

Kent Academic Repository

Full text document (pdf)

Citation for published version

Hodges, Matt (2009) Disciplining Memory: Heritage Tourism and the Temporalisation of the Built Environment in Rural France. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 15 (1). pp. 76-99. ISSN 1352-7258.

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13527250902746112>

Link to record in KAR

<http://kar.kent.ac.uk/27776/>

Document Version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

researchsupport@kent.ac.uk

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

**DISCIPLINING MEMORY:
HERITAGE TOURISM AND THE TEMPORALIZATION OF
THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT IN RURAL FRANCE**

MATT HODGES

POSTPRINT

Published in International Journal of Heritage Studies 15(1): 76-99, 2009.

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13527250902746112#.VG9mFousWSo>

Contact Details:

School of Anthropology and Conservation, University of Kent, Canterbury, Kent,
CT2 7NZ, UK ; email: m.hodges@kent.ac.uk; tel: + 44 (0)1227 823835.

ABSTRACT:

This article presents an ethnographic case study of the relationship between the development of heritage tourism, and the role of material culture in memory practices in rural Southern France. Drawing on anthropological fieldwork in the village of Monadières, it provides an analysis of how artefacts in the locality's built environment have been renovated and revalued in a climate of historical change. This was the consequence of varied acts of commemoration by both independent individuals and the local council in which heritage tourism development was not necessarily the end-goal. Nevertheless, these acts were implicated in the council's 'disciplinary programme' to produce a local

infrastructure for heritage tourism. The article therefore explores how this industry co-habits with and colonizes modern memory practices at a micro-level. To this end it adapts analytical tools from the anthropology of time, which enable an integrative analysis of these differing ‘temporalizations’ of the past.

KEYWORDS:

heritage tourism, anthropology of time, material culture, commemoration, France

PLACING ‘HERITAGE’ IN HISTORICAL TIME

A recent issue of *IJHS* (11(5), 2005) devoted to anthropological perspectives on heritage highlighted the ways in which objects, sites, and practices are adapted, revalued, and resymbolized as they are incorporated into heritage practices, and the ethnographic nuance anthropology can bring to analyzing these events and related conflicts. Such analysis overlaps in anthropology with wider debates about material culture and the ‘social life’ of things (Appadurai 1988, Miller 1997) – which draw attention to how artefacts, and in particular commodities, are resymbolized as they transit through different social and economic contexts, underlining the importance of ethnography to grasping such transformations. This paper extends this ethnography of symbolic revaluation for heritage studies. It presents an historical ethnography of alterations made to the built environment of the Southern French village of Monadières, that took place during the development of local infrastructure for rural heritage tourism in the late 1990s. To the tourist, and recent incomers, Monadières now presents a scenic assortment of heritage diversions characteristic of its region. This article unearths the ways

selected features of its built environment attained their tailored appearance, highlighting the historical ‘disciplining’ of memory practices of different individuals and social groups which, in Monadières and no doubt farther afield, lies behind the antiquated ‘look’ of today’s rural French Midi.

This revaluation comprises initiatives involving both the *conseil municipal*, and independent individuals in Monadières.¹ It ostensibly constitutes a form of ‘restoration’, in the sense of material appearances being repaired or ‘brought back to a former state’ (*Chambers*). Yet as has been pointed out for the nearby ‘medieval’ city of Carcassonne, rebuilt after Viollet-le-Duc’s imaging of the Middle Ages during the nineteenth century, ‘every instance of restoration must lie in the sense that authenticity is unattainable, all heritage being created in and by the present’ (Graham *et al.* 2000:16). The revaluation addressed, then, can be viewed as a form of ‘symbolic antiquation’, through which artefacts are reconstructed as *simulacra* of an imagined former state. Thereby, and in diverse ways, they also become potential symbols of a mythic modernist epoch and ‘heritage’ of handicraft and community (cf. Sutton 1998:48–51, Williams 1993) for tourist consumption.

The actors involved had differing objectives – some concerning social and individual remembering, some recognizably oriented towards heritage tourism – but all of the antiquated artefacts ended up available for consumption within the developing heritage tourism industry in the locality. The article therefore constitutes a micro-study of the ways in which rural heritage tourism co-habits with, and co-opts other ‘modern’ practices of remembering, frequently through local *disciplinary programmes* pursued by emergent middle classes comprised of entrepreneurial incomers and some locals (Foucault 1977, 1980). It is also partly

informed by an analytical model adapted from the anthropological study of time, proposing that an understanding of heritage tourism initiatives in Monadières is facilitated by a broader examination of related ‘temporalizing practices’ (Author 2008, Munn 1992) for invoking the past in the village. If ‘heritage’ is ‘not simply the past, but the modern-day use of elements of the past’ (Timothy & Boyd 2003:4), the anthropology of time provides a foundation for conceptualizing the ways in which the past is actualized in cultural practice which is yet to inform analyses that seek to clarify the term (e.g. Graham *et al.* 2000:1, Timothy & Boyd 2003:3–4, Tunbridge & Ashworth 1996:1–3), or heritage debates more broadly.

For Nancy Munn, an anthropological approach to time and temporal experience:

... views time as a symbolic process continually being produced in everyday practices. People are ‘in’ a sociocultural time of multiple dimensions (sequencing, timing, past-present-future relations, etc.) that they are forming in their ‘projects’. In any given instance, particular temporal dimensions may be foci of attention or only tacitly known. Either way, these dimensions are lived or apprehended concretely via the various meaningful connectivities among persons, objects, and space continually being made in and through the everyday world.

(Munn 1992:116, cf. Fabian 1983:73)

Perception and experience of the past thus involves actualizing it in the present or, in phenomenological terminology, *temporalizing* the past. Memory and imagination are the chief organs of temporalization; but there is an inescapable

socio-cultural and material component to remembering the past, of course (Gell 1992, Munn 1992). Likewise, it is important to note that temporalizing the past always implicates the future,² and is a key dimension of the exercise of power, given that control over pasts and futures that are temporalized influences action in the present. In this regard, such practices act as a hinge that connect subjects to wider social horizons and networks of power (Munn 1992:109). This approach to historicity therefore advocates a social scientific analysis that locates and foregrounds ‘the implications of the meaningful forms and concrete media of practices for apprehension of the past’ (ibid.:113), and their corresponding future orientations, within an integrative theoretical model of the human experience of historical time (Gell 1992, Author 2008, Munn 1992). Framing heritage practices alongside other cultural memory practices as instantiations of how villagers are re-structuring their relationships to the past under modernity, and more specifically their *practices for inhabiting time*, facilitates an integrative analysis of these practices. Heritage practices, and other forms of relating to the local past, are thereby placed within an analytical frame that reveals their commonality of existential focus (cf. Jackson 1989:14–15). The article provides an indication of what such an approach might contribute.

Turning to our ethnographic focus, the village of Monadières lies on a lagoon bordering the Mediterranean Sea, some 10 kilometres from the city of Narbonne in the Aude *département* of the Languedoc *région* of Southern France.³ The administrative centre of the *commune* that bears its name, with some 600 permanent inhabitants, it is clustered on and around an outcrop of rock that juts out into the lake’s northern half. The lake supports one of the two economic activities for which the village is locally renowned: it is still fished by a handful of

remaining artisanal fishermen for eels. As for the other, much of Monadières' arid, stony earth, crossed by the motorway that leads to Montpellier and Toulouse in the north and Barcelona in the south, is covered with vines whose grapes are used to produce the local variety of Corbières wine.

The village population, however, is far from comprising an integrated, indigenous community living off fishing and agriculture. While 60% of permanent residents do claim to be from the village, the other 40% are recent immigrants, and 25% of the houses in the village belong to second-home owners, of predominantly urban, north European origin. Briefly, inhabitants of Monadières comprised 'long-term residents', or 'Monadiérois' (those of indigenous heritage, of at least second generation descent, or sometimes claiming parental or more distant relatives in the village, who effectively comprise a 'kindred'); 'recent immigrants', 'second-home owners', and 'tourists'. These social groups as perceived by the anthropologist are viewed as such by local people as well. Any sense of community is thus significantly fragmented, and on-going tensions exist between long-term residents and recent arrivals – who are seen by many Monadiérois residents to be 'colonizing' the village in a pejorative sense, driving up house prices, and contributing to their marginalization and dispersal as a social group. Agriculture and fishing are also no longer the predominant local sources of employment: only 13% of the village now live exclusively off viticulture and fishing, as opposed to 75% in 1946, and the other people who grow grapes do so to supplement an income derived principally from other jobs, more than 60% of the active population working in the shops, service industries, and factories of nearby Narbonne, only ten minutes away by car.⁴ The decreasing importance of Monadières as a site of economic activity, however, has recently been countered.

Since the 1980s independent individuals, and more recently the *conseil municipal* have begun to cash in on the growing numbers of visitors that come seeking heritage tourism experiences. Indeed, since 2000 this local industry has begun to modestly flourish.

Historical change in France in the last 40 years has been substantially influenced by the growth of an internal, and international tourist industry. In Languedoc, this took the form of a series of state-inspired coastal developments during the 1960s and 1970s, which resulted in the building of tourism infrastructure along all parts of the region's coastline. Monadières and two other villages on the lake's borders, due to environmental obstacles, remain the only coastal settlements throughout Languedoc which have escaped substantial restructuring. These developments then diversified, towards the end of the 1970s, into a state-led initiative to develop a new decentralized tourism to satisfy the desire of holiday-makers for diverse experiences, while diverting capital into, and creating economic growth in inland rural areas adversely affected by the post-war modernization of agriculture. The objective was to mobilize the historic diversity of the French state just as it was popularly perceived to be threatened by the spectre of homogenization. Regional ways of life, many rapidly being transformed beyond recognition by the upheavals of the post-war period, were symbolically codified in museum exhibits; the idiosyncrasies of local produce and the built environment refashioned and repackaged for visitors; the burgeoning narratives of local and professional historians drawn upon to provide depth to this differentiation of identities that would render each region unique, distinctive, and it was hoped, attractive to outsiders.

The story is that of the complex and conflictive emergence of rural tourism under European modernity, concordant with the development of heritage and cultural tourism more broadly (Abram *et al.* 1997, Boissevain 1996, cf. Graham *et al.* 2000, Hewison 1987, Samuel 1994). In this respect, the practices addressed in this article are characterized by their concern with temporalizing the local cultural past via material artefacts, which underwrites their discussion here in relation to ‘heritage tourism’ (Boissevain 1996, Moscardo 2000). However they also existed within a wider spectrum of environmental heritage and cultural tourism practices (cf. Richards 1996, Timothy & Boyd 2003:2–6, 45–8), the former being of particular importance given the area’s great natural beauty.⁵ The earliest incidence of heritage tourism can be traced to the activities of Pierre Cadassus, an entrepreneur and fisherman. In the late 1970s he began to offer hospitality services at his restaurant incorporating symbolizations of local cuisine as products of historic local traditions, and fish dishes in particular as the produce of historic local artisanal fishing practices – via menu texts and decorative wall-displays (see Author 2001).⁶ This first independent revaluing of local practices in terms of a distinctive local heritage, and their commodification for tourists, was followed by further projects seeking to develop heritage tourism in the village focused on the production and consumption of ‘traditional’ local products and the past-infused ambiance of the local built environment, integrated with enjoyment of the ‘natural’ heritage of the area.

It is this which characterises the heritage tourism active in the village today, which comprises: three restaurants themed around regional traditional produce; two shops selling ‘traditional’ local produce; a number of walking trails around scenic parts of the village and environs – the proclivity of the rural *flâneur* so

central to such heritage practices – which alight on the ruins of a château and two fortified gates dating from the Middle Ages, an ornate sundial built by order of Louis XIII, large nineteenth century *lavoirs* (‘washing basins’), an old stone well, and the small fishing port, several attractions being set among the winding, shady streets of the antique ‘old village’; a number of households offering bed-and-breakfast; and two art galleries (which might be classed as ‘cultural tourism’ attractions). The heritage tourism involved is of that modest, unspectacular kind characteristic of so many parts of rural Western Europe, essentially involving consumption of ‘traditional’ local produce and the local ‘historic sights’; but which often provides an income for local residents (cf. Timothy & Boyd 2003:45–6). In terms of turn-over, although exact figures are unavailable for Monadières, approximately thirty-five individuals earn their principal income off tourism at present during the summer months, not including dependents; of which about thirty are recent immigrants.

THE *CONSEIL MUNICIPAL* AND *LE PAYS CATHARE* HERITAGE TOURISM PROGRAMME

The *conseil municipal* has been the key player in the development of heritage tourism in the locality, and an overview of the its appointment and policies will flesh this out, while situating local initiatives in relation to the development of heritage tourism in the Aude. The *conseil* – a coalition called the *Liste d’union et d’ouverture communale*⁷ – was elected in June 1995, and remains in power at the time of writing. It replaced a socialist majority, which had held sway since the municipal elections of 1979. Its victory was, in local terms, a landslide, and the reasons for this are relevant to our discussion – if disputed as might be expected.

A key factor was the influence of the large number of recent immigrants to the village since the early 1980s, and the perceived composition of the *listes* themselves. The victorious *liste* contained eight members (out of twelve) who were recent immigrants, the defeated *liste* only four. The consensus of those interviewed was that the election was decided by recent immigrants to the village, who felt that councils dominated by Monadiérois were insensitive to their needs. They therefore voted for the *Liste d'union et d'ouverture communale* in force. The result signalled a sea-change in the balance of power within the *commune*, reflecting the increasing dominance of recent immigrants in village life – and gave further cause for grievance on the part of long-term residents. With respect to our own interests, it also signalled a new approach to tourism, likewise identifiable with recent immigrants.

The policies of the new *conseil municipal* were couched in the rhetoric of a new beginning. ‘The men and women who make up the *Liste d'ouverture et d'union communale*,’ began their manifesto, ‘want to work for the development and harmony of the village, while safeguarding its identity.’⁸ In this regard, a chief thrust of their policies has been to develop the *commune* for tourism, an industry they claimed would bring economic benefits to everybody. There have been two main avenues of tourism development that the *conseil municipal* has subsequently sought to encourage. The first concerns ‘eco-tourism’, oriented towards the *Parc naturel régional du pays narbonnais*, a regional nature park which has recently been established; the second concerns heritage tourism, in relation to the state-led *Pays Cathare* heritage tourism project, the focus of our interest here.⁹

What, then, does the *Pays Cathare* project involve? During the early 1980s the *conseil général* (general council) for the Aude set to work developing the inland tourist infrastructure in the *département* through the initiative of *le Pays Cathare* ('Cathar Country'). Throughout the Corbières mountains are scattered the remains of the hill forts of the Cathars, the medieval adherents of a heretical faith who were wiped out by Catholic crusaders, sponsored by the Pope and the King of France, during the mid-13th century. During the early 1980s the departmental committee for tourism chose the story of the Cathars – which had acquired symbolic resonance for local identity in the regionalist political climate of the time – to form the centrepiece of a new tourist initiative and historic identity for the *département*. This was in keeping with the drive throughout France to develop historic regional particularities for heritage tourist consumption. A centre for the study of the Cathars was established, and a museum in the nearby town of Puivert, while '*Le Pays Cathare*' became the brand-name for a project whose objectives were to revitalize the rural economy, and diffuse and augment the profits to be had from tourism throughout the *département* – through encouraging visits to Cathar sites and enjoyment of the local countryside via walking trails; consumption of related books and museums; purchase of the branded 'traditional' food and artisanal products of 'Cathar Country'; and knock-on use of local hospitality services; all co-ordinated via the widely-publicised *Pays Cathare* network.¹⁰ The departmental initiative aimed to explicitly encourage projects by municipalities or individuals. These would then be co-ordinated by a number of administrative bodies operating at the departmental level. As Amiel *et al.* write: 'The idea was to attract [tourists] into the countryside, and keep them there for a few days, by increasing the lodgings and attractions available, but also by

developing the Cathar castles and renovating the villages, re-opening ancient footpaths and organizing exhibitions, and training tourist guides who would also be able to sell [the tourists] local products' (1994:349, my translation).

How were such plans received in Monadières? Since mass tourism had commenced in Languedoc in the 1960s, insofar as successive *conseils* in Monadières had been concerned with tourism, it was largely to prevent the village being bought out by developers. Since the 1980s, the attitude of the socialist *conseils municipals* had remained either hostile, or indifferent. The current *conseil* is the first to have had an enthusiastic approach, and their actions have aimed to co-ordinate with the pattern of development outlined above. On one level, then, this has involved initiatives to encourage visitors, and in turn assist those restaurants and petty commodity producers offering 'traditional' local food products, and hospitality services, to tap the wider *Pays Cathare* network. On another level, they have worked in partnership with *l'Association pour la conservation du patrimoine*, a village heritage association,¹¹ to collate and rationalise knowledge about, and symbols of the village past – old photographs, oral narratives, material artefacts – with a view to creating a local museum of some description, although this has not yet been realized. Regarding the built environment, our focus here, they have sought to renovate village features and outmoded artefacts directly, while controlling the general appearance of the village through organizing and encouraging floral displays around the village, the discreet relocation of municipal waste collection sites, and more minor details of upkeep. Otherwise, they encourage, supervise, or co-opt the work of others, partly through exerting control over planning permission in liaison with the *Direction départementale de l'équipement* (departmental planning committee). This has been

undertaken with a view to cultivating an image redolent of handicraft, artisanal trades (wine-growing, fishing), and face-to-face rural community – arguably open to temporalization as a concrete embodiment of the modernist myth of pastoral rurality (Williams 1993). Significantly, features of this work can be productively characterized as a ‘disciplinary programme’.

Disciplinary programmes ‘define a domain of social reality to be turned into an object of rational knowledge, intervened in and made functional’ (Gledhill 1994:148) which is then implemented through *technologies* of power (appropriately designed practices), according to contingent *strategies*.¹² Foucault, as is well known, defines such practices as pervasive in, and key to the reshaping of power relations in Western societies over the past four to five centuries, and they can also be viewed as a sociological feature of wider modernity. The *conseil*’s policy ‘strategy’ throughout has been to create a rationalized local resource of materials concerning the village past that can be implemented through ‘technologies’ of organization in Monadières, and the wider heritage tourism industry, and ultimately temporalized in heritage tourism consumption, as we will see. More specifically, this local process of rationalisation has involved a disembedding or ‘deworlding’ (Feenberg 2004) of past-related materials from the sociality of the Monadiérois (long-term residents), which was intrinsically entwined with them; and their ‘disclosure’ into a body of cultural capital (Bourdieu 1992) for use by the local middle classes and predominantly recent immigrants who dominated the *conseil municipal*.¹³ At the same time, it has usually been presented, in election pamphlets, statements in the local press, and the newsletter the *conseil* produces, as the safeguarding of the village’s

‘communal heritage’, in relation to the acknowledged value throughout France of conserving ‘local history’, and the state’s role as guardian in this process.

It is important to note, then, that these developments, although sometimes integrating independent initiatives, have a state-backed framework, as might be expected for a strongly centralized bureaucracy such as the French state. This contradicts observations that the heritage spectrum comprises independent players ‘making decisions about tourism markets with little or no reference to what others are doing, while hoping to attract the same audience’ (Middleton 1997:215, cf. Timothy & Boyd 2003); and reveals how in this case the diffuse ‘capillary’ organization of the Foucauldian disciplinary programme (Foucault 1977, 1980) is directly co-ordinated with more conventionally ‘top-down’ state apparatuses. It is also significant that this village ‘heritage’ may be conceived as ‘communal’ by the recent immigrants on the *conseil*, with the backing of state authority; but for long-term residents, it comprises the cultural resources of the ‘kindred’ or what we might effectively term its ‘intangible cultural heritage’ (UNESCO 2003). This is often spoken of as being exploited by the new arrivals – highlighting the local transparency of this ideological gloss.

VILLAGE LANDMARKS: RESTORATION, REVALUATION, ANTIQUATION

Having analysed the role of the *conseil municipal*, and penned in the historical context for heritage tourism in Monadières, let us now proceed to our three historical ethnographic studies that unearth how Monadières’ built environment attained its contemporary state of antiquation. The first two cases exemplify novel, characteristically ‘modern’ memory practices in Nora’s (1997) sense, as we

will see. The third might be classified as a ‘post-modern’ initiative of the *conseil* (Baudrillard 1983); and all three can also be characterized as responses to local historical rupture occasioned by the social changes impelled by local modernity, as has been more widely observed in relation to heritage practices (Graham *et al.* 2000:11). Tracing their outline ethnographically, and analyzing them as temporalizations of the local past, will illustrate how these initiatives were coordinated with the *conseil*’s disciplinary programme for the development of heritage tourism.

Case 1: *Monuments and Mementoes*

Our first case addresses the commemorative practices of an elderly bachelor, Etienne Bonhomme, and is best understood in the context of his wider remembrance of his dead family. When I first met Bonhomme, he was working in his vegetable garden across the road from his house. He was preparing it for planting up for the summer ... As we talk, he is standing by a large basin of some kind. ‘This,’ says Bonhomme, ‘was where my family did all their washing until the 1960s, when washing machines arrived.’ His tanned face crinkles in a smile. ‘It was my family’s private one, you know? ... The people without a private one would go to the *lavoir* by the port.’ ‘Yes,’ I say, ‘I’ve seen it.’ ‘Or they’d go out to the springs, out to la Bajole, les Monadières¹⁴ ... And then, outside the cemetery there are bushes, of lavender and thyme, and they’d hang the washing over them to dry. And it would smell nice, oh, very nice.’ Bonhomme is gripping the edge of the basin with his hands as he speaks, and now he taps it gently, almost tenderly. ‘Look,’ he says, gesturing towards the basin’s two compartments. ‘This part here was used for rinsing the clothes –’ and indicating to his left ‘– this part here for

washing ... So you washed the clothes in here, and then you put them here to rinse them. That's how my mother used to do it, but you wouldn't do that now ... Water's much too expensive.' He laughs a quiet laugh, almost to himself. 'I kept it as a memory. I could have got rid of it, but I kept it. There. To remember how we used to do things ...'

On another occasion we were talking in his house when the conversation turned to our point of interest here: the well Bonhomme restored, *Lou Pouts de la Coundamino*¹⁵ [see figure 1].

BONHOMME: ... It was me who rebuilt the well.

AUTHOR: Can you tell me the story of that?

BONHOMME: Well, ... my parents weren't rich, they had three or four vineyards. Mmm... My grandparents lived in a house at la Placette, where there's the restaurant now ... I was born there.

AUTHOR: I see.

BONHOMME: It belonged to my grandparents. And we had the horse there, we fed it where you go in now to the restaurant. That was the stable. But when my brother was born the house was too small, so my grandparents bought this one in '27 ... [*He pauses to remember*] And the owner of the house had three or four vineyards, and he said to my grandfather, 'You can't buy the house and not buy the vines, you've got to buy the lot! ...' And so we had to buy the vineyards ... And the one down there, where the well is, at the bottom of the hill, was actually one of the best vineyards in Monadières ... And then my father died young, we were soldiers, we had to sort out the vines before we went to Algeria, and it was Joseph Olivera, I don't know if you've heard of him?

AUTHOR: Yes ...

BONHOMME: Now he's an example of a fisherman and a wine grower at the same time – he does both ... And so when my father died, we came on leave for eight days to bury him, and then we had to leave for Algeria, and Joseph Olivera's father said to me, 'If you're looking for someone to take care of the vineyards, you only have to ask. I'm ready and willing ...' And we said yes, thank you, that's very kind. They were a good family ... Olivera was Spanish, and he came here during the war, in '36. And he worked the vineyards for twenty-one years ... When my brother died I was fifty-three and I told him, 'If you want the vineyards, you can have them ...' And I also gave them the cellar down by the edge of the lake, where there are vats to make the wine. And so I was happy ... I knew the vineyards would be well looked after. He gave me a bit of wine, at first a little money, afterwards we stopped that and I just drink a bit of wine now and that's it. So to get back to the well. I've always been afraid that children might fall in and drown, and when they started to work on the road down there, two or three years ago, I took the opportunity to have it blocked up completely... It was very old, you know. So with Mademoiselle Annie Desbiens, I don't know if you know her? ... Well, she volunteered to sort things out, and we re-built the well-head on top, and I made a plaque, in *patois* [Occitan] in fact. 'Lou Pouts de la Coundamino, 1820-1997' ... I painted it all, and Annie did the flowers, and looks after them. So there you go. So their memory lives on ... Until they widen the road, of course. Then they'll demolish it. But for the moment, it looks pretty.

AUTHOR: It does.

BONHOMME: So ... You know, you need to look after the past.

It is clear that the well-head Bonhomme had been instrumental in restoring, along with the basin and other objects in his garden and house, were for him chiefly *reminiscentia*, in Casey's sense that 'rather than functioning strictly as reminders or as records of the past... they act[ed] as inducers of reminiscence' (Casey 1987:110, emphasis removed). The past of Monadières was inseparably entwined with the story of his family who, now vanished along with the way of life of which they were a part in the wake of recent historical rupture, were temporalized by Etienne Bonhomme with the assistance of outmoded artefacts which persisted from their lives. The fact of these artefacts having been in contact with, or even bearing the mark of the presence of the now vanished body of the deceased and acting as symbols of the everyday world she or he inhabited, added vitality to the memories themselves, permitting Etienne Bonhomme to temporalize the world of his family's past more intimately and often spontaneously, and momentarily 'regain' lost time (cf. Proust 1996: 51-55). In the well's case, the commemoration was of a public nature, and was perhaps inspired by other public monuments such as war memorials (Bonhomme was the president of the local *Légion française*, or veterans association); and its inscription with dates clearly evokes the imagery of a gravestone. We should also note, however, that the well was in fact a *simulacrum*, comprising a reconstruction, partly with new materials, of the original artefact – a self-conscious antiquation of its remains, which endowed it materially with a contemporary temporal referent.

Alongside this role, the well had the character of a *lieu de mémoire*, which Nora (1997) singles out as emblematic of modern atomised societies where social memory is no longer relational, but becomes embodied in self-conscious monuments of remembrance. However, Bonhomme was still part of the

community of Monadiérois, so it would be wrong to assert with Nora that such temporalizing practices occur primarily where social communities of memory break down – although the popularity of such monumental remembering would certainly appear to be characteristic of modernity, as Nora suggests. More important to Bonhomme was the straightforward act of restoring and thereby conserving an artefact that his dead family had close associations with, thus enabling its temporalization as an intimate memento of the past. Perhaps its conservation served to offset their disappearance, and assuage his associated sense of existential finitude (Jackson 1989:15). Indeed, the story he told me to contextualize how he came to restore the well illustrates the complex of memories he associates with it. Through such temporalizing practices, focalised as illustrated through ‘meaningful forms and concrete media of practices for apprehension of the past’ (Munn 1992:113), with very specific *future* goals of reminiscence, Bonhomme revitalized his relationship with his dead family, and his own sense of who and where he was, in a world which in his eyes had changed momentarily.

That said, for current purposes it is very important to note that this restoration was carried out with the consent and approval of the *conseil municipal* – if Bonhomme had wanted to tear out the well and erect an idiosyncratic modern memorial, he would not have succeeded. As it was, his actions were informally encouraged, and more importantly, tacitly approved by the village authorities, although no planning permission was required. This was because Bonhomme’s plans fitted with the *conseil*’s aesthetic conception of the local environment, itself related to their disciplinary programme for developing heritage tourism. Little co-option, in this case, was required, as Bonhomme’s intentions regarding the built

environment fitted closely with their own, although his motivations were categorically distinct.

It has been observed that the administered conservation and, when required, restoration of the built environment is a key component in the revaluation of local resources for heritage tourism consumption, as much in rural as urban areas (Grenville 1999, Holdsworth 1985, cf. Timothy & Boyd 2003:45). What is beginning to emerge is how, in Monadières, this has been achieved. Bonhomme's restoration of the well undoubtedly fulfilled a personal role in stilling grief. With respect to the *conseil*'s objectives, it refurbished a material memento of a past when water was drawn from the ground by hand, which for the heritage tourist comprised a core symbol and temporalizing resource for a chiefly mythic pastoral past. (In this regard it was located, fortuitously, by the roadside at the main entrance of the village.) The work of intervention and rendering functional (cf. Gledhill 1994:148) characteristic of disciplining social reality and producing, in this case, rationalized material symbols here requires a light touch. In our second case, this pattern of individuals restoring local outmoded artefacts that fit with this pastoral heritage aesthetic, and the *conseil*'s programme, continues.

Case 2: The Basins of Monadières

As already mentioned, there were also several public *lavoirs* in Monadières. Each comprised a smaller basin nearest the water source for rinsing, and a larger one into which this water flowed for washing. Such washing, often undertaken in company, was regularly mentioned by older Monadièrois in their reminiscences about life in the past, and was a laborious and, during winter, unpleasant activity. Nevertheless, as an exclusively female task, it had been valued for the opportunity

it provided for women to exchange news without men being present. It now had a high profile in temporalizing practices throughout the Midi, having become a ‘core symbol’ (Schneider 1980) for the region’s past. The restoration of the public *lavoirs* in Monadières took place in two stages, the first of which was independent from the *conseil municipal*, although the plan for renovation was negotiated with, and approved by it. The protagonist of this independent initiative was Annie Desbiens, a recent immigrant to Monadières with an ‘amateur’ interest in the village past and its preservation – the same woman who encouraged Etienne Bonhomme to restore *Lou Pouts de la Coundamino* – who subsequently publicized her intentions with an announcement in the village column of a local paper. The article read as follows:

THE ‘SOLEIL’ CLUB AT LA BAJOLE

The spring and the basins of la Bajole hold many memories for Monadièrois. Over the years, time has eaten into and damaged the lining of the basins, and the water now flows down the nearby path. The ‘Soleil’ club invites everyone with an interest in preserving this unique and irreplaceable heritage to participate in the renovation of the larger basin. A mason will be coming from Prat-de-Cest [a small hamlet in the commune] to work with us and help those volunteers who want to pitch in with the trowel and the shovel.

*Renovation day will be Saturday 22 June, from 8am to 6pm. All participants please bring a lunchbox ready for a picnic on site. A path across the vineyards and the garrigue will be marked out in yellow. We will meet at the bottom of the rue de l’Aiguille. Further information available from Annie Desbiens, tel. ***.¹⁶*

As may be seen from the announcement, Annie's original intention had been to restore only the larger of the two basins. However, a further newspaper article publicized the conclusion of the story the following week. The presence of the mason enabled the work 'to be carried out in the old style', and along with the help of six adult volunteers and a child, Annie Desbiens, by working through the week-end, had been able to restore both basins [see figure 2]. 'The logic and usefulness of the work convinced the volunteers to press on,' she wrote, 'desirous to preserve this unique and irreplaceable heritage of all Monadiérois'.

La Bajole and the other springs within the *commune* had already been commented on in the election manifesto of the *Liste d'union et d'ouverture communale*: 'In the *garrigue* of Monadières there are some delightful little springs. It would be excellent if these springs, Boutarel, Monadières, and Bajole, were renovated along with the basins into which they flow. They constitute a heritage that we should re-evaluate and protect.'¹⁷ In the context of our interest in 'reevaluation' practices, the *conseil*'s mention of 're-evaluation' illustrates a comparable self-understanding of their actions. Annie Desbiens' relatively independent initiative – albeit couched in the *conseil*'s 'communal heritage' ideology, and carried out with their consent – was soon complemented by another on the part of the *conseil* itself, who commissioned the renovation of the basins in the village itself. These basins, of the same format as those at la Bajole, had been in a similar state of disrepair. A further touch was added this time, with the installation of floodlights to illuminate the stonework at night. Finally, out in the countryside, a third set of basins was renovated by the *conseil* shortly afterwards at les Monadières, and work thereafter carried out at le Boutarel, so that all the basins and springs in the *commune* had been 'restored'.

Turning to analyse these restoration projects, they consisted of several different impulses. In the case of the *Soleil* club, the individuals involved were recent immigrants with an enthusiasm for the village past, and an interest in the outmoded techniques of stonework used in constructing the basins, and the project was completed as a result of this enthusiasm. It was inspired, however, by Annie Desbiens, with her wider interest in renovating features of the built environment that had led her to work with Etienne Bonhomme, and her personal initiative was key. By contrast, the intentions of the *conseil municipal* were to stylize certain aspects of the built environment to attract heritage tourists, which in this case was also synonymous for them with ‘safeguarding’ the ‘heritage’ of the village. When setting out to renovate the basins, their specific objective was to furnish visual signs of the village past that could be temporalized by heritage tourists, and this goal also underwrote their approval of the other projects.

The work of renovation, therefore, changed the ways in which these artefacts could be invoked in temporalizing practices. The basins were already temporalized in different ways among the village inhabitants, as we might expect: for Monadiérois, as mementoes of the way washing was once carried out, either by themselves or their family members; by recent immigrants or second home owners, as symbols of the past of the village, about which they might know more or less depending on the extent of their historical knowledge. Having initially been the ruins of artefacts that had become technologically outmoded, however, *after* renovation they shifted to being the recreation of these artefacts – in effect a simulacrum of what they had once been, and an antiquation of their former remains. In this sense, one consequence of their new status as a reproduction was arguably the loss of an authentic ‘aura’ (cf. Benjamin 1992:211-244).

As for the reaction of local inhabitants, most Monadiérois were bemused that people had taken interest in the remnants of public washing, about which they sometimes spoke nostalgically, but were glad to see the back of. Some took a more cynical view and saw the restorations as part of the wider drive to attract tourists into the village. Many recent immigrants, and those Monadiérois with an enthusiasm for local history, were pleased to see the objects prevented from falling into a further state of disrepair, and continued to temporalize them as symbolic of the village past with all the different associations it held for them, while recognizing that they were no longer the ruins they had once been. As for tourists, some noticed that the basins had been restored, and were monuments to an aspect of the past of the locality; but others certainly failed to do so. In the case of the latter, it is important to note that the status of the basins was different again, arguably verging on *radical simulacra* (Baudrillard 1983) of a past that never was (although they were still largely composed of original materials); and fully open to temporalization as symbols of a mythic pastoral past.

We grasp here ethnographically, therefore, with the help of our comparative theoretical framework, how differing temporalizing practices – all distinctively modern and monumental forms of remembering (Nora 1997) – can co-exist and symbolize the same objects differently, while ultimately being disciplined within the *conseil's* wider agenda. This process was partly one of the *conseil* encouraging individual initiatives that accorded with their objectives; partly one of coordinating these objectives with other local activities and the regional *Pays Cathare* and wider heritage tourism infrastructure. The net result was that such objects attained the potential for symbolising the pastoral past that visiting heritage tourists were seeking in the local built environment. This tacit or explicit,

rationalized supervision of production, orchestrated according to the *conseil*'s overall strategy, reveals how these contingent projects integrate with their wider disciplinary programme to develop the required 'backdrop' for visiting heritage tourists (cf. Gledhill 1994:147–8).

Case 3: The 'Renovation' of the Village Square

The final work of renovation and recreation to be addressed concerns the village square, *Place juin 1907*, which was to be totally refashioned, rather than restored as with our previous case studies [see figures 3 & 4]. The fact that this was the initiative of the *conseil* renders it an explicit example of their heritage activities. When I arrived in Monadières in 1996, the square was surfaced with tarmac and used as car park. During the following winter, after due warning from the *conseil*, the area was cordoned off and the tarmac dug up. Over the following months, the square was then completely rebuilt, with the deadline for completion being the commencement of the tourist season – which constituted a lively subject for gossip and speculation as villagers debated whether it would be finished in time. The surface was re-laid with small, roughly-hewn stones matching the light-coloured stone of the square's old buildings, although this method of paving certainly had no referent in the previous appearance of the village. Before tarmac was first laid in the square in the late 1960s, its surface comprised impacted stone and earth. Once the new stones were laid, and low matching walls added for decoration and to prevent car parking, the square was adorned with small 'old-fashioned' wooden wine barrels which had been converted into flower basins – just in time for the arrival of the first tourists.

The use of stone similar to that of the old village buildings, in place of tarmac, was intended to evoke aesthetic and temporal continuity with the built environment of the village; perhaps, an uninformed visitor might speculate, they dated from the same epoch. At the same time, both buildings and square now evinced the mark of handicraft, itself locally associated with the past, as their stonework bore the traces of having been shaped by hand. For Monadièrois, and some recent immigrants, the re-building was initially seen as a waste of money: ‘It’s typical. Every new *conseil municipal* wants to leave their mark,’ was how one sceptical Monadièrois put it. However, reactions changed once the square was finished, and most people I spoke to thought it aesthetically pleasing, some of them commenting on its synthetic evocation of the past. Tourists, however, could temporalize the square as a *genuine relic* of the past – and given that it was totally refabricated, it thus became a simulacrum of a material past that never was in a more complete fashion than the basins.

The square was in one sense, therefore, for knowledgeable audiences, a conventional simulacra of what it *might* once have been – in the sense of an image or representation. But when it was mistaken for how things *really* were, it took on the characteristics of the radical process of simulation identified by Baudrillard as a pervasive element of the post-modern:

[Such s]imulation is no longer that of a territory, a referential being or a substance. It is the generation by models of a real without origin or reality: a hyperreal. The territory no longer precedes the map, nor survives it. Henceforth it is the map that precedes the territory.

(Baudrillard 1983:2)

Even if our experience of the past is always ontologically novel, as philosophers and social scientists have convincingly argued (Ansell Pearson 2002:176, Bergson 1988, Graham *et al.* 2000), one can nevertheless observe that a significant dimension of the ‘heritage’ in such heritage tourism practices has a *contemporary* temporal referent – given the role of renovated and antiquated material culture in such temporalizing practices. This is no doubt also the case for the consumption of ‘traditional’ cuisine, highlighting the ethnographic pervasiveness of the ‘hyperreal’. In this regard, the square was another symbolic marker to be read off the built environment, seemingly evocative of a local past that had been made available for temporalization, and whose actual status as a reconstructed object was either irrelevant, or inaccessible in the course of a tourist’s visit – unless, of course, specific enquiries were made. It thus constitutes a further example of the *conseil’s* reshaping of the built environment of the village in keeping with a modernist pastoral heritage aesthetic which guided rural restoration activities in both Monadières and elsewhere in the region, and seemingly intended to signify a pre-industrial epoch of small-scale agricultural community – the local manifestation of a wider-ranging myth of rurality (cf. Williams 1993).¹⁸

Finally, we should also note how such refashioning of the built environment constitutes a local example of how wider tourist practices develop. As Urry (1990:3) writes:

The tourist gaze is directed to features of landscape and townscape which separate them off from everyday experience ... The viewing of such tourist sights often involves different forms of social patterning, with a much greater sensitivity to visual elements of landscape or townscape than is normally found in everyday life ... The gaze is constructed through signs, and tourism involves the collection of signs.

The remodelling of the built environment that has taken place in Monadières since the late 1990s – which began as a range of more varied initiatives – has been directed via the *conseil municipal's* tacit or active disciplinary orchestration towards the construction of just such a rationalized network of ‘antiquated’ signs or core symbols (Schneider 1980) of the local past, for temporalization in heritage tourism practices. It also correlates with a wider ‘deworlding’ of practices and artefacts concerning the local past from Monadiérois sociality, to comprise the *conseil's* broader disciplinary programme for assembling resources for ‘disclosure’ in heritage tourism practices (cf. Feenberg 2004, Foucault 1977, 1980). Such antiquated signs can now be ‘consumed’ on walks through the locality alongside other heritage tourism activities, such as dining on ‘traditional’ cuisine in the local restaurants, purchasing artisanal food commodities packaged as the products of historic local traditions, visiting museums in nearby villages and Narbonne, or consuming tourist leaflets and local history books. They constitute local cases of how the built environment of rural France – and farther afield – is being carefully cultivated via such disciplinary programmes to actively serve in heritage tourism practices, ultimately via local initiatives but in keeping

with state government policy (cf. Graham *et al.* 2000, Samuel 1994, Timothy & Boyd 2003).

DISCIPLINING THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Analyzing such activities as *temporalizing practices*, I have argued, enables the framing of heritage tourism activities alongside other memory practices with which, in environments such as Monadières, they are entwined in disciplinary programmes. In Monadières, this ‘disciplining’ has not been overtly coercive, but has nevertheless worked to produce an intended outcome, as is characteristic of such programmes (Foucault 1977, 1980). In conclusion, it is nevertheless useful to provide a subtly coercive example. This involved the apparently mundane removal of the municipal rubbish bins from the square by the *conseil*, and their repositioning down a side street some 250 metres away, which coincided with the remodelling of the square. This was intended to enable tourists to enjoy the square’s appearance without suffering the sight and odour of refuse rotting in the summer heat. However, it was violently opposed by many long-term residents, and initially the bins were retrieved by the younger relatives of elderly Monadiérois who had difficulty carrying their rubbish over such a distance. While a solution was being sought, there was a great deal of aggravation between long-term residents and recent immigrants, largely comprising a campaign of whispering by the former about the latter’s disruptive and exploitative agency in village life; although there were also some very public, and heated verbal disagreements. After a stand-off lasting some weeks, the *conseil* agreed to build a special sealed alcove on the square to house the rubbish bins on the square. This

example reveals the intentionality of the *conseil*'s disciplinary programme in greater relief.

As is common with the development of heritage tourism, therefore, we perceive in this article conflict over cultural resources that are deemed inalienable to certain sections of the population, and fair game for commodification by others – but here telescoped to a specific aspect of this phenomenon's historical emergence in a small French village. This has been possible through application of an analytical apparatus which, in interpreting our case studies *comparatively* as symbolic temporalizations of the past, and relating these to wider historical contexts, has enabled us to unpick and articulate the complex relationship between otherwise entangled and conflictive temporalizing practices; and reveal the processes of 'antiquation' and ambiguous, contemporary temporal referents at their heart. It has likewise ensured that analysis of heritage tourism practices, and temporalizations of the past more generally has entailed consideration of their dynamic and multi-layered future orientations. In this way, these varied temporalizing practices have been revealed as elements of a co-ordinating disciplinary programme; and their historical ethnographic character has given depth to what at the present time otherwise appears as an apparently enduring built environment resonant of earlier times, as with so many renovated areas in rural France. This theoretical approach adapted from the anthropology of time therefore furnishes a workable comparative framework through which to conceptualize and analyze inter-relationships between the range of human practices focused on our relationship with the past, i.e. our diverse 'cultural heritages' broadly conceived. Its theorization of such 'temporalizations' as integrated in temporally dynamic social practices likewise provides a model that

permits nuanced analytical correlation of small-scale ethnography with a range of broader historical processes.

Moving on, how can the power relationships detailed for Monadières be characterized? Might they be defined in Marxian terms as a class-based conflict? In one sense this was the case, given that recent immigrants, and the occasional long-term resident involved in deworlding and commodifying cultural resources for temporalizing the local past aspired to an exploitative relationship to the cultural capital of Monadiérois. In other respects, however, members of these two social groups occupied broadly similar positions with respect to productive means in the Narbonnais, even if their positions in the labour hierarchy were usually different. On the whole they worked as wage labourers, petty commodity producers, or small business-people – i.e. recent immigrants cannot be viewed as a unified class that was in a direct exploitative relationship with long-term residents. Hence a class-based political economic analysis is not necessarily enlightening. The potential evidently existed, however, for recent immigrants to develop heritage tourism within the village, drawing on Monadiérois cultural capital, and also employing them, predominantly in restaurants. This has begun to take place.

With respect to the built environment, however, we should nevertheless observe that the results endorsed the *conseil municipal's* vision, and that these projects are indeed capable of fulfilling the role of both novel, if limited forms of social memory, and commercial heritage ventures (cf. Author 2001: 207).¹⁹ It is also clear from the quoted passages from the manifesto, and its subsequent actions, that the *conseil's* stated aims were to benefit the population as a whole, and its attempts to redevelop the built environment while respecting local peoples'

interests and the tenor of the architecture must be credited considering the eyesores that have sprung up in other coastal villages catering for tourism. The *conseil's* stated intentions were to promote heritage tourist development, while moderating its influence on the life of the *commune*. Its desire was to encourage local employment, and local initiatives in an industry that was largely decentralized, in a *commune* in which roughly 20% of the active population was unemployed at the time. In the cases presented here, there was only limited adverse reaction among the population, who acknowledged that the village has been beautified as a result. But below the surface, we see divisions that have dogged the village in subsequent years, as such renovation projects assume their role in the wider development of a heritage tourism that at the present time is endorsed by some (usually recent immigrants), and often vilified by others (usually Monadiérois, concerned that 'their' village, pasts and traditions are being 'sold off'). In subsequent years, this has led to the disruption of large-scale fêtes held ostensibly for visiting tourists, for example, and further deterioration in the relationship between long-term residents and recent immigrants, predicated on shifting financial fortunes.

In this regard, and looking to the future, Gledhill's (1994:147), comments on changing relationships between Dhan-Gadi Aborigines and the Australian state offers a pessimistic vision of the potential effects of such developments in the Monadières case:

[D]isciplinary power requires the creation of a body of knowledge about the subject group. The Aborigines were turned into an object of specialist knowledge ... Others thereby came to become 'dispenses of truth about the

needs and requirements' of Aborigines, and the Aborigines themselves were increasingly called upon to fulfil the constructions of their identity created by those in authority over them. They thus lost control over their communal identity (or more precisely, their ability to define themselves).

It is clear that in some regions of rural France, heritage tourism has encouraged novel and invigorating economic and cultural developments in small communities (Abram 1994, 1996); although equally clear that this is not always the case. In recent years Monadiérois have found themselves increasingly marginalised as escalating house prices, fuelled by the purchases of second-home owners and urban incomers, are driving the young to seek accommodation in Narbonne. In this sense, the correlation between different temporalizing practices enabled in this paper illustrates the process that is taking place in Monadières, and undoubtedly farther afield in rural France, as certain social groups appropriate and discipline material about local pasts for development of local heritage tourism, which in turn fuels the rural housing market. They thereby assume disciplinary control over the cultural memory and intangible heritage of those long-term residents whose temporalizing practices, and communal identities, depend upon such materials, the consequences of which are unpredictable and not beneficial for all concerned, in Monadières at least; and certainly problematic with regard to broader conservation and safeguarding objectives (e.g. UNESCO 2003).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks to friends and associates in Monadières. Fieldwork was funded by the ESRC.

¹ Pseudonyms replace the names of the village and its inhabitants. The French state is comprised of state, regional (*région*), departmental (*département*), *arrondissement*, cantonal (*canton*), and communal (*commune*) units of government and administration, in diminishing order of locality. The *conseil municipal*, or ‘local council’, is elected to represent the *commune*.

² As Munn (1992:115) writes: ‘the past-present-future relation [...] is intrinsic to all temporalizations ... inasmuch as people operate in a present that is always infused, and which they are further infusing, with pasts and futures.’

³ One year’s initial ethnographic fieldwork was carried out from 1996–7, with subsequent updates and communication with key informants over intervening years. As rural heritage tourism has developed, the importance of the late 1990s as a point of departure for subsequent activities has become apparent and given historical focus to the ethnographic material in this article.

⁴ Censuses of 1946 & 1999.

⁵ As Timothy & Boyd (2003:6) write: ‘what exists is a wide heritage spectrum, which embraces ancient monuments, the built urban environment, aspects of the natural environment and many aspects of living culture and the arts.’ They nevertheless acknowledge that ‘heritage tourism’ may be used to designate specifically past-oriented practices within this spectrum. The *temporality* model would suggest that such tourism practices could indeed be classified according to their respective past-present-future orientation, or *temporal modality*.

⁶ That said, Pierre Cadassus was himself inspired by my landlady, Jeanine Bonnet, who had moved to the village in the 1960s to open an *auberge* (‘Inn’). This served ‘typical’ –

in my landlady's words – Languedocian cuisine for local businessmen, presented with a self-conscious regional identity. Her project was in turn inspired by Bonnet's experience cooking in urban areas in Southern France such as Tarbes, Narbonne, and cities on the Côte d'Azur. Her *auberge*, which closed during the early 1970s, might thus be viewed as a forerunner of the self-styled 'heritage cuisine' offered by Cadassus, emergent in response to an earlier manifestation of consumer interest in 'authenticity' under modernity (cf. Graburn 1994, MacCannell 1976).

⁷ 'The Team for Uniting and Opening-up the *Commune*'.

⁸ Translated from the *Liste d'union et d'ouverture communale* manifesto, June 1995, p.2.

⁹ 'Eco-tourism' and 'heritage tourism' are the designations of the *conseil*; academic classification could take a number of forms, as already indicated (cf. Timothy & Boyd 2003:2–6). The two strands are, of course, not necessarily segregated in practice.

¹⁰ For example, see http://www.cg11.fr/www/contenu/d_payscathare_colis.asp at the state website for the Aude (hyperlink dated 18/08/2008).

¹¹ The 'Heritage Preservation Association', a group of villagers with a variety of overlapping interests in conserving the local past, many of whom hoped to use the material collected in developing heritage tourism in the village. Disagreements between the association's members over whether or not to use their findings for commercial ends have hampered their efforts, as has the reluctance of Monadiérois to contribute 'raw material' on the past to their efforts.

¹² Foucault distinguishes between what he terms "strategies", "technologies" and "programmes" of power. Programmes of power define a domain of social reality to be turned into an object of rational knowledge, intervened in and made functional. Technologies of power are techniques and practices for the disciplining, surveillance, administration and shaping of human individuals. Programmes define forms of knowledge and discourses about objects of knowledge. Technologies are apparatuses of power designed to implement that knowledge. Strategies of power are what agencies do

in practice in exercising power and in operationalizing programmes and technologies. They develop in response to changing circumstances and are therefore improvisations. Furthermore, the field of strategies also includes strategies of resistance. Foucault sees power relations as present in all social relationships, permeating society in a capillary way rather than coming “down” from a single centre of control such as the state’ (Gledhill 199:148, emphasis retained).

¹³ As Feenberg (2004:97) writes: ‘Deworlding is a salient feature of modern societies, which are constantly engaged in disassembling natural objects and traditional ways of doing things and substituting technically rational ways ... Deworlding consists of a process of functionalization in which objects are torn out of their original contexts and exposed to analysis and manipulation which subjects are positioned for distanced control ... Disclosure involves a complementary process of realization, which qualifies functionalization by orienting it toward a new world containing those same objects and subjects.’ These concepts form central components of Feenberg’s ‘Instrumentalization Theory’.

¹⁴ ‘La Bajole’ and ‘les Monadières’ are two springs, with large accompanying washing basins, located among vineyards about ten and twenty minutes by foot from the village respectively, whose restoration is addressed below. My reported conversations with Bonhomme are edited transcripts of conversations.

¹⁵ *Occitan* for ‘The Coundamino Well’.

¹⁶ *Midi Libre*, 20.06.96. The *Soleil* (‘Sun’) club was one of a number of small association clubs active in the village.

¹⁷ Translated from the *Liste d’union et d’ouverture communale* manifesto, June 1995, p.11.

¹⁸ I detail some of these wider regional activities in Author 1999.

¹⁹ In discussing the ‘heritage’ food business (Author 2001), I point out how novel, commercially-oriented temporalizations of the past often lack accountability, while

enjoying a public voice of much greater power and access than many other, local narratives of the past – which is also at the heart of unease regarding such developments by local people in Monadières.

REFERENCES:

Abram, S. 1994. 'Recollections and Recreations: Tourism, Heritage and History in the French Auvergne'. D.Phil. thesis, Oxford University.

———1996. 'Reactions to tourism. A View from the Deep Green Heart of France', in J. Boissevain (ed.), *Coping With Tourists. European Reactions to Mass Tourism*. Providence & Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp.174–203.

Abram, S., Waldren J., & Macleod D. (eds.) 1997. *Tourists and Tourism. Identifying with People and Places*. Oxford & New York: Berg.

Amiel, C. *et al.* 1994. *Aude*. Paris: Editions Bonneton.

Ansell Pearson, K. 2002. *Philosophy and the Adventure of the Virtual. Bergson and the Time of Life*. London: Routledge.

Appadurai, A. 1988. *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Benjamin, W. 1992. *Illuminations*. London: Fontana.

Author 1999, 2001, 2008.

Baudrillard, J. 1983. *Simulations*. New York: Semiotext(e).

Bergson, H. 1988. *Matter and Memory*. New York: Zone Books.

Boissevain, J. 1996. 'Introduction', in Boissevain J. (ed.), *Coping With Tourists. European Reactions to Mass Tourism*. Providence & Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp.1–26.

Bourdieu, P. 1992. *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge.

Casey, E. S. 1987. *Remembering: A Phenomenological Study*. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Chambers English Dictionary. 1990. Edinburgh: W. & R. Chambers Ltd.

Fabian, J. 1983. *Time and the Other. How Anthropology makes its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Feenberg, A. 2004. 'Modernity Theory and Technology Studies: Reflections on Bridging the Gap', in T.J. Misa, P. Bray & A. Feenberg (eds.), *Modernity and Technology*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, pp.73–104.

Foucault, M. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Allen Lane.

———1980. *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Gell, A. 1992. *The Anthropology of Time. Cultural Constructions of Temporal Maps and Images*. Oxford: Berg Books.

Gledhill, J. 1994. *Power and its Disguises. Anthropological Perspectives on Politics*. London: Pluto Press.

Graham, B., Ashworth, G., & Tunbridge, J. 2000. *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy*. London: Hodder Arnold.

Graburn, N. 1994. 'Tourism, Modernity and Nostalgia', in A. Ahmed & C. Shore (eds.), *The Future of Anthropology: Its Relevance to the Contemporary World*. London: Athlone, pp.158–178.

Grenville, J. 1999. *Managing the Historic Rural Landscape*. London: Routledge.

Hewison, R. 1987. *The Heritage Industry*. London: Methuen.

Holdsworth, D. 1985. *Reviving Main Street*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Jackson, M. 1989. *Paths toward a Clearing. Radical Empiricism and Ethnographic Inquiry*. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

MacCannell, D. 1976. *The Tourist. A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Schocken Books.

Middleton, V.T.C. 1997. 'Marketing Issues in Heritage Tourism: an International Perspective', in W. Nuryanti (ed.), *Tourism and Heritage Management*, Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press, pp. 213–19.

Miller, D. (ed.) *Material Cultures*. London and Chicago: UCL Press/University of Chicago Press, pp. 3-21.

Moscardo, G. 2000. 'Cultural and Heritage Tourism: the Great Debates', in B. Faulkner, G. Moscardo & E. Laws (eds.), *Tourism in the 21st Century: Lessons from Experience*, London: Continuum, pp.3–17.

Munn, N. 1992. 'The Cultural Anthropology of Time: a Critical Essay', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21: 93-123.

Nora, P. 1997. *Les lieux de mémoire* (3 volumes). Paris: Gallimard.

Porter, B.W. & Salazar, N. B. 2005. 'Heritage Tourism, Conflict, and the Public Interest: An Introduction', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 11(5): 361-70.

-
- Proust, M. 1996. *In Search of Lost Time. Vol. 1: Swann's Way*. London: Vintage.
- Richards, G. 1996. 'Production and Consumption of European Cultural Tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research* 23:261–83.
- Samuel, R. 1994. *Theatres of Memory. Volume 1: Past and Present in Contemporary Culture*. London & New York: Verso.
- Schneider, D.M. 1980. *American Kinship: A Cultural Account*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sutton, D. 1998. *Memories Cast in Stone. The Relevance of the Past in Everyday Life*. Oxford: Berg.
- Timothy, D.J. & S.W. Boyd. 2003. *Heritage Tourism*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Tunbridge, J. & G.J. Ashworth. 1996. *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. Chichester: Wiley.
- UNESCO. 2003. *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?pg=00006> (hyperlink dated 18/08/2008).

Urry, J. 1990. *The Tourist Gaze. Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies.*

London: Sage.

Williams, R. 1993. *The Country and the City.* London: Hogarth.