material objects are given the status of symbolic entities, financial resources are spent, wealth appears to be squandered, but is displayed and transferred from the rich to the destitute and reconstituted.

Heritage brings wealth to society as the economically wealthy (tax payers/visitors/patrons) are made by political authorities to contribute directly or indirectly, as heirs, successors, and descendants, to the staging of ceremonies celebrating episodically or permanently, the past of a social group.

In 19th Century Native Communities of the Canadian West Coast, a traditional potlatch included feasts, dances, speeches and distribution of goods; it was organized to celebrate important events either in the life of an individual or in the life of a community.

"Potlatches are characterized by the reenactment of the sacred family histories that document the legitimacy of the claimant to (some) rank, by ritual feasting, and by the formal distribution of gifts by the hosts to its guests, each according to its rank… the wealth distributed at a potlatch is much less important than the requirement that it be distributed according to the correct social protocols and moral prescriptions" (Walens 1987, 465).

In Kwakiutl communities, chiefs amassed and gave away properties, their own or the clan's. The potlatch was a sign that the potlatcher could draw resources from the community. The legitimacy of the potlatcher was proven by his ability "to command the allegiance of his group in organizing a complicated ceremony and in performing correctly the formal display of his family's origin myths and ceremonial objects" (Walens 1987, 465).

Goods that the potlatcher had gathered were distributed to his guests, or destroyed/spent before them as a sign of wealth. Guests came, were fed and entertained as long as a week. An invitation to a potlatch could not be declined for fear of appearing incapable of responding to the challenge.
Potlatching was meant to proclaim and confirm the leader’s status in society and the honours that came with it. To assume a title was to ascertain certain rights, and an obligation to proclaim them. These rights were reaffirmed at subsequent potlatches when the bonds between the individual and the group on the one hand, and between the host and the guests on the other, were renewed.

Potlatches provided a stage where factions and heads of families, enacted their rivalry; it was meant to establish political influence and social position in the community. Potlatching was also a redistributive exchange: food was given to the hungry and the impoverished. The Kwakiutl distributed the real wealth, the tangible means of subsistence to people who needed it, and substituted in its place, a symbolic of objects, titles and intangible treasures (stories and dances) to be used in potlatching only.

The importance of a clan was related to the wealth it displayed during its last potlatch. Wealth was thus defined not so much by accumulation of goods as by the generosity of the potlatch giver. A rich man was someone who could spend conspicuously, and could challenge others into doing so. Spending conspicuously was part of the obligations and means of power.

The objects used in potlatching were the representations of a moral order to be achieved through acts of self-sacrifice and the giving away of possessions. These acts placed human beings in harmony with the moral order of the universe said to have been, before the first potlatch, nothing but "a place of self-interest and possessiveness" (Walens 1987, 465). Northwest Coast people believed that the universe "would collapse back into the primordial chaos of selfishness unless humans continually reaffirm(ed) their willingness to disburse their possessions, to pass out wealth to their fellow men, and to pass on rank to their children" (Walens 1987, 465).

As fitting to a dominant symbol, the potlatch played on the best to be expected from a community, and against daily instances of selfishness and threat to the order of things. It was a template for the cosmic moral order and a reaffirmation by all its "participants - hosts, guests, ancestors, the unborn, and supernatural beings - of the system of moral covenants and mutual dependencies that lied at the basis of society" (Walens 1987, 465).
In contemporary societies, whenever national communities spend money to build and maintain special places where to stage the symbols connecting them with their ancestors, they potlatch. They display their wealth and their worth by spending resources to make capital - promise a secure future, and set the present into a grid of significant and rich symbols.

Commemorating the national past in prestigious sites validates the claims made by authorities and community members. At the local level, heritage potlatching provides the host, be it the political party in power, its local representative and followers, with honour and prestige. It leaves the public with an object - Versailles, Beamish, or The British Museum collections, that should never be used for commercial purposes again. The potlatch will endure and be repeated as taxes, entrance fees, and investments are planned and paid in order that the ancestors, the authorities, their representatives, and the community can compete with other groups having similar pretenses.

The last heritage Potlatch, in Canada, started in 1974, and lasted a decade; Parks Canada, had been given the mandate of updating and expanding its network of historic sites throughout the country. Canada was then prosperous, and had been promised a 'just society' by its elected leaders.

The Great Heritage Potlatch saw an amount of 'goods' given away by the Federal Government at a time when the authority of the Canadian Prime Minister (P.-E. Trudeau) was challenged by other powerful men from his own 'tribe' (Québécois). Both Provincial and Federal authorities set ceremonies, the former organizing public gatherings, like pop concerts, to celebrate national anniversaries, the latter replying with a string of heritage sites celebrating the Canadian Nation History.

The Federal Government, being late in the field, leaned on the past as a tool to maintain the prevailing political order; the Provincial Government, being the heir of an ancient national tradition, preferred the public celebration of days to come while claiming to redress an historic fault. Both spent lavishly and called on the public to validate their respective claims. The public, in Québec, responded the trickster's way, electing a separatist leader, but voting in a Provincial referendum against separation from Canada; it reconducted
Federal Prime Ministers - born in the Provincial tribe, three times (out of five), in the past twenty years.

The Great Canadian Heritage Potlatch peaked when each government built its own respective sets of common ancestors. Two Museums were built, and claimed to be the legitimate interpreters of the past in Canada and in Québec. They were given the same name - the Canadian Museum of Civilization, in Hull, on the Québécois side of the Ottawa River, and the Musée de la civilisation, in Québec City, and each stood as the centre of the Universe.

Each monument provided its builders with an opportunity to spend, redistribute resources and reciprocate gifts. Each museum sang the praises of the leader, and made a legitimate claim for him to lead: "the use of wealth as a strategic instrument (which is meant to achieve economic ends as it is with the redistribution of wealth, and involves every form of social communication, including the hierarchies of prestige and power) belongs to the sphere of political confrontations" (Balandier 1970, 71).

The heritage potlatch is a public statement that wealth is brought to society by those powerful enough to spend without restraint the community's patrimony and transform cultural capital into symbolic goods. The heritage potlatch is paid by the producers of economic capital in society. It is produced by political authorities, the celebrants, and enacted by their representatives, the heritage bureaucrats, to which the writer now turns as the most legitimate producers of heritage liturgies in society.
Part III: the bureaucratic monument - legitimating bureaucratic producers
7. "China's last imperial court eunuch did last month at 94. Sun Yao Ting's family had him neutered for the job when he was eight, as a way out of poverty. Traditionally, the eunuch's genitals were preserved in a jar to insure that they would be buried with him and he would be reincarnated as a full-man. However, Mr. Sun's family destroyed his jar during the country's Cultural Revolution, fearing punishment for possessing feudal relics. He used to joke about it " (Kesterton, The Globe and Mail, 02 February 1997).

8. "History will be presented with integrity. This will include the presentation of different contemporary views, perspectives informed by traditional knowledge, and later interpretations. Parks Canada will not play the role of arbiter of Canada's human history " (Canadian Parks Service Proposed Policy, 1991).

9. "The modern technocrat and the royal courtier are virtually indistinguishable... In China (the courtier) did not have dynastic pretensions. He was the emperor's man... The eunuchs were in the inner court and thus served power and not the population. The notion of 'inner' meant they served in a secretive and arbitrary manner. Their personal power could be increased to the extent that they were able to elaborate on other formal structures surrounding the emperor. Perhaps the most eloquent surviving illustration of this power is the maze high walled lanes which carve up the Forbidden City in Peking. Each short section leads everywhere and nowhere and was part of the unlimited manipulation which the eunuch lived " (Saul Voltaire's Bastards 1992).

10. "He is scornful of the professional employee of organization, describing him or her as the 'palace eunuch', well rewarded for important services, but unable and unwilling to question the real nature of his contribution or the real power behind his spurious freedom" (Solomon Work Organization Resistance and Control 1979)
Introduction: Heritage and Trust

In historical societies of the Western World, celebrating the Nation's heritage is a moral duty imposed unto every member of the community (the Polity): "Our slowly awakening concern for the conservation of both our natural resources and our human history is linked to a reawakening of the ancient idea of stewardship - one personal and collective responsibilities for the continuity of life of civilisation. What we have received, we hold in trust for future generations" (Ontario 1987, 6).

In the Polity, every member of the community is made a duty of acting as a trustee to the City's Heritage. Trustees are given "an estate, interest, or power, under the express or implied agreement to administer or exercise it for the benefit or the use of a beneficiary" (Black's Law Dictionary – on trust 1991).

Trustees act in obsequium: they owe a duty both to the predecessors and to the successors of society's members. Members of a Polity are simultaneously fiduciaries and beneficiaries of the resources they have inherited. The heirs to glorious and generous Ancestors are continuously in the process of becoming predecessors themselves: the decisions they make are to be borne by their descendants.

Trust is a moral concept. To the Romans, it was [fides], either the condition of having trust placed in one, a guarantee, a promise, an assurance, or credit, and the good name one enjoyed in society. Trust was associated with [pietas], an attitude of dutiful respect towards those to whom one was bound by ties of religion, consanguinity, politics. [Pietas] applied to the attitude of man towards the gods, parents, other human beings, and towards the City and its rulers. [Pietas] was to be reciprocated.

Trust presupposes that there are alternatives to a situation, that alternatives (and other trustees), are considered and that risks of failure are acknowledged. Trust calls for an elaborate apparatus of legitimation which involves legality, expertise and rationality.

What is held in trust, in the heritage field, is cultural capital - in its incorporated form, an enduring disposition of the body that education or ritual knowledge teaches (in the heritage
field, the proper way to display interest towards cultural resources, for instance); in its *objectified* form, a collection of material and immaterial objects to which a special status is assigned and the meaning of which must be learned; in its *institutionalized* form: “an *enduring set of articulated collective goals, valid and acceptable norms, of organization structures, frameworks and necessary resources*” (Eisenstadt 1968, 415).

The cultural capital of a given group is its culture - the symbolic order that a society recognizes and abides by, comprises specific symbols, cultural conceptions of social organization and the social classification schemes (e.g., race and ethnicity).

In *Part III* of this work, the writer comments on the tasks, functions, procedures and objectives, that employees of government agencies (and dependent non government organizations) follow when staging heritage activities. The bureaucrat is said to be the most influent agent in the heritage field. The writer discusses what bureaucrats do present when called to justify their right to define the national heritage.

Bureaucrats are the trustees of symbolic objects confided to them by the State or the Nation. Heritage bureaucrats need political authorities to act as employers; heritage presentations need a public to be enacted. But heritage resources must be protected from the public - either when it is acting as an inattentive adult, or as a feral child capable of breaking the very tools meant to teach him 'civilization'.

Legitimacy comes to heritage bureaucrats as they are seen dispatching their duties efficiently and effectively; legitimacy comes as they claim to communicate efficiently and effectively with the members of the community they serve.

To reach his goals, the bureaucrat relies upon a set of existing procedures by which he is wants to control the variables of any given situation: “*the legitimacy of a modern state ( ) is rooted in conceptions of proper procedures - procedures deemed legitimate if they have been established according to norms of legality and constitutionality and if they conform to certain conceptions of citizenship and representation. They are intended to serve as mechanisms for negotiating policies oriented towards the common good*” (Ericson 1991, 7).

References to tradition or absolute values are still made, in contemporary societies, but they are muffled by the discourse on procedural property.
The argument in the following pages is built around the enduring discussion that public, bureaucrats and critics keep as to the degree of trust they should grant one another. The argument establishes that heritage bureaucrats, for the sake of efficiency and effectiveness, are seen depriving the very people by which they have been entrusted with the management of heritage resources.

It must be assumed that the heritage bureaucrat understands how limited and how restrictive - thus eventually ineffective, his position may be. But it is the very restrictiveness of that position which makes it efficient: a narrow path spells sacrifice, and sacrifice calls for reciprocation.

On the one hand, heritage bureaucrats appear to be the field's reprobates; they are untrustworthy, and steal capital from the rightful owners. On the other, reprobation, in a Bourdelian world, can become a capitalization opportunity. Said clearly, the heritage bureaucrat may be both the predator and the prey. Bureaucrats are fed and granted privileges to fulfill an impossible task. Bureaucrats are 'kept' (as in 'kept person') in a privilege situation, to be made responsible, when time comes, for the failure of the public and political representatives to keep their commitments to the Ancestors. Bureaucrats are then sacrificed that the idea of wealth, cohesion, unity and significance endures.

The universal contempt they bear is an indication of the importance of the power they are attributed; the power they claim is an indication of the importance of the task they have been assigned. Bureaucrats may be responsible for the symbolic violence imposed unto other members of the Polity; but these others rarely fail to retaliate in kind.

The writer begins his second argument by situating the heritage bureaucrat in his political environment (Part II). Later, he will bring forward traditions, charisma and rationality as instruments of legitimation (Part III). Charisma, after Weber, will be used to introduce Bourdieu on the 'fetish' and on the nature of the 'representative'. The writer will pursue by commenting on the analogy made between religion and heritage as bureaucrats turn ultimately to the Gods to establish their authority (Parts IV & V). He will conclude on the heritage experience as a pilgrimage.
Chapter 9: heritage commemoration - a political business

The commemoration of the National Past is a political matter. In Canada, carrying out a national program of natural and cultural heritage falls under the responsibility of the Minister of Canadian Heritage. The Minister directs the national program of historical commemoration; he is authorized by Parliament to make designations of national historic significance and to determine appropriate forms of commemoration.

The Minister holds a public office where "he exercises on his right some of the attributes of the sovereign he serves for the benefits of the public" (Black's Dictionary of Law 1991).

The Minister represents the Canadian People whenever heritage affairs are discussed in Parliament. He is given legislative, executive and judicial authority over the field. He is legally authorized to proceed to the extraction, the allocation of resources, and the institution of programs and regulations pertaining to heritage matters. He can also initiate legal procedures in case the laws of the Land and his decisions are met with disrespect.

The Minister shares some of his responsibilities with the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada. Members of the Board are nominated by the Minister, and act as representatives of various professional and political groups in the Canadian Polity: "In practice, the Minister will not designate or commemorate without the Board's advice. All parts of the country are represented on the Board, which includes two residents from Ontario, two from Quebec, and one from each of the other provinces and territories. The Board meets at least twice a year and submits minutes of its meetings to the Minister for approval" (Canadian Parks Service 1991a, 70).

In practice, Board members will not make any decisions on commemoration without the Minister's approval.

monuments

Board Members and Minister set historic 'benchmarks' in the interest of the Canadian Polity. The monuments they erect are symbolic stakes that define Canada as a moral and
Heritage monuments are instrumental in Nation building: "the development of a sense of national identity (in) the inhabitants of a territorial state serves to increase the sense of loyalty and legitimacy accruing to that Nation State" (Jackson 1986, 45). Heritage monuments promote and justify the Nation-State - 'a form of political organization with which governmental institutions are capable of maintaining order and implementing rules of laws over a given population or within given territory' (Jackson 1986, 14). Heritage monuments justify the State - a human community which successfully upholds a claim to the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force in the enforcement of order within a given territory.

Heritage monuments are meant to admonest and recall, remind and celebrate.

In parts or as a system, they are symbols that carry a given society's 'collective representations' ("the quasi textual representations of social reality", or the various "systems of ideas in which individuals represent to themselves the society in which they are members and the obscure but intimate relations which they have with it" [Connerton 1989, 50]). Through the process of symbolization, symbolic representations, essentially man made creations, acquire a material presence, a tangible existence as if they were, not individual states of consciousness, but real objects.

These real objects are handed down from one generation to another, sometimes with little variance in the meaning as demonstrated in the obituary written in memory of John Tait, 'The Perfect Public Servant', who passed away in August 1999 (Ottawa Citizen, 15 August). The article almost plagiarizes Ecclesiasticus (Ecc 39; 7-39:9), and the virtues which it eulogizes - [gravitas], [celeritas], [prudentia], and [charisma], are those that the Western World narratives recognized to its heroes (Girardet 1986). These were cardinal virtues that medieval rulers abided by when tending to their worldly business. They appeared as allegories on the mural painted by Lorenzetti in Sienna's Palazzo Publico ("The Good and the Bad Government" 1338-40). Lorenzetti was then repeating what sculptors had presented on portals of cathedrals in Paris, Chartres and Amiens (Mâle 1958, 201-211). John Tate ruled over his people inspired by the virtues of the true Christian
territorial entity. Heritage sites help Canadians 'learning about their country and its cultures'; they reinforce national unity by instilling 'appreciation of the diversity of the Land and of its people' (Canadian Parks Service 1994a, 12). Historic sites and monuments provide Canadians with 'opportunities for education, recreation and inspiration'.

Heritage monuments are instrumental in Nation building: "the development of a sense of national identity (in) the inhabitants of a territorial state serves to increase the sense of loyalty and legitimacy accruing to that Nation State" (Jackson 1986, 45). Heritage monuments promote and justify the Nation-State - 'a form of political organization with which governmental institutions are capable of maintaining order and implementing rules of laws over a given population or within given territory' (Jackson 1986, 14). Heritage monuments justify the State - a human community which successfully upholds a claim to the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force in the enforcement of order within a given territory.

Heritage monuments are meant to admonest and recall, remind and celebrate.

In parts or as a system, they are symbols that carry a given society's 'collective representations' ("the quasi textual representations of social reality", or the various "systems of ideas in which individuals represent to themselves the society in which they are members and the obscure but intimate relations which they have with it" [Connerton 1989, 50]). Through the process of symbolization, symbolic representations, essentially man made creations, acquire a material presence, a tangible existence as if they were, not individual states of consciousness, but real objects.

These real objects are handed down from one generation to another, sometimes with little variance in the meaning as demonstrated in the obituary written in memory of John Tait, 'The Perfect Public Servant', who passed away in August 1999 (Ottawa Citizen, 15 August). The article almost plagiarizes Ecclesiasticus (Ecc 39; 7-39:9), and the virtues which it eulogizes - [gravitas], [celeritas], [prudentia], and [charisma], are those that the Western World narratives recognized to its heroes (Girardet 1986). These were cardinal virtues that medieval rulers abided by when tending to their worldly business. They appeared as allegories on the mural painted by Lorenzetti in Sienna's Palazzo Publico ("The Good and the Bad Government" 1338-40). Lorenzetti was then repeating what sculptors had presented on portals of cathedrals in Paris, Chartres and Amiens (Mâle 1958, 201-211). John Tate ruled over his people inspired by the virtues of the true Christian
leader. His name will thus be forever remembered, a medal to be awarded annually to meritorious civil servants in the Federal Government.

**socialization**

Learning the shared meanings that heritage symbols convey, is part of a process by which individuals born into a group become fully proficient members of society. Socialization is a life-long endeavour. Through socialization, individuals develop selfhood and acquire the knowledge, skills and motivations required to participate in the life of their culture. Socialization is impressed unto the individual; the individual, alternatively, is expected to show an active interest in the process.

Socialization is cultural transmission. Modern states are held together by coercion and by the culture that rulers and ruled share - "ways of doing things and seeing the world so ingrained as to have become 'common sense'". (Horne 1984, 2).

Culture is learnt from parents, friends, teachers and instructors, and media. One is socialized initially within the immediate group where one is raised. "To a very large extent, we do not choose our identity. We receive the cultural identity which has been handed down to us from previous generations... our 'natural' characteristics are the products of the accumulated effects of the nurture received by our parents and of the naturalization of our own nurture... as we grow older, we proceed to modify the identity which we have inherited. The identity is not intrinsic but the scope for changing it is circumscribed by the social expectations of the group with which we are associated. By our actions, we informally reinforce our inherited group affiliation. We adhere to groups (and) we adopt the identifying images of social groups, ... so as to confirm our social identity. For the same reason, we take steps to distinguish ourselves from those who belong to different groups. Our tastes and our life-style have no intrinsic value but serve to maintain the coherence of the group to which we belong. If we aspire to adopt the tastes of a group other than the one to which we were initially socialized, many of our unconscious habits betray our origins" (Robbins 1991, 174; on Bourdieu and socialization).

Heritage is taught by the State political institutions (in ceremonies, regalia, and in cultural productions); by institutions of high educational purposes (in curricula), by business entrepreneurs and by voluntary associations. Culture is also learnt from employees of the State.
Minister and Members of The Historic Sites and Monuments Board are guided in their tasks by civil servants from Government Departments. The documentation, evaluation, acquisition, and management of heritage resources rest mostly upon civil servants. Civil servants obey their political masters - elected politicians, and the People. They are employees bound by contract to act towards their employers like servants do towards their masters. As public officers, civil servants also exercise some of the power of the Sovereign of the Land.

Civil servants are dedicated to the public interest and the public welfare: "the prosperity, well-being, or convenience of the public at large, or of a whole community, as distinguished from the advantage of an individual or limited class. It embraces the primary social interests of safety, order, morals, economic interest, and non-material and political interests" (Black’s Dictionary of Law 1991 - on public welfare).

In official documents, the public unto which civil servants are seen waiting is either - the Canadian Nationals, the Canadian People, or Canadian Citizens. As all of the above, the Canadian public is permitted unrestricted access to its heritage properties (Canadian Parks Service 1994a, 68, 73). By law, the Canadian Public is entitled to the "benefit, education and enjoyment' that anyone is promised when coming in contact with the Nation's cultural resources.

Civil servants make both the heirs and the ancestors visible. Part of their purposes is to confirm the Polity's members in their rights and obligations as heirs, successors, and descendants. When dealing with civil servants, members of the public expect to be treated as the rightful beneficiaries of the material and immaterial wealth that their ancestors have gathered.

All the previous agents are 'ministers' - they are in attendance, they exercise a function on behalf of a greater authority; they are instruments in the management of the Polity's treasures.

public policies - redistribution and exhortation

Minister and civil servants plan, write and implement heritage policies. Policies establish the conditions after which these resources are to be distributed as reciprocation to the
Minister and civil servants plan, write and implement heritage policies. Policies establish the conditions after which these resources are to be distributed as reciprocation to the public. Policies and regulations prevent, or solve the conflicts arising over the use of resources said to be valuable. Policies are prepared in response to the expression of the general will.

The State is the main character in heritage policies; it appears as an entity capable both of taking care of all heritage affairs, and of blaming those responsible for failures in the field. Through policies and programs, the State rewards its most meritorious members. As befits heritage, the rewards granted are both material (contracts and salaries, for instance), and immaterial, (a sense of belonging). Policies profit those who can interpret the Public's will; bureaucrats, politicians, professional organizations, special interest groups are permitted to do so when contributing to the wealth of the Polity.

Heritage policies are distributive and redistributive. Heritage policies are mainly exhortative. They are meant to induce individuals and groups into complying voluntarily to government objectives in the absence of more immediately profitable instruments. Exhortative policies are economical: they save rulers in the Polity from spending considerable resources to secure public support (read Schwartz, in Johnson 1982; 93-94)

Heritage policies through their symbolic outputs are meant to generate trust, or affection towards the State: "No power could stand if it relied upon violence alone, for force is not strong enough to maintain itself against the accidents of rivalry and discontent. The might that makes right must be rooted in emotion, embedded in feelings and aspirations, in morality, in same maxims, in forms of rationalization among the higher levels of cultural groups" (Merriam 1964, 109).

Trust in the Polity's leaders comes as the benefit of staging the Polity's miranda and credenda - things that must be believed and admired.

Miranda are the symbols which political authorities surround themselves with to impress beliefs and admiration. They include anniversaries, memorial days and periods; public places and monuments, music and songs, art works, legends and historical narratives, ceremonialal and mass demonstrations (Merriam 1964, 111-118).
Credenda are the reasons which oblige the intellect to give assent to the continuance of authority, from either the Government, or the acting rulers of the Polity. They refer to its specific system of government, and to beliefs that all systems of government hold in common: respect and deference for the Government, obedience to the authority established without regard as to how it was set up, willingness to sacrifice for the general good of the group, and the recognition of other monopoly of legality for the ruling class:

"through credenda and miranda, power seeks to protect itself into prestige, and prestige to transform itself back again into power. Ideology, symbolism ( ) are never far apart; and they reinforce each other in many ways (because) the raucous voice of command, the bearing and gesture of authority, the fixed and piercing eye ( ) may go a little way, but not all the distance" (Merriam 1964, 134).

"Miranda invoke admiration and even adoration...credenda creates the basis for rationalizing belief in the rightness of power by imputing the presence of ordained authority, expertise, or reasonableness. While conscious manipulation of the masses does occur, miranda and credenda as a belief system emerges over time and in myriad ways, ...its nature reflects the historical heritage and the ongoing challenge of current times, including those imposed by external events" (Goodsell 1990, 13).

Not to be interested in miranda and credenda could mean waving off the privileges of being a descendant, and reneging which society is owed. Failing them voluntarily, may be perceived as a direct challenge to the ruling authorities and as a display of contempt towards the rest of the Polity.

Failing to act properly as an inheritor will create personal uneasiness (guilt, shame, embarrassment), and cause public reprobation: "One of the inevitable premises of life in an exclusive group is that its members think of themselves as being alike, as indeed they are by virtue of their criteria for membership. A major characteristic of such groups is that their members do not tolerate sustained and outspoken dissent from established opinions and decisions. In such groups, there are clearly defined alternatives to unresolvable heterodoxy; an individual who refuses to yield will lose his membership by being banished, ostracized, or declared a non person" (Cohen 1971, 180).
heritage commemoration: organization and bureaucracy

The civil servant's main concern is the satisfaction of the public's needs and expectations; his constant preoccupation is serving the ruling political authorities.

Civil servants, assigned to Heritage duties in national governments, share their responsibilities with associates from international agencies, foreign governments, federal departments, provincial and territorial ministries, local governments, education institutions, public associations, and with citizens advocating the preservation of heritage resources (Ontario 1990, 34). Heritage associations bring together political leaders, civil servants, professional experts, and politically active citizens, entrepreneurs and investors, members of volunteers groups, real property owners, organizers of community celebrations, practitioners of traditional skills and custodians of heritage properties. All operate in the field as members of formal organizations.

The celebration of community spirit needs to be organized; functions and stations must be assigned that the Polity be instructed in the proper lessons of heritage. Heritage comes then through the organization - the agency of an integrated system of roles and functions set for the production of goods and services.

Organizations stabilize the conduct of individuals and social units. Organizations set human behaviour into a manageable, predictable pattern. Organizations harness people together to accomplish goals through shared and profitable incentives; they develop authority structures, rules and a division of labour that serve to coordinate and guide the actions of their members. Individuals join organizations under the assumption that acting collectively generates greater profits than not.

Heritage organizations are bureaucracies. Heritage grows in the cubicle of the bureaucratic manager whose function it is to plan, organize, direct and control the production in the field. Society's miranda and credenda are first displayed in mission statements, policy objectives, job descriptions, programs, evaluation devices through which objects from the past are transformed into cultural capital.

Bureaucracy, in principle, applies to most human phenomenon because of its abstract formality: "an organization can be set up following no logic but its own. In extreme case a
bureaucracy may do nothing but operate itself ... As a result, the processes of bureaucratic organization have a high degree of arbitrariness" (Berger 1973; 50). Bureaucracy presupposes general and autonomous organizability.

Bureaucrats are responsible for (A) the identification and recovery of heritage resources - the search for, the selection, documentation, analysis and reconstitution of these resources; (B) the preservation of cultural artefacts - their protection, stabilization, repair, restoration and maintenance; and (C) their interpretation - the recreation, transmission, presentation, communication, and promotion that heritage ceremonies call for (Ontario 1990a, 24).

In contemporary societies, bureaucrats make themselves to appear as the only agents capable of articulating collective goals, defining acceptable norms, establishing organizational structures, and mobilizing the necessary resources to celebrate national heritage (Eisenstadt 1968, 415). Bureaucrats institute society; they define against whom the community stands, and which goals it should pursue.

It is through the good agency of bureaucracies that the full possibilities of heritage is enacted. Heritage bureaucracies are entrusted with the preservation and presentation of "a living resource. Heritage is the basis of our identity and our social and economic well-being. It is a source of confidence in what we can achieve; as we come to understand it, we discover who we are and what we can do. We see an Ontario in which individuals and communities are enabled to learn about their heritage and conserve and develop it as the foundation of liveability and continuity in the Province" (Ontario 1990a, 27).
Chapter 10: Legitimacy - Public Participation

Legitimacy, necessarily, comes to the Minister of Canadian Heritage and the employees of its Department from an Act in Parliament: "three pieces of federal legislation have been instrumental in the development of the historic site program - the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act (1911); Part II of the National Parks Act (1930), and the Historic Sites and Monuments Act (1952-1953)" (Canadian Parks Service 1994a, 70).

Legitimacy comes to the heritage bureaucrat through the claims to expertise he displays while doing his work. Expertise is built upon trust and credence: "the attribution of expert power is very much determined by the situation and the institutional context, since, by definition, the recipient cannot normally evaluate the correctness of the information. The process of effect relies on a definition of expert status in a given situation and for a given subject which is acceptable to the recipient" (McQuail 1983, 149; after Raven 1968, on influence and communication).

Expertise is Might that has become Right. Expert power is competence: "Each jurisdiction and each agency being deemed competent only for its assigned sphere of life and being supposed to have expert knowledge appropriate to this sphere" (Berger 1973, 43).

Competence comes with attributions and obligations - those of proper procedure ("bureaucracy is assumed to operate within rational rules, and sequences. These are known or in principle knowable. In the political sphere... this is directly related to the idea of legality and lawful procedures..., and implies the possibility of improper procedures and of avenues of redress"); those of coverage ("within a particular bureaucratic sphere 'nothing is left out' from the web of competence"); those of referral ("in principle information about jurisdictions may be obtained if it is not in the individual's possession"), (Berger 1973, 44-45).

Referent power is based on the identification of the recipient with the agent; reference implies the desire of an individual to become one with a prestigious person or a group by adopting their attitudes and beliefs. In the heritage field, the public is expected to seek identification with the Ancestors and the Nation, or with their representatives.
Bureaucrats operate in a hostile environment. Society is disorderly and inimical: expertise, then, is proven by the importance of the problems heritage bureaucrats are called to tackle: "We must (integrate) heritage conservation within the context of major public policy challenges facing the province. (In Ontario), we face problems that challenge our basic assumptions about who we are and where we are headed - economic changes, environmental problems (increasing contamination of our air, land, and water, while urban pressures threaten the livability of our communities); social issues (racial and linguistic issues, problems of housing and health care); cultural concerns (mass communications and the implications of free trade create anxiety about our identity as Canadians and as Ontarians)" (Ontario 1990a, 8).

Much is expected from heritage institutions: "the museum is best that helps to free a society from the tyranny of a redundant and conventional vision - that is to say, from the tyranny of the present... What we require are museums that tell us what we once were, and what is wrong with what we are, and what new directions are possible " (Postman 1991, 58).

These new directions are many, and more uncertain than ever. In contemporary societies: "the nature of work has changed; dependence on paternalistic systems of government has been replaced by belief in the capacity of individuals to govern themselves. People now expect to be judged on the basis of their productivity rather than circumstances of birth. They have become increasingly secular rather than sacred in their systems of belief, urban rather than rural in their settlements, specialized rather than broadly skilled, and concerned with the future rather than with continuity with the past ... Male and female roles are currently being redefined ..." (Levin 1984, 265-6).

Heritage places, (and museums), however, should be "an argument with its society... A good museum always will direct attention to what is difficult and even painful to contemplate. Therefore, those who strive to create such museums must proceed without assurances that what they do, will not be appreciated (Postman 1991, 58).

Heritage bureaucrats are expected, through heritage commemoration, "to stop the progression of time, to put a halt the work of forgetfulness, to stabilize the order of things... to materialize the immaterial, to capture a maximum of meanings within a minimum of signs; ... places of commemoration endure for the only reason that they are capable of
transformation amidst the unrelenting and surprising redefinition of their meanings, and the unpredictable outgrowth of their ramification" (Nora 1984, XXXV).

Heritage organizations promise to bring together everyone looking for a solution to society's problems: "museums must find their ego rewards not in pride of possession but in the noble responsibilities of stewardship; they must find their intellectual rewards not in the exclusive rights to baptize - to name - but in sharing the search for the understanding of the nature of things with all who would join them" (Cameron 1993, 160).

**public participation**

Heritage organizations promise their followers community (public participation), order and a sense of place (proper location in society).

Community translates for the bureaucrats into a willingness to share with the public their management, and the profits and the risks that managing heritage resources entails. The Canadian Parks Service must "provide opportunities for public involvement in the identification, development and operation of national historic sites"; "interested Canadians will be provided with the opportunity to state their views on such major issues as national policies, the establishment of new national parks, the acquisition of new national historic sites, and the preparation and review of management plans" (Canadian Parks Service 1991a: 17 and 71).

Sharing responsibilities for bureaucrats is a matter of efficient socialization. It is 'for its own good' that the public is invited to share the bureaucrats' responsibilities: "opportunities for public involvement in the national commemorative program contribute to an overall sense of national identity and to a greater appreciation of the public benefits of national historic sites" (Canadian Parks Services 1991a, 71).

It is a matter of "sound decision making (that) the Canadian Parks Service be committed to the principle of public participation" (Canadian Parks Service 1991a; 17). The view of the public must be taken into account when establishing priorities, developing policies and implementing programs: "the care and presentation of cultural resources require knowledge of ... expectations of the public for whom the resources are held in trust" (Canadian Parks Service 1991a, 102).
For the sake of efficiency, a very fractious group (historians, folk historians, material culture experts, archaeologists, researchers, project managers, interpreters, educators, guides and exhibit designers), appears willing to forsake corporate privileges, and discuss with the public, in a civil manner, the meanings and the means of heritage presentations.

Sharing fiduciary duties is a matter of ideology in a liberal society: “the following principles have been endorsed to inform decisions and practices: (A) respect for diversity [all of Ontario’s heritage has value and merit. All forms of heritage are important and must be evaluated for their potential to contribute to our future]; (B) equality of opportunity [no one will be denied access, physical or intellectual, to the benefits of our heritage, on the basis of region or socio-economic or ethnocultural background]; (C) shared responsibility [responsibility for conservation is shared across government and across society]; respect for individual interests [conservation efforts must respect the rights of individual Ontarians, including property interests and the freedom to uphold specific traditions and beliefs]” (Ontario 1990a, 27).

But, above all, sharing fiduciary duties is a strategic imperative in a field where trustees expect to deliver results, and the beneficiaries’ expectations are unlikely to be met. The responsibility for failure in delivering results then could be transferred from a willing but powerless bureaucrat to an indifferent and non-participating public.

Heritage bureaucrats will go at great length to make believe that everyone touched by their presentations will have a say in them. It is a matter of proper procedures: “When a community senses a need to recall the past in the form of a material statement”, (a significant symbol, a memorial), three groups are traditionally expected to come forward: (A) professional historians, whose function it is to determine the significance of the event to be celebrated as it applies to present experience; (B) significant groups and personalities, community’s leaders, who make the case before the community and prove the relevance of both the event to be recollected and the means of celebration; (C) existing community’s institutions who have a role in regulating initial decisions to build the memorial as well as well as in its actual construction” (Gregory 1988, 217).

Historians are called to retrieve from an existing stock of past events, some elements that make a specific event significant, for “time must past to heal wounds and fade conflicts generated by events, but time also nurtures reflection, and provides maturity for memory
invoking a perspective that situates experience within an appropriate historical context” (Gregory 1988, 217); “There has to be that interval of neglect, there has to be discontinuity; it is religiously and artistically essential. That is what I mean when I refer to the necessity for ruins; ruins provide incentive for restoration, and for a return to origins. There has to be an interim of death or rejection before there can be renewal and reform. The old order has to die before there can be a born-again landscape” (Jackson 1980, 100; on ruins)

Significant personalities and groups come to promote the project, share its relevance and build its meanings, by redefining the original signification in the light of an evolving situation. Meanings must be established with the setting up of an organization made of like minded people.

The significant personality, individual and organization, stands as a public representative: “the case for a memorial must be presented as if the event has public significance, and though the significant personality has vested interest, this interest is generated from public sources. Therefore, it is made to appear as a community effort and not strictly personal. Relevance of the events not supported by personal interests alone, and the personality has authority to speak on behalf of the community only because he or she now represents those community interests. The significant personality acts as a sponsor of the ultimate values of the community, and must make the dignity of the supra individual values of the community regarding the memorial salient and accessible to view” (Gregory 1988, 218).

Only then, does the heritage bureaucrat deem proper to appear and vouch for the integrity of the process. Heritage bureaucrats from the community’s institutions are the guardians of the public interest; they facilitate and protect “community efforts from excessive incursion of special interests. The essential point in this connection is that these bureaucratic entities can act to place a conservative community filter on the entire process of memorial building, and, as is the case with a judge in a court of law, act as arbiter when contending community groups are at odds” (Gregory 1988, 219).

While it is the function of the significant personality to gather support from powerful political groups, “it is the role of administrative bureaucracies to filter, translate, and negotiate decisions to meet formally instituted community norms. The legitimate authority and role of community institutions is critical and can direct a case in a multitude of unpredictable directions. A bureaucracy whose authority includes evaluation of a memorial
plan can change the direction of the original decision in a variety of ways” (Gregory 1988, 219).

Bureaucrats play the role of arbiters: they ‘filter’ (purify) the whole process of improper procedures and interventions. Bureaucrats rule. Ultimately, it is the bureaucrat who reminds the public and significant personalities, that their influence is restricted - since the “responsibility for policies and plans, and their implementation rests with the Minister” (Canadian Parks Service 1991a; 17).

It is part of the legitimation process that expertise be displayed on stage, for peers and professional opponents, and for the public, to witness. Staging a professional potlatch of their own, bureaucrats invite their significant others (peers and public), to share the wealth that they have accumulated. At the same time, they set themselves in a position to control the field where to call associates and visitors to come and pay reverence to them. Heritage bureaucrats are then claiming symbolic capital for themselves, while making believe that they are helping others in gathering capital.

legitimacy: asceticism, self-denial and order

Political rights, good communication and democratic process are pitted against the bureaucrat’s obligations to effectiveness and efficiency.

Heritage bureaucrats stage themselves in institutional publications and policies, as forever capable and knowledgeable agents. The projects and practices they promote are made to appear universally valid, and their monuments, sitting either on coffee tables or in town squares, are meant to be forever significant.

Bureaucrats consider normal that reality be treated according to their programs; that memory, perceptions and emotions be submitted to their standards; that information be held under their influence, problems be defined according to their terms, and that the rules and legislation that they deemed relevant prevail (after Douglas 1989, XII; on social institutions).
Heritage institutions are expected to foster economic prosperity, political stability, and social cohesion (Ontario 1990a, 2); these come to society as the consequence of the bureaucrats’ involvement in preserving and presenting society’s most powerful symbols.

The function of power in society (and that of heritage bureaucrat), is to “save (it) from its own weaknesses, to keep it in ‘good working order’ and, if necessary, to stage the accommodations that will not stand in contradiction to its founding principles” (Balandier 1967, 47). Bureaucrats institute what passes for social order; heritage bureaucrats arrange, marshal, organize, systematize. Legitimacy comes to them as the result of their efforts to preserve order in society.

Order is a social need and, as such, is self legitimating: “I do not know why this need for order exists. It is not simply a need for an instrumentally manageable environment, though that is part of it. It is more like the need for a rationally intelligible cognitive map, but it obviously is more than cognitive. There is a need for moral order - for things to be fit into a pattern which is just as well as predictable... Whether it be God’s law or natural law or scientific law or positive law or the society as a whole,... whatever embodies, expresses, or symbolizes the essence of an ordered cosmos or any significant sector thereof awakens the disposition of awe and reverence... men need an order within which they can locate themselves, an order providing coherence, continuity, and justice” (Shils 1975, 261).

The entire body of national and international laws, regulations, recommendations and treaties vouches for the idea that heritage is threatened with disorder, and that there is a professional - managerial view of the significance of heritage. Order in society and in the field is function of such a view being adopted by everyone.

Heritage bureaucrats are managers - from the French, faire le ménage (to keep a place tidy, in good order), and ménager (to economize). Heritage managers preserve and present the Polity’s symbolic treasures; they set things and people in their proper place.

Order comes to the field and to society with bureaucrats defining the proper procedures for things to happen: “bureaucracy is not only orderly but orderly in an imperialistic mode. There is a bureaucratic demiurge who views the universe as dumb chaos waiting to be brought into the redeeming order of bureaucratic administration” (Berger 1973, 49): “order entails proceeding according to an established sequence of customary procedure. It is a method according to which things are understood to act or events to take place. When
things or events do not process methodically, visualizations of deviance come to the forefront and procedural strays are identified" (Ericson 1991, 5). The heritage bureaucrat makes the world a rational place. Order is instrumentality.

In a reasonable world, action follows an organized sequence – definition of objectives; formulation of derivative objectives, policies and plans; determination of activities necessary to execute policies and plans; enumeration and classification of these activities; grouping of activities in the light of human and material resources available; assignment to each group of the authority necessary to perform the activities; and tying these groupings together horizontally and vertically, through authority relationships and information systems. Bureaucratic order is orderliness based on taxonomic propensity. Heritage bureaucrats "must produce a system of categories into which everything within a certain jurisdiction can fit and in terms of which everything can be handled" (Berger 1973, 49). Every phenomenon or situation calls for a clear and concise definition.

Phenomena within the bureaucrat's reach are classified rather than analysed or synthetised. They are made into components of a whole, the bureaucrat being satisfied once everything has been put inside its proper box. The bureaucrats taxonomic propensity expands from the field to society, since the field is a reflection of society: "order addresses hierarchy. Order means class, status, position, rank, and distinctions as to qualify. It entails differentiation on the basis of special interests, occupation, character, excellence, and so on. (Heritage, like the news - to which this quote applies) is fundamentally a discourse of morality, procedure, and hierarchy, providing symbolic representations of order in these terms" (Ericson 1991, 5).

Bureaucrats create the normal out of the normative and the normalized. They weed out the field of what is out of place and sequence. Everyone and everything, according to bureaucratic rationality, must be assigned a proper place and function in the order of things.

Being the guardians of order in society is a stressful function as vouched for on the 'portraits cum symbols' of individuals Ambrose & Runyard selected to represent the British museum field in their Forward Planning (1991).
These exemplary characters stand, next to the instruments of their passion, demanding rationality, discipline, property and integrity. They stand abstemious: "Institutions (aristocracies) must spend a lot of energy to persuade the chosen ones into accepting the necessary sacrifices that come with a privilege granted by birthright or with the acquisition of endurable dispositions that are the conditions to keep the privilege intact. When the side taken by the dominants is that of culture, that is, most of the time, that of asceticism, tension, contention, the work of institution must take into account the alluring alternative of Nature and Counter Culture... Groups entrust to the human body treated as memory their most important values, and the universal use of human suffering in initiation rites can be understood ... as the fervour of an adhesion to a given institution depends on the severity and the painfulness of the rites that signal the introduction of a candidate into the group" (Bourdieu 1982, 61).

The necessity of asceticism comes to heritage bureaucrats as they are called to manage the symbols that vouch for and create continuity, recurrence and regularity, order and structure, for society to endure (McQuail 1984, 144). Heritage bureaucrats direct, and expect obedience as a sign of reverence destined to those they represent. The heritage bureaucrat, like the Wise Man of the Bible, is seen finding legitimacy in the presence of rulers (Ecc.39:7; 39:12), and in the service of kings, princes and bishops (Cameron 1993).

Heritage bureaucrats manage the public 'theatre' of dominant memory: "There are biases of power and privilege in societies. In the myriad of social conflicts there are always winners and always losers, and 'legitimations'... grow up around the winners and explain the world (create 'realities') in ways that justify them. The winners will look to preserving what they see as their interests. To do this, if necessary, they will be ready for conscious deceits, acting not only from self-preservation, but also from the justification that their power comes from God and the demands of human destiny or that their interests are really the interests of all, or of a chosen class, or of a master race, and that their power is a burden which they must not shirk" (Horne 1986, 34-5).

Heritage bureaucrats preserve and present society's master symbols: "in the political centre of any complexly organized society, there is a governing elite and a set of symbolic forms expressing the fact that it is 'in truth' governing. No matter how democratically the members of the elite are chosen, or how deeply divided among themselves they may be, they justify their existence and order their actions in terms of a collection of stories,
more revolutionary situations, invented. It is these that make the centre and give what goes there its aura of being not merely important, but in some odd fashion, connected with the way the world is built” (Geertz 1977, 152-153)

Sitting next to the Centre dispenses of providing reasons for ‘being there’. Accordingly, the past in contemporary narratives: “is recorded almost exclusively in the voices of elites and males, in the viewpoints of the wealthy and the powerful, in the visions of the literate and the educated. That already constructed report is available sometimes through the deliberated decisions of later dominations but also through the vagaries of change and luck, fate and accident...and our present looks back to the past, to that already doubly filtered past, dependent, of course, on where one's present is located, but, let say, in individualistic, democratic, urban, middle-class American, often with ethnocentric presumption it is not even aware of projecting” (Crossan 1992, 3).

The structure of state and productive relations functions (1) to legitimate and perpetuate itself while it seeks to extend its power; (2) to exclude systematically from decision-making processes affecting their lives particular groups defined along economic, racial or sexual lines; (3) to promote the political and moral illusion that science and technology, through professionals and experts, can ‘solve’ political problems; and so (4) to restrict public political argument, participation and mobilization regarding a broad range of policy options and alternatives which are inconvenient to / incompatible with the existing patterns of ownership, wealth, and power...citizens of advanced capitalistic societies (remain) not only ignorant of their own democratic political traditions, but also oblivious to their own possibilities for corrective action...” (Forester 1985, 205).

Dominant memory, if it does not exclude an interest in change (provided it originates from situations, and not people), is reluctant to acknowledge the existence of alternatives either serious or ironic - for irony implies doubt, disbelief and disrespect, and alternatives cast a shadow over the legitimation of official pronouncements. Heritage bureaucrats stand immobile, facing eternity: “museums...map out geographies of taste and values, which is an especially difficult and controversial task when it is necessary to redraw the maps in response to major social changes. Although some new museums are trying to develop a role for themselves which is future-oriented and promotes innovation, the past is still the main concern” (Lumley 1988, 2).
Heritage bureaucrats make the world predictable both to the rulers and to the ruled. It may then be maladroit to ask from them the staging of new myths ("new myths are to arise giving more realizable shape to desires for greater liberation, there is one sense in which they must come from the people since a 'myth' of such force must be a complex act of folk creation" [Horne 1986, 237]).

"At one level, museums can provide emotional and social refuges where the past is rearranged to suit the needs of the moment. In this they become salves to the problems and pressures of modern living by suggesting that there were better and other times and places. Alternatively, they can be candid witness of social change, expressing common humanity and errors. Either way, the histories in museums are neither innocent nor pure. They are created using current mind-maps and express dominant ideologies, in essence our beliefs about ourselves and the world. As a result, they reveal the traditions of history-telling that are prioritized in contemporary life" (Kavanagh 1990, 5).

Horne is right when defining (and lamenting) the museum narratives for being progressive, nationalistic, taxonomy oriented, positivistic and for being obsessed with authenticity-integrity (Horne 1992, 63-65). Museum narratives are. In this, he comes after Schlereth who is wrong when recommending that heritage (history) narratives be not patriotic, simple, progressive, consensual and nostalgic (Schlereth 1980, 207-21).

legitimacy: dual allegiance

Legitimacy comes to heritage bureaucrats as they are left to assign a proper place and function to political masters and the public. Power and influence are confirmed to them as they succeed in neutralizing both public and political representatives as sources of disorder in the field.

Heritage bureaucrats are bound to a dual allegiance; heritage bureaucrats are committed by trade and mandate to serve People, and politicians. Both Public and political 'patrons', which should be speaking with one voice, are deeply divided into political parties and advocacy groups. These divisions are experienced by the bureaucrats as a threat to their commitment to efficiency. They are also an opportunity for them to secure a better stronghold in the field.
As trustee and manager, the heritage bureaucrat needs to abide by both the political process where consultation is the rule, and by the administrative process where consultation must be evaluated against efficiency. On the one hand, the bureaucrat must obey political representatives - for the sake of staying employed; on the other, they are made by political mandate and academic training to give everyone in the Policy an equal voice in their affairs.

Bureaucrats must speak two languages - that of democracy, "which will express the sovereignty of the subject, the creative power of action, the spontaneity of thought and the problems of interaction and reciprocity, (and whose grammar) will tend to lay stress on predication, with the verb required to make the sentence meaningful", and that of hierarchy which tends to "deny both interaction between subjects and the evolution of ideas and values; ... its grammar and syntax will be magical, its language collective. The predicate will not be an answer to a question put by the subject, but will be a commentary upon it. Word symbol will not stand for things, but will tend to become things in their own right, with a well-defined place in the hierarchy of values and participation in the ritual of their proper level" (Laswell 1966, 385).

As a rule, the language of hierarchy prevails in the field. In official documents, whenever reference is made to the power of the People, it is routinely accompanied by restrictions that reinstate the bureaucrat’s control. Calls to ‘decentralize partnership’, to the ‘nurturing of local community commitment’, for ‘programs to be implemented at the level of government nearest to the people’, inevitably are followed by remarks as to the necessity for “another level of government to take the initiative', (and provide the) "overall framework, guidance, leadership and support aimed at increasing the capacity and self sufficiency of local or regional organizations" (Ontario 1987, 10).

Whenever governments are seeking greater involvement from citizens, they are also looking “for effective mechanisms to coordinate and rationalize the participation of various public and private sector agencies” (Ontario 1987, 10). However helpful public consultations have been in creating “clearer pictures of roles and responsibilities”, considerations must be given to the fact that the “field has extended so much over the past twenty years” that “few participants will have a clear overview of the many complementary roles [that need to be played] within the system as a whole” (Ontario 1990a, 30).
Whenever a move towards heterodoxy is made by the 'organized' public, the bureaucrat's response is either intense interest or sonorous silence: "Special programs and events offer important opportunities to integrate the presentation of cultural resources... with related activities in their surrounding communities and to develop partnerships with others. In planning for these activities and uses Parks Canada will be sensitive to the size, nature and interests of existing and potential visitor groups, while acknowledging that not all visitor expectations are compatible with the demand for national historic sites and national parks" (Canadian Parks Service 1994a, 114).

For strategic purposes, the heritage bureaucrat will make a display of serving both public and political representatives as often as they are seen pursuing common goals. When they do not, they will minimize differences between adversaries, seek common ground, and capitalize on the fact that they are available as arbiters. When common ground cannot be found, bureaucrats will side with whomever is most likely to guarantee them proper resources and continuity.

In any event, they will make sure that the principle and the consequences of expertise are fully understood, that their expertise is publicly recognized, and that it is sought after as a political necessity.

Since there is such a reality as a legally recognized expertise, it must be assumed that the experts are capable of proper decisions and actions in their field. Conversely, it is expected that anyone who is not an expert, either will defer to greater authorities, or will risk personal and public embarrassment for entering a field where he does not belong.

As non-experts, political representatives and public must realize that their involvement in the public sphere of Heritage will be conducted most likely either at their detriment or at the detriment of society's best interests. Whatever is sought during public consultations, the end result will be a display of either the greater expertise of well instructed bureaucrats, the unexpertise of members of the public who are merely passing by, or the display of the bureaucrat's corporative interests masquerading as public service.

Authorities want to save everyone from embarrassment and restrict the public's participation to what is strictly relevant: "one of the many ways of opening up the museum process is to involve people outside museums" provided they come "with relevant insight
and experience in both analytical and practical positive programs within the museum” (Porter 1986, 12).

The heritage bureaucrat makes a rule of never opposing directly either political representatives or members of the public - for fear of being locked in an adversarial position, for fear of forsaking their proper station (servants), and for fear of frightening the game away from the trap. Heritage bureaucrats need to have public and politicians coming confidently unto their ground where to be delivered a most important heritage lesson: boundaries should not be crossed for the sake of order in society.

For members of the public, crossing the line between amateur and expert would be proceeding where they should not. Not crossing that line, on the other hand, would make them appear uninterested in heritage, and inconsiderate to social matters (society’s survival). Standing before that line, in both cases, is being given an opportunity to meditate on presumptuousness, incompetence, and powerlessness.

Public and political representatives may be leery, when requesting a participation in heritage affairs, to take responsibility for an activity which is, at best, promised limited profits and uncertain success. Consorting with experts then may be looking for troubles, or seeking too obviously an opportunity to make a quick profit. The presence of newcomers, in the field, is bound to alarm the habitual bureaucrats, and defeat the interlopers' purposes.

Neither members of the Polity, who are said to be involved in heritage in order to become who they should be, nor the political representatives, who are believed to be self-serving and cautious, will want to bear the responsibility of failing the ancestors - and endanger the survival of the community.

Heritage bureaucrats are accountable for their work: experts are occasionally evaluated - by other experts, participating politely (if they wish to be invited once again), in a bureaucratic ritual that reinforces everyone's instituted position.

Evaluation rarely leads to radical changes - the museum institution, for instance, is rarely questioned, as such, despite its very datedness ("There is no assurance that museums will continue to be an important form of social institution" [Kelly 1987, 31]). Recommendations, most of the time, must profit the sponsors of the evaluation study who,
in exchange of a short period of embarrassment, are provided with an opportunity to ask for more resources and authority against their promise of bringing corrections to a threatening situation.

The logic of expertise and delegation excludes the idea of blaming the expert, a lack of success in implementing exhortative policies. Critiques addressed to bureaucrats from academic circles recognize their strong position in the field, and the very nature of their work. These critiques, like the bureaucrats' work, when facing the public, are limited to exhortations.

Failure in exhortation must be blamed on the means used to preach proper behaviour, and on the assembly's reluctance to listen to the sermon. The responsibility for failure in heritage then is routinely assigned to the public and authorities who fail to provide sufficient means and proper attention to what was so expertly suggested.

*the public*

In practice, heritage bureaucrats make a rule of making the public and political authorities feel responsible for their failure in attaining their objectives of efficiency and effectiveness. It is then that they introduce a fourth character in the equation, the Public, and present it as a formidable entity to which everyone must pay respect. The public, "a political grouping of individuals brought into being as a social unit brought through mutual recognition of common problems for which common solutions should be sought" (Dewey [1927]; quoted in McQuail 1983, 152), becomes the Public, a dangerous animal that must be tamed.

The Public rarely plays fair: "visitors to museums are demanding. They want constant stimulation, but they often prefer to remain passive" (Woods 1991, 77).

The Public is both malevolent and benevolent. To fragile, bureaucratic egos, it may appear to be overbearing: "We are many publics - there is no 'public' - and we are not passive. We are all participants... When we go to a museum, all of us are negotiating meanings and those are the meanings that museum has for us. And we are all of us, however ill-educated or highly educated, critics of existence and, as such, we approach a museum not on the terms of the museum, but on our terms. We can seek from it material for our general
criticism of existence. Or, as I would put it, museums can mean most to us if we can learn to 'read' museums” (Horne 1992, 63).

The Public is the last Savage Tribe where to discover wealth and symbolic capital; it is also the last of the Barbarians threatening Civilization. Heritage bureaucrats, in their cubicles, are the keepers of the Light who bear witness to the survival of Civilization: “An anxious aristocrat alignment considers (British History) sold short, cut off in its prime, seeing themselves as latter-day Lindisfarne monks, lone custodians of the fragile traces of a vanishing civilization, they harp on its precarious plight to enlist help for its preservation. And public support of that heritage legitimizes the hierarchical order its symbolizes” (Lowenthal 1987, 438; reviewing Wright 1985).

The Public is forever in a state of non/definition; it is thus a threat, and its presence demands forever more research grants in order that vital epistemological explorations be conducted: “We need to analyze and to understand much more clearly the structures our audiences use. Where are the points of interchange. Where are these differing historical understandings deeply perhaps, unbridgeable parallel” (Blatti 1987, 8).

The Public as an ever-changing aggregate of individuals with specific needs and interests, is forever without the bureaucrat’s controlling reach (see Maletzke’s [1963]; in McQuail 1993) (30).

Individuals from the Public are the main source of chaos in the field: “there is no evidence that sites are uniformly read and passively accepted by visitors... visitors frame and interpret the visit in ways not expected or planned by its designers. They connect together exhibits not intended to be linked, they read the exhibits as prescriptive when they are not intended to be, and they mostly do not describe the exhibition in ways the designers had intended” (Urry 1996, 54).

The Public is the most important threat to Heritage; it is the Public which forgets either the wise lessons of the Past or, worse, its civic duty to enquire about them. It is individuals in the Public who threaten the integrity, both material and immaterial, of heritage resources when misusing them or failing to support the stewards’ work. It is the Public which ultimately denies legitimacy to the bureaucrats by depriving them of an opportunity to display properly the significant symbols of national heritage (and their expertise).
It is the Public which is to be blamed and punished as bureaucrats think of depriving the Nation of its significant symbols since these have not been kept in full integrity: "To maintain the integrity of the commemorative program, a designation of national historic significance ( ) may be revoked by the Minister ( ) Such action will be undertaken rarely, and then only when (I) the commemoration was based on the existence of resources that have since disappeared; or (ii) the resources have fallen into such a state of disrepair as to nullify the reason(s) for the commemoration; or (iii) the commemorative significance of the structure or site has been severely compromised as a result of having been moved and/or altered" (Canadian Parks Service 1994a, 78).

The process of reification

Legitimacy comes to the heritage bureaucrats as they are left to define the nature of relationship taking place between trustees and Public in the heritage field.

Bureaucracy operates in moralized anonymity. Anonymity, in bureaucracies, is not only "recognized as a pragmatic necessity but is given allegiance as a moral imperative...in bureaucracy, anonymity is intrinsically defined and morally legitimated as a principle of social relations" (Berger 1973, 52).

Bureaucrats and Public meet in a state of affective neutrality; bureaucracy assigns emotional states to both officers and clients, both parties conducting their business, bracketing personal biases, and adhering stiffly to procedures even in situation of great stress (Berger 1973, 57).

Social relations staged in a bureaucratic situation appear to go beyond human control and have a fixed and immutable quality: "the social structure, (to the bureaucrats and their clients) is a reified world since it is a structure of roles, not persons, that are laid out in organizational charts that specify the relationships of hierarchy and function. Authority inheres in the position, not the individual, and social exchange is a relation between roles: a person becomes an object or a thing, not because the enterprise is inhumane but because the performance of a task is subordinated to the organization's ends" (Bell 1976, 11).

Heritage bureaucracies reify the relation between users and producers, allowing "any aspect of human life to be imagined as an object, bounded in time and space, or ..."
associated as property within a particular group, which is imagined as territorially and historically bounded" (Handler, 1988, 124; on culture and nationalism).

Heritage bureaucrats are mainly concerned with cases. Heritage bureaucracy is encountered by the individual as processes, and procedures; bureaucrats meet their clients as the bearers of problems to which solutions must be found with the delivery of services.

Bureaucratic competence, procedures, rights and duties are not attached to concrete individuals but to holders of bureaucratic offices (Berger 1973, 46): "All individual characteristics, peculiarities or eccentricities of both the bureaucrat and his client are irrelevant in principle to the business at hand and are carefully excluded from consideration by the bureaucratic procedures being enacted" (Berger 1973, 46).

Once a breach is made in anonymity, the process of heritage exchange/commerce is deemed to have been corrupted, and is thus made irrelevant. It is abstract categories (functions and status) that interact when bureaucrats communicate with members of this public. This is the reason why, in the bureaucratic universe, the means are nearly as important as the ends: "the proper means and procedures are given a positive, moral value, and in many cases it is assumed that even if a legitimate end is obtained by illegitimate means, the damage done by this to the integrity of the bureaucratic agency far outweighs any positive benefits from the action. The bureaucrat will therefore always try to maintain a non-separability of means and ends because this non-separability serves to legitimate his procedures." (Berger 1973, 52).

To the citizen, the encounter with a civil servant takes place in a mode of explicit abstraction which is recognized and agreed upon by both parties. That encounter also takes place in contradiction.

On the one hand, a client, expecting a fair treatment, will want his rights (mostly values such as personal autonomy, dignity, work and pious feelings that are foreign to the bureaucratic realm) to be respected. On the other hand, the just treatment which is sought is said to be possible only if 'the bureaucracy operates abstractly' and the client is treated 'as a number'. The very justice in the treatment entails that, as a matter of rule, emotional manifestations of any kind or intensity, are kept under control as the bureaucratic encounter precludes any manifestation of behaviour contrary to effectiveness.
Reciprocity, as a voluntary exchange, is not expected to take place when clients and bureaucrats meet. Bureaucrats and clients are not engaged in "common tasks, and therefore have difficulty in reciprocally identifying with each other's roles in the process"; the latter expecting a commitment to his expectations, the former trying to fulfil a task as abstractly, as impersonally, as predictably as he is morally committed to. The individual in ordinary life needs to be actively involved; but when dealing with bureaucracy, he is expected to be properly passive; "in encountering bureaucracy the individual does not basically do things; things are done to him" (Berger 1973, 55).

Heritage bureaucrats provide 'services' with the purpose of convincing their clients to agree to a set of propositions of ideological, social, political and cultural nature. These propositions, they put forward as if it were essential for them to appear to be free, while operating, from any external constraints (political, ideological) or any internal pressures (organization and technical).

While heritage symbols are expected to agitate feelings and inspire personal commitment, bureaucrats want to be recognized as dispassionate, objective, rational - instruments. Legitimacy comes to bureaucrats as they are capable of standing collected on the line that separates what is Civilization and what is not. There, they stand as boundary markers - monuments.
Heritage bureaucrats are decision makers - from the Latin caedere - to cut off.

In Bourdelian language, heritage bureaucrats delineate, drawing a line between what will take place, and what will not. They decide on behalf of individuals and organizations which are either incapable of doing so, or reluctant to endanger their interests in tricky endeavours. Heritage bureaucrats are thus left to make the important decisions in the field, and to choose between preservation and presentation, political and moral commitments, social justice and the necessity of order, corporate interest and public service, a commercial approach and a political approach to heritage, a professional perspective and a managerial perspective to culture.

Heritage bureaucrats draw the same line that surveyors drew between civilization and wilderness at Lower Fort Garry in 1871. That line is drawn in national historic site when profane ground is separated from what is sacred ground to the Nation.

Heritage places recall places where, in the past, a line has been drawn, - sites where beginnings took place, (in Canada's 'L'Anse-aux-Meadows' where the Vikings are celebrated for having discovered the New World; at Gaspé where Cartier discovered Canada; at Port-Royal where Champlain built his first Abitation'); places where divides are acknowledged (at the Chambly Canal, where the official trade with the USA is commemorated; at Fort Chambly, where the antiquity of (illegal) trade between the USA and Canada is instituted; places where social groups have clashed, and new 'configurations' have been defined (at Lower Fort Garry, [Man.], where European and Natives met to trade; at Batoche [Sask] where Metis Rebels fought Canadian soldiers, and lost; in Fort Saint Frédéric [Crown Point U.S.A.], where British caserns have been left to ruins, and in Ticonderoga U.S.A., where (French) fortifications have been rebuilt to celebrate the American Colonies' enduring victory over England).

It is the same 'line' that visitors, exhibition planners and interpreters follow when going through an exhibition, the 'proper planning process' and the proper steps of a demonstration.
It reappears as a moral and an epistemological imperative in (1) Westley and McLean 'Conceptual Model for Communication Research', (Severin & Tankard 1992, 49); (2) McQuail 'The Gatekeeper Model of Communication' (McQuail 1994, 100); (3) Lipe 'Relationship of Cultural Resource Value', (Cleere 1984, 3), (32-34).

The straight line is the structuring analogy of the field. It indicates the visitor’s advance as he goes from presentation, attention, comprehension, yielding, retention, and active advocacy (McGuire 'The Hierarchy of Communication Effect', quoted in Severin and Tankard [1992], 5).

The visitor’s advance is meant to be a progress which takes the receiver of some official information from (A) the realm of thoughts (cognitive realism where messages provide information and facts), to (B) the realm of emotions (affective realm, where messages ought to modify attitudes and feelings), and, finally, (C) to the realm of motives (the conative realm where messages stimulate or direct desires), (Lavidge and Steiner “A Model for Predictive Measurements of Advertising Effectiveness” (1961); quoted in Severin and Tankard [1992], 4).

managers: ‘régisseurs and interpreters

In the Canadian Parks Service, those who draw the line between public and administrative space are called [régisseurs] - managers, and stage-managers. Those they send to the front lines to engage the public are called interpreters. Interpreters are responsible for the production of activities, facilities, programs and services "which bring the public into contact either directly or indirectly with national historic sites" (Canadian Parks Service 1990a, 109).

Both have inherited in modern society parts of the functions that the 'Rex' held in Indo European societies (Benveniste [1973]; Détienne [1967], 1999). The 'Rex' defined limits, profane and sacred (regere fines, regere sacra). "More a priest than a king in the modern sense, (he) was the man who had authority to trace out the sites of towns and to determine the rules of law" (Benveniste 1973, 307).

In the Latin, [ rex, regere, regio, rectus ] referred to a concept that was at once concrete and moral; "the 'straight line' represent(ed) the norm, while the [regula] (was) the
instrument used to trace the straight line, which fixes the ‘rule’... Hence ‘straight’ is equivalent to ‘just’, honest’, while its contrary ‘twisted, gent’ is identified with ‘perfidious, mendacious’, etc ... In [Rex] we must see the one who traces out the line, the way which must be followed, which also represents what is right” (Benveniste 1973, 311, 312).

interpretation - the making of the audience

Romans resorted to ‘interpretatio’ to identify the similarities between their gods and the gods of conquered countries. In contemporary heritage situations, interpreters act as mediators between given realities - present and past, here and there, authorities and people, symbolic and material life. They act as translators, instructors, or hermeneutic scholars: they vouch for the existence of some difficult, complex, authoritative reality.

In the heritage field, interpretation “seeks to teach certain truths, to reveal meanings, to impart understanding... It is based on original objects( ), objects have been around much longer than language and, when properly arranged, have innate powers to impart and inform.. Interpretation is supported by sound scientific or historical research ... It makes use of sensory perception whenever possible... It is informal education without the trappings of the classroom, is voluntary and dependent only on the interest of the viewer, and is often enjoyable and entertaining.” (Alexander 1979, 195-6).

Interpreters are performers: under different names - [coryphée, shamans, griots], since time immemorial, they have been “dancing, singing, wearing masks and costumes, impersonating other people, animals or supernaturals (or being possessed by them), acting stories, ( ) rehearsing and preparing special places and time for these presentations - all coexistent with the human condition” (Schechner 1987, 436; on drama).

In heritage sites, interpreter and site manager [ régisseur ] draw the line between what must be preserved and presented, and what will not. That line makes the Public into an audience - an aggregate of persons brought together at a given place, at a given time, “by individual voluntary acts of choice according to some expectation of benefit to enjoy, admire, learn, experience ( ). (An audience is) also subject to potential or actual control by authority and is thus an institutionalized form of collective behaviour...” (McQuail 1983, 150).
The invention of the audience brings order to the field. The audience situates individual members in a community, and provide them with a function and purposes - to be instructed, entertained and inspired.

Heritage interpreters, onstage, draw the line between the realm of reality and that of representations: they make believable the claim that representations are more real than reality. What is presented onstage, due to the simple fact of 'being there', appears to be more authentic, more important, and compelling, thus more legitimate, than if it were set into an ordinary setting. All objects on stage, persons or artefacts, are recognized "an overriding signifying power which they lack - or which at least is less evident - in their normal social function" (Elam 1980, 18). All that is on stage is a sign; being on stage grants significance.

Like Peale in his *Self Portrait* (1822), the heritage interpreter plays two roles on stage: that of showing things and that of being on display when showing these things. In the Polity, the civil servant cannot be anything more than an actor repeating the lines written either by the ancestors or the People; in reality, for the sake of fulfilling his role of a delegate, and abiding by the nature of the media, he stands tall, speaking loud, occupying alone the centre stage.

On stage, the heritage bureaucrat as interpreter literally indicates (pointing the index finger) significant objects and ideas. He performs within frames of his own making (Wittlin 1970: 32, 33, 35, 58, 63).

All that is situated inside the perimeter of a heritage site sits within a frame. All that sits within a frame becomes ostensible: "Ostension represents the most elementary act of active signification and it is the one used in the first instance by two people who do not share the same language; sometimes the object is connected to a pointer, at others it is regularly picked up and shown; in both cases the object is disregarded as a token and becomes, instead of the immediate possible referent of a mention, the expression of a more general content...in ostension there is always an implicit or explicit stipulation of pertinence" (Eco 1976, 225).

As interpreters, heritage bureaucrats are called on stage to present objects (including themselves) properly.
Both theatre and heritage sites operate according to a tacit understanding after which members of the audience are expected to accept that "an alternative and fictional reality is to be presented by individuals designated as performers, and that (their) own role with respect to that represented reality is to be that of privileged 'onlooker(s)' - The central understanding is that the audience has neither the right nor the obligation to participate directly in the dramatic action occurring on the stage (Goffman 1974) ... It is on the basis of this understanding that the performers are able to interact on stage apparently oblivious to the audience... and that the spectators ( ) do not expect to impinge directly on the interaction" (Elam 1980, 88).

On the one hand, the heritage audience (virtual or real), is made of individuals who are more or less ignorant of what they are presented and who are expected to react to the presentators in appropriate manner - in grateful silence because they are granted an audience. On the other, they stand as the representatives of the People (the Sovereign), and are invited to act accordingly - in a dignified and attentive silence because they are granting an audience.

Both times, the audience sits pondering what could have been an interactive or a transactional opportunity - a promise of something else, but what has come out as a staid ceremony.

Implicit in the contract between performers and audience is the understanding that the interlocutory audience is a purely passive, non speaking receiver - but for well choreographed interventions when manifestations of understanding, interest and encouragement are permitted. Implicit is the belief that the tale from the storyteller is worth the audience's attention. Also implicit is the assumption that the audience both as representative of the Polity and as spectator is sufficiently competent to comprehend the narratives and the processes staged on behalf of the Polity: it then stands as if purged of all undesirable elements - and fully convinced of its social duties.

According to that tacit contract, members of the audience (A) are promised information, identity, social interaction and entertainment; (B) they are recognized a special status - that of patrons for having initiated, by proxy, the symbolic and practical process that institute both historic sites and procedures of institution; (C) and they are delivered, at various degrees, stimulation (a unique, interesting experience), confirmation (reinforcement of the knowledge they bring to the experience, and that of their expectation when they come to
the experience), and integration (surrender of the individual to a greater unit, either the Audience, or the Nation [Elam 1980, 97; and McQuail 1983, on the ‘Uses and Gratifications Communication Theory’].

That is to say that interpretation, in its philosophical connotation, the action of making sense from different and contradictory proposals, has taken place before spectators and interpreters have come face to face. Anything of consequence to the commemoration process, the reason of some specific interest, the constraints of the format, and the place of the commemorated event in a sequence, has already been transacted. Interpretation as an institutional function, belongs exclusively to the interpreters, and bureaucrats are not expected to share with the audience what is theirs legally and logically. The window they open on the world is theirs, the screen they fill with marvelous images is theirs, and they are occupying all of the stage, by public consent.

Implicit in the action of contracting is the possibility of the heritage bureaucrats to loose control over the audience, and their staunch desire to ignore this possibility: “Through a narrative text I meet you in a struggle which may be co-operative or may be combative, a struggle for knowledge, for power, for pleasure, for possession. The meeting is manifest in the course of the narrative performance in which the performer, whether human or textual, undertakes to control the audience by words or signs alone, while they, the partners in the act, use their power as hearers to dictate the terms of the control” (Maclean 1988, XII).

The audience, actually the many audiences in the room or elsewhere, may consider the possibility of participating in the process as being a debt for having entered a contract with the authorities. The audience then becomes a dangerous, unpredictable actor both vulnerable to the strategies of performance, and empowered with the privilege of cooperating or not. It is thus sent into the dark - and intentionally so, for it is preferable to consider the action of making sense, a private activity - since there is ever anyone to discuss at length with the visitor, there is hardly time for the visitor to make a proper selection in the mass of stimuli that are pitched at him, and there are rarely any provisions to correct the production once it has been criticized by visitors.

The response from the public may be positive or negative; it may come from the mind, and be ironic, or from the emotions, and be respectful or transgressive. It will be perceived as a private matter, and will be rarely given a public stage. What comes after [ostension], the display of an object, a narrative, a process, is a supplement to the main discourse; it is
transacted, 'aside', between spectators and some junior interpreters going out of their way (actors discussing a play), once the performance is over. It is a privilege extravagantly granted to the blessed: "(a friend of mine and her mother, coming to the British Museum to see the famous Ramesside glass fish, found out that) it was being cleaned. A sympathetic keeper took them to the bowels of the museum, where my friend was able to look at it and handle it. A museum needs, along with ten thousand casual visitors, at least one with the dedication of my friend. For then the past enters the discourse of love through which we survive. The transaction between keeper, fish and friend is curiously emblematic of the museum's task of transmission. The keeper is Osiris, the guardian of the dead; the fish, in Ramesside poetry, is the heart and the gift of love; my friend - perhaps the initiate, perhaps Persephone, who travels to the underworld and brings the spring" (Landy 1993, 24).

mass audience

The audience of heritage communication is a mass audience: the bureaucrat stages his performance for the Public, the People, the Polity and the Nation. His audience is large in size, heterogeneous, dispersed, anonymous (McQuail 1983, 152).

As a mass audience, it is deemed not/organized, not/rational and not/focused: it is denied "representation and the capacity to respond, not only because the technology is unavailable for (efficient) direct response but because the social conditions for having a significant collective reply" (are available only periodically to certain groups) "within a previously authorized and controlled setting" (McQuail 1983, 160).

Bureaucrats, for the sake of bringing order to the field, and in the name of efficiency and effectiveness, stage displays that need to be striking, clear, unambiguous. Their message needs to be immediately perceived as acceptable and relevant. For the sake of bringing order into chaos, communication in an heritage setting is a closed process, working according to established definitions of who the participants should be, how they relate in terms of precedence, what effects to expect from communication and what kinds of information is relevant to the system, (McQuail 1983, 32). Communication is a project, not a reality.

Heritage communicators operate under the belief that, since there is a collectivity to speak to, there should be a collective narrator. Since there are collective representations to be staged, there ought to be a collective presentator. Contrary to the mass audience which "is
much less likely to have any collective perception of itself, any organised set of expectations or view of its rights" (McQuail 1983, 168), the collective presentator is organized. It has "an internally differentiated structure of relationships, with its own internal network of communication, some degree of shared norms and values, and a shared location within which face-to-face interaction with others can take place". The heritage interpreter can develop "a view of what it is seeking to achieve, of its audience and of its rights and obligations" (McQuail 1984, 168); the audience cannot develop an equivalent view of the producer.

Reality, after a brush with the public, is evidently different, from what has been planned. It is as shocking to the bureaucrat who goes up to the front line, as it is to the Museum Studies graduate facing suddenly an hourly quota of 200 visitors coming to live the 'Persephone Experience'.

Reference to a mass communication model remains extremely comforting to the bureaucrat because it permits to define reality as it should be, either for the Nation in relation with its destiny, or for the public in relation to its masters' expectations.

Since there is no possible control over all occurrences in the field, and since all occurrences are bound to defy purposes, it is strategically more profitable for the bureaucrat to let the public bear the responsibility of its shortcomings. It is more efficient and effective to look forward to the future (namely, captive school groups), than to face the possibility of losing one's normative edge in daily occurrences. In doing so, heritage bureaucrats stand a chance to save their turf by erecting a 'wall' between themselves and their competitors.

The logic of mass media wants that individuals coming to a heritage site be treated as components of a greater, more significant whole. Their loss of individual privileges is compensated with cultural capital, in its incorporated form (the proper behaviour to adopt when approaching heritage resources), in its objectified form (the collections of cultural resources), and in its institutionalized form (the organizations).

The logic of capitalization makes the owners of that capital different from people of other Nations who have no right to it, no interest in it and no use for it.
the right to delineate: differentiation/distinction

The logic of expertise wants the bureaucrats to proceed to the selection, classification, and evaluation of facts and objects; the process also applies to people visiting heritage places. It takes into consideration differences in expectation, attention, perception and effect associated with knowledge previously acquired and personal interest developed towards heritage. These, in turn, translate into receptivity to the message from the mass communicator.

When the purpose of the heritage institution is to get as many to be interested as possible, it is logical to expect that some individuals within the potential audience will be properly interested while others will be moderately or not interested at all. What distinguishes the (national) community from another can also be used to differentiate one segment of the community from another. In practice, heritage places have done well at being instruments of social differentiation.

Legitimacy comes to heritage bureaucrats as they help delineate who, in society, is significant and who is not. Museums and historic sites are places where social positions are assigned and displayed: "the stratification system is ... society's mechanism for encouraging the most able people to perform the most demanding roles in order to have the society operate efficiently" (Lipset 1979, 43; quoted in Kelly 1987, 3). Heritage professionals, bureaucrats all, have played their role according to the rules, and made the most of all the negative aspects (failure of trust, misrepresentation, misappropriation) that their official position presented. They have been very competent in selecting the most meritorious within society.

"Which 24 per cent of British adults visit museums? The ETB survey identifies museum visitors as more affluent, more mobile, younger and better educated than the population as a whole... it would appear from the nature of the visitors that museums have the function of supporting, comforting and promoting the interests of the most privileged section of British society" (Hooper-Greenhill 1983, 12)

"Museums have become, at least to some components of the population, status symbols... They exemplify meaningful leisure by embracing elements of education, the arts, and cultural heritage under one roof. In fact, they serve as absolute arbiters (through their collection decisions) of what is culturally or artistically significant. Their curators (and their
socially privileged constituencies alike) speak a language little understood by those not exposed to the academic models on which the language is based. Thus, being in a museum or a gallery, is prima facie, evidence of the intellectual and social credentials necessary for belonging. In essence, museum-gallery visiting is revealed taste" (Kelly 1987, 13).

Their selective practices and success are corroborated in Hood (1983) on museum visitors and the search for a satisfactory experience in museums.

Out of all the potential visitors to the Toledo Art Museum (school groups excluded), 40% never came to the Museum, 46% came occasionally and only 14% were frequent visitors. Non-users “perceived museums as environments that restricted activity and were socially and physically uncomfortable. Museums were described as formal, formidable places that were physically or socially inaccessible to them” (Falk 1992, on Hood 1983).

As expected from a study about visitors, recommendations were made in order that the museum professionals keep their jobs, their funding and their reputation as people of integrity.

Changes would involve satisfying both the public’s needs - (1) being with people, (2) doing something worthwhile, (3) feeling comfortable and at ease in one’s surroundings, (4) being challenged to new experiences, (5) having an opportunity to learn, (6) participating actively in the acquisition of knowledge (Hood 1983), and the bureaucrat’s needs presented as a public service - (a) ‘the need for collections of our human heritage judiciously chosen and ordered, and for effective ways of retrieving the knowledge lying within them, (b) the need “to seek the truths through facts” and the continuing study, re-interpretation and communication of what we have inherited, (c) and “the need for the general public understanding of its heritage” (Volmer 1982, 3).

The need for change indicates that both bureaucrats and clients are at a deficit towards one another. Changes would mean promoting more frequent usage amongst the museum’ current users, developing new products, seeking new users and creating new uses of the basic material.

However, changes to the field, for the heritage bureaucrats, would also mean defying the logic of capitalization, since change would first imply the public recognition of their
incompetence (worse, of their malevolence), either before the academic critics or before
the dominant classes in society to whom they fail to deliver the masses proper
indoctrination - "Surveys show that museums are most likely to be visited by those who
are of above average education and affluence. Those who would be considered to be the
'dominated' tend not to go to museums. The effectiveness of the dominant ideology in
effecting social reproduction depends on its message being received and assimilated by all
sections of the population. If the very group who are supposed to be kept in place by the
dominant ideology do not go to museums, then their effectiveness as ideological
institutions must be strongly questioned" (Merriman 1991, 17).

Critiques, either malevolent or benevolent, are in fact exhortations, and may either be well
received as they signal errors to be addressed by the bureaucrat in search of excellence,
or they may be perceived as nothing but exhortations made by agents who do not play an
implementing, productive role in the field. They can also be a trap set by an adversary to
have the heritage bureaucrat squander his capital.

Responding to the people's needs as stated by their academic interpreters would mean
that heritage bureaucrats be adding to their own plight, and demonstrating strategic naivety
when confiding their position in the Polity to a group (the non/visitors) that, as an institution,
they have systematically shunned.

Reform in this perspective is a trap to the current heritage managers. On the one hand,
they have to perform as their functions wants them to - cautiously: "It is natural that a
curator who is not driven by a missionary spirit and who is concerned above all to gauge
the success of his or her efforts immediately, measured by the number of the faithful
recorded, addresses him - or herself preferentially to the groups with the greatest number
of devotees. It is understandable that a museum's Society of Friends should be, along with
special exhibitions, the second main focus of the 'museological' enterprise" (Bourdieu
1990, 91). On the other, they have to go where their position in the field will inevitably lead
them to: "the total opposite of the devotees who are dedicated to the culture of the
established works of defunct prophets, and of priestly culture, who are dedicated to the
organization of this culture, are the cultural prophets who disturb the routine of ritualized
fervour, only to be routinized in their turn by new priests and new devotees" (Bourdieu
1990 60). Prophets become clerics when they can save themselves from being crucified.
Taking a stand for the sake of social justice or for the sake of self interest can be very costly. Moral rectitude and job keeping, both self-preserving, depend; (a) on antagonizing the bureaucrats' most reliable patrons, the frequent visitors who are yet to be convinced that they have been wrong in making sacrifices, and that they should be sharing the capital thus gained with everyone else; (b) on devaluing the field for the non-frequent users still labouring valiantly towards acceptance within the cultural elite; (c) on being believed when promising reform in a field that has forever been an institutionalizing tool.

In a capitalist field, it is to be expected that everyone will be toiling to keep things as they have been accumulated. Institutions delineate; divulging the code, then, telling how the trick is performed would be self-defeating: "the only way to lower the level of transmission of a work is to provide, along with the work, the code in which the work is encoded, in a verbal or written explanation whose code has already been partially or totally mastered by the receiver, or which continuously provides the key to its own decipherment, in accordance with the mode of perfectly rational pedagogical communication" (Bourdieu 1990, 95). Salvation for the heritage bureaucrats, then, will not depend on adopting existing material to the need of new, forever reluctant and unreliable customers, but on relying upon the enduring power of the institution to keep the agents in their proper place.

Ultimately, even this is performed at a loss for everyone involved: "the true miracle to come from acts of institution is to be found in their power of persuading chosen, consecrated individuals that they are justified to exist, that their existence is useful. But the essentially diacritical, differential, distinctive nature of symbolic power comes with a curse - the access by the distinguished class to Being comes with the inevitable fall of the complementary class into nothingness or into a lesser state of Being" (Bourdieu 1982, 63).
Conclusion: legitimacy challenged - the bureaucrat in disrepute

Bureaucrats as cultural capitalists, for the sake of efficiency and effectiveness, must stand where his functions want him to - on stage, and perform the ceremonies that the public expects from its interpreter.

The stage however is a place where he is trapped since as a trustee, a delegate, he must perform both as the valid representative of his masters, and, in the process, appear to own what belongs to them. A servant dressed in his master's garbs soon becomes an object of mockery.

On the one hand, the heritage bureaucrat is very careful not to take greater responsibilities than he needs to, for fear of being made the only agent responsible for an endeavour which is inevitably bound to fail. On stage, the bureaucrat's strategy consists of enduring as long as possible, performing before an audience that knows he will fail because it has sent him there for both success, temporary, and failure, also temporary.

Already, the bureaucrat has gained time by reminding the audience of its heritage duties - participation, shared responsibilities. Soon, he is once again to distract the audience attention from the officiant to his props by performing extraordinary deeds, staging marvelous ceremonies and making appear under the bright light magnificent objects. The bureaucrat deflects the attention of the public from himself to his presentations - objects, like traditions, heroic characters and deeds, and significant meanings. These objects are treated like religious fetishes in the service of which the bureaucrat readily stands. Later (Part V), the bureaucrat will reappear transfixed in the legitimating glow of objects he has helped to sacralize.

Legitimacy is a three step process during which the servant becomes the master by virtue of the tricks he performs, the proficiency he demonstrates in providing meaningful symbols. All along, however, the attacks on his reputation will not stop; coming either from academics, from the marketplace or from the public, they are as crude to the bureaucrat as his power and influence are believed to be significant and dangerous to his critics. If
legitimacy is a good reputation, heritage bureaucrats, from all corners, have fallen in
disrepute: “the strength of the manager are continuity, stability, and the delivery of services
and products from existing structures. Unfortunately, managers also discourage creativity,
imagination, non-linear-thinking, individualism and speaking our mind, an insubordinate act
by which problems are identified. The manager distrusts public debate, abhors any
admission of doubts and unpredictable behaviour” (Saul 1995, 200).

The bureaucrats' position in the field, the legal right of being there, or even their expertise,
are rarely taken to task. Bureaucrats, however, are constantly reminded by voices from
their own past that they have failed in being good disciples: they are guilty of moral
betrayal, inefficiency, obsequiousness and, most of all, of stubbornness in not responding
to the warnings they are given. These voices have the bureaucrat realize that he is
trapped - denied by the political authorities the proper means to be efficient and effective
as he is committed to; shunned by most of the public, which spends time elsewhere in
more appropriate ceremonies; censured by the Ancients of the trade who want him off the
stage.

These [voices] read from formidable scripts.

Karl Marx believed that bureaucracy was to politics what the fetish of commodities was to
economics - an instrument of alienation: “the state is bureaucracy's private property. The
general ethos of bureaucracy is secrecy, mystery, safeguarded within by hierarchy and
without by its nature as a closed corporation. Thus public political spirit and also political
mentality appear to bureaucracy as a betrayal of its secret. The principle of knowledge is
therefore authority, and its mentality is the idolatry of authority. But within bureaucracy the
spiritualism turns into a crass materialism, the materialism of passive obedience, faith in
authority, the mechanism of fixed and formal behaviour, fixed principles, attitudes,
traditions...(In bureaucracy), the aims of the state are transformed into the aims of the
bureaus and the aims of the bureaus into the aims of the state. Bureaucracy is a circle from
which no one can escape” (Marx quoted in McLellan 1971, 68-9).

To Max Weber, the marxian circle - society, is an iron cage: “No one knows who will in this
cage in the future, or whether at the end of this tremendous development entirely new
prophets will arise, or there will be a great rebirth of old ideas and ideals, or, if neither,
mechanized petrification, embellished with a sort of convulsive self-importance. For the last
stage of this cultural development, it might well be truly said: Specialists without spirit,
sensualists without heart; this nullity imagines that it has attained a level of civilization never before achieved" (Weber (1958), 182). Bureaucracy and rationalism instrumental reason, are a threat to freedom, creativity and the very survival of Western Civilization.

The bureaucrat is either an obnoxious parasite living on society, or a formidable foe, raging at the Centre of the Labyrinth, devouring minds and resources to force feed itself into continuity. He is an incompetent subordinate - ineffective, soulless, slow, irrational and stupidly formulaic (31).

Failing to communicate with the public and their political masters, heritage bureaucrats turn to the symbols in their keep - disappearing behind the object they create and present, becoming the equivalent of a glass case or a pedestal - a stool, and claiming legitimacy for being the keepers of things that are, contrary to them, significant, evocative, instructive, powerful - fetishes.

"In the beginning is the object in a circle of light; a display case, within which lies an artfully carved ivory plaque whose wide-eyed and bearded figures (clerics), cloaked in finely modeled folds, touch the beholder in an extraordinary way. In the yellow light the thousand-year-old object appears at once archaic, fragile and invulnerable; an object that clearly speaks with power - would it move us otherwise? - but in a language that we do not understand" (Groebner 1995: 193; on the exhibition "Bernward von Hildesheim and the Ottoman Age [Hildesheim 1995]).

Bureaucrats are into reification. Heritage bureaucrats find legitimacy and power in the objects they hold ostensibly before the audience. The objects they present are powerful entities; they can instruct, entertain and inspire; they can modify behaviour in individuals and, as such, once they are recognized, foster cohesion within a fractious field. If objects can give existence to the Polity as significant symbols, objects ought to bring legitimacy to their handlers.
Part IV: the bureaucratic monument; legitimating heritage bureaucrats – fetishes
11 "Member States should undertake educational campaigns to arouse widespread public interest in, and respect for, the cultural and natural heritage. Continuing efforts should be made to inform the public about what is being and can be done to protect the cultural and natural heritage and to inculcate appreciation and respect for the values it enshrines" (UNESCO Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage 1972).

12 "Whenever appropriate, therefore, every effort should be made to acquire enough land around the sites to create a suitable buffer zone to minimize these intrusions, to preserve and enhance their historical value" (Canadian Parks Service National Historic Parks Policy 1974)

13 "Mr Parsons acknowledged that this consulting firm has no special experience with historical sites, but said he was sensitive to the need that the historical theme of Upper Canada Village not be compromised. His proposal uses landscaping and trees to buffer the site from the new attractions (baseball batting cages) to 'keep the village sacred' (Ross The Globe and Mail 07 August 1996).
Introduction; the fetish, charisma and authority

The heritage object is a fetish: " (A) Originally, any object used by the Negroes of the Guinea Coast and neighbourhood as an amulet or means of enchantment, or regarded by them with dread; (B). Anthropology: an inanimate object worshipped by savages as having magical powers or as being animated by a spirit" (Oxford English Dictionary 1933).

Fetishes come out of the bureaucrats magic box to vouch for the existence of a more significant reality: "man made products are made to appear to have been assigned a life of their own. Fetishes are people, classes, beings who seem to owe but to themselves an existence that they have been granted by social agents...those who have given them a mandate now worship their own creatures, the plus value that is seen in the political character, something that came out of man's imagination ('de la tête de l'homme'), in the original, as opposed to his side], appears as a mysterious, objective property attached to a person, a charm, a charism, the 'ministerium' [ministry] appearing as a mysterium [mystery]" (Bourdieu 1984, 49).

Fetishes designated the carved figurines Portuguese explorers and merchants of the 16th Century saw on the West African coast. These were believed to have 'feitíço' – they were made in order to make. They were man made instruments to which was attributed a supplement of power incommensurate to their material origins.

Fetishism, in Marxist sociology, consists in attributing objective reality to non existent things. It is a process that grows out of alienation, when an individual / man in society, dominated by the products of his own labour, expresses his alienation by projecting an ontological status onto objects, artefacts of ideas of his own making - idols.

"Marx believed that commodities have simple use values, are capable of satisfying human needs and serve the purpose of sustaining existence. The fetishes of commodities occurs only when commodities are believed to have powers which surpass their simple use values. In capitalism, as soon as commodities enter into a system of exchange, they appear to have values beyond their mere use... Commodities appear to have a life of their own and enter into social relations with one another, and as such appear to have human
qualities. As a direct consequences, human relations become thing-like so far as individuals confront each other as the possessors of commodities" (Morrison 1995, 314).

Submitting themselves to their idols, human beings expect tangible and intangible benefits for their compliance and piety. They are 'crushed by them'. They find satisfaction from the very act of worshipping in the expectation that, one day, worship – obsequium, will pay off (Lima 1986, 315).

The bureaucrat is a fetish maker. Fetishes, in turn, demand proper ceremonies. The cares given to the Fetish justify the caretakers' existence. The Fetish, once on display, summons up the ancestors, and the heirs. Charisma emanates from the objects the heritage bureaucrat handles; the Fetish is by itself charismatic, and, soon, the handler is expected to be recognized the same characteristics.

charisma

In Weber, charisma applies to "a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional power or qualities" (Weber [1946], 358). In Shils, charisma is shown by the deference accorded to "authoritative roles, their incumbents, and the norms they promulgate in consideration of their capacity to create, maintain, and change the order of society" (Shils 1967, 386):

" In all societies there is a propensity in most human beings, on occasion, to perceive, beyond immediate and particular events, the forces, principles, and powers which govern the immediate and the particular and which impose and necessitate an order which embraces them. Particularly serious attention and respect are given to what are thought to be those transcendent powers which are manifested in the orders of nature and society and in patterns of norms which intend the ordering of human action. Where institutions, roles, persons, norms or symbols are perceived or believed to be connected or infused with these transcendent powers, we say that they are perceived as charismatic " (Shils 1967, 386).

Charisma is the quality which is imputed to objects (persons, actions, roles, institutions, symbols and artefacts), because of their connection with ultimate, vital, order-determining powers: "this presumed connection with the ultimately 'serious' elements in the universe
and in human life is seen as a quality or a state of being, manifested in the bearing or demeanor and in the actions of individual persons: it is also seen as inhering in certain roles and collectivities” (Shils 1967, 386).

According to Weber, “the stability of social systems depends on acceptance by followers of the right of the leaders to exercise control. This implied legitimate authority; and Weber defined three types... (a): The first type is charismatic authority, according to which leaders are thought to be endowed with extraordinary, sometimes magical powers. Charisma on the part of a leader elicits obedience out of awe... (b): Second, traditional authority appertains to those who possess the right to rule by virtue of birth or class. The traditional leader is obeyed because he or members of his class or family have always been followed... (c): The third type, legal authority, applies to those who hold leadership positions because of demonstrated technical competence. Legal authorities act impersonally, as instruments of the law, and they are obeyed impersonally out of a sense of duty to the Law” (Tannenbaum 1967, 104; quoting A. Etzioni 1961, on Weber [1922]).

Bureaucrats claim legitimacy for their efficiency and effectiveness in the presentation of the Polity’s traditions, of its exemplary characters, and of its founding analogies (meanings). Deference towards the virtual fetishes proves the handlers’ dexterity and their legitimacy.

It is one of the bureaucrats’ functions to determine, with others, “what traditions will serve best the ends of a state. What past of the group experience should be systematically transmitted to the next generation... what should be emphasized, what should be glossed over, what should be suppressed, what heroes, what events, what traits are to be held up, as models for the young, and as symbols for the group. What fundamental are preeminently desirable, and what special differentials are valuable for the special group” (Merriam [1931], 1966, 169).

The following pages are divided in three parts - each one commenting on a form of heritage fetish: traditions, heroes and systems. It is while in direct contact with their fetishes that members of the public are confirmed in their status of inheritors, successors, descendants and associates in the preservation of society.
Chapter 12: the heritage fetish: tradition and heroes

Legitimacy comes to heritage bureaucrats as they claim to be the most vigilant guardians of traditions in the Polity. Heritage is tradition: "Tradition is whatever is persistent or recurrent through transmission, regardless of the substance and institutional setting. It includes orally transmitted beliefs as well as those transmitted in writing. It includes secular as well as sacred beliefs; it includes beliefs which were arrived at ratiocination and by methodical, theoretically controlled intellectual procedures as well as beliefs which were accepted without intense reflection; it includes beliefs thought to have been divinely transmitted as well as interpretations of those beliefs. It includes beliefs formed through experience" (Shils 1981, 16).

Traditionality - "the appreciation of the accomplishments and wisdom of the past and of the institutions especially impregnated with tradition, as well as the desirability of regarding pattern inherited from the past as valid guides", is a major pattern of human thought (Shils 1981, 21).

Traditional authority exists when legitimacy is claimed and believed in, on the basis of the sanctity of the order and of the attendants’ powers to control what has been handed down from the past. (Weber 1922; Parsons 1956, 341). Traditionality is "compatible with almost any substantive content. All accomplished patterns of the human mind, all patterns of belief or mode of thinking, all achieved patterns of social relationships, all technical practices, and all physical artefacts or natural objects are susceptible to becoming objects in a process of transmission: each is capable of becoming a tradition" (Shils 1981; 16)

Traditions embody a fixed truth from an authoritative source: a tradition is such because "it is received from the hands, lips, or examples of others rather than being discovered or invented; received on the assumption that the authors and transmitters are reliable and therefore the tradition valid; and received with the express command and conscious intention of further transmission without substantial change" (Vallière 1987, 1)
Tradition makes history into reason, and the past into a present aim; traditions “arise and command respect wherever the individuals seeks to relate himself to something transcendent”; they arise any time the state, putting authority, allegiance, and tradition together, wishes to make a citizen who has rights into a subject who has duties (Scruton 1990, 40).

Traditions are a set of “practices ... which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past. In fact, where possible, they normally attempt to establish continuity with a suitable past”. Traditions are established upon an analogy: “they are responses to novel situations which take the form of reference to old situations, or which establish their own past by quasi-obligatory repetition” (Hobsbawm 1983, 1-2).

Traditions, in modern societies, are invented, and formally instituted, but, for the sake of efficiency (good symbolic capitalization), they must appear not to have been: “(traditions) must be the palpable remainder of something that has flourished, and not the latest in a series of abortive starts... they must engage the loyalty of their participants, in the deep sense of moulding their idea of what they are and should be. Finally, they must point to something durable, something which survives and gives meaning to the acts that emerge from it” (Scruton 1990, 42).

The traditions that heritage bureaucrats activities maintain are the traditions of the State: “the core of the [129] national historic sites administered by Parks Canada consists of properties transferred from other federal government departments and agencies (...)....Not surprisingly... these properties bear a strong thematic relationship to traditional federal roles such as defence, public works, transportation, law enforcement, etc” (Canadian Parks Service 1994b, 52).

Heritage places celebrate institutions who, in the Nation's Past, have brought together the various geographic parts of a land, and made them into a country; have created a governing body around which individuals have learnt to become citizens; have fought to establish and preserve the Nation-State’s sovereignty, and have fostered a sense of community and common identity amongst those who happened to have been born within its limits (Jackson 1986, 39).
Visitors to heritage sites are presented the spectacle of their groups' social, economic, political and cultural institutions. The "tangible and irreplaceable links to what define a community as a nation and as a people" (Canadian Parks Service 1990, 69), most of the time, are the symbolic expressions of social institutions - "regulated principles which organize most of the activities of individuals in a new society into definite organizational patterns from the point of view of the perennial, basic problems of ordered life" (Eisenstadt 1968, 409).

At the Upper Canada Village Heritage Park (Morrisburg, On.), demonstrations of various trades and techniques teach how people in the 19th Century took care of the 'basic needs' of their society; actors playing the role of the blacksmith in his shop, the merchant in his store, the housewife in her kitchen, and the farmer in the field, are cast shadows of some main characters from Greek mythological narratives.

In the reconstructed environment of heritage sites, past members of a social group are represented telling their descendants why they are who they are, because others came before them. Others have adapted to the conditions of the natural environment, and provided for their physical needs and secured sustenance. Others have instituted their political system, and set goals for the community, sometimes defining its destiny in constitutional documents, but always securing proper resources to reach their goals. Others have solved conflicting situations with the creation of social institutions, legal norms, rules, regulations and standards. Others have established systems of beliefs, rituals, values and symbols for their descendants to be able to confront the ultimate questions about reality.

These have created a precedent, and it is in their cast shadow that their descendants are searching for their own identity. Traditions of belief are normative, "in the sense that they are intended to influence the conduct of the audience to which they are addressed, beyond the limits of assents to their factual correctness" (Shils 1981, 24).

Traditions as objects of enlightenment or attachment are also instruments of power: "it is normative transmission which links the generations of the dead with the generation of the living in the constitution of a society, [the dead] being objects of attachment, but (more significantly), their work and the norms contained in their practices (influencing) the actions
of subsequent generations to whom they are unknown ( ) The normativeness of tradition is the inertial force which holds society in a given form over time" (Shils 1981, 24-25)

The fetish handlers operate under the assumption that most of the time, most of the people will comply to what it is presented. The public will abide by bureaucrats rule - because it is explicitly wanted from them (threat or pressure applying), because others do so, because it has been done in the past, and because it can be reasonably anticipated that the repetition of similar venerable activities will carry the benefits that they have conveyed in the past (the logic of belief in a greater authority and the logic of habitus playing in the instance). What the members of a Polity have been forced or convinced into seeking (in bourdelian sociology, what authorities and followers believe in, willingly of duplicitously), is also often respected for no other reason than they are traditions.

Severing the links with the past, and debating the relevance of the contemporary order of things, would amount to pursuing personal and social catastrophe. To the heritage bureaucrats, traditions, as such, dispense from arguing legitimacy.

traditions: divisiveness

Traditions are meant to solve problems; they are supposed to shape a mass of individuals into a society. However, for the very people who stand for them, traditions are divisive.

On the one hand, bureaucrats as a power brokers from society’s Centre will hesitate to side with traditions on the ongoing Quarrel between the Ancients and the Moderns. Taking side would mean losing an opportunity to seek profitability elsewhere: bureaucrats will not want to lose the opportunity to profit from, oppose, and influence what is happening at the more innovative periphery. Bureaucrats will want to be everywhere, serving the Centre, listening to the Periphery, promoting traditions, and claiming legitimacy in reference to efficiency and ‘up-to-datedness’.

On the other, as the promoters of the past’s moral prestige - the normative continuance of established practices, beliefs and institutions, bureaucrats will have to oppose the general belief in Western societies that change, as opposed to traditions, is a moral necessity.
Modern societies believe that traditions and ancestral practices and institutions habitually need to be replaced with new, thus better ones - the inherited and the traditional suffer from a presumption of being undefendable. In this, contemporaries are heirs to the 18th Century Philosophers who regarded traditions as the causes, or the consequences of ignorance, superstition, religious intolerance, social hierarchy, and economic inequality. Modern social sciences have inherited "a skeptical attitude towards tradition and a conception of society which leaves little place for it": the 'here and now' prevails in the more systematic and theoretical social sciences.

The time dimension is being obscured by the concept of equilibrium stressing "the immediately present function of each of the variables in the system. Whatever history each of these variables possesses had been deposited in its present state; the mechanism of recurrent self-reproduction is not sought..." (Shils 1981, 7)

Traditions run counter to belief "that within each human being there is an individuality, lying in potentiality, which seeks an occasion for realization but is held in the toils of rules, beliefs, and roles which society imposes" (Shils 1981, 11); the metaphysical dread of seeing the self being encumbered by something alien to it translates into 'finding one's own identity' in one's opposition to accumulated knowledge, norms and ideals handed down by previous generations.

When pressed either to name enduring traditions or to describe a time in history when a given society abide by traditions - ("in no society could life be lived entirely under the domination of tradition; no society could survive only from the stock of objects, beliefs and patterns presented. Human beings have so much that is pressing to do in life; everyone faces some tasks to which there is not immediately available solution or where such solutions as there are leave a residue of dissatisfaction" [Shils 1981, 27]), heritage bureaucrats find convenient and reasonable to predicate either change in continuity, or change and continuity: "conformity with traditional rules is desirable but not imperative. It is a much more serious breach to infringe on the imperative of change. Change must not be resisted; it must be accepted. Even better is to seek change; best of all is to initiate it" (Shils 1981, 4).

Heritage preservation needs not to be a tactic to prevent but to guide change "so as to guard against the unnecessary damage, waste or loss, ensuring the continuity of those natural and historic elements that we cherish because they have a continuing practical
Traditions need not to be necessarily adverse to change: "as a temporal chain, a tradition is a sequence of variations on received and transmitted themes. The connectedness of the variations may consist in common themes, in the contiguity of presentation and departure, in descent from a common origin" (Shils 1981, 13).

Society needs traditions to anticipate the future - "the demands of the next century through excellence in education, adaptation, to technological change, and the social impact of changing demographics" (Ontario 1987, 24).

Rulers in society thus can profit from encouraging both traditions and change; they will "accelerate integration and cohesion in the name of necessity, efficiency and the gradual and safe management of change", but will keep control over "the good development and good stewardship of (the Polity's) resources, (enabling it to transform itself) without losing its original configuration, welcoming change without being alienated by change itself" (Ontario 1987, 14).

Heritage bureaucrats claim legitimacy for being capable of controlling the definition, the conditions and the advent of both change and traditions in society. Societies that are oblivious of traditions are bound to face "awesome difficulties (when desiring to put modern visions) into practice. The modernizers risk losing the way to the future for lack of an orientation received from the past and risk proving themselves incapable of imagining the new because they disallow analogies with the old" (Vallière 1987, 15).

Legitimacy comes to heritage bureaucrats as they associate their own functions in society with the glorious deeds of the Polity's heroes. Through heroes, heritage bureaucrats are connected to "some central feature of man's existence and the cosmos in which they live. That central feature is the source which is capable of initiating, creating, governing, transforming, maintaining or destroying 'what is vital in man's life'" (Shils 1975, 258).

In contemporary societies, plaques, cairns, paintings, postage stamps and street signs call members of the Polity to show their gratitude; they identify the creators, the initiators/inventors of socially revered institutions and the bearers of the community's distinctive traits. The history of the Nation is still presented as the sum of the extraordinary
deeds that were done ‘in illo tempore’: “In some ancient cultures, the hero was glorified as the father of a nation... among modern cultures the heroic content of historical education in the early years has remained comparatively unaffected by changing pedagogical fashions. This may be due to the dramatic effect of the story form that naturally grows up when history is treated as a succession of personal adventures. Or perhaps it reflects the simplest approach to the moralistic understanding of the child” (Hook [1943] 1955, 8-9).

These extraordinary deeds, either historical or mythical, have instituted the Polity, and the Nation, in the present, still reaps the benefits of what the ancestors fought for.

Heroes are "striking instances of virtue, enterprise, courage, and patriotism" that community members need to recreate somehow in the present the magic that was there when foundational deeds created society.

In time past, heroes have been the representatives of their descendants in events where the fate of these descendants was at stakes. Heroes represent the community in the Pantheon of Gods and demi-Gods from all nations.

In the Indo European tradition, (Dumézil 1950), heroes were given three functions; either to rule over men and represent them before the Gods (the king and high priest function); to fight on behalf of their people and represent them on the battlefield (the warrior function), or to bring wealth, prosperity and continuity in society, and trade on their behalf with foreigners (the merchant function, and the reproduction [fertility] function).

The Christian Faith was built upon four (4) heroic narratives. Late Medieval devout sought eternal life in the imitation of Jesus Christ. Renaissance scholars fetched in narratives from the Past the illustration of timeless truths and the material for effective action: knowledge of the Past helped in forestalling the Future. French Revolutionaries found in the History of the Roman Republic examples of virtue, honour, patriotism and stoicism that inspired them when shaping the future of the Nation.

In ‘Illo Tempore’, (and by analogy, in historical times), cultural heroes made the world habitable and safe, brought wealth to their people, and instructed them in the arts of civilization. Foreseeing the difficulties that scarcity, selfish expectations and incomplete socialization would mean to their descendants, cultural heroes created the conditions that
would forever save their people from extinction, indifference, apathy or, worse, assimilation into their enemies. They performed the group’s archetypal actions.

In historical narratives, the hero is a saviour of his People. Forces of evils have conspired against the People; the People has cried for help; the hero came to lead the good fight against chaos, moral decay, intellectual confusion, and political disorder. Successful, he left to other adventures or, when he staid, was put to death for his excesses. Even then, he became an example to future generations.

The historical hero comes as society goes through a legitimation crisis - political stalemate, administrative chaos, economic bankruptcy, social disorder, and military disaster. Polity members feel then alienated from their own system: their institutions seem to have fallen into the enemy’s hands. Leaders and government authorities have become foreigners to their own people.

Conversely, anytime political authorities need to ascertain their legitimacy, heroes can be made to appear and perform a preemptive action. In 1979, Charles-Michel de Salaberry has been called from the mythological past to wage war on behalf of Canadian Federalism, on the same ground (NHS 'The Battle of the Châteauguay'), where, in 1813, he had fought American invaders. In 1999, heroes from the national past are summoned by the authorities of the Canadian Museum of Civilization to restore the institution's reputation; since they once saved the country in times of great challenge, they could do the same for the story tellers threatened by the public's lack of interest.

The hero, and its handlers, give shape and substance to a cohesive vision of the collective destiny. The original hero, as a heritage fetish, is the embodiment of the general will.

What is gained in the company of heroes is a vicarious experience - a cultural capital to be enjoyed by the community, provided neither the exemplary characters it is given nor the traditions that these illustrate are discussed:

"The splendour, the power, the flame of the leader are shared imaginatively. New elements of meaning enter the lives of those who are emotionally impoverished. The everyday disparities and injustices of social life, and sometimes the lacks and incapacities of personal life, fade out of the centre of concern. The ego is enlarged without effort and without cost" (Hook [1943], 1955, 22).
"All the great group victories he shares in; all the great men are his companions in the bonds of the group; all its sorrows are by construction his; all its hopes and dreams, realized and thwarted alike, are his. And thus he becomes although of humble status a great man, a member of a great group; and his humble life is thus tinged with a glory it might not otherwise ever hope to achieve. He is lifted beyond and above himself into higher worlds where he walks with all his great ancestors, one of an illustrious group whose blood is in his veins and a reputation he proudly bears" (Merriam 1966, 167)

What is received by the people in return from vesting power in the bureaucrats, is a collection of stones and plaques staged along the roads leading to the City. From these, one can fetch one's way, (they are beacons in space), and inspiration, (they are moral benchmarks). They promise that the community is soon to be regenerated - that it can be regenerated whenever citizens take their bearings from personages who once have exorcized meaninglessness, anonymity and personal insignificance.

What is gained by bureaucrats in hero making, is an enduring power for being associated with cases of exemplarity, or with the idea of exemplarity. That is, for everyone unhappy with his own lot, the certainty that it can be changed, the hero promising the possibility of breaking away from current social order, the bureaucrat promising a better life as a trade for compliance.

The dynamic component of heritage is sitting clearly 'du côté des ancêtres' and their representatives; successors who fail to heed to their wise counsels are to be left without directions - the past providing the only logical and safe structures within which the present can be lived.

heroes and heroic institutions

The charisma which emanates from heroic characters does 'rub in' in the institutions and the people that preserve and present them: "there is an attenuated, mediated, institutionalized charismatic propensity ( ) in routine functioning of society. Thus, in society, a widespread disposition to attribute charismatic properties to ordinary secular roles, institutions, symbols and strata or aggregates of persons" (Shils 1975, 251).
Heritage bureaucrats who are in contact with the powers 'transcendent or earthly' that men perceive as ruling over their lives "become the objects of the attribution of charisma (because they are) being possessed by (these powers) in cognitive or expressive contact with them, or they are charged with their earthly objectivation" (Shils 1975, 263). The particular incumbent of the role of civil servant, administrator or judge, can be perceived as the representation of a larger centre of tremendous power.

Bureaucrats from all government spheres appear to be the privileged inheritors of cultural ancestors; they are their most direct descendants. What, once upon the time, has been brought into the community by heroic characters, is now their daily concern: bureaucrats, in government offices, define, regulate and maintain, hence create, against equally great odds, society's institutions. Bureaucrats authorize the reenactment of (ancestral) creative / foundational patterns.

Like cultural heroes, in their own time, bureaucrats bring wealth, cohesion, unity and meanings to the community. Bureaucrats, since the 19th Century, instruct and edify. Museums in the 21st Century will fulfill the same purpose (Lord; quoted in Boylan 1992, 77).

Bureaucrats, thus, could find heroes amongst themselves: "It may be harder, however, to be a hero in this cold country than anywhere else...Statues to heroes in Canada usually celebrate non-Canadians like Churchill and Bolivar. A small bronze cast of Sir Galahad by the Parliament Buildings honours not Galahad, but a public servant who drowned while attempting to save the life of a small child who had fallen through the ice. Public service, Canadian hero" (McGregor 1998, A18).

Canadians, then, are justified to seek inspiration more often in 'the natural environment, their institutions, and their collective accomplishments" (Ontario 1990, 11), than in the activities, adventures, discoveries and disappearance of (their) first creative ancestors: "It's true we have a few symbols, a beaver, a cop on a horse, a game played on ice. We lack a language that is uniquely our own, a long history, folklore or myths. One thing we've counted on in their place is a set of socially constructed institutions ....These are real not mythical entities, but they serve a reassuring function. They not only deliver TV shows, pension cheques and the mail - they give us the sense of a cohesive society" (Salutin 1995, 42).
Heroes still have to fight. In contemporary societies, they fight for their own legitimacy. Heroic gestures are "an illusion of leadership, ... the rational substitute for democratic leadership. To bypass the general complexities of the public place, technocratic expertise has been allied with the distracting excitement of leadership on horseback" (Saul 1995, 159).

There are "no present heroes, ( ) most dead ones are frauds" (Price 1978, 78): "certain emotions are apparently no longer available to us in literature, and not very much outside of it either: awe, tremendous admiration, the sort of feeling one gets for a truly great human being who touches our lives. For the most part we make about in a debris of failed hopes" (Zweig 1978, 30).

In the 20th Century, heroes have been abandoned to universal ridicule: "Important among explanations ( ) are the growth of compassion for the poor and powerless (traditional heroes being mostly highborn and powerful), the backwash of revulsion after the Great War at the patent stupidity and savagery of politicians and generals and - crucial- the steady spread by press, radio, and now television of intimate information." (Price 1978, 16).

Heroes have died a little more since God has been pronounced dead. Heroes of old have become obsolete in the dominant ideology: "Boys would be boys, would say their teachers. Not any more, now that boys are seen as mere products of a patriarchal culture that could and should be changed, and that female values are part of the dominant ideology. Boys' typical behaviour is often seen as a symptom of a 'violent' personality; and traditional male values - physical courage, competitiveness, the desire to protect one's family, stoicism and emotional reserve - are denigrated in favour of female values [compassion, verbal communication, intimacy, the display of emotions, and so on]" (Gagnon 1999, A19; on the Anniversary of the Shooting at Ecole polytechnique de Montréal).

Societies have become weary as much of their heroes as of their founding narratives. Heroism has been defiled by its association with mass media (especially video games); popular culture heroes are contemptible: "they seem like ( ) a grotesque mummery between acts of the weightier drama of real life. (They) have no maze of inner qualities that
seep into their talk and gestures, through gaps of hesitation, of failure. ( ) they strike us as partial figures, a sort of half-men who give us a playful kind of pleasure. (Narratives about them leave us with) no residue of reflection by which these enlarged personages can become alternative lives for us" (Zweig 1978, 35).

Heroic characters from the past and the present annoy bureaucrats known not to be charismatically inclined: "extraordinary individualities, powerful, ascendant, persistent, effectively expressive personalities who impose themselves on their environments by their exceptional courage, decisiveness, self-confidence, fluency, insight, energy, etc" (Shils 1975, 258). Charismatic authority "denies the value of action which is motivated by the desire for proximate ends sufficient unto themselves, by the wish to gratify personal affections, or by the hope of pecuniary advantage. Charismatically generated order is order which acknowledges and is generated by the creativity which seeks something new, by discovery which discerns something new, by inspiration from transcendent powers" (Shils 1967, 387).

Charismatic leaders and bureaucrats are fundamentally incompatible: bureaucrats are not found amongst the Prophet's disciples (Weber 1947, 243), but there is no political system that can dispense with exemplary characters. Heroes then will be embarrassing to bureaucrats - one generation paying for past celebrations of characters who have become over time politically despicable, or for shunning characters that are now politically acceptable. Louis Riel hanged in Regina (1885) for having led twice Canadian Métis into Rebellion against the Crown; his death was then celebrated in Orange Lodges throughout the Dominion. Riel is now soon to be recognized a Father of the Canadian Confederation (he made Manitoba into a Province against the will of the Crown). The actual Crown is making amend, as it seeks to mend fences with Natives and Métis groups in the Country.

There are no heroes that cannot be debunked - as there are no fallen heroes that cannot be rehabilitated. Despite opinions to the contrary, heroes do come a dime a dozen. And the very idea of heroism has become as necessary as heroes are expendable.

Historians in heritage organizations have been paid to find similarities between past and present events. But the historical trade has kept itself busy stressing differences between present and past. Heroic characters were given as examples to society because society believed in the reality of Human Nature. But exemplarity is now failing authorities since 'Human Nature' has been recognized as an ideological construct.
Cautiously, History has become a reservoir of explanations, propositions, and a collection of references against which prevailing personal experiences can be tested. The dream of a socially unanimous narrative has been disappearing for some 500 years: personal interpretations of the past are now tolerated, alternative interpretations to received narratives are produced, and, once filtered, are integrated into institutional presentations. In public, professional historians differ on the relevance of creating significant analogies, but rarely take their bureaucratic colleagues to task; in the private sphere, 'everyman' is left with the possibility to create his own meanings, as freely as 'habitus' permits.

Still, bureaucrats cultivate heroes - for the sake of political expediency. Heroes promote and support change, when change is needed; heroes promise change, especially when ruling authorities would prefer promising change than discussing change. Heroes postulate that change, either radical or progressive, is legitimate and must be taught.
Chapter 13: the heritage fetish - the system

Legitimacy comes to heritage bureaucrats as they promote the 'system' as society's founding analogy. The common language understands a system to be either an organized group of objects, or an organized set of principles and procedures. Engineers are concerned with systems as sets of technological devices. Social scientists speak of economic, political systems and social systems.

A system is "a group, set or aggregate of things, natural or artificial, forming a connected or complex whole; (when man-made objects or appliances), they are arranged or organized for some special purpose, as pulleys or other pieces of mechanism, columns or other detail of architecture, canals, railways, telegraphy" (The Oxford English Dictionary 1933; system).

The idea of 'System' permeates the heritage discourse. Canada's heritage, to the former Director of Heritage Canada is "composed of separate parts, each with its own nature and functions but each (contributing) to one reality. Heritage is holistic, and greater than the sum of its parts, it is through heritage that we know who we are, as individuals, as a community, as a region, as a nation, as citizens of the world" (Dalibard; quoted in Government of Canada 1990b, 21). The Canadian Parks Service is part of a "nation-wide family of parks, sites, protected areas and heritage programs" (Canadian Parks Service 1994a, 20). The Ontario Heritage Policy writer defines Heritage and its benefits after Parsons' definition of a Social System's sub-systems: "(heritage) is all that our society values and that survives as the living context - both natural and human, from which we derive sustenance, coherence and meaning in our individual and collective lives" (Ontario 1990a, 23).

The 'System' is the third in a series of charismatic objects that members of the Polity are made to acknowledge as significant to their being together.

The System provides lessons on how things should be interpreted - once they have happened. Faith in the System generates the belief in those who collect, classify, maintain,
and comment signs that the system, as an ordering epistemological device, borrows to manifest itself. Those who stand next to the fetish - that is, next to what is promoted, demonstrated and accepted as being the most vital and significant entity in society, are, by virtue of proximity, also attributed authority (Shils 1967, 387).

There is something mystical - mystical and mystifying about systems ( "their underlying regularities and structural uniformities which characterize the world in general" [Burrel 1979, 58] ), that makes it reasonable to believe that, for the knowledgeable, human behaviour can be as predictable as they are: "Systems Theory is not intrinsically tied to any specific view of social reality; insofar as its general positivist orientation (implies), a social world characterized by some form of order and regularities which can be captured in the notion of system" (Burrel 1979, 8).

Grand Systems Theory, Systemism, applies to bureaucracy not as a reading of reality, but as a project for society. It precedes action like the Medieval Catalogue of Vices and Virtues informed the believer as to what to expect from reality. It is how society should work - an utopia, as real as the Decalogue for those who have to apply the words of the very High, and as compelling and unfathomable for those who have to read their pronouncements. Systemism, through structuro-functionalism, came naturally to functionaries dwelling in bureaucratic structures. Functionalism, which proceeds from the idea of system, brought certainty to the beleaguered bureaucrats in search of a unifying creed.

Making a commitment to abide by the System’s ruling provides heritage bureaucrats with epistemological respectability, the density of the propositions conveniently pulling a veil over their appetite for power, their failure in finding indisputable principles and in achieving quantifiable results.

If the artefact is the main agent in the heritage field, it is mostly as the material support to a more significant reality. Identifying systems supports the desirability of a System. Writing about the System in human affairs, describing its features, is defining a cosmology, a theodicy, and an ethics.

**systems: features and characteristics**

Systems that are, in biology, parts in an animal body and, in physics, "a group of bodies moving about one another in space under some particular dynamical law, as the law of
"gravitation" (Oxford English Dictionary 1933; system), can be used analogically to define the workings of human societies. Societies operate like a system, features observed in natural environment will reappear in social groups as certainly as knowledge of whole emerges from knowledge of the parts.

All systems display the same characteristics from which all and every situations can be interpreted: all systems are to be considered as if they were living organisms: "the concept of commemorative integrity is used to describe the 'health or wholeness' of a national historic site" (Canadian Parks Service 1994a, 71).

All systems are made of all, or anyone of four components: objects, attributes, internal relationships and environment. Objects are parts, elements, or members of a system; they may be physical or abstract, or both. Attributes are the qualities or properties of the system itself and of its objects. Objects within a system establish internal relationships which imply mutuality and constraint (Littlejohn 1973, 35).

As a living entity, a system is geared towards preservation (self maintenance, and continuity). A system survives as the result of the commerce it initiates with its environment. An open system passes on and receives matter and energy from its environment, a closed system does not, and is bound to disintegration or chaos (entropy). Heritage systems are oriented towards life and growth: "the more comprehensive understanding of heritage runs directly counter to ideas of heritage as a static collection of old ideas and antiques. Like people everywhere, we are coming to see our heritage as the dynamic and ever-changing context within which we live our lives" (Ontario 1990a, 19).

Heritage systems import, transform and export human resources, ideas, knowledge and influence to and from their own 'perimeter': "(during the planification phase of its new exhibits, the Canadian Museum of Civilization needed) to develop a combination of themes and techniques which serve to interest as well as educate the visitor. Our task is to find a successful balance between evocative and educational techniques. Through a process of research, consultation and discussion, numerous issues have to be resolved before this goal can be reached. Your comments are welcome " (Ruddel 1995, 22).

Systems and subsystems are located; they have boundaries that keep changing with the flux of exchanges in the environment. The most critical transactions for a system's survival are conducted at its boundaries: "Parks Canada works with a broad range of federal,
provincial, and municipal government agencies, the private sector, groups, individuals, and Aboriginal interests to achieve mutually compatible goals and objectives. These relationships support regional integration, partnerships, cooperative arrangements, formal agreements, and open dialogues with other interested parties, including adjacent or surrounding districts and communities" (Canadian Parks Service 1994a, 19).

Systems are organized into a hierarchy. They are embedded into one another, each system being divided into a number of subsystems whose complexity level increases progressively: "All of us feel a sense of belonging to a range of communities from the most intimate - our immediate family, friends, and surroundings - onward to broader connections of neighbourhoods, city, region, province, nation and ultimately to interests and attributes we share with humanity the world over" (Ontario 1990a, 19)

Systems are goal-oriented: they are governed by their purposes. The activities of a system are controlled by its aims, the system itself appearing to be capable of some regulation of its behaviour to achieve these aims: "National identity, like the individual's identity is made up of many overlapping and inter-locking parts... These elements are not mutually exclusive. They are mutually affirming and supporting. The resonances vary and shift, but together they create circles of shared images and stories out of which identity emerges" (Writer's Union of Canada, Brief, 1991, 4; quoted in Government of Canada 1992, 1).

Systems are self-regulated and controlled organisms; coordination provides orderly and systematic articulation through priorities setting and routine. The many parts of a system must behave according to some 'proclaimed' guidelines and adapt to the environment according to the feedback it gets from it.

Systems call for coordinated and integrated activities, coordination being the addition of various devices in order to insure the functional articulation of tasks and roles, and integration, the achievement of unification through shared norms and values: "conservation must be understood to be fundamental to the social and economic life of the community and a key factor in drafting of public policy as are indication of such policy integration, heritage resources ought to be considered in all comprehensive government planning" (Ontario 1987, 3).

Systems seek to secure their own balance, (homeostasis), by sensing deviations from the norm and by correcting faults; a system must be expected to be forever at a deficit, always
seeking through its components an equilibrium that is never to be achieved - "The concept of an open system is (thus) essentially processual. Whilst a closed system must eventually obtain an equilibrium state, an open system will not. Given certain conditions, an open system may achieve a steady state, in which the system remains constant as a whole and in its phases, though there is a constant flow of the components materials. However, such a steady state is not a necessary condition of open systems" (Burrell 1979, 59).

To survive, systems must adapt and change. Advanced systems must be able to reorder themselves in response to environmental pressures. In this perspective, adaptation means either counteracting outside forces, or changing structurally to adapt to the environment: "success and ultimately the survival of a society depend on its adaptability - (on) its ability to respond to and to integrate the new without losing its natural balance and personality. This personality is a society's identity and is rooted in its natural and human heritage" (Ontario 1990, 4).

Change is secured in systems through the process of differentiation. Open systems move in the direction of differentiation and elaboration. As differentiation proceeds, it is countered by processes that bring the system together for a unified, integrated functioning: "any heritage policy must have as a central goal the reconciling of (some) conflicting interests. The tasks must be to identify the proper balance between the rights and responsibilities of the private and the public sectors" (Ontario 1987, 3).

Abiding by the System is a daily concern to every true bureaucrat who recognizes traces of it in memos from his supervisors, in ministerial communiqués, and in the Director's Season's Greetings. System Theory is the buzz that runs through an institution's informal communication System. It is never demonstrated, nor is it commented. It is accepted and recognized as 'ours'.

Man in bureaucracy follows the system in obsequium. Man in society should operate as a system does. Living "in the world", according to the bureaucrat, is a juggling act that calls for adaptation and change, balance, integration, and coordination, control and self-regulation, hierarchy and differentiation, self-preservation, continuity and change.

The 'System' suggests that human beings are of a lesser importance in social affairs. The System entices individuals into doing according to what was once, and should endure. The present state of affairs, however unstable it is, in its perpetual search for equilibrium,
is to be understood as the result of a long process of adjustment - a covenant negotiated at various levels, daily, which is shaped by Nature, and that must be upheld. Those who know the Covenant are given to pursue research on the Nature of things, apply their research to their discipline, and teach their findings for others to benefit from.

What is predicated in systems, what is demonstrated, is what must be addressed by individuals, as a matter of survival in societies.

Systems Theory comes to be universally compelling and all encompassing; it simplifies into the obvious the relations interpreters and rulers maintain with those subjected to their rules and teachings. It is self referential.

system and conservatism

Social systems render less interesting the analysis of specific causes that could challenge the received understanding of an actual state of affairs. They also will render less useful the search for alternatives; there can be no alternatives but those negotiated according to the System, within the System, or with its most remarkable representatives: "a nation is an organization or organism, and every break in the continuity of its life is injurious. In vain have been the thoughts, the wisdom and the sacrifices of our fathers... unless we take the trouble to understand the principles on which they acted. Especially when clouds overhand our future, is there the greater need to look to the past for light. If we do so, ( ), we shall find that, notwithstanding differences in circumstances, the identity of principles may easily be discerned" (Berger 1970, 96; quoting Grant 1892).

Systems confirm conservators, curators, interpreters in their conservative views. Since social phenomena are said to be contributing in some way to the survival of society, it follows that they cannot be subjected to any fundamental criticism. Their very existence suggests they meet a need. While it is possible that some social phenomena may act temporarily in a dysfunctional way (soon to be rectified), the fundamental principles by which the system works are not to be questioned. The existing structure (the status quo), is functional and should not be tampered with.

Systems are about order. Essentially, as systems go, there is but one 'message' to come out of a site, a national heritage system (nature and historic sites), or out of the World
Heritage system: it is that order can be found under the sun, and should be sought beyond the disorder of things.

The order of the system is the bureaucrat’s dream of society - an uneasy one, since no Prima Causa can be found in human affairs: “Parsons’ model of social life, with its emphasis on equilibrium, balanced exchange and functional relationships, cannot make sense of social change and conflict. (It was) likened to a literary Utopia, a vision of a perfectly good or perfectly bad society, a world of balance, with no sense of history and without any source of change inside the society” (Craib 1992, 50).

Despite evidence to the contrary, because evidence to the contrary, because there is evidence of an abhorrent alternative, it is propitious and pious to teach the necessity of order, and demonstrate the feasibility of order in the Cosmos.

**system as a legitimation device**

A system, in the heritage field, refers both to an organized connected group of objects, and to a set of principles that must be followed when performing professional and administrative duties.

Bureaucrats fullfil their functions systematically, according to an ‘organized system’ that ensures regularity and method in the provision of services; bureaucrats perform their duties while following some orderly and regular sets of procedures. Bureaucrats make sense of the field they occupy by acting systematically and creating systems.


The Systems Plan followed the administrative lead of the National Parks Program which had divided Canada into 48 natural regions (1971).

In the words of its makers, the Systems Plan was to be ‘a general guide to the systematic establishment’ of new national historic sites; it was ‘to assist’ the Historic Sites and Monuments Board ‘in identifying’ ‘potential sites and research priorities’ for ‘future initiatives’. The Plan was ‘to correlate’ the major themes of Canadian History with surviving cultural resources (Swannack 1979, Introduction).
The Plan was a Thematic framework, a system broken into parts: divisions, categories, components, themes and sub-themes, that was believed to be "sufficiently comprehensive to capture almost every conceivable fact of Canadian History" (Swannack 1979, Introduction). Following the Parsons' social system model, the grid was divided into three main sectors - social, economic, and political history, and ultimately split into 339 components, (35).

The Systems Planning Process created collections - a collection of themes and subthemes; a collection of sites and material remnants; a collection of procedures to help define priorities and feasibility; a collection of historic sites to be acquired and vested in the Canadian Parks Systems, and a collection of sites that had been granted national significance.

As a managerial tool for the Minister and the Board, the Plan was meant to bring orderliness and rationality into the selection of National Historic sites. The process, until then, had been 'too reactive', and open to dubious practices - too often, the Board had been "dumped" federal properties that, once obsolete, had not found a buyer; the Board's political masters had been pressured into declaring a place a national historic site after listening to self interested local personalities. As a consequence of the Board's lack of proactiveness, there were gaps to fill in the collections.

The Plan came with its legitimating analogy: "It might be helpful to visualize history as a ball of string created by knotting together varying lengths of individual strings - the knots and individual lengths representing events and processes and the entire ball as the interwoven, steadily expanding sphere of history through time. The framework can then be seen as a kind of X-ray machine that helps to explain the internal structure of that sphere" (Swannack 1979, 2). The ball of strings was a modern version of the metal sphere that medieval rulers held in their hand to symbolize the fullness and completeness of their power.

The Plan came with a disclaimer. The Thematic Framework was only "an essentially sensible and comprehensible classification system" (Swannack 1979, 17). But the Plan would bring back validity, accuracy and reliability to the selection process.
The Plan would provide politicians and heritage managers with a tool to fend off unreasonable, self-serving or unsolicited requests. The grid was nothing more than an evaluation tool - the final decision remaining with the political representatives, subject to proper resources. The Plan was not to be "a statement of Canada's History".

Both Systems Plan and Thematic Framework were organic documents, whose components would grow, as societies do become progressively differentiated (fine tuning / structure), and would have to be balanced: "the Framework ...will continue to change and evolve to meet problems in application and to reflect advances in knowledge and historical interpretation. It is therefore unwise to spend great amounts of time in 'perfecting' a document that is inherently imperfect - that 'perfection' is in the eye of the beholder and not something inherent in the thing itself. The Task Force makes no claim as to the 'truth' of the framework organization, nor does it feel that what was produced is the only or best way to look at history" (Swannack 1979, 3-4).

The System's grid was arbitrary - as a consequence of disorganization in the Academic community: "In dealing with classification systems pertaining to human history, the Task Force recognized that there were no accepted and uniform points-of-view within the academic and non-academic communities in the historical discipline. There are many theoretical biases - there is no 'unified field theory' in the social sciences and historical disciplines. The Task Force was therefore faced with making 'arbitrary' decisions toward producing a classification system for systems planning application for National Historic parks - recognizing that there would be serious problems in attaining agreement. For the reasons outlined above, the Task Force felt that it was best to make a stab at it in the interests of getting on with the job while leaving to the future its major revisions." (Swannack 1979, 4). The Task Force believed that it should pursue its work despite intimations that they were failing logic and acquired knowledge.

The Systems Plan instituted an integrated, federalist perspective on Canadian History; it vouched for the fact that there was such things as 'Canadian History', 'Canadian Heritage' and a Canadian People which needed to fill its Destiny. It provided the national community with the ultimate rationalization - a logical narrative of its past, a collection of facts and places that made sense. The Plan and its Grid were a demonstration to the Country and the World that there was such a thing as the Canadian Nation, since it could be broken into and displayed within an objective/objectifying grid. Without that grid, the sequence of
events vested in the institutional past would be nothing more than rare, unusual and awe inspiring events.

naturalization

The System Grid was established to be a companion piece to the existing National Parks Systems Plan which divided the Canadian Polity into ecological systems. With the advent of the Historic Systems Plan, scientific principles applying to the selection of natural parks were "loaned" to the Historic Sites Program, and granted to a socially constructed narrative the legitimacy of scientific methodology.

In a country where the volume of good feelings generated by Nature (Mater et Providentia) outweighs the mass of ill will created by two cultures cohabiting, bureaucrats had found it extremely sensible to anchor their careers to the steadier ground of national (natural) parks, and to blend two different realities into a new serviceable definition. Under the rational manager, 'History' and 'Nature' were to become 'Heritage', the former benefiting from the intrinsic political neutrality attributed to the latter.

Within the Canadian federal bureaucracy, the same managerial staff could administer scientifically and rationally either Historic Sites or National Parks abiding by the same administrative regulations and obeying the same set of principles. The blurring of the two realms, originating in the UNESCO's 1972 Recommendations on National Heritage, was confirmed with the transfer of Historic Sites and National Parks to the Department of the Environment - or when managers from the National Parks Program were sent to guide the bad people from the Interpretation Services in Historic Sites.

Bureaucrats preferred Nature over History as a legitimating referent: "every established order tends to produce the naturalization of its own arbitrariness ( ) Schemes of thought and perceptions can produce the objectivity that they do produce only by producing misrecognition of the limits of the recognition that they make possible... merely founding immediate adherence ... to the world of tradition, experienced as a 'natural world' and as a natural world and as taken for granted" (Parmentier 1989, 281; quoting Bourdieu 1977, 164-167).

"Federalism, shaped by 124 years of living together in Canada, has nurtured our sense of community, our diversity within unity. No traveller to Canada fails to be struck by our great
size and by the diversity of our climate, geography and peoples. Canada is an island in three oceans, mountains, prairies, rich farmland and orchards, fishing village, wilderness and tundra, resource and industrial towns and cosmopolitan cities. How could the architects of Canada have imagined any form of political organization other than federalism. The provinces, territories and regions of Canada are all different. Federalism respect this diversity. Like our rich and varied country, federalism itself can be diverse and conducive to many ways of life" (Report from the Committee for Canadian Unity 1991).

Reference to Nature grounded arbitrary, constructed principles in some supra-historical, transcendent, natural reality. Through naturalization, heritage bureaucrats would stand a chance of achieving their purpose - taking an object, a situation, a character out of the realm of the ordinary and, as expected, turning it into a resource, making it a powerful entity and presenting it "as being objective rather than socially constituted, invariant rather than malleable, autonomous rather than historical, universal rather than relative and necessary rather than contingent" (Parmentier 1989, 280).

Naturalization, as a political process, discredits alternatives or less amenable values: "Ecologist concerned to articulate conceptions of equilibrium, ...as properties of the natural world, have reflected as much about the human search for permanence and security as the quest for an accurate and neutral description or theorization of ecological processes. And the idea of harmony with nature not as a human desire but as a nature-imposed necessity likewise smacks of the view that to be natural is to be harmonious rather than conflictual and contradictory both of which are quickly dubbed as artificial, the result of 'disturbance' and the like. We have loaded upon nature... in our science as in our poetry, much of the alternative desire for value to that implied by money" (Harvey 1996, 163).

Through naturalization, bureaucrats could be perceived as the necessary keepers of social structures and biological phenomena, both appearing as timeless, universal, invariable, and 'genetic'. (O'Sullivan 1983, on naturalization).

The Bureaucrat, trustee and steward of all things material and immaterial, quietly rules at the Centre of an all encompassing system - from which their keep, the public, learns who they "are as individuals, as a community, as a region, as a nation, as citizens of the world" (Dalibard; quoted in Government of Canada 1990b, 21).
Critics persisted despite calls to Reason and metaphor. As civil servants, heritage bureaucrats are tainted by their association with ‘the obverse side of political power: “every personal injustice experience in the political association rankles the soul - the brutal word, the cruel blow, the lie of the government, the penetrating stench of fraud and its acrid taste, injustice, arbitrary inflexibility, and arrogance, stupid, silly adherence to the ways of the past, the disgusting impotence of authority... (Merriam 1966, 137; on the shame of power).

Heritage bureaucrats, as such, are considered self-serving, obsequious and venal: "They talk marketing jargon and managerese, all about mandates, mission statements, repositioning, and learning curves. They claim they live in the 'real world'( ) They shift opinions with ease: when national unity is in fashion they are national-unity fanatics, and when cultural diversity is important they are passionately devoted to cultural diversity. They're quick to fire those who don't fit the current mandate, ( ) they love reproducing themselves and (they) can't believe that anyone does not want to be like them ( ). They live lives of manic futility" (Fulford 1994: C1).

They have been abusing their privilege: “First I described the museum as an acquisitor gathering up the material evidence of the Creation and man’s creativity, but creating nothing itself except a new content; an acquisitor giving arbitrary meanings to whatever came to hand that would validate the acquisitor’s established values. I also described the museum’s historic role in parading the spoils of war, in representing other cultures in ways that reinforced the museum’s ideals of racial and cultural superiority, and I accused the museum of being biased within its own society in matters of gender, religion, ethnicity and class as it has been in the representation of the so-called ‘other’ “ (Cameron 1993, 166).

Strangely for the main characters on the Heritage stage, bureaucrats are expected to leave little behind their passage: “the labour of some of the most respectable orders in the society is, like that of menial servants, unproductive of any value’, says Adam Smith and ranks among them, ‘the whole army and navy’, the ‘servants of the public’, and the liberal professions, such as ‘churchmen, physicians, men of letters of all kinds”. Their work, ‘like the declamation of the actors, the harangue of the orator, or the tune of the musician,...
perishes in the very instant of its production" (Adam Smith The Wealth of the Nations, I: 295-6; quoted in Arendt 1965, 93).

Heritage has lost "its power as a broad cultural metaphor, (and) the historic environment has become an exclusive enclave, no longer figuring in discussions of current issues nor in a collective vision for a better future)".

Heritage "has been relegated to increasingly conventional spheres of meaning ( ), (to) patriotism and generalized pride in our forebears. (It does not) "relate to most people's private, everyday worlds, (and) appears detached from what really matters. (It) is not part of family, learning or life". Historic environments have been "relegated to the periphery, (and belong) to the marginal areas of recreation, a superficial form of tourism, a mild curiosity" (National Trust [U.S.A.] 1987, 4).

The bureaucrat has played the field according to the rules. But since the field may be a place where nothing happens in a civilized manner, he has sought refuge in rules and regulations which he can control.

Because the game played in the field is essentially a display, a representation - the bureaucrat acted as if everyone believed that there was a need for one interpreter and one audience - the audience being provided with the opportunity to dissent privately, the interpreter securing his own survival under the bright lights by claiming that 'it might only be theatre', that he is only the representative of the 'author', that he has had a bad performance, but that he will not be faulted for the short-sightedness and the avarice of those he represents. In a cul-de-sac, the heritage bureaucrat returns to the institutional scenario.

His function wants him to present significant artefacts, events, ideas for the instruction of the public. These 'objects' are powerful entities - about which everyone want to forget that they are man-made. To preserve his privileges, the bureaucrat will disappear behind the authority of the text - the narrative in historic narratives and in the various objects that he puts on stage.

Legitimacy comes to the heritage bureaucrat for being capable of holding for everyone to see ostensibly the significant, meaningful entities whose presence is necessary for the Polity to be and to endure. The bureaucrat has become the representative of the resources
he holds before the Assembly. He is the servant of the fetishes he holds before the Polity on behalf of its Ancestors, the Gods of the Polity, and the caretaker of the Signs they left behind that their successors 'endure': bureaucrats, the deft handlers of instrumental rationality, come as nothing but the instruments of higher authorities.

They come as messengers of the Gods: "Sometimes, God speaks to the Masses, sometimes He speaks to the individuals, and sometimes he visits an interpreter" (Ontario Art Gallery. Poster - The Courtauld Collection at the AGO [1998]).

They speak in tongues: "But once managers buy into an overarching management theory, (one, moreover, that is a continuation of ancient Chinese or Greek wisdom, they begin the process of rationalizing their deprivation. They write 'mission statements', implying that they have been sent here from another world to accomplish something; they attend endless retreats and seminars where they learn a new cultic form of English that uses nouns as verbs and otherwise subverts normal syntax, making it fully intelligible only to the initiated; and, finally, they commit themselves to the eternal pursuit of "Total Quality', or whatever buzzword is at the centre of the system they have embraced" (Rutkowski 1994, A18).

Bureaucrats, cartographers of infinity: "It is impossible to imagine a human life without a map or blueprint as to how the cosmos is organized, what makes it related, and how humans fit in it. Whether this map will be produced by science or politics or a revamped version of an old religion, the attempt to realize the integration will be essentially 'religious' even if couched in scientific terminology, because it will have to represent through signs a set of relationships that probably will never be completely exhausted", (Csenkmihaily 1981, 42)

Bureaucrats, spinners of sacred narratives: "Common to all human communities over time and space is the attempt to articulate social experience and to order social life by the shared experience of a narrative; human communities will inevitably authorize persons to ritualize and storify their integrating myths; to preserve, interpret, and teach the current relevance of their sacred writings; to connect the past with the present and the future" (Rice 1987, 494; on preaching).

Bureaucrats, fetish makers: "I use the word narrative as a synonym for god... It is the purpose of such figures or images to direct one's mind to an idea and, more to my point, to
a story - not any kind of story, but one that tells of origins and envisions a future, a story that constructs ideals, prescribes rules of conduct, provides a source of authority, and, above all, gives a sense of continuity and purpose. A god, in the sense I am using the word, is the name of a greater narrative, one that has sufficient credibility, complexity, and symbolic power in the to enable one to organize one's life around it ... There are gods that serve, as well as gods to serve" (Postman 1996; 6-7).

In the last chapter, the writer has described the bureaucrats' attempt to gain legitimacy with claims of efficiency and effectiveness (his usefulness to society, and the fair redistribution of his production being implicit). To achieve these goals, bureaucrats have 'created' 'objects', and entified/reified the relations they had with other human beings. Acting as representatives of members in the community, bureaucrats have created the heritage object, a stage upon which to make them ostensible and the audience. Before the audience, he has staged fetishes of his own making: traditions, heroes and systems that were meant to provide him with legitimacy.

In the following pages, the writer examines how the process of sacralization is set into gear as bureaucrats put themselves without reach of their critics, and return to the stage as makers of sacred things (material evidences left by the ancestors), sacred narratives (myths), sacred places, and providers of sacred experience.
Part V: legitimating the heritage bureaucrat - the religious analogy
"Sometimes, God Speaks to the Masses. Sometimes, He Speaks to the individual. And sometimes, He uses an interpreter." (Poster, Courtauld Exhibition at the Art Gallery of Ontario, 1998).

"We are tellers of tales. We each seek to provide our scattered and often confusing experiences with a sense of coherence by arranging the episodes of our lives into stories. This is not the stuff of delusion or self-deception. We are not telling ourselves lies. Rather through our personal myths, each of us discovers what is true and what is meaningful in life. In order to live well, with unity and purpose, we compose a heroic narrative of the self that illustrates essential truth about ourselves. Enduring human truths still reside primarily in myth as they have for centuries" (reference lost – probably from MacAdams 1993, 1).

"Life on earth is a pilgrimage. Through its fleeting days, months and years, it brings men closer to their Father's eternal Home... Dear Saint Anne, you have inspired your Beauvрей pilgrims to believe more deeply in God's loving designs on them, in the meaning and value of life's fleeting years and of all earthly miseries. They have been endowed with the strength to carry their crosses with patience, even with joyful resignation. You have taught us to meet the outpouring of God's love with loving response " (Lefebvre, Saint Anne de Beauvрей Prayer Book, 1963).
Introduction: heritage commemoration as a religious function

It is in the company of associates, preachers and educators of all tenures, that heritage bureaucrats teach the rules by which the character of their society is maintained eternally. Dedicated to the perpetuation of social order and the teaching of symbolic knowledge after which a social group takes its identity, they are tasked to produce society's integrative rituals and promote the values that keep its members interacting over time and space.

Heritage bureaucrats have made the most of Durkheim's arguments that - the sacred is the social carried to the "highest point of categorical imperative in the lives of individuals", (and that) the social is at bottom distinguishable but not separable [from the sacred]" (Nisbet 1967, 243; quoting Durkheim 1912).

Religion to Durkheim was, above all, a system of ideas by which individuals represent the society they belong to. However 'metaphorical' and symbolic it may be, their representations were not unfaithful. Religion helped to interpret or 'represent' social realities by means of their projection in a special symbolic language. Mythologies made connection between things in order to fix their internal relations, to classify and to systematize them. They represented reality, as faithfully as sciences did. The function of religion was ultimately social integration, which is effected by 'constantly producing and reproducing the soul of the collectivity and of individuals' Symbolism is the very condition of social life; symbols helped social communication to become communion - the fusion of all particular sentiments into one common sentiment.

The connection between political authority and religious power is habitual in organized religion. The privilege granted to secular rulers in primitive societies of presiding over communication between the body politic and the idealized clan (the assembly of ancestors as the ultimate sources of values), in contemporary secular societies, is acknowledged in heritage places - "the prevailing political order being sacralized because civil society wishes to confirm its needs of being eternal and its repugnance towards chaos - to be considered as a sign of its own possible death" (Balandier 1967, 119).

"In any case, man's knowledge is finite, incomplete and, in the final analysis, only man's. The wisdom of the gods, however, can be infinite and all-embracing and may be vested
with authority even beyond man's power to comprehend, Hence the acceptance of religious authority makes an end to doubt and question and provides a stable and enduring source of validation of group norms - a justification for them and their primacy" (Bredemeir 1962, 286).

Commemoration, (in the English language [1599] to signify - to make mention of, to mention as worthy of remembrance; to celebrate in speech or writing; to call to remembrance by some solemnity or celebration), comes from the Latin [commemoratio] that gave to the French [commémoration] (1262), and [commémoraison] - mention made of a saint on a more solemn celebration when his anniversary is superseded by a more important event, (1386), or the mention of a departed soul from the congregation.

Bourdieu, taking after Rheims (1959), recognized the analogy with religion as being the very foundation of the field: 'in these sacred places of art... everything leads to the conclusion that the world of art opposes itself to the world of everyday life just as the sacred does to the profane; the untouchability of objects, the religious silence which imposes itself on visitors, the puritan asceticism of the amenities, always spare and rather uncomfortable, the quasi-systematic absence of any information, the grandiose solemnity of decor and decorum... all seem to serve as reminders that the transition from the profane to the sacred world implies, as Durkheim says, 'a veritable metamorphosis', a radical transformation of the mind, that the establishment of relations between two worlds 'is always a delicate operation in itself, demanding great precautions and a more or less complicated initiation' (Bourdieu & Darbel [1966] 1990, 112).

A strong smell of liturgical incense lingers over the field. The use of analogy as a legitimating device for heritage follows an ancient theological practice: “The entire vocabulary of religion is based upon the perception of analogies between the material and the spiritual worlds. Words which now bear an immaterial and spiritual significance were originally used to denote visible and tangible objects... The innermost secret of religion is still put into speech by means of the analogy of fatherhood “ (Joyce 1908, 416).

The association with religious practices is still deemed to be profitable - especially when secularization feeds in society yearnings for a time when signs were convincing and authorities were obeyed: “The Church covered the range of the past, the present and the future; could invoke the aid of tradition on the one hand and the treasures of hope and faith on the other; was able to employ the hope of heaven and the fear of hell. The ecclesiastical
agencies were able to appeal to the highest forms of personal allegiance to God and lesser forms of divinity, to saints and fathers of the most illustrious line of descent." (Merriam 1966, 95-96).

Canadian interpreters have entered in the analogy game almost naturally: at Head-Smashed-In-Buffalo-Jump World Heritage Site (Ab), at Sainte-Marie-des-Hurons (Middland, On.), at Petroglyphs Park (Peterborough, On), where a cathedral-like structure protects ancient Native engravings as a monument to both the artistic ability of Algonkians shamans (AD 900-1400), and to the benevolence of scientists from the Canadian Conservation Institute who helped preserve their work: "You are entering a sacred place. Given the nature of some of the figures anthropologists have suggested that some of the petroglyphs may have been carved by medicine and holy men called shamans. Today these mysterious images are being treated as irreplaceable works of art, of which much has yet to be understood. As such they should be treated with reverence and respect" (Interpretive Sign, Peterborough 1991); at the N.H.S. The Battle of the Châteauguay (Howick, Qc), where the heritage planner has represented Charles-Michel de Salaberry surrounded by representations of imaginary and historical figures in the same manner that Christ appears in Parousia on the walls of the Sistine Chapel.

The Canadian Parks Service wants the public to believe that "some cultural places evoke an aura or spirit 'that speaks directly to visitors' (without) minimal interpretive support" (Canadian Parks Service 1994, 113). Past and present museum curators want to believe, like their Victorian predecessors, that: "objects expressed the spirit of the people that made and used them... museum artefacts seemed to actually contain abstract moral qualities that would be self-evident in their appearance. The physical nature of artefacts was merely a reflection of their spiritual nature. By exhibiting the best products of human civilization museums would convey those vital qualities to the public. Since the important lessons were thought to be in the objects themselves, no further explanations were really necessary" (Ettema 1987, 66).

profits from sacralization

References to religion brings to secular institutions the legitimating glow of the sacred. It gives secular ideas and norms a sense of 'rightness' that can fend off doubt as to the legitimacy of those who define norms: "The division of forces and things into the sacred and profane lends to the former a quality of stability and primacy that protects them from an
instrumental attitude. To challenge, question or alter the sacred is a profanation that frequently is defined as a vile heresy and may bring down upon one's head the wrath of the group or the gods themselves. Because there is a certain contagion to the sacred, this inviolability may extend to embrace a wide range of objects and beliefs and, man made patterns that may thus be maintained by protecting them against rational analysis of their validity or consequences" (Bredemeir 1962, 287).

The analogy profits bureaucrats as they are vested with the authority that the faithful recognize in their priests. In it, they find an alternative to empirical evidence, analytical management and epistemological objectivity that they could not sustain otherwise. Bureaucrats stand above and beyond the restrictions of everyday reality.

Heritage bureaucrats still are given to be amongst the most prominent of those "legitimised specialists" who perform the ceremonies of what American sociology called "civic religion": "there (is), differentiated from the churches, an elaborate and well institutionalized civil religion in America... This religion dimension has its own seriousness and integrity, and requires the same care in understanding any other religion does. It is genuinely American and genuinely new. It has its own prophets and its own martyrs, its own sacred events and sacred places, its own solemn ritual and symbols. It is concerned that America be a society as perfectly in accord with the will of God as men can make it, and a light to all nations" (Bellah, 1975). Heritage bureaucrats act in the field as "institutionalized surrogates" for traditional ones (priests), serving public values through rituals taking place in sacralized public spaces " (Allcock 1988, 41).

The heritage bureaucrat is a trustee who becomes a delegate. He represents the ancestors in the society of their living descendants; he stands before the ancestors as a substitute for the members of the community. The experience he puts community to is a vicarious experience: "the underlying design of that experience is to set up a group of the living, the dead, and those who are yet unborn, a group of which the individual finds himself a part of which he is in fact glad to count himself a member, and by virtue of that fact an individual of no mean importance in the world" (Merriam 1966, 166).

It is built upon the shared and implicit belief that the group has existed in perpetuity from generation to generation; that an unbroken link has endured over generations within the group; that the idea of ancestors is still influential in the group. It is believed that the quick and the dead should be in constant interaction with one another: that the living are being
charged with the maintenance of ancestral traditions, society's survival (or individual success and failure in society), depending on abiding by these traditions.

Legitimacy comes to heritage when bureaucrats set themselves in a position where they are compared to priests, where their objects are treated like relics, where the heritage celebrations they stage are organized like ceremonies or rituals, and where the narratives they write become myths.
Chapter 14: heritage and religion - the founding analogy

Viewed as analogous (comparable) cultural systems, religion and heritage differ only by virtue of religion referring to superhuman beings. Their respective components are acquired through similar enculturation processes. Heritage bureaucrats - as well as their critics, treat heritage as if it were a functional equivalent of religion. Traces of this, as if they were prayers, are found in official pronouncements.

Heritage ceremonies, pageants and civic rites, including visits to cultural sites, take after religious ceremonies; the latter being used as matrices to the former: "Not only do they employ the same processes as the real drama, but they also pursue an end of the same sort; being foreign to all utilitarian ends, they make men forget the real world and transport them into another where their imagination is more at ease; they distract. They sometimes even go as far as to have the outward appearance of a recreation: the assistants may be seen laughing and amusing themselves openly" (Nisbett 1966, 250; quoting Durkheim 1912).

Heritage, like religion, generates beliefs - an enduring organization of cognition(s) about one or more aspects of the past and present of society: these beliefs are normative. Heritage stages rituals: these rituals are mostly a collective business, and promote values which are prescriptive: "the long-term success of efforts to commemorate, protect and present Canada's natural and cultural heritage depends on the ability of all Canadians to understand and appreciate this heritage and to personally adopt practices which are sensitive to heritage and environment"; (as a consequence of experience and knowledge interacting, heritage values) "will be increasingly recognized as part of a nationally unifying ethic" (Canadian Parks Service 1994a, 17).

Heritage narratives provide members of society with a belief system that explains situations that otherwise would be meaningless. Like religion, Heritage holds the promise of either escaping the common fate of all creatures, being recompensed with wealth, cohesion, unity and meanings, or being offered solace (support, conciliation, reconciliation). Like religion, Heritage provides alternative dreamscape and refuge from real life - unequal life-fates, frustration, finitude, moral or social suffering. Through Heritage, even fleetingly, the
individual can hope to transcend everyday life and break away from the limiting circumstances of personal experience.

Heritage clerics, like their counterparts, manage a system of expressive symbols, the presentation of which is intended to create a sense of community: "The emotive values of pride, distinction and sense of place are a part of the very essence of our national identity as well as being part of the Department trust" (Canadian Parks Service 1990a, 10).

Heritage is presented as making the 'here and now' meaningful, fitting it into the context of an existence which is promised to be continued beyond the present. Heritage provides a sense of identity with the past and continuity into the future. It expands the reach of individuality by making individuals significant in the universe and the universe significant to individuals: "The parks of this country are more than the sum of their trees and bears... They are the raw material from which we have shaped much of our lives today. They are the optimist's definitive answer to the world-weary question: 'Is that all there is" (McMillan, Minister of the Environment, Banff 1985; on national parks).

Through heritage, personal identity, is shaped by the beliefs and values prevailing in society. Learning about these values and beliefs ensures stability and order: "The peace and sense of renewal we feel in wandering through a forest, along a mountain path or beside a surging sea encourage us to want to share these experiences with our children. The sense of wonder and reverence we feel as we learn about the past human activities that laid the foundation of our country stimulate a profound concern for ensuring the survival of historic places, artefacts and structures" (Dupuy, Minister of Canadian Heritage; Canadian Parks Service 1994, 6).

**the making of heritage sacredness**

Legitimacy comes to heritage bureaucrats as they stand in the service of things declared to be sacred. These objects - places, things, narratives, activities, are said to be radically different from those in use in ordinary life. They are "significant", "irreplaceable", and "valued" (Canadian Parks Service 1990a, 100).

Bureaucrats act as 'sacerdotes' and 'sacrificantes': they confer sacredness to objects, and spend the community's wealth to please a powerful entity - the worshippers' participation
consisting in giving up, denying, even destroying what they value the most. Heritage calls for sacrifices, but promises returns.

It is one of the fundamental facts of civilisation, according to Durkheim (1912), that all things material and immaterial are divided in two mutually exclusive domain - that of the sacred, and that of the profane. The sacred must be understood as the ultimate structure of the universe, symbolized either in certain sacred principles, or in man made objects treated as if they were God given. Religion creates a "category of objects, values or rituals that cannot be questioned; they are sacred. Profane things are just ordinary - they can be argued about and used without much care, but sacred things are special. Whether they are, stones or cows or human beings, or ideas, the sacred things are beyond ordinary reach" (Brown 1981, 30).

Man's relation to the sacred is ambivalent; "it is sometimes one of awe, or love, or measured dread; other times, (it is) one of ease and pleasure" (Nisbet 1967, 244). The sacred is ambiguous in that it is both material and immaterial, human and cosmic, positive and negative, attractive and repugnant, helpful and dangerous to men. The sacred is necessarily providential to those who proceed humbly towards sacred places; it is dangerous to those who are disrespectful to the power inherent in numinous objects.

Sacredness, in heritage resources, is a matter of legislation: "any place declared to be of national historic interest or significance by the Minister of the Environment, acting under the authority of the Historic Sites and Monuments Act, including buildings or structures of national interest..., lands set aside in accordance with the National Parks Act" (Canadian Parks Service 1990a, 115).

Sacredness in heritage entities is a matter of location: (whenever possible, visitors to National Historic parks and Sites should "not be distracted from appreciation of the historic environment ( ) by the obvious or violent intrusion of modern developments ( ). Where appropriate, therefore, every effort should be made to acquire enough land around a park or site to create a suitable buffer zone to minimize these intrusions..., to preserve and enhance their historical value" (Canadian Parks Service 1974a: Buffer Zones).

It is a matter of expertise: proper rituals have to be performed either to facilitate the transfer of objects from the indistinct into the distinctive, to preserve the power immanent in sacred objects from withering away when in contact with the profane, or when displayed to
the whole assembly. Society's sacralia are so dangerously powerful that curators need literally white gloves and "white" words when speaking about or handling them).

Sacredness is a matter of piety: sacredness conferred to heritage objects is made manifest by the attention shown to their identification, selection and designation: "Trustees are obliged to act in ways that best ensure the continued survival of the resource, with minimum deterioration"; "respectful, preventive and continuing maintenance will form an indispensable part of cultural resource management" (Canadian Parks Service 1994a, 103).

Sacredness in heritage resources is a matter of power contained and revealed: sacred objects are expected to be instrumental in providing sustenance, coherence and meaning in individual and collective lives. As religious relics, they once have performed "miracles of various kinds; they have been used to ward off evil, to effectuate cures, and to ensure the prosperity of individuals, cities and even nations; they have legitimized the rules of kings and emperors; they have helped spread and popularize religion; they have been bought, stolen, traded, and fought over, and have held social, economic, and political importance" (Strong 1987, 281).

Power in heritage objects is a matter of contamination: there is more than common sense in the recommendations that monuments and plaques be "erected at a place that is not closely associated with what is being commemorated" (Canadian Parks Service 1990a, 72), and that commemorative activities not take place on a site that does not "include significant resources related directly to the purpose for which the site is being commemorated" (Canadian Parks Service 1990a, 74).

When treated as relics, heritage objects are presented as being charged with significance, force, virtue or mana, which are transferrable. The power of a heritage object expands from one part to the whole object, from a period in time to another, from the material to the symbolic, from the natural to the cultural, from one element of a system to its whole, from the celebrants of heritage liturgies to the audience, and from the audience to the extended community.

Sacredness in heritage objects is made patent by the attraction it exercises over the faithful drawn to the hallowed ground (Canadian Parks Service 1990a, 10). That source of power is not inexhaustible: familiarity defiles the sacred, and unsupervised contact with the
profane sets the sacred back to insignificance. Sacredness, in heritage objects, is thus a matter of preservation of the resource against any object, agent or activity, that could threaten its physical and commemorative integrity. Sacralization is a matter of proscriptions and prescriptions.

Prescriptions and proscriptions are the belief and ethical dimension of heritage. They build the wall that separates what is sacred from what is 'not/sacred'. They set the conditions for heritage worshippers to be allowed in the presence of the fetish. They call for a sacrifice of material, intellectual and social rights, to be performed by heritage followers as a sign of cleanliness from all that is profane, and a sign of readiness to consecrate their time to the sacred.

Heritage implies - that money is consecrated to maintain trustees and objects in trust, and that money is not invested in other equally profitable ventures; that time is consecrated to attend certain ceremonies, and that time is not spent in otherwise profitable endeavours; that a price is paid in intellectual and physical efforts in order to reach a level of inspiration, receptivity and understanding needed to participate in these activities, (alternatively, the psychic effort necessary to fend off bad conscience when not attending, not understanding and feeling excluded into the community).

Prescriptions and prohibitions, rules and regulations, are actually presentation activities. They are a public commitment to the good fight which is fought to preserve the cultural resource, the stories cultural resources carry, and the social unit these stories create over time and space.

*the heritage bureaucrat as the custodian of truth*

Heritage bureaucrats as sacristans perpetuate, in contemporary societies, "a more or less official body of elders or priests or wise men or medicine men (who) constitute(d) the recognized custodians of the tribal experiences and legends, and, in elaborate ceremonies, attend(ed) the initiation of youths into the 'mysteries' of the past" (Hayes 1960, 16).

Without their intervention, sacred knowledge would not take place: "By 1985, we had discovered no new artefacts, precious little data, but we had to respond to a new audience, one that neither fully comprehends nor appreciated the phonograph, the telephone or the
light bulb (an invention commemorated in Greenfield Village). *It was up to the museum to invest these artefacts with excitement, awe and reverence, because the public no longer brought that with them* (Craig 1989, 64).

In Indo-European societies, priests were committed to memorize an ideal corpus of myths, and rituals, sacred invocations and expressions. In Rome, sacred narratives were traditionally confided to sacerdotal colleges. Unknowingly but duly transferring in profane settings what was sacred practices in traditional societies, descendants of ancient speakers predict and plan the future inside their cubicles in Heritage planner offices.

Parks Interpreters have been acting as if they were god sent: "*Interpretation has moved from prophecy to priesthood: interpreters' proclamations no longer are prayer, but revelation (Present day interpreters have come to) perceive their roles far too ambitiously. They tamper with the lives - mental, physical and spiritual - of people. Interpreters take from people not only their definitions but their defining capabilities and processes too. And the fundamental question is: do they know what they are doing?*" (Nyberg 1984, 152).

*aletheia*

What they do is speaking in truth, and their authority is made manifest by the language they use, the uniform they wear, the pondered pace of their walk, and by the place, in the middle of the community circle, where they stand to speak.

They are, in contemporary societies, the masters of truth, a function that was recognized "*like wings and flippers were attributed to a particular species*, to poets, diviners and kings of justice in Archaic Greece (Détienne 1999, 15; after Homer and Hesiod). All had access to what lied behind the appearances that framed human lives, and were expected by function to lift the curtain and reveal the truth, the words of the gods.

Truth, 'what was, what is and what will be', was pronounced as poetry, prophecy and justice. Truth is still a function of contemporary museums - required by Postman (1991, 58)

"*(to) tell us what we once were, and what is wrong with what we are, and what new directions are possible...*" (Postman 1991b, 58).

In contemporary societies, truth summons up notions of "*objectivity, communicability, and unity. (It) is defined at two levels: conformity with logical principles and conformity with*
reality. Accordingly, truth is inseparable from concepts of demonstration, verification and experimentation”. Truth comes from dialogue; it is secular and it is complemented by action. As [veritas] to the Romans and [Rta] to the Indo-Iranians, truth was associated with “liturgical prayer, the power ensuring the continual return of dawn, the order established by the cult of the Gods, and law” (Détienne 1999, 35). As [aletheia], it is truth proclaimed: “Jesus said to him: ‘I am the way, the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me” (John 14: 6).

The Poet was inspired by the Muses, and by Mnemosyne (Memory), their mother. Memory was a gift of second sight allowing the Poet to formulate his song (the technique, the material, and the enthusiasm put into its utterance), and the speech itself - forever enduring and forever identified with the man and the God it celebrated:

“The bard and the diviner have in common a single gift of 'vision', a privilege that they have paid for with their eyes. Blind to light, they see the invisible. The god who inspires reveals to them those realities that escape the sight of ordinary men. It is a twin vision that bears in particular upon those parts of time inaccessible to mortals; what once was, what has yet to come ... (The) activity of the poet is oriented almost exclusively toward the past. Not his individual past, nor a past generalized as if it were an empty framework independent of the events that have occurred there, but 'ancient times' with its own contents and qualities: a heroic age or, still further, a primordial age, the origin of time” (Vernant 1965, 53; quoted in Vance 1979, 377).

When the Poet spoke, his words were solemn words like those uttered by a man swearing revenge, or by the dying man putting a curse on his murderers. Words said in Aletheia were efficient, irrevocable and thus carried the same obligations as if they had been spoken by the Gods.

Through the power of language, the Poet established the powers of the invisible world, and exposed in details the theory of the gods, “wherein each (was) assigned his proper place in the hierarchy and accorded the appropriate honor due” (Détienne 1999, 71). Through the power of the language, the Poet made an ordinary mortal equal in destiny to a king. Exploits that went uncelebrated ‘died’.

The speech did not reflect an event that had already occurred, it was part of its realization; it took immediately effect, and became action. The poet was always a 'master of truth': “his
truth was a performative truth, never challenged or demonstrated” (Détiene 1999, 52). Truth depended on the fact that it was being presented.

Based on memory, Aletheia was complemented by oblivion, which was, with blame and silence, destined to be the lot of the socially unmeritorious. Truth brought also forgetfulness to the listener, the “servant of the Muses (making him) forget his cares (that he) no longer remembers sorrow” (Détiene 1999, 81).

To the Assembly as a political entity, Aletheia was the discourse of how things came into being, who made them, what significance and what rank the characters had in theogonies, cosmogonies and in genealogies. Poetic praise established the order of reality; the myths of emergence “foregrounded the determining role of a divine king who, after many struggles, triumphed over his enemies and once and for all established order in the cosmos” (Détiene 1999, 44).

To the individuals in the Assembly who were seeking directions in the stories about the past, Aletheia was displayed as much as it was concealed, and the power to do wondrous things is still cursed with ambiguity for the magicians working in contemporary museums - as in Cameron who summons up the metaphor of the alchemist to elucidate the museum's awesome power “not just to transform, but to invert the meanings of things... In the museum we, the professionals, are the new alchemists who, albeit at the pleasure of our masters, can do wondrous things (turn base metals into gold and silver). As long as our myth prevails we have in our hands one of the most life-enhancing potions in the pharmacy of light and one of the most dangerous poisons in the arsenal of darkness” (Cameron 1993, 166; commenting Genesis and Mozart).

skeptron, and the heritage object

In Homeric assemblies, the authority to speak was claimed and taken by raising the ‘sceptre’ (Il.2; 278-283). In contemporary assemblies, the heritage bureaucrat raises the heritage artefact which has been capable, over generations, to impose silence in the assembly.

In Homer the sceptre was the attribute of the king, of heralds, judges, and all persons who, whether of their own nature or because of a particular occasion, were invested with authority. The skeptron was the staff of the messenger, a traveler, who came forward and
spoke on behalf of the gods. The skeptron was "the symbol of his function and a mystic sign of his credentials". (Benveniste 1973, 326). In Homer, the skeptron had come to Agamemnon from Zeus, through "a succession of bearers".

Like the Homeric skeptron, heritage objects are a legitimating connection with the people from the past, and the instruments that authorize special individuals to speak on their behalf.

Cultural (historic) resources are kept principally for their capacity to speak in aletheia; they link "past, present, and future within the experience of any given human generation" (Lipe 1984, 2).

Cultural resources are efficient; they make people do things on their behalf and for their profit. Objects turn their former users into caretakers dedicated to their "continual survival" - inventory, evaluation, monitoring and collection management.

The cultural resources that the heritage messenger holds high, in the middle of the Assembly, are evidence of truth: they are "the means by which any alleged matter of fact, the truth of which is submitted to investigation, is established or disproved"; they are demonstrative evidence "directly addressed to the sense without intervention of testimony" (Black's Law Dictionary 1991; 'evidence').

Heritage objects, to be evidence, must appear to be authentic. A heritage object, a site or an artefact, must bear evidence of its integrity. Integrity means: "completeness, soundness and unity - for both the ecosystem and historic places". It is an absolute necessity for commemoration to take place: "ecological and historical integrity will provide the foundation for public use, understanding and enjoyment. The protection and conservation of heritage resources are fundamental to their use by present and future generations" (Canadian Parks Service 1990, 15).

Integrity of a site or an object is a necessity for a commemorative activity to be efficient. The integrity of an artefact guarantees the truthfulness of the communication between the public and heritage producers.

Canadian heritage bureaucrats are made an obligation to maintain the integrity of their objects (National Parks Act; Amendments, 1988) - ecological integrity: "the conditions of an
ecosystem (1) where the structure and function of the system are unimpaired by stresses induced by human activity, and (2) the unimpaired system retained resilience in that its biological diversity and supporting processes are likely to persist", and by extension (analogy), commemorative integrity, that is, to ensure that "the resources that symbolize the significance of a historic site are not impaired or under threat, that the reasons for the sites' national historic importance are effectively communicated, and that the site's heritage values are respected" (Canadian Parks Service 1994b, 24).

The skeptron in contemporary societies is held by the referee on the ice rink, by the teacher raising his open hand, and by museum guides calling for attention with their index pointed at a display; it has morphed into the arrow on the computer screen which "makes everything happen". It is the Band Leader baton, the Sergeant Major stick, the Bishop's crosier - an axis mundi, the staff that indicates the 'centre of the world'. It is held by people who still speak in Aletheia.

Aletheia is to be found as knowledge which "emanates from a higher authority, and (which) is to be accepted without question" (Postman and Wingartner (1971, 203; on knowledge): "It is the myth of the museum as the new temple of truth where, appropriate to our secular age, the priests are robed in the vestments of science and the academy. It is the myth of our objective truth-giving, free of all extrinsic influences as though we were exempted by divine intervention from all cultural bias, prejudice and calumny. The power of the myth lies also in the pervasive belief in the magical powers of objects. The museum is the temple, the keeping place of these objects whose magical powers are enhanced by the blessings of the priests who enshrine them there" (Cameron 1993, 167).

Traces of Aletheia are to be found in the old canons of education, in the concept of absolute, fixed, unchanging ‘truth’, particularly from a polarizing good-bad perspective; the concept of certainty; the concept of isolated identity, (that ‘A is A’ period, simply, once and for all); the concept of fixed states and ‘things’, with the implicit understanding that if you know the name you understand the thing; the concept of the simple, single, easily identifiable cause; the concept that differences exist only in parallel and opposing forms; the concept that knowledge is ‘given’, that it emanates from a higher authority, and that it is to be accepted without question (Postman and Weingartner 1969, 203; after Lynn White Frontiers of Knowledge 1956).
"When I use a word, Humpty Dumpty said, in a rather scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to means - neither more nor less". / "The question is", said Alice, "whether you can make words mean so many different things" / "The question is", said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be master, - that's all" (Carroll [1982], 184).

Knowledge found in heritage stories is meant to be received as an absolute, unmoveable truth. Heritage narratives are the enunciation of certainty, and the disqualification of any alternative; they are truth as self-evidence, truth given a name, and understood by virtue of nomination so to spare the speaker from causal explanation. They generate knowledge stated from an official position, and knowledge made manifest, in a logical discussion.

"General visitors to the museum do not 'read' what they see as the selection and interpretation of one person, or a group, from a range of possible 'meanings'; they have no access to alternative material, meanings, and arrangements. The process and the underlying principles of selection for display and collection are rarely discussed and shared with the public by individual curators or museums. The focus of any discussion, among professionals or with others tends to be narrow, specific and descriptive" (Porter 1986, 104).

Heritage bureaucrats, like their predecessors in Aletheia, perform a ministerium in the community: "The preacher-teacher is one who approaches and lives in the community's mythology in a special way, acts that out in his or her persona, and in ritual and speech, perpetuates the myths and their power among the group… The enlightened guru or master, the leader of the prayers who preaches, the ethical teacher, the poetic sage - all participated in and perpetuated the community's integrating myth by telling the stories again and again and by showing their pertinence to the group's present needs" (Rice 1987, 496).
Chapter 15: sacralization - the heritage bureaucrat as myth teller

The narratives that heritage bureaucrats present are society's "characteristic myths, its imagined or real events, laden with associations, symbols and marginal meanings, which express its deepest interpretation of the visible world and of the world of good and evil". Traces of these are found in "the concrete representations of their age; in the stories, the folk tales, the philosophical visions, the entertainment, the questions that are taken for granted and those that are an issue on the society's exhortations and cautions" (Keniston 1960, 101).

Legitimacy comes to heritage bureaucrats as they claim the right to perform society's sacred stories: "A myth is an expression of the sacred in words; it reports realities and events from the origins of the world that remain valid for the basis and purpose of all there is... a myth functions as a model for human activity, society, wisdom and knowledge" (Bolle 1987, 261).

The words of the myth "have an extraordinary authority and are perceivable in a manner distinct from common speech. The language of the myth does not induce discussion; it does not argue", (Bolle 1987, 262). The words of the myth present.

What characterizes mythological presentations is the fact "that they express a unanimous conception (which) gives them a force and authority (that) enables them to impose themselves without being subject to verification or doubt. That is why there are formulae in our societies which we imagine are not religious, but which nevertheless do have the character of a dogma and are not questioned" (Allcock 1988, 33; quoting Durkheim 1912).

Heritage clerics tell stories of the ancestors' deeds. They recount the creation of a given group, and the advent of the physical, moral and social reality shared by the descendants of this group: "Formative periods are made by the magic attraction, and the prestige of origins"; "it is the first manifestation of a thing that is significant and valid" (Schwartz 1982, 375; quoting Eliade 1965). Myth is a celebration of a primordial reality that still prevails. The time of the origins is the 'receptacle' of the founding event, and for all other events to come after.
As society's remembrancers, bureaucrats instil in their listeners the belief that there is, in the future, as once it was, a possibility of breaking away from the limitations of historical time, and returning to the sources of all things. Members of a group created by the heritage narratives are made to believe that they still can become one with the environment, with their ancestors, with their own descendants and with what will be found beyond the immediate and the circumstantial.

Attending the re-presentation of a myth, in primitive societies, was to escape from the conditions of the ordinary life and reach the Great Time, (set beyond Past, present and Future). In contemporary societies, going to historic sites is still said to be 'going back in time'.

In heritage sites, history returns to whence it came, and the authenticity of the stories that are presented, as a rule, appears to be less important than the conclusion or the solutions they bring to society's problems. The truth content of historic narratives (their accuracy, integrity, authenticity) matters less than their abundance, their variety, or the example of loyalty, nobility and self sacrifice that they provide.

"The well-nigh magical influence of stories upon children and adults as well opens an important avenue to the celebration of power... They listen even when they do not fully understand. For in this mood of relative approachability, lulled by the voice of the professional narrator in the early times, and in the later thrown off guard by the scientific mask of the historian, the subject may readily be indoctrinated with whatever the situation demands... For if the story is really good, what matters whether it be really true. If it does not embody the literal truth, it may express the ambitions of the group and its dream picture of itself in its best moments" (Merriam 1966, 114).

Heritage narratives have to do with truths that society needs in order that it can be perpetuated. They are simultaneously historical experiences and fables, orthodoxies and para/doxies: "they exist as a whole body of beliefs in any given age, and may be linked to certain fundamental assumptions which at the time, whether they are actually true or not, are believed by the mass of the community to be true that they hardly appear to bear the character of assumptions" (Laswell 1966, 9).
In contemporary historic sites, history gives legitimacy to myth and the staging of heritage rituals brings legitimacy to history. Mythological narratives find their way into historical narratives with the willing participation of heritage clerics who stress their timelessness while draping them in circumstantial accuracy - the historian's and the curator's meticulous inventories and foot-notes being a counterpart to the detailed stories of the myth teller.

Being part of the audience to which these sacred words are conveyed, being part of the community for which they are preserved makes one different. Telling sacred narratives, and keeping them makes the keeper as sacred as the keep: "All societies do have an explanation of their being, sometimes, legendary, sometimes historical, sometimes implicit, other times put down in traditions of sacred wrts that designate the originality and specificity of their configuration. However, this explanation ... is justified fundamentally by the purpose of presenting a whole group as a person which, without the myth, would only be a rounding-up of individuals" (Burdeau 1979, 127; on the myth of the people).

the Nation's sacred narratives

Myths narrated in historic sites are the story of the Nation. The Nation "embodies or symbolizes the territory, the people, the culture, the institutions, the interests, the heritage and whatever else the people have or think they have in common... The nation, for nationalists, is larger that the sum of its parts, becomes a mystical symbol, an organism, a being. Once more, a devotion to it develops with time and with consciousness of common experience, ( ) the Nation, representing a vast mass of feelings, "residues", becomes itself a symbol of the heritage and aspiration that unify, a symbol to which subjects owe allegiance" (Hayes 1926, 20).

"All such personification operates emotionally upon individuals, presenting them with a glorified picture of the spirit, the principle, the ideal of their group and thereby persuading them to a deeper loyalty to their common nationality... once fancies to discover something eternal, the life of a group which existed without beginning long before any of its present members and which, by the same token, will exist without end long after its present members are gathered to their father's dust. Man's powerful longing for immortality receives aid and comfort from historic traditions which center in nationality" (Hayes 1926, 17).
Contemporary heritage narratives promote Nationalism, the "ideological movement for attaining and maintaining autonomy, unity and identity on behalf of a population deemed by some of its members to constitute an actual or potential 'nation'" (Smith 1991, 73). Heritage narratives altogether teach that "the world is divided into nations, each with its own individuality, history and destiny; (2) that the nation is the source of all political and social power, and loyalty to the nation overrides all other allegiances; (3) that human beings must identify with a nation if they want to be free and realize themselves; (4) that nations must be free and secure if peace and justice are to prevail in the world" (Smith 1991, 74).

Heritage narratives illustrate the distinctive traits of the community, and identify a common interest in keeping these traits. They make a sacred entity of the Nation - a place in time and space, and the promise of continuity over the ages.

Heritage narratives are markers that make a given territory into a "different" place where to find -

- a homeland, "the cradle" of the nation, "where terrain and people have exerted mutual, and beneficial, influence over several generations ( ), the repository of historic memories and associations, the place where our sages, saints and heroes lived, worked, prayed and fought" (Smith 1991, 9);

- a 'patria' and a 'polis', "a community of laws and institutions with a single political will, some common regulating institutions that will give expression to common political sentiments and purposes" (Smith 1991, 9);

- a culture, the agents of which "are united, if not made homogeneous, by common historical memories, myths, symbols, and traditions, (and) a set of common understandings and aspirations, sentiments and ideas, that bind the population together in their homeland" (Smith 1991, 11).

Heritage narratives transform a well preserved territory into the sacred Land, a real and benevolent entity from which everyone proceeds: "Country of mine, the freedom you possess / Liberation to believe what you believe and choose the panoply in which you dress / You are a bountiful goddess bestowing gifts among your subjects / Justice, truth, beauty and love have moulded you into a dynasty no one rejects" (Wicks 1995, 53; quoting
Woatke, in a book made of drawings and poems by Canadian schoolchildren celebrating their country).

The land is home, "as a host you are charming and gracious. Your house is lovely and neat. Your table is laden with bounty. There are always enough chairs around it, for you my love, refuse no one" [Wicks 1995, 18; quoting Haxton]. It is unique and, as such, its places "become 'sacred' places of veneration and exaltation whose inner meanings can be fathomed only by the initiated, that is, the self-aware members of the nations" (Smith 1991, 6).

It is "OURS": this is where "truly human beings live a proper human life as opposed to those living beyond in strange, chaotic lands peopled by barbarous sub-humans or ghosts deprived of the benefit of belonging" (Turner 1979, 21).

The making of the national community

Heritage narratives delineate the moral topoi which define the Nation's destiny; they provide "moralities' for the regenerated community, ones that could inspire present generations to emulate the public virtues constitutive of the national character. (They create) a cognitive basis and moral purpose that would ensure the continued renaissance of its distinctive cultural heritage and vision" (Smith 1991, 65).

"In our land, in our space, we need not map or compass to find our way; we navigate by the dead reckoning of morality, history and geography. Our guide is a sense of community, a belief in democracy, a commitment to compassion, tolerance and moderation, a liberal internationalism" (Editorial The Globe and Mail 01 July 1995).

The Nation is the place where all contradictions are to be resolved. In Canada, the traditional Ethnic nationalism still prevailing on monuments and in the mechanics of heritage discourse, coexists with Civic nationalism: "What, after all, is the raison d'être of any nation (as opposed to state), if not also the cultivation of its unique (or allegedly unique) cultural values? Ethnic distinctiveness remains a sine qua non of the nation, and that means shared ancestry myths, common historical memories, unique cultural markers, and a sense of difference, if not election (that) in the modern nation () must be preserved, indeed cultivated, if the nation is not to become invisible" (Smith 1991, 70).
Mythical narratives call for the resolution of contradictions; Canada's character is the sum total of all the negatives of Ethnic nationalism turned positive. The Canadian Nation is magically instituted as Canadians recognized their uniqueness from the celebration of their difference: 'We' are different from all other nations because 'we' have become 'a nation' by standing against all that makes other nations as dangerously despicable as nationalism makes them.

Against the negative aspects of ethnic nationalism, Canadians believe that “it is true to say that one of the principal common bonds helping to tie this country together is our very diversity; not only our regional, ethnic, or linguistic diversity, but also the magnificent diversity of our landscape which is the grand natural environment that we all share as a common heritage" (Government of Canada 1992, 9); that “we are distinctive in the world. We have chosen to cherish our diversity, not to diminish it. The challenge facing us today is to forge a collective view of the country - one that takes into account all of its parts but is even larger than the sum of its parts” (Government of Canada 1992, 19).

That belief is legitimized both by Law and Tradition: (cultural diversity) "has existed from the earliest days of Canada's history. The aboriginal peoples, themselves extremely diverse, form a fundamental aspect of Canada's society. Our Constitution has always recognized the importance of English and French as Canada's languages, a matter of diversity that makes Canada unique and strong" (Government of Canada 1993, 13). Canadians-in-community believe that "those who created, joined and continued to create (the country) shared a fundamental commitment to freedom, representative democracy and the rule of law. To many people coming to Canada has meant freedom from persecution, prejudice, or domination; for others, freedom to choose, to seek and pursue better economic prospects" (Government of Canada 1993, 3).

sacred narratives and sacrifice

When society fails to fulfill the promises of the Nation - that is, when it is recognized that "political and legal battles (are still waged) by threatened communities and other disadvantaged groups [aboriginal peoples, Women's groups, minority language communities] (to secure) protections that others take for granted" (Shared Values 1993, 23), heritage bureaucrats have to find a stronger alternative to Civic Nation.
They will find it by reverting to ethnic nationalism, and point the finger to the Nation's enemies within and without. They call for the sacrifice of its most precious members, its eldest sons while fighting against the foes. Ultimately, the many bombastic and brutal monuments to the military in every square in the Realm are justified by the same reasons that exquisite collections in National Galleries are. The symbolic sacrifice made to the importance of heritage both directed at the individual visitors, and at the tax payers, are a prefiguration of greater sacrifices requested elsewhere by the Nation.

Necessarily, despite promises of a 'civic nation', sacred narratives unfold into violence: the Other as the Enemy makes both the environment within which the Nation survives, and the Nation's survival, a matter of aggression: "We believe in Canada less because we are sentimental than because we are rational. We Canadians have seen too much. We have built too well. We have fought too hard. We have endured together too long. Dominion Day 1995, Canada was here last year. Canada will be here next year" (Editorial, The Globe and Mail, 01 July 1995);

"(Canada is) a place of hope and gladness, For all eternity. If someone split this country, And put our land at risk, Somewhere inside these borders, Good people would resist" (Wicks 1995, 29; quoting Farmer).

In past times, Canadians have fought against Nature: "Canada is about survival. In early times, the challenge was survival in the wilderness. Today it is the survival of what we hold dear in the face of globalization and technology, the fault lines of profound social changes, and the regional divisions evident in the recent election" (Maxwell 1997, A21), and against those who held the Land before they came, - the Natives, and the 'French' - who, despite their defeats (commemorated in N.H.S. Louisbourg [1758]; Québec City's, The Plains of Abraham [1759], in N.H.S. Restigouche [1760]), have yet to concede defeat in British North America: "Don't the French [sic] know that they lost at the Plains of Abraham?" (Graffiti, Men's Room, National Archives of Canada, Ottawa 1995).

In time of social tension, the polite indifference of civic nationalism turns to name shouting: "There are apparently two different versions of Canadian history ( ) The French texts always give a great deal of space to the history of New France from 1663 until 1760 (and) write of the British conquest as if it were a catastrophe, whereas the English texts write happily of it as the dawn of a new day. The English texts skip over the pre-Conquest French period very quickly and devote most of their book to the later period" (Spencer..."
“Here is a sample of words gathered from the English Canadian press [reacting to a set of new constitutional proposals made by the Parti Québécois Government]. I have organized them into four families, depending on which part of our anatomy they are directed at” (1) **Intelligence**: brainless, wacky, ridiculous, futile, dumb, stupid, ignorant, insignificant, simplistic; (2) **Guts**: cowardly, chicken, nerveless, spineless; (3) **Heart**: merciless, cruel, sanctimonious, condescending; (4) **Soul**: immoral, corrupt, hypocritical, decadent, pretentious, unscrupulous. Not to mention a few other adjectives I have yet to classify, such as ‘monstrous’ and ‘vacuous” (Latouche 1995, A23; on “Name Calling”).

History and progress rarely speak the language of the defeated: “The (French Regime) was characterized by mental sluggishness and a torpid repose. The French desired no innovations - no improvement of any kind; they were fond of pleasure, unreflecting, indolent, superstitious; they knew nothing of that sober steady love of constitutional liberty that animates every true Briton” (Berger 1970, 112; quoting McMullen 1855).

Canadians still fight their American neighbours who are more repugnant to them than anyone else: "Top 10 Reasons to Live in Canada: 1. It isn’t America" (Wicks 1995, 35; quoting McLsaac).

The Neighbour has been, over the years, a Rebel to his King (1780), a Republican Brigand (1812), a vile Slave Owner (1860), an aggressive Expansionist (1890), a morally Decadent Individualist (1920), and the troubled Child of the Western World (1950): “The sources of insecurity today are different. It is not U.S. military might that intimidates so much as U.S. cultural and economic hegemony, and the emerging powers in Asia. We also experience insecurity in the changing nature of work, in weakening family structures and in the dramatic changes in community” (Maxwell 1997, A21).

Living on the Other side of the ‘Hadrian Wall’, the American still symbolizes the inversion of social conventions. Similar to “us”, though different, despised for leading “us” into temptation, envied and hated for the liberties he takes and the Liberty he seems to own exclusively, he is invested with the performance of all that is negative in Canadian society.

Nationalism makes violence an acceptable alternative to exhortative policies: “Nationalism as a religion inculcates neither charity nor justice; it is proud, not humble; and it signalistically fails to universalise human aims. It repudiates the revolutionary message of Saint Paul and proclaims anew the primitive doctrine that there shall be Jew and Greek; Nationalism's
kingdom is frankly of this world, and its attainment involves tribal selfishness and vainglory, a particularly ignorant and tyrannical intolerance - and war" (Hayes 1966 [1926], 124).

The Enemy against which violence is exercised is a necessary part of the institutional process. The Enemy which is summoned in heritage narratives institutes order in society. In society, disorder creates order. Rebellious episodes in heritage narratives act as safety valves, lessening the weight of dissent and disaffection, dissipating resentment and neutralizing, in effect, any challenge to the authorities. "The supreme ruse of power is to allow itself to be contested ritually in order to consolidate itself more effectively" (Balandier 1970, 41). The Enemy creates consensus.

In time of crisis, the Other from within becomes a scapegoat whose sacrifice will appease the wrath of an angry god. It is the necessary victim upon which a society is built. Its main function is to spare the national community from the most terrifying of all realities - that of being incapable of finding, but within itself, the sources of social evil. The scapegoat turns members of a given social group into sacrificants - all.

In times of crisis, sacrifice is also expected from the members of the Nation: "The power holder assumes that in the community there is the impulse to surrender and sacrifice. The germinating principle of politics is not found in the will to rule, but in the will to sacrifice, in a broad satisfaction in the generous impulse of community devotion" (Merriam 1966, 224).

The many military monuments maintained by heritage clerics are there to recall all of the other symbolic places of sacrifice where the Nation's enemy, body and soul, are still being defeated, daily, and where the Nation's institutions, momentarily threatened, are being reinstated.

What is being wasted in the battles waged by the Nation is promised consecration 'in saeculos': "Human beings do not normally and willingly give their lives for economic gain. The supreme sacrifice is oftenest paid for an ideal and in response to a religious sense; and the best and final proof of the religious character of modern nationalism is the unquestioning willingness with which all manner of its devotees have laid down their lives on battlefields of the last hundred and seventy years... Modern nationalism has indeed been a peculiarly bloody religion" (Hayes 1966, 171).
The sacralization process comes to a conclusion with the making of citizens into sacrificial objects: "(No element in the whole credenda that heritage narratives support)... has the wide vogue attained by the doctrine of the importance and necessity of sacrifice in the interest of the group. None is more beautifully and constantly interwoven in the miranda of the group than this same doctrine or more harmoniously intertwined with the whole network of social organization and allegiance" (Merriam 1966, 130).

Blood is drawn from enemies or from confederates, indifferently: "In their differences, estrangements and enmities, men seek unity, brotherhood, and love. This is not achieved in social "process" or in a "return to equilibrium" but through community dramas of guilt, redemption, victimage, and hierarchy. In such dramas, we do not hide or deny guilt but confront it (as the penitent does in confessional) ... Germany lost a war, Germans are sinning by polluting their blood. They can redeem their defeat by sacrifice of themselves on the battlefield with enemies abroad, or of the scapegoat in 'rituals of riddance' at home, in the death camps" (Duncan 1962, 246).

Heritage narratives tell the audience that they are perennially at a deficit when standing before the Nation. In their narratives, heritage clerics implicitly demonstrate to their listeners, that they are unworthy of their ancestors, unworthy of the lessons that have been handed over to them, and that they are to be held responsible for the failure of the Nation to provide wealth, cohesion, unity, or meanings.

The lesson of heritage is guilt: the individual may "have sinned against (the nation); in fact, it is almost certain that he has at some time or other fallen short of his legal duties and obligations; and he (must) make up for it after a fashion by the attitude of devotion and the penance of service" (Merriam 1966, 224).

In wartime, the deficit is repaid by the surrendering of "comfort, convenience, industry, profession, home, health, liberty and life" (Merriam 1966, 223); in peacetime, it is repaid by attending heritage ceremonies in a spirit of atonement.

Like the priest, makers of heritage stones use "language shared by the faithful in order to control them by making them feel guilty. (They use their) language as a strategy to bring about guilt. Language is more than a form of words; it is the 'game' by which (they call) forth guilt, promotes repentance, forgive the sinner, and the like. (Like the priest, they engage) in symbolic violence" (Snook 1991, 175; after Bourdieu on ministerium).
The following pages address the procedures by which individuals are called to demonstrate physically that they willingly pay respect to their fetish. They describe the proper behaviour to hold before the Nation's fetishes, when the sacred narratives are recalled first in public ceremonies and in private visits.
Chapter 16: sacralization - sacred gestures: rituals

Legitimacy comes to heritage bureaucrats because they are permitted to determine and teach the community the proper way to behave when approaching heritage objects and places.

Heritage activities, commemorations, are collectively or individually performed acts aimed at manipulating profitably and efficiently both invisible powers and worshippers into doing what is expected from them.

Heritage rituals, as prescribed behaviour, come as recitations, gestures, sequences of actions, and dramatic ceremonies. In the durkheimian tradition, rituals are collective rites through which a community conceives of itself in its relations with symbols and narratives that bear witness to significant past events.

Rituals as dramatic performances are described and discussed in Ozouf (1976; French Revolution), in Connerton (1989; Nazi Germany) and in Gross (1986; Royal Progresses during the Renaissance). Public performances and museum presentations are similar: "Each float (of the parade) was heralded by a placard with its date and description prosaically and rationally set down. Immediately following came the historic tableau. At one level of understanding they were, except for their movement, display cases in a modern scientific museum. Well labeled, authentic representations of ethnological reality. Behind them was authority expressed in expert design and workmanship" (Warner 1959, 124-125).

Ritual acts indicate which of past beginnings, endings and continuities are used to mark "with significance, which have mental, and emotional signs placed upon them, saying in effect: 'Look at these objects. Understand and feel again through them what was once true and what, when you recognize and value its significance, will be true again' " (Warner 1959, 112).

Rituals staged in heritage settings are stereotyped, stylized, repetitive acts. Like religious rituals, they are made of formulaic speech and gestures which indicate to ritualists, (public, liturgists and sponsors) that 'something different from the ordinary' is taking place.

Rituals are repetitive, either in the reenactors' demonstrations (the musket drill, for instance), in the guides' presentations, in displays created by exhibition planners, in the
sequence that the visiting public must follow: "repetition after all is a natural way for the body to proclaim, enact and experience the choice of true as opposed to false things and ways, and to dwell self-consciously in determinative model realities, in the 'holy'" (Zuesse 1987, 406).

Rituals vouch for predictability in human affairs by the regularity in which they appear both at a given time during a year and in the appearance within a given sequence.

Rituals are essentially conservative activities; repetition in rituals implies both continuity with the past, and the recollection of such a continuity (Connerton 1989, 48). Rituals make human behaviour predictable - staging a ritual is doing 'things by numbers' (as in keeping the rhythm or as in counting the numbers). The formality, fixity and recapitulative imitation present in rituals are found in animal behaviour (instinct), and in human behaviour (obsessive, compulsive behaviour).

**rituals in heritage settings**

The structure of the heritage ritual is necessarily economic. A visitor-to-be leaves home, travels to a site, meets with the keeper of the place, offers a donation, joins a group of like-minded persons, abides by the instructions given him, looks where he is directed to, acquiesces, asks questions, comes to the end of a circuit, promises the sacristan to come back, crosses the threshold and returns home.

The visit was a progress from one display into another, from one label to another, from one page of a catalogue to the next one. While reading, the visitor may have moved his lips (as when reciting the breviary), felt the need to comment, found a friend to talk to, respectfully backed away from the visited object while forward to another empirical epiphany.

Essentially, the heritage visit has been a display of discrete acts of reverence, each visitor bending down (virtually) before the things presented to him, in a display of trust, veneration, submission, contrition and gratitude. Ritualists, liturgists and participants have willed "their own bodies into identities and movements that stem from the ancestral past. They must be humble" (Zuesse 1987; 407). Theirs have been acts of religious worship translated in a secular setting. They have displayed -
adoration: "Wow! Awesome!";
affirmation: "I'm proud to be a Canadian"; "the Military should be proud";
consecration: "I wish you well, son" (14 September 1998);
curse: "these ass..., in Ottawa, they sold our (regimental) heritage";
gratitude: "thank you so much for letting us in that late";
humiliation: "Do you know anything about the military - I'm afraid I don't";
invocation: "I wish I had come earlier";
mourning: "It's a shame, all the things that have been lost";
oath taking: "I will come back";
penitence: "I'm back; I didn't have time to do it all, the last time";
praise: "Remarkable; you must be proud";
prayer: "Could you show my father's picture (sic) in your museum?";
protection: "I will tell my friends";
remorse: "I should have come sooner";
submission: "Will you show us around?" (CFB Petawawa Museum, Curator's Note Book 1998).

performance

Heritage rituals are part of a spectacle that the national congregation is provided to display its sense of duty, its interest and devotion for ancestral ways - either in time of duress, when power needs to be maintained and patterns to be changed, or in periods of celebration, when the people is presented with a symbolic display "not of present categories, but of utopia, the image of a future state in which there occurs 'the victory of all people's material abundance, freedom, equality, brotherhood'" (Connerton 1989, 50).

Rituals turn objects and stories from the past into a performance: they require the organization of inhabitional acts around objects whose presence is necessary for the ritual to be accomplished: "(these include) actors [performers and audiences]; settings or stages for the ritual performance, a class of previously selected objects to be acted on during the occasion of ritual display, and a script, or prearranged interactional text, that will be followed, spoken and enacted" (Denzin 1994, 324).

Rituals, in this manner, are a way to bring attention to the facts that things that ought to have been, have yet to happen.
Rituals are performative language; they do not provide a description of an action, as mythical and historical narratives do, but constitute an action by themselves. Rituals have a propositional force: they take place, and when they do, they carry by themselves their justification and legitimacy. They do not "consist in the reporting of events or the description of objects or the statement of experimental findings or the formulation of hypotheses... liturgical language is a certain form of action and puts something into practice... it is an action" (Connerton 1989, 57).

Ritual speech, either uttered in inauguration speeches, in floats, in exhibitions and markers, is intended to display power economically - "compared with everyday speech, ...it is characterized by a restricted vocabulary, the exclusion of some syntactic forms, a fixity in the sequence of speech acts, fixed patterns in the volume of utterances, and a limited flexibility of intonation. All these features propel ritual speech acts in the same direction. Thus any single utterance, instead of being followable by a large number of potential utterances, can be followed only by a limited set or indeed mostly by one utterances" (Connerton 1989, 60).

**power and authority**

Heritage rituals are a presentation of the Polity's authorities as they preside over commemoration, and assign everyone a rightful place in the order of things. Rituals indicate differences both between officiants and assembly, and between the social group that supports them, and all the others, either unconcerned or malevolent.

Rituals put everything beyond discussion; they pre-decide what validity claims will be accepted or raised in relation to whom, without making explicit the potential reasons and interests of the ritualists. Rituals provide conceptually preset framework for thinking and feeling, as well as constraints and channels for action. Rituals project social relations unto the empirical world. With rituals, implicit claims to the truth are mixed with normative rightness, personal authenticity, and material integrity, (after Pertierra 1987, on Habermas).

Essentially, rituals in heritage places indicate that power and authority stand where they should. "Ceremonial gestures are bids for authority, prestige, recognition, and control" (Grimes 1982; quoted in Alexander 1987, 179): 'Bless the Squire, and his relations / For their significant presentations!'.


Rituals and ceremonies create and reassert the social order, defining the domains of competence of social actors in such a way that social relations appear to be external and objective elements from/in the order of 'Nature'. Rituals, by "conflating the expressive, communicative and objective aspects of action, ... prevent the discursive redemption of validity claims appropriate to each aspect" (Connerton 1989, 61). They support the belief that "it is right for the rulers to rule, and for the governed to be governed" (Beattie 1964, 160).

Authorities, through rituals, symbols and myths stamp their territory with signs of dominance, spreading 'their scent around the countryside' (Geertz 1977, 152) like Renaissance monarchs did as they journeyed throughout their kingdom.

**consensus**

Rituals are meant to attenuate differences and accentuate common characters. Solidarity is achieved with the transformation of an assembly of individuals into a community as these individuals meet repeatedly, year after year, site after site, room after room, object after object, dancing their rituals around tribal totems - in places 'which evoke our past, our aspirations, and our values" (Canadian Parks Service 1991, 8).

When repeating the "we", as visitors to a site implicitly do, participants in heritage liturgies meet not only in an externally delineated area of a specific site, but in an ideal space determined by clerical authorities: "Their speech does not describe what such a community might look like, nor does it express a community constituted before and apart from it". The heritage presentations they set are the place in which the community is constituted and "recalls to itself the fact of its constitution" (Connerton 1989, 59).

No one, thus, will challenge rituals, for fear of retaliation (including ostracism). Foreigners, attending national rites, may be amused, or rendered perplex, but are mostly made to feel unconcerned. On the contrary, members of the ritualizing community may abstain from the ceremony, may attend reluctantly, may disagree even while in attendance, but are always concerned.
Heritage rituals, symbolically, or literally, emphasize efficacy. Rituals heal the sick (those who need to mend their ways), initiate the neophytes, bury the dead (or turn dead associates into ancestors), teach the ignorant, maintain the status quo, propitiate the gods (and those who represent them), exorcize the demonic (opposing symbols to 'diabolic' objects), maintain cosmic order (after Schechner 1994, 613). Rituals also help remembering the past. They commemorate.

(By commemoration), “I mean any gesture, ritualized or not, whose end is to recover, in the name of a collectivity, some being or event either anterior in time or outside of time in order to fecundate, animate, or make meaningful a moment in the present. Commemoration is the conquest of whatever in society or in the self is perceived as habitual, factual, static, mechanical, corporeal, inert, worldly, vacant, and so forth” (Vance 1979, 374).

The memory represented and created in heritage rituals was anamnesis to the ancient Greeks. ‘Memory’ in 'commemoration' now is the public, ritualistic repetition of a paradigmatic model handed over by the ancestors, and lost partly by the heirs.

Recapitulative imitation is found in the "cult of ancestors, in the tradition of precedence in common law, in the ritual of pilgrimages, in the typology of monarchical theory, and in notions as diverse as those of archetype, universal, exemplum, authority, figura and miracle not to mention that of historia itself, as representation of the past, in short, in any pattern of thought man ontologically privileges some moment or principle of origins" (Vance 1979, 375).

What is done 'in commemorationem' implies that reality or truth is conceived as anterior to the present (or to existence itself), and that what is, in the present, or what lies ahead, will necessarily be deficient; it is meant to cover a failure, a vice in the process - time and history being the framework and the vehicle of decline and decay that memorialists need to restore.

Remembrance is not a matter of material preservation but of reconstruction. It is not a mechanical operation, imprint, stocking and retrieval (the function of the individual
worshipper), but a symbolic activity - the conditions of which both clerics and community conveniently forget for the sake of acquiring symbolic capital.

It is memory borne by signs, landmarks, the use of space as a mnemonic device that society institutes, and by the 'social framework of memory' set for that purpose [language, chronological indications and designation procedures] (Halbwach 1925).

Remembrance is collective memory; it is made of shared 'souvenirs' created explicitly by a few for society to remember: "like individuals, social groups have important memories that help them define themselves, understand the world, and structure their motivations. Also like individuals, social groups may often find that a literal, objective record of the facts is not always the most helpful way of satisfying those interpretive needs. As a result, social groups (again like individuals) will sometimes gradually distort their memories in systematic ways" (Baumeister 1997, 277).

Like private memory, public memory is selective: "only some experiences are recollected, and only some groups are involved as subjects or objects. A social memory universalizes itself - it presents itself as a memory of the total society rather than the property of any segment"; it is a recollection: "in an active process that takes place in the present, (and) explains why it is that memories are constantly changing, even while records remain the same"; it proceeds according to recognizable scripts and is meant to serve definite moral and political purposes: "in social memories, the past is always meaningful - it always has lessons and is always available for invocation. Memory grants both power and virtue. Since every memory has a lesson or meaning, a social memory is always political, just as any political argument or program or document involves some rendering of the past" (Nerone 1989; 93, 96).

The process of memorialization, both in the private and in the public sphere is arbitrary; institutions and individuals, when left to their interests, reshape, omit, distort, combine and reorganize what is a relatively finite stock of raw materials that each generation is given to rearrange.

Memory being "subject of discourse and debate in which competing and discontinuous elements are present" (Radley 1991, 66), authorities must be well aware that commemoration is a dangerous activity and a promising opportunity. Heritage authorities will not shy away from embellishing or purifying their narratives, rendering them either
more amenable and compliant to modern concerns (their own, ultimately), or making them distant and mute. Expectedly, setting to memory, either in narratives or in rituals, is an act of authority; it has as much to do with forgetting intentionally as with remembering.

The political ritual helps to define "certain ways of seeing society; it serves to specify what in society is of special significance, it draws people's attention to certain forms of relationships and activity - and at the same time, therefore, it deflects their attention from other forms, since every way of seeing [is] also a way of not seeing" (Lukes 1975, 301; quoted in Alexander 1987, 179).

memory and incorporation

Ritualists proceed to commemoration with the quiet knowledge that "experiences and actions, however minimal, engage consciousness more immediately and irresistibly, and bestow a much stronger sense of reality, than any merely mental philosophy or affirmation of faith" (Zuesse 1987, 406).

"The nature of the grand ceremonial (as applied in civic ceremonies or in inaugurations) is such that it stresses the element of adoration in the psychology of power. The elaborate series of ritualistic steps under no circumstances to be varied, imposes the idea of conformity and obedience without question... But while ritual is approached with a spirit of conformity, there may be a sense of satisfaction in its performance, as we swing along in its rhythm and beauty, if we 'enter into the spirit of it'. Thus in the most subtle fashion the power purpose and the aesthetic sense are blended, and the power process is identified, not with blood and cruelty but with harmony and beauty" (Merriam 1966, 112).

But a visit to a heritage site is also an obligation society puts upon the bodies and minds of its members. It includes, not surprisingly, physical and psychological stress - museum fatigue standing here both as an indication that power, authority and legitimacy are conveyed with all their weight, and that the individual gives his consent with body and mind.

Rituals treat the body as memory: " every group, then, will entrust to bodily automatisms the values and categories which they are most anxious to conserve. They will know how
well the past can be kept in mind by a habitual memory sedimented in the body " (Connerton 1989, 94; after Bourdieu 1992, on objectification and embodiment).

"The principles embodied in this way are placed beyond the grasp of consciousness, and hence cannot be touched by voluntary, deliberate transformation, cannot even be made explicit; nothing seems more ineffable, more incommunicable, more inimitable, and, therefore, more precious, than the values given body, made body by the transubstantiation achieved by the hidden persuasion of an implicit pedagogy, capable of instilling a whole cosmology, an ethic, a metaphysic, a political philosophy, through injunctions as insignificant as - [ a ‘welcome to the museum’ sign on the entrance door ] (Bourdieu 1992, 94).

the representation of foundational moments

Participants in heritage performances enact in their own bodies the primeval or constitutive acts by which the world came into being. To exist truly is to remember, that is, to re/present onstage, the community's founding events; to forget is to let the world revert to chaos.

To stage rituals is to recreate society; to attend and participate in rituals is to help regenerate society to the power of its origins. Rituals performed in heritage sites are meant to re-present, make present, anew and powerfully, the historical events that saw the constitution of a given community. Rituals are performed with the hope that reenacting the founding gestures, bringing them back as staged representations, will recreate and release the conditions present at the origins of ‘things’.

Rituals provide symbolic means whereby participants represent themselves/are enacting a role considered central to society. In heritage settings, ritualists (public, liturgists or sponsors) learn to be inheritors, descendants, successors to glorious predecessors: “through ritual, the self is discovered as a public, external reality, which can be known only through perspectives mediated by others and especially by transcendent others; the self is something already determined and presented” (Zuesse 1987, 407).

Rituals performed in museums and historic sites are a re-actualization of typical roles as defined in the Past.
In this case, the heritage visitor is reminded - 'through a glass, darkly' - of the two Creation(s) of the World, as he is given the spectacle of the site's collections, and of the quest for the Promised Land, as he progresses slowly from one display to another as if on a ritual pilgrimage.

When God recreated the World, he put a guest curator in charge of the project: "In the myth of Noah as ur-collector resonate all the themes of collecting itself; desire and nostalgia, saving and loss, the urge to erect a permanent and complete system against the destructiveness of time" (Elsner 1994, 2). Noah prefigured present day collectors and re-enactors without which civilisation could not exist: "tax collectors, and gatherers of information, harvesters and hoarders, census takers and recruiting officers, rent collectors, ticket collectors, refuse collectors, undertakers" - collectors all (Elsner 1994, 2).

The appointed collectors and trustees, creators and restorers of new worlds, in turn, are given the wandering public to become one again, recolleced around their presentations. Paradise is lost to those who do not listen to the most precious objects kept in reserves. Paradise Lost is reconstituted in the rational order of things that heritage bureaucrats presiding in museums and historic sites preserve. The division between authorities and clients that Uzzell explains as being a consequence of professionalization (that which exists "between providers and consumers, those who have the approved skills and those who do not, those who are 'interpreters' and those who are not, those who are accepted by the professional gate-keepers and through some rite of passage become a member of the in-group, and those who remain at the margin" [Uzzell 1989, 5]), is in reality the reenactment of the founding patterns after which both society and the heritage institution, as places where world-views are created, operate.

Memory is sedimented in bodily practices. Visitors proceeding to the heritage site, or visitors going through a museum exhibition, ritually reenact the virtual progress human beings go through in search of a place where, respectfully, obediently, they can dream of what has been and what should be once again.
Conclusion: sacralization – the promise of becoming someone else

Legitimacy comes to heritage bureaucrats as they convince members of a given (national) community to leave the site of their ordinary life-world, take to the road and go, as if attracted, to sites where being exposed to sacred objects, narratives and rituals may change their lives, and alter the fabric of society.

Legitimacy comes to heritage bureaucrats as they are entrusted with the reenactment of the ritual that is meant to give the ultimate meaning to individual life. Life is a pilgrimage; man is only passing through, en route to a final destination, the place of the origins, a place where he will be reborn, or endure as an 'aeternus puer'.

Heritage bureaucrats promise significance in the search of the other - out there, at the end of one's time, there is a source of infinite knowledge with which the soul must be reacquainted - in one's own time, this source can be seen, as if through a glass darkly, in sacred places: "The sacred place is therefore one of the most complex developments in human history, rich with meaning and of many functions, the centre of reference from which all else is orientated, understood, or valued and on which it should be patterned, the one ordered place in a disordered world, the source of life's meaning and the anchor that gives security, the rendezvous between the human and the divine where the two worlds intersect and the god and man may meet" (Turner 1979, 32).

Individuals and (national) communities in search of individuality "require some centre of reference for their lives so that amid the vagaries of a changing world there is a pivot that may provide an anchor in the ultimate" (Davies 1987, 385).

Heritage sites, as sacred sites, are places where the presence of the ancestors as immanence and transcendence can be felt, where ancestors and descendants meet any where descendants congregate to witness a rendition of the world as instituted by the ancestors' benevolence and power.

None of existing human or natural forms and structures "is regarded as an autonomous reality, self-perpetuative, self-explanatory, complete and lasting. Each is only too liable to
collapse, to prove inadequate or succumb to attack from hostile powers. All become completely reliable and receive the protection they need only when linked to or organized from some secure centre of power that is unassailable, permanent and immutable" (Turner 1979, 19).

Without some centre of reference, "some organized system which supplies meaning and direction for our actions, some point from which we take our bearings and make sense of it all", life is "a senseless flux of events and degenerates into chaos. Value systems, world views, ideologies, philosophies of life as well as the more physical orientation to our material environment through sight, hearing, movement, and memory are essential to existence as a man, and all of these imply some centre of reference" (Turner 1980, 19).

Heritage sites are promoted as places where society promises personal renewal, and personal authenticity: "MacCannell contends that modern cultural productions are centrally preoccupied with authenticity. As the modern world itself is seen as shallow and spurious, our most popular cultural productions are based on themes drawn from other cultures, or, more likely, redolent with simplicity, truth, naturalness, and purity... Modern peoples seek authenticity even in cultural productions which.. represent deliberate pretense, (and) encounter a pristine and genuine spirit of festivity that they believed has been 'lost' in their own society" (Manning 1993a, 25).

pilgrimage as heritage founding ritual

Visitors to heritage centres are modern day pilgrims: "it is tourists who are the main modern pilgrims, carrying guide books as devotional texts. Moving from one architectural feature of the Church to the next, or, in museums, passing from glass case to glass case.... They may scarcely look at the exhibit or the monument; their essential function is to read the guide book. What matters is that they are told what they are seeing" (Horne 1984, 10). The reward they seek is not: "religious merits, but rather connoisseurship, elites status, enhanced prestige, and self-esteem" (Moore 1985, 640).

Going to a heritage site is a civic pilgrimage similar to the sacred progress undertaken by the Muslim going to Mecca, and to its seventeen places of pious visitation. Australian Aruntas dreamt the lessons with which their ancestors left them by returning to the same places where they once lived, and by visiting the signs they left of their passages - each
site being to the descendants the repository of the foundational event, and the memorial to that event.

"The forms of ancestral narrative is an itinerary: the ancestors journeyed from this place to that; something happened; for this reason the place is called 'so and so', a feature in the present topography either was formed by or memorializes the event; the ancestors moved on to another place" (Smith, 1987a, 7).

The most accomplished of the Western Civilization narrative is the life of Jesus - "the story of a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and of the terrible progress from Gethsemane to the Golgothas. Christian life is a movement, a progress, a discipline in which sin is being constantly overcome through grace. That is to say that the Christian life is a way of pilgrimage, summed up in the way of the cross, and it is because the devotion of the Stations of the Cross concentrates this way for us and so helps to shape the whole way of life that we follow, that this devotion can be a useful discipline, conforming our lives to Christ" (Macquarrie 1972, 115; quoted in Robinson 1997, 21).

In contemporary societies, heritage pilgrims, progressing morally as they advance in space, either within a system of sites, or even, from one display to another, are taught by the very fact of advancing that 'history', as practised in heritage places, is progressive because the commemoration ritual is a progress.

A pilgrimage is a differentiating ritual. Like the 'real' progress to sacred places, heritage pilgrimage involves a structured break from ordinary reality, a movement away from the world of home, work and compulsory activity, to the world of the non/ordinary where leisure and voluntary activity can be experienced. As it is with other rituals, the heritage pilgrimage, involves a period of marginality during which the habitual order of daily life is inverted.

Heritage journeys are structured after rites of passage - pilgrims leave their homes, journey to a sacred precinct, enter the site, are made different by the experience they go through (the display of symbols, the telling of narratives and the enacting of rituals), then they break the spell, leave the site, and return home, forever enlightened by their experience, and capable of finding inspiration by recalling to memory an event that was a founding moments in their lives.
Heritage pilgrims are promised true liminality; they are most likely to live a liminoid experience. Liminality is thresholdness, and pilgrims who cross over the threshold of a social space "are without social identity", lost in the group of present past visitors, "neither what they once were, nor what they are about to become" (Moore 1980, 210; quoting Turner 1969). Liminality is the period of transition when the real pilgrim ceases to be what he ordinarily is, takes on an unusual role, shedding signs of social distinction, and becoming one amongst equals (a visitor), as they stand together before the gods, the saints, their priests.

Liminality entails participation, and fulfillment after some physically demanding ritual activities in order to warrant that something of a psychologically, intellectually and socially challenging nature has taken place. Set against the didacticians' obstinate quest for pleasurable (ludic) experience, liminality - or the expectation and promise of liminality, is the condition sine qua non for a heritage experience to be efficient (a little 'pain' is always commendable; the more painful and destabilizing, the more memorable).

"Pilgrims travel in search of forgiveness for sins committed and so search for cleansing. A few travel as a form of punishment inflicting hardship on themselves as they go. Others journey in the hope of physical healing and inner spiritual healing. But above all, pilgrims travel in search of God and so hope to find themselves... Those who travel have understood the essential paradox that we cannot truly find the "I" within until we have found the "thou" without" (Robinson 1997, 10).

In opposition to a society where the individual is left to his own resources, powerless and isolated, the society of the pilgrimage, however diluted when applied to tourist centres, promises a place where to find integration, coherence and solidarity. It is sought because it appears to be the necessary condition to succeed when seeking to 'survive' and transcend individual destiny. It is while progressing from one heritage narrative to another that the individual becomes part of a community - that is, the individual makes his own community.

Heritage sites are places where societies stage their fables with which the protect their cohesion, explain their structures and imagine their destiny (Burdeau 1956, 21). They are dream spaces (Annis 1986,168), where to be shown things both as they are and as they
should and could be. Narratives in heritage sites are models of and models for reality; they promise otherness - but carefully never, ever offer alternatives.

Heritage sites are, sometimes a striking, sometimes a clumsy evocation of the primordial moment and place where wealth, unity, cohesion and meaning came into being. They display perfection, plenitude, freedom, spontaneity, peace, pleasure, beatitude and immortality (Partin 1987, 185).

Creating a difference in the landscape, heritage sites institute the idea difference in society. The heritage visitor has come 'here' and has arrived 'somewhere else'.

Heritage places, like religious dwellings, serve as a “focusing lens, establishing the possibility of significance by directing attention, by requiring the perception of difference. Within the temple, the ordinary becomes significant, 'sacred', simply by being there. A ritual object or action becomes sacred by having attention focused on it in a highly marked way. From such a point of view, there is nothing that is inherently sacred or profane. These are not substantive categories, but rather situational ones. Sacrality is, above all, a category of emplacement” (Smith 1987a, 104).

Heritage sites are set to be places of communication with the ultimate reality of society. They are displayed as sacred places where material representations of the ancestors are cared for, where favours are sought, and instructions, guidance and meanings are received.

By definition, they are places of purity (authenticity, integrity), from which the imperfections, deficiencies and the ineluctable conclusion of human life have been expurgated. Heritage places reveal an ideal order of things, associated with “the perfect realm of divinity, with life and vitality among humans, or with the values to which people should aspire” (Smith 1987b: 528). They are places where to see the perfection of social life, both in presentations of past occurrences and in the proper behaviour demanded from their visitors.

Heritage places provide a prefiguration of what the world should resemble once the lessons from gatherers of collections and makers of exhibitions are finally understood.
Visitors to sacred places learn about the symbolic system that brings meanings to their world. They are shown how the world is divided into places of order and places of insignificance; how it progressively came into being; how time was divided into sacred Time and ordinary occurrences; how the community's sacred narratives are now transmitted through rituals, dramatic representations and material relics - the sacred place eliminating the distance between worshippers and actors of the origins, blending present and past into the Great Time.

Visiting a heritage place, as a ritual, is a means for "demonstrating that we know what ought to have been done, what ought to have taken place. Nonetheless, by the very fact that it is a ritual action rather than everyday action, ritual demonstrates that we know 'what is the case'. Ritual thus provides an occasion for reflection on and rationalization of the fact that what ought to have been done was not, what ought to have taken place did not" (Smith 1987a, 109).

In contemporary times, the ritual/visit is then a sign that what should be remembered is not - as the quest for memory, and the search for otherness turn out to be the recognition of similarity and forgetfulness.

What visitors find, at the end of their progress is the heritage experience - the opportunity to stand solemnly, seriously, affectionately, reverently, astounded by a collage of significant utterances.

What comes to them is another fetish - the ancient 'genius loci', the spirit of the place, through which bureaucrats claim antiquity and power: "There are also over 800 national historic site in Canada. ranging from the great Fortress of Louisbourg on the Atlantic to the Chilkoot Trail that led to the Klondike gold fields [spreading 'a mare usque ad mare']. Every site has a 'spirit of place' and each helps to tell the story of a unique Canadian event, place of person of historical significance" (Canadian Heritage Promotional Leaflet 1998, 23).

What the spirit of place whispers to the common visitor is that norms and values are the basic elements of social life; that life in society calls for personal commitment, and sacrifices; that societies need differentiation but proceed to greater cohesion; that social life depends on solidarity, and is built on reciprocity and cooperation; that societies rest on
consensus and on legitimate authority, and that social groups endure provided they abide by the previous (Craib 1992, 58).

What the spirit offers in conclusion is a meditation on the pervasiveness of self-interest, coercion, opposition, exclusion, hostility, structural conflict, abusive power, contradictions and reluctance to change as the prevailing conditions of life in society.

The World is a place of chaos, dissidence, disaffection, and incoherence, and a place where to dream of wealth, cohesion, community and meanings.
Coda: the enduring religious analogy

The use of the religious analogy is a recurrent theme in the contemporary heritage discourse: Charles Vincent Peale argued, "though unsuccessfully, that museums were 'a public benefit', that must be regarded on the same terms as seminaries of learning or places of worship" (Flint 1990, 64); Warner compared members of Yankee City Tercentenary Committee with "priests at the altar" taking ordinary things into their hands, "and by authority vested in them" transforming "them into symbols of ultimate significance" (Warner 1959, 127); guides at the Linderheimer House (Tex.), transformed an old house into a relic: "More than any other phrase of sacralization, the enshrinement phase accomplishes a ritual transformation of socially segregated tourists into some communities who share experience with the hostess, the tour sight and each other. The fullest and most emotionally rewarding tours the authors witnessed included two types of enshrinement: the telling of enshrined stories and the revealing of enshrined objects" (Fine & Speer 1985: 92; after Jakobson and MacCannell 1976).

The religious analogy is also an embarrassment: "In the halls of the sacred and all-knowing Temple, disciples began to create a place for discussion. The new values replaced the authority of the object and the institution with a growing respect for the participant's frame of reference. The rising popularity of visitor studies and evaluation signals a shift in museum ideology from a dominant orthodoxy of functionalism towards a humanist ideology. The philosophical shift towards humanism which has shaken and toppled the monolith museum as Temple, has introduced new voices into the museum..." (Harper 1993, 20-21).

sacredness

The analogy is a tradition in the field, to be reactivated wherever heritage merchants and bureaucrats meet and predict the future in terms of 'what is in and what is out' ( writer from the Museum Store reporting on 'The Symposium on Museums for the New Millennium' Smithsonian Institute 1995 ).
The Homeric skeptron is thus held very high in 'the Assembly', and aletheia is still uttered in such a way that professionals in the field may feel their religious calling reconfirmed.

Aletheia is professed by the Chairman/Shaman of the Folklife Programs and Cultural Studies (Smithsonian Institute) who wrote some State of the Museums Address, and set the future by calling 'what is in and what is out' in the field.

'What's out' is just stuff /
What's out are collectors
What's out is outworn experience
What's out is exhibits only;
What's out are our needs'
What is out is awful,
What's out is elitism
What's out is exclusivity
What's out these days is divorce
Outreach is out;
What's out is the authoritative
Conforming is out
What's out is demeaning, demeaning of people, visitors,
Rigid is out
Giving to is out
Monologue is out
Reflecting, as in a mirror reflecting
on the standing of society is out,

What's in' is value added stuff (stories, and research).
What's in are stewards stewards of cultural, of the society that generates the stuff'
What's in is attraction
What's in is packaged experience as in tourist and as in people attraction
What's in is our customers' needs
what is in is awe
what's in is communalism
what is in is connectivity
what's in is engagement
what's in is inreach
what's in is the helpful
informing is in
What's in is making meaning'
flexible is in
sharing with is in
dialogue, multilogue, is in.
helping generate those understandings within society is in
The museum as an attic is kind of out; the museum as forum is in
Culture-consumed is in, eaten up by the museum, put in cultural formaldehyde - is out;
Opaque is out, transparent is in
Hype is out; trust is in
Low tech is out high tech as a tool is in
Authenticity still seems to be in, but really debate is about what the authentic thing represented is.
The museum singular is out; museums are in
Museum as vehicle is in museum as end in itself is out
Mission as a description of what the museum does is out Mission as a promise of an actionable type of behavior is in
(Museum Store Winter 1996 Issue, 54).

silence

Christ in Majesty of Medieval Cathedrals, in their durkheimian might, endure. Their priests are still intimidating - as they define imperatively who the legitimate agents should be in the trade, what agenda should be promoted, what means should be preferred, and where to stand morally. They are appeasing - as they make a public display of their dedication and generosity - both calling for silence.

Silence as a sign of veneration. Silence as an indication as to what remains unnamed. Silence, in this case, over the bag of newer analogies that heritage bureaucrats carry with them when they come over from the Palace into to the Temple. Silence over their own inefficiency in bringing about the changes promised in their discourse.

The traditional set of mechanical analogies with which authorities have defined Society, over the past four centuries - "Cybernetic metaphors of process, feedback, biopower, resource, waste, disposal, date-environment patterns, and entropy, or the metaphors of field theory - displacement, circuits, differential equations of motion, exchanges, and relations", has been replaced by - "forces, pressures, bodies, densities of mass, uniform
motions, agency, causality, action-reaction, margin-periphery, in short the language where things are presumed to exist and interact in enclosed space and sequential time classifiable by a detached observer" [Emberley 1989, 747])

Heritage presentations, as constitutive and representational of a world made of 'prescriptive places and meaning endowed durations and sequences', are challenged by the idea of the 'global village' where "what we have taken to be distinct, fragmentary, and separate", and what has been "the basis of possession - be it measures drawn from the order of being, historical artifacts and meanings, or even individual uniqueness" (Emberley 1989, 748), dissolve.

Nationalism, for some but not for all, is passé, and, with it, the whole store of symbolic objects, stories and accompanying admonitions that beg redefinition early in this century.

In the light of modern communication technologies, not only museums and heritage sites do show their great age, but the concepts they staged in their instituting narratives, are pronounced obsolete: "the 'Euclidian' notions of space (enclosure and exclusion), and time (succession and duration) which constituted the human experiences of sequentiality, causality, continuity" are losing progressively their ordering power (Emberley 1989, 745).

In the process, the possibility of reaching otherness, at the conclusion of a liminal experience, has diminished steadily: "Generally speaking, post-industrial society gives rise to a new experience of the reality. It is a world where one meaning constantly replaces another, performance and play replace the real..., order has no center..., and community no boundaries. Under these circumstances the relevance of a performance of the symbolic reversal of order and the power of the travelers to imply an order from which they are enigmatically apart, querying its ontological bases, can hardly be effected. It is difficult for the show to go on because the significance of the symbolism of 'the traveler' has been eroded. The (circus) is treated by its public, to a large extent, as a nuisance, something left behind, something irrelevant" (Carmelli 1988, 280; on traveling circus to be compared to cultural productions).

Traditional competitors for the various capitals in society have been induced in the sacred circle. Economic capitalists are discussed extensively in museum seminars, less and less as a moral embarrassment, or an embarrassing necessity, but as legitimate agents in the field.
In the process, radical views on the nature of social commerce ("And interestingly, fixing it is out; and breaking it is in" (Museum Store 1996, 54), have become acceptable. The edginess of radical views is being dulled; radical invectives are made to appear naïve or maladroit in an extremely polite world, where all things are in the process of integration, (the 'other' soon to become 'us'), and authorities are to be pitied for the load a demanding, manipulative crowd has put unto them.

traders and capitalists

The capital analogy which is set for cultural producers, after Bourdieu, is a loaded one: any cultural capitalist involved is bound to find himself at a deficit. For traditionally, capital is associated with the morals of the marketplace; explicitly, it involves profit, deceit, self service and indifference to the idea of community.

Contrary to anything for which heritage producers are made to stand, benevolently or not, mercantile exchanges are always conducted for immediate gains, without any considerations for the consequences of the act but profit and individual satisfaction. Traders come to the deal as strangers, remain so during the exchange, and will leave strangers.

Bureaucrats from the Palace, (they mascarade as priests), are concerned with the necessary continuation of a common past into a shared future; they are guided by the need for uniformity and constancy, conformity and obedience, order and hierarchy, solidarity and responsiveness. Traders, but for the sake of a safe and predictable environment, are not concerned with these.

Social commerce defined and enacted after the capital analogy is cursed, and the curse, be it described by Dante or Bourdieu, is irrevocable. It reeks with greed and despair "Why do you hoard?", and the other: "Why do you waste?" (Dante [1949] Divine Comedy; Hell - Canto VII; 22-30).

In that world, the honest man, a rare character in the heritage discourse, must make a wager, after Pascal, on the possibility that there is something else in society for himself or his descendants, which will make him abide by the prevailing rules. He will abide by them
- for the sake of profiting from them, in the event that there is no ultimate reason to do so, or for the sake of leaving a world that is not any worse than it was when he came into it.

In that world, the actor tricks himself into pursuing frivolous goals (mainly recognition by others of his importance), for fear of facing the emptiness that sits at the core of human life - the important thing being the hunt itself, not the kill.

It that world, social commerce is an exercise in self defence against institutional bullies. It is a world where the logic of the Book of Job is perpetually reenacted, as the Just resists being tempted into speaking up against the Founding Principles of Society, despite the bad joke that is played on him.

It is a world, once Bourdieu has been read, which is shut tight since the authorities from the 'Palace', the 'Temple' and the 'Marketplace' have congregated to one single, virtual place (delineated by the critics' invective), to deprive the 'rank and file' of their legitimate inheritance: the Adamic privilege to complete God's creation by naming things.

It is a world where all differences have been flattened - everyone, somehow, being under someone else's influence, dependence, domination, and where everyone is justified to shout abomination in a credible manner: "Come now you rich, weep and howl for your miseries that are coming upon you! Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth-eaten. Your gold and silver are corroded, and their corrosion will be a witness against you and will eat your flesh like fire. You have heaped up treasure in the last days. Indeed the wages of the laborers who mowed your fields, which you kept back by fraud, cry out; and the cries of the reapers have reached the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth" (James 5; 1-4).

the trickster

Despite a shared dominating agenda, differences do exist in the field, between capitalists from the Palace, the Temple and the Marketplace: "the ideology of the market justifies personal autonomy, novelty (change) and contact with foreigners. Spokespersons for the temple call for homogeneity, collectivism, and constancy. Apologists for the palace rationalize hierarchy, call for obedience, and justify the use of violence against the disenchanted. The marketplace calls for freedom of opportunity, including the freedom with
the welfare of the collectivity; the palace calls for all to subordinate themselves to the program of the palace for the greater glory of the palace" (Couch 1986, 153).

No one can claim, without dispute, precedence over the others in social or heritage matters. For the "market-centered world is too volatile and shallow to sustain human existence. The temple-centered world is too constraining and unadaptive. Embeddedness and conformity provide temporary security, but no variety. Palace-centered relationships provide an order and sometimes excitement, but they generate corruption, decadence and alienation" (Couch 1986, 155).

The alternative is inscribed in the structure and in the lessons of society's most precious rituals - progressing, walking, putting one step after another: "To everything there is a season, a time for every purpose under heaven; a time to be born, and a time to die; a time to plant and a time to pluck what is planted; a time to kill, and a time to heal; a time to break down, and a time to build up; a time to gain, and a time to lose; a time to keep, and a time to throw away; a time to speak, and a time to keep silence" (Ecc. 3:1, 3:6, 3:7).

For, as a rule, there is always an alternative - a crack, a lull, an awkward rhyme that has been put there, in the most polished of sacred narratives by the inattentive copyist, the left-handed ritualist, and the clumsy curator: "in a teller-hearer relationship, the gap become noise, the hearer's emotional, ideological, physical tendency towards non-cooperation" (Maclean 1988, 3).

It is then possible for the heritage producer to edge his bet, load the dices before playing with those who stand in Majesty (36).

Having prepared and memorized the Courtier's lines, and rejected the fate reserved to the Sorcerer (Balandier 1980), claiming back the ambivalence of his status as a producer and a community member, the heritage producer may find solace in the knowledge that power needs a proficient stage manager to be choreographed, and that the ceremonies of power need a compliant audience for the powerful to be recognized publicly.

Both ways, the lessons in deceit learnt from the authorities may not be lost on members of the community - either the individual producer wearing the three masks tradition recommends to those approaching power, or on the audience returning instructional noise with silent contempt, mass information with massive inattention, making a wager on the
"unreliable narrator, who, by disorienting readers and violating their trust, leads them to a
greater depth of thought and self awareness" (Warwick 1989, 498; on Ricoeur Time and
Narrative 1988).

For there is always a gap, a privileged position where producers and public may look at
heritage productions for what they could be, and for what they are - precarious
rods/staffs/totems authorities are nailed to by the fear of losing their hold over a crowd,
rational labyrinths where to lose oneself in oblivion while making transitory commitments to
memory - monuments dedicated to forgetfulness and forgiveness, and magnificent illusions
that, on the strength that created them, might even be real.

Do "mind the gap", for this is where "the spirit of disorder, the enemy of boundaries"
(Hurley 1991, 69), the trickster sits, as the agent of disruption or as a cultural hero - "the
origins, the liveliness, and durability of cultures (requiring) that there be space for figures
whose function is to uncover and disrupt the very things that cultures are based on"; "When
he lies and steals, it isn't so much to get away with something or get rich as to disturb the
established categories of truth and property and, by doing so, open the road to possible
new worlds" (Hyde 1998; 9 and 13).

The Gap then, epistemologically or ethically, is a dangerous, narrow but promising place:
it is a border that the heritage producer is expected to respect, but should not, in order to
secure 'his' ways: "Disorder belongs to the totality of life, and the spirit of this disorder is
the trickster. His function.. is to add disorder to order and so make a whole, to render
possible, within the fixed bounds of what is permitted, an experience of what is not
permitted" (Hurley 1991, 69).

The individual producer, in a field that stands still, moves: "a trickster does not live near
the hearth; he does not live in the halls of justice, the soldier's tent, the shaman's hut, the
monastery. He passes through each of these when there is a moment of silence, and he
enlivens each with mischief, but he is not their guiding spirit. He is the spirit of the doorway,
leading out, and of the crossroad, at the edge of town. He is the spirit of the road at dusk,
the one that runs from one town to another and belongs to neither" (Hyde 1998,7).

The heritage communicator as the go-between: "The road that trickster travels is a spirit
road as well as a road in fact. He is the adept who can move between heaven and earth,
and between the living and the dead. As such, he is sometimes the messenger of the gods,
and sometimes the guide of souls, carrying the dead into the underworld or opening the tomb to release them when they must walk among us" (Hyde 1998, 7).

The institutional producer as a boundary-crosser: "Every group has its edge, its sense of in and out, and trickster is always there, at the gates of the city and the gates of life, making sure there is commerce. He also attends the internal boundaries by which groups articulate their social life. We constantly distinguish - right and wrong, sacred and profane, clean and dirty, male and female, young and old, living and dead - and in every case trickster will cross the line and confuse the distinction. Trickster is the creative idiot, therefore, the wise fool, the grey-haired baby, the cross-dresser, the speaker of sacred profanities. Where someone's sense of honorable behavior had left him, unable to act, trickster will appear to suggest an amoral action, something right/wrong, that will set life going again. Trickster is the mythic embodiment of ambiguity and ambivalence, doubleness and duplicity, contradiction and paradox" (Hyde 1998, 7).

The heritage producer as worshipper of Hermes, moving from the feral to the civilized, and leaving monuments behind to be grateful for a safe passage: "The name Hermes once meant 'he of the stone heap', which tells us that the cairn is more than a trail marker - it is an altar to the forces that govern these spaces of heightened uncertainty, and to the intelligence needed to negotiate them. Hitchikers who make it safely home have somewhere paid homage to Hermes" (Hyde 1998, 7).
Monumentum

In memory of J.H. Lydius
Notorious Canada Trader, and Interpreter
(Albany 1704 - Kensington 1791)

"The disreputable John Henry Lydius earned the dubious distinction of eventually incurring the enmity of nearly everyone who came to know him. In 1725, he moved to Montreal, where he married a French woman and acted as an agent for New Englanders who participated in the clandestine fur trade.

After being expelled from Canada, he settled on New York's northern frontier, where he eventually built a blockhouse on the route between the Hudson River and Lake Champlain. Traveling back and forth between Albany and this fort, he carried on a profitable trade with Canada, probably through his oldest son, who lived there.

Although the Governor of New York had once described Lydius as 'either Mad or a Knave', he attempted to have the British government appoint him as Indian Secretary in 1749. The Governor and his associates valued Lydius for his influence among the Indians, but eventually the Iroquois discovered that the old rogue had been trying to cheat them out of their lands, and at a conference an Oneida sachem declared to the King's representative: 'You promised us that you would keep this fire place clean from all filth and that no snake should come into this Council Room. That Man sitting there (pointing to Lydius) is a Devil" (Norton - The Fur Trade in Colonial New York [1686-1776], 1974).

Tradition wants that Johannes Hendricks, jean-henri, John Henry Lydius walked with a limp.
On the common use of analogy

**CITIZEN DOG** by Mark O'Hare

Treasure hunters often discover that history isn't as rich as they were led to believe.

2: Prime Minister Bouchard bringing gifts to the English speaking minority in the Province of Québec. Edwards, Syndicated Feature in the Globe and Mail (Private Collection. No date).

5: Role reversal – the Natives doing to the White Man what White anthropologists have been doing to their ancestors’ “bones”. Eddenden, in the *Globe and Mail*, 29 January 1998.
LES PARCS HISTORIQUES NATIONAUX

RÉGION DE L'ATLANTIQUE
1. ALEXANDER GRAHAM BELL
2. TOUR MARTELLO DE CARLETON
3. CASTLE HILL
4. FORT AMHERST/PORT-LA-JOYE
5. FORT ANNE
6. FORT BEAUSEJOUR
7. FORT EDWARD
8. FORTERESSE DE LOUISBOURG
9. GRAND-PRIE
10. CITADELLE D'HALIFAX
11. LANSE-AUX-MEADOWS
12. PORT-AU-CHOIX
13. PORT-ROYAL
14. TOUR MARTELLO DU PRINCE-DE-GALLES
15. PROVINCE HOUSE
16. BLOCKHAUS ST-ANDREWS
17. SIGNAL HILL
18. REDOUTE YORK
19. CAP SPEAR
20. ARDOOWAN
21. LA PÊCHE SUR LES BANCs À L'ÈRE DE LA VOILE
22. FORT McNAB
23. L'ÎLE BEAUBEARS
24. LA SURVIVANCE DU PEUPLE ACADIEN
25. L'ÎLE GRASSY
26. MARCONI

RÉGION DU QUÉBEC
27. PARC-DE-L'ARTILLERIE
28. BATAILLE-DE-LA-CHÂTEAUGUAY
29. CARTIER-BRÉBEUF
30. LOUIS-S.-ST-LAURENT
31. CANAL-DE-LACHINE
32. CÔTÉAU-DU-LAC
33. LES-FORGES-DU-ST-MAURICE
34. FORT-CHAMBLY
35. FORT-LENNOX
36. FORT-NUMERO-UN
37. FORT-TEMISCAMINGUE
38. FORTIFICATIONS-DE-QUÉBEC
39. SIR-WILFRID-LAURIER
40. COMMERCE-DE-LA-FOURRURE-À-LACHINE
41. VIEUX-PORT-DE-QUÉBEC
42. BATAILLE-DE-LA-RISTIGOUCHE
43. SIR-GEORGE-ETIENNE-CARTIER
44. PHARE-DE-POINTE-DE-PÈRE
45. GROSSE-ÎLE

RÉGION DE L'ONTARIO
46. VILLA BELLEVUE
47. LA MAISON COMMÉMORATIVE DE BETHUNE
48. MONUMENT BROCK
49. FORT GEORGE
50. FORT MALDEN
51. FORT ST-JOSEPH
52. FORT WELLINGTON
53. WOODSIDE
54. BATAILLE DU MOULIN À VENT
55. CASERNES BUTLER
56. TOURS MARTELLO KINSTON

RÉGION DES PRAIRIES
57. BATOCHÉ
58. BATTLEFORD
59. FORT PRINCE-DE-GALLES
60. FORT WALSH
61. LOWER FORT GARRY
62. S.S. KLONDIKE
63. YORK FACTORY
64. MAISON RIEL
65. LIEUX HISTORIQUES NATIONAUX DU KLONDIKE
66. MOTHERWELL HOMESTEAD
67. LE MASSACRE DE CYPRUS HILLS
68. FORT ESPÉRANCE
69. PRESBYTÈRE DE ST-ANDREWS
70. LA FOURCHE

RÉGION DE L'OUEST
71. FORT LANGLEY
72. FORT RODD HILL
73. FORT ST. JAMES
74. ROCKY MOUNTAIN HOUSE
75. ST-ROCH
76. KITWANGA
77. PHARE FISGARD
78. COL ROGERS
79. CENTRE DU CENTENAIRE DE CAVE ET BASIN
80. MUSÉE DU PARC NATIONAL BANFF
81. LA PISTE CHILKOOT

6: Location of Parks Canada's National Historic Sites 1990. (Canadian Parks Service).
On daily life and philosophical concepts

Peanuts

I FAILED A BIG TEST TODAY.. ALL THE TRUES WERE FALSE AND ALL THE FALSES WERE TRUE..

THAT'S LIFE.. ALL THE TRUES ARE FALSE AND ALL THE FALSES ARE TRUE..

LIFE IS PROBABLY EASIER IF YOU'RE A DOG..

THAT'S TRUE.. OR IS IT FALSE?


EXISTING ORDER THRIVES UPON IGNORANCE AND LIES.

OBJECTIVE TRUTH AND INDIVIDUAL REASON ARE FEARED ABOVE ALL.

WHY ARE YOU TELLING HIM THINGS LIKE THAT?

SEE?


Non Sequitur

THE OPENING CEREMONY OF THE ANNUAL DOGMA DAY PARADE.

FOLLOW ME TO THE TRUTH.

FOLLOW ME TO THE TRUTH.

FOLLOW ME TO THE TRUTH.

Par ses activités et produits, Parcs Canada offre à des publics cibles des possibilités d’apprentissage spécifiques qui les aident à gravir les échelons de l’appartenance à la cause patrimoniale (patrimoine naturel et culturel).

**SOUTIENT PAR SES ACTIVITÉS**
L’individu participe activement, d’une manière ou d’une autre, aux commémorations ainsi qu’à la protection et à la mise en valeur du patrimoine naturel et culturel du Canada.

**SOUTIENT PAR SON COMPORTEMENT**
L’individu, par sa conduite, se soucie du patrimoine et croit au mandat de Parcs Canada.

**VALORISE**
L’individu croit à la valeur intrinsèque des parcs nationaux et lieux historiques nationaux, ainsi qu’à leur importance pour l’identité canadienne.

**COMPREND**
L’individu connaît à fond le réseau national et les concepts d’intégrité écologique et commémorative, et les comprend.

**APPRÉCIE**
L’individu saisit la portée et l’importance du patrimoine mis en valeur dans les aires patrimoniales nationales et peut faire des commentaires à ce sujet.

**A UNE CONNAISSANCE GÉNÉRALE**
L’individu a une idée plus ou moins claire de ce qu’est le réseau national des lieux patrimoniaux et peut nommer plusieurs parcs nationaux et lieux historiques nationaux.

**NE SAIT PAS**
L’individu ne sait rien de Parcs Canada ou du réseau national des aires patrimoniales nationales.

**NE SOUTIENT PAS**
L’individu ne soutient pas la cause de la protection et de la mise en valeur du patrimoine naturel et culturel canadien, et n’y croit pas.

---

On economic capitalists in disrepute

15: Museum, politics and money – the view from the Canadian Museum of Civilization as it is made to appear through computerization on a Canadian Bank Note; in Canadian Museum of Civilization Treasures, Trésors

17: Merchandizing the National Parks in the wake of the movie 'Grey Owl' - Gable, in the *Globe and Mail*, 20 October 1999.

18: Cashing on an institution - Jenkins, in the *Globe and Mail*, 25 September 1999
**BETWEEN POLLS**

By Michael Eddenden

I DON'T UNDERSTAND ALL THIS Fuss ABOUT ARCHEOLOGISTS STUDYING NATIVE BURIALS...

IT'S NOT LIKE THEY'RE GOING TO DISPLAY THEM AS CARNIVALS DID YEARS AGO—"SEE THE NOBLE SAVAGE, A LOOK!

NOW IT'S SCIENTIFIC!

TV. SPECIALS, VIDEOS, GLOSSY PHOTO SPREADS IN MASS MARKET MAGAZINES...

NOT TO MENTION FRIDGE MAGNETS, STICK-ON TATTOOS...

---

19: Merchandizing the Natives; now and then - Eddenden, in the *Globe and Mail*, 20 January 1998.

---

**BETWEEN POLLS**

By Michael Eddenden

WE AT THE NOVA NADA MONASTERY SPEND MUCH OF OUR DAY IN SILENT MEDITATION. THE GHASTLY NOISE OF YOUR LOGGING OPERATIONS WILL MAKE THIS UTTERLY IMPOSSIBLE.

...IT IS FOR THE SILENCE OF SILENCE THAT WE CAME TO THIS WILDERNESS.

WILDERNESS? I THOUGHT THIS WAS ZONED INDUSTRIAL? OF COURSE IT IS. IT'S FULL OF TREES.

HEY, IF YOU'RE LOOKING FOR QUIET, TRY THE SUBURBS.

WE DO. BUT, WELL...

THE TEMPTATION OF CABLE... YOU KNOW.

---

**BETWEEN POLLS**

By Michael Eddenden

THE NOISE OF YOUR LOGGING DESOLATES OUR MONASTERY'S WAY OF LIFE!

EVEN PRAYER IS NOT POSSIBLE!

HUMANITY HAS BEEN REPLACED BY BUSINESS!

STRAVING FOR HIGH, MIGHTY ASPIRATIONS IS NOW MERELY CHASING MONEY.

WHAT'S HE SAY?

SOMETHING ABOUT 'CHASE MONEY, NOW'. WE ARE! WE ARE!

---

20: Capitalists negotiating; the Nova Nada Monastery stand-off against the Irving Company lumbering the woods surrounding the Monastery - Eddenden, in the *Globe and Mail* 7 July and 4 October 1998.


24: Cultural capitalists paying their debt to society - Piraro, Syndicated Feature in the Globe and Mail, 23 September 1999.
Non Sequitur

How to tell
You've wandered
into the bad part
of the resort.

WE TOURISTS!


Bizarro

Do you want to wait till two for the meaning of life, or shall we just go someplace else?

Map 1. Lower Fort Garry, 1991


29: Lower Fort Garry (circa 1865) from a Parks Canada leaflet (1991)
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On managers – and bureaucrats in disrepute

WE'VE DIGITALIZED AND INDEXED THE WORLD'S GREATEST ART. THIS IS "THE LAST SUPPER.”

THE COMPOSITION IS CLUTTERED. DELETE A FEW OF THOSE GUYS. DO YOU HAVE ANY CLIP ART OF BAGELS?

DO THEY LOOK HAPPY?

WALLY AND I CAME UP WITH A GREAT NEW PRODUCT IDEA!

STATE YOUR IDEA NOW

UM, YOU TELL HIM.

IF YOUR NUMBERS ARE CORRECT, MY STRATEGIC PLAN IS IRRATIONAL.

COGNITIVE DISSONANCE TAKES OVER

YOU SURE ARE BAD WITH NUMBERS.

WHAT WAS THAT NOISE?

YOUR COMPENSATION IS RELATED TO THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE YOU MANAGE.

LIKEWISE, MY CAREER AS DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEPENDS ON THE QUANTITY OF EMPLOYEES.

IT'S AS IF THERE WERE A CONSPIRACY TO HIRE HORDES OF INCOMPETENT EMPLOYEES.

DESIGNING A CALL CENTER

GIVE THE EMPLOYEES SIX MINUTES OF BATHROOM BREAKS PER SHIFT.

TINY CUBICLES...AND WELL MONITOR CALLS AND HAVE INCOMPATIBLE OBJECTIVES, SUCH AS SPEED AND CUSTOMER SERVICE.

HOW'S THE PROJECT GOING?

I'M STILL COLLECTING THE ABUSER REQUIREMENTS.

DESIGNING A CALL CENTER

IF THE EMPLOYEES GET THIS VOLUME OF CALLS PER DAY THEY WILL WISH THEY WERE DEAD.

BUT THEY WON'T BE DEAD, JUST TOO BEATEN-DOWN TO LOOK FOR BETTER JOBS.

I DON'T KNOW HOW TO MAKE IT ANY MORE INHUMANE.

WE CAN PUNISH THEM FOR NOT BEING CHEERFUL.

THIS IS OUR NEW CEO. HE HAS A REPUTATION AS A TURNAROUND EXPERT.

IT IS A PLEASURE TO MEET YOU. DO YOU FAVOR TQM OR MORE OF A BUSINESS PROCESS APPROACH?

I'M PARTIAL TO THE VALUE-BASED MANAGEMENT METHOD.

I'M NOT FAMILIAR WITH THAT ONE.
I'VE BEEN ORDERED TO BUILD A COMPANY CALL CENTER WITH INHUMANE WORKING CONDITIONS FOR THE EMPLOYEES.

BUT I DON'T FEEL GUilty BECAUSE I'M ONLY ACTING UNDER ORDERS, AND MAYBE THEY DID SOMETHING TO DESERVE IT.

I MIGHT NEED YOUR HELP TO DEMONIZE THEM.

I'M ALL OVER IT.

PEOPLE WITH BAD OPINIONS

THE INTERNET SHOULD BE FREE. WHY SHOULD I HAVE TO PAY SOME GREEDY CORPORATION OR LOOK AT ADS??!

I WILL NOW USE THIS CARDBOARD TUBE TO EXPLAIN THE INTRICACIES OF CAPITALISM.

LESSON ONE:

THIS WAS SOMETHING THAT SHOULD BE FREE.

THERE'S A RUMOR THE COMPANY IS MOVING TO SOUTH DAKOTA FOR TAX REASONS.

DO YOU SERIously THINK THEY WOULD DISRUPT THE LIVES OF THOUSANDS OF EMPLOYEES JUST TO SAVE MONEY ON TAXES?

I THINK THEY'D KILL US IN OUR SLEEP AND SELL OUR ORGANS IF THE RETURN ON INVESTMENT WAS GOOD.

STOP IT. ILL BE AFRAID TO SLEEP IN MY CUBICLE NOW.

HOW MUCH BUDGET DO I HAVE FOR MY PROJECT?

IF YOU KNEW WHAT YOUR BUDGET WAS, YOU'D SPEND IT ALL.

CAN YOU AT LEAST TELL ME WHAT OUR COMPANY STRATEGY IS?

NO, I DON'T WANT YOU TO LOSE HOPE.
On the use of the straight line as a rhetorical device

(a) Objects of orientation (X₁, ..., Xₙ) in the sensory field of the receiver (B) are transmitted directly to him in abstracted from (X₁, ..., Xₙ) after a process of selection from among all Xs, such selection being based at least in part on the needs and problems of B. Some or all are transmitted in more than one sense (X₃ₙ, for example).

(b) The same Xs are selected and abstracted by communicator (A) and transmitted as a message (X') to B, who may or may not have part or all of the Xs in his own sensory field (X₉₈). Either purposively or nonpurposively, B transmits feedback (fBA) to A.

(c) What Xs B receives may be owing to selected abstractions transmitted by a nonpurposive encoder (C), acting for B and thus extending B's environment. C's selections are necessarily based in part on feedback (fBC) from B.

(d) The messages C transmits to B (X") represent his selections from both messages to him from As (X') and C's selections and abstractions from Xs in his own sensory field (X₉₉, X₉₄), which may or may not be Xs in A's field. Feedback not only moves from B to A (fBA) and from B to C (fBC) but also from C to A (fCA). Clearly, in the mass communication situation, a large number of Cs receive from a very large number of As and transmit to a vastly larger number of Bs, who simultaneously receive from other Cs.

33: The Gatekeeper Communication Model, in McQuail 1994, 100.

Fig 1. Relationship of cultural resource value.

Preserved Cultural Resources
- Preserved material from past cultures: Objects, structures, sites, human landscapes
- Governmental policies, laws, agencies, educational institutions, societies and interest groups; and businesses devoted to cultural resource preservation and study

Societal Institutions
- Public understanding of and appreciation for cultural resources
- Books, articles, films, classes, lectures, museum displays about past cultures

Types of Value
- Economic
- Aesthetic
- Associative/symbolic
- Informational

Value Contexts
- Economic Potential: Market factors, costs of development vs. preservation
- Aesthetic Standards: Stylistic tradition, human psychology, etc.
- Traditional Knowledge: Historical documents, oral tradition, folklore, mythology, etc.
- Formal Research: History, archaeology, art, and architectural history, folklore studies, etc.

Basic phenomena
- Cultural Resource Base: Objects, structures, sites, human landscapes surviving from the past

## CATEGORY A: DEMOGRAPHY (I.A.)

### Component 1: Population (I.A.1)

**Theme a:** Composition (I.A.1.a)
- * Sub-theme i - Ethnic Groups (I.A.1.a.i)
  - li - Population Change (I.A.1.a.ii)
  - lii - Population Characteristics (I.A.1.a.iii)

**Theme b:** Movement (I.A.1.b)
- li - Early European, pre-17th Century (I.A.1.b.i)
  - lii - French Regime 1604-1759 (I.A.1.b.ii)
  - liii - Conquest Period 1759-1770 (I.A.1.b.iii)
- li - Industrial - St. Lawrence Valley (I.A.1.b.iv)
  - lii - Upper Great Lakes (I.A.1.b.ii)
  - liii - Hudson Bay Lowlands (I.A.1.b.iii)
  - liiv - Great Plains (I.A.1.b.iv)
  - liii - Mackenzie Valley/Yukon (I.A.1.b.iii)
  - liiv - Pacific Slope (I.A.1.b.iv)
  - liv - Arctic (I.A.1.b.v)

### Component 2: Settlement (I.A.2)

**Theme a:** Patterns (I.A.2.a)
- li - Extractive (I.A.2.a.i)
  - lii - Agrarian (I.A.2.a.ii)
  - liii - Commercial (I.A.2.a.iii)
  - liv - Residential (I.A.2.a.iv)
  - lv - Industrial (I.A.2.a.v)
  - li - Mixed (I.A.2.a.vi)

**Theme b:** Policies (I.A.2.b)

**Theme c:** Hunting and Trapping (I.A.1.c)
- li - Atlantic (I.A.1.c.i)
  - lii - St. Lawrence Valley (I.A.1.c.ii)
  - liii - Upper Great Lakes (I.A.1.c.iii)
  - liv - Hudsons Bay Lowlands (I.A.1.c.iv)
  - lv - Great Plains (I.A.1.c.v)
  - lii - Mackenzie Valley/Yukon (I.A.1.c.ii)
  - liii - Pacific Slope (I.A.1.c.iii)
  - liiv - Arctic (I.A.1.c.iv)

## CATEGORY A: SOCIAL ORGANIZATION (I.B.)

### Component 1: Occupations (I.B.1)

**Theme a:** Types and Distribution (I.B.1.a)
- li - Primary Industry (I.B.1.a.i)
- lii - Secondary Industry (I.B.1.a.ii)
- liii - Tertiary Industry (I.B.1.a.iii)

### Component 2: Secondary (I.B.2)

**Theme a:** Manufacturing (I.B.2.a)
- li - Manufacturing (I.B.2.a.i)
- lii - Metal (I.B.2.a.ii)
- liii - Plants, factories, shipyards (I.B.2.a.iii)

## CATEGORY A: INDUSTRY (I.I.A)

### Component 1: Primary (I.I.A.1)

**Theme a:** Agriculture (I.I.A.1.a)

**Sub-theme a:** Ocean (I.I.A.1.a.i)
- li - Colonial Subsistence (I.I.A.1.a.ii)
  - lii - Mercantile (I.I.A.1.a.iii)
  - liii - Early Scientific (I.I.A.1.a.iv)
  - liv - Late (I.I.A.1.a.v)
- lii - Modern (I.I.A.1.b)

**Theme b:** Fishing (I.I.A.1.b)

**Theme c:** Hunting and Trapping (I.I.A.1.c)
- li - Atlantic (I.I.A.1.c.i)
  - lii - St. Lawrence Valley (I.I.A.1.c.ii)
  - liii - Upper Great Lakes (I.I.A.1.c.iii)
  - liv - Hudsons Bay Lowlands (I.I.A.1.c.iv)
  - lv - Great Plains (I.I.A.1.c.v)
  - lii - Mackenzie Valley/Yukon (I.I.A.1.c.ii)
  - liii - Pacific Slope (I.I.A.1.c.iii)
  - liiv - Arctic (I.I.A.1.c.iv)

**Theme d:** Mining, Quaries, and Wells (I.I.A.1.d)

**Theme e:** Forestry (I.I.A.1.e)

**Theme f:** Mining, Quarries, and Wells (I.I.A.1.f)

## CATEGORY A: ECONOMIC HISTORY (I.I.I.A)

### Component 1: Secondary (I.I.I.A.2)

**Theme a:** Manufacturing (I.I.I.A.2.a)

**Sub-theme a:** Ocean (I.I.I.A.2.a.i)
- li - Metal (I.I.I.A.2.a.ii)
- lii - Plants, factories, shipyards (I.I.I.A.2.a.iii)

## CATEGORY A: POLITICAL HISTORY (I.I.I.A)

### Component 1: Executive (I.I.I.A.1)

**Theme a:** Crown (I.I.I.A.1.a)

**Sub-theme a:** Government (I.I.I.A.1.a.i)
  - lii - Lieutenant-Governor (I.I.I.A.1.a.iii)
  - liii - Scale of Government (I.I.I.A.1.a.iv)

**Theme b:** Appointed Council (I.I.I.A.1.b)

**Theme c:** Cabinets (I.I.I.A.1.c)

**Theme d:** Leaders (I.I.I.A.1.d)

### Component 2: Legislative (I.I.I.A.2)

**Theme a:** Appointed Council (I.I.I.A.2.a)

**Sub-theme a:** Native Councils (I.I.I.A.2.a.i)
  - lii - Colonial (I.I.I.A.2.a.ii)
  - liii - Provincial/Territorial (I.I.I.A.2.a.iii)
  - liv - Privy Councils (Canada) (I.I.I.A.2.a.iv)

**Theme b:** National Assemblies (I.I.I.A.2.b)

**Theme c:** Colonies (I.I.I.A.2.c)

**Theme d:** Executive Councils (I.I.I.A.2.d)

**Theme e:** Deans (I.I.I.A.2.e)

## CATEGORY A: INSTITUTIONS OF GOVERNMENT (I.I.I.A.1)

### Component 1: Executive (I.I.I.A.1)

**Theme a:** Crown (I.I.I.A.1.a)

**Sub-theme a:** Government (I.I.I.A.1.a.i)
  - lii - Lieutenant-Governor (I.I.I.A.1.a.iii)
  - liii - Scale of Government (I.I.I.A.1.a.iv)

**Theme b:** Appointed Council (I.I.I.A.1.b)

**Theme c:** Cabinets (I.I.I.A.1.c)

**Theme d:** Leaders (I.I.I.A.1.d)

### Component 2: Legislative (I.I.I.A.2)

**Theme a:** Appointed Council (I.I.I.A.2.a)

**Sub-theme a:** Native Councils (I.I.I.A.2.a.i)
  - liii - Colonial (I.I.I.A.2.a.ii)
  - liii - Provincial/Territorial (I.I.I.A.2.a.iii)
  - liv - Privy Councils (Canada) (I.I.I.A.2.a.iv)

**Theme b:** National Assemblies (I.I.I.A.2.b)

**Theme c:** Colonies (I.I.I.A.2.c)

**Theme d:** Executive Councils (I.I.I.A.2.d)

**Theme e:** Deans (I.I.I.A.2.e)

## CATEGORY A: SOCIAL ORGANIZATION (I.B.)

### Component 1: Occupations (I.B.1)

**Theme a:** Types and Distribution (I.B.1.a)
- li - Primary Industry (I.B.1.a.i)
- lii - Secondary Industry (I.B.1.a.ii)
- liii - Tertiary Industry (I.B.1.a.iii)

### Component 2: Secondary (I.B.2)

**Theme a:** Manufacturing (I.B.2.a)

**Sub-theme a:** Ocean (I.B.2.a.i)
- li - Metal (I.B.2.a.ii)
- lii - Plants, factories, shipyards (I.B.2.a.iii)
On an alternative meaning to the concept of continuity

BIZARRO

By DAN PIRARO

WE’RE ANCESTORS OF YOURS AND HAVE BEEN ALLOWED TO COME BACK LONG ENOUGH TO TELL YOU YOUR CAPACITY FOR OFFENDING PEOPLE IS ENTIRELY HEREDITARY.

YOU’LL ALWAYS BE A JERK. JUST ENJOY IT.
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