A nostalgic visit to heritage centres and museums

Maaria Linko: Societies represent the relationship to their history through museums. In recent years there has been critical debate on the way the museums themselves influence our understanding of the past and our perceptions of the present. The Finnish sociologist Maaria Linko analyzes the ideology of heritage centres and museums. She takes up her own position: nostalgia is not just to be rejected.

The heritage industry
The term heritage production is used to refer to the dramatic expansion of museums in recent years and to their increasing economic and cultural significance. In a wide sense many postindustrial countries, perhaps Britain especially, is manufacturing heritage, a commodity which nobody seems to be able to define, but which everybody is eager to sell, in particular those cultural institutions that can no longer rely on government funds. Most particularly, this applies to museums with displays of Britain's industrial history. The museum time machine discusses not only the situation in Britain but also that of France, Australia, the United States and Canada. The discussion on heritage has become lively in many different formats, although no one quite seems to know how the concept itself should be defined.

The key question in the debate is: what sort of picture of the past and the present does heritage production convey to the general public? For example, is it possible that the thriving heritage industry draws people's attention too much to the past so that they lose sight of the present and future? Are museums starting to resemble mass marketed commercial culture, a place in which to escape the problems of the outside world? Or are they an innocent part of leisure activities whose participants are conscious of their role as consumers?

Robert Hewison looks at the thriving business around heritage and draws important connections to contemporary culture and to the future prospects in Britain. The writers of the museum time machine discuss not only the situation in Britain but also that of France, Australia, the United States and Canada. The discussion on heritage has become lively in countries such as Sweden, Norway and Germany as well. Historical roots for the construction of identity have been sought more and more intensively since the late 1980's on both individual and national level.

The Australian Donald Horne (1984) travelled to each European national capital and went through their official sights. Horne takes a critical stand on the picture of the past that is offered to tourists.

The background for Robert Hewison's book lies in the notion that even though the standard of living in Britain has risen since World War II, the relative position of Britain among other European countries has deteriorated. At the moment, Hewison has noted, the whole of Britain seems to be turning into a museum. Paradoxically, at the same time, single museums are fine institutions whose purpose is to restore and display objects, educate the public and keep conceptions of the past alive.

For Hewison the heritage industry is an attempt to dispel the climate of decline by exploiting the economic potential of culture in Britain. He does not criticise the heritage industry simply because so many of its products are fantasies of a world that never existed or because it represents some undemocratic social values. It is ideologically based on escape from today's recession: 'Hypnotised by the images of the past, we risk losing all capacity for creative change,' he writes. The concept 'heritage industry' refers to a large business branch and not only to museums: we can escape to the 'lovely past' by watching a historical drama series on TV or by looking at a Laura Ashley catalogue or by reading a historical drama series on TV.

Visitors as actors
The heritage industry has been taken to its extreme in Britain but at the same time art and heritage have turned into successful goods for consumption all over the world. The marketing of these goods is flourishing and it is based on augmented leisure time and chances to travel and it is not completely impervious to economic swings. Also, another explanation for the success of heritage industry is connected with the modern identity which is characterized by a need to new experiences in consumption. The modern hedonist is a consumer in the landscape of consumer goods. Instead of consuming real objects he is the consumer of more and more distinctive images or experiences. Heritage centres and all kinds of heritage products are typical examples of this kind of consumption.

One of Hewison's illustrative excursions is that of Wigan Pier, a place described earlier by George Orwell in his novel the road to Wigan Pier which is set in the recession of the 1930's. At the museum a team of actors have been employed to perform episodes of life as it used to be in 1900. Hewison's point is that the presence of actors does not show that we want to be reminded of the past, but in fact, that we want to live in the past. An actor, even when performing the hardships of life in the past makes the past look picturesque - the emotional experience surpasses the cognitive elements.

Hewison does not seem to consider the possibility that the visitors act as self-conscious actors like the audience of television series or readers of popular fiction. They may be conscious about the ways in which they use the cultural products, for instance in their social interaction or as other resources in their social action. Cultural products are not necessarily received as representations of reality, they can be experienced as resources for freedom and strength.

Generally, Hewison's claims are interesting but highly provocative. A possible option might be that heritage centres had a minimum effect on the shape of industry and its grim prospects. Instead they might potentially have a relatively high indirect effect on employment in the tourist industry.
An embellished industrial history
The success of ‘historical tourism’ has been enormous. Closed mines, factories and other industrial sites have been transformed into either museums or elegant shopping malls. Lately these two and other functions have been combined at the same site. A luxurious shopping centre might include an art gallery or a museum. In another case, a huge shopping mall may include a wide range of leisure activities such as an amusement park and a skating rink. An extreme example of this development is the West Edmonton Mall in Alberta, Canada.1

On the other hand, a heritage site might turn into a market of all kinds of consumer goods as has happened at Stonehenge historical site in Britain.2 In Southern Europe, ordinary shops for tourists are often called ‘exhibitions’ or ‘galleries’ (‘entrée free’). The entrepreneurs of consumer culture try to imitate the high status of museums, and at the same time many museums try to learn from the elegance, accessibility and pleasure of the senses offered by different stores. The distinction between a shopping mall and an exhibition may be vague in practice, too. Adrian Mellor’s (1991) self-ironic description of observing people in Liverpool’s redeveloped Albert Dock shopping area is a good example of that phenomenon. He expected to find alienated and melancholic wanderers. Actually, he found cheerful people with no difficulty to combine a museum visit, shopping and the pure enjoyment of leisure and strolling.

Bob West, a Birmingham school historian, has criticised industrial museums by using the Ironbridge Gorge heritage centre in central England as an example. Industrial museums are usually organised around associations which receive financial support from a broad range of charity organisations and private companies, and of course they are also founded by the state. What they all have in common is a view of the significance of history, and the museum faithfully reproduces this view in relics radially separated from their social relations of production and consumption. This is the crucial point in Bob West’s criticism.3 The collection and display of objects gives an overly positive view of the privileged classes. He even claims that values behind such museums ‘favour the privileged classes and antiprogressive accounts of history with their blindness to class struggle, gender inequalities, and racist legacy of the British Empire’.4 At the same time an illusion of objectivity is maintained.

West analyses idealised museum saw mills and compares them to ‘real saw mills’ characterised by class conflicts, masculinity, contest, aggression and humour. My argument is that as a subtext there is also just one notion of historically realistic saw mills in West’s own writing. West’s point of view prevents him from giving value to some other aspects such as the way the machinery is reconstructed and represented to the public. The representation of a saw mill consists of several elements of which the representation of power relations is one and the representation of technology is another. The various descriptions also lead to the need to define visitor experience, West continues, and calls this effect image control. Every detail of the display has to carry the idea of good taste. A visit to a museum has to be an invitation to a ‘respectable day out’.5 West even argues that amusement parks would be better places as leisure activities than heritage centres because every visitor is aware of their meaning. Visitors being critical of the view of reality in a heritage centre display is unrealistic. My impression is that West would get more pleasure out of a visit to American theme parks described by Umberto Eco (1986) and others with fine irony. Also at Eurodisneyland too, the need for the ‘authentic experiences’ of the visitors is not being used; the inauthenticity is clear to everyone, or perhaps the question of originality is posed within the Disney culture. However, to make this distinction between heritage centres and amusement parks more confusing, Disney inc. is planning to build a vast historical theme park called Disney’s America near Washington. This theme park would include an imitation of American history, hotels, a golf course and a water park.

The Bonk business in Finland
An interesting art and heritage industry project taking place in contemporary Finland is called Bonk Business Incorporated. This case ties in the ongoing discussion about the heritage industry, especially with the history of industrialism. Bonk is an imaginary company producing mostly imaginary products founded by a young Finnish artist Alvar Gullichsen. There have been several humorous Bonk exhibits which have included especially machinery recalling the early phases of industrialism. These machines are extremely well made and they are treated as elegant sculptures. According to the artist, there is one thing all the machines have in common: not a single one of them works. And most critics and the art public are thrilled.

The Bonk products include, for instance, paintings of the machinery and advertisement posters that resemble American posters from the fifties. An ‘official’ history of the fictitious company has even been written—all in a humorous manner and with great elegance and polish. Shares in the company can be bought (with real money); reality and fiction are entangled in a manner that makes people curious. It is widely known that this artist is a descendant of the founder of a large industrial company in which his family is still the biggest shareholder. The concept that binds the Bonk business together could be called industrial nostalgia.

Bonk business includes features that are at least as absurd as those described by British heritage critics. For instance, a museum for Bonk items was opened recently in the Finnish city of Uusikaupunki, whose economy used to be based largely on the automobile industry and before that on ship building. Nowadays the unemployment rate is higher than 30 per cent in the area and the future looks gloomy. A business that started out as a joke has turned not only into legitimate art but also into a potential business branch and employer, if its indirect impact on tourism and employment in the area is counted. In this situation it is possible to ask in a pointed way: what effect does it have on the identity of the area if its optimistic prospects rely on replicas of outdated machinery— which do not work? Yet, the answer is not necessarily simple. Humour, irony and reflectivity have turned out to be useful tools in difficult circumstances before.

The ideology behind open-air museums
Heritage critics argue that the ideology behind open-air museums and heritage centres in particular is an ‘amnesic one’ (Bennett 1988). Museums are inclined to give an overly romanticised picture of the past. In heritage centres such as Beamish in Northern England (which Tony Bennett uses as an example) the display of objects gives a harmonious and uniform general effect. Even if the museum spans the period from the 1790s to the 1930s, the visitor is given ‘an overwhelming sense of an undifferentiated time suggested by the museum’s setting’.

The background for open-air museums is in Scandinavia. The first one, Skansen, was established in Stockholm in 1891 and the second one, Seurasaari, in Helsinki in 1909. The interest in folk culture in Scandinavia was
originally a progressive phenomenon. The national romanticism that developed in the nineteenth century was born out of the need of the cultural periphery for self-determination. However, this interest in folk culture turned, in many countries, into a form of backward-looking romanticism. According to Bennett the open-air museums mediated an embellished image of the ‘folk’ as a harmonious population of peasants and craft workers. This may be true but, on the other hand, even from the beginning Seurasaari island was a people’s park, a popular site where the city’s workers in particular could make their Sunday outings.

The idea of open-air museums was rooted in the United States in the 1920s and 1930s and the romanticisation of the past went even further there. However, different museums reflect not only a building or an institution in a narrow sense of uniformity of culture with its astonishing eclecticism. This museum contains one of the most significant collections of American arts and crafts and utensils. Also, the residence of the founder of the museum, Elektra Havemayer Webb in New York has been converted into the museum; a paddle steamer and a lighthouse have also been transported to the site. The collection consists of items produced by numerous ethnic groups. By a glaringly open definition of ‘Americans’ the false sense of uniformity criticised by West and Bennett is avoided though not necessarily consciously. However, a sense of a beautiful and harmonious way of living in the past is engraved on the visitor’s mind as he passes impeccable lawns on his tour from one beautiful restored building to another.

Even if the ideology behind the new heritage centres in Britain is related to the romanticism of the older museums, there has been a change in the museums’ displays. Whereas the everyday lives of ordinary working people were previously almost nonexistent in museums, many new museums work on the basis of popular memory and restyle it. This results in an easy-going at-homeness and familiarity.

The British museum and heritage criticism is not quite applicable to, for example, Finland. It is true that the smell of dirt and blood is hard to imitate, but the modest local open-air museums in Finland do perhaps remind visitors of the hardships of life in the past rather than emphasising its harmony. The modesty of living conditions and personal property do not lead the visitor to romanticised nostalgia. Instead the visitor might leave with a relieving sense of the Finnish people surviving despite difficult circumstances and high mortality rate. And a feeling of relief can possibly lead to the sort of optimism that some heritage critics have demanded.

The changing uses of museums

British heritage critics (Lumley, Hewson) have pointed out that in the late 1980s one new museum was opened in Britain every fortnight. In 1990 there were more than 80 million visitors to museums and galleries. The number of visitors to museums has risen also in other countries. Also, the uses of museums have changed. From the visitors’ point of view they have become places to see an exhibition, to have coffee, to attend lectures or to study in a library, to watch a film or slide show, to organise panel discussions, to attend conference banquets, to meet people or to go shopping. The museum is not only a building or an institution in a narrow sense. Museums map out geographies of taste and values, which is an especially difficult and controversial task when it is necessary to radically redraw the maps in response to major social change.

Inexperienced museum visitors as well as museum ‘regulars’ usually have little understanding of art historical periods and stylistic differentiations and do not use this system to structure their viewing, as Danielle Rice has emphasised. However, art is defined in the art world, which does not remain static. The participants in the ‘art world’ or the ‘insiders’ (to use David Unruh’s term) change according to who gets recruited, or to the resources available, or to the kinds of audience. In an art museum setting the culture of the art world clashes perhaps more than in other museums. The selection and display of art in the museum setting are often in direct conflict with the definitions of art of ordinary museum-goers.

Douglas Crimp claims that modern art melted into commodity culture a long time ago. The Museum of Modern Art in New York resembles displays of furniture in department stores. According to Crimp, the development in museums has completed a full circle and in contemporary culture it is ready to return to the art market, the predecessor of the museum. In the 1950s it evolved around some new ideas aimed at changing the traditional museum concept and creating a ‘museum easily accessible to anyone passing by’ (genomgangsmuseum). This museum would also filter contemporary culture. In other words, the museum tried to make it as easy as possible also for inexperienced museum visitors to drop in to see an exhibition. In the 1960s this ideology was even stronger. The decision makers claimed in the democratic atmosphere of the 1960s that if the museum were right in the city centre instead of being situated on a historic island although in a walking distance from downtown, it could reach those who are not very accustomed museum visitors more than before. In the 1960s when the extension of the museum was being planned, a more traditional museum concept became dominant again: museums’ main tasks were again seen to collect, restore and display objects. This development includes returning closer to the enlightenment ideals of the previous century.

In many other countries, museums have only recently become increasingly aware of being dependent on their publics. More generally, it has been said that the museum curators and directors have worked from within their own world views and have assumed that visitors share their values, assumptions and intellectual preoccupations. Museums can be powerful identity-defining machines. The decision makers in museums control the representation of a community and some of its highest, most authoritative truths, Carol Duncan argues. Those who share the values behind a museum and those who are experienced museum visitors have better access to this knowledge and decision makers thus have the ability to generate arguments that leave a minor or no role to the visitors’ own means of making sense of museum exhibitions.

Opposite views have, however, been proposed as well. The earlier Bourdieuan notion of museums as temples inaccessible to the inexperienced public is used by museum authorities as an excuse to justify the transformation of a museum into ‘a Disneyland’. If the number of visitors is the highest, most authoritative truths, Carol Duncan argues. Those who share the values behind a museum and those who are experienced museum visitors have better access to this knowledge and decision makers thus have the ability to generate arguments that leave a minor or no role to the visitors’ own means of making sense of museum exhibitions.
Whose culture is represented?
In all western countries the bourgeois upper class culture has gained more space in museums and in archives than the culture of other classes. The question is not how groups marginal to power, such as servants, women, children, different ethnic groups are represented, but in many cases the question is whether they are represented at all. One problem is the lack or small volume of documents from these groups.

In The great museum Donald Horne (1984) has noted that tourism in Europe is so patriarchal that it is even tedious to repeat it being so. The virgin Mary and Jeanne D’Arc are almost the only women in history that appear as persons in European museums and sculptures. Otherwise women appear as dummies in museum kitchens and naked in paintings as objects for male vision. Gaby Porter27 has studied the representation of women and ordinary life in museums. She has noted that women are absent from virtually every trade and craft workshop in small museums and barely visible in larger industrial museums. Except as domestic servants and shop assistants the visitor is given an impression that women in the past did not work outside the home at all, and spent most of their time sitting at home and sewing. Porter28 has pointed out that only one third of museum professionals in British museums are women and has suspected this (among other structural features of the museum organisation) as being one reason for the one-sided view of women offered to visitors. My impression is that the overall ideology or values and ways of thinking of the surrounding culture in question have more impact on the definition of what is interesting and worth saving than the consistency of the museum staff and its hierarchical structures.

Studying the representations of gender in museum exhibitions and collections is one way of making the hidden presumptions behind museum practices visible. By this process it is possible to start to develop alternative ways of classification, restoring and displaying objects. One way to make the museum more open to the outside society and to the visitors would be to invite specialists from different fields of society to take part in planning exhibitions and other activities.29

Nostalgia as therapy
The critique of the current ideology behind heritage centres and museums discussed above has raised some interesting questions. However, to conclude, I would like to make some critical remarks on this discussion. First, the overall impression of or ‘hidden agenda’ lying behind Hewison’s, West’s or Bennett’s texts is that there is one single, correct idea of history that heritage centres and museums should represent and visitors should adopt. This idea includes a monolithic view of the past, even though our ideas of history are always connected with values that change over time. In addition, the museum critics’ view of correct museum experience seems to come from above of ordinary visitors’ own ways of giving meanings to objects outside the museum and the way they criticize, Donald Horne30, however, believes in the critical potential of visitors or tourists; sightseeing, for instance, can be one of the ways in which we can speculate on these ‘reality-making’ processes. Horne agrees that tourism (and museums can be seen as a part of tourism) can be used to escape from reality and it is acceptable to do so: but we should recognise that we are simply using the past as therapeutic fantasy.

My second critical point is that perhaps people are simply not interested in museum experience, which is predominantly that of a learning situation or consciousness raising. Different kinds of experiences that might, for instance, be emotional or aesthetic in nature, also in museums other than art museums, can be most important to visitors. For instance, through a museum exhibition it may be possible to visualise one’s childhood again. For these reasons exhibitions which are based on popular memory are usually very popular. Seeing a familiar object such as a Tupperware plastic container in the Museum of Modern Art in New York can turn out to be the most cherished memory for a visitor. A Tupperware item can be associated with the visitor’s own family history. Generally, the same item potentially carries symbolic meanings which can be associated with the rebuilding period after the war, with modernisation, with the growth of international trade and contacts and with the beginning of suburban life, just to name a few options. Mihaly Csiksentmihalyi and Eugene Rochberg-Halton (1981) have pointed out that people’s personal belongings in their homes are carriers of memories and emotions: unpersonal objects are transformed into meaningful objects via the emotions attached to them. In other words, to most people the emotional dimension is present in their museum experience and, fortunately, it is being acknowledged more and more in new displays at museums.

It is possible, and also important, to ask what it is that people miss most from the past. Maybe it has to do with a nostalgic longing for stable values and group formations in a culture which has undergone rapid changes. Contrary to other writers on museums, I do not see why this longing could not also include integrating, harmonising and creative elements.

Nostalgia can be a way to adapt to change. It is not only a longing for the past but a reaction to current circumstances. A nostalgic reaction is usually felt at times of discontent, worry or disappointment. In other words, nostalgia is useful in an anomic situation. Nostalgia is closely connected with the feeling of loss of authenticity, and the market uses this need for authenticity in many ways.31 The focal point in the discussion on heritage is the kind of past we want to preserve and who decides on its content.

As part of the need to preserve the past, there is also a need to restore a conception of who we are. Objects in museums are important and meaningful as cultural symbols. A relatively stable system of giving meanings to these symbols facilitates adjustment to changes. Being charmed by nostalgia can be seen as means of adjustment. Nostalgia is not the problem; the problem is simply how deep we lose ourselves in it.

Notes
1. Among the main sources of this article are Robert Hewison’s The heritage industry (1987) and The museum time machine (1988), a collection of essays edited by Robert Lumley.
25. Ibid. p. 102; see also Delaney 1992.
27. 1988, pp. 102-127.
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