**Expo 67, Canada's National Heterotopia:
A Study of the Transformative Role of International Exhibitions
in Modern Society**

by

Sonja Macdonald, B.A.

A thesis submitted to
The Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

**Mass Communication Program
School of Journalism and Communication**

**Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
September, 2003**

Copyright ©2003

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file   Votre référence

ISBN: 0-612-89054-6

Our file   Notre référence

ISBN: 0-612-89054-6

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this dissertation.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de ce manuscrit.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the dissertation.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Abstract

This thesis presents a discussion of different ways in which narratives of national identity are communicated through international exhibitions. Two existing approaches to the study of exhibitions and nationalism are presented; the national propaganda and way of seeing approaches. A third theoretical model is presented as an alternative approach. This is an adaptation of Michel Foucault's concept of a heterotopia. To understand how international exhibitions function as heterotopias, Expo 67 is used as the central example to demonstrate how a sense of unity of meaning is constructed through the imposition of a general theme for Expo and through the selection and design of the exhibition site. Examples of three competing narratives of national identity in the Canadian Government Pavilion, the Quebec Pavilion, and the Indians of Canada Pavilion are discussed to demonstrate how multiple opposing narrative of national identity can function together in a heterotopia to communicate new symbols that make sense of social change.

Acknowledgements

I want to thank a number of people who have assisted in the formulation and completion of this thesis. My classmates and peers from Carleton were central in making this a truly educational and entertaining experience, without their support and assistance both the Master's program and the thesis writing process would have been very boring indeed. Dr. Vincent Mosco has undoubtedly been one of the greatest teachers I have encountered in my life. He taught me to say it simply and to think critically, and I thank him for that. Dr. Ross Eaman allowed me the space to formulate my own ideas for this project and to make my own mistakes. I appreciate the assistance he provided throughout this process. My family and friends provided me with wonderful encouragement and they have been amazingly understanding of my absenteeism in life for the last two years. I promise to you all that I am finally emerging from this cocoon. Finally, Paul Shaker has been my greatest supporter, advisor, and cheerleader for the last two year. I thank him for his continued enthusiasm about my research interests, particularly at those moments when I questioned what it was that I was doing.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter 1: A Short History of International Exhibitions	9
Precursors to International Exhibitions	10
Brief Overview of International Exhibitions	14
<i>Victorian Era Exhibitions</i>	16
<i>Inter-war Era Exhibitions</i>	21
<i>Post-war Era Exhibitions</i>	25
Chapter 2: Nationalism and Two Approaches to the Study of International Exhibitions	33
Approaches to Nationalism	35
International Exhibitions and Nationalism	39
<i>The National Propaganda Approach</i>	41
<i>The Way of Seeing Approach</i>	46
Chapter 3: Defining a Heterotopic Medium	59
Foucault's Concept of a Heterotopia	60
Interpretations of Foucault's Concept	70
Heterotopias as Media of Communication	78
Chapter 4: International Exhibitions as Heterotopic Media	85
Foucault's Six Principles of a Heterotopia	86
International Exhibitions as Places in Between	94
Chapter 5: Canada as Host of Expo 67	100
Canada at International Exhibitions before Expo 67	101
Canada as Host	107
<i>Theme of Expo 67</i>	109
<i>Location of Expo 67</i>	118
Chapter 6: Competing Nationalist Narratives at Expo 67	126
The Canadian Government Pavilion	128
The Quebec Pavilion	136
The Indians of Canada Pavilion	141
Conclusion	152
Bibliography	157

List of Illustrations

Fig. 1 – The Great Exhibition of 1851	15
Fig. 2 – Inside the Crystal Palace	15
Fig. 3 – Frederic Le Play’s elliptical design for the Paris Exposition Universelle, 1867	19
Fig. 4 – Man in the Community Pavilion	114
Fig. 5 – Expo 67 – Main Map	119
Fig. 6 – The Canadian compound of Pavilions	129
Fig. 7 – Katimavik and the People Tree	133
Fig. 8 – Quebec Pavilion	138
Fig. 9 – The Indians of Canada Pavilion	142

Introduction

International exhibitions are spectacular places in modern society where a multitude of different objects, people, and ideas are on display. They are constructed to inform and entertain a large audience. Since their first appearance in 1851, they have become important events in the history of the nations that host them as they have a unique ability to demonstrate to their large audience the processes of change that are underway outside their gilded gates. Since there are so many different parts of society on display in this same space, anyone interested in studying these events is faced with many possible discourses at work in international exhibitions. One of the discourses that has been displayed at international exhibitions is nationalism. There are numerous scholars who have studied the relationship between exhibitions and nationalism; as a result, there are a number of different ways that this relationship can be understood. One way to study this relationship is to view international exhibitions as heterotopic media, where competing nationalist narratives come together, collide and create new symbols. A heterotopic medium is a unique space that gives unity of meaning to a collection of unusual things, like different nationalism narratives, creating new symbols to make sense of change in society. A good example of how international exhibitions function as heterotopic media to communicate new symbols of national identity is Expo 67.

The first chapter of this thesis provides a historical review of exhibitionary culture. The ancient Roman market was the first recorded example of this type of temporary event where communities met to exchange goods and services and share local news and tales. This exhibitionary model remained central in different societies

throughout history such as in the pre-industrial market, where on certain occasions different communities came together to celebrate the harvest, exchange their goods, and share stories about different parts of the country. The exhibitionary model expanded as society transformed into the industrial era. Local markets and fairs became larger regional and eventually national exhibitions. These national exhibitions, which emerged at the end of the eighteenth century, reflected Enlightenment ideals of industrial progress and universal brotherhood. Central to these events was a push to increase relations between regional communities and the presentation of a unified ideal of national industrial success and culture.

The first international exhibition was hosted in London in 1851. The Great Exhibition was the first event of this scale, and its success led to subsequent exhibitions hosted by other nations in the Victorian era. These events extolled the imperial virtues of the host nations through the display of manufactured goods and raw materials. The British, French and Americans hosted the most exhibitions in this period. The second significant era of international exhibitions occurred in the years between the First and Second World Wars. In this period, those traditional host nations returned to this medium to attempt to reinforce their economic and cultural dominance on an international scale. National competition overtook the ideal of international brotherhood and there was a split in the types of events that were mounted at this time. The split was between international exhibitions, which focused on idealized themes of originality and education and world's fairs, which were spectacles specifically focused on the displaying of commercial products. Following the Second World War, this division between exhibitions and fairs became more entrenched. Fewer international exhibitions were

hosted, but those that were had themes that were committed to the expression of a common sense of humanity in the hope of counteracting existing geopolitical tensions between the West and the U.S.S.R. International exhibitions continue to be held around the world, and the medium has been adapted in other forms. The transformation of these events throughout their history demonstrates their relationship to larger transformations going on within society.

International exhibitions are objects of study within a variety of academic fields, as many different discourses and aspects of society were on display in these singular venues. One of the central discourses displayed at international exhibitions was nationalism. Chapter 2 provides a review of the various theories of nationalism and two different approaches to the study of the relationship between nationalism and international exhibitions. The conceptualization of nationalism that is adopted in this analysis relies on the work of Craig Calhoun, which argues that nationalism should be understood as an ambivalent discursive formation at the root of modern society. He argues that the violence and racism so often associated with nationalism is not central to the discourse itself but specific to certain nationalist narratives. This discursive formation is then applied as the lens through which to study the relationship between international exhibitions and nationalism.

Two different approaches to the analysis of international exhibitions and nationalism are presented. Robert Rydell and Paul Greenhalgh are two scholars who have studied these discourses through a top-down national propaganda model. This model presents the argument that the dominant elite in society use international exhibitions as media through which to impose specific images of national identity. This

model incorporates the concept of hegemony, whereby the dominant elite use events like international exhibitions to make common ideas about society. Even though Robert Rydell allows for the existence of alternative or oppositional discourses within his model of hegemony, both his and Greenhalgh's approach present a unidirectional model of communication. Another failing of this approach is that it tends to focus solely on how the domestic political elite use international exhibitions to control the ordering of society without addressing the inter-relationship between nations that occur at these events.

The second approach to the study of nationalism and international exhibitions is the "way of seeing" approach. This model draws on Calhoun's primordialist model, which assumes that cultural artefacts and symbols exist outside of the influence of human agency. The way of seeing approach does present cultural symbols as pre-existing, yet those who advocate this position argue that these symbols can be altered in the construction of nationalist narratives presented at international exhibitions. These constructed narratives rely on a set of binary oppositions which assist in reinforcing a sense of national unity. The first opposition is established between the western Self and the foreign Other, whereby a unified notion of identity is formed for western populations by a comparison to pejorative representations of other cultures. The second opposition is that between the real world and the representational environment of international exhibitions. Although some of the way of seeing scholars concede that there is some sense of confusion of real and representational at exhibitions, the binary still stands as a fundamental critique of how international exhibitions are used to present appropriate images of national identity.

Chapter 3 builds on the discussion of the two approaches discussed in Chapter 2 and presents a third alternative to the study of international exhibitions and nationalism. Rather than understanding the ordering of society as either a top-down dissemination of images to a non-responsive mass audience or as a set of fixed binaries through which to establish a unified notion of identity, this third approach argues that international exhibitions should be studied as heterotopic media. A heterotopic medium is a real place that gives unity of meaning to a collection of unusual things and discursive statements, creating new symbols, which are then communicated to a larger community to assist in making sense of change in society. It is one space in society where the process of transformation occurs and is communicated. The concept of a heterotopia discussed here is informed by the work of Michel Foucault. He outlined six principles that make up a heterotopia in the article "Of Other Spaces," which act as superficial criteria by which heterotopias are identified. Two of Foucault's principles are particularly important in the analysis of international exhibitions: these are the principles that address the layering and fleeting nature of time within these spaces and the limited access to heterotopias. Beyond Foucault's initial use of the concept of a heterotopia, the idea has been adapted by a number of scholars. Kevin Hetherington's adaptation of the concept provides a set of appropriate functions for heterotopias. He argues that rather than existing as space of the 'Other', heterotopias are the spaces in between real and representational, self and other, and center and margin. As spaces in between, they are sites where multiple different things come together to shatter old myths about how society is ordered and communicate new symbols to a broader population to assist them in making sense of social change.

The concept of a heterotopic medium is applied to a general discussion of international exhibitions in Chapter 4. This discussion sets out examples of the ways that international exhibitions fit Foucault's six principles, with specific focus on the ways that these spaces simultaneously present time as accumulated and fleeting. The discussion then explains how international exhibitions have functioned as spaces in between the center and margin, and in between competing narratives of nationalism.

Chapter 5 presents the first part of a more detailed analysis of Expo 67 as an example of a heterotopic medium. The chapter opens with a brief historical discussion of Canada's participation in international exhibitions, the role played by the federal government, and the images of national identity presented throughout the history of exhibitions. The historical review demonstrates the established myths and symbols that were relied upon to communicate Canadian national identity through international exhibitions before Canada hosted its own event. As host of Expo 67, the Canadian government could no longer fully control the images of Canadian identity that would be displayed at the exhibition. Yet there were two features of Expo through which a sense of unity was presented: the selection and application of the general theme "Man and His World" to all the pavilions on site and the selection and design of the Expo site. These two features provided not only a sense of unity for the general exhibition, but they also assist in establishing how Expo was constructed as a heterotopic medium through which new symbols of identity were articulated.

The final chapter continues the discussion of Expo as a heterotopic medium, but shifts the attention from the construction of the medium itself to more detailed analysis of three narratives presented at Expo 67: those found in the Canadian Government Pavilion,

the Quebec Pavilion, and the Indians of Canada Pavilion. The Canadian Government Pavilion was the largest national exhibit on the Expo site. There were three main structural features, the main exhibit building, Katimavik, and the People Tree. The federal government constructed its vision of national identity through these three spaces, yet rather than offer new ideas about Canada, the narrative relied on many old myths that had been presented at previous international exhibitions. Where new symbols did emerge in this narrative, they were often presented as problems or challenges facing the nation rather than new ways of understanding social change. The Quebec Pavilion was designed in contrast to the other exhibits within the Canadian compound of pavilions. Quebec, as provincial host, mounted the largest of the provincial pavilions that sought to demonstrate how the province and its people were unique within Canada. The design of the space and the selected images used within the exhibit narrative aimed to present an ideal image of Quebec as a culturally and ethnically uniform society that was rooted in a long history that pre-dated Canadian Confederation. Some general concepts such as the human struggle against the natural environment appeared in both the Canadian Government and Quebec Pavilions.

The final narrative discussed in this chapter is that presented in the Indians of Canada Pavilion. This exhibit was a space outside of the 'official' compound of Canadian pavilions. It stood directly across the Ile. Notre Dame from the Quebec Pavilion, and like this other space that stood apart in design and site location, the Indians of Canada Pavilion stood apart from those around it. Through the use of traditional Aboriginal symbols and the inversion of the utopian images of progress presented in the other two Pavilions, this space presented a powerful and effective critique of Canadian life. These

three pavilions presented very different and competing narratives of national identity. Through their collision in this heterotopic medium of Expo 67, new symbols emerged and were communicated to a broader national and international audience about how Canada defined itself. Many of these symbols would go on to become central elements of a renewed sense of Canadian national identity.

This thesis concludes with a discussion of the legacy of Expo for Canada. In particular, it is argued that Expo 67 was a central event that presented new images of national identity to Canadians and the international community. The commingling of the three narrative positions discussed in the previous chapter worked together to present several contested images of Canada that continued to dominate the national political discourse for the decades following the international exhibition.

Chapter 1: A Short History of International Exhibitions

International exhibitions emerged in the middle of the nineteenth century and quickly became central institutions for the displaying of industrial success, national order and cultural superiority. These events were temporary exhibitions which displayed the goods and products of industrial society to an ever increasing mass audience. The fundamental role of these events was to present an idealized model of society as a whole, which assumed that society and its processes could be fully understood and controlled. There were a number of key functions which were performed at international exhibitions which included the competition between nations; initially between western imperial powers, and later, after the Second World War between two ideological models of society. Exhibitions were also important for domestic commercial growth, emigration, and the communication of a unified sense of national pride. In the first instance, those participating at international exhibitions displayed new technologies and industrial processes, for example the introduction of electricity, the television or the automobile. These events provided the national and commercial participants with a venue through which to introduce new products and ideas to a mass audience. Another function of exhibitions was the articulation of methods of social control, yet this was not always as overt as other functions. Again for those participating in exhibitions, the event provided a way of presenting modes of production and social behaviour through a comparative categorization of society as a whole.

This chapter aims to provide a brief review of the history of international exhibitions. The discussion will begin with an understanding of the progression from

ancient Roman market to international exhibition. This will be followed by a discussion of the British and French national exhibitions which directly preceded and informed the structuring of international exhibitions. The methods and techniques of display used at international exhibition were inherited from these earlier forms of spectacle and they were expanded on an international scale. The chapter will then present a discussion of the progression of the international exhibition from the Crystal Palace in London in 1851 to the exhibitions hosted after the Second World War. The focus of this discussion will emphasize the transformative nature of this medium which paralleled broader transformations in society. There have been well over 150 international exhibitions held around the world since 1851. As a result the discussion in this chapter will be limited to a selection of larger international exhibitions and world's fairs held in Britain, France and the United States. Those exhibitions that will be discussed here were selected for their long-lasting impact and, in some instances, for the transformations in methods of display that occurred and which influenced later events. This historical review of international exhibitions will provide the reader with a greater understanding of this medium of display and it will also set the groundwork for the following discussions dealing with nationalism, heterotopic media and how Expo 67 progressed as a point of transformation for Canada in particular but also for the medium of exhibition in general.

Precursor to International Exhibitions

Many have argued that international exhibitions owe their inception to the traditions established in the markets of Ancient Rome which inspired the markets of a feudal Europe.¹ International exhibitions, as Allwood argues, were deeply rooted in modern culture and they are a communal means of "showing off" or making an

exhibition of one's wealth and knowledge.² The older forms of events were occasional occurrences where communities came together to exchange goods and share stories. The scale of these events was minute in comparison to the international exhibitions of the modern era, yet these two types of events shared certain features; particularly the bringing together of different communities of people into one space for a fixed period of time. The scale of participation was also drastically different, as the ancient fairs and markets were attended by local populations interested in sharing their goods and news with people from other localities. The displaying or showing off was an important element of these early events, as a way of demonstrating prowess as compared to other regions and localities. The exchanging of stories and local news was also central and was a key way of communicating ideas about society in pre-literate societies. This form of communication has been defined as the aural tradition of communication.³ As society itself expanded, so too did the markets and fairs to a regional and then national level. In the late eighteenth century, the national exhibitions emerged and marked a shift in focus in these types of events from the immediate function of economic exchange to a venue for the education of larger segments of the society and the demonstration of new industrial practices and products. Jean-Louis de Lorimier suggested that the first national exhibition was held in Prague in 1791.⁴

National exhibitions were also commonly found around the same time in Britain and in France. In Britain, national exhibitions were hosted as an extension of the Royal Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, following its founding in 1754. In France, the national exhibition appeared in the years following the French Revolution of 1789 as "outward manifestations of a nation attempting to flex

economic, national, military, and cultural muscles.”⁵ In both instances, these events were held in the interest of promoting Enlightenment values, specifically demonstrations of industrial progress and national intellectual endeavour. Although the functions of these events were manifold, only three will be highlighted here. Primarily, national exhibitions were concerned with the display of products and inventions for industrial development. In this instance the hope was for an expansion of markets for regional goods throughout the country. Secondly, the national exhibitions were organized in the interest of bringing together different communities from the geographic regions to reinforce an internal sense of nation among British and French citizens. The French national exhibitions aimed to heal some of the wounds that were exposed during and after the French Revolution, as well as flex the muscles of industrial superiority.⁶ Finally, national exhibitions were extensions of educational and learned societies. This was particularly the case for the British exhibitions where they were organized by the Royal Society and also by the national Mechanics Institutes.⁷ The purpose of these institutions was to act as the medium to communicate new methods of industrial progress throughout the nation by stimulating “working class consciousness and to generally advance industrial culture.”⁸

The transformation of the fair medium from pre-industrial market to the international exhibition corresponded with the transformation in the methods of acquiring knowledge that was occurring at the same time. As noted, one of the ancillary activities of the feudal market was sharing of stories, by aural means, from one community to the next. By the time of the national exhibition the means of transmission of these stories of society had altered and were moving towards a more visual rather than aural pattern. The visual order of the national exhibition was one based on comparison and competition.

Different objects were placed on display in comparison to others similar items and then they were judged and awarded a value. Objects were ordered by general categories such as manufactured goods or agricultural goods. Then within each general category status was ascribed to differing types of textile or cattle based on the judgment of the sponsoring societies. Beyond the categorizing and measuring of different artefacts, national exhibitions also provided the opportunity for the proliferation of certain methods of industrial operation, ultimately leading to greater standardization within national industrial sectors. The organizers of national exhibitions hosted lectures dealing with the application of industrial innovations and methods. This was particularly the case in Britain. In France, the national exhibitions also provided for a larger national exposure to a unitary national culture as a result of the displaying of works of art. Beyond the displaying of national industrial methods and cultural artefacts, national exhibitions also provided for the introduction of artefacts from foreign lands, namely colonial territories. This display offered one way for the larger population to be exposed to the world beyond national boundaries.

The move from national to international exhibitions was a result of a number of larger trends within society in the mid-nineteenth century. Economic markets were opening up as free trade was becoming a more common economic model. Tied into this expansion of the international marketplace was a competitive relationship between imperial nations, particularly Britain and France. It was following a visit to a French national exhibition that Prince Albert became more intrigued by the notion of mounting an international exhibition. Although the idea of hosting an international exhibition originated with the French, it was the British who first hosted such an event in 1851. One

of the central figures behind this event was Prince Albert, who hoped that an international exhibition could reduce international hostilities, challenge British manufacturers to hone their techniques and products in light of foreign competition, and finally, he hoped the event might bring a sense of united national pride to undercut rising labour tensions in the country. He had invested this one temporal event with many lofty expectations. Perhaps this is one of the greatest legacies of the Crystal Palace: the view that an international exhibition, in its presentation of a holistic utopian image of society, could solve the tensions of the present day.

Brief Overview of International Exhibitions

The first international exhibition was Prince Albert's exhibition, "The Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of all Nations." Twenty five nations participated and it was attended by over 6 million people.⁹ The event was held in London's Hyde Park, where a temporary structure made of glass and iron was erected. The building was designed by Joseph Paxton, and it resembled an excessively large greenhouse. (fig. 1) The design and construction materials gave this exhibition its popular name, which was the Crystal Palace. The event did not occur without local tensions though, the greatest of which related to the site location. Once the site in Hyde Park had been determined, many local Londoners were horrified to find out that to erect the temporary exhibition structure several of the parks trees and gardens would have to be felled. A compromise was reached whereby the trees were saved and included inside the Crystal Palace. (fig. 2) Although striking and unique in its design, the Crystal Palace did indeed resemble a green house in its amplification of sunlight through the glass. After a number of visitors

Fig. 1 – The Great Exhibition of 1851¹⁰

fainted, Paxton removed a number of glass panes in the hopes of improving circulation. Despite this initial problem, the exhibition was a great success and it sparked the race to impress for all nations there after.

A prolific number of international exhibitions followed the Crystal Palace. Since the first international exhibition much has changed in the methods of display, in the exhibit construction, and in the nature of the images and products presented. As a result a number of scholars have attempted to categorize exhibitions to draw out similarities and differences in the general form. Some of the taxonomies have been geographical, demonstrating the differences between British international exhibitions, French expositions universelles, and the American world fairs.¹² Others have focused on chronological markers which separate different groups of exhibitions. One common chronological division of fairs has been identified by Richard Mandell who argued that there was a marked difference between those international exhibitions held before 1900 and those held after.¹³ Another scholar who has focused on chronological groupings of exhibitions is James Gilbert, who has split these events into three chronological groupings. Gilbert's groups provide a good starting point for a more general understanding of the transformation of the medium of exhibitions over time. The first grouping is the Victorian period which ranges from the Crystal Palace in 1851 to after WWI. The second period encompasses those fairs held between the end of the First World War and the beginning of the Second World War. The final period is that which occurred following the Second World War until the end of the 20th Century.¹⁴ Although Gilbert's eras provide a good general guideline, they are not entirely accurate. Specifically, Gilbert includes those exhibitions which were mounted from 1900 to 1914

as part of the Victorian era, yet others like Mandell have successfully argued that the Victorian era of exhibitions came to an end with the 1900 Paris Exposition. Despite this difficulty, Gilbert's system does provide the general categorial model that will be followed here to demonstrate differences between different international exhibitions throughout their history.

Victorian Era Exhibitions

The Victorian era of fairs was characterized by "the idea of universal culture, a complex notion defined, in part, by European opposition between civilization and savagery."¹⁵ This focus on a universal culture reflected broader ideas within society that harkened back to Enlightenment ideals. Here, Western man was envisioned as the universal subject, and those aspects of civilization, like architecture, industrial machinery and fine arts were symbols of the universal culture which would provide the mechanism for national or global success. The early hosts of the Victorian era fairs were imperial nations. As mentioned, Britain was the first to host an international exhibition with the Crystal Palace in 1851. Here the exhibits were separated into 31 industrial categories dealing with industrial machinery and their products, agricultural goods, and raw materials. They were all housed within the Crystal Palace structure. The French quickly followed suit, and in 1855 they hosted the "Exposition Universelle des produits de l'Agriculture, de l'Industrie et des Beaux-Arts". The important development in France's first exhibition was the inclusion of the fine arts exhibit, which had not been present at the Crystal Palace. Not to be outdone by the French, the British hosted their second exhibition, again in London in 1862, titled "The London International Exhibition on Industry and Art". This event was again housed in Hyde Park in a structure remarkably

similar to Paxton's Crystal Palace, although covering a larger area. At both the 1855 and 1862 exhibitions, attendance remained close to 6 million.

The French continued the exhibition tradition in 1867, where the theme focused again on agriculture, industry and the arts. The 1867 Expositions Universelle was significant as it was the first exhibition where the displays were partitioned by both industrial categories and nationality. Here the exhibition designer Frederic le Play created an elliptical system of display which allowed for a general national grouping with different industrial categories ranging from the center to the top of the ellipsis. (fig. 3) Le Play's divisions would be adopted for future exhibitions, and the national separations would only become greater as exhibitions continued.¹⁶ The attendance for this Exposition Universelle was significantly larger than the previous exhibitions. Fifteen million visitors attended, demonstrating the increased popularity of this type of spectacle for the Victorian audience. The French hosted three more expositions before the end of the century; in 1878, in 1889, which was hosted to celebrate the centennial of the French Revolution and for which Eiffel constructed his tower, and finally the Exposition Universelle of 1900. The last of these was the largest exhibition to date with a record attendance of 50 million visitors. The Paris Métro was built to transport visitors to and from the exposition site. This, as Mandell argues, was the fair to end all fairs. He states that the ideals of universal brotherhood, cooperation and cosmopolitanism that were trumpeted and popularized at the Crystal Palace and the following exhibitions had become "deeply suspect" by 1900 and that the drive for nationalist superiority far exceeded the international cooperation of the early fairs.¹⁷

The hosting of international exhibitions was not limited to Britain and France. Exhibitions had also been held at Vienna in 1873, at Melbourne in 1880, and at Barcelona in 1888. Other than the British and the French though, only the United States hosted more than one international exhibition in this period. Its first event was held in honour of the national Centennial in Philadelphia in 1876. This exhibition was an important event for the federal government in rebuilding a sense of national unity following the American Civil War in the 1860s. This was followed by the Chicago Columbian Exhibition in 1893, which was more popularly known as the White City Fair. It was at the Chicago Fair in 1893 where the Midway, or amusement zone, first become incorporated into the exhibition proper rather than being a side show held nearby. It was also at the White City Fair that electricity was displayed for common commercial use. The American exhibitions differed somewhat from their European counterparts, as private companies were more directly involved in the planning and funding of these events. The business community had always been involved in the British exhibitions but through the learned societies and Mechanics institutes, therefore their direct impact was diluted by the associations. In the American case, there was no intermediary, and in fact the urban business communities of the cities that hosted world's fairs were the direct engines for the events themselves. The federal government's involvement was limited to relations between nations, encouraging foreign nations to participate through the hosting of national exhibits.¹⁹

The international scope and exposure provided by these events was a new phenomenon. The latter half of the nineteenth century was the first time that many domestic citizens were exposed to objects, information, and people from foreign lands.

This exposure, which was a result of improved rail transportation and the growth of print media, was perhaps the most successful and useful aspect of international exhibitions as a means to disseminate notions of empire, nation, culture, and industry to a mass audience. As Carol Breckenridge argues, “trains, the latest in transport inventions, facilitated the temporary movement of people for leisure, and advanced the ideas of the excursion as a sign of an accomplished middle-class person.”²⁰ International exhibitions became extremely popular events for the middle classes of Europe, as visiting them demonstrated a new focus on leisure as part of modern life. The popularity of these events was expanded beyond just those who attended by extensive advertising and promotion within the burgeoning newspaper industry. Another important way in which these events were provided greater social legitimacy was through the inclusion of information about the displays and exhibits as material in the classrooms in the ever expanding educational systems in Western nations.

The Inter-War Era Exhibitions

In the early part of the twentieth century many international exhibitions were held in nations around the world. Only one exhibition was hosted by a traditional host, which was the St. Louis Exhibition in 1904. Neither Britain nor France hosted international exhibitions of their previous scale at this time. The First World War halted any such events as it was clearly impossible to advocate universal brotherhood and peace among men while hundreds of thousands were dying in Europe. This did not diminish the popularity of international exhibitions though as national governments and business leaders in Britain, France and the United States returned to the model of the exhibition after the First World War. The exhibitions in this period differed from their predecessors,

in that the main aim was the competition between nations as displayed through their cultural and economic artefacts rather than the celebration of the overarching success of industrialization. The competition between nations became ardent at these events as did the competition to host one's own event. This led to the call for international regulation of exhibiting and in 1928, thirty one nations came together in Paris and produced the "Convention Regarding International Exhibitions" which was drafted to establish the criteria for international exhibition. In 1931, the rules set out in the convention came under the regulatory authority of the Bureau International des Expositions (BIE).²¹ One of the most important regulations defined in the Convention was the differentiation between international exhibitions and world fairs.

The clarification of the difference between exhibitions and fairs was an important contribution to the exhibiting culture. The BIE qualified that there was fundamental difference between a first category international exhibition and a world's fair. A fair is defined as "a marketplace where many producers have an opportunity, generally at regular intervals, to offer samples of their goods. It has no stated educational aim, but exists principally to facilitate buying and selling."²² An international exhibition, on the other hand, was required to "demonstrate through originality of presentation, the value and usefulness of the considerable number of articles assembled."²³ This differentiation was important in the qualifying of the types of events that were held in Europe and the United States. The U.S. chose to host world's fairs over international exhibitions as these fairs were mounted by the business community who saw these events as an excellent way to display their products to a mass audience. The European, and in particular the French,

exhibitions had shifted their focus in this period away from the displaying of industrial products and toward the displaying of culture.

Each host nation had different reasons for returning to this medium after the war. The British did so in the hope of bolstering their declining empire. They hosted the British Empire Exhibition at Wembley in 1924-25, where the national pavilions of the dominions of Canada and Australia were prominent. Another reason for hosting this event with the focus on the colonies was to encourage emigration to those territories, as the British economy was struggling and there was high unemployment at the time. France saw the benefits of international exhibitions as a way to reinvigorate the spirit of the national population that had witnessed the loss of a large segment of its population and the devastation of much of its lands as battlefields during the First World War. The French hosted a number of successful events in this period, although the events became more focused on demonstrating the French cultural superiority rather than their economic prowess. The most significant French exhibitions were the 1925 “Exposition Internationale des Arts Decoratifs et Industriels Modernes” and the 1937 “Exposition Internationale des Arts et Techniques dans la Vie Moderne”, both of which were held in Paris. The attendance at both these exhibitions was less than had been achieved in 1900, yet despite the international tensions that were on the verge of exploding, the 1937 Exposition drew over 31 million visitors.

As noted the American exhibiting culture pursued the world fair model rather than the international exhibition model. This was particularly the case at the 1933-34 “Century of Progress International Exhibition” held at Chicago and the New York World’s Fair of 1939-40. The Chicago World’s Fair was conceived of and mounted by the Chicago

---

business community in the hopes of spurring the local economy which had been hard hit by the Great Depression. The Fair was a success, in that there was a high attendance and a small profit resulted. The planners of the Fair had constructed an elaborate image of a utopian future which required the purchase of new products and technologies that were displayed at the Fair. Unlike their French counterparts, the American Fairs in this era began to blend the commercial and entertainment value of fairs and the educational component became less and less central.

The World of Tomorrow, which was the theme at New York in 1939, was conceived of and constructed by the New York business elite as a response to the success of the 1933-34 Chicago Fair. The utopian model of the future America at New York 1939 revolved around the automobile and the restructuring of the urban environment to account for it. This is particularly clear as demonstrated by the central exhibit of the theme pavilion, Democracity, which projected a vision into the future of how the modern city would function in 1960; one dividing the suburban dwelling from the urban working environment, yet still connected by six-lane super highways. The images of Democracity were paralleled in the General Motors pavilion Futurama which presented the automakers rendition of the city of the future. It too presented the World of Tomorrow as one split between the suburban home and the urban workplace where a car was required for membership in this life. The New York World's Fair in 1939 was a success because of attendance, but also for its longer term influence on the urban design of American cities.

The exhibitions held between the World Wars were prolific and quite successful, particularly as compared to those that would follow after 1945. It was in this period where a split opened up between the international exhibitions in Europe which were

focused on cultural and educational expressions of the future versus the American world's fairs that highlighted the blending of commerce and entertainment. Despite this split, both types of exhibitions were attended by different nations all of which hosted expansive national pavilions. These pavilions demonstrated the move away from the Victorian era practise of exhibiting in one building to the pattern of a more expansive exhibition site where each nation had its own building. This pattern reflected the move away from the early themes of universal brotherhood and cooperation to a more explicit demonstration of national competition. This national competition displayed at international exhibitions mirrored the growing tensions between nations in other parts of society. The beginning of the Second World War in 1939 heralded yet another significant transformation within the broader global order, but it also heralded another lesser transformation within international exhibitions.

The Post-war Exhibitions

The post World War II exhibitions were not nearly as successful as their Victorian and inter-war years predecessors, and this lack of success led many to suggest that the era of the international exhibition was over. Ada Louise Huxtable, an American urban critic commented in 1960,

The world's fair is a tired institution. It is a long time since it startled the world with its products or offered stimulating or controversial ideas. No longer an instrument of genuine intellectual exchange, it has been reduced to an expeditious economic shot in the arm and an instrument of national propaganda.²⁴

Yet there are many significant elements of the postwar exhibitions that assist in understanding the development of the cultural consciousness of many Western nations. The study of the exhibition medium has already demonstrated how these events herald change in society as a whole. The Victoria era exhibitions marked an important point of

transformation of Western society where the Enlightenment ideals of universal brotherhood and cooperation were incorporated to support an increased globalization of the economy through the exploits of imperial nations. The inter-war exhibitions marked the split within the exhibition culture between cultural and commercial events. These events also demonstrated the increasing competition between nations. Finally, the post-war exhibitions demonstrate even more points of transformation occurring in the greater society, for example the drive for increased recognition of newly independent post-colonial nations, heralding yet another change in how nation and nationalism are articulated and presented. This transformation in nationality occurred within a larger global conflict, that between the Western capitalist system and the Soviet-styled communist system, both of which were actively displayed at international exhibitions in this era.

Huxtable's lament over the loss of relevance of the institution of the world's fair reflected the emergence of increased competition for this medium after the Second World War. The Victorian and inter-war era exhibitions had succeeded in part because of their positive relationship with print and radio as a means of broadcasting and advertising the exhibitions and those events and artefacts on display. After the Second World War, this relationship with other popular media became competitive rather than complementary, as television and film were spectacles of themselves that could also transport the spectator into other utopian spaces. The cost of mounting an international exposition was far more daunting, which explains why there were far fewer fairs in the three decades following the Second World War than there had been in the 1920s alone. There were three first category international exhibitions and one world's fair held in this period. The three

exhibitions were the 1958 Expositions Universelles and Internationales de Bruxelles (Expo'58), which was the second first category exhibition ever held, the 1967 Universal and International Exhibition held in Montreal (Expo'67), and the Japan World Exhibition (Expo'70). Each of these three exhibitions focused on a theme of unity among the world's population which reflected broader concerns within the international community about the heightened tensions between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. It was also in this period that the split between international exhibitions and world's fairs became most apparent. The New York World's Fair of 1964 was again conceived and constructed by the corporate sector in the United States, yet it was not nearly as successful as its inter-war years counterpart. The Fair has been broadly criticized as scattered and ultimately a failure, unlike its predecessor.²⁵ As John Allwood states,

Although the theme was 'Peace through Understanding', there were more arguments and more people upset, from foreign governments to local grocery chain bosses, than would have been thought possible. Cheap tawdry commercialism was finally given its head with predictably disastrous results.²⁶

International exhibitions continue to be held around the world although far less frequently. The last first category international exhibition was held in Hanover, Germany in 2000. Although 155 nations participated in Hanover and it was attended by approximately 18 million visitors, this pales in comparison with the 1900 Paris Exposition, which was attended by approximately 50 million visitors²⁷. The only post-war Expo to exceed the Paris 1900 attendance was Expo'67 in Montreal. The next first category international and universal exhibition will be held in 2010 in Shanghai, China. Despite waning attendance numbers, the national and corporate interest in hosting and participating in exhibitions continues. Beyond BIE exhibitions, the format of exhibitions has been adapted and applied at different scales, examples of which are the international

trade shows and the permanent amusement parks. The most infamous of the latter is perhaps Disney World, which was where, following the 1964 New York World's Fair, a model of the permanent World's Fair in the Experimental Prototype Community of Tomorrow (EPCOT) was designed and constructed next to Disney World in Florida.²⁸ EPCOT was planned to encapsulate all of the utopian idealism and commercial success of the world's fair medium, but on a permanent basis.

Despite the transformation in the nature of exhibitions from the ancient Roman markets to the modern world's fair, the performance of this type of public event continues throughout the world. The international exhibition tradition, as briefly described here, provides a good way to comprehend the cultural, economic, social and political ideals of a specific time and place. These events mark points of transformation for the culture they reflect as they are often mounted in an effort to counteract or ease tensions occurring outside their gilded gates. The Victorian era exhibitions lauded the power of empire and industry in an ever expanding global marketplace. The inter-war exhibitions demonstrated increased national competition and the emerging tensions between cultural versus commercial means of display. The post-war exhibitions sought to ease growing tensions between the two dominant ideological political structures of the time through the presentation of a global unity based on shared humanity. The power of these events lies not only in the images that are presented by their architects but also in the ability of the visitors to incorporate the ideals into their everyday lives. The breadth of these events provides a rich arena for analysis of social development, whether the role of empire, the construction of national identity, the displaying of culture and commerce,

or the tensions between education and entertainment. These are just a few possible ways to understand the impact of these events on society as a whole.

Notes

¹ See Jean-Louis de Lorimier, "A Proud Tradition," *The Memorial Album of the First Category Universal and International Exhibition held in Montreal from the Twenty-seventh of April to the Twenty-ninth of October, Nineteen hundred and Sixty-Seven* (Montreal: Thomas Nelson and Sons Limited, 1968): 35; Pierre Dupuy "Message from the Commissioner General," *Expo 67, Official Guide* (Toronto: Maclean-Hunter Limited, 1967): 1; John Allwood, "Introduction," *The Great Exhibitions* (London: Studio Vista, 1977): 7; and Paul Greenhalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas: The Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions and World's Fairs, 1851-1939* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988).

² Allwood 7.

³ For a more detailed discussion of the aural tradition of communication, see Harold A. Innis, *Empire and Communications* (Victoria/Toronto: Press Porcupine, 1986). Innis' discussion of the transition from an aural to visual society parallels Tonnies' sociological discussion of the shift from traditional to modern society. See Ferdinand Tonnies, *Community and Society* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1957).

⁴ de Lorimier 35.

⁵ Greenhalgh 6.

⁶ Greenhalgh 3.

⁷ Greenhalgh 7.

⁸ Greenhalgh 8.

⁹ See the International Bureau of Exhibitions' website <http://www.bie-paris.org/eng/index.asp?m1=5&sm1=18#>

¹⁰ T. Picken, *Crystal Palace from the South*, Colour Lithograph (Victoria and Albert Museum, n/d)

¹¹ Benjamin Brecknell Turner, *Crystal Palace, Hyde Park, 1852, Transept*, Albumen print from calotype negative (Victoria and Albert Museum, 1852).

¹² See the work of Robert Rydell, which focuses almost exclusively on the American exhibitions. Paul Greenhalgh has separated exhibitions according to the national hosts, but he has limited his analysis to those events hosted by Britain, France and the United States.

-
- ¹³ Richard D. Mandell, *Paris 1900: The Great World's Fair* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967).
- ¹⁴ James Gilbert, "World's Fairs as Historical Events," Robert W. Rydell and Nancy E. Gwinn, eds. *Fair Representations: World's Fairs and the Modern World* (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1994): 14.
- ¹⁵ Gilbert 17.
- ¹⁶ Allwood 13-41.
- ¹⁷ Mandell 121.
- ¹⁸ John Allwood, *The Great Exhibitions* (London: Studio Vista, 1977): 37.
- ¹⁹ For a complete list of international exhibitions held between 1851 and 1975, see John Allwood 180-5. For a complete list of international fairs in the years following 1975 please consult the Bureau International des Expositions (BIE) website, www.bie-paris.org.
- ²⁰ Carol A. Breckenridge, "The Aesthetics and Politics of Colonial Collecting: India at World Fairs," *Society for Comparative Study of Society and History*, 31 no.2, (1989): 121.
- ²¹ Allwood 179.
- ²² See National Archives of Canada, RG 71/11/13, *Theme Pavilions* (n/d): 2.
- ²³ *Theme Pavilions*, 2.
- ²⁴ As quoted in Pierre Berton, "Terres des Hommes," *The Last Good Year: 1967* (Toronto: Doubleday Canada Limited, 1997): 256.
- ²⁵ Another critical comment regarding the 1964 New York World's Fair can be found in James Acland, "Expo: the space frame fair" *ArtsCanada* 24, no.107 (1967): 4-8. He stated "The recent fair in New York became little more than a jumble of competing company symbols and a garish display of some of the more untidy aspects of Madison Avenue commercialism."
- ²⁶ Allwood 121.
- ²⁷ All statistics related to attendance, participation and cost of international exhibitions can be found at the BIE website, www.bie-paris.org.

---

²⁸ For a good discussion of the relationship between U.S. World's Fairs and EPCOT see Steve Nelson, "Walt Disney's EPCOT and the World's Fair Performance Tradition," *The Drama Review* vol. 30 (1986): 106-46.

Chapter 2: Nationalism and Two Approaches to the Study of International Exhibitions

“Each one [International Exhibition], as Prince Albert said in 1851, has been ‘a true text and a living picture of the point of development at which the whole of mankind has arrived’, although sometimes the pictures they have reflected have not been quite those intended by the organizers!”¹

As the Allwood quotation suggests, the general purpose of international exhibitions has been to articulate a holistic utopian image of society. One of the results of the presentation of this holistic image is the combining of multiple discourses of society in one place. The combining of these discourses has made international exhibitions a rich area of study for academics from various fields. As Robert Rydell states, “world’s fairs have gained increasing significance in the eye of historians trying to understand the massive economic, political, and cultural changes that have swept the world between the mid-nineteenth century and the present.”² Not only historians but architectural scholars, anthropologists, geographers and many others have turned their gaze and analysis to the import of fairs in the development of the West. Rather than addressing these numerous discourses on display at exhibitions, this discussion will focus on only one: nationalism. As noted in the previous chapter, Prince Albert believed that an international exhibition was a powerful medium by which to present a unified image of the nation. This type of event provided Prince Albert and the succeeding exhibition organizers with two ways to articulate this unified image of nation; primarily as a way for the national government to present a notion of national identity to its domestic citizenry, and secondly to solidify this unique identity through comparisons with other nations on display at international exhibitions.

Nationalism is a very complex and contentious discourse. Many scholars have attempted to study this concept as a root cause of much of the conflict and mass violence that plagued the twentieth century.³ One of the central contentions of these and other scholars is that nationalism and the nation-state are concepts that emerged as modern society developed. The history of the nation-state and the concept of nationalism will not be debated here. Rather the focus will be on the relationship between the transformations in nationalist narratives as they were articulated through international exhibitions. This chapter will provide an introduction to the concepts associated with nationalism and with some of the debate surrounding it. Two ways of understanding the communication of national identity will be presented: the constructivist and the primordialist. These two models will be developed in greater detail through examples of the study of international exhibitions and nationalism. Specifically, these models will be discussed more fully through two approaches to the study of international exhibitions. These approaches are the national propaganda model which argues that the images of nationalism presented at exhibitions are designed and communicated by political elites through this medium to a mass audience. The second approach is the way of seeing approach, which envisions international exhibitions as arenas where pre-existing symbols and cultural myths are used to establish binaries which allow for a more unified notion of national identity. The chapter will conclude by highlighting a number of weaknesses of these two approaches, namely the rigidity that they both describe in the way in which nationalism is articulated through exhibitions.

Approaches to Nationalism

As noted, the complexity of the debate about nationalism has fuelled a rich academic literature. Rather than presenting an exhaustive analysis of all this literature, this discussion will begin with Craig Calhoun's 1997 work, *Nationalism* which provides an excellent overview of the progression of the debate about nationalism and how it has been studied from a variety of different perspectives. His conception of nation provides, perhaps, a better reflection of the complexity of this notion. He states that,

Nations are made by internal processes of struggle, communication, political participation, road building, education, history writing and economic development as well as by campaigns against external enemies.⁴

For Calhoun, these multiple processes which contribute to nation-building, challenge narrower definitions which focus only on the political and economic dimensions of nationalism. Instead of viewing nationalism as an essential action or ideology, Calhoun draws on Michel Foucault's notion of discursive formation.

Nationalism is, among other things, what Michel Foucault called a 'discursive formation', a way of speaking that shapes our consciousness, but also is problematic enough that it keeps generating more issues and questions, keeps propelling us into further talk, keeps producing debates over how to think about it.⁵

In defining nationalism broadly as a discursive formation, Calhoun is separating his understanding of the concept from other scholars like Ernest Gellner and Eric Hobsbawm.⁶ Ernest Gellner's 1983 work entitled *Nations and Nationalism* has become a key study of these concepts. Gellner's primary contention is that nationalism is 'a political principle, which holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent.'⁷ Calhoun departs from this narrow definition and argues for the need to broaden out the concept of nationalism from something that affects only political

institutions and debates to be understood as a generalized communicative act. Again, unlike Gellner, Hobsbawm and even Benedict Anderson,⁸ who imbue negative aspects to nationalism itself, Calhoun posits that nationalism is a neutral discursive formation, but the specific instance of nation and identity building, such as in Nazi Germany or Quebec, may be destructive narratives in a larger discourse. He cautions that students of nationalism must learn to differentiate between the general discourse of nationalism and the specific narratives of specific movements around the world.

Claims to national identity are so basic to modern politics and culture, and on recognizing the difference between the highly general nationalist discourse that shapes the modern era and the numerous and heterogeneous specific movements, policies, ideologies and conflicts that are constituted through use of that discourse.”⁹

Calhoun’s insistence on the neutrality of nationalism as a discourse is central to his view of how national identity is constructed. He begins his study by arguing that, within Western societies, nationalism only becomes apparent when it is negative and violent, even though it is ever present.¹⁰ He argues that it is basic to the functioning of modern society. The construction of national identity is a rhetorical action that emerged out of the formation of modern nation-states. As western nation-states transformed their political structures into systems reliant on the will of the ‘people’ as a result of popular citizen revolts as exemplified by the French and American Revolutions, those who garnered the public legitimacy to lead needed to construct a uniform sense of nation. This uniform sense of nation, or need for it, was amplified as the state developed and became more reliant on its citizenry to people large armies and to tax for the purposes of a larger list of national services such as mass education. By the mid-nineteenth century, both the franchise and the role of the state were expanding; therefore, there was a greater

demand for the construction of an idea of national identity to attempt to unify the broader citizenry behind the endeavours of the state.

Calhoun's discussion of national identity is hinged on the democratization of the citizenry but he does not rest solely on a top down conception of identity construction. He, like Hobsbawm, recognizes that national identity is only one of a series of possible identities with which one individual may ally him or herself with. The endeavour of those in power is to present the national identity as the primary one, above regional, religious, ethnic or even gender identities. This is where the discourse or rhetoric of nationalism is adopted and formulated in any specific nation-building endeavour to construct a loyalty and commitment to the function of the nation-state.¹¹

An additional strength of Calhoun's analysis of the study of nationalism is his identification of two approaches; the constructivist, or instrumentalist and the primordialist. These offer a general typology of how certain scholars view the study of society and culture. The constructivist, according to Calhoun, emphasizes "the historical and sociological processes by which nations are created."¹² The instrumentalist also relies on these same processes for the creation of nation but extends the approach by stressing "that this 'invention' is often carried out by elites who seek to secure their power by mobilizing followers on the basis of nationalist ideology."¹³ Finally, the primordialists, according to Calhoun, are those who emphasize the continuity of national character and culture from before the modern era. Here, the nation is not a construction of social human action, but something that exists separate and before human engagement. Calhoun extends this point to suggest that this approach argues that people are formed "in social relationships that are already shaped by culture."¹⁴ These approaches are presented

by Calhoun to establish two general oppositional positions. He then situates his own analysis of nationalism in between the two, arguing that,

clearly people experience their social worlds as always in some part given to them prior to their own actions. Equally clearly, many aspects of these social worlds – including the demarcation of nations – are products of human action and subject to potential manipulation.¹⁵

This middle of the road approach allows Calhoun to insist on greater agency for national citizens as nationalism is not imposed entirely by the political elite, nor does it come from pre-established cultural symbols and myths. Instead, Calhoun's approach to nationalism allows for the use of traditional symbols and myths to be incorporated within the dialogue about national identity all the while recognizing that these cultural symbols can be manipulated by those designing narratives of national identity. He also suggests that these cultural symbols are engaged by citizen in different ways, according to their own articulation of collective identities.

The rhetoric of national identity, which Calhoun addresses but in tandem with his understanding of nationalism as a discursive formation, is more clearly articulated by Bruner in his *Strategies of Remembrance* as a “clash of public discourses.”¹⁶ Bruner argues that “nations do not have stable or natural identities.”¹⁷ Rather,

nation building takes place not only rhetorically, through the clash of public discourses, but also legally, through constitution building; language and immigration laws; international agreements; rules for citizenship; and laws concerning individual, collective and corporate rights. It takes place culturally through the construction of public memories, dominant ideologies, popular cultures, literary and artistic traditions, and educational systems. It takes place ethnically through the construction of imagined communities based on physical and/or genetic traits; and it takes place economically through financial systems, economic policies, and the institutional infrastructures supporting those systems and policies.¹⁸

He argues that the struggle to create a national identity is a struggle between not only competing national institutions, such as at the courts or the market, but also a tension between different collective identities within the nation itself. Bruner implicates the citizen in the process of identity construction, even if the rhetoric or discourse is constructed by those in power. His is a very apt way of viewing the construction of national identity, particularly as it relates to large cultural events like international exhibitions. Like Calhoun, Bruner argues that national identity construction relies on a universal discourse of nationalism, yet the symbols and strategies used in constructing the narratives within this discourse are unique to the collective identities in confrontation.

Bruner concludes arguing that

rather than assuming that national identity is a purely 'natural' process from the bottom up, or a purely manipulative process from the top down, national character is most appropriately conceptualized as a constant tension between motivated interpretations of the past and motivated visions of the present and future.¹⁹

The approach to the analysis of nationalism and the construction of national identity offers a starting point from which to analyze the ways in which international exhibitions have been used to mediate the narratives of nationalism.

International Exhibitions and Nationalism

The discussion of the role of nationalism at international exhibitions provides for a more detailed analysis of the study of exhibitions in general. As noted in the previous chapter, nationalism was a central component of national exhibitions which were the precursors to the international exhibition. Yet the national exhibitions only provided for one way of unifying the image of nation. This was done by bringing together different segments of the national population in one space to learn more about other parts of their

country and to witness a more unified image of identity presented by the organizers of these events. Although the national exhibitions were successful in bringing together these different regional groups they did so only in the national arena. International exhibitions were also successful in bringing together disparate groups of the national population, but they also offered a secondary means of articulating national identity, which was the ability to present a unified national image as compared to those offered by other nations.

The two-pronged power of international exhibitions as means to present a unified image of nationhood is a central theme in the academic literature on international exhibitions. Like the two poles presented by Calhoun in the discussion about the study of nationalism, there are two approaches to the study of exhibitions which incorporate the constructivist and the primordialist models. Primarily there is the national propaganda model which is closely allied with Calhoun's classification of the constructivist or instrumentalist approach, and secondly there is the "way of seeing" approach which provides a blend of the constructivist and primordialist models as articulated by Calhoun.

National Propaganda Approach

International exhibitions, since their first appearance, have been events that were organized by political elites aimed at entertaining, educating, enlightening, and encouraging the masses to consume the goods that were on display. Behind the simple display of products and oddities, though, were ideological visions about how society and the nation should function. Much of the scholarly work about international exhibitions has focused on the controlled planning by those elites and the power of the messages they designed for the mass audience. Two significant contributions to this approach are the

work of Robert Rydell on American fairs and Paul Greenhalgh's more general study of American, British and French international exhibitions.²⁰ These authors, among others, have argued that international exhibitions represent an excellent model of hegemonic control in society. The dominant social, political and economic elites within any one society sought to reinforce and expand their preferred notions of social organization and national identity through the multiplicity of narratives available at international exhibitions. The tools for this hegemonic control were models of display, education and entertainment that were central methods of informing visitors at exhibitions. Robert Rydell, more than Greenhalgh, does address the existence of counter or alternative discourses presented by marginal groups in American society, particularly African Americans.²¹ He expresses his view of world's fairs as follows;

My own view is that while world's fairs have lent a significant measure of legitimacy to the authority of dominant classes in American society and made significant contributions to reproducing dominant social relations, these fairs have always represented 'contested terrains' or 'sites of struggle' between dominant and subordinate groups."²²

Central to Rydell's discussion of fairs is their role in centralizing and unifying support behind the nation, particularly in times of economic depression and civil unrest. He recognizes the power of these events to mobilize and reinvigorate popular support behind national strategies by relying on symbolic images of the American pioneer and settler. In fact, one of his central arguments is that the American affinity for fairs in the latter part of the nineteenth century and in the interwar period was a direct response by dominant elites to the tensions that were present in everyday life due to the repercussions, in the first instance, of the Civil War and economic depression in last nineteenth century, and in the second instance to the devastation wrought by the Great Depression. Here,

Rydell mirrors the categorical divisions that Gilbert establishes in the transition of fairs over time. The late nineteenth century fairs, in 1876 in Philadelphia and 1893 in Chicago, speak to the strength and wonders of America and its founding myths. The interwar fairs, such as Chicago in 1933-4 and New York in 1939, were thematically focused on the power of new technology, mass production and modern urban planning to bring the U.S. a gleaming world of tomorrow. Although Rydell does address the presence of alternative and subordinate groups in the broader discourse of fairs, he does not engage in a discussion of the visitor experience or the ways in which they may have contested responses to the dominant messages that were articulated at the fairs.

Paul Greenhalgh's *Ephemeral Vistas* provides an excellent overview of the history of international exhibitions from 1851 to 1939. He focuses his study on those international exhibitions hosted by Britain, France and the United States in this period and rather than following a chronological pattern from one fair to the next, he organizes his discussion along thematic lines. His discussion of 'the national profile' raises a number of interesting points about the relationship between international exhibitions and the promotion of official nationalistic images. Greenhalgh argues that the national component of international exhibitions was not a central component at the Crystal Palace in 1851. Rather, the first time international exhibitions were organized along national lines was in 1867 in Paris, when the fair designer Frederic Le Play reconfigured the exhibition building to organize displays first by national then thematic categories.²³ Greenhalgh argues that France was the first to recognize the value of using international exhibitions to promote the nationalist discourse. He argues that each of the three nations

profiled adopted a set of cultural and historical concepts which were part of the unifying criteria of what it meant to be French, British or American.

The French saw their nation as “the spiritual leader of humanity” and this leadership was articulated through arts and culture.²⁴ Greenhalgh highlights two problems which arose from the French as cultural civilizers; first, as Paris was the central location of international exhibitions, it also became viewed as the cultural center of France, overtaking other regions. This centrality in Paris presented a model of France to the outside world as singularly defined by the city. This caused tensions between the capital and the regions. Greenhalgh argues that while the French were successful in presenting a nationalist notion of themselves to the rest of the world at the Paris exhibitions, this “had the unfortunate back-lash of alienating the provincial bourgeoisie.”²⁵ The second tension that resulted from France’s national identity as forged through culture and the arts was “theoretical problems with the identifying of the arts as a nationalist characteristic.”²⁶ Inherent in the discourse of the glory of nations at international exhibitions was the modern notions of progress and industrial growth, these were difficult to partner and express in much of the artistic work presented by the French as central to their identity. In fact, most of the work harkened back to historical periods prior to the Revolution and the Enlightenment notions upon which the international expositions were founded.²⁷

Like the French, the British returned to pre-modern images of their nation to present key characteristics of their national identity. Primarily empire and royalty were presented as central tenets of national pride, whereby the strength of Britain was in its multiple and varied overseas holdings, and the honour of its royal house. This

demonstrated the economic and military strength of the nation. As the imperial power of Britain began to wane particularly in the early part of the twentieth century, British elites turned to an “invented Englishness” which relied on pre-industrial images of the Tudor and Elizabethan eras. Again, like the French example, the British nationalist construct relied more on inherent characteristic of the pre-industrial era rather than on their industrial and economic strengths.²⁸ Fundamentally, what this reinforced was the same difficulty that was presented in the French case, as international exhibitions were venues of progress and industrial innovation, the national characteristics did not coincide with the other aspects of the national display. In the post-war era of international exhibitions, Britain was to revisit these images of national identity, as they chose to move further away from the imperial and royal connections in favour of highlighting successes in popular culture.

Finally, Greenhalgh’s analysis of the American presentation of national identity coincides in some instances with that presented in greater detail by Rydell, yet Greenhalgh places greater emphasis on the American reliance on their own construction of the nation through a republican tradition, the pioneer spirit and a commitment to ‘Progress’. More so than the French and British, the American national identity as expressed at world’s fairs was one of the strength of the founding of the nation and how that prepared the nation to become a center of ingenuity and progress for the future.

Greenhalgh’s analysis of nationalism and exhibitions provides an interesting study of the messages that were presented by the respective host nations. His central point is that each one focused on constructing images of nation which relied on a strong unity of identity which was rooted in historical tradition. What Greenhalgh does not

address though is an expansive discussion of the tensions that were at play in creating these images of national identity. Although he does highlight the tensions that arose from the regions of France in opposition to the central presentation of Paris as cultural center, he overlooks many of the more contentious issues that these formal constructions of identity were working to overcome, like the conflicts over race in America, like the issues of class in Britain and anti-Semitism in France.²⁹ One central exception to this lack of broader socio-political engagement in Greenhalgh's work is found in his discussion of Picasso's *Guernica* as a commissioned work for the Spanish Pavilion at the 1937 Paris Exposition. He recognized the criticism and sadness that this painting articulates in the context of the Spanish Civil War and Picasso's connection to it. Greenhalgh also aptly states the connection between the painting and the foreshadowing of the ravages of World War II.³⁰

Both Robert Rydell and Paul Greenhalgh present comprehensive histories of international exhibitions. In both cases they address the strength and centrality of how the dominant elites in each host nation were centrally focused on presenting a unified construction of national identity. Rydell, perhaps more than Greenhalgh, succeeds in presenting the nature of the struggle between dominant and subordinate groups in the articulation of a national identity. Yet they both take an instrumentalist view of international exhibitions. Human action was central to the construction of these images of national identity. International exhibitions were important venues to present these constructions as they provided legitimacy on an international stage of the dominant notions of identity. This legitimacy extended to allowing for these notions to become entrenched as historical realities in and of themselves after the fair walls had come down.

What is missing in the work of both authors is an understanding of how these constructions of national identity were received and adopted by the visitor. They both describe the messages that were presented but they do not continue to see how the organization of the fair itself was central to reinforcing these messages to the visitors themselves. Finally, this model functions well in the understanding of the relationship between the dominant elites and their domestic citizenry, yet it does not address the relationship between one nation's construction of a unified identity and how that is presented and received within the international arena, a fundamental aspect of the international exhibition.

The Way of Seeing Approach

One of the central ways to inscribe notions of unity in national identity is through the presentation of an 'Other'. One of the key strengths of the international exhibition as a medium for communicating notions of national unity is the comparative power it allows for one nation in relation to others. As imperial interests were a central discourse in early international exhibitions, nations like Britain and France sought to present their own national identity in opposition and as superior to those of other nations and colonial territories. What this presentation of the Other allowed was a sense of security for national citizens in who they were versus this image of the uncivilized savage that became prevalent in international exhibitions after 1867.³¹ The construction of this unity through opposition was one of the central features of what can be called the "Way of Seeing" approach to the study of international exhibitions and nationalism. This approach hinges on the construction through methods of display and organization within the exhibition itself to build a certain way of understanding the world. This approach

incorporates aspects of Calhoun's primordialist approach, as the way of seeing approach advocates the ordering of existing cultural symbols, ideas and artefacts in a new way. This new way, which is specific to the modern era, is the construction of knowledge into a visual order of experience rather than the pre-modern model of aural communication practices.

Key scholars who have worked to build this approach are Carol Breckenridge, Raymond Corbey, Aram Yengoyan, Timothy Mitchell and Burton Benedict³². These scholars have focused on the nature of the representations of people at international exhibitions, whether the local audience, the indigenous peoples from the colonies who are on display or the foreign visitors. The focus here on the creation of a way of seeing and representing people rather than the overarching political and economic goals of the national propaganda model discussed above.

Carol Breckenridge defines this way of seeing as the "spectacle of the ocular."³³ She sees "late nineteenth century world fairs as part of a unitary, though not uniform, landscape of discourse and practise that situated metropole and colony within a single analytic field, through precisely such cultural technologies as the international exhibition."³⁴ The presentation of colony and metropole within the same analytic field presents a direct comparative relationship between the two. Breckenridge argues that international exhibitions presented a point of transition within the displaying of knowledge that aligned with what she termed the Victorian ecumene whereby "a concept of the cultural other, for these new technologies, routines and rituals of rule were frequently developed in relation to this imperialized or imperializing other."³⁵ This ecumene was demonstrated in the transition within the leisure and collecting practices of

the time. There was a move away from the private disorder of the cabinet of curios to the public order of displays at museums and international exhibitions. This public and ordered display of artefacts and eventually people at international exhibitions required a narrative to make sense. It is this narrative that Breckenridge focuses on and articulates as a way to create social distinction, both between national classes and between national citizens and colonial others.

The narrative of the polarity between the domestic Self and colonial Other is expanded upon by both Raymond Corbey and Aram Yengoyan, both of whom argue that fairs and their messages of separation between western Self and colonial Other contributed to the creation of this stereotype as a part of reality. Corbey argued that “these modes of dealing with the exotic, with colonial otherness, functioned in a context of European hegemony, testifying to the successful imperialist expansion of 19th Century nation states and to the intricate connection that developed between scientific and political practises.”³⁶ This reference to scientific practises raises another significant aspect of how the construction of national identity was based on primordialist assumptions. Many new scientific and academic disciplines, including anthropology and eugenics,³⁷ were first given legitimacy within international exhibitions. Much of their findings relied on emphasizing how certain genetic or cultural characteristics formed the difference between the western citizen and the colonial Other. Yengoyan argued that “throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century to the 1920s the exhibitions were microcosms of the Western commitment to ideas of progress, prosperity, a scientism which would solve national and global problems, and a colonial system which would partake of the benefits of Western Civilization.”³⁸ The ordering of all aspects of the

imperial relationship by a visual taxonomy became central to the success of international exhibitions.

Corbey focuses on the use and rigidity of spatial organization at international exhibitions and how that increased the division between these two groups. Again, a very rigid order was ascribed to the role and places of colonial Other at international exhibitions. “The living exhibits had to stay within a precisely circumscribed part of the exhibition space, which represented their world; the boundary between this world and that of the citizens visiting and inspecting them, between wilderness and civility, nature and culture, had to be respected unconditionally.”³⁹ This separation was exaggerated as the colonial displays, particularly those exhibits that demonstrated the indigenous ways of life in different colonies, were separated from the central parts of the fair and located within the amusement zones. This only escalated the view of the colonial Other as freakish, strange, and a spectacle.

Corbey and Yengoyan argue that one of the reasons behind this separation was to minimize perceived differences within the national community and to place the national audience in a privileged position to the colonial Other in two ways. Primarily, the colonial displays were presented to offer the domestic audiences with a view of “contemporary ancestors” which only naturally reinforced the proof of western progress.⁴⁰ Yengoyan expands on this concept as he argues that “the great exhibitions were active agents in portraying other cultures and other civilizations to the West either in form of viable cultures, or as part of our past, or as earlier stages of the evolutionary trajectory.”⁴¹ The second way that this separation privileged the spectator was to provide them with what Corbey calls an “optical empiricism” meaning an omniscient position by

which to visualize the reality as it was presented at the fair. The construction of this presentation of the colonial Other as reality was central to the effectiveness of this method of display in reinforcing ethnic stereotypes throughout future international exhibitions. Thus this representation became its own reality as it was referenced time and again as the model of how other cultures functioned. The presentations and experiences of the others at the exhibition came to stand as markers for western populations. As they travelled to other parts of the world, they anticipated viewing life there as it had been presented to them at an international exhibition.

Timothy Mitchell develops this idea of the “world as exhibition” more fully. He argues that international exhibitions “were not just exhibitions of the world, but the ordering up of the world itself as an endless exhibition.”⁴² The spectacle of the fair “was to set the world up as a picture.”⁴³ Mitchell raises a number of key points in his analysis of fairs as a medium by which western citizenry were trained to view the world as exhibition. He focuses first on the experience of Egyptian scholars visiting the Paris Exposition of 1889, he argues that these visitors were initially horrified by the representation of Cairo and life in Egypt that was presented at the Exposition, and that they were made to feel as though they too were part of the exhibit even though they were spectators like all others visitors.⁴⁴ To emphasize the world-as-exhibition vision of the world, Mitchell focuses on the fact that, according to the memoirs of the Egyptian visitors, there was confusion for them in deciphering the boundary between exhibition and reality.

The boundaries of the exhibition were clearly marked, of course, with high perimeter walls and monumental gates, but, as Middle Eastern visitors had continually discovered, there was much about the ‘real world’ outside (in the

streets of Paris and beyond) that resembled the world exhibition: just as there was more about the exhibition that resembled the world outside.”⁴⁵

Mitchell then goes on to invert the world as exhibition concept and to apply it to the western citizen visiting those nations that they had first witnessed through exhibitions. He argues that the structuring of the understanding of the world through the exhibition medium “created a distance between oneself and the world, and thus to constitute it as something picture-like – as an object on exhibit.”⁴⁶ What resulted was that Western travellers were often confronted with a world that was not as neatly ordered or explained as the one they had witnessed in the exhibition grounds. Mitchell’s strongest point here is the separation that occurs into “two fundamental realms – the representation and the original, the exhibit and the external reality, the text and the world.”⁴⁷ It is this polarity that came to inform much of the western middle class population in its understanding of its place in the world and the way the world worked outside the boundaries of its existence.

Burton Benedict, like Mitchell, focuses on the representational components of international exhibitions, yet he argues that exhibitions are “giant rituals” that inform our understanding of other parts of the world. Benedict disagrees that there was a fixed representation of colonies and their people at international exhibitions; he argues instead, that ethnic stereotypes and representations have shifted over the years of exhibiting, yet they have done so within the confines of the exhibition medium.

During the nearly 150 years of world’s fairs, ethnic stereotypes, gradually altered, moving from manifestations of Euro-American superiority and imperialism towards expressions of nationalism in new nations. In this process new traditions were invented that incorporated elements from old cultural traditions, from former colonial masters, and from newer nationalisms.”⁴⁸

Benedict does not suggest that ethnic stereotyping originated at international exhibitions, but that these events were a very powerful way to present and repeat these stereotypes over a period of time. These stereotypes of ethnic groups were presented in the organization and design of the pavilions themselves, which were initially constructed by those hosting nations based on their assumptions about these foreign lands and colonies. He argues that “such exhibits promoted ethnic stereotypes, for what was being shown was a type (a Bushman, a Fijian) not an individual.”⁴⁹ It was only later, when many former colonies were independent nations that they were able to design and construct their own pavilions with their own narrative. Although Benedict argues that post-colonial nations adopted some of these stereotypes and changed “their meaning once again to become symbols of a new nationalism”⁵⁰ he does not address the fact that these nations were in many ways restricted to working within the confines of these older stereotypes when designing the images of themselves at international exhibitions.

Benedict’s analysis is a good point of transition from the very structured understanding of western nation-states and how their views of identity are constructed to the efforts of the newly independent, post-colonial nations which appear after the Second World War. This discussion also reinforces Calhoun’s argument about nationalism as a more general discursive formation. The post-colonial nations use their own constructions of national identity to present a renewed view of themselves within the international community that congregates at international exhibitions.

This discussion of international exhibitions, national identity and the two approaches to the study of these concepts informs a general understanding of how international exhibitions are communicative media through which nationalist narratives

are presented, at times contested, but more often given legitimacy and fixity. Over the last two centuries, different nations around the world have continued to choose to host and participate in international exhibitions despite the cost and the reduction of visitors lost to competing media forms. Although these events have changed in function throughout their history the commitment to a unitary vision of the world and the functioning of modern society has persisted. Like international exhibitions, the concept of 'nationness' has also persisted. The reason for the continued presence of nationalism is due to its more ambivalent character as a discursive formation which is rooted in the basic foundation of the modern nation-state.

The propaganda approach and the way of seeing approach both provide direct examples of how fairs have been studied for their communicative value. The propaganda approach is more instrumentalist in its bent; those who advocate studying international exhibitions in this manner do recognize the existence of larger cultural symbols and ideas, but they argue that these symbols can be manipulated and reformulated for the purposes of the dominant elite. The fundamental weaknesses of the propaganda model is that it does not address the international context of exhibitions, nor does it recognize the active construction of the events themselves and how this assists in communicating certain perspectives over others. The way of seeing approach does rectify some of the shortfalls of the propaganda model. It expands the communicative power of international exhibitions to the international arena whereby the western nations have historically used methods of display to articulate a unified national identity in opposition to a foreign 'Other'. Another rigid polarity that this approach establishes is that between the 'real' and the representational worlds. The way of seeing approach structures rigid polarities

---

between self and other, real and representational, without recognizing that the separations break down within the walls of the exhibitions. The analysis of international exhibitions, national identity and their communicative values needs to move beyond these rigid polarities. The next chapter will aim to address the hybridity of these cultural spectacles which are both real and representational. Their power to communicate long lasting notions of national identity rests in their existence as places in between, or as an example of a heterotopic medium.

Notes

-
- ¹ John Allwood, *The Great Exhibitions* (London: Studio Vista, 1977): 8.
- ² Robert Rydell, "Introduction," *Fair Representations: World's Fairs and the Modern World* (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1994): 4.
- ³ See Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983); E.J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990); and Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* Rev. ed. (London: Verso, 1991).
- ⁴ Craig Calhoun, *Nationalism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997): 79.
- ⁵ Calhoun 3.
- ⁶ Hobsbawm builds his discussion of nationalism on Gellner's definition, yet differs in the primacy of the concept.
- ⁷ As quoted in Calhoun 11.
- ⁸ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*.
- ⁹ Calhoun 126.
- ¹⁰ Calhoun 1.
- ¹¹ Calhoun uses discourse and rhetoric interchangeably in his explanation of nationalism.
- ¹² Calhoun 30.
- ¹³ Calhoun 30.
- ¹⁴ Calhoun 30.
- ¹⁵ Calhoun 31.
- ¹⁶ Bruner, M. Lane, *Strategies of Remembrance: The Rhetorical Dimensions of National Identity Construction* (Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 2002).
- ¹⁷ Bruner 1.
- ¹⁸ Bruner xiii-iv.
- ¹⁹ Bruner 92.

---

²⁰ For a discussion of the hegemonic model of analysis of exhibitions see Paul Greenhalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas: The Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions and World's Fairs, 1851-1939* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988); Robert W. Rydell, *All The World's A Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), and, *World of Fairs: The Century-of-Progress Exhibitions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993); and E.A. Heaman, *The Inglorious Arts of Peace: Exhibitions in Canadian Society during the 19th Century* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999).

²¹ Rydell, *World of Fairs* 9.

²² Rydell, *World of Fairs* 225.

²³ Other scholars who provide a greater discussion of Le Play's display techniques are Graeme Davison, "Festivals of Nationhood: The International Exhibitions," ed. S.L. Goldberg and F. B. Smith, *Australian Cultural History* (Melbourne and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988) 158-77; and John Allwood, *The Great Exhibitions* (London: Studio Vista, 1977).

²⁴ Paul Greenhalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas: The Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions and World's Fairs, 1851-1939* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988): 123.

²⁵ Greenhalgh 119.

²⁶ Greenhalgh 119.

²⁷ Greenhalgh 120.

²⁸ Greenhalgh 122.

²⁹ See Richard D. Mandell, *Paris 1900: The Great World's Fair*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967). Mandell discusses the Paris 1900 exposition and the relationship to the Dreyfus Affair in France at the time.

³⁰ "The full flow of Picasso's cubism meets here with his classicism, both orchestrated masterfully to express his politics and his humanity. Guernica remains one of the greatest comments on the tragedy of war ever made in Western art; it is also the greatest work of art ever produced specifically for an international exhibition." (Greenhalgh 135)

³¹ Objects and artefacts from other parts of the world have always been on display at international exhibitions. In Paris in 1867 the displaying of other cultures was expanded to include live exhibits of indigenous people, whereby establishing a binary opposition between the Western civilized man and his savage colonial counterpart. See Burton Benedict, "Rituals of Representation: Ethnic Stereotypes and Colonized Peoples at

---

World's Fairs," ed. Robert W. Rydell and Nancy E. Gwinn *Fair Representations: World's Fairs and the Modern World*, (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1994): 28-62.

³² Carol A. Breckenridge, "The Aesthetics and Politics of Colonial Collecting: India at World Fairs" in *Society for Comparative Study of Society and History*, 31, no.2, (1989):195-216; Raymond Corbey, "Ethnographic Showcases, 1870-1930" *Cultural Anthropology*, 8, no.3, (1993): 338-69; Aram A. Yengoyan, "Culture, Ideology and World's Fairs" Colonizer and Colonized in Comparative Perspectives" ed. Robert W. Rydell and Nancy E. Gwinn *Fair Representation: World's Fairs and the Modern World*. (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1994): 62-83; Timothy Mitchell, "The World as Exhibition" *Society for Comparative Study of Society and History*, 31, no.2, (1989): 217-36; Burton Benedict, "Rituals of Representation: Ethnic Stereotypes and Colonized Peoples at World's Fairs," ed. Robert W. Rydell and Nancy E. Gwinn *Fair Representations: World's Fairs and the Modern World*, (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1994): 28-62.

³³ Breckenridge 196.

³⁴ Breckenridge 196.

³⁵ Breckenridge 196.

³⁶ Corbey 338.

³⁷ Robert Rydell discusses the rise of eugenics in the United States after WWI and argues that world fairs were a central venue for the legitimation of this study of difference. See *World of Fairs*.

³⁸ Yengoyan 80.

³⁹ Corbey 344.

⁴⁰ Corbey 360.

⁴¹ Yengoyan 77.

⁴² Timothy Mitchell 218.

⁴³ Mitchell 218.

⁴⁴ Mitchell 218.

⁴⁵ Mitchell 224.

---

⁴⁶ Mitchell 229.

⁴⁷ Mitchell 233.

⁴⁸ Benedict, "Rituals of Representation" 28.

⁴⁹ Benedict, "Rituals of Representation" 36.

⁵⁰ Benedict, "Rituals of Representation" 58.

Chapter 3: Defining a Heterotopic Medium

The structuring of a discourse of society between two polar opposite views, such as real and representational or self and other is quite common in the study of society and its institutions. This kind of polarity, which may provide easy and established points against which to organize an understanding of the world, does not provide a complete understanding of the processes by which society alters over time. Rather than being understood in terms of a polarity, the study of the processes of change in society should take into account the spaces in between these poles. These spaces in between are the places where the existing process of social structuring buffer up against alternative and oppositional visions of society. The space in between is not always present in everyday life. There are certain times and events when these places are realized and encounters between competing visions of society are made more visible. International exhibitions are one example of the realization of the space in between. They are real places where the center and the margins, the real and the representational, and the self and the other intermingle and offer a broader public awareness of the choices of how to structure the future. The import of international exhibitions and other public spaces in between is that they communicate to a broader community new ideas and symbols about society. It is then in the hands of this broader community to accept or reject these new ideas and symbols through the incorporation of them in everyday life. These spaces in between can be understood as heterotopic media. This concept is one that requires additional explanation which will be the focus of this chapter.

There are many ways of defining this space in between, but for this study of international exhibitions, the concept of Michel Foucault's heterotopia¹ can be best applied. Heterotopias are described by Foucault as "real places – places that do exist and that are

formed in the very founding of society – which are something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted.”² Foucault’s definition provides a good starting point for understanding this concept, yet it falls short from explaining how this space really works in society to lead to change. Here the discussion will move beyond Foucault’s initial definition, retaining and incorporating some of his principles into a broader discussion of how other scholars have adapted the concept.

Beyond just an understanding of how these spaces function, there is a need to explain how heterotopias communicate new ideas. Here the discussion will draw on Marshall McLuhan’s broader view of media, which assumes that any artefact or event can be understood as a medium, as they extend the human senses to alter and frame a perspective of the world. As such a heterotopic medium would be any space where multiple, often incongruous parts of society come together in one place and broadcast to a broader community not only how the existing structures of society function, but also new ideas and symbols which have developed from the commingling of these other parts of society. The power of heterotopic media lies in the hands of the members of the broader community who will either incorporate or reject these new ideas and symbols. To illuminate and clarify the concept of heterotopic media, the next chapter will provide a more detailed discussion of how international exhibitions are good examples of heterotopic media.

Foucault’s Concept of a Heterotopia

The concept of a heterotopia first appeared in *The Order of Things* first published in 1966, but it was developed more fully in a lecture Michel Foucault presented to architecture students in 1967. The lecture notes were released by the author just before his death in 1984,

but were never edited for publication. They were published posthumously in 1984 in the French journal *Architecture – Mouvement – Continuité*, then translated into English and published in *Diacritics* in 1986 as an article entitled “Of Other Spaces”.³ Kevin Hetherington explains that, “the term heterotopia originally comes from the study of anatomy. There it is used to refer to parts of the body that are either out of place, missing, extra, or, like tumours, alien.”⁴ Foucault adopted this medical term and applied it to his analysis of discursive formations and space. The concept has been used broadly within several disciplines, from literary criticism,⁵ to architecture,⁶ even though Foucault himself did not place much emphasis on it in his work. Heterotopia is a concept that allows for a deeper discussion of the struggles and tensions within the existing and normative discursive structures and institutions within society.

As mentioned, Foucault first introduced the idea of heterotopia in the introduction to *The Order of Things*. In this instance, he applied the term as a model of demonstrating the linking of incongruous things and how this upset the existing order of society. He defined heterotopias as

disturbing, probably because they secretly undermine language, because they make it impossible to name this *and* that, because they shatter or tangle common names, because they destroy ‘syntax’ in advance, and not only the syntax with which we construct sentences but also that less apparent syntax which causes words and things (next to and also opposite one another) to ‘hold together’... heterotopias ... desiccate speech, stop words in their tracks, contest the very possibility of grammar at its source; they dissolve our myths and sterilize the lyricism of our sentences.⁷

Heterotopias exist in opposition to utopias which Foucault viewed as no-places where a comforting order can exist. The example of heterotopia that he developed here was derived from a passage in Borges recounting the ordering of objects in a Chinese Encyclopaedia.⁸ The taxonomy of objects described, Foucault argued, is incongruous and inappropriate, yet

he could not dismiss the list so easily. It caused him to think more generally about the way in which segregation of things was structured in society, recognizing that the separation between this or that was indeed constructed rather than natural. This preliminary use of the concept of a heterotopia provides little clarification as to what this concept is. Here Foucault does not address heterotopias as real places, but instead he framed them as a type of discursive formation that convolutes and confuses the order of language. There is one central point that Foucault introduced in this definition of heterotopia that is drawn upon by others who have interpreted it. This point is the dissolving of myth. Heterotopias dissolve myths by bringing together uncommon things in one space, thus challenging the ways that people make sense of their surroundings. This exposes weaknesses in the existing order of things and leads to the need to reassess and create new myths and symbols by which to order a changed society.

Foucault revisited the concept of a heterotopia in a speech given to architecture students in 1967 and later published as the article “Of Other Spaces.” In this instance, Foucault expanded on the linguistic definition of heterotopia found in *The Order of Things* and applied it to a different way of understanding space. He defined it as follows;

There are also, probably in every culture, in every civilization, real places – places that do exist and that are formed in the very founding of society – which are something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted. Places of this kind are outside of all places, even though it may be possible to indicate their location in reality. Because these places are absolutely different from all the sites that they reflect and speak about, I shall call them, by way of contrast to utopias, heterotopias.⁹

This definition relates directly to space. Foucault’s definition provides some key points here that should be drawn out for the concept of a heterotopia to be developed and applied in the analysis of international exhibitions. The first point worth highlighting is the relationship

between utopia and heterotopia. Foucault's analysis demonstrated that although utopias are not a real space, they present an alternate vision of society. He argued that heterotopias are both the concrete realization of utopias and a contrasting space to utopias in the fact that heterotopias are real spaces. The second point to address in Foucault's definition is the hyperbole in the rigidity of his definition. He argued that all other spaces in culture are simultaneously represented in a heterotopia. Perhaps all other spaces are represented in heterotopias in general, but it is difficult to accept that all other spaces are represented in one singular heterotopia. For this analysis, heterotopias will be understood as spaces which are constructed by the simultaneous representation of many other spaces in society, but not a requisite for all spaces to be represented. Foucault's final contention that heterotopias are entirely different from all other spaces represented within them proves somewhat difficult. Heterotopias are indeed different from those spaces that are represented within them. This difference emerges as a result of the comingling of each other space within the heterotopia, whereby the interaction of these spaces alters the original form and ultimately creates a new vision of culture.

In an attempt to clarify the concept of a heterotopia, Foucault presented six principles which included a confusion of examples of heterotopias. He set out a series of oppositional elements to demonstrate different types of heterotopias. Foucault was perhaps playing with the rigidity of the oppositional discourse, as he presented often firm categories within the principles of heterotopia, but when studied in the context of real space, these firm categories do not necessarily apply. As Foucault used a number of different examples of real spaces in society as heterotopias, he appeared to be suggesting that almost any site in society could in some way be heterotopic. This is not the case, as there are specific elements of a heterotopia

---

that make it unique in its place in the process of social change. A review of Foucault's six principles and his examples will assist in building a clearer understanding of those elements that make up a heterotopia.

The first principle, Foucault highlighted, "is that there is probably not a single culture in the world that fails to constitute heterotopias."¹⁰ He goes on to describe the difference between primitive and modern society in the construction of this space, whereby the primitive society develops "crisis heterotopias" which are "privileged or sacred or forbidden places, reserved for individuals who are, in relation to society and to the human environment in which they live, in a state of crisis: adolescents ...etc."¹¹ The crisis heterotopia is a space in primitive society where the transformation of a member of society occurs, from childhood to adulthood, events such as the bar mitzvah are an example of this. Another example is a couple's transition from being single to being married, where the honeymoon would be the heterotopia. According to Foucault, these places are replaced, in modern society, by "heterotopias of deviation" which are places "in which individuals whose behaviour is deviant in relation to the required mean or norm are placed."¹² Examples of these are retirement homes, psychiatric hospitals and prisons. This list of examples is a little disturbing, primarily because Foucault appeared to be suggesting that aging and requiring care in a retirement home is comparable to being locked in a prison for illegal acts. Aside from the trouble in this comparison, what this example aims to demonstrate is the coming together of different people from different parts of society into this one space which is outside all others. The time that these people spend in this place alters them, both through their exposure to the other people within this site and also in relation to the effects of the site itself. The existence of these spaces has a direct function in challenging the existing models

of social order. The prison is a space, which functions in relation to all other spaces outside of it as it stands as an example of how those outside the heterotopia of deviation should behave. Although Foucault attempted to separate these spaces chronologically, it is clear that they both still exist in society. Both these examples demonstrate how heterotopias are places where the process of transformation occurs in society; in the first instance the transformation of a human through a different stage of life; in the second instance, specifically in the case of the prison, the transformation of members of society who reject the existing order into an environment where a more rigid order is imposed on them.

Foucault's second principle is "that a society, as its history unfolds, can make an existing heterotopia function in a very different fashion."¹³ The example of this is the cemetery which Foucault argued has changed over time. A cemetery is by its very function a place of its own. In some circumstances it does bring together other spaces outside of it by virtue of the fact that those buried within it come from different walks of life. Yet it does not bring all other spaces into one, as there have traditionally been different cemeteries for those of different religious denominations. Foucault's point here was that the role of a cemetery in society has shifted in the last several centuries. He argued that where they were once central parts of town and cities, where the living could frequently visit their dead, the cemetery is now relegated to the outskirts of society. This shift, he argued, was a result of the change in how society viewed death. As Foucault concluded his discussion of this principle; "The cemetery came to constitute, no longer the sacred and immortal heart of the city, but "the other city," where each family possesses its dark resting place."¹⁴

The third principle marks a continuation from Foucault's first definition of heterotopias in *The Order of Things*. Here again, he emphasized the function of this concept

in bringing together the incongruous. He stated that “the heterotopia is capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible.”¹⁵ Here Foucault used the example of the garden. He briefly described the history of the Persian garden which was designed as a sacred place where all parts of the world were to be represented within the boundaries of the garden. The selected plant materials were chosen to display the multiple environments around the world coming together in this microcosm. In this small space the world as a whole was represented. It is within this principle of heterotopias that Foucault softened his original definition of heterotopia as a place where *all* other spaces come together. Here he focused instead on the coming together of *several* different spaces rather than all spaces. It is this feature of the heterotopia that international exhibitions demonstrate, as will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.

Foucault’s fourth principle of heterotopias suggests that they are “most often linked to slices in time – which is to say that they open onto what might be termed, for the sake of symmetry, heterochronies.”¹⁶ Here Foucault demarcated two opposing types of heterotopia and how they address time; those that layer our understanding of time, and those that are fleeting and temporary. The first type consists of those spaces of “indefinitely accumulating time” and here he used the example of museums or libraries.¹⁷ They are spaces where the records of time are built in layers upon one another. These heterotopias present a juxtaposition of symbols that have developed over time rather than the confluence of different symbols from different parts of the world. Through accumulation, differing and often contrasting ideas are presented together in one venue despite their incongruity when compared with one another. The second and opposite type of heterochrony that exist within

heterotopias is that which is “linked ... to time in its most fleeting, transitory, precarious aspect, to time in the mode of the festival.”¹⁸ Here Foucault relies on the example of the fairground. The uniqueness of these spaces is the fact that they are temporal. For a fleeting period of time every year, a variety of different spectacles comes together on one site. There are agricultural displays and contests, amusement rides and games, food concessions and often (yet not so common anymore) educational displays about the community. The spectacle of this site and its importance comes from its temporality – the community can access it for only a limited time.

The two heterochronies are not necessarily separate. In fact, for the analysis of international exhibitions, these two come together, and it is partially the merging of the layering of time found in museums and the temporality of the fair that imbue the international exhibition with one of its most important heterotopic features. Foucault did recognize this blending of the heterochronies in his example of the vacation village. He argued that the village was fleeting in that those who visited it did so for a limited holiday period. The symbols of the society that was being visited demonstrated the layering of different periods in time. In Foucault’s example he discussed “those Polynesian villages that offer a compact three weeks of primitive and eternal nudity to the inhabitants of the cities.”¹⁹ These villages presented traditional images of primitive Polynesian life for a limited time to the visitor from the city.

The fifth principle relates to access to these sites. Foucault argued that heterotopias “always presuppose a system of opening and closing that both isolates them and makes them penetrable.”²⁰ Here, as with the fourth principle related to time, Foucault demonstrated that there are opposing ways in which a heterotopia can provide access or restrict it. He

highlighted the difference between those sites where access is restricted to certain members of society, where whoever enters requires specific permission and must perform certain acts, and those sites where access appears to be free and open even though this is only an illusion, as the visitor can access only a part of the space.²¹ To demonstrate the first model of access, Foucault returned again to the example of the prison. Here he argued that access requires the fulfilment of specific acts. In the case of the prison, these acts are anything that countervails the legal system. This type of access is directly linked to crisis and deviation heterotopia, as Foucault's second example of restricted access is that which requires certain acts of purification for entry. His examples are the hamman of the Muslims and the Scandinavian sauna.

The second model of access to heterotopias is those sites which appear to be open but in fact exclude those who visit. Foucault described these as sites "that seem to be pure and simple openings, but that generally hide curious exclusions. Everyone can enter into these heterotopic sites, but in fact that is only an illusion: we think we enter where we are, by the very fact we enter, excluded."²² His example here was of guest houses in South America, where the guest has access to the room they have let, yet cannot access the family quarters of the main part of the house. Another contemporary example he offered was that of the American motel room, where the guests can enter into the room directly without having to go through any other rooms or parts of the space. This type of access provides a layered effect when viewed in relation to more public sites like museums and fairs. Even though any who wish to enter the museum or fair can do so, their access is restricted to specific areas and activities. There are significant parts of both venues that are restricted to the visitor. These are the spaces where the operations and design of the actual displays and activities occur.

This sets out a model of access whereby the visitor can access the displayed information, but cannot alter that which is displayed.

The final principle that Foucault established for his concept of a heterotopia is “that they have a function in relation to all the space that remains.”²³ Here again Foucault established opposing poles of how this relationship between spaces exists. He argues that heterotopias either “create a space of illusion that exposes every real space, all the sites inside of which human life is partitioned, ... or else, ... create a space that is other, another real space, as perfect, as meticulous, as well as arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed, and jumbled.”²⁴ The former type of heterotopia is a place of illusion, and Foucault suggested that brothels are key examples of this. The latter of these two contrary sites are heterotopias of “compensation” and he argued that certain colonies are examples of this.²⁵ In particular, he discussed the American colonies of the seventeenth century, where the settlers sought to fulfill their utopian visions of society by creating an environment where order and religiosity were the prevalent features. This was in direct opposition to the disorder and the religious persecution the settlers witnessed in Britain, from which they had removed themselves. The American colonies, therefore, began as an attempt at creating a heterotopia of compensation. The new colonies stood as examples of how a heterotopia can expose the weaknesses (or perceived weaknesses) of the existing social order, in this instance the way in which British society functioned. The opposition presented between heterotopias of illusion and compensation is a false one. Rather it is more useful to blend these two features of heterotopias into one element. It is as a space outside all others created as a realization of utopian ideals that the cleavages and weakness in the functioning of all other spaces in society is exposed.

Foucault's concept of a heterotopia is very difficult at times. He presented heterotopias as both a singular space and, at times, all spaces in society. There is a sense of disorder and incongruity in this space, yet it is one that is both constructed and in some instances highly ordered. To make sense of this concept and demonstrate that only certain unique spaces can be viewed in this manner, a greater reliance will be placed on the analysis of the concept by other scholars. In particular, the following discussion will highlight Kevin Hetherington's application of the concept of a heterotopia. Before turning to that discussion, there are some key elements of Foucault's definition and six principles that must be drawn out. Primarily, the six principles act as guides for how a heterotopia is constituted. A heterotopia is a real place, outside of all others, where the utopian ideals of other spaces, perhaps incongruous, come together to expose the way in which society as a whole functions. The heterotopia is an important space in relation to all others as it not only exposes the existing structures but through the meshing of these different other spaces within the unifying elements of the heterotopia, it can create and promote new and alternate symbols for society.

Interpretations of Foucault's Concept of a Heterotopia

Many of the scholars who have adopted the concept of a heterotopia in their own work have done so as a way to move beyond the study of society in terms of the kinds of polarity found in the two approaches discussed in the previous chapter; the propaganda and way of seeing approaches. Yet, the adaptation of the concept is not uniform, and the emphasis is placed on different points according to how this concept is applied. There are those scholars who have adapted the concept of a heterotopia in their own work to expand and explain the emergence of the post-modern structuring (or lack of structuring) in society. One example of this is Edward Soja who has worked with the concept in his discussion of

architecture and geography. He saw Foucault's heterotopias as offering "a way out of the dishevelled discourses of late modernity."²⁶ Soja focused on heterotopias as examples of post-modern space in society. He argued that heterotopias occur "where modern history is forcefully collapsed into a contemporary post-modern geography."²⁷ Soja interpreted heterotopias as spaces of tension between established traditional ways of studying society and newer visions of understanding the world. In his case, he saw a transition from the tradition of studying society in the frame of history and time to the post-modern model of understanding the world through the spaces humans inhabit.

Robert Reid-Pharr, in his literary analysis, adopted the concept of a heterotopia as "a prophetic vision of society that allows for the presence of constant change and improvisation."²⁸ Again, as with Soja's work, this interpretation places the emphasis on heterotopias as sites of change and new ideas. Others like Tobin Siebers and Pia Maria Alhbäck have focused specifically on heterotopias as places of the "Other", which have built on aspects of the "postmodern" discourse of identity formation in a diverse society.²⁹ Here we see an adoption of the concept of a heterotopia, less as the location in between center and margin, but as the space which is created by the margin in society for their own functioning.

Kevin Hetherington has focused on the concept of a heterotopia in a study of social ordering. He has provided, in three different yet complementary works,³⁰ a strong argument in favour of understanding social change in terms of a process that occurs in spaces like heterotopias. He defined heterotopias as bringing "together a collection of unusual things (or discursive statements), and give them a unity of meaning through the production of a space that acts symbolically as a site for the performance of an alternate mode of social ordering."³¹ Hetherington's discussion emphasizes that change within society does not occur as a result of

one structure overtaking another, but rather change is a process that occurs in specific places which establish new symbols and ideas by which society is ordered.

Hetherington's most developed interpretation of heterotopias appears in his work entitled *The Badlands of Modernity: Heterotopia and Social Ordering*. Here he offers a way to understand where heterotopias exist in relation to the margins and centers in society, and he also provides a strong argument in favour of using the concept of a heterotopia in our understanding not of the postmodern world but also of the modern one. Hetherington chose to apply the concept of a heterotopia to his study of the Palais Royal in the period just before the French Revolution in 1789. He argues that this is a prime example of a heterotopic site as it blended civility and the carnivalesque, commercialism and radicalism, those firmly placed within the centers of society and those relegated to the margins. For Hetherington,

heterotopia do exist, but they only exist in this space-between, in this relationship between spaces, in particular between eu-topia and ou-topia. Heterotopia are not quite spaces of transition – the chasm they represent can never be closed up – but they are spaces of deferral, spaces where ideas and practices that represent the good life can come into being, from nowhere, even if they never actually achieve what they set out to achieve – social order, or control and freedom. Heterotopia, therefore, reveal the process of social ordering to be just that, a process rather than a thing.³²

Hetherington argues that the Palais Royal was just such a site and was a central location for the transformation of French society: a change that would lead to the establishment of the Enlightenment and those ideals which would come to form the foundations of modernity.

In his adaptation of the concept of a heterotopia, Hetherington focuses on some central points which demonstrate how these sites exist to present opportunities for changes in social ordering. Specifically, he addresses the relationship between utopia and heterotopia and unlike Siebers and Ahlbäck mentioned above, he does not assume that heterotopias are spaces outside society, but rather Hetherington incorporates the work of Louis Marin on

utopics to explain the complex interweaving that exists between the concept of utopia and heterotopia. Again, like Foucault's definition, Hetherington emphasizes the relationship between utopias and heterotopias, where heterotopias are often attempts to realize utopian ideals, but Hetherington developed this connection more fully and argues that there is a tension in this relationship, as explained more clearly in Marin's work.

Marin's emphasis is on the manner in which utopian ideals, which were embedded in the idea of good, freedom and order, were synonymous, have been used to help shape modern society through the ordering of its spaces (1984). For Marin, this is a process, known as utopics, meaning quite simply, a spatial play on the theme of utopia. This term, which he derives from a deconstructive reading of Thomas More's *Utopia* (1985), is associated with the ambivalence, or more precisely what Derrida would call difference (1976), contained in the original word utopia, which for Thomas More referred to both *ou-topia* meaning no place and *eu-topia* meaning good place. For Marin, which is neither concerned with *ou-topia* nor *eu-topia* directly but the gap between them, a space that he calls the neutral, this deferral expresses the utopian idea as a process of spatial ordering and disordering that tries to close this gap. Marin's neutral... is also Foucault's heterotopia."³³

Heterotopia, then, can be seen as the way to transform no place into a good place. Here the relationship between heterotopia and utopia is presented as more of a process where heterotopia is the place where utopian ideals are realized. Hetherington places great importance on the transformative process that occurs within a heterotopia.

The emphasis on process is most clearly articulated when Hetherington addresses the debate within cultural geography, sociology and other fields where the focus has been placed on the relationship between the center and margins. The concept of a heterotopia has often been adapted in this discussion to act as the Other space of the margin, yet this is not an entirely appropriate understanding of how this concept works. Hetherington provides a survey of some of the significant scholars who have addressed this center/margin relationship. He discusses the work of Jacques Lefebvre and representational spaces, Rob Shields' work on place myths and marginal places, Victor Turner's work on liminal and

liminoid spaces, and Bruno Latour's concept of "an obligatory point of passage".³⁴

Hetherington is careful not to place his concept of a heterotopia on the margin. In fact, he expresses his scepticism of a certain view of the idea of margins.

... My criticism of the valorization of margins rests on seeing them as counter-hegemonic spaces that exist apart from 'central' spaces that are seen to represent the social order. All the same, I accept that something like margins do have some importance in the shaping of society. However, they have to be seen as more complex spaces than is usually the case, caught up in the processes of what I have called, alternate social ordering.³⁵

Heterotopias are not margins in the sense that is conveyed above, but they are margins in the sense of the unbounded and blurred space-between rather than the easily identified space at the edge. *Margins are spaces of traffic*. They are spaces that contain both the central and the 'marginal' in ways that unsettle social and spatial relations.³⁶

Hetherington applies the work of Turner and Latour to expand on the complexity of the relationship between the center and margins.

From Turner, Hetherington focuses on the discussion of liminal and liminoid spaces. The difference between the two is that liminal space is associated with primitive societies and social rites of passage. It is the space the individual enters at a certain time of life. This can be compared with Foucault's idea of crisis heterotopia. Liminoid spaces for Turner emerge in modern societies and are not as fixed and identifiable as liminal spaces and rituals. They are "likely to be created out of spaces during particular events or in breaching of the mundane order".³⁷ Hetherington highlights Turner's focus on liminoid spaces as those associated with "leisure activities and political protests that have a strong carnivalesque element, and sees spaces as being ones associated with the individualism and personal freedom that such practices aim to achieve."³⁸ As Hetherington emphasizes, the importance of liminoid spaces and rituals are "their significance as sites for the production of new symbols for new modes of living."³⁹

This social experience of liminoid or even heterotopic spaces is central to understanding the power they have to transform social ordering and to promote new symbols. Hetherington incorporates the idea of 'communitas' in his discussion of liminoid spaces. Communitas refers to "an intense, if fleeting, condition of affectual solidarity and bonding that produces its own form of sociation through which an identification and shared sense of belonging is formed."⁴⁰ The inclusion of the idea of communitas is important in explaining how it is that the new symbols that emerge within heterotopias are experienced and propelled into those other spaces of society. Although new ideas and symbols are created within a heterotopia, their influence on the larger community is dependent on a shared reception and incorporation of them. Those that enter into a heterotopia experience this fleeting sense of solidarity. It is a result of the temporality of the event itself by which the heterotopia then stands as a symbol itself of the point of transformation within society. It is through this sense of communitas that the larger community comes to be exposed to the shared need for new symbols and ideas by which to make sense of their society.

For Hetherington, heterotopias do not exist as yet another structure or place in society that is fully formed and separate. Rather, heterotopias are visible locations of the process of change in society. To emphasize this point, Hetherington adopts the idea of "the obligatory point of passage" from the work of Bruno Latour. Heterotopias exist as the places where other sites and structures in society meet in the process of change. He states

The real significance of sites like the Palais Royal is not that they are marginal places from which people can thumb their noses, counter-hegemonically, at the rest of society, nor is it that they are more complex, disordered or uncertain than any other site; rather the significance of such spaces is that they act as obligatory points of passage through which an alternate mode of social ordering is performed.⁴¹

Hetherington connects the central concepts raised by Latour, Turner and Marin, the concepts of obligatory points of passage, liminoid spaces and the neutral to compare them with heterotopias. He equated one with the other and argued that these locations are fundamental in society and that they exist to provide a real space for the tensions between the utopian and the real, between differing concepts of freedom and control. The outcome of the dialogue within these spaces is a presentation of a new way of looking at the world and the way it is structured.

The discussion of Foucault's heterotopias and Kevin Hetherington's adaptation of this concept sets the ground work for a specific model to assist in the analysis of international exhibitions. Although Foucault was the first to use the concept of a heterotopia in reference to cultural space, only a few elements of his discussions of the term are valuable to use in this definition. From Foucault we can draw out the idea that heterotopias bring together incongruous utopian ideals into a real place where they collide to shatter old myths that assist in making sense of the order in society. Foucault's six principles provide a superficial list of criteria to identify heterotopia, but two of the principles, those dealing with time and access, must be expanded to apply to the study of international exhibitions. Foucault's heterochronies need to be blended so that the layering and fleeting nature of time exist together to offer a unique way to expose old myths from different others spaces to allow for the emergence of new symbols which will assist in making sense of a changing world. The layering of time allows for incongruous histories to confront one another, exposing the symbols and myths of existing society. The temporality of heterotopias is a result of their role as points of passage for society. Foucault described access to the heterotopic space as either restricted for only those who have performed certain acts or as an illusion of openness

where all can enter yet they are restricted from the functional area of the space. The latter description of access is the one that applies to the study of exhibitions. Access to this type of heterotopic space is limited. All may enter to see the displays but the narratives of these displays are not directly open for the visitor to alter within the site.

This brings the discussion back to Kevin Hetherington's adaptation of the concept of a heterotopia. He provides a clearer and more applicable definition of the concept: that of a real place that brings "together a collection of unusual things (or discursive statements), and gives them a unity of meaning through the production of a space that acts symbolically as a site for the performance of an alternate mode of social ordering."⁴² Hetherington's discussion expands and clarifies Foucault's initial definitions of the concept. He does so by qualifying that heterotopias are different then most spaces in society, but that they are not outside all others. Rather heterotopias are those spaces in between: in between the centers and margins, the old and the new, the real and the representational. It is as this space in between that heterotopias function as part of the process of social transformation to expose the inner structures of the other spaces. Hetherington incorporates two ideas from Victor Turner, the first is the concept of liminoid space and the second is the idea of *communitas*. Liminoid space, as Hetherington describes it, breaches the mundane order of life. This brings the discussion back to Foucault's emphasis on the temporality of heterotopias. It is in the breaching of mundane life through the structuring of a spectacular space that the order of life is then exposed. The second idea that Hetherington incorporates from Turner is that of *communitas*. Again the fleeting nature of heterotopia is an element of *communitas* – it is what allows for the fleeting sense of solidarity. Those who enter this site are presented with the same displays of old myths from other spaces in society. Through the attempt to

establish some unity in a heterotopia, visitors are provided with new symbols which assist them in making sense of the multiple ideals within the heterotopia and which they also take with them from this space back into their everyday life. The new symbols which emerge within the heterotopia to assist in making sense of it then become new myths by which a changing society may be ordered.

Heterotopia as a Medium of Communication

The discussion so far has focused on heterotopia as a place where a collection of unusual and often oppositional things comes together. Yet what still needs to be addressed is the way in which these spaces act as communicative media which elicit change in society. Marshall McLuhan provides a broader definition of media, which will be applied to this analysis. As Robert Babe states, McLuhan believed “all artefacts extend some aspect of the person, and therefore mediate human relations, making *all artefacts* media of communication.”⁴³ In his study *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*, McLuhan looked at traditional forms of communicative media, such as film, print and radio, but he also included in his analysis housing, clothing, and forms of transportation such as the bicycle and the airplane. He argued that media, whether the radio or a house, are the extension of one or several of the human senses and that by constructing these media humans sought to extend their senses into the physical world. Each medium emphasized and prioritized certain senses. International exhibitions can be understood as extensions of a number of human senses and, therefore a medium that provides a specific frame to human relations.

In adopting McLuhan’s notion that all artefacts are media of communication which structure and inform our perspective of society, it becomes useful then to see international exhibitions as a very specific media form. These events have communicated ideals of social,

political and economic progress since their inception in 1851. As was discussed in greater detail in the previous chapter, two approaches were presented to the study of international exhibitions, the national propaganda model and the way of seeing model. Both of these approaches support McLuhan's contention that it is the construction of the international exhibition as a mass medium that influences and structures the way the exhibition visitor comes to know his or her environment. Both of these approaches assist in supporting the notion that international exhibitions are indeed effective media that can communicate specific notions about society and social order. Yet these approaches fall short in their ability to address the fundamental strength of this specific medium, which is rooted in the heterotopic nature of how it is structured to present often unrelated and conflicting things in a unitary manner. The communicative power of international exhibitions rests in how they are structured as heterotopic media.

McLuhan's focus on all artefacts as media was central to his broader vision of the structuring of society. He contended that society privileged certain media over others and the use of these media ultimately structured the human perspective of the surrounding environment. McLuhan argued that;

... all media, from the phonetic alphabet to the computer, are extensions of man that cause deep and lasting changes in him and transform his environment. Such an extension is an intensification, an amplification of an organ, sense or function, and whenever it takes place, the central nervous system appears to institute a self-protective *numbing* of the affected area, insulating and anaesthetizing it from conscious awareness of what's happening to it. It's a process rather like that which occurs to the body under shock or stress conditions, or the mind in line with the Freudian concept of repression.⁴⁴

For McLuhan, as one medium comes to dominate the functioning of the environment, the way it functions becomes invisible and unquestioned. This vision of how modern society has come to be structured is the central point that McLuhan's critics have focused on in their

claims of his technological determinism.⁴⁵ Those advocates of McLuhan's work argue that his criticism of the way visual culture has come to dominate modern society is in fact a broader reaching criticism of modernity itself.⁴⁶

McLuhan argued that modern society, since industrialization, had been dominated by visual media, creating an environment that privileged the visual senses while diminishing the importance of the other senses. McLuhan used the term 'environment' to characterize the functioning of daily life within specific dominant or hegemonic structures and processes. He states that

the ground rules, the pervasive structure, the overall pattern eludes perception except in so far as there is an anti-environment or counter-situation constructed to provide a means of direct attention ... an environment is naturally of low intensity or low definition. This is why it escapes observation. Anything that raises the environment to high intensity... turns the environment into an object of attention. When an environment becomes an object of attention it assumes the character of an anti-environment or an art object.⁴⁷

One way for an environment to become an object of attention is with the challenge from a new form of media which threatens to alter the pervasive structure of society. It is at this point that we become aware of the old structures. As Paul Grosswiler suggests, "McLuhan was mining the interstices of media change for openings that allow human awareness and change or, in other words, praxis."⁴⁸ Here we can see a direct connection to the concept of a heterotopia, which like McLuhan's anti-environment contests and inverts the way in which 'real' society functions. A counter or anti-environment is the same space as a heterotopia.

A heterotopia, like a counter-environment is a real place that exposes the structuring of existing environments by the collision in this one space of uncommon and competing utopian ideals. This collision leads to the creation of new symbols which are used to make sense of the changing structures of society. The heterotopia communicates these new

symbols to those who enter the space by creating a sense of *communitas*. This *communitas* then legitimizes and entrenches the heterotopia as a reference point of the process of transformation that occurred at this time. This discussion has set out the elements of a heterotopic medium; the next chapter will use the example of international exhibitions to demonstrate how these heterotopic media function.

Notes

---

¹ There is conflicting use of the singular and plural of heterotopia, some authors use the same term for both tenses, while others use heterotopias as the plural and heterotopia as the singular. The latter model will be used here.

² Michel Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" *Diacritics*, Spring, (1986): 24.

³ Edward W. Soja, "Heterotopologies: A Remembrance of Other Spaces in the Citadel-LA," *Postmodern Cities and Spaces*, ed. Sophie Watson and Katherine Gibson (Oxford UK & Cambridge, US: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 1995): 14.

⁴ Kevin Hetherington, "The Utopics of Social Ordering: Stonehenge as a museum without walls" *Theorizing Museums*, ed. Sharon Macdonald and Gordon Fyfe (Oxford, UK & Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 1996): 158.

⁵ See Robert F. Reid-Pharr, "Disseminating Heterotopia," *African American Review*, 28, no.3, (1994): 347-57; and Pia Maria Ahlbäck, "The Road to Industrial Heterotopia: Landscape, Technology, and George Orwell's Travelogue *The Road to Wigan Pier*," *Technologies of Landscape: From Reaping to Recycling*, ed. David E. Nye (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999): 254-266.

⁶ See Soja 13-34 and George Teyssot, "Heterotopia and the History of Spaces," *Architecture and Urbanism*, 121, (1980): 79-100.

⁷ Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Vintage Books, 1970): xviii.

⁸ Foucault, *The Order of Things* xvii.

⁹ Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 24.

¹⁰ Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 24.

¹¹ Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 24.

¹² Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 24.

¹³ Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 25.

¹⁴ Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 25.

¹⁵ Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 25.

¹⁶ Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 26.

-
- ¹⁷ Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 26.
- ¹⁸ Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 26.
- ¹⁹ Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 26.
- ²⁰ Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 26.
- ²¹ Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 26.
- ²² Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 26.
- ²³ Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 27.
- ²⁴ Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 27.
- ²⁵ Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 27.
- ²⁶ Soja 30.
- ²⁷ Soja 19.
- ²⁸ Reid-Pharr 349.
- ²⁹ Tobin Siebers, ed. *Heterotopia: Postmodern Utopia and the Body Politic*, (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1994); and Ahlbäck, "The Road to Industrial Heterotopia" 254-266.
- ³⁰ Kevin Hetherington, "Identity Formation, Space and Social Centrality," *Theory, Culture & Society*, 13(4), (1996): 33-52; _____, "The Utopics of Social Ordering: Stonehenge as a museum without walls," *Theorizing Museums*. Ed. Sharon Macdonald and Gordon Fyfe (Oxford, UK & Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 1996): 153-76; _____, *The Badlands of Modernity: Heterotopia and Social Ordering* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997).
- ³¹ Hetherington, "Identity Formation" 38.
- ³² Hetherington, *The Badlands of Modernity* xi.
- ³³ Hetherington, *The Badlands of Modernity* 11.
- ³⁴ Hetherington, *The Badlands of Modernity*.
- ³⁵ Hetherington, *The Badlands of Modernity* 21.
-

-
- ³⁶ Hetherington, *The Badlands of Modernity* 27.
- ³⁷ Hetherington, *The Badlands of Modernity* 34.
- ³⁸ Hetherington, *The Badlands of Modernity* 34.
- ³⁹ Hetherington, *The Badlands of Modernity* 34.
- ⁴⁰ Hetherington, "Identity Formation" 39-40.
- ⁴¹ Hetherington, *The Badlands of Modernity* 37.
- ⁴² Hetherington, "Identity Formation" 38.
- ⁴³ Robert Babe, *Canadian Communication Thought: Ten Foundational Writers* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000): 282.
- ⁴⁴ H. Marshall McLuhan, "Playboy Interview with Marshall McLuhan: A Candid Conversation with the High Priest of Popcult and Metaphysician of the Media" *Canadian Journal of Communication: Special Issues – The Medium's Messenger, Understanding McLuhan*, fall, (1989): 105.
- ⁴⁵ See James W. Carey, "Harold Adams Innis and Marshall McLuhan" *The Antioch Review*, vol. 27, (1967): 5-39.
- ⁴⁶ See Arthur Kroker, *Technology and the Canadian Mind: Innis/McLuhan/Grant* (Montreal: New World Perspectives, 1985) and Judith Stamps, *Unthinking Modernity: Innis, McLuhan, and the Frankfurt School* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995).
- ⁴⁷ As quoted in Richard Cavell, *McLuhan in Space: A Cultural Geography* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002): 96-97.
- ⁴⁸ Paul Grosswiler, "The Dialectical Methods of Marshall McLuhan, Marxism, and Critical Theory" *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 21, no.1, (1996): 3.
-

Chapter 4: International Exhibitions as Heterotopic Media

Throughout their history, the purpose of World's Fairs has been to enable everyone to view, enjoy, and apply knowledge from the products and ideas of the world's peoples. At their best, they have achieved this, and even if some critics today call "Expos" obsolete, they still leave a clear mirror of their times, reflecting, like succeeding editions of an encyclopaedia, the products, exhibit techniques, and architecture of their periods. They contain much, though, and one must be patient to see them. Properly conceived, however they are much more than amusement parks with long lines – they are environmental cosmos.¹

International exhibitions are spectacular and fleeting events that bring together a multitude of different ideas, objects and people from different parts of society in one space. They are the perfect example of a heterotopic medium. Kevin Hetherington's definition of the concept of a heterotopia seems to be written with exhibitions in mind. To paraphrase his definition, which is discussed in greater detail in the previous chapter, heterotopias are real places that give unity of meaning to a collection of unusual things and discursive statements, creating new symbols to make sense of change in society. International exhibitions are exactly this type of site. They bring together a collection of different nations, peoples, objects and ideas under the unity of a broad theme. They are often physically located outside of all other sites in society and they are spectacles which perform the role of both reinforcing and altering existing symbols and myths. A central part of this concept is the physical representation of an ideal or utopian vision of how society should function, for example, the spectator is offered perspectives of ideal architecture, housing, artistic creation, industrial success and many other answers to the uncertainty and lack of clarity that exist in the 'real' world.

This chapter will provide a greater explanation of how international exhibitions function as heterotopic media. The discussion will begin with the application of Foucault's six principles to international exhibitions. A greater emphasis will be placed on the particular way that time and access function within the heterotopia of international exhibitions. Beyond the application of the six principles, the discussion will then turn to demonstrate how international exhibitions function as the space in between the relations of other spaces outside of them. This will assist in demonstrating how the analysis of exhibitions as heterotopias differs from the two approaches to exhibitions that were presented in Chapter 2. As a space in between, international exhibitions bring together the utopian ideals from many other spaces in society, whether political, cultural, social or economic. Following a review of some of the central other spaces that are reflected within exhibitions, this chapter will conclude with a look at how, through the construction of a sense of *communitas*, new symbols are both created and carried forward into the rest of society.

Foucault's Six Principles of a Heterotopia

Foucault's first principle stated that heterotopias exist in every culture and society. Similarly, the exhibitionary form has existed throughout history. As John Allwood suggests, international exhibitions are one way that a community can show off its wealth and knowledge. Allwood contends that this showing off has occurred throughout history and across many different cultures. As the discussion in the first chapter of this thesis outlines, this tradition can be traced back to the ancient Roman market.² Foucault established two types of heterotopias in this principle; those of crisis and those of deviation. He argued that the crisis heterotopia was prevalent in primitive

societies and that they were the place where the point of passage from one stage of human life to the next occurred. The heterotopias of deviation were found in modern societies and they were places where 'deviant' members of society were placed, such as psychiatric hospitals and prisons. International exhibitions can be seen as incorporating both types of heterotopias. They exemplify crisis heterotopias as they are places where a society demonstrates its level of development, whether industrial or cultural. For example, the Crystal Palace was mounted as a means of demonstrating Britain's industrial maturity in relation to other nations. International exhibitions can also be viewed as heterotopias of deviation, particularly after the White City Exhibition held in Chicago in 1893. It was here that the amusement zone became a part of the official exhibition, which allowed for the displaying of people and artefacts that were deviant and odd. The inclusion of the amusement zone was twofold. On the one hand, it was a means of entertaining visitors, thus generating revenue for the organizers of the exhibition. On the other hand, it was a way to demonstrate to the exhibition visitor what was considered deviant in society, thus emphasizing appropriate social behaviour.

In his second principle, Foucault argued that the function of heterotopia can change over time. Foucault used the example of the cemetery to demonstrate this change in function. He argued that the change in the location of cemeteries throughout history reflected a broader change in how society viewed death. It is important to note though that although the location and relation of cemeteries to the rest of society may have altered throughout the centuries, their purpose, as a resting place for the dead, has remained the same. Similarly, the functions of international exhibitions may have changed since 1851, but their purpose, as a means of displaying artefacts and ideas about

society, has remained the same.³ The Victorian era exhibitions had several functions: they were designed to display the successes and benefits of empire, they were instrumental in popularizing the products and methods of mass production, and they created a sense of commonality among the domestic population. The interwar exhibitions shifted their focus away from empire and more to the competitive strengths of individual nations. It was in this period of exhibitions where two different types of exhibitions emerged: the world's fair, which was commercially driven, and the international exhibition, which was focused on cultural and educational expression. The post-war exhibitions were no longer hosted by imperial nations, rather, other countries hosted these events in the effort to emphasize a common humanity in light of the growing Cold War tensions. Despite the fact that exhibitions have functioned differently since their introduction in 1851, their purpose has remained the same: a way of displaying ideas and artefacts about society to a mass audience.

Foucault argued, in his third principle, that heterotopias were able to juxtapose many different other spaces within this single real place. This is perhaps the central way that international exhibitions exemplify Hetherington's idea of heterotopias as spaces in between. Within exhibitions, many elements of modern society are on display, from industrial artefacts, to new technologies, fine arts, new educational disciplines, entertainment and political ideals. The spectator is faced with often conflicting and challenged visions of how society functions. These different spheres of society competed for priority placement within exhibitions. This was particularly the case when addressing the discourse of nationalism at international exhibitions. Since the Crystal Palace, international exhibitions have hosted many nations, initially imperial nations, and then

after the Second World War, post-colonial nations, all in one space. The focus on national representation was not prominent until after the Paris Exposition of 1867, yet, there was always a sense of conflict and competition between different countries. This only increased as the displaying techniques transformed from one general building to the housing of individual national pavilions within the exhibition site. The post-war exhibitions were rife with the juxtaposing of oppositional national ideals. There were the former imperial nations and their former colonial holdings, now independent nations, displaying in the same place. There was also a heightened competition in this period between the pavilions of the western capitalist nations such as the United States and Great Britain versus those representing a Soviet-styled socialism, such as Czechoslovakia and Russia.

Foucault's fourth principle established the two ways in which heterotopia address time. He described two separate 'heterochronies'. One presented accumulated time in one place, the other presented the fleeting nature of time within a heterotopia. As discussed in the previous chapter, Foucault's heterochronies are better understood together, particularly as they are applied to the analysis of international exhibitions. Tony Bennett, in his introduction to his book *The Birth of the Museum*, opens with a discussion of Foucault's heterotopia and the separation between the heterochronies, specifically focusing on the examples given of the museum and the fair. Bennett argues that international exhibitions are events which blend Foucault's heterochronies, just as exhibitions blend the functions of museums and fairs into one place.⁴ International exhibitions, in their efforts to present a holistic ideal of society, present to the visitor a review of a nation's history in one place. Soja is correct in his analysis of heterotopias as

sites where the old confronts the new.⁵ A central ideal at exhibitions was progress, which was presented through the displaying of artefacts and peoples in comparison to older, historical examples. This is particularly the case with the displaying of people. As discussed in relation to the 'way of seeing' approach to the study of international exhibitions, the displaying of colonial peoples at international exhibitions was presented to allow for a model of contemporary ancestor. Here the exhibition visitor is presented with a comparison which assisted in understanding the progression of human development from primitive society to the contemporary modern world.

Another way that international exhibitions present the layering of time in one place is through the entrenchment of previous exhibitions as historical artefacts in their own right. As the displays at each progressive event addressed similar themes, whether industrial progress and cultural maturity, those who designed the exhibits relied on symbols established at previous exhibitions to demonstrate a nation's progression. This was particularly the case at the post-war exhibitions, where the newly independent post-colonial nations tended to present their own progress as a narrative of how they differed from the earlier displays mounted by imperial nations depicting the noble savage. The layering of time that was used in methods of display at international exhibitions was a crucial way that nations could legitimize their own histories and entrench key symbols of nationalism within these histories.

As well as presenting time as a layering of histories in one place, international exhibitions are also ephemeral events. Their exhibit halls and national pavilions are temporary structures that are removed once the allotted time for displaying is over. After the close of the Great Exhibition in 1852, Paxton's Crystal Palace was moved to a

permanent home in Sydenham, England. Unfortunately the building burnt down in the 1930s. Hyde Park returned to its role as a public park for Londoners. The majority of the pavilions erected for the British Empire Exhibition of 1924-25 were removed after the exhibition closed, all except for Wembley stadium, which was recently demolished to make way for a more modern sports stadium. The same occurred in Paris and in the United States with their exhibitions. In the U.S., all that remains of the Chicago White City Exhibition of 1893 is one classically-designed building on the lakefront which is now a museum of natural history. The pavilions that filled the site of the New York World's Fair of 1939 in Flushing Meadows were removed in 1940. The same site was used again for the New York World's Fair of 1964. The temporality of the displays did not take away from their majesty in design. In fact, the temporality encouraged the sense of the carnivalesque and as result, many nations created dramatic and fanciful pavilions in which to house the products of their national success. As a full presentation, the extravagant architecture and the narrative of progress exhibited within combined to present an ideal image of that nation at that time. This contributed to the use of this ideal symbol again and again at succeeding exhibitions.

Another way that the temporality and layering of time blends in international exhibitions is through the existence of certain remnant structures and artefacts of these events. There are a number of structures and features of the exhibitions that were not demolished, for example the Eiffel Tower in Paris, which was constructed for the Exposition Universelle in 1889, and the Paris Metro continues to transport people through that city. The fact that the Eiffel Tower still stands today and has become a central defining feature of Paris demonstrates the power of the symbols of progress and

utopian ideals expressed at international exhibitions. The Eiffel Tower stands as a model of French industrial glory, providing a real structure for contemporary visitors to understand the pride and priorities of France in 1889. The contents of the pavilions were also retained and displayed in permanent museums, for example, the Victoria and Albert (V&A) museum in London was constructed not far from Hyde Park with the mandate to display the artefacts used at the Great Exhibition of 1851 and those successive British exhibitions. This is perhaps the most striking example of the blending of Foucault's heterochronies and of his two examples, the fair and the museum. The V&A contains not only examples of what was displayed at the British Exhibitions, but it also contains the history of these events, thus incorporating the international exhibitions as historical artefacts in their own right.

Foucault's fifth principle dealt with access to heterotopias. Here again, he set out two separate types of access to these places. The first was a model of restricted access for those who had permission or performed certain acts to gain access to the heterotopia. The second model of access was one that appeared to be open for anyone to enter, but where, in fact, 'curious exclusions' existed. The example he used for the latter was the South American guesthouse, whereby the guest can enter into the guestroom but is restricted from entering the family quarters beyond that. This second model of access is the one that is reflected in international exhibitions. Exhibitions appear to be open to all who would like to visit them, yet this access is an illusion. The illusion lies in the fact that the spectator can view the displays but cannot alter what is on display. The discussion of the Egyptian visitors to the Paris Exposition in 1889 demonstrates this exclusion most pointedly.⁶

Access to international exhibitions was not always freely open for all at the same time. In fact, for the majority of the Victorian era of exhibitions, there were specific days when certain classes could visit the exhibition.⁷ In the interwar period in the United States, access was limited for certain segments of the population, in particular African Americans.⁸ Although the post-war exhibitions were more 'open' than their predecessors, they did retain the model of certain days for certain visitors. This did not mean that people from the specified groups were not allowed entry into the exhibition at other times, as had been the case in earlier exhibitions. It just meant that the focus of the activities on that particular day would be directed at a specific national, gender, religious or ethnic group. What this highlighted was another layer of competition between exhibitors and their constituent groups. A measure of attendance and scale of celebration began to be recorded, for example the measure of how many visitors participated in Canada Day, Labour Day and the like.

Foucault's final principle was that each heterotopia functions in relation to other sites in society. Again he established two separate ways that this relationship exists, and again, in reference to the analysis of international exhibitions, these two will be blended. The first way that heterotopias function in relation to other sites in society was what Foucault called a space of illusion that exposes the other spaces of society. The second type of relation to other sites was called a space of compensation which was perfect and ordered compensating for the imperfection and disorder in everyday life. International exhibitions blend these two in that the designers of these events attempted to create a real space which was an articulation of the utopian ideals of different other spaces in society. International exhibitions sought to display idealized images of society for the spectator.

Perhaps the most extreme example of this is found at the New York World's Fair of 1939 and the creation of a perfectly designed and controlled urban environment in both the theme exhibit Democracity and the General Motors exhibit, Futurama. In both exhibits, the designers had set out very pristine and ordered visions of the world of tomorrow. In both cases, the world of tomorrow consisted of six lane highways linking the working urban environment with the ideal suburban living experience.⁹ The displays presented pristine images of working America that were in direct contrast to the real living conditions of most Americans in 1939. What this example demonstrates is the use of the displays at international exhibitions to present a space of compensation. The result of presenting the perfectly idealized world of tomorrow was to expose the faults of the contemporary experience of American society at this time.

International Exhibitions as Places in Between

Foucault's six principles help to identify how international exhibitions are constructed as heterotopias. What still needs to be addressed is how international exhibitions function, like heterotopias, as spaces in between. As noted in the previous chapter, heterotopias must be understood not as spaces on the margin but as the spaces in between center and margin, real and representational, and self and other. The study of international exhibitions as spaces in between provides a more productive way to understand how they have influenced change in many different parts of society.

International exhibitions are clearly not spaces on the margin. They are events that have been mounted and designed by those at the centers of power in an attempt to present idealized images of society. Yet this process is not as unidirectional as the national propaganda model discussed in Chapter 2 would suggest. These events are far

more complex than just an avenue for the reproduction of the authority of one segment of the population over the other. The power of these events and those ideals presented within them stem from the fact that those dominant classes feel as though they need to make their case for their vision of society. As noted earlier, one of Prince Albert's reasons for hosting the first international exhibition in 1851 was to create a vision of British life, as compared to other nations, in the interest of diminishing the increasing power of those others in society calling for a unionized work force. The Prince felt compelled to make his case for the status quo, in response to changes that were already occurring in society, and the international exhibition provided him with a venue in which to do just that. If the authority of the dominant elite in British society was so entrenched then why was there a need to present such an extravagant case in favour of their vision? It was required because there were oppositional visions of society gaining legitimacy in Britain that the idealized presentation at the Crystal Palace was intended to counteract.

There is no doubt that the Victorian era exhibitions were more tightly orchestrated by the dominant classes in society, as was the audience that visited the exhibition. As the medium of the international exhibition transformed over time, so to do the number of different visions of society presented within the exhibition space. The fact that foreign scholars were invited to participate in the associated lectures and congresses hosted at exhibitions was one of the first examples of the margins entering the exhibition space to present alternate visions of society. Another significant example of the 'margins' of society being represented at the exhibition emerged with the inclusion of the amusement zone as a key section of the international exhibition. The shift in focus to entertainment soon overcame the initial emphasis on 'educating' the masses, and demonstrated a greater

shift in the function of these events, which was to ensure that some profit was made to counteract the extreme costs of mounting such a spectacle.

By the interwar years era, the number of different participants at exhibitions was demonstrated by the participation of different nations presenting often opposing visions of how society should be ordered. There were the traditional western hosts, the British, French and American, and each was honing a specific national image of itself: the British aiming to retain the honour of the empire; the French relying on their cultural superiority; and the Americans displaying their ingenuity and pioneering spirit. The Soviet Union also participated at these events, hosting expansive pavilions demonstrating the glories of a socialist state. At the Paris Exposition of 1937, the German and Italian pavilions depicted the benefits of fascism as a model of social order. All of these different models of a nation were presented within the same space, each vying for acceptance by the visitors strolling through the different pavilions. It was also in the interwar period where theme and other general pavilions aimed at specific segments of the population emerged. Pavilions aimed at women were one example of this. These displays were most common at the American world's fairs and they were often sponsored by women's magazines and corporations aiming to sell household products specifically to women.¹⁰ These displays were in direct contrast to the representation of women found in the amusement zones. Unlike the displays in the main areas of the fairs which focused on the functions women performed as housewives, the amusement zone entertainment were a sexualized representation of the ideal woman.

In the post-war era, the diversity of national pavilions expanded as many more nations from around the world participated at international exhibition. On one level,

exhibitions were ideological battlegrounds for the two Superpowers, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. On another level exhibitions were arenas where newly emerging independent countries, former colonies, were presenting their own image of themselves. Within these exhibits were multiple messages about national identity, religion, territoriality, and history. Aside from the national pavilions, it was also in the post-war era when more non-national groups participated. Beyond corporate and industrial representation, there were also exhibits focused on women, youth, religious and ethnic groups. This expansion of displays demonstrated an increased number of different possible identities being presented to the exhibition visitor and the exhibitions themselves became the places where all the different identities converged.

The multiple different visions of society presented within international exhibitions are given a broad unity through the theme of the event and the design and positioning of the pavilions throughout the exhibition site. The efforts of the organizers to create a narrative for the variety of objects, ideas and people on display provided a communal experience of these different things. It is partially through the design of the exhibition site that the sense of *communitas* is created. This sense of *communitas* is reinforced in the temporality of the event and the limited access to the displays. The commonality of the experience reinforces the import of the event as a point of transformation in society. This sense of *communitas* in the experience of participating in an exhibition leads to the important element of this space as means of communicating new symbols. New symbols emerge as a result of the meshing of the different ideas presented in this one space and the shared, although fleeting, experience of participating in this event leads it to become a central point of reference for a larger segment of the population.

The analysis of Expo 67 which will follow in the next two chapters will demonstrate in greater detail, how international exhibitions function as heterotopic media. As there are a multitude of differing aspects of society that are presented within each international exhibition, the study of Expo 67 will focus only on one area of tension in Canadian society. The competing and contested visions of Canadian national identity that were presented at Expo 67, by the federal government, the Quebec government and the Indians of Canada, will be reviewed to demonstrate how a variety of oppositional positions, from the center and the margins collided at Expo to create an alternate discourse for Canadian society. The discourse that resulted did not arise from just one of the perspectives presented here but as a result of their encounter. The power of this interplay then informed the national debate on identity within Canada for many decades to follow Expo 67.

Notes

---

¹ Lawrence G. Zimmerman, "World of Fairs: 1851-1976" *Progressive Architecture*, 55, no. 8, (August 1974): 64-73.

² For a longer discussion of the exhibitionary model see chapter 1, 10-14.

³ See Chapter 1, 15.

⁴ Tony Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum* (London & New York: Routledge, 1995).

⁵ Edward W. Soja, "Heterotopologies: A Remembrance of Other Spaces in the Citadel-LA," *Postmodern Cities and Spaces*, ed. Sophie Watson and Katherine Gibson (Oxford UK & Cambridge, US: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 1995): 14

⁶ See Chapter 2, 48.

⁷ See Paul Greehalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas: The Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions and World's Fairs, 1851-1939*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988).

⁸ See Robert Rydell, *World of Fairs: The Century-of-Progress Exhibitions*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993).

⁹ For a good account of a visitor's experience (if only fictional) at the New York World's Fair of 1939, see E.L. Doctorow, *World's Fair* (New York: Penguin Books, 1985).

¹⁰ Rydell, *World of Fairs*.

Chapter 5: Canada as Host of Expo 67

In this world, so different from the one he [the visitor] has just left, he escapes the stress of congested, run-down streets, the smell and noise of automobiles, the anonymity and harsh realities of everyday life. And yet this new discovery is not an escape. Everywhere he goes, the visitor is in the presence of man and man's works; he has a part to play in this spectacle which enchants him; he has, in fact, discovered Man and His World in all its diversity and richness.¹

The designers of Expo 67 were committed to ensuring that everyone visiting the exhibition site would be inspired. The quotation above is striking because the description of the visitors encounter with Expo fits into the concept of a heterotopia: a real place where uncommon things from other space in society commingle to create new symbols. Expo 67 was just such a place, and it produced new symbols for many sectors of society. One of the central sets of symbols that emerged out of this international exhibition was a series of competing images of Canadian national identity. The following chapter will address these competing images of national identity in more detail with a focus on the Canadian pavilion, the Quebec pavilion, and the Indian of Canada pavilion that were hosted at Expo. The focus of this discussion will center on the way in which Expo 67 was a heterotopic medium which allowed for the confrontation of these nationalist narratives to result in the new symbols which would dominate the next forty years in Canadian political discourse.

In an attempt to understand why Expo 67 was such a point of passage for Canadian national identity, this chapter will begin with a brief historical discussion of Canada's participation in earlier international exhibitions. This brief history will demonstrate a two-fold relationship between Canada and exhibitions, whereby primarily, the expo medium has been used by the Canadian federal government in the past to

present an image of a unified nation. Secondly, Canada's participation in international exhibitions has aided in cementing the role of the federal government as primary architect of national identity. The discussion moves to describe the process by which Canada became the host of Expo 67 and how the traditional uniformity of control by the federal government was diluted in the Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition (CCWE). The historical review and the process of hosting Expo leads into a discussion of two features of Expo 67: the theme of the exhibition and the selection and design of the site. These two features of Expo help to demonstrate how the event functioned as a heterotopic medium. They will do so by demonstrating how the designers of the exhibition sought to bring unity to the many uncommon things on display at Expo; how both the theme and the site exemplified Foucault's heterochronies which are essential to heterotopia; and how the site itself was specifically chosen as place outside all others in society.

Canada at International Exhibitions before Expo'67

International exhibitions functioned as an important medium by which Canada, in particular the federal government, could fulfill numerous functions related to nation building. E.A. Heaman argues that "Canada emerged as a nation during what Henry James called 'the age of advertising' and international exhibitions were one of its earliest means of self-expression."² This means of expression was never a simple presentation of the objects and images of Canada; rather it was an example of one of the arenas through which the tensions of defining a national identity were played out. Since before Confederation, those colonies that would make up Canada participated in international exhibitions and were faced with difficult choices about the construction of their identity.

Whether prior to or following Confederation, the federal authority was responsible for the participation of the colonies and then the nation at international exhibitions. This was one way in which a unified image of Canada could be portrayed, yet there were also significant choices that those negotiating the nation's participation were required to make regarding Canada's place within the international community and what images of Canada would dominate the exhibits. What becomes apparent in reviewing this period of Canada's participation at international exhibitions is that the nation was very successful in presenting a consistent image of itself over time, one that came to dominate international perception. It was this image that those behind Expo 67 were trying to alter and update.

The colonies of British North America were present alongside other British colonies at the Crystal Palace in 1851. Following this first effort, there was repeated representation at the Paris Exposition of 1855, and the British Exhibition in London in 1862. Participation in the first and the subsequent fairs before Confederation allowed for the colonies to articulate ideas about their own identity and to broadcast these ideas to the world.³ The cost of and distance to the early European exhibitions were so great that the colonial governments were the only ones with the capacity to send exhibits. Heaman argues that because the colonies were British properties "they were not recognized as entitled to diverse representation, therefore the government designed and controlled what was presented for inclusion to the British Commission."⁴ There were multiple reasons for the colonies to participate in the first international exhibition. For the British government, colonial displays informed the broader population of the benefits of the colonial territories that they defended and supported financially. For the British colonies

participation in international exhibitions as part of the British Empire display, was one way to reinforce the bonds between colony and metropole. There were also domestic motivations for the colonies to participate in the early exhibitions. These motivations were to expand markets for the sale of raw materials, demonstrate that the colonies were desirable locations for emigration, and to begin to encourage a “bringing together [of] the people in more kindly unison.”⁵ The question arose though, as the cost of travel to Europe was still pricey, what residents of the colonies would be witness to this push for kindly unison? Few residents from the colonies visited the early international exhibitions as the cost and distance were prohibitive. Thus the pre-Confederation exhibitions were more about expanding economic markets and encouraging emigration from Europe. One important feature that this early participation established was the role of the government in designing the images which were to be exhibited.

The Paris Exposition of 1867 was significant for Canada, as it was the first exposition where the unified nation would be presented. As Eva-Marie Kroller argues, the 1867 exposition was, “a watershed in the formation of Canada’s self-image and in its participation in world fairs: no longer divided into several colonies, the country now had to project a unified image, a strong common purpose.”⁶ Again the federal government was uniformly responsible for the Canadian exhibits in Paris in 1867, and again they relied on the drive for new markets and immigrants as the primary benefits of participation, yet there were also those within the new Canadian government who saw exhibitions as means to promote a national image. Charles Tupper and Darcy McGee, in particular, were what Heaman called idealists as they “believed in the power of exhibitions to construct a new Canadian nationality.”⁷ This nationality was founded in

the images of Canada as resource rich and of a population that was resourceful and practical. The images of Canadian nationality which were presented at the 1867 Exposition were constructed to convince Europe that Canada was a viable independent nation with which to trade and where European immigrants would find vast opportunity. The ideas of Canadian nationality were being reported to Canadians through the press, and Tupper and McGee hoped that the unified images would assist in bringing together the population behind the new nation.

After Confederation two areas of tension were prevalent in Canada's participation in international exhibitions. The first related to where Canada placed itself within the international community particularly in relation to Britain. Eva-Marie Kroller argues that it was difficult to find the Canadian exhibit at international exhibitions after Confederation, as "it was not always clear whether the country continued to define itself as part of the colonies or as a separate country."⁸ Canada continued to participate as an active member of the British Empire until well after the First World War. In particular, Canada, unlike other dominions like Australia, actively participated in British exhibitions after 1900. As John M. MacKenzie commented,

Canada was particularly active, even building impressive pavilions at Wolverhampton (1902), Cork (1902), and many regional exhibitions where other Dominions were not represented. The reason is clear: Canada was particularly active in encouraging migration, having to counteract the powerful pull of its neighbour, the United States, Canada was also impressively represented at most Continental, American and colonial exhibitions.⁹

MacKenzie's comment is apt in emphasizing the efforts made by the Canadian government to maintain its colonial ties from the standpoint of emigration, but he misses one central aspect of the impetus as it related to the Canadian and American relationship. There was a competitive need for Canada to promote itself as an alternative to the U.S.

for new immigrants, but Canada's participation in European exhibitions was also a result of attempting to expand access to foreign markets, those which were closed to them in the United States. One of Canada's largest presentations as a nation between the wars came at the British Empire Exhibition at Wembley 1924-25. Here Canada and other dominions were wooed by the British government to participate. This exhibition had two goals for the British government, primarily to actively encourage emigration to its colonies to assist in diminishing the economic tensions they were suffering at the time; and secondly, to present a strong and united image of the British Empire which was waning following the First World War.

The second area of tension that arose in Canada's participation at international exhibitions related to the unified image that the federal government packaged for presentation. Kroller articulates this tension most clearly as Canada had to "decide whether it wanted to join the western race for urbanization and industry, present itself as a pastoral alternative to both the old world and to America, or somehow find a synthesis between the two."¹⁰ Ultimately, the pastoral won out against the urban. Canada's national identity came to be intertwined with agricultural and rugged myths which are still relied on today. These myths placed greater emphasis on Canada's vast landscapes and scenic beauty rather than on the industrial and urban development in Montreal or Toronto. Winter became "the quintessentially Canadian season, as the time when the country's best 'northern' qualities – physical and moral stamina – were put to the test."¹¹ These images of wilderness were reinforced most notably at Wembley in 1924 by two striking components of the exhibit. The first was the inclusion of several Group of Seven canvases depicting the rugged and beautiful Canadian wilderness. The second, more

comical example blends the two tensions discussed here about Canada's self-definition at exhibitions. This was an equestrian statue of the Prince of Wales, sculpted entirely of butter. This sculpture demonstrated both the continued ties to the British Empire and the reliance on rural and agricultural symbols of Canada.

Canada's active participation in exhibitions was very successful in constructing its self-image and ultimately reinforced the view of the nation as one vast wilderness that was sandwiched, politically and economically at least, between Britain and the United States. After the Second World War, those responsible for Canada's exhibits at international exhibitions attempted to move beyond this entrenched view of Canada as a vast wilderness, yet it was not easily done. Canada's participation at international exhibitions demonstrated the nation's challenge in finding its place in relation to the outside world. Kroller argues that those commenting on Canada's exhibit at the Brussels Exhibition in 1958 stated that "Canada's chief virtue consisted of its lack of ostentation; in fact, there seemed to be more consensus on what it was *not* than on its characteristic attributes."¹² The Canadian national image had shifted from images of a vast winter wilderness to one in between the models of nation presented by either Britain or the United States. Following Brussels 1958, the Canadian federal government returned to the medium of international exhibitions as a way to redesign the images of nationhood in Canada. Expo '67 provided the federal government with a singular opportunity to reinvigorate how it packaged its identity to the international community. In many ways, Canada as host of Expo 67 exemplifies the first of Foucault's heterotopic principles and Turner's liminoid space: Expo was for Canada a space of crisis similar to those that can be found in all cultures. Like the point of passage that occurred for the teenager in

---

primitive societies, Expo, was for Canada, a space of crisis where a significant transformation was to occur. Those in control of this space may not have been entirely aware of this aspect of it though, and once the event was underway, their entire control of the space was not as complete as they too were participating in this point of passage, this heterotopia.

Canada as Host of Expo 67

It was following his visit to Expo 58 in Brussels that a Canadian Senator, Mark Drouin, first came forward with the idea of Canada as host of a universal and international exhibition in 1967. The aim was to host the international exhibition as the central event in Canada's centennial celebrations. The federal government was quick to agree to the idea and the host site of Montreal was chosen, as 1967 would mark the 325th birthday of the city. At the time, the federal, provincial and municipal governments agreed to cooperate and fund the bid for the exhibition. The Bureau International des Expositions (BIE) announced in 1960 that the 1967 Universal and International Exhibition would be hosted by Russia, in honour of the 50th anniversary of the Communist Revolution. Canada was greatly dismayed by its loss and there were those who retained a hope that things might change. In early 1962, Russia withdrew its intention to host the 1967 exhibition stating that there was too little time remaining to mount the type of event they had hoped for, and that the estimated costs were prohibitive. Two other reasons supposedly supported Russia's decision to pull out: that Russia felt as though its exhibition would be undermined by the New York World's Fair of 1964-65, and growing concerns about the presentation of capitalist national pavilions and western visitors on Soviet soil.¹³

The Canadian government did not rush to resubmit its bid for Expo 67. Prime Minister Diefenbaker was skeptical about the limited time and the cost of such an endeavour, but he was convinced by the enthusiasm of the newly elected Mayor of Montreal, Jean Drapeau. Again, as with the previous bid, the federal, provincial, and municipal governments pulled together to bring forward a proposal for the 1967 Universal and International Exhibition to be held in Montreal. In November 1962, the BIE announced that Montreal would host a first category exhibition in 1967, leaving Canada only 5 years to mount this extravagant event. The federal government moved quickly to create the infrastructure needed to complete this project. The Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition (CCWE) was created by an Act of Parliament at the end of 1962. The creation of the CCWE formalized the tripartite agreement between the federal, provincial and municipal governments and detailed the fiscal and operational breakdown of responsibility at each level of government. The federal government was responsible for fifty percent of the financial cost of Expo, the province was responsible for thirty seven and a half percent and the City of Montreal for twelve and a half percent.¹⁴ Once the CCWE was incorporated, the Commissioner General and other staff were officially appointed. There was early controversy as the individuals chosen by Prime Minister Diefenbaker to hold the two top jobs, the Commissioner General and General Manager of Expo 67, both resigned in August 1963.¹⁵ Under a new Prime Minister, Lester B. Pearson, Pierre Dupuy, a life-long diplomat and formerly Canada's ambassador to France, was appointed Commissioner General and Robert Shaw filled the position of General Manager.¹⁶ Alongside these two men was a tightly

organized management team to oversee the building and operation of Expo 67 in four years.

In light of the time restrictions that the CCWE faced, the vision of Expo was a very ambitious project. The construction of the exhibition site was tightly managed by the Head of Installations, Colonel Edward Churchill, who adopted the military model of the critical path method to ensure that everything would be in place for Expo's official opening on April 28th, 1967. As Expo was to be the centerpiece of Canada's Centennial celebrations efforts were made by the CCWE to demonstrate the participation of Canadians from across the country. This was accomplished by establishing Advisory Committees which were responsible for the conception and oversight of specific elements of the event, from the theme and fine arts to engineering and architecture. The representation on these committees was intended to encourage the best in the specific fields in Canada to contribute to the national symbol of Expo. It was also hoped that the national members would succeed in increasing the profile and enthusiasm for the event in parts of Canada outside of Montreal and Ottawa. The general interest in Expo before the gates opened was in many ways quintessentially Canadian, reserved and cautious. Both the critical path method and the Advisory Committees were important features of the building of Expo that contributed to it being completed in the time provided.

Theme of Expo 67

One of the first Advisory Committees established was responsible for developing the theme of Expo 67. The general theme of "Man and his World" was first articulated as part of the Canadian bid to the BIE in 1962. This was inspired by one phrase from *Terre des Hommes*, a novel by French writer and aviator Antoine de Saint-Exupery: "If to be a

man is to feel that by placing one's stone, one contributes to building the world."¹⁷ The general theme was an attempt to present a sense of global unity, whereby "the emphasis will be on the common bonds uniting the people of the world rather than on the differences, real and artificial, that tend to separate them."¹⁸ Once Montreal was chosen as host for Expo 67, the Theme Advisory Committee was composed in the interest of articulating more clearly how this broad theme would apply to the actual event.

The Theme Committee was composed of members from universities, the Quebec press and national cultural agencies. From academia, representatives were drawn from across the country and from different fields of study; they included A. Davidson Dunton, President of Carleton University; Wilder J Penfield; Frank R. Scott, Dean, Faculty of Law; McGill University; and J. Wilson, Department of Geophysics, University of Toronto. Andre Laurendeau from *Le Devoir* represented the Quebec press. Allan Jarvis, National Director of the Canadian Conference of the Arts and Jean Louis Roux, President of La Société des Auteurs, Compositeurs et Editeurs du Canada; and novelist Hugh McLennan represented the national cultural community¹⁹. There was one female representative, Franco-Manitoban author Gabrielle Roy. The members of the committee met in May 1963 at the Seigneury Club in Montebello, Quebec for a three day session to discuss how the theme would be articulated and expanded in the exhibition's pavilions. They determined that Expo 67 should illustrate "the behaviour of man and his environment, extolling his ideological, cultural and scientific achievements."²⁰

The report from the Montebello Conference inspired the infusion of "contemporary humanism" through the theme of Expo. Benoit and Seguin framed contemporary humanism

in the image of the classical humanism of the Renaissance but further enriched by all the new contributions of civilization, contemporary humanism integrates all creative activities in the fields of science, culture and thought. While humanism of the Renaissance, however, was almost exclusively concerned with the fulfillment of the individual, a new dimension has been added: the awareness of belonging to the community of men.²¹

This contemporary humanism was intended to express the dominance of 'Man' over his natural environment in all areas of society. Additionally, contemporary humanism was intended to highlight the commonalities of humanity in the interest of undercutting the existing geopolitical tensions between the West and the U.S.S.R. Contemporary humanism, as the quotation suggests, sought to highlight the common bond of individuals in society. This common bond was the structured attempt by the event organizers to achieve some sense of *communitas*. Gabrielle Roy explains this in her discussion of what the committee took from Saint-Exupery's work. She wrote that "Man's Earth, then, is also an expression of the merging of efforts coming from thousands of sources and uniting in the creation of a single vision: Earth, the creation of man."²² The important element of this statement in reference to Expo as a heterotopia is the idea of thousands of sources uniting. The creation of a single vision was perhaps what the members of the Theme Committee had hoped to create as a result of their efforts, yet Expo created many more visions and symbols of the future than only earth as the creation of man.

The Theme committee was faced with the challenge of creating the frame through which to articulate the general theme for a vast exhibition. Initially, the committee was determined to encourage the CCWE to enforce a strict adherence to the Expo theme, forgoing the now traditional national pavilions in favour of a series of sub-theme areas to which each nation would contribute objects and exhibits for display. The aim was to counter the tradition of competition between nations and focus more on the

interrelationships and commonalities between them. This suggestion was not entirely adopted. Instead, the CCWE did adopt a series of sub-theme pavilions to which many nations did contribute artefacts, but they also retained the national pavilions, encouraging each nation to adapt their exhibits to incorporate the theme “Man and His World.” The CCWE was committed to the theme as the central component of the international exhibition. The sub-themes extended the reliance on notions of modernity that were inherent in the general concept of “Man and his World.” The general theme harkened back to the Victorian era exhibitions as it was drawing on the notions of universal brotherhood and progress in the form of man’s control over nature. The Theme Committee focused specifically on the idea of progress. Gabrielle Roy describes the commitment to progress as follows:

Firstly, one firm basis of accord was established: faith in progress... Rather than the acquisition of more material and spiritual ease, progress should signify an increasingly equitable human distribution of misfortune and advantage. To progress then would mean to work towards a gradual “rapprochement” of all men of every condition and origin.²³

She connected this definition of progress to the single phrase from Saint-Exupery that inspired the theme: the phrase was “To be a man is to be responsible, to feel that by placing one’s own stone, one contributes to building the World.”²⁴ The way in which this general theme was articulated was very structured in the theme pavilions, but less so in the national pavilions.

The sub-theme pavilions were Man the Explorer, Man the Producer, Man the Creator, Man the Provider, and Man in the Community. Each one was split again into smaller thematic sections which built up different aspects of ‘Man’s’ relationship to his world and his control over the natural environment. The exhibits attempted to

demonstrate a way of bringing all the components of life into one large spectacular space where they all blended with one another, ultimately exposing and challenging how each one is viewed. Man the Explorer demonstrated how humankind had used science and exploration to more fully understand first the human body, then the earth and all its regions, whether the oceans or the arctic, and finally space. The Man the Producer pavilion highlighted industrial successes in mining the riches of the earth for their economic benefit. Man the Creator focused on cultural and artistic endeavours. A multinational art exhibition, displaying painting and sculpture from around the world and from a variety of different historical periods, was the centerpiece of this sub-theme pavilion. Man the Provider highlighted the taming of the natural environment to produce a bountiful variety of agricultural crops initially for human survival and eventually as a modern industrial sector itself. Finally, there was Man in the Community which addressed how individuals coexist in the urban environment. The Man in the Community theme pavilion was a strong example of some of the central aspects of heterotopia, namely the blending of time in heterochronies, and the incorporation in one single space of the other spaces from outside it.

Man in the Community was located on the Cité du Havre Pier, the entrance point for most visitors. It included the central pavilion buildings, which resembled a pagoda-like structure made of indigenous Canadian Douglas fir, the Labyrinth project, and Habitat 67. The design of the Man in Community central pavilion was a striking entrance to this series of exhibits. It was designed by Canadian architect Arthur Erikson and demonstrated a blending of Asian-inspired architecture with local materials. (See fig. 4)

Fig. 4 – Man in the Community Pavilion²⁵

The Douglas fir pagoda rose over open gardens below, allowing the natural elements, rain and sun, to stream in to feed these gardens. The space juxtaposed several elements of style and structure. Primarily it relied on the form of a formal and spiritual space like the pagoda; yet the use of the Douglas fir and the open concept feeding the gardens below seemed to incorporate Canadian natural elements, raising them to a more spiritual level. As well as the blending of the spiritual and the natural, the Man in the Community pavilion was reminiscent of the Crystal Palace. The similarity was found in the way that this pavilion was set up as a greenhouse garden just as Paxton's building had been with

the inclusion of the existing trees in Hyde Park in 1851. This demonstrated a layering of time, where a foundational symbol of international exhibitions, the Crystal Palace, was recalled in the Man in the Community Pavilion, yet in the contemporary instance the structure incorporated many other influences as well. These other influences were the blending of architecture and material from different parts of the world and the blending of notions about spirituality and nature. These elements worked together to create a very reflective environment, which functioned as the gateway to Labyrinth and Habitat 67.

Labyrinth was a project which blended unique architecture with a multi-screen film project designed by the National Film Board of Canada presenting a modern interpretation of the Theseus legend. The project was the precursor to the now greatly popular IMAX experience that occupies many museums around the world.²⁶ This was not the first time that multi-screen film techniques were used at an international exhibition, nor was it the only instance of this technology at Expo, yet it was a massive display of the blending of two media forms to create what Marshall McLuhan would term an anti-environment. The architecture was designed to work with the screens to enhance and expand the content of the film providing the audience with a new way of seeing an old tale. What was also striking about this project was the use of an ancient legend as the content. This presented the audience with a familiar narrative of humankind overcoming the beast, which was intended as a metaphor for the individual's battles in society. Here it was less the content of the experience and more the way the content was presented in a unique environment that left visitors with a sense they had seen something new and different.

Habitat 67 was a new housing experiment that was designed for Expo by Moshe Safdie, a recent PhD graduate from the McGill architecture school. The project was initially designed as a way to provide affordable housing in an ever-crowded urban environment. The call for housing solutions for working and middle class urban housing was not new at Expo 67. There had been models provided at the Crystal Palace in 1851 and again in New York in 1939. Here Safdie was attempting to respond to many needs in one space. The Expo Guide explained Habitat as a project that

reveals to the fullest extent to which man has used his ingenuity in combining shelter with all the attributes of modern life, in an urban environment in which living space is at a premium. It unites the advantages of apartments, by housing many families in a small area. It answers the suburban dream of gardens. And it places every home within walking distance of stores on sheltered streets.²⁷

Habitat aimed to unite residential desires and overcome urban dilemmas all in one space. Unlike the urban designs articulated in New York 1939, the suburban and urban were no longer separated by great distances and superhighways. Gardens and a view were provided to each resident. Despite the hopes of the architect and his supporters, Habitat did not fulfill expectations. The scale of the project had been greatly reduced due to cost and time; as a result, the 158 units that were constructed were too few to ensure a public school or other community services in the area. Also, the dream of services within walking distance on sheltered streets never materialized. The units, which were initially lauded for the mass production of every minute feature, left little opportunity for personal choice for the resident. Finally, although intended for low and moderate income residents, Habitat has actually become a high end dwelling on the Montreal Pier.

The theme pavilions brought together many aspects of human life, all relying on the general idea of "Man and His World," from the exploration of the human body and

the polar regions to the struggle to coexist in an urban environment. The general theme provided a broad unity for the different exhibits, yet they each presented their own perspective on the world. As each theme grouping aimed to recount the story of a certain component of human existence, it presented a layering of time that is central to a heterotopic medium. This layering of time is most evident in the formulation of the theme of contemporary humanism, adapting the concept from its Renaissance reference and applying it as a blending between individuality and community in the hopes of constructing a sense of *communitas*. Other ways in which this layering occurred can be found in the Man the Creator cultural exhibits, which brought together different artistic forms from different periods in human history. This allowed for a sense of order in one place, although often conflicting images were presented together. The layering of time was also found in the Man in the Community Pavilion and both Labyrinth and Habitat. In the case of Labyrinth, an ancient legend was reproduced and retold to a modern audience through a new hybrid medium. In Habitat, Safdie was inspired by ancient Mediterranean villages to present a modern housing alternative for the congested city. The theme pavilions were not placed all together in one area of Expo; instead they were placed throughout the three spaces of the exhibition site in relation to other national and private pavilions. The result was a sense that there was no specific center to Expo, but that the whole space reflected the tale of Man and His World.

Location of Expo

This attempt at ensuring that there was no center to Expo was a deliberate planning device. The site and its design were perhaps the most powerful ways that this exhibition exemplified a heterotopic medium. The location for Expo 67 was hotly debated and the final decision for the site was announced in January 1963; yet the official inauguration did not occur until August of that year. The final site chosen for Expo had three components. There was the existing MacKay Pier (Cité du Havre) on the St. Lawrence River, the expansion of Ile. St. Hélène, a small island already located just off the Pier, and finally, the creation of a whole new island, Ile. Notre Dame (see fig. 5). The landfill used for the islands was taken from the construction of Montreal's new Metro system, which was to assist in transporting visitors to the Expo site and around Montreal. The actual construction of the islands began in October 1963 and the project was completed by June 1964.²⁸ This allowed for a two and a half year period for the construction of pavilion buildings.

The construction of an entirely new space for Expo at the boundaries of the city and in the St. Lawrence allowed the designers of the exhibition to control their environment more than would have been possible elsewhere. They could create the access points to the islands and they could create the features of the islands themselves. An example of the former was the construction of the new Metro stations to transport visitors to Expo and the construction of the Concordia Bridge. An example of the latter

was the use of water and canals throughout the Expo site. During the construction of the space, it became clear that there was neither enough time nor material to completely fill the spaces on the islands; therefore, the site planners decided to adapt the site by incorporating water as a central and consistent feature. They created canals and lagoons that flowed through the islands and created a certain natural separation between certain pavilion sites and provided the visitor with a physical and visual guide as to the flow of the space. The Expo environment, the island itself, and how the space was organized between pavilions were constructed in a deliberate manner to ensure a sense of unity for the vastly diverse images and architecture that were presented by the many exhibitors.

The design of the Expo site was a tightly controlled plan that sought to blend traditional elements of the English country garden in contrast with the highly urbanized spaces set aside for the pavilion buildings. Again here we see a harkening back to the legacy of the Crystal Palace, which blended the English gardens of Hyde Park with the eclectic exhibits of the event. Edouard Fiset, the chief architect of Expo 67, was the man who controlled the Expo environment. His aim was to respect the regulations of the BIE while also establishing some element of unity on the site. He stated that:

Every Exhibition, even if it is universal and international and has the sanction of the International Bureau of Exhibitions as is the case here, comprises a considerable diversity of expressions, which is not only unavoidable but desirable. Nevertheless, if the disposition of such varying, and sometimes even heteroclite structures is not submitted to some form of order, and if not, architectonic or other element provides the factor of continuity and coherence required, the result can only be chaotic and discordant; notwithstanding individual successful results, the whole will in the end be both vulgar and unsightly.³⁰

Fiset set out six principles, which were strictly applied to the Expo site to ensure continuity, unity of theme and a dispersal of visitors. The first principle was to place the

largest pavilions on the extremities of the exhibition site, which would “force the visitor to pass through the less interesting sections” to reach the more popular exhibits; the second principle sought to group like pavilions, based on geography or similarity of character together; the third principle was to design the flow of traffic from one pavilion to another using structural features like the canals on Ile. Notre Dame or bridges; the fourth principle was to incorporate the visitor’s service facilities into the general environment; the fifth principle was to enforce the sense of unity through the use of landscaping and street furniture; and the sixth principle was to adopt a controlled and consistent policy relating to signage and the use of colour in all parts of the Expo site.³¹

The six principles encompassed all aspects of the visual environment that visitors required to pass through during their time at Expo. Each one assisted in the designers’ commitment to a unified experience despite diverse and often incongruous displays and pavilions. An additional element of Fiset’s principles was the fact that, in an effort to honour the general theme “Man and his World,” the theme, national, and private pavilions were placed together, breaking down the previous display techniques of earlier international exhibitions which had separated these different components. The inversion of the center-periphery relationship of the larger, more popular pavilions at the extremities of the site demonstrated the breakdown of the center-margin relationship that Kevin Hetherington argues is a central component of a heterotopic space. Another way that Expo was constructed as a heterotopic medium is in the designing of limited access points to the site, and the fact that the only residential component of the exhibition, Habitat, was located on the Cité du Havre. This exemplified the illusion of access that Foucault describes as one of his principles of heterotopia. The illusion that is presented is

that visitors were welcome to visit Expo, but they were not welcome to stay on the majority of the site for an extended period of time. This limitation of access reinforced the temporality of the place.

Since the Crystal Palace in 1851, the colonies that would become Canada participated in this and future international exhibitions. The federal government determined that participation in these events was a way to expand markets for Canadian raw materials, to increase much needed immigration, and most importantly to present a unified image of the nation. This image was reliant on defining Canada in relation to Britain and the United States and it promoted images of a nation composed of vast winter wilderness, which excluded representations of other aspects of Canadian life. Canada's decision to host Expo 67 presented the federal government with a grander way to advertise a reinvigorated image of Canada. Yet new challenges were presented to the federal government's traditional control over the packaging of Canadian identity, which emerged from the breadth of activities related to hosting an international exhibition of this scale. Canada was bound by BIE regulations to encourage diversity and originality in the pavilions at Expo. The creation of the CCWE forced the federal government to share responsibility for Expo with the Quebec and Montreal governments. The structuring of the CCWE, the adherence to the critical path method, and the broad responsibilities ascribed to Advisory Committees ensured that the corporation and not political actors in Ottawa had a stronger hand in the designing of the exhibition. The theme Advisory Committee was one example of this as it was composed of a membership from a number of academic fields, the Quebec media, and national cultural organizations. This committee was responsible for articulating the general theme of "Man and his

World” through a number of sub-theme pavilions. This was an attempt to bring together all spaces of Man’s life into one space at Expo. These sub-theme pavilions demonstrated how Expo functioned as a heterotopic medium, bringing together symbols, ideas and artefacts from different times and places in the world into one space in an attempt to expose the way contemporary society was structured and to create new alternatives for the future. A sense of unity was given to this intermixing of different, often uncommon elements, through a strict site plan which used natural features and the constructed environment to provide a flow and connection from one pavilion to the next. The many ways in which Expo 67 was constructed as a heterotopic medium can be best summed up in a comment by Charles Beaulieu in *The Memorial Album*; he stated that;

The World Exhibition of Montreal developed into a world-wide confrontation which outstripped all expectations. Saint-Exupery’s theme had been fulfilled: Man and his World was truly a place where diverse schools of architecture, design and the fine arts came to closer contact. From all corners of the earth came ideas destined to reveal hidden affinities beneath divergent surfaces, to complement one another, or to intermingle, without any pre-established plan to do so. The goals of communication and information were sometimes reached in similar environments but by contrasting methods; they sometimes stemmed from similar premises but developed in patterns that were totally opposed. And universal agreement was reached in the explosion of a thousand and one audio-visual effects.³²

Notes

---

¹ Edouard Fiset, "The Master Plan," *The Memorial Album of the First Category Universal and International Exhibition held in Montreal from the Twenty-seventh of April to the Twenty-ninth of October Nineteen Hundred and Sixty-seven* (Montreal: Thomas Nelson and Sons Limited, 1968): 40.

² E.A. Heaman, *The Inglorious Arts of Peace: Exhibitions in Canadian Society during the Nineteenth Century* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999): 7.

³ Heaman 141.

⁴ Heaman 141.

⁵ Heaman 141.

⁶ Kroller, Eva-Marie. "Canadians at World Exhibitions," *Canadian Travellers in Europe, 1851-1900*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987: 150.

⁷ Heaman 180.

⁸ Kroller, "Canadian" 151.

⁹ John M. MacKenzie, "The Imperial Exhibitions," *Propaganda and Empire* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984): 100.

¹⁰ Kroller, "Canadian" 150.

¹¹ Kroller, "Canadian" 159.

¹² Eva-Marie Kroller, "Expo'67: Canada's Camelot?" *Canadian Literature*, Spring/Summer, no. 152-3, (1997): 37.

¹³ Raymond Grenier, *Inside Expo 67*, trans. Patrick Gossage (Montreal: Les Editions des Hommes, 1965): 26.

¹⁴ For information about Bill C-103 and the tripartite agreement see Canada. National Archives of Canada, RG 71/11/13, *Theme Pavilions* (n/d): 14; and Canada. *House of Commons Debates. Official Report*. Ses. 1, 25th parl., 11-12, vol. III, (1962-1963): 2873.

¹⁵ For more information about the reasons for the resignation of the first Commissioner General and General Manager please see Berton, 259 and Grenier.

¹⁶ Ambassador Dupuy played a central role in negotiating the sticky terrain of foreign representation of Quebec in France while he was the Canadian Ambassador to France in

---

the early 1960s. For more information on him and this issue see Thomson, Dale C. "De Gaulle and Quebec's Quiet Revolution," *Vive le Quebec Libre*. Toronto: Deneau Publishers, (1988): 90-125.

¹⁷ See National Archives of Canada, RG 71/13/13, *Man in the Community*. (n/d): 1.

¹⁸ See National Archives of Canada, RG 71/11/13, *Theme Pavilions*. (n/d): 5.

¹⁹ For a full list of candidates for the Theme advisory Committee see National Archives of Canada, RG 71/184/1 pt.1 *Minutes of the Fifth [Sixth and Seventh] Meeting of the Directors of the Canadian Corporation for the World Exhibition*.

²⁰ G.R. Benoit and Fernand Seguin, *Expo '67 Development of the Theme "Man and His World,"* rev. ed. (National Archives of Canada, RG 71/139/5, May 25, 1964): 5.

²¹ Benoit and Seguin 5-6.

²² Gabrielle Roy, "Reasons for Hope," *Terre des Hommes: Man and his World* (Ottawa: Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition, 1967): 29-30.

²³ Roy 26.

²⁴ As quoted in Roy 26.

²⁵ Jeffrey Stanton, *Expo 67 - Montreal World's Fair*(August 8, 2000) (<http://naid.sppsr.ucla.edu/expo67/map-docs/mancommunity.htm>).

²⁶ See Acland, Charles. "IMAX Technology and the Tourist Gaze," *Cultural Studies*, 12, no.3, (1998): 429-445

²⁷ Charles C. Milne, *Expo '67: Official Guide* (Toronto: Maclean-Hunter, 1967): 31.

²⁸ See Staunton <http://naid.sppsr.ucla.edu/expo67>

²⁹ Stanton <http://naid.sppsr.ucla.edu/expo67/map-docs/expo67-mainmap.htm> .

³⁰ Edouard Fiset, *Introduction of an Urban Concept in the Planning of the Exposition* (National Archives of Canada, RG 71/13/6 (April 12, 1965): 1.

³¹ See Fiset, "Introduction of an Urban Concep" 1-2.

³² See Charles Beaulieu, "Architecture," *The Memorial Album of the First Category Universal and International Exhibition held in Montreal from the Twenty-seventh of April to the Twenty-ninth of October Nineteen Hundred and Sixty-seven*, (Montreal: Thomas Nelson and Sons Limited, 1968): 340.

Chapter 6: Competing Nationalist Narratives at Expo 67

To a large extent Expo was about “image”, an old word that had taken on a new meaning in the age of television and political pollsters. Many pavilions were intent on projecting a new image – not the one they had of themselves but the one they hoped others would gain from the exposition.¹

As the host of an international exhibition, a nation has the opportunity to showcase itself to the world. The act of hosting such a large and prestigious event may also encourage a coming-together of the national population behind this central cause. On the other hand, hosting such events can also prove risky. As the above quotation suggests, the national image presented at an international exhibition is an idealized vision which, for the host nation, collides daily with the everyday functions of life in the city outside the exhibition gates. The images of the real and idealized are not the only points of collision at an exhibition either. For the host nation, differing perspectives about the identity of the nation are presented within the exhibition.

When it decided to host Expo 67, the Canadian government was aware of the tension between the real and ideal and the possibility of challenges to its idealized image from within the exhibition. As noted in Chapter 5, the Canadian government had used its participation at international exhibitions as one medium through which to express a unified image of national identity. Expo 67, however, offered Canada both the opportunity and the challenge of transcending this long-standing image of itself on its own soil. One of the central challenges that the Canadian organizers of Expo faced was how they would articulate a unified national image in light of significant tensions between different groups in Canada. The key tensions at this time were those involving Quebec and the federal government, and Aboriginal Canadians and the federal

---

government. In the Centennial year, with Expo 67 as the centerpiece event of the celebration of the Canadian nation, these tensions were broadcast not only to Canadians but also to an international community. As a result, Canada was indeed successful in one of its goals for Expo 67, which was to alter the long-standing image of itself as a vast winter wilderness that was neither British nor American. Expo 67 was a point of passage for Canada, a critical event which heralded an alternate vision of the country as a complex and at times fragile connection of multiple identities across a vast and varied landscape.

Signs of this transformation in the conceptualization of Canadian identity at Expo 67 can be found in many different features of the exhibition. Yet the most striking of these, in the context of Expo as a heterotopic medium, lies in the study of the Canadian Government Pavilion, the Quebec Pavilion, and the Indians of Canada Pavilion. The study of the pavilions, their contents, and their relationship to each other demonstrates the way different nationalist narratives work within a heterotopic medium to create alternative images and new symbols. The Canadian Government Pavilion was the most overt display of the federal government construction of Canadian identity. The central elements of this Pavilion were the main exhibition hall, the People Tree, and Katimavik through which the key symbols of the Canadian government's narrative of national identity were presented. The Quebec Pavilion stood apart from the other structures in the Canadian section of Expo. The location of the pavilion and its contents worked together to portray an image of the province as separate from the rest of the country. The Indians of Canada Pavilion was located at the opposite end of the Canadian section of Expo, it was designated as a "private" pavilion rather than a national or regional pavilion, yet the

narrative of Canadian identity presented here was markedly different from the other two pavilions. Through the use of similar display techniques and traditional Aboriginal symbols, the message was one that challenged not only the traditional ideals of Canada but also the medium of Expo itself. The commingling of the three pavilions worked to create numerous new and conflicting symbols of Canadian identity.

The Canadian Government Pavilion

Like our oft-baffling country, the pavilion defies any quick diagnosis. To some visitors, it is Katimavik, the massive 109-foot-high pyramid dominating the exhibit complex. To others it is the People Tree, a six-storey-high abstraction with brilliant red and orange nylon 'maple leaves' whose glow turns incandescent under floodlights.²

As host of Expo 67, Canada had numerous ways of presenting itself to the Expo visitor both on and off the exhibition site. The most centralized presentation of Canada was found in the Canadian Government Pavilion located at one end of Ile. Notre Dame. The Pavilion was financed and officially sponsored by the federal government, and the general presentation was one that blended recognition of Canada's Centennial celebration with the overall theme of Man and His World. The pavilion was one of the spaces within Expo 67 where the Canadian government could control and promote its ideas about the nation.

Fig.6 – The Canadian compound of pavilions.³

The Canadian Government Pavilion was the largest national pavilion at Expo. It was located at the tip of the island and was the centerpiece of the Canadian compound of pavilions. There were three central structural components to this one exhibit; the main exhibition building, Katimavik, and the People Tree. The exhibition building which was a semi-circular, low-level, tent-like structure surrounded Katimavik, a massive inverted pyramid, and both of these opened into an elaborate outdoor public space that included a large garden in which the “People Tree” was the central feature. (see fig.6) This sculpture was a large replica of a maple tree with multi-coloured leaves containing photographs of Canadians performing different tasks. Just beyond the Canadian Government Pavilion was the span of provincial and regional pavilions. The location of the Canadian Government Pavilion and the associated regional exhibits was consistent with Edouard Fiset’s design for Expo. The placement of the Canadian Government

Pavilion on the periphery of the Ile. Notre Dame with the two arcs of the associated Canadian pavilions reached out beyond it was analogous to a horseshoe, yet the luck was not on the side of a unified image of national identity.

The low-level exhibition building constituting the main exhibit areas was devoted to exhibits dealing with the Land of Canada, the Growth of Canada, the Challenges to Canada, Canada and the World, and the People of Canada. The Land of Canada section of the exhibition was the first in the series and it was the one section of the exhibit to address most directly the traditional notions of Canada as a vast and wild landscape. Unlike the earlier depiction of Canada as solely a vast wilderness, this portion of the exhibit attempted to highlight the natural diversity in the Canadian landscape and in the differing urban and rural elements of human settlement in Canada. The theme of this section was “earth, water, forest and deserts, the mountains and geography,”⁴ which assisted in recalling the old symbols of Canada as a vast natural environment from other international exhibitions.

The Growth of Canada section of the pavilion presented the “origins and history of the Canadian nation.”⁵ This segment of the pavilion displayed the tale of human settlement in Canada through film. Similar to the experience in Labyrinth, the exhibition visitor entered into a counter-environment which exposed the structures and faults of the existing images of Canada. The audience was seated on a revolving platform which transported them through five theatres breaking up the history of Canada into five stages. The first stage introduced different groups of Aboriginal Canadians framed in relation to the arrival of the first settlers rather than as existing prior to their arrival. The second stage introduced the first settlers in New France, placing the emphasis on the difference

between the settler community in Canada and the “Establishment” in France. The third stage focused on “newly emerged conflicts” between Aboriginal communities and the settlers and between the French and the English. The fourth stage addressed Confederation as resting “on one single gigantic assumption – Canada’s economy and viability as a nation could be organized on an east-west basis, as a separate and competitive economy in North America.”⁶ The final stage of the *Growth of Canada* film experience addressed those nation-building activities which occurred following Confederation. These included the “race for the West” which could not have occurred without the construction of the railway, and Canada’s role in the twentieth century; encompassing the nation’s participation in both World Wars and resulting immigration patterns.

The national images that were presented in the *Growth in Canada* relied on the older symbols of Canadian identity that the federal government had successfully promoted since before Confederation. The displaying of these images in this manner performed two significant functions. The chronological ordering of human settlement as it was presented in the *Growth of Canada* film established a historical timeline for the nation. The chronology of the film also established a certain time-based hierarchy for Canadian citizens, beginning with Aboriginal Canadians, then the two ‘founding’ people, and new immigrants as the last to be welcomed. The presentation of Canada’s settlement history in this one space exemplified the layering of time that is fundamental to a heterotopic medium. Another impact of the layering of Canada’s history is the way it situated particular members in society at particular times. Specifically, Aboriginal Canadians were presented as the primitive peoples who first appeared on Canadian land.

Within the Canadian Government Pavilion, there is little to no reference to the life of contemporary Aboriginal communities.

The Growth of Canada film concluded with an open ended vision of the permanence of the Canadian nation. "Confederation remains a continuous dynamic process. The evaluation of the viability of the concept of the Canadian nation goes on."⁷ The essential point of this comment is the fact that in an attempt to suggest that Canada is still growing and changing, the nation is presented not as a real place but rather as a concept. This is significant as it relates to how the other two pavilions are designed and how their narratives are presented. The five-stage film recreated the three main images of Canadian identity that the government had relied on in the pavilions it had hosted at previous international exhibitions. These were the images of Canada as a vast and challenging wilderness, the nation's place in between the British and American models of nation, and the existence of three founding peoples.

The Challenges to Canada area illustrated "the response of Canadians to the factors of resources, distance, climate, and topography."⁸ Here again the messages emphasized Canada's bounty of natural resources, available to the world market, yet another example of an old image used in previous exhibitions. The first section of the Challenges to Canada addressed Canada as the home of vast mining and energy resources; the second section demonstrated how Canadians overcame the vast space of the nation through the development of communication and transportation networks; and the final section demonstrated how Canadians continued to adapt to challenges of the modern world through education, scientific research, and successes in international relations.

Fig. 7 – Katimavik and the People Tree⁹

The focal point of the People of Canada area in the Canadian Government Pavilion was the People Tree, (see fig.7) which was the symbolic representation of the general slogan of Canada's identity; unity in diversity. The People Tree was a 66 foot-high sculpture of a maple tree (although it was constructed using Pacific coast wood). The selection of the maple tree as the model of the People Tree drew on another new symbol of 1967, the recently-adopted national flag, which has a maple leaf at its centre. Each element of the Tree held symbolic meaning intended to present some commonality in the identity of Canadians. The soil in which the Tree was rooted and upon which it fed was said to reflect "the relationships and influences that Canada has from elsewhere."¹⁰

The roots represented four core "human problems" facing Canada; these were biculturalism, ethnic plurality, technological transformation, and urbanization. There is

no small irony that the four problems identified here would eventually become the central symbols of Canadian identity at the end of the twentieth century. The roots, stemming from different locations, fed on the soil and created the grounding for the tree. The problems that the roots represented posed individual challenges for Canada, but the intertwining of these roots together also presented difficulties. Biculturalism, which was the first of the human problems facing Canada related to the relationship and tensions between French and English Canadians. The problem stemmed from the increased call for a separate Quebec where the French language and culture could be protected. The second root problem was that of ethnic diversity in Canada. Again this was two-fold. On the one hand, Canada had always relied on immigration to people its territory from sea to sea. On the other hand, at a time when the nation was struggling with its self-definition, the introduction of numerous ethnic and linguistic communities was seen to threaten the established understanding of what Canada was. The third root problem was technological transformation. This transformation was presented in the form of greater industrial automation and improved communication networks which posed a problem for the Canadian workforce. Urbanization was the final root problem for the People Tree. Yet another dichotomy was presented in this problem. Canada was the second largest national landmass in the world, yet the majority of its population lived in a small band of urban centers along the Canada-U.S. border. The problem here stemmed from the increased density of the diverse Canadian population in these centers where tensions arose because of ethnic differences, lack of employment and other issues.¹¹

These four root problems did not present a particularly positive image of the soundness of the People Tree. The value of the symbol was redeemed though in the

purpose of the trunk and the leaves. The trunk was meant to symbolize the concept of Canada itself, its strong unity. Here was the solid foundation out of which numerous branches grew. The branches of the People Tree were filled with 1,500 leaves, which were orange, red and gold nylon sheets, of which 700 contained images of Canadians at work and rest. The leaves were intended to symbolize Canada's diversity of population. The People Tree was a strong symbol which incorporated the central philosophical idea of contemporary humanism that informed Expo's general theme Man and his World. The structure symbolized the intermixing of all the components that define the Canadian identity. It did so in a manner that demonstrated the flow of ideas and people who constituted Canada drawn up from the soil at the base of the tree, through four roots that intermingle to form a united central core community in the trunk which fed a multitude of branches of smaller communities, off of which individual leaves fluttered in the wind. The flow from bottom to top, from the international community to the individual is an image about Canada that is repeated, but in the inverse in Katimavik.

Katimavik, an Inuit word meaning "gathering place", was the largest element of the Canadian Government Pavilion. The structure was an inverted pyramid made of steel and glass. The pyramid housed a performance theatre, four exhibit halls dealing with Expo's general theme of Man and his World and at the top of the structure was an observation deck overlooking all of the Expo 67 site and Montreal.¹² The use of the Inuit word as the title of this central feature of the pavilion was one of the only references to the contribution of Aboriginal Canadians in the image of unity in diversity.

The Canadian Government Pavilion was composed of three significant structures that were hinged on older symbols that had been used again and again at previous

international exhibitions; the vast wilderness, the bounty of natural resources, and a burgeoning immigrant population. The image of identity presented in this pavilion was still presenting Canada as bridging the British and American models of nation. The People Tree which was the centerpiece of the People of Canada area of the pavilion provided a conflicting metaphor of national identity. Again, nature was the central unifying image, yet the specific identification of the four root problems seemed to demonstrate the weakness of this specific symbol of Canada and by extension a weakness in the call for unity in diversity. This slogan demonstrated, if only superficially, the multiple identities that were indeed juxtaposed in this space and in Canada as a whole. Yet the diversity was presented more as something to overcome than something to be lauded. The exclusion of Aboriginal Canadians in the People Tree was a fundamental omission that only reinforced the view that their role was only of historic importance rather than viewing their continued contribution to Canada. The layering of different historical periods offered some legitimacy to the concept of Canada as a nation.

Quebec Pavilion

The 1960s proved to be a decade of significant transformation within Quebec as exemplified by the Quiet Revolution and the rise of the separatist movement.¹³ The decision to bid for and to host a universal and international exhibition in Quebec was a public attempt by Canadian federalists, in Quebec and the rest of Canada, to present a very public and international case for Canada as a unified nation and a demonstration of how Quebec and the rest of Canada could cooperate. Pierre Dupuy, Expo's Commissioner General, stated that "If we [meaning French Canadians] were the conceivers, the English Canadians were the engineers and the builders. Without them,

we would not have been able to do anything.”¹⁴ In a less patronizing tone, Pierre Berton referred to Expo as “a unique example of Canadian ingenuity – French flair and English pragmatism.”¹⁵ Pierre Bourgault, the leader of the RIN, one of the separatist organizations active at the time, speaking in early July at the Youth Pavilion said that Expo “thrust the movement for Quebec independence into the shade.”¹⁶ He would later be surprised to find that Expo was more effective at thrusting the call for independence onto the international stage. The decision to host Expo in Quebec at this time is the most significant way that it can be understood as a heterotopic medium. It was created and mounted as the place in between French and English Canada. This was only reinforced by its location on two newly constructed islands in the St. Lawrence. Despite the best efforts of the Canadian federalists to use Expo as a demonstration of a unified Canada, it was also the catalyst for one of the most important events which fuelled the separatist movement in Quebec. It was during his official visit to Montreal to see Expo 67, that French President Charles de Gaulle uttered his now infamous rallying cry, “Vive le Quebec libre”.¹⁷ Therefore, as many attempted to present Expo as a symbol of bicultural cooperation, it was in reality the site where competing ideals of nationalism collided.

As host province, Quebec mounted the largest of the provincial pavilions. In fact, Quebec and Ontario were the only two provinces to host individual pavilions. The Atlantic and Western provinces hosted amalgamated pavilions respectively. All of the provincial pavilions surrounded the Canadian Government Pavilions, thus creating a sense of a larger Canadian exhibit area. Quebec’s pavilion appeared to be suspended above water on Regatta Lake, wedged strategically at the border of the Canadian complex between Ontario and the French National Pavilion. Quebec was separated from the

Canadian Government Pavilion by the Ontario Pavilion, which sent an interesting message to those discerning Expo visitors.

Fig.8 – Quebec Pavilion¹⁸

The pavilion itself was set apart from others in a number of ways. The first point of departure was its physical placement on a platform just off of land. The second distinctive feature was its architecture. Although there was little unity in the architectural style of any of the pavilions, many of the buildings were designed as temporary structures that suggested some sense of the carnivalesque. The Canadian and Ontario pavilions both used some type of tent-like motif in their building presenting a seamless continuity between the pavilions. This was shattered abruptly where the Ontario pavilion buffered against Quebec's. The architecture of the Quebec Pavilion was far more simple and reserved. It was constructed in glass, concrete, and steel and was a large modernist-inspired cube structure. The most common descriptive phrase for the Pavilion was that it appeared like "a feudal chateau-fortress,"¹⁹ because it was an enclosed structure surrounded by water with the only access via a bridge that was reminiscent of a

drawbridge. At some points during the day, the glass was transparent and the inside of the Pavilion was exposed to visitors outside. At other times of the day, the glass reflected the light and colours that surrounded, no longer exposing the inside of the Pavilion, rather reflecting the images of the surrounding environment.

The central element connecting the Quebec pavilion with others at Expo was the adaptation of the general theme of Man and his World. The theme was presented in the form of three distinct human actions: Challenge, Struggle, and Drive. The pattern of the display that the visitor followed was a linear path and it inspired the sense of travelling down a river. This experience was heightened by the physical placement of the pavilion jutting into the lake, and the glass which narrowed the separation between the exterior and interior of the pavilion. The first section of the exhibit was focused on Man's challenge with the natural environment. Nature was again a significant feature of the Quebec Pavilion, as it had been for the Canadian Government Pavilion. In this instance, nature was presented less as the central defining feature of Quebec, as it had been in the Canadian Government Pavilion, and more as what the Quebec 'citoyen' was challenged to overcome.

Man's Struggle traced the settlement history of the province. This segment of the exhibit used the displaying of objects and the continued narrative of the Quebec citizen to emphasize the longevity of the French settler.²⁰ Similar to the Canadian Government Pavilion, the narrative layered historical settlement periods in the same space in an attempt to legitimize the specificity of the Quebec citizen. This offered one of the first points of direct contrast to the Canadian Government Pavilion as the Quebec narrative demonstrated the existence of a viable French culture long before Canadian

Confederation. This exposed the youth of the Canadian nation. The Quebec 'citoyen' was the central agent in the narrative and time was lapsed in the connections that were made between the early coureur du bois and explorers and the modern industrialists and engineers. This link between generations of the Quebec population was important in establishing the cultural and ethnic continuity of the Quebec people. This was again in direct contrast to the ideal of unity in diversity presented in the Canadian Government Pavilion.

The Drive segment of the pavilion was specifically focused on Quebec culture. Displays highlighted the contributions of the Roman Catholic Church to the social structuring of Quebec society; the importance and prevalence of the French language, not only in the privacy of individual homes but as a central link within communities; and the unique folk arts tradition throughout the province. These symbols reinforced the uniform model of the idealized Quebec society and grounded it in foundation features of community: faith, language, and art. The emphasis on French culture was important in connecting the images of Quebec to those of France, as the French National Pavilion was located on the other side of the Quebec Pavilion. The display of shared symbols such as language, faith and culture with France was another way that Quebec could separate its identity from the Canadian one.

The Quebec pavilion provided a very clear and structured image of the province and the life of its citoyen. The central messages of the exhibit were the unique character of Quebec, its specific and longstanding history, its cultural and ethnic uniformity, and the deep cultural ties still apparent between Quebec and France. The narrative in the pavilion reflected many of the emerging symbols that the separatist movement would

come to rely on to defend its call for a 'Quebec Libre'. The exhibit was a strong expression of the internal structural transformation that was underway in the province at the time.

The Indians of Canada Pavilion

Like the Quiet Revolution in Quebec, the Aboriginal peoples of Canada were also undergoing a period of transformation with respect to their relationship with the federal government. Since the end of the Second World War, the federal government had been re-evaluating its policies and treatment of the native communities in Canada. This move provided for some broader recognition within Canadian society that life for Aboriginal Canadians was not equitable with that of other citizens. By the 1960s there were three significant events which assisted in highlighting the tensions between the Government of Canada and Aboriginal peoples. These were the closure of the religious residential school system, the release of a highly critical study of the social and economic status of Aboriginal Canadians, and the emergence of the first national Aboriginal organization, the National Indian Council of Canada (NIC).²¹ These three events highlighted the shift in the 1960s to a more public discourse on the role of Aboriginal Canadians in the nation.

The Indians of Canada pavilion at Expo 67 was a "private" pavilion which was sponsored by the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs and mounted with the assistance of a group of prominent Aboriginal Canadians. Initially the Canadian Government Pavilion had planned to incorporate the Aboriginal experience as a segment of its exhibit site, but due to pressure from NIC and other governmental concerns, the decision was taken for a separate pavilion. The chosen site for this pavilion was at the opposing side of Ile Notre Dame from the Quebec Pavilion. Again, similar to the

placement of the Quebec Pavilion, the Indians of Canada Pavilion was located at the end of the arc of the Canadian compound, separated from the Canadian Government Pavilion by the Atlantic Provinces, and beside the United Nations and the Christian Pavilions. As a 'private' pavilion, the Indians of Canada were placed in an ambiguous relationship with the other 'official' Canadian spaces. Perhaps because Aboriginal Canadians did not represent any one territorial area within Canada, they were left outside of the official Canadian compound despite the fact that the Pavilion's funding and oversight came from a federal government department. Thus Aboriginal Canadians were then presented outside of the official Canadian national narrative. This was one fundamental way that this Pavilion was not only a conflicting other space within the larger heterotopia of Expo 67, but it demonstrated how this Pavilion could also be viewed as its own heterotopia.

Fig.9 – The Indians of Canada Pavilion²²

The Pavilion structures and contents were striking. There were three external structural features that set apart the Indians of Canada Pavilion from all others; exterior

murals, a totem pole, and the central building which was designed to replicate a tepee. Similar to other pavilions, the display of fine artwork was a central means of articulating culture for the Indians of Canada Pavilion. Unlike these other pavilions though, the artwork was presented on the external structures of the site rather than inside in a gallery. Large murals by Aboriginal artists like George Clutesi and Norval Morrisseau decorated the external walls of the pavilion buildings.²³ A 65-foot totem pole carved by Henry and Tony Hunt was a central symbol on the pavilion site. Since there was to be only one totem pole on site, the carvers decided that rather than trace the tale of one lineage, this pole would incorporate symbols from a variety of native communities in Canada. The murals and the totem demonstrated the layering of time within this space. Both were traditional aboriginal symbols presented in a contemporary manner used to portray a sense of continuity between early generations and modern Aboriginal peoples. The representation of the many different Canadian Aboriginal groups in the one exhibit and symbolically on the single totem pole extended the way that this Pavilion could be viewed as a heterotopia. The exhibition building was designed to replicate a large tepee, which was supported by the different exhibit halls all connected at their roofs. The Indians of Canada Pavilion reflected continuity with the tent-like structures of the Canadian Government and Ontario Pavilions, and the vibrant and celebratory exterior was in direct contrast to the austerity of the Quebec Pavilion.

The narrative within the Indians of Canada Pavilion was highly controversial as it blatantly opposed those images of Aboriginal Canadians presented in any of the other spaces at Expo. The images that emerged from this Pavilion were more powerful because of the veritable lack of representation of Aboriginal Canadians in the other

Pavilions. As noted earlier, both the Canadian Government and Quebec Pavilions made fleeting reference to early Aboriginal groups in Canada, but neither offered a look at the contemporary life of natives in their respective pavilions. Like those of the Canadian Government Pavilion and the Quebec Pavilion, the narrative of the Indians of Canada Pavilion depicted the progression of life in Canada following the arrival of European settlers. Richard Gordon Kicksee provides an apt description of the overall theme of this pavilion,

Its displays depicted Amerindian experiences with modernity as a tragedy, presenting a sombre story of how contact with European civilization had displaced or destroyed much of traditional Amerindian cultural ways of life. The contemporary poverty and social alienation of many Amerindians was also illustrated through texts and photographs calculated to dispel mythical images of “Indians” as noble savages or a “disappearing race”.²⁴

The inversion of the myths of modernity which was a central point of continuity in the international exhibition was a very successful effect to shock the visitor into viewing the world, and particularly Canada in a different way. There was a series of exhibit spaces within the pavilion which recounted this narrative. The first exhibit space called the Ancestral Land detailed the relationship between native peoples and their natural environment. This established some connection back to the other two Pavilions and the general theme of Expo. However, these images rejected the view of ‘Man’s’ dominance of nature and instead presented a sense of the need to coexist with nature. The next exhibit space was called the Awakening of the People which aimed to demonstrate the diversity of aboriginal communities in Canada.²⁵ Here the display attempted to challenge the traditional native stereotype of an ‘Indian’ type as had been witnessed at previous exhibitions.

The central area of the pavilion was called the Drum, which was composed of the five exhibition areas beneath the tepee. Here again was a historical presentation of human settlement in Canada like those found in the Canadian Government and Quebec Pavilions. This was the area where the relationship between native peoples and European settlers was recounted. The first area demonstrated the arrival of the Europeans where the relationship was depicted through the display of items of trade between the two cultures, for example, furs and beads. The second area recounted the transformation of aboriginal life in the nineteenth century as the European settlements expanded. The focus was on native involvement in disputes between French and British settlers and treaty rights. The third area demonstrated the relationship between Christian missionaries and native peoples. The emphasis here was on demonstrating that there was spirituality in native culture prior to the arrival of the missionaries. "Long before they came, we had already talked with God, who we called the Great Spirit, after our fashion. We lived as brothers and we saw the Spirit present in every living thing."²⁶

The fourth area focused on the relationship between "The Government and the Indians." This part of the Pavilion directly confronted the slogan of unity in diversity found in the Canadian Government Pavilion. Throughout the displays, examples were presented of the efforts of the Canadian government to assimilate Aboriginal communities into Euro-Canadian society. Maps provided by the Government of Canada were displayed at the opening of this area. The identification of national, provincial and other territorial borders was set in opposition to the traditional patterns of settlement for Aboriginal communities. The focus then moved to a presentation of the reserve as the last vestige of native land. Finally this section presented a conflicting image of modern

Aboriginal people. On the one hand, images were presented of native people working as professional within Canadian society, for example as teachers and as nurses. Yet the final image in this area is of a 'modern' native family: an "impoverished family, faced the viewer as a stark reminder that some native peoples face desperate circumstances."²⁷ The final area of the central exhibit was dedicated to the Aboriginal child in the educational system. It was here that the narrative articulated the fundamental cultural differences between these two communities. The exhibit was set out as a pictorial storyline which contrasted between the experiences of a 'white' Canadian child versus that of an Aboriginal child, concluding with the assertion that the government education system was an alien environment for the Aboriginal child. A similarity can be drawn between this description of the loss of culture with the Quebec Pavilion's description of the need to preserve and honour French language and culture. Both are presented as threatened in relation to the ubiquity of English in Canada. Yet, the Aboriginal loss of culture occurred not only at the hands of English Canada but also in Quebec. The final exhibition area of the pavilion, the Future Area, was a communal space with a symbolic campfire in the center of a seating area. The visitor was asked to sit and contemplate what he or she had just seen and to bring forward that knowledge into his or her future life.

Public response to this pavilion was mixed. Aboriginal people from Canada and the United States lauded the messages displayed in the exhibitions. Buffy Sainte-Marie reportedly said that she was not surprised if visitors to the Pavilion were shocked, and would not mind if it shocked them even more. She said that the Pavilion was "more serious than most pavilions, its' like a classroom, but that's what's needed."²⁸ John

Belindo, the leader of the National Congress of American Indians was greatly impressed by the Pavilion and stated that it would act as the model for displays mounted by American Indians at future events.²⁹ The introductory text of the Indians of Canada section of *The Memorial Album* was very defensive about the messages of this Pavilion, it stated:

The Indians of Canada introduce their exhibit with an accusation addressed to their fellow countrymen. "You have stolen our native land, our culture, our soul... and yet, our traditions deserve to be appreciated, and those derived from age-old harmony with nature even merit being adopted by you."³⁰

The Indians of Canada Pavilion was a controversial exhibit at Expo 67 because it presented a critical perspective of Canadian life. This Pavilion was successful in demonstrating that despite funding from the federal government, the narrative was one that shattered the myths of unity in diversity that the Canadian Government had hoped to portray. The narrative was also successful in presenting an odd sort of commonality between the Canadian Government's images of identity and those of Quebec's. It did so by highlighting that the assimilative practises that undermined Aboriginal culture could be found in the actions of both groups. Within this narrative, a blending of the real and the representational occurred. The designers of the Pavilion adopted symbols of their past and those ideal images of Aboriginal life as used in other pavilions to counter idealized representations with real displays depicting the poverty and cultural starvation of Aboriginal peoples in modern Canada.

The collision of the three narratives of national identity within the Canadian compound at Expo 67 provided strong examples of how conflicting parts of society come together within a heterotopia to shatter old myths and create new symbols. Significant symbols that emerged from this meshing of narratives were those of a multicultural,

bilingual, urban nation that continues to struggle with defining itself in real terms. As much as the vast wilderness was an inescapable feature of Canada, the focus of the nationalist discourse in Canada after Expo 67 shifted to a difficult balancing of multiple identities, whether linguistic, cultural, ethnic, territorial or political, within this one expansive place. Expo communicated these new symbols of Canada not only to Canadians but to the international community.

Notes

---

¹ Pierre Berton, "Terres des Hommes" *The Last Good Year: 1967* (Toronto: Doubleday Canada Limited, 1997): 279.

² "Canada Pavilion," *The Memorial Album of the First Category Universal and International Exhibition held in Montreal from the Twenty-seventh of April to the Twenty-ninth of October Nineteen Hundred and Sixty-seven* (Montreal: Thomas Nelson and Sons Limited, 1968): 109.

³ "Canada Pavilion" *The Memorial Album* 117.

⁴ Robin Bush, "the Land and the Growth," *Canadian Government Pavilion: My Home, My Native Land: A People, their Land, Their Growth* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967): 3.

⁵ Bush 7.

⁶ Bush 11.

⁷ Bush 13.

⁸ See "Canada: Host to the World," *Expo '67: Official Guide* (Toronto: Maclean-Hunter, 1967): 89.

⁹ Jeffrey Stanton, *Expo 67 - Montreal World's Fair* (<http://naid.sppsr.ucla.edu/expo67>).

¹⁰ Lacoste 25.

¹¹ The root problems discussed here are taken from Norbert Lacoste, "The People Tree" *My Home, My Native Land: A People, Their Land, Their Growth* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967): 19-26.

¹² For more details about the construction of Katimavik see "Katimavik," *Expo Journal*, 1, no.3, (Nov. 28, 1964): 6-7; and James Acland, "Expo: The Canadian Buildings," *ArtsCanada*, 24, no.108, (May 1967): 4-11.

¹³ The Quiet Revolution is commonly believed to have begun with the successful election of Jean Lesage and the Liberal Party in 1960 following their promises to modernize Quebec. Lesage's election was a formalized demonstration of the transformation that was already underway in the social, economic and cultural spheres of Quebec society. The fundamental changes were the transference of the social authority of the Catholic church over education and health care to the provincial government; an attempt to establish a level of economic equity within Quebec society; and the recognition of the diminishing role of French language and culture within a modern society which was slowly becoming dominated by English. These changes were implemented in the interest

---

of reversing what had long been viewed as the “internal colonialism” of English Canada over Quebec.

Despite the changes instigated by the Lesage government, there was still an increased demand within a growing segment of the Quebec population for a separatist movement. This began with the emergence of organizations like the Rassemblement pour L’indépendance Nationale (RIN) and Le Front de la Libération du Québec (FLQ). The separatist movement gained political legitimacy with the founding of Parti Québécois in 1968.

¹⁴ As quoted in Fulford 30.

¹⁵ Pierre Berton, “Terres des Hommes” *The Last Good Year: 1967* (Toronto: Doubleday Canada Limited, 1997): 269.

¹⁶ Canada, National Archives of Canada, RG 71/11/4, *The Expo 67 Story*, vol. 1 (April 27-July 31, 1967): 50.

¹⁷ For a detailed account of de Gaulle’s visit, the speech, and the Canadian response see Berton 300-312.

¹⁸ Stanton <http://naid.sppsr.ucla.edu/expo67/map-docs/quebec.htm>.

¹⁹ “Quebec Pavilion” *The Memorial Album* 126.

²⁰ “Quebec Pavilion” *The Memorial Album*, 126-130.

²¹ Richard Gordon Kicksee, “Contested Liberal Commonsense and the Negotiation of Indian Participation in the Canadian Centennial Celebrations and Expo’67” M.A. Thesis (Queen’s University, 1996): 35-45.

²² Stanton <http://naid.sppsr.ucla.edu/expo67/map-docs/indianscanada.htm> .

²³ For a detailed discussion of the aboriginal art on display at Expo, see Sherry Brydon, “The Indians of Canada Pavilion at Expo 67,” *American Indian Art Magazine* (Summer 1997): 55-63.

²⁴ Kicksee 155.

²⁵ Brydon 59.

²⁶ *The Memorial Album* 121.

²⁷ Brydon 60.

---

²⁸ Canada, National Archives of Canada, RG 71/11/4, *The Expo 67 Story*, vol. 1 (April 27-July 31, 1967): 33-4.

²⁹ *The Expo Story* 16.

³⁰ "Indian of Canada," *The Memorial Album* 118.

Conclusion

The discussion in this thesis relating to international exhibitions and nationalism aimed to demonstrate that the relationship between these two modern institutions should be understood as an example of the functioning of a heterotopic medium. International exhibitions are clear examples of a heterotopia as they are real places in society that bring together different objects, people and ideas. This type of place is where the processes of social transformation occur through the collision of these different things. They are spaces in between the centers and margins and the real and representational. As these spaces in between, international exhibitions shatter the old myths about social order and replace them with new symbols which compete to communicate a new way of making sense of a changing society. The transformation of the medium of the international exhibition throughout its history demonstrates how this space is influenced and altered by the different processes of social change that merge together within it.

One of the central discourses that has been reflected within international exhibitions throughout their history is nationalism. Different nationalist narratives have collided within the international exhibitions through their history. In the Victoria era, competing ideas of imperial superiority were displayed. In the inter-war period, a more dramatic competition between nations emerged as a significant point of tension outside of exhibitions, yet this competition was also reflected actively in the numerous expansive national pavilions, whether American or German, mounted at international exhibitions. In the post-war era, the competition between nations continued, yet there were a far greater number of countries that chose to display themselves at exhibitions. A central

---

underlying utopian theme seemed to inform the exhibitions in this era, this was the theme of a common sense of humanity which attempted to undercut other ideological characteristics that marked the separation between the West and the Soviet Bloc. It was also during this era of exhibitions when those newly emerging former colonial nations displayed their own narratives of national identity in opposition to the old myths of empire which were deeply rooted in the international exhibition tradition.

Despite the numerous competing narratives of nationalism that were presented at international exhibitions, the host nation was often faced with a more complex challenge in articulating its self-image. This was the case for Canada as host of Expo 67 where a number of different groups within the national population presented competing visions of identity. These were on display both within the exhibition site and outside its walls. The Canadian government, which had tightly controlled the images of the nation that were presented at previous international exhibitions, was faced with the opportunity and the challenge of blending competing narratives of identity within the grounds of Expo 67. This event had many diverse elements to it, including vastly different architectural styles that were used by those nations hosting pavilions. A sense of unity was constructed to make sense of the many diverse spaces through the imposition of a general theme and through the location and design of the Expo site itself. The general theme of "Man and his World" was represented in all of the pavilions in one way or another on the Expo site, whether through the theme pavilions which were found scattered through the two islands and the Pier, or in the national and private pavilions.

The decision to construct two new islands in the St. Lawrence as the site for Expo 67 was a very important element in understanding this exhibition as a heterotopia. As a

result of these new spaces, it was very much a place outside all others in society. The construction of the exhibition site also allowed the planners of the exhibition to use physical features like water as a way to reinforce the sense of unity required to make sense of the diverse images presented in this one space. The theme and site of Expo were two examples of how this was a heterotopic space. The theme layered different historical periods into a general theme which was to unify all the pavilions on the site. The site itself was heterotopic because it was a space outside of all other. The design of the space simultaneously assisted in providing unity to the exhibition and it was also important in presenting Expo as a space in between. It did this through the deliberate emphasis on the decentring of main pavilions on the site, therefore blurring the division between center and margins.

Despite the success in imposing a sense of unity through the theme and site design at Expo, the Canadian Government was not able to control the competing narratives of national identity found in the compound of Canadian pavilions. Here three central narratives stood out in opposition to one another. These were found in the Canadian Government Pavilion, the Quebec Pavilion, and the Indians of Canada Pavilion. The federal government relied on well trodden older images of Canada in its pavilion. Those longstanding images of wilderness, resourcefulness and a new and practical population were presented as comforting symbols of self-definition. There was recognition of shifting images of Canadian identity, but these were articulated more as problems to be overcome rather than new symbols to assist in making sense of the changing realities in Canada. Despite the characterization of these new symbols as problems, they have emerged since Expo as the new myths which define the nation. The four root problems

of the People Tree at Expo 67 were biculturalism, ethnic diversity, urbanization and technological transformation. These four notions now inform the federal government's image of Canada as a bilingual, multicultural, urban nation which has harnessed the benefits of the information society.

The Quebec Pavilion was designed to appear apart from the other official Canadian exhibits. The architectural design was completely different from the neighbouring Canadian and Ontario pavilions, and its placement on a platform in the water off in Regatta Lake only reinforced its separation from other pavilions around it. The narrative presented within the Pavilion building was of a serious image of an ideal Quebec society, unique in its historical longevity, cultural uniformity, and continued relationship with France. The emphasis on ethnic continuity and cultural uniformity presented within the Quebec Pavilion was in direct contrast to the slogan promoted by the Canadian Government Pavilion, which was unity in diversity. The symbols presented within the Quebec Pavilion were clear and unapologetic and they are the same ones that have continued to be used by provincial political leaders since Expo 67.

The Indians of Canada Pavilion was the third in the series of significantly oppositional narratives of Canadian identity. This exhibit exemplified the place that Aboriginal Canadians inhabit outside of the official Canadian discourse. Through the use of traditional symbols such as the totem pole, the exhibit demonstrated the continuity of Aboriginal peoples from those idealized representations found in the historical accounts of the other two pavilions and the modern Aboriginal Canadian. The narrative in this pavilion squarely rejected the idealized image of the noble savage and in its place articulated a troubling series of symbols about how Aboriginal peoples in Canada have

been left outside. The critical images presented here provided an odd unity between French and English Canada as there was no distinction made between the harmful ways either group had related with Aboriginal peoples. The pavilion narrative rejected the idealized slogan of unity in diversity, and in its stead presented real images of assimilation of Aboriginal Canadians by Euro-Canadian communities. This dramatic critique of Canadian life was the marker of the beginning of a long and continuing struggle for Aboriginal peoples in Canada. Although some progress has been made in healing some of the wounds inflicted in the centuries of this relationship, the process is very slow.

Expo 67 was both a coming out and coming of age for Canada. It stands as an important marker in Canadian history where new symbols of identity were communicated to a broader audience. Expo was successful in communicating the fact that significant processes of transformation were occurring within Canadian society. Expo was a real place, which provides a unity in meaning for the collision of these different processes, creating new symbols for Canadians to use in their self-definition. Many new symbols that emerged out of Expo have now become founding myths about how we define the nation. This definition is not fixed, and like the open-ended concluding statement in the Canadian Government Pavilion at Expo 67, Canada is a fragile concept that brings together complex and competing identities in the process of nation-building.

Bibliography

Acland, Charles. "IMAX Technology and the Tourist Gaze." *Cultural Studies*, 12, no.3, (1998): 429-445.

Acland, James. "Expo: The Space Frame Fair." *ArtsCanada* 24, no.107, (April 1967): 4-8.

_____, "Expo: The Canadian Buildings." *ArtsCanada* 24, no.108, (May 1967): 4-11.

Ahlbäck, Pia Maria "The Road to Industrial Heterotopia: Landscape, Technology, and George Orwell's Travelogue *The Road to Wigan Pier*." *Technologies of Landscape: From Reaping to Recycling*. Ed. David E. Nye. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999. 254-266.

Allwood, John . *The Great Exhibitions*. London: Studio Vista, 1977.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. Rev. ed. London: Verso, 1991.

Babe, Robert. *Canadian Communication Thought: Ten Foundational Writers*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.

Benjamin, Walter. *The Arcades Project*. Cambridge: Bell Knapp Press of Harvard University Press, 1999.

Benedict, Burton. "International Exhibitions and National Identity." *Anthropology Today*, 7, no.3. (1991): 5-9.

_____. "Rituals of Representation: Ethnic Stereotypes and Colonized Peoples at World's Fairs." *Fair Representations: World's Fair and the Modern World*. Ed. Robert W. Rydell and Nancy E. Gwinn. Amsterdam: VU University Press, (1994): 28-62.

Bennett, Tony. *The Birth of the Museum*. London & New York: Routledge, 1995.

Benoit, G.R. and Fernand Seguin. *Expo '67 Development of the Theme "Man and His World"*. Rev. ed. National Archives of Canada, RG 71/139/5, (May 25, 1964).

Berton, Pierre. "Terres des Hommes." *The Last Good Year: 1967*. Toronto: Doubleday Canada Limited (1997): 255-312.

Breckenridge, Carol A. "The Aesthetics and Politics of Colonial Collecting: India at World Fairs." *Society for Comparative Study of Society and History*, 31, no.2, (1989): 195-216.

Brecknell Turner, Benjamin. *Crystal Palace, Hyde Park, 1852, Transept*. Albumen print from calotype negative. London: Victoria and Albert Museum (1852).

Bruemmer, Fred. "Expo 67: Man in the Community." *Canadian Geographical Journal*, 74, no.6, (1967):180-99.

Bruner, M. Lane. *Strategies of Remembrance: The Rhetorical Dimensions of National Identity Construction*. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 2002.

Bureau International des Exposition. www.bie-paris.org

Bush, Robin. "the Land and the Growth." *Canadian Government Pavilion: My Home, My Native Land: A People, their Land, Their Growth*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer (1967): 3-18.

Calhoun, Craig. *Nationalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Canada. National Archives of Canada. *Expo 67: Virtual Tour*.
http://www.archives.ca/05/0533/053301_e.html

Canada. National Archives of Canada, RG 71/11/4. *The Expo 67 Story*. vol. 1, April 27-July 31, 1967.

_____, RG 71/11/13, *Theme Pavilions*, n/d.

_____, RG 71/13/13. *Man in the Community*. n/d

_____, RG 71/184/1 pt. 1. *Minutes of the Fifth Meeting of the Directors of the Canadian Corporation for the World Exhibition*. April 5, 1963.

_____, RG 71/184/1 pt.2. *Minutes of the Sixth Meeting of the Directors of the Canadian Corporation for the World Exhibition*. April 12, 1963.

_____, RG 71/184/1 pt.3. *Minutes of the Seventh Meeting of the Directors of the Canadian Corporation for the World Exhibition*. April 19, 1963

Canada. *House of Commons Debates. Official Report*. Ses. 1, 25th parl., 11-12, vol. III, 1962-1963.

Canada. Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition. *Annual Report/Rapport annuel*. 6 vol. Montreal: Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition, 1963-68.

_____. Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition. *The Memorial Album of the First Category Universal and International Exhibition held in Montreal from the Twenty-seventh of April to the Twenty-ninth of October Nineteen Hundred and Sixty-seven*. Montreal: Thomas Nelson and Sons Limited, 1968.

_____. Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition. *General report on the 1967 World Exhibition / Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1969.

_____. Canadian Government Pavilion Expo 67. *My Home, My Native Land: A People, Their Land, Their Growth*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967.

Carey, James W. "Harold Adams Innis and Marshall McLuhan." *The Antioch Review*, vol. 27, (1967): 5-39.

Cavell, Richard. *McLuhan in Space: A Cultural Geography*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.

Corbey, Raymond. "Ethnographic Showcases, 1870-1930." *Cultural Anthropology*, 8, no.3 (1993): 338-69.

Crosby, Theo. "Design and Purpose in World Exhibitions." *The Journal of The Royal Society for the encouragement Of Arts Manufactures and Commerce*, 5139, no.116, (1968): 239-257.

Davison, Graeme. "Festivals of Nationhood: The International Exhibitions." *Australian Cultural History*. Ed. S.L. Goldberg and F. B. Smith. Melbourne and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1988): 158-77.

Eco, Umberto. "A Theory of Expositions." *Travels in Hyperreality*. San Diego and New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers, (1986): 291-307.

Fenwick, Rudy. "Social Change and Ethnic Nationalism: An Historical Analysis of the Separatist Movement in Quebec." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 23, no.2, (April 1981): 196-216.

Fiset, Edouard. *Introduction of an Urban Concept in the Planning of the Exposition*. National Archives of Canada, RG 71/13/6, April 12, 1965.

_____. "The Master Plan." *The Memorial Album of the First Category Universal and International Exhibition held in Montreal from the Twenty-seventh of April to the Twenty-ninth of October Nineteen Hundred and Sixty-seven*. Montreal: Thomas Nelson and Sons Limited, (1968): 40-52.

Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage Books, 1970.

_____. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings, 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

_____. "Of Other Spaces" in *Diacritics*, Spring, (1986), 22-27.

Fulford, Robert. *this was expo*. Toronto: McClelland and Steward Limited, 1968.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.

Genocchio, Benjamin. "Discourse, Discontinuity, Difference: The Question of 'Other' Spaces." *Postmodern Cities and Spaces*. Eds. Sophie Watson and Katherine Gibson. Oxford UK & Cambridge, US: Blackwell Publishers Inc. (1995): 35-46.

Gilbert, James. "World's Fairs as Historical Events" *Fair Representations: World's Fairs and the Modern World*. Ed. Robert W. Rydell and Nancy E. Gwinn. Amsterdam: VU University Press (1994): 13-27.

Greenhalgh, Paul. *Ephemeral Vistas: The Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions and World's Fairs, 1851-1939*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.

Grenier, Raymond. *Inside Expo 67*. Trans. Patrick Gossage. Montreal: Les Editions des Hommes, 1965.

Grosswiler, Paul. "The Dialectical Methods of Marshall McLuhan, Marxism, and Critical Theory." *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 21, no.1, (1996): 95-124.

"Habitat" *Architectural Review*, Special Issue (1967): 143-146.

Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1990.

_____. *Spaces of Hope*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000.

_____. "Cosmopolitanism and the Banality of Geographic Evils." *Public Culture*, 12, no.2, (2000): 529-64.

Harvey, Penelope. *Hybrids of Modernity*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Heaman, E.A. *The Inglorious Arts of Peace: Exhibitions in Canadian Society during the Nineteenth Century*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

Hetherington, Kevin. "Identity Formation, Space and Social Centrality." *Theory, Culture & Society*, 13, no.4, (1996): 33-52.

_____. "The Utopics of Social Ordering: Stonehenge as a museum without walls." *Theorizing Museums*. Ed. Sharon Macdonald and Gordon Fyfe. Oxford, UK & Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc. (1996): 153-76.

_____. *The Badlands of Modernity: Heterotopia and Social Ordering*. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

Hobsbawm, E.J. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Innis, Harold A. *Empire and Communication*. Rev. Ed. Victoria and Toronto: Press Porcupine Limited, 1986.

Johnson, James. "Communication, Criticism, and the Postmodern Consensus: An Unfashionable Interpretation of Michel Foucault." *Political Theory*, 25, no.4, (1997): 559-583.

Juteau, Danielle. "The Citizen Makes an Entrée: Redefining the National Community in Quebec." *Citizenship Studies*, 6, no.4, (2002): 441-58.

Kaplan, David H. "Two Nations in Search of a State: Canada's Ambivalent Spatial Identities." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 84, no.4, (1994): 585-606.

"Katimavik." *Expo Journal*. 1, no.3, (November 28, 1964): 6-7.

Kicksee, Richard Gordon "Contested Liberal Commonsense and the Negotiation of Indian Participation in the Canadian Centennial Celebrations and Expo'67". M.A. Thesis. Queen's University, 1996.

Kroker, Arthur. *Technology and the Canadian Mind: Innis/McLuhan/Grant*. Montreal: New World Perspectives, 1985.

Kroller, Eva-Marie. "Canadians at World Exhibitions." *Canadian Travellers in Europe, 1851-1900*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987: 149-65.

_____. "Expo'67: Canada's Camelot?" *Canadian Literature*, Spring/Summer, no. 152-3, (1997): 36-51.

Lanken, Dane. "Remembering the magic of Expo67." *Canadian Geographic*, July/August, (1992): 76-82.

MacKenzie, John M. "The Imperial Exhibitions." *Propaganda and Empire*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, (1984): 96-120.

MacFarquhar, Larissa. "Truth in Architecture: How Moshe Safdie decided what a building should be." *New Yorker* (January 20, 2003): 43-50.

Mandell, Richard D. *Paris 1900: The Great World's Fair*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

McCallum, Pamela. "Walter Benjamin and Marshall McLuhan: Theories of History." *Signature*, 1, (1989): 71-89.

McLuhan, H. Marshall. "Playboy Interview with Marshall McLuhan: A Candid Conversation with the High Priest of Popcult and Metaphysician of the Media." *Canadian Journal of Communication: Special Issues – The Medium's Messenger, Understanding McLuhan*, fall, (1989): 101-37.

_____. *Understanding Media: The Extension of Man*. Rev. ed. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1998.

Milne, Charles C. *Expo '67: Official Guide*. Toronto: Maclean-Hunter, 1967.

Mitchell, Timothy. "The World as Exhibition." *Society for Comparative Study of Society and History*, 31, no.2, (1989): 217-36.

Nelson, Steve. "Walt Disney's EPCOT and the World's Fair Performance Tradition." *The Drama Review*, vol. 30 (1986): 106-46.

Oppenheimer Dean, Andrea. "Evaluation: Habitat A Generation Later." *Architecture*, (October 1986): 52-55.

Philp, Mark. "Foucault on Power: A Problem in Radical Translation?" *Political Theory*, 11, no.1, (1983): 29-52.

Picken, T. *Crystal Palace from the South*. Colour Lithograph. London: Victoria and Albert Museum (n/d).

Reid-Pharr, Robert F. "Disseminating Heterotopia." *African American Review*, 28, no.3, (1994): 347-57.

Roy, Gabrielle. "Reasons for Hope." *Terre des Hommes: Man and his World*. Ottawa: Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition, 1967: 22-34.

Rydell, Robert W. *All The World's A Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

_____. *World of Fairs: The Century-of-Progress Exhibitions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

_____. and Nancy Gwinn ed. *Fair Representations: World's Fairs and the Modern World*. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1994.

Seljak, David. "Why the Quiet Revolution was "Quiet": The Catholic Church's Reaction to the Secularization of Nationalism in Quebec after 1960." *CCHA, Historical Studies*, 62 (1996): 109-124.

Siebers, Tobin ed. *Heterotopia: Postmodern Utopia and the Body Politic*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1994.

Soja, Edward W. "Heterotopologies: A Remembrance of Other Spaces in the Citadel-LA." *Postmodern Cities and Spaces*. Sophie Watson and Katherine Gibson ed. Oxford UK & Cambridge, US: Blackwell Publishers Inc., (1995): 13-34.

Spry, Graham. "Notes on Two Ideas of Nation in Confrontation." *Journal of Contemporary History*, 6, no.1, (1971): 175-96.

Stamps, Judith. *Unthinking Modernity: Innis, McLuhan, and the Frankfurt School*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995.

Stanton, Jeffrey. *Expo 67 - Montreal World's Fair*.
<http://naid.sppsr.ucla.edu/expo67/index.html> (August 8, 2000)

Susman, Warren I. "Culture and Communications." *Culture as History: The Transformation of American Society in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Pantheon Books, (1984): 252-270.

Taylor, Charles "Foucault on Freedom and Truth." *Political Theory*, 12, no.2, (1984): 152-183.

Teyssot, George "Heterotopia and the History of Spaces." *Architecture and Urbanism*, 121, (1980): 79-100.

Theall, Donald F. "Unique Art Form." *ArtsCanada* 24, no.107, (April 1967): 3.

"The Quebec Pavilion to Rise from the Water." *Expo Journal*. 2, no.6, (July 1965): 6-7.

Thomson, Dale C. "De Gaulle and Quebec's Quiet Revolution". *Vive le Quebec Libre*. Toronto: Deneau Publishers, 1988.

Tonnies, Ferdinand. *Community and Society (Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft)*. Trans. Charles P. Loomis. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1957.

Yengoyan, Aram A. "Culture, Ideology and World's Fairs: Colonizers and Colonized in Comparative Perspectives." *Fair Representations: World's Fairs and the Modern World*. Eds. Robert W. Rydell and Nancy E. Gwinn (1994): 62-83.

Zimmerman, Lawrence G. "World of Fairs: 1851-1976" *Progressive Architecture*, 55, no.8, (1974): 64-73.