Abstract: This paper discusses the strategic importance of understanding, accepting and preserving heritage as material and spiritual values as well as the value of its experience. We explain the potential of heritage as lifelong practice of advancement based on difference that exists between inheritance (that which is an excess) and heritage (which is appropriated as a value for individual practice). Although analysis of our social practice of management and the delight in its fruits as heritage reveals complete inactivity, we maintain that the experience of inheriting as such is the only real general resource with which we will enter the era of knowledge.
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I. INTRODUCTION

What is taken into account in the suggested title are the opposed values that emerge in the reception of a mundane phenomenon that is in many ways a product of real needs of the majority of the community (1. fetish) and values attributed to the object produced based on the principle of representative selectivity as the sophistication – artificialization of the reality (2. heritage). We will try to explain the limits of the common understanding of both (heritage and fetish) and confront them with the results of the generic analysis of the concept of heritage, on the one hand, and the possibilities and the need to understand all social concepts as witnesses of the past, on the other, as valuable sources for the opening of the process of understanding the totality of the reality in the representative musealization procedures.

The model represents the encounter of a historical research spurred by the contemporary science, on the one hand, and information theory spurred by the ontological questioning, on the other.

In other words, fetish is a relevant object of musealization only if: (a) acknowledged as an important part of everyday life, (b) got to be known and (c) transformed into valuable entity for memory keeping.

(a) Fetish is important in the life cycle of every individual, even more important for the arrangement of interpersonal relations, behaviours and customs of the community, as well as in the evolvement of life pursuits, all in all: it is important as a model for social behaviour. It should be considered as a serious characteristic of social phenomena.
(b) Getting to know it is a complex and responsible process initiated by the socially beneficial scientific community which requires that all relevant content of mundane life is to be:

studied as a social (anthropological) phenomenon,
analysed as a phenomenon that has its formal specifics, a way of working and laws by which it appears. Formal specifics are, in the first place, living language and direct communication. The way of working of fetish is a specific modus vivendi characterised by an instant change in the behaviour of all members, i.e. rapid formation of "like-minded" according to the prevailing model of influencing public opinion. In the same way this way of working of fetish is subjected to the critical reception of the elite. The way of working is an indicator of the appearance of fetish in social crisis, while the preservation of the communication language that allows easy substitution of meaning is a formal law by which it operates. This has to be accounted for as a common scientific treatment.

(c) Finally, through the process of musealization, what was made out of the serious content of life into a common fact is now turned into important entity for memory keeping. Here is what could be the cardinal importance of this process.

The whole process of modern redefining of the concept of heritage is directed to avoid instrumentalization, this plague in every polity. Over two centuries the instrumentalization was being applied on the principle of "useful abuse"; from the beginning of the public, civic, institutional life of heritage it was being used for the benefit of national identification, for the confirmation of religious being, and in leisure activities (in play and playing, as well as in the extreme forms of cultural tourism). This dominant (characteristic) deficiency of modern institution of patrimonium, uncomfortably points towards the manipulation within the system that was once established on the category of exceptionalism instead of the primacy of patrimony. When the system of patrimony is established as the measure of a social value for everyone not only for the inheritors, entitled by the individual or family rights, this ethically coded value opens a vulnerable space of blind belief – I don't have the deed but I believe that all of us are entitled (collective inheritors). The belief is placed into the document, in that which is the proof in the process of establishing rights, so even today in all polls of public opinion the museum, as the custodian of the documents of the past, is the social institution mostly believed in. In this constellation, in the liberated civic society economically determined by the free market, instantly upon the establishing of trust certain interest groups started to work, first of all those willing to create their own history. Within the space of blind belief the problem of the document, the originality, and the authenticity "can be" compensated (1). This is the situation in which fetish works. With the same force it works in the old communities and in the modern parliamentary monarchies or the idolatrous presidential regimes. What would be the basics for this comparison? The expanded concepts of heritage and heriting (2).

II. FACES OF HERITAGE

Expansions have their generic premises that not only justify them but also influence their development. On the other hand, this endeavour appears as the answer to "eternal" dilemma of humanistic knowledge.
Heritage vs. Fetish

like that of J-L-Schefer – Ut pictura poesis or By which given apostolic right something is art heritage and something is not (3), or that of Ivo Babic, the anthropologist from Split – Everything is important as the witness of the past, but everything cannot be preserved, we cannot overwhelm the future with the past (Babić, 1994)

Every inheritance turns into someone’s heritage when somebody recognises the basic quality of good in it. To appropriate something as one’s own heritage means that the past comes to life in our memory as a repeated confirmation of good, love and beauty. High regard for these values as the dominant content of memory gives away the image of cultivating personal growth. Cultural goods are the marks of the sustainability of humanistic personal growth: good is something that the love for knowledge leads us to. The satisfaction of knowing reveals all beauty of the world to every single individual. This basic quality of the culture of remembering essentially determines the memory treasuries as: living processes of remembrance, and material marks for reminding.

III. FACES OF FETISH

Due to its broad-based presence in different cultures and especially due to its long history, the fetish is the distinctive evidence of the presence of remembering. Its absence would consequently open the question of the absence of remembering, at least in the sense of general representation on the massive scale i.e. as a collective phenomenon. Therefore, not only it is normal to musealize the fetish as heritage but it is normal to verify it as the factor of the reanimation of memory or, as well as the so called negative heritage when it for example pervades in taste and interferes with the Enlightenment or protestant mission (Bourdieu, 1966).

The distinctive manifestation of this type was the recent marvel and participation in the birth of the UK crown prince. The symbolic function of the heir to the throne replaces, as ever in history, the biography of the new-born being and his privacy becomes a collective property. This historical stereotype disregards the throne’s ignorance for the new technologies of generating power of profit. This power does not correspond to old patrimonial principles, whatever they may be. Therefore, today the subjects of the Crown are offered that last asset, the intimacy. As all subjects are in the same deficiency, they easily recognise each other in seemingly desperate swap of collective ideal for privacy. In that way the innocent new-born becomes the object of fetishist worship. But let us remind ourselves that this is (negative) heritage itself and that it applies to all cases of birth and it is apparent in all past (so-called timely) and present (so-called late) births of nations, actually a kind of inherited pregnancies.

All in all, the significance and the importance of the mausoleum (Mother Theresa, Skopje) as well as archaeologism and historicism, the so-called “antiquization” in the Forum of Skopje or earlier on the Ohrid locality of Plostad, is hard to explain from the scientific point and to formulate culturally if their quality of fetish is ignored (Чаусидис, 2013).

What is this conclusion based on?

First of all on the consensus on fetish (fétique, facticus - made, artificially constructed) which encompasses all kinds of its forms. First in real life as a material object made for residing of spirit, every dead thing attributed with magical force, for instance a rock, a
carved figure..., something man is excessively loyal to, something he adores. Then, in scientific theology. Prominent re-actualisation and transformation of the concept of fetish happens in the 19th century rebirth of political economy. As the fetishism of commodity it introduces the critique on three levels of the inevitable conclusion that will soon become determinant in all social sciences. The default 1. equality of work understood as the equality of the objectiveness of their products and 2. the time spent working – as the measurement of object’s value, are necessary causes of the fact that 3. social relations of the product manufacturers appear as social relations of the products themselves i.e. objects, and not as the total values man makes. Finally, almost simultaneously with the birth of civic society, critical philosophy warns us about the fetishization of institutions. One of the earliest, E. Kant, spoke of the “clergy” that imposes itself as the Church’s establishment, because in its public reception there is “the governance of fetishistic service”, “the statutory commandments and rules by which to believe and perceive” already points to future forms of fetishization of institutional practice. It can be recognised in today’s disturbing phenomena of global fetishization of heritage encouraged by the advanced conventionalization, first of all in UNESCO programmes and their followers. In all politics of socialisation which are based on this global consensus on universal values of antiquities and inheritance it happens that it is easier to apply a commanding rule than to conduct the professionalization of heriting. The former would mean that the standards recommended by UNESCO are to be applied in existing institutions. The latter would mean that the professional conduct enables us to attribute our identity to a universal value and to participate in it and make it ours not only by origin, inheritance and care we put into it, but also in the way it is revived. This professional conduct implies that the standard is brought in the functioning of makers, bearers and users of the identity. In professional terms it would mean, as T. Šola vividly points out, to “bring the museum into real life not vice versa”.

Therefore, following Kant it may be said that the discrepancy between standardisation (professionalization) and institutionalisation is visible. The politics of socialisation are easily fetishized in conventions – UNESCO and all others made alike. Having in mind that in heriting one has to consider all community members, it can be objectively foreseen that proportionally considerable number of actors behaves in authoritarian manner. On the other hand, every professional who takes part in the process objectively, should ethically appear as the protector of all custodians from the fal-
lacy of authoritarianism. At the same time, he or she can also, again very objectively, fall into the trap of scientific authoritarianism. The real danger for every professional lies in uncritical (dictated) acceptance of authority of institutions of standardisation instead of participating in the making of the same. Since in both, public and private, domains of understanding of this issue the problem of identity appears to be the objective factor; this discussion points to this causality also. The causality heritage-fetish is inexplicable without the causality heritage-identity and only together they determine heriting as a "critical practice".

The reality of the museum always appears as interpreted reality. If we would like to elaborate on this claim, first of all, we must say that in deeper and broader, and in a way more binding sense – it is the reality of inheriting. This reality of inheriting takes the museum as its institute of memory i.e. as its attained media. That what is mediated in all musealizations wants the status of objective knowledge that is the condition of heritology itself. This process has its own, sort to speak, mildly fluctuating subject. That is to say, as A. Chastell (1987) points out, the notion of relativity entered the concept of heritage at the end of the 19th century. By redefining itself through new worldviews, new philosophy, it moves towards new approaches. First of all, the integral approach which compared to first holistic collector's paradigm (world images) let us not forget the privacy in relation to conventional publicity. Certainly, modern syncretism of an old paradigm – heritage as fetish – and a new one – heritage as identity, are both embedded in this structural causality.

IV. Two Faces of Fetish

Fetish is an object of holly adoration. Adoration imposes the belief upon something absent physically, upon spirit, but the adoration itself is symbolic and it has to do with the acceptance of the substitution not with the object itself. To believe in the process in which the real is being replaced with the representation of the real – isn’t that exactly what we do in musealisation, as W.Gluzinski relentlessly points out (Gluzinski, 1981) - requires a double play. And it is played by the same actor. On the one hand, believing in the ideal world order implies the reality that has its representation which is never full but which is adequate. Man makes the symbols, imprints or marks, in terms of heritage, of his faith. On the other hand, this process has its material side: its body constituted by heritology as a testimony or, in other words, made the bearer of documentary (Bulatović, 2009).

Fetish is invested also with love, but a kind of fearful love, realised through the substitution of object and not the object itself. In musealisation it is the process of otherness – of shifting signifier (Bulatović, 2011). It is also a process of walking the fine line between totally elusive and totally documented, as one way of seeing the problem, or with a potential to be documented as another way. As a model theory for the first part of the problem we may follow entropic application suggested by I. Maroevic, while for the second part it would be most convenient to rely on the bold hypothesis of T. Sola about total museum, in the first case, or the hypothesis about total informacy of D. Bulatovic, in the second (Maroević, 1998; Šola, 1997; Bulatović, 2011).
Compared in this way fetish is in fact invested emotion that instigates love relation. As the original is not being worn of in this relation, since there is no actual physical original, than the whole relation is based on voyeurism. Only the fear of the possible dethronement of spirit to the level of practice is being worn of. This fear is highly conditioned by the materiality of the production of representation. The human organism, its optical organ, is a part of the system that produces mental creations by means of unconditional causality, through the lens of an eye is directly linked to the brain through its receptors. In every moment the receptors gather visual information which in the trigger – given, physical, made image – have to stimulate complex (structured) images and in that way attack and, desirably, release unconditional causalities. This last thing is in biological sense generic datum – inevitability of the organism to build itself as a mentally-organic construct (Bulatović, 2013 :325-337). In a word, in jargon, the constructed image has to be lovely (sine qua non of kitsch is lovely) in order to motion a chain of empathy without which there is no adoration. When empathy is missing it has to be compensated – even by prosthetics? Like in psychotherapy when apathetic patients are stimulated to feel via chemicals. The point is that fetish is invested emotion which instigates a love relation, only this love is fearful and realized not in the object itself but in its substitution. How real?

The first quality of fetish: to carve one’s own object of belief, produces in consequence (even when it only makes it conditionally possible) its second quality – alienation, separation from the real and substitution with another, while its third quality supports the transition from kynicism to cynicism i.e. institutional instrumentalisation. That is why this danger was pointed out by A. Malraux, in the proto-museology period, then by Z. Stránsky, W. Gluźniński, I. Maroević, T. Šola, and D. Bulatović, in the first phase of the systematic science of museology and heritology, and D. Preziosi, H. Belting and B. Groys, from the position of the relation between art history and museology.

According to the first quality of fetish that what could be carved in museum practice is the production of blind belief in the scientific truth or the true museum value. When the fetish/museum object is produced it is made at disposal for legitimate manipulation according to the rules of social communication. In this constellation museology throughout its history had been nothing else but the science of the sanctity of the museum object! The crises on the turn of the century definitely took out the nonchalance of asking unsolvable questions. Mentally and scientifically, in synchronicity with the 21st century notions of competitiveness, the contemporary concept of plural identity, with the place for national within it, has been construed.

V. THE FACE OF IDENTITY

Each attempt to reveal an identity (to snatch it from oblivion) to make it public, includes the process of becoming aware of the importance of any inheritance, its certain aspect or form. Really and essentially this relates to the knowledge i.e. to the creation of (scientifically sustainable) image of the past and (the forgotten or) the neglected in collective consciousness. This had been practiced for centuries as musealisation of the past i.e. objectification of a desirable self-image. Objectification is always a serious process from the aspect of truthfulness. Only the concept of truth has varied. Not
only because of the specified deficiency had all historical models of musealisation suffered from serious alienation. This will be the end of the last great model of musealisation – heriting the identities of modern nations. Exactly in the time of globalisation when the national model is being devoured at the place of its origin (Europe), the project Skopje 2014 manifests archaic fetisization of an extraordinarily polyvalent and pregnant inheritance. Instead of being revealed, musealised identities (complexes, saved memories, living heritage of well-studied and identified / produced social and cultural testimonials – goods, musealia) are being carved based on quickly conducted scientific re-systematisations of the inheritance, in a kind of a fetish factory which manufactures contemporary objects of adoration. These cannot bear the huge burden of bearing witnesses of times passed but they will certainly be recruited as guardians of the new identity and become characteristic witnesses of their own time (Чаусидис, 2013) So, the nature of cultural inheritance implies that we can count on memory only if it’s immaterial and material – objective structure is documented. Therefore, the only usable tool in the domain of contemporary treasuring is hypertext. Only if the phenomenon of cultural good is operationalized as post-processed structure, it is possible to postulate an efficient algorithm: conceptual initiations – of material stimuli – of the remembering product. Least of all because we are aware that a physical object from the corpus of heritage does not speak for itself, on the contrary. Even despite dominant cultural codes read into its primary meaning (e.g. urbanism of the antique forum), the experience of this “guaranteed” quality is at least a bit different for each individual whose interest in past revives the past. Therefore, the product of memory is always, significantly, a bit different depending on the formal association of the qualities of the mark, e.g. architectural and constructional with mythological / theological / secular qualities of the building or its social function. And what about intimate histories? In other words: not only the object or the event that triggers the nostalgia has to be treasured, but also the context which gives the whole process a certain value, value that is the product of memory appreciation. The culture of individual memory is the basis for affluent collective memory. This order of things should not be disturbed in the process of (targeted) identitytreasuring. It should not be turned into naked, analogue copying of staled paradigms – replicating appearances and forms - from the objects of heritage, i.e. replicating the body without the soul. In the algorithm those databases of museology sources – laws, rules, customs; documents of everyday public and private existence, would be the basis for initiating the processes of the reconstruction of “the soul” of a cultural good and our experience of heritage as our own asset.

Why is the latter “better” from the former? Because then questions such as who can claim the Greek stones or who can claim Kyrillos and Methodius are pointless. Of course by origin, genetics, and by titular right they are Greek but by culture, by the right to remember they are Slavic missionaries and saints.

In suggested sense the algorithm (minimally variable) of memory would include documenting significant marks of remembering through the making of databases of:

1. processes / sources / motivations
2. forms / events / products
3. meanings / uses / purposes / beneficiaries
Only this entire process can create remembering entities.

In the operational sense, databases of the first and second type are, on the one hand, provocatively reproductive (Benjamin, 1936) (supple for analogue descriptions), and on the other hand insufficient without reconstruction (therefore, conspicuously similar to hypertextual logic). Based on the first characteristic the so-called highly coded memory forms are easily and rashly recruited, such as language, alphabet, literature, then music, theatre forms, films, but also artificial intelligences and genetic memory. These forms could easily be made into crippled and estranged virtual libraries, museum exhibitions, as well as periodical customs – annual celebrations and similar “new idolisations”.

Based on the second characteristic, entities of heritage are love, good and beauty, and the recognition of those gives us strength, reason and power. If for two centuries city museums exploited the most only the third pair of entities (i.e. produced battles for defending identities) than today we humbly turn to accelerated treasuring of testimonials for museums of reconciliation, salvation, breaking-up, etc.

In the only possible way at this time, the two sides of nature of cultural inheritance are reconciled by remembering entities which are called living heritage. Regardless that in practice we often talk about revived [simulated] heritage, this is the model that should be taken as the criterion for any systematic protection of oblivion which could take part in the cultural revival of every community without exception, guided by the principal of elitist representativeness.

Databases of the third type are made possible by treasuring sources and conditions i.e. those causalities that could be established only within hypertextual structures. Setting of these databases and their subsequent activation depends completely on beneficiaries i.e. on the time and the place within which this treasury type projects itself inquisitively onto the past, as well as on the time and the demands of the society that will have use for it. Therefore, not “antiquisation”, not reproductive but reconstructive conservation that enables the culture of remembering as active learning. If we speak about accessibility and (various) exploitation of inheritance than we count on the active beneficiary i.e. pulled in or out of the educational process. He or she is the one that cannot be replaced, cannot be fetishized, he or she initiates the selection of significant goods (remembering marks) but he or she also uses and spends them in active life. This personal expenditure of significant qualities – experiences of the truth of a document on a time and a place, develops the constant need for new more significant marks of the new productive goodness, new – newly recognised – cultural goods. At this point the science gives us enough support to delineate in existing paradigms that we offer:

A reproductive approach to treasuring includes:

1. morphological description (of the material of a cultural entity), databases of formal tools and materials
2. identification of the syntax (databases of techniques and shapes according to scientific and technical typologies and classifications)
3. deciphering of the semantic structure (meaning), databases of codices, canons and iconologies. If the algorithm is properly placed than the reciprocity of exploitation of these databases provides reliable (non-arbitrary) deciphering of cultural code. Only in such open communication of values of cultural treasuries we may speak of well-based identifications and production of sustainable identities.
The reconstructive approach to treasuring includes active use of cultural values in: education, work (sustainability and productivity), leisure time (cultural leisure time and cultural tourism). The only remaining solution we have to offer is the culturologist one.

VI. The New Face of Skopje

Underground compression of Skopje, as described in terms of stratigraphic methodology of an experienced archaeologist, Professor N. Chausaidis, has its aboveground face also. It is decidedly recognisable as fetishist because it was made out of the desire to place at all costs a devotional gift on the town square like it was placed before an icon of Virgin Mary, since it helps, it heals. Then another one and all put closely together for the purpose of one thing only – the fetishist faith. The problem is, however, that it comes natural for votive objects but the town may not function at this level of density. Apart from the insult to urban body it is an insult to urban culture, also. It is unparalleled in all known cases of urbicide. Not even in the war one, not in the demographic one (at least not prominently), not in the economic one. Present-day devastation of Detroit reminds us on the fall of the British textile industry’s metropolises and their arising from the ashes on the wings of cultural tourism. It seems that in the case of the project Skopje 2014 the situation is reversed: from the cultural-identity-touristic-economic reasons the body of urban culture is being suffocated. The letter one is at this point very rich in the stratigraphy of cultures, in polyvalent qualities and in persistency. The belief that persistency will prevail is renewed in the face of the excellent alternative cultural projects that can be found on the virtual creative map of Skopje. Prominent examples of reconstructive, actively productive, creative approach to the problem of devastation of urban culture are the projects of the group Kooperativa. Their approach is analytical not cynical, it is easily identified with the feeling of belonging to the troubled entity. Fetish should be well investigated and often placed in the space of real everyday needs, but we should also demonstrate the capacity for coping with its overdue existence and its inclination to instrumentalization. This warning is not unreasonable. It was given after the proclamation of the experienced investigator of one of the most powerful fetishes of socialist Yugoslavia: Tito’s baton. This is the reconstruction of its origin and influence:

First of all, the baton is an object of one owns making (each local community, school, working collective). Then, it is carried hand to hand in a rite of transference of the energy of worship. In the end everything merges and it is being replaced with one baton (Federational) that is to be presented to the loving comrade.

Although in this final act the switch is made, our adoration of our baton remains the main source of our belief. That is why all batons were brought to the museum as gifts to comrade Tito. Very cynical!

However, cynicism was revealed when museum adviser Momo Cvijovic learned from the operatives that comrade Tito was always given the baton that was never before touched by a single person. And that is when everything went to pieces: the unselfish energy put into making of the object of worship, the enormous energy transferred by the running and the singing of songs that wormed up this inanimate object before it came to hands of the beloved comrade who was then supposed to feel the unconditional love it bestowes. None of that. He always took the cold and sterile copy.
Certainly, it is not the negation of our belief which is anyway fetishist and completely ours. It cannot be negated by some operational-security logic. The bad thing is that it was suspected to be an easy alienation. The destiny of everything which comes easily is to be easily forgotten.

As we said before, there is no way to prove premeditation in the urbicide of modern Skopje or the intention to replace the original with the copy that moves us away from the object of worship in the case of the baton in mimicking expressions of love and belief. Both are, however, the consequences of easy compliance with fetishist reality which makes us susceptible to manipulation.

**ENDNOTES**

[1] This was excellently presented by theoretician and littera Pavao Pavličić in the novel Večernji akt (Evening Nude), Zagreb 1982.

[2] We use heriting as the verb form of the noun heritage, meaning the practice of making something a heritage.
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