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Abstract

This thesis explores central issues of heritage management through frameworks of place identity, collective memory, as well as heritage and information studies to investigate the following two questions: How is the connection between a community and a built space shaped by heritage designation? Which community members, whether individuals or groups, are involved in the production of heritage information, how is that information selected, codified, communicated, and otherwise promoted through heritage management systems including planning and conservation policy frameworks?

A case analysis of the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse provides a means of examining the social processes involved in heritage management and designation as they relate to community engagement and urban development. Through analysis of archival materials from the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse Foundation and Little Trinity Church Archives, this study found evidence of communication trends, interests and motivations of individuals and groups, as well as differences in the representation of Schoolhouse narratives.
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1.1: Introduction:

Notions of heritage, in particular the management and ownership of narratives and identity connected to both the past and present, are central to contemporary discourses of heritage planning and interpretation. Examinations of dominant heritage discourses, undertaken by researchers within the fields of heritage and cultural studies, urban planning, and geography have demonstrated how heritage sites and artifacts are often “co-opted by elite interests,” (While and Short, 2011, p.4) to support particular place-making, urban redevelopment, and gentrification strategies (Bianchini, 1990; Graham et al. 2000; Garcia, 2004; Jenkins, 2005; Peck, 2005; While and Short, 2011). In the past two decades alone, major shifts in culture and heritage policy, spurred in part by global economic competition (Garcia, 2004; Jenkins, 2005; Olsson, 2008; Zukin, 1982), have led to the adoption of an instrumental view of heritage as an economic resource, which has been linked to a wide scale redevelopment and revitalization of heritage landscapes within urban centers throughout Europe and North America (Tweed and Sutherland, 2007; Bianchini, 1990).

What has been less intensively studied, according to While and Short (2011), is the “relationship between place identity and debates about what should be conserved” (p.4). Their contribution to this stream of research provides insight into the processes by which place narratives, defined as heritage narratives linked to specific sites and/or places, are incorporated into heritage planning and regulatory decisions, through an analysis of post war heritage in the City of Manchester, England (While and Short, 2011). This research study intends to build on place narrative discourse by examining the production and selection of heritage information by local heritage and community actors. Until now, heritage information has been primarily referred to and investigated through computer and library sciences discourse as a matter of retrieval and database design (Koolen et al. 2009; Soler et al. 2013). Within this study however, the concept is redefined as a product of social processes connected to place and people.
This study explores central issues of heritage management through frameworks of place identity, collective memory, as well as heritage and information studies to investigate the following two questions: 1. How is the connection between a community and a built space shaped by heritage designation? 2. Which community members, whether individuals or groups, are involved in the production of heritage information and how is that information selected, codified, communicated, and otherwise promoted through heritage management systems including planning and conservation policy frameworks? These questions are explored further through the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse (ETS), which provides a compelling case through which to examine the social processes involved in heritage management and designation as they relate to community engagement and urban development. Examining what information related to the ETS was researched, cited, archived, re-represented and communicated to others, illuminates the values, interests, and motivations of community actors participating in heritage management practices. In the case of the Schoolhouse, the site’s easily accessible location, long and varied history of use and adaptation as well as its legacy of community support and governance are aligned with the research questions and objectives of this study.

Located within the City of Toronto’s historic Corktown neighbourhood, the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse is a small heritage site. The original, one-room structure, known as the Trinity Street School, was built in 1848 by wealthy philanthropist and businessman Enoch Turner on land provided by the Little Trinity Church. Today, the site consists of a one-story redbrick building (Gothic Revival design) with an extension on its west side that was added in 1869.
As the city’s first free school (socialized education through taxation as today), it was intended to serve the neighbourhood’s large demographic of urban poor. During both the Second Boer War and WWI, the schoolhouse was converted to a recruitment center and then later it became a soup kitchen during the Great Depression. By the 1960’s, the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse had fallen into disrepair and was at risk of demolition, before being preserved by local citizens and church members, who established the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse Foundation (ETSF) to raise funds for its ongoing maintenance and protection. During the redevelopment of the building, the site was formally renamed as the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse, and after extensive renovations, it was reopened as a living history museum. The Schoolhouse received a heritage plaque in 1970 from the Historic Sites Board and was later designated as a heritage building under the Ontario Heritage Act in 2000 (“History of the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse,” 2015). While site ownership was formally transferred to the Ontario Heritage Trust in 2008, the Foundation, which operates as an independent charitable organization, has remained an active supporter and is still involved in programming at the site (“Enoch Turner Schoolhouse,” 2015). Present day management of the Schoolhouse is the responsibility of the Ontario Heritage Trust, which owns and maintains the property’s physical structures, while the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse Foundation participates in aspects of educational programming as well as a number of heritage events held at the schoolhouse. A historical background of the ETS and LTC is provided in Chapter 4 to allow for
greater insight into the schoolhouse - moving this study beyond an examination of policy to a deeper understanding of place identity and heritage processes.

1.2: Theoretical Framework: A Review of Place Identity and Collective Memory Frameworks as well as the Concept of Heritage Information and Heritage Policy Discourse

Place identity and collective memory provide the conceptual framework for this study through which observations about heritage narrative development and practices are explored. The notion of identity, and in particular place identity, has become increasingly cited in both heritage and urban studies as an argument for heritage conservation. However, these interpretations have traditionally lacked a clear theoretical base, resulting in narrow understandings (Waterton and Smith, 2010; Tilley, 2006). Place identity, a framework central to this research project, is largely defined as the incorporation of place by an individual into a larger concept of self (Hauge, 2004; Hauge and Jenkins, 2005; Proshansky, Fabian and Kaminoff, 1983). Within this meaning, the environment-person relationship is both variable and interactive (Hauge, 2004; Gifford, 2002; Millar, 2006). It is understood however, that place identity is not a separate unit of identity concerned only with space, but rather as Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996) have suggested, “All aspects of identity will, to a greater or lesser extent, have place-related implications” (p.206). As such, Breakwell’s revised model of identity, as outlined by Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996), conceptualizes identity as being developed as an individual comes in contact with the social world over time and provides a framework for understanding the multiple ways in which place can be integrated into one’s sense of self (Twigger-Ross and Uzzell, 1996). As such, place narratives, the stories connected to place, allow people to express this sense of self. Place and function are understood as connected within this study and the notion of a place for activity is important for understanding how peoples’ interaction with built spaces become part of their place and heritage narratives. In the context of the ETS, the place and heritage narratives that become most prominent are those of education. Equally important for this exploration is the conceptualization of memory as social and collective. From this perspective, collective or social memory is defined as a socially constructed practice that draws on a common context to remember or recreate the past (Closer, 1992). The social nature of memory is revisited in greater detail in Chapter 2.
Definitions of cultural heritage have undergone a perceivable shift over the past three decades from rather narrow conceptions based largely on material or physical attributes of the historical layers exhibited in artifacts and architecture, to more inclusive understandings that incorporate associative values that often reflect both cultural and regional diversity (Araoz, 2008; Cameron, 2008; Jerome, 2008). Moreover, theoretical debates within cultural heritage studies such as those relating to identity and to the nature of heritage itself, have provided a more nuanced articulation of the term heritage, which is often applied within heritage management contexts to refer to built space, landscapes or archeological sites (Waterton and Watson, 2013). As such, the present study incorporates this richer conceptualization of heritage as a social practice, one that participates in the “construction and regulation of a range of values and understandings” (Smith, 2006, p.11). In this context, the conservation and promotion of heritage involves the selection and interpretation of aspects of the past to support contemporary interests (Arantes, 2007; While and Short, 2011; Graham et al. 2000). Evidence of this selectivity is visible in many urban landscapes where built heritage assemblages are most often “heterogeneous, hybrid and multiple” (While and Short, 2011, p.4). A significant body of research has attempted to explore the heritage selection processes at play in these environments to better understand how preservation and interpretation decisions are made, both at a local, municipal level as well as within higher national and international policy frameworks (Arantes, 2007; Bianchini,1990; Gupta et al.1992; Hobson, 2004; Larkham, 1996).

The concept of community is also addressed within this study and is defined as people living in a bounded geographic area or district, and as groups of people who share some common backgrounds, ideas, beliefs, thoughts, and motivations. Using this conceptualization it is possible to explore the intersectionality of community and collective understanding within social environments, with membership to more than one community possible along with a hierarchy of affiliation that is selected by individuals in response to different social interactions and environments (Coser, 1992; Craig, 1990; Olick, 1999; Misztal, 2003; Hedstrom, 2010). However, the complexity of community must also be acknowledged, as there exists a growing critical discourse within heritage studies that problematizes the many generalized and often
unreflexive interpretations of the concept. According to Waterton and Smith (2010), a number of recent scholarly observations within the study of community heritage suggest that communities are far from uniform cultural units, but rather full of conflicting interests and “thick seams of power that structure any given collection of people” (p.8). In this way, notions of community should also be understood as socially constructed, fluid, and inherently connected to the processes of social identity construction (Waterton and Smith, 2010).

Further discussion of the theoretical frameworks used in this research occur in Chapter 2. Next, the goals and methodologies of the research are presented.

1.3: Research Goals

This study seeks to extend academic knowledge on the relationship between place identity and heritage narratives by exploring the local production and reproduction of heritage information. Within this context, heritage information is knowledge about and of historical and cultural resources, objects, sites, and phenomena that is produced through participation in heritage processes. Heritage information can be selected, stored, transmitted and communicated through heritage management practices such as heritage conservation and interpretation.

The objectives of this research study include:

1. To identify local sources of heritage information and heritage information production connected to the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse.

2. To develop an understanding of the link between place identity and heritage narratives at the site level.
These objectives provide a starting point for mapping the life cycle of heritage information and the intersections between heritage information and archival practice. The social processes explored here establish a link between place identity and the development of heritage narratives, which lends insight into the management of community heritage resources, including local museums, archives, and heritage sites. More broadly, this study contributes to the field of information science and critical heritage studies by extending our understanding of the social organization of information and how that organization provides evidence of meaning-making by local community actors.

1.4: Brief Description of Methodology and Analysis

The case analysis utilized archival sources of data, both textual and visual. Since research objectives were focused on exploring social processes involved in the production and management of heritage information, this study looked for evidence of communication trends, focus, and intentions of individuals, groups and institutions as well as differences in communications content. Primary data sources included the archives of the Little Trinity Church and Enoch Turner Schoolhouse Foundation, however, a scan of records from the City of Toronto Archives and the Archives of Ontario was also conducted during the initial stages of research. Archival research focused on a review of operational records including correspondence, board and committee meeting minutes, as well as research and interpretive documents, which pertained to the both the redevelopment/designation of the building and the transfer to and management of the heritage site by the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse Foundation. The collection of archival materials spans nearly 50 years of operations. Document samples were selected based on a chain/snowball sampling technique that began from a randomly selected box of records in each archive, in part, because neither collections were cataloged.

A qualitative, mixed methods approach was used within the study, consisting of critical discourse analysis, archival research, and narrative analysis. Discourse analysis was applied to
textual material to look for patterns of knowledge and social interaction, which reflected power 
dynamics and negotiations of power between different groups and individuals. Within this 
context, social power was conceptualized as a non-absolute form of control, which was dynamic 
and layered. Through an examination of institutional records, public programming documents, 
and ETS narratives reflected in newspaper articles, media releases, and published articles, the 
study identified examples of power in the form of interpretative programming and heritage 
management decisions as well as the construction of the ETS identity that were made by 
members of different social and interest groups. Narrative inquiry or analysis was considered a 
useful tool in this study for exploration of social power within the production of collective 
memory and place-centered heritage narratives. In particular, this study analyzed narrative texts 
as social and cognitive structure through an exploration of plot, themes and coherence of ETS 
stories. Here, narrative texts were defined as stories and/or historical interpretations of the ETS 
and the events and people involved in the site over its lifespan. Research methods are elaborated 
upon in Chapter 3.

1.5: Thesis Overview and Research Contributions

Chapter 5 of this research study explores the selection and formalization of predominant ETS 
heritage narratives, during the redevelopment of the site into a heritage center and living history 
museum, and the integration of these elements into shared memory and identity. The negotiation 
of this collective connection to materiality and locality by groups associated with the Little 
Trinity Church and the ETS Foundation is of particular interest, as was the space formed by the 
ETS museum and heritage site, in which layers of community interaction occurred. The 
influence of heritage narratives on site functionality are also explored through an examination of 
the ETS’s dual role as museum and rental facility. The observations made through this analysis 
contribute to the understanding that heritage, place identity, and collective memory are both 
dynamic and hybrid. They also suggest that these social processes exhibit evidence of underlying 
tensions between heritage management and community layers in which heritage goals and 
community interests do not always coexist easily.
Chapter 6 of this study builds on place narrative discourse by exploring the production and reinterpretation of “heritage information” by local heritage and community stakeholders. The novel adaptation of the term heritage information allows for the application of place identity and collective memory frameworks to the examination of archival records resulting in evidence of the development and maintenance of place within official ETSF and LTC narratives. Resulting observations and analysis of what heritage information was produced through such activities as research and publication, archival acquisition, and heritage interpretive planning and programming enable key insights into the values, interests, and motivations of the actors and discourses involved in heritage development and management at the ETS. The codification of select heritage information through narrative construction and archival practice also provided evidence of the intersectionality of power exhibited and negotiated through the relationships between different community groups that engaged in the ETS heritage site and its archives. The interpretive processes by which heritage information is converted into heritage programming and programming tools such as brochures, articles and instructional materials are examined within this analysis. Here, heritage interpretation is understood broadly as the way in which heritage information is communicated and explained. Gaps and silences within the ETSF and LTC archives, where heritage information is missing, as well as absences of and abridged heritage information within official narratives is also acknowledged within this study. Observations based on this data contributed to a more complete understanding of the prioritization and de-prioritization of certain identities and histories by dominant heritage actors.

Chapter 7 outlines the contributions made by this case analysis of the ETS along with recommendations for future research. Critical heritage discourses have extended the field by challenging assumptions about the selection and validation of heritage within urban regeneration, place-making, and heritage conservation strategies and policy (Graham et al. 2000; While and Short, 2011; Waterton and Smith, 2010). Dynamics of power and social injustice have also been identified and discussed especially in the context of community heritage and interpretive practice (Crooke, 2010; Prangnell et al. 2010). This study contributes to these ongoing debates and discourses by both deepening the understanding of the connection between place identity and heritage narratives as well as by exploring novel research approaches and data pools, namely through an examination of heritage information within systems of heritage management.
Chapter 2
Theoretical Framework: A Review of Place Identity and Collective Memory Frameworks as well as the Concept of Heritage Information, and the Development of Heritage Discourse

2.1: Introduction: Central Frameworks and Concepts

Place identity and collective memory are central frameworks within this study and provide a lens through which observations about heritage narrative development (stories about cultural heritage) and heritage management practices are interpreted. As such, a review of place identity and collective memory, as understood and applied within this study, are extensively explored within this chapter. Place narratives, the stories drawn from and connected to place, are a medium through which place identity becomes expressed and are therefore useful for understanding how place is represented within heritage.

Definitions of cultural heritage have undergone a perceivable shift over the past three decades from rather narrow conceptions based largely on material or physical attributes of the historical layers exhibited in artifacts and architecture, to more inclusive understandings that incorporate associative values that often reflect both cultural and regional diversity (Araoz, 2008; Cameron, 2008; Jerome, 2008). Moreover, theoretical debates within cultural heritage studies such as those relating to identity and to the nature of heritage itself, have provided a more nuanced articulation of the term heritage, which is often applied within heritage management contexts to refer to built space, landscapes or archeological sites (Waterton and Watson, 2013). As such, the present study acknowledges this richer conceptualization of heritage as a social practice, one that participates in the “construction and regulation of a range of values and understandings” (Smith, 2006, 11). In this context, the conservation and promotion of heritage involves the selection and interpretation of aspects of the past to support contemporary interests (Arantes, 2007; While and Short, 2011; Graham et al. 2000). Evidence of this selectivity is visible in many urban
landscapes where built heritage assemblages are most often “heterogeneous, hybrid and multiple” (While and Short, 2011, 4). A significant body of research has attempted to explore the heritage selection processes at play in these environments to better understand how preservation and programming decisions are made, both at a local, municipal level as well as within higher national and international policy frameworks (Arantes, 2007; Bianchini, 1990; Gupta et al.1992; Hobson, 2004; Larkham, 1996). The concept of heritage information is also defined within this chapter and discussed alongside archives and archival practices. The production and reinterpretation of heritage information by local heritage and community actors is explored through the lens of place narrative discourse because it provides evidence of place within ETS narratives produced by both the ETSF and LTC. A review of heritage policy discourse is outlined here as well because it provides context for understanding how ETS heritage narratives and practices were influenced by the external policy frameworks codified by professional heritage associations and government.

2.2: Defining Place Identity, Community, and Social Memory

Equally selective and inherently social are conceptualizations of identity. Central within this study is, the role of place within identity. The epistemological origins of place identity, which are rooted in place-related discourses of environmental psychology, Eco-criticism, and geography, are focused on understanding the meaning and significance of places for those who live in and use those spaces. Theorists such as Hogg and Abrams (1988) propose that social identity is comprised of different social categories, which can become noticeable, depending on the context (Hogg and Abrams, 188; see also Twigger-Ross and Uzzell, 1996). Within this discourse, place identification is a type of social identity that could express the membership of a group of individuals who are defined by location. According to Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996) this position becomes problematic because place identity can be subsumed within the larger framework of social identity rendering it a relatively unimportant variable. Harold Proshanksy (1983 as discussed in Twigger-Ross and Uzzell, 1996), one of the founders of place identity theory, alternatively proposes that place identity is a separate unit of identity, one that is comparable to social identity, but describes an individual’s socialization within the world. While
this understanding repositions place and affords it more influence over the construction of identity, according to Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996), Proshanksy’s work leaves the relationship between social and place identity unclear. Tilley (2006, p. 9) suggests that debates about identity become problematic because of what he calls a “polysemic nature and usage of the concept.” This non-essentialist approach suggests that identity is fleeting and unstable, rendering it difficult to deconstruct (Tilley, 2006). Despite these ongoing debates and complexity of identity as a construct, the notion of place identity has become increasingly cited in both heritage and urban studies as an argument for heritage conservation. However, these interpretations have traditionally lacked a clear theoretical base, resulting in narrow understandings (Waterton and Smith, 2010; Tilley, 2006).

Davis (2007) suggests that debates over whether identity is rooted in geography, locality, or social factors, is less important than understanding the process itself, which he views as dynamic, continuous and social. Within this dynamic view, identity is web-like and the environment-person relationship is both variable and interactive (Hauge, 2004; Gifford, 2002; Millar, 2006; Hall et al, 1996). According to Davis (2007), Mceachern (2007), and Millar (2006), understanding the significance of objects, buildings, and physical locations within the construction of identity and meaning-making first begins with a separation of the notion of “place” from its physicality. Within this discourse, “place” occurs in the mind and transcends objects or physical surroundings. Place is an embodied relationship with the physical world that manifests as a “web of understanding between people and the environment, between people and their neighbours, between people and their history” (Davis, 2007; p. 70). The formation of place becomes a mosaic of past and present traditions, ideas, language, powerful symbols, and physical spaces that intermingle to form identity (Davis, 2007). Understanding how important materiality is to the development of identity, however, remains problematic because it is difficult to quantify the role of objects, buildings, and landscapes in the formation of, or as a repository of identity (whether individual or collective) in comparison to other cultural/social influences (Tilley, 2006; Davis, 2007). Scholarship from the fields of material culture and museum studies have suggested that physical objects, built landscapes, and other forms of materiality serve as mediums or vehicles for exploring and representing social experiences, collective memory and identity (Tilly, 2006). Physical objects or spaces can become what Mceachern (2007) refers to
as “central devices in peoples’ performance of their popular narratives (p. 466)” or “cultural touchstones” as they are described by Davis (2007). In her exploration of memory and identity within the District Six museum of Post-Apartheid South Africa, Mceachern (2007) observed museum participants re-enacting and recreating their memories and experiences through an interactive floor map of the District Six neighbourhood. For these individuals, particular places on the map became focal points for the re-enactments of events and relationships, evoking a sense of community as shared space. According to White (1991) and Mceachern (2007), these stories of the past serve as a strategy for identity construction.

This study follows an integrative approach to the conceptualization of place identity, whereby it is not a separate unit of identity concerned only with space, but rather as Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996, p. 206) have suggested, “All aspects of identity will, to a greater or lesser extent, have place-related implications.” As such, Breakwell’s revised model of identity, as outlined by Twigger-Ross and Uzzell (1996), and which conceptualizes identity as being developed as an individual comes in contact with the social world over time, provides a framework for understanding the multiple ways in which place can be integrated into one’s sense of self (Twigger-Ross and Uzzell, 1996). Place identity, a framework central to this research project, is largely defined as the incorporation of place by an individual into a larger concept of self (Hauge, 2004; Hauge and Jenkins, 2005; Proshansky, Fabian and Kaminoff, 1983).

Within this context, place is also understood as being closely linked to functionality. The notion of a place for activity or meaning-making, i.e. education, museum curatorship, religious service, etc., is central to the exploration of place-related narratives within this research. This connection between place and function implies that places can have more than one place identity and that those identities can be layered and conflicting based on the experiences of various communities occupying shared spaces. Those experiences feed into stories told about places and are therefore represented in the operational records and heritage information produced by groups involved in site management. In the case of the ETS, tensions are observable, because the schoolhouse served more than one function and because the heritage process involved the prioritization of certain functions.
Equally important for this exploration is the conceptualization of social practices of memory. From this perspective, collective or social memory is defined as a socially constructed practice that draws on a common context to remember or recreate the past (Coser, 1992). Much like place identity, collective memory is interactive, dynamic, and created through the lens of present day perspectives, priorities and needs. Within this study individual memory is understood as recreated because the brain fills in informational gaps in recalled events by using what has been learned or is already known about the world (Anastasio et al., 2012). Memories are partially rebuilt each time they are recalled through a process that neuroscientists refer to as “memory consolidation” (Kandel, 2006; Nader, 2003). Collective memory is understood within this research as created because it does not happen within an organ but rather occurs between individuals and is therefore actively formed by people over time. In the context of memory, Huyssen (1994, p.15) suggests that museums, and by extension, historic sites and the objects they contain, “like memory itself, construct the past in the light of the discourses of the present.” For Tilley (2006, p.17), “Senses of self-identity and social identity are bound up with the contingencies and uncertainties of the present, ways in which to relate to an idealized past and an imagined future.” Collective memory is, according to Mistral (2007, p.380), the intentional ordering or “narrative organization” of the past, which can be prompted by physical environments and cultural artifacts. White (1991) and Mceachern (2007) assert that these stories and social rememberings constitute identity, which for Mistral (2007), is where the inherent significance of memory is situated. Pierre Nora’s (1989) exploration of the relationship between memory and history within cultural studies further nuances the concepts of collective and historical memory by exploring the role that lieux de memoire or “places of memory” play in the development and maintenance of collective memory. According to Rothberg (2010), Nora’s conceptualization of collective memory is drawn from Halbwach’s social framework of memory and in particular, the multiplicity of memory, but extends the concept by suggesting that places and objects, both monumental and utilitarian, embody the material, symbolic and functional aspects required to spark and renew collective memory. Within this construct, lieux de memoire are their own “pure signs” (Nora, 1989, p.23) and therefore capable of representing multiple meanings. It is this dynamism, which Nora identifies, that is most significant for this study, as it enables the decoding of social meanings within sites such as the ETS.
Another term which requires further explanation is that of community, which is defined within this study as people living in a bounded geographic area or district, or a group of people who share some common ideas, thoughts and motivations. In this way, it is possible to envision a multi-dimensional layering of community and collective understanding within social environments, with membership to more than one community possible along with a hierarchy of affiliation that is selected by individuals in response to different social interactions and environments (Coser, 1992; Craig, 1990; Olick, 1999; Misztal, 2003; Hedstrom, 2010). The complexity of community must be acknowledged as there exists a growing critical discourse within heritage studies that problematizes the many generalized and often unreflexive interpretations of the concept. According to Waterton and Smith (2010), a number of recent scholarly observations within the study of community heritage suggest that communities are far from uniform cultural units, but rather full of conflicting interests and “thick seams of power that structure any given collection of people” (p.8). According to Watson (2007) contemporary sociological discourse warns that the term is so transient and vague that it has been rendered virtually meaningless. She contends that community should be conceptualized as a form of social identity construction that is relational and dependent in part on the influence of others (Watson, 2007). As such, this study understands notions of community as socially constructed, fluid, and inherently connected to the processes of social identity construction (Waterton and Smith, 2010).

2.3: Heritage Information and Community Archives

This research study examines the production and reinterpretation of heritage information by local heritage and community actors through the lens of place narrative discourse in order to answer the research question outlined in Chapters 1 and 3: who is involved in the production of heritage information at the Schoolhouse and how is that information produced and promoted through heritage management practices? Until now, information related to heritage has been primarily referred to and investigated through computer and library sciences discourse as a matter of
retrieval and database design (Koolen et al. 2009; Soler et al. 2013). More broadly, it has been aligned with the conceptualization of information as “records”, which is connected to archival science discourse as well, often in terms of the management of records that hold cultural value. According to the International Standard on Records Management (ISO15489) and the International Committee on Archives (IAC), a record is defined as information created, retrieved, and maintained as evidence and information by an organization or person in pursuance of legal obligations or in the transaction of business. Within this study however, the concept is refocused as a cultural artifact and product of social processes connected to place and people. Heritage information consists of historical records, data, photographs, artifacts, programming materials, and ephemera that are intentionally collected and archived in order to establish a site and/or event as part of a community’s heritage.

While archives are diverse in terms of size, purpose, and user groups, ranging from large public and for-profit entities to small community archives and personal archives, there are some distinctions between these and heritage information that are outlined here for the purposes of this study. In particular, heritage information is more specific both in terms of its intentionality and temporal elements. Heritage Information is intentionally collected to create and deploy heritage, unlike operational records which are collected and stored for administrative and legal purposes. There is very little distance between user and collector in the case of heritage information, because the actors responsible for gathering information are themselves accessing and using the materials to create meaning and narrative. Heritage information has to work to create narrative and while this information has a purpose, it is not prescriptive, which makes heritage information useful over time. It becomes a resource from which facts and details are selected, combined and recombined in order to maintain, shift, or reinterpret identities and narratives. As such, it is also highly temporal and can change depending on who is creating it. This temporal element is particularly important, especially in relation to use, because once heritage information is no longer actively collected and used, it can become archival in nature, especially if the collection of information is then transitioned to an archival institution or into a more formal archival system, which are generally not required to be time-sensitive. There is also the potential for some heritage information assemblages or materials to be lost or absorbed over time, when they are no longer required to be heritage information. Historically, most archives, with the exception
of local community archives, would not have consciously held or collected things to create narratives, and so in this way, heritage information looks most similar to the small community museums and archives described by scholars such as Moore and Pell.

In this context, heritage information provides evidence of the development and maintenance of place within official ETSF and LTC narratives. What information was researched, cited, archived, and re-represented by stakeholders through heritage interpretive practices, meaning all the ways in which information is communicated to visitors in a heritage setting, during these processes provides insight into the values, interests, and motivations of those involved in heritage management. These actions also provide evidence of intersectional power dynamics and relationships between different community groups engaging with one another in the contact zone created by the ETS heritage site and its archives. Once gathered, heritage information is subject to further selection processes that result in heritage interpretation and educational programming. What information is missing from official narratives is also significant for the purposes of this study, because it may help to explain what discourses and perspectives have been deprioritized.

Schwartz (2006) quotes Richard Schein as stating, “the archive is not an inert and inactive thing, but a coalescence of very real legal and social intention made manifest in the material record” (p.17). As such, the LTC and ETSF archives presented an opportunity to explore and understand the process by which heritage was created and maintained through an exploration of the document deposits found in these local community archives and the representation and interpretation of those records into an official site narrative. For the purpose of examining heritage information and the development of heritage narratives, documents sampled from both the LTC and ETSF archives were grouped into two temporal categories: records associated with the transitional period of the ETS from pre-designated building to designated heritage site (roughly 1968 to 1974) when new narratives about the ETS were being formed; and the post heritage designation years of the ETSF’s management of the Schoolhouse (1974 to 2005) when narratives were being maintained, enriched, and reinterpreted. In order to explore place-making through heritage information and interpretation, the type of records examined within this study
were narrowed to documents collected as a by-product of research conducted on the Schoolhouse, those which were used in the development of place-making and collective memory, and interpretive documents, which were crafted from the archive’s information and chronicled the ETS narrative. What becomes evident through an examination of the ETSF and LTC archives, is that these documents provided both evidence of and a platform form for local community heritage management.

2.4: Development of Heritage Policy and Discourse in Canada

The evolution of heritage and museum policy frameworks and management discourses in Canada provide context for the redevelopment and ongoing heritage decisions made by ETS stakeholders between the late 1960’s and early 1990’s.

In North America, as with Europe, many historic sites, including historic house museums and heritage structures, began as preservation initiatives driven by the desire to connect with and establish, local and regional heritage identity (Inglis, 1971; Killan, 1976; Coleman, 1933; Leon and Piatt, 1990). Early preservation attempts usually focused on the homes of wealthy elites or heroic and patriotic figures (Young, 2007; Coleman, 1933). Killan (1976) suggests that in 19th century Ontario, local historical societies were among the first and primary sources of support for the establishment and preservation of local and regional heritage. The Ontario Historical Society (OHS), founded in 1888 under the title of Pioneer Association of Ontario, became an active supporter and defender of local heritage sites such as Fort York and aggressively lobbied both provincial and municipal governments to preserve them for the nutriment of British/Canadian nationalism, which was perceived to be under threat from both the US as well as cultural assimilation at the hands of continued immigration (Killan, 1976). By the 20th century, as a result of these grassroots preservation initiatives, early staffing at local heritage sites and heritage museums was comprised mainly of enthusiastic volunteers. While the focus, more often than not, was still one of preservation, living history architects such as William
Goodwin and their supporting philanthropists, began to employ costumed guides and craft demonstrators at sites like Colonial Williamsburg in the 1930’s (Leon & Piatt, 1989). These approaches were popular with visitors and provided an influential interpretive framework for historical house and living history museums in the 1950’s and 60’s (Leon & Piatt, 1989). The redevelopment of the ETS, first by Little Trinity Church and later by the ETSF, shares many similarities with these early preservation initiatives, because it too was initiated by local community volunteers, many of whom contributed their time at the site and later participated on its board of governance. ETSF operational records and programming materials indicate that the site operated as living history museum with costumed interpreters. Such activities facilitated nostalgic connections to place and materiality through recreated environments and simulated activities, which was in keeping with this aforementioned mid-20th century interpretive framework.

As described in a Ministry of Culture and Communications brochure from 1990, in Ontario, as with much of Canada, cultural conservation at the government level began as a means of solidifying a national identity distinct from that of the United States and to foster national unity. Among the government’s first preservation efforts was the provision for a monument to General Isaac Brock at Queenston Heights after the War of 1812. Similar to the United States, later 19th and early 20th century preservation initiatives included nature as heritage, such as the establishment of Alan Gardens in 1864 by the municipal government and Algonquin Park in 1893 by the province of Ontario, reflected the growing recognition that natural resources and landscapes were integral to the development of Canada’s identity (Ministry of Culture and Communication, 1990; Parks Canada, 2003).

By the mid-20th century, large national and international associations committed to cultural heritage protection and the profession as a whole also influenced the development of heritage preservation policy and heritage management discourses at the local and provincial level. In the 1930’s Sir Henry Miers, president of the British Museums Association, conducted a survey of Canadian museums and through his report, identified a number of challenges including a lack of professional training, conservation and standards of practice
In 1947 representatives from 13 Canadian museums established the Canadian Museum Association to address issues such as training, professionalism, galleries and sites of historical significance, curation and exhibition of artifacts, as well as membership requirements.

Just a year before the birth of the CMA, the International Council of Museums was established (“The Genesis of the CMA,” 2015). Within the first two decades, the organization highlighted three main concerns which consisted of the educational role of museums, exhibitions, and the international circulation of cultural goods (“The Genesis of the CMA,” 2015). Through membership and grants, these organizations began to influence cultural heritage practices and management philosophy. The role that grant funding policy played in shaping heritage management practices within the ETS is explored further in chapter 5. Also in the 1950’s, the Province of Ontario established the Archaeological and Historic Sites Board as the agency responsible for protecting and promoting built, natural and cultural heritage. One of its earliest and most recognizable programs was the Provincial Plaque Program, which has since resulted in over 1,200 blue and gold signs outlining the history and cultural significance of heritage sites for the public (Ministry of Culture and Communication, 1990). The Board was incorporated and renamed as the Ontario Heritage Foundation in 1968, and renamed again in 2005 as the Ontario Heritage Trust. Despite these changes, its central function since 1975 has been to serve as registrar for all properties and districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, act as a subject matter expert and to advise the Crown on the provincial significance of heritage properties, and to advocate for conservation standards (“Heritage Act,” 2015). The Act itself was designed as the Province’s legislative framework through which municipal and provincial government could preserve heritage properties and archaeological sites. For the LTC, it’s Restoration and Fundraising Committees, and the ETSF, aligning the site’s function and mandate with that of Ontario’s cultural heritage industries, translated into a professional engagement with local and provincial discourse and policy frameworks that were also connected to international developments in Europe and the United States.
The 1970’s and 1980’s saw an increase in the number of trained museum professionals and historians occupying positions within house and living history museums. On an international level, UNESCO convened the first international convention on the protection of world cultural and natural heritage in 1972 and established a number of criteria for determining the value of cultural resources (“UNESCO Milestones,” 2015). UNESCO’s early policies focused primarily on tangible aspects of the built environment, with a special emphasis on monumental architecture (Cameron, 2008). In Canada, that valuation became linked to a positivist framework of research and evidence-gathering to demonstrate a site’s character-defining elements, as defined by professionals from within the fields of heritage management or museology (Parks Canada, 2003). When the Province’s Ministry of Culture and Communications began a heritage policy review in 1987 to update the Ontario Heritage Act, it cited both UNESCO’s policy recommendations and those of the World Commission on Environment and Development in its strategy report published in 1990. Operational records and Heritage Information Objects reviewed in chapters 5 and 6 of this study, illuminate the emphasis that LTC and ETSF restoration activities placed on researching and establishing ETS’s character defining elements. These efforts also demonstrate the commitment of ETS community actors to align the ETS restoration with a provincially established heritage policy that valued the preservation of physical attributes of the build environment.

According to Leon and Piatt (1989), many of these newly specialized staff sought to incorporate academic research emerging from the new social history movement (a form of historiography that emerged in the 1960’s in Canada, Britain and the US) into their own work and as a result, began to shift away from isolated craft demonstrations and lectures on buildings and furnishings to a more interrelated approach that focused on such themes as work, family, and community (Leon and Piatt, 1989). This functional approach often linked demonstrative activities together in an attempt to explain how communities functioned. However, more often than not, such approaches also diminished or avoided aspects of historical life that were unpleasant or confrontational (Christensen, 1993; Leon and Piatt, 1989; Tigert, 2000). During this time Eugene Genovese, an American historian of slavery in the US, and others began to criticize social history for not addressing issues of labour, power, and societal conflict, while Thomas Schlereth challenged history museums to include a broader range of community experiences in
their interpretation such as minority political movements and family conflict (Leon and Piatt, 1989). More recent heritage interpretive approaches have turned away from demonstrative exhibits to those which are more issues based and museum administrators are attempting to find a balance between what visitors generally find attractive about the past and its many complexities (Tigert, 2000).

2.5: Conclusion: A Review of How Heritage Narratives Are Connected to Place

The application of place identity and collective memory frameworks to the examination of heritage management practices lends insight into how community actors make site level heritage management decisions and ultimately construct heritage narratives. Within this study, the social aspects of identity and collective memory are understood as dynamic and layered. Scholars such as Huyssen (1994) suggest that museums and historic sites, like memory, construct the past through discourses of the present. As such, this chapter also summarizes the heritage discourse and policy trends promoted and codified through government and professional associations during which ETS heritage management activities occurred. By doing so, the relationship between heritage narratives linked to place and debates about what is and should be conserved can be more clearly examined in chapters 5 and 6. The concept of heritage information, defined as product of social processes connected to people and place, is also explored through the lens of place narrative discourse. The production and reinterpretation of heritage by community actors provides evidence of place within stories about the ETS produced by both the ETSF and LTC.
Chapter 3  
Methodology: ETS Case Analysis Design, Techniques, and Description of Data Sources

3.1: Introduction to Research Goals and Questions

This study explores central issues of heritage management through place identity, collective memory, and heritage and information studies to investigate the following two questions: How is the connection between a community and a built space shaped by heritage designation? Which community members, whether individuals or groups, are involved in the production of heritage information and how is that information selected, codified, communicated, and otherwise promoted through heritage management systems including planning and conservation policy frameworks?

Critical heritage discourses have made significant contributions to their field by challenging assumptions within urban regeneration, place-making, and heritage conservation and planning strategies, especially those that relate to the selection and validation of what eventually becomes designated as “heritage” (Graham et al. 2000; While and Short, 2011; Waterton and Smith, 2010). Dynamics of power and social injustice have also been identified and discussed especially in the context of community heritage and interpretive practice (Crooke, 2010; Prangnell et al. 2010). This study contributes to these ongoing debates and discourses by both deepening understanding of the connection between place identity and heritage narratives as well as by exploring novel research approaches and data pools, namely through an examination of heritage information within systems of heritage management.

Heritage information exists in many forms beyond the operational records of a heritage site or museum. While information in the form of artifacts, photographs, promotional and interpretive
materials, ephemera, research, written stories and oral histories all contribute to heritage information assemblages, what remains unclear is how often and to what extent different forms of heritage information are preserved, catalogued, curated, and digitized. In heritage sites and museums with limited resources, which often defines many small scale and community heritage organizations, gaps in the representation and accessibility of such information may impact the completeness of heritage information assemblages. In the case of the ETSF, funding constraints, lack of adequate storage, and changes in ownership have all influenced what heritage information has been kept and what has been deaccessioned. While speculative, given that the ETSF is an example of a small-scale heritage site and museum, it is likely that the environmental factors (i.e. funding, staffing, and space resources) which have shaped the composition of its heritage information assemblage will be found at other sites of similar size and organizational structure. What heritage information is likely to be retained by a heritage site or community museum and in what form? What heritage information has historic value for such an organization and why? Such questions extend the discourse of heritage information beyond the case analysis of the ETS to the broader heritage management sector and present opportunities for further research.

For the purpose of examining heritage information and the development of heritage narratives, documents sampled from both the LTC and ETSF archives were grouped into two temporal categories: records associated with the transitional period of the ETS from pre-designated building to designated heritage site (roughly 1968 to 1974) when new narratives about the ETS were being formed; and the post heritage designation years of the ETSF’s management of the Schoolhouse (1974 to 2005) when narratives were being maintained, enriched, and reinterpreted. In order to explore place-making through heritage information and interpretation, the type of records examined within this study were narrowed to documents collected as a by-product of research conducted on the Schoolhouse, those which were used in the development of place-making and collective memory, and interpretive documents, which were crafted from the archive’s information and chronicled the ETS narrative. What becomes evident through an examination of the ETSF and LTC archives, is that these documents provided both evidence of and a platform form for local community heritage management.
3.2: Approach to the Case Analysis of Enoch Turner Schoolhouse

This research project focused on archival sources of data, both textual and visual. Archival records were chosen as the primary data sources for several key reasons. Archival records enabled this study to sample detailed interactions and experiences that would not otherwise have been easily accessed, in some cases, nearly 50 years after the occurrence of original events. Certain key participants, both individuals as well as local community groups, involved in the redevelopment phase of the ETS and early site management by the ETSF were no longer available to provide personal accounts of their experiences and as such, archival data provided a more representative sample of events and activities. Focusing solely on archives allowed for more equity across the selected time periods and organizational structures, making it easier to compare the structure and production of narratives between organizations. Since the research objectives were focused on exploring social processes involved in the production and management of heritage information, this study looked for evidence of communication trends, focus, and intentions of individuals, groups and institutions as well as differences in communicated and interpreted content. Due to limitations of scope and access, this study focused on archival content that dated from the redevelopment of the site and its management under the ETSF Foundation roughly 1965 to 1993. Data sources included the LTC archive and records belonging to the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse Foundation archive. Since neither of these organizational archives were open to the public, access was sought through members of the ETSF Board of Directors and LTC’s volunteer archivist/librarian. A written request accompanied by a copy of the research proposal was submitted to both organizations for consideration. The ETSF archive was temporarily housed in facilities belonging to the Ontario Heritage Trust. As such, access to the collection, while granted by the ETSF, was also facilitated by staff at the OHT.
3.2.1: Description of ETS Data Sources

The ETS Foundation Archive contains operational, programming, legal correspondence, artifacts, photographs, and research documents related to the Foundation and its development. As such, the collection spans roughly 50 years of institutional activity, and while not digitized, it is relatively organized. Most materials are stored in clearly labelled folders and boxes, with some organizational consistency. While the Foundation is a small non-profit with limited resources, as an institution, they are quite structured and kept detailed records on many aspects of their operation. The archive has been moved several times and is currently housed in a temporary facility belonging to the Ontario Heritage Trust. There is no library or archival cataloguing system in place to document the collection, so research conducted within this study consisted of manual examination of the physical contents of the archive, without computerized finding aids. Some materials, primarily artifacts, were donated to the Ontario Heritage Trust when ownership of the ETS was transferred to the province in 2008, and as such, some materials may not be represented in the archive’s current state. Due to the limited scope of this project, it was not possible to review the archive in its entirety. In total, the entire sample included 6 boxes, consisting of approximately 7700 pages of documents and 300 photographic slides. Research records (historical data gathered from other archives, primary sources, oral history projects, etc.) found within the ETS sample followed a basic organizational methodology that consisted of categorization by subject, with records filed in labelled folders. The sample of ETSF’s research records consists of 66 files containing approximately 2700 pages of records. Analysis consisted of a broad examination of subjects and research themes rather than a detailed content analysis of individual folders.

Of that initial data pool, approximately 500 pages of documents were reviewed and/or analyzed for the study. Records were selected based on a chain/snowball sampling technique that radiated from a randomly selected starting point. This non-probability technique was based on the judgements of the researcher. Documents were selected for the sample if they provided information on the history of the ETS, stakeholders involved in the designation and redevelopment of the ETS, actions and events that contributed to the redevelopment and ongoing
ETSF management of the site, as well as examples of narratives and interpretive documents relating to the ETS.

This subset of the archival sample consisted of a broad spectrum of document types including: operational documents (Board meeting minutes from 1977-1992); newspaper articles and media releases relating to the ETS (37 newspaper articles from nationally syndicated and local community papers); historical research conducted by Foundation staff; legal and operational correspondence between the Foundation and community stakeholders including Little Trinity Church; photographs and photographic slides, as well as promotional and interpretive materials.

The archives of the Little Trinity Church were also reviewed for this study and yielded a much smaller sample, consisting of two medium-sized archival boxes containing 1200 pages of documents along with a published narrative commemorating the 150th anniversary of the Church. These records included legal and operational correspondence relating to the formalization of the ETS Restoration and Fundraising Committees as well as the transition to the Foundation. Located in the basement of Little Trinity House, adjacent to the Church, the LTC archives were also uncatalogued. Most materials were contained within archival boxes that were clearly labeled.

3.3: Analysis Techniques: Critical Discourse and Narrative Analysis

To analyze the archival materials sampled, this study undertook both critical discourse analysis and narrative analysis.
Within this research context, discourse does not refer solely to linguistic units or aspects. Instead, discourse is defined in terms of complex communicative events (Teun A. van Dijk, 2003). As such, this study looked for patterns of knowledge and social interactions that reflect negotiations of power. Here, social power is understood as control, following the frame provided by Teun A. van Dijk (2003), in which groups may to varying degrees, control other groups in specific institutions or social domains including public discourse. Control and power are not interpreted as absolute, but are viewed as dynamic and layered. In this study, institutional records, public programming documents, and narratives (consisting of newspaper articles, media releases, and published articles) were selected because of their institutional nature and connection to public discourse. Through an exploration of archival content, the study identifies “seams of power” (Teun A. van Dijk, 2003) in the form of control over decisions, heritage interpretation and narrative choices in the construction of the ETS identity by members of different social and user groups. ETSF, Church, Restoration Committee (RC) and Fundraising Committee (FC) board minutes, correspondence, and policy were examined to identify which groups had access to formal modes of discourse, such as institutional and public discourses, and how the power of dominant groups were integrated into norms, rules, practice, and general consensus.

Based on Fairclough’s three-dimensional model of discourse analysis, the examination of communicative events focused on linguistic features of text, discursive practice (which consists of processes relating to the production and consumption of text) and wider social practice to which the communicative events belong (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002, p.69). Tools used for textual analysis included those proposed by Fairclough including: grammar tools consisting of transitivity and modality, as well as metaphors, interactional control, and ethos.
Analysis of context surrounding the content of documents was conducted on selected archival records, including a scan of a number of categories following the analysis framework outlined by Teun A. van Dijk that includes: a broad definition of the situation; a review of its setting, which includes time and location; ongoing actions (including discourses and discourse genres); and participants in various communicative, social, or institutional roles including their mental representations (i.e. goals, knowledge, opinions, attitudes, and ideologies). Documents such as ETSF Board minutes as well as Church and ETSF correspondence were suitable for analysis using van Dijk’s framework, because they were written by and included information on stakeholders and participants who occupied a number of different roles within the communities (ETSF and LTC) involved in site-level decision making. As such, they yielded great insight into the various opinions, motivations, interests, and knowledge of community members and their ongoing actions. In most cases, these documents were also clearly dated and of known authorship, which also made them easier to analyze contextually using time and location as evidence of setting. Van Dijk’s model can clearly be seen in the textual analysis described in both chapters 5 and 6, in ETS board meeting documents including early ETS curator reports from the 1980’s and 1990’s, as well as heritage information objects such as the ETSF schoolhouse brochures selected for analysis in chapter 6.

This method was incorporated into the research design both because of its suitability as a qualitative small-scale analysis tool and because of its ability to translate language and text into data, which accounted for the largest portion of documents with the archival sample. Critical discourse analysis enabled the research design to focus on aspects of power negotiation and was useful for understanding how access and control are socially mediated. Heritage information assemblages are a by-product of the social negotiations involved in the construction of heritage identity and meaning, which aligns well with the underlying epistemological assumptions within critical discourse analysis, whereby social and linguistic practices constitute one another.

Textual analysis began with a general scan of documents to develop a chronology of events and actions for the ETS and its stakeholders. From this point of entry, texts relating to different time periods, i.e. the LTC’s establishment of the RC and FR Committees, the designation and
redevelopment of the ETS, transition of ownership to the ETSF and the ongoing management of the site by the ETSF, were grouped. Once categorized, discourse analysis began with a single text in which motivations, themes, and behaviours that provided evidence of social interaction were identified. This information provided the basis for patterns that informed hypotheses about place-related heritage discourses. Other related texts were then analyzed in order to fill in gaps, answer emerging questions, and ultimately confirm or disprove hypotheses.

3.3.2: Narrative Analysis ETSF & LTC Heritage Information

Narrative inquiry or analysis was considered a useful tool in this study for exploration of social power within the production of collective memory and place-centered heritage narratives. In particular, this study analyzed narrative texts as social and cognitive structure through an exploration of plot, themes and coherence of ETS stories. Here, narrative texts are understood as stories and/or historical interpretations of the ETS and the events and people involved in the site over its lifespan. For the purpose of this study, 5 documents were selected from the ETSF and LTC archives to further probe narrative. These heritage information objects represented the time periods that were of interest to this study, namely the designation and redevelopment period of the Schoolhouse’s history as well as the proceeding years under which the site was managed by the ETSF foundation. The themes, story grammars, and other observations were then compared with a broader cross-section of interpretive materials produced by members of the RC and ETSF, as well as media forms such as newspaper articles. The LTC archive sample included over 37 newspaper articles from local and national newspapers that spanned the time periods previously identified.

This study adapts Polkinghorne’s Chronological Organizational or Diachronic Organizational method of narrative analysis (Polkinghorne, 1995), which focuses on the contexts in which narratives are created. It forms a sociological approach to the examination of stories by exploring relationships between the storyteller and others within the narrative itself along with
other aspects such as historical continuity and the chronological organization of events. According to this method, all narratives contain basic units including a distinct beginning, middle, and end, which are all constructed of narrative data. Paradigmatic reasoning was used to analyze themes within and across content of narratives.

Narrative analysis was considered useful within the parameters of this study because of the platform it provided for exploring how meaning is co-produced by social actors. The focus of this case analysis was not so much one of determining the validity of stakeholder accounts, but instead an exploration into the multiplicity of views and how these different “truths” develop and are integrated into the place identity of the ETS. More broadly, heritage information is a novel approach to the study of information within museums, libraries, and archives and is useful for understanding meaning-making processes across these institutions. It is particularly aligned with contemporary knowledge organization initiatives that focus on community or collective organization and representation of artifacts and records, such as Howarth and Knight’s (2015, p.580) use of community-based collections to facilitate memories of “maker-culture” and to generate meaning used in artifact documentation processes. Within this context, narrative analysis is a tool that can explore and triangulate user-generated-stories through an identification and analysis of the themes, events, people, and places represented within those narratives.

3.4: Reliability and Validity

This study constituted an initial phase of research into the formation of place-related heritage narratives within the ETS and as such, discourse and narrative analysis were used to construct theories about how social processes actively shaped and reshaped cultural heritage meanings at the site level. These tools contributed to a multi-method approach that explored and embraced data complexity. In other words, there was less emphasis on the isolation of variables, because the inquiry was more focused on a search for meaning rather than causality (Knight, 2002, p. 28). Validity was maintained through a reflexive and systematic approach to the research that
continually evaluated whether the research questions are being investigated by the methods used. Furthermore, research design was grounded in a detailed reading of theory and current research in the field.

3.5: Limitations of Data Sources, Analysis Techniques and Research Design

3.5.1: Delimitations

Research design focused on archival data for a number of reasons. The first was to limit the scope of the project and to focus inquiry on heritage information and its relationship with place and meaning-making strategies. Data was also focused temporally; only records pertaining to the site’s redevelopment phase and the timeframe in which it was managed by ETSF were sampled. The records of the LTC and ETSF archives yielded significant amounts of data relating to a broad time period, including the earliest years of the site’s history as a museum and heritage site, which enabled the study to look for and identify patterns and relationships that would have otherwise been challenging to find. Furthermore, it enabled the study to map changes in these relationships over time. Data connected to the transition of ETS ownership from the Foundation to the Ontario Heritage Trust in 2008 was not gathered. Resource limitations contributed to this decision, but another significant factor was lack of access to archival data within the Ontario Heritage Trust. Open access to the archives of the Ontario Heritage Trust could not be negotiated and as such, operational records (including board minutes and correspondence between the OHT and ETSF) remained too heavily mediated and filtered by the Trust to be useful within this study.
3.5.2: Limitations

There are limitations to archival research that must be acknowledged within this study. Rudestam and Newton (2007) suggest that archival datasets often consist of incomplete, missing, or compromised data, which manifest as insufficiently small samples, an absence of information on important variables, or dependence on flawed data measures. This study was able to navigate these challenges by utilizing data from two inter-related organizations that shared a common history and in some cases, even record collections. Another limitation of archival data is its inherent selectivity, because material is filtered, accessioned and deaccessioned according to the policies and protocols of organization themselves. In this study, inherent selectivity is embraced because these “silences” may be attributable to the social processes that this research intends to identify and explore. While some material within the ETSF archive had been deaccessioned during the most recent transfer of ownership in 2005, the remaining sample was still significant in size and diverse document types for the scope of this exploratory project. Furthermore, in the case of the ETSF and LTC archives, no further restrictions were placed on data access. The researcher was able to access and evaluate documents and records directly rather than having materials culled and retrieved by a third person.

Future research could build and expand on this study by adding additional data sources such as staff interviews and oral histories as well as more advanced content analysis with-multi-coder and/or computer analysis. Such tools could be employed to compare any semantic connections that might occur across different documents. According to Palmquist, Carley, and Dale (1997), this form of map analysis enables exploration of shifting definitions and meanings over time and across different individuals and groups and so textual analysis using this method could provide useful historical and cultural insights. Furthermore, an examination of municipal and provincial heritage designation processes and/or funding programs could provide further insight into the link between local heritage management decisions and dominant heritage discourses rooted in place.
3.6: Conclusion: A Comprehensive Approach to the ETS Case Analysis

A comprehensive approach to understanding both ETSF and LTC archival content and practices, including interpretation, was applied to this research study. In order to look for patterns of social interaction, operational records sampled from both collections were analyzed using critical discourse analysis techniques, including Fairclough’s three-dimensional model and analysis of context surrounding the content of documents using the framework of Teun A. van Dijk. Narrative analysis, using Polkinghorne’s Chronological Organizational method, was applied to the heritage information objects examined in Chapter 6 as a novel way to explore social interaction within the production of collective memory and place-centered heritage narratives.

The next chapter presents a brief history of Enoch Turner, his contemporaries, the Little Trinity Church, and the ETS, which provides historical context for the restoration and management of the schoolhouse as well as the documents and records produced as a byproduct of those actions. This outline is helpful for applying the critical discourse analysis framework outlined by Teun A. van Dijk to operational documents examined in chapter 5, because it provides a point of reference from which to review the setting of documents, including the time and location in which they were created.
Chapter 4
Historical Overview of Enoch Turner, Little Trinity Church, and ETS (19th-20th Centuries)

4.1: Introduction to the History of the ETS and Key Characters

For the purposes of this study, a brief biography of Enoch Turner, history of the schoolhouse and Little Trinity Church are presented in this chapter. This historical outline provides context for understanding not only the long historical connection between the two buildings, but also the evolution of contemporary relationships between various groups involved in the schoolhouse’s restoration, redevelopment, and management. The site’s history and varied functionality also serve as a chronological baseline for examining the selection of historical attributes, events, and characters by the RC, FC, and ETSF in order to craft and shape a new place-related identity during the redevelopment of the building as a heritage site. It also helps to establish which details, such as Turner’s strong support of Christian-based education, were less often incorporated in the post-restoration identity of the Schoolhouse. Communities of interest and their relationships to the schoolhouse are identified and introduced through this concise history, as are their historical connections to the physical structures of the church and schoolhouse.

4.2: Enoch Turner: Founder of the ETS

Charting the early years of Enoch Turner’s life in York along with key figures in the development of both the Church and schoolhouse helps to more clearly establish that the church and schoolhouse were closely linked by the motivations and interests of their founders, a topic that is explored further in chapters 5 and 6.
Enoch Turner is believed to have immigrated to Upper Canada between 1830 and 1831 from Staffordshire, England (Macauley Sutton, 1993). He was born in 1790, at Bagnall Grange in the village of Bagnall near contemporary Stoke-on-Trent. Enoch's marriage records indicate that as a young man he worked as a wheelwright, even though he may have come from a family of potters (Macauley Sutton, 1993). Enoch was married twice. His first marriage, registered in England on May 11th 1812, was to Jane Newill at St. Mary's Church, in Staffordshire (Macauley Sutton, 1993). The ceremony was witnessed by George Lockett and Hannah Newill, who was likely a relative of Jane's. There is no record that Enoch's first marriage produced any children and Jane Turner did not emigrate with her husband, which suggests that she may have died prior to his departure. The second marriage, to Hannah Lockett (formerly the wife of his friend George Lockett), was registered on January 11th 1835 in Toronto (Macauley Sutton, 1993). Hannah who was also widowed, arrived in Upper Canada with her daughter Louisa. Enoch and his second wife were 45 years old when they were married, which was officiated by Bishop Strachan (Macauley Sutton, 1993). Details about Turner’s personal life are not evenly described across stories about the schoolhouse which are examined in chapter 6. However, one biographical fact - namely that Enoch Turner had no biological children - is retold quite frequently by the ETSF as a way to highlight the generosity of his gift of the schoolhouse and the opportunity for education which he bestowed upon poor children of York Township.

Not long after Enoch Turner arrived in Upper Canada, records suggest that he established a brewery in the town of York in what was then Park Preserve (Pope, 1971). The three-acre property was located in an area known as Vale Pleasant, which was south of Palace Street, now Front Street, on the west side of Taddle Creek, just to the east of modern day Parliament Street. Other businesses were developing in the area, including that of William Gooderham and James Worts, who had completed a windmill a short distance to the south east of Turner's property, which was producing flour and then later supported distillery operations (Pope, 1971).

Unfortunately for Enoch, his newly built brewery was almost completely destroyed by fire, which was reported in the Upper Canada Herald on February 8th, 1832. His losses were considerable, including most of the building, a large quantity of malt, and brewing utensils, none
of which were insured. Turner, who had invested most of his resources in the business was, according to the newspaper, "reduced to poverty" (Upper Canada Herald, 1832, p. 3). Luckily for Enoch, a local establishment, the York Circus, donated the proceeds of one of their evening performances to his benefit (Upper Canada Herald, 1832, p. 3).

Census reports from the mid-19th century provide additional information about Enoch Turner's early years in Vale Pleasant. According to the 1842 census, Enoch was listed as a 'gentleman' and land owner, which entitled him to vote in government elections (City of Toronto Census, 1842). The census also indicates that in addition to his second wife, their household supported a female servant, although no children were listed, nor did the property raise any produce or livestock (City of Toronto Census, 1842). Other families also resided on Turner’s property, one of which included Samuel Platt, an immigrant from Northern Ireland, who Turner had hired in 1837 as a clerk (Macauley Sutton, 1993, Pope, 1971). Samuel married Enoch's stepdaughter Louisa later that year and by 1842 he had taken up residence at Vale Pleasant, eventually adding a distillery to the Enoch brewing operation. According to the City's 1843 and 1846-47 directories, Platt's occupation was listed as brewer but by 1850-51, the occupation of distiller was added to the description. In addition to living and working with Enoch Turner, Samuel Platt was also a member of Little Trinity Church and according to Macauley Sutton (1993), "he would become an active supporter of education in the City, serving as a trustee for the Toronto Board of Education…and later would serve as a Member of Parliament for East Toronto” (p.8).

According to Macauley Sutton (1993), Turner's activities in brewing, real estate, and other investments, made him a successful business man. In addition to property, Turner held stock in the Toronto Gas Company, which contributed to his financial stability long after he sold the brewery in 1855 and moved his family to Sherbourne Street. Records indicate that he was generous with his wealth, especially for causes that aligned with his religious affiliations. For example, Little Trinity Church Vestry minutes from 1850 indicate that Turner had donated 14 acres of land to Church, which were to be converted to funds for the construction of a gallery in the building (Little Trinity, 1850-52). Macauley Sutton (1993) suggests that this and other substantial donations, including £200 in funds and £1,500 in land for the establishment of
Anglican University, which later became the University of Toronto's Trinity College, indicate that Turner was interested not only in expanding Little Trinity but also with providing opportunities for a Christian education. Turner was certainly very engaged in the management of Little Trinity, serving as a Church Warden alongside William Gooderham for almost a decade; from 1850 to 1851 and then again from 1853 to 1860 (Hayes, 1991).

Interestingly, Macauley Sutton notes that Turner's concern for the Church and the schoolhouse may have resulted in some friction between himself and the Reverend Richard Mitchelle, who served during the early 1850's, and that the "unhappy differences" (Little Trinity Church, 1850-52) that are described in the meeting minutes, coincided with the timing of the Schoolhouse's rental to the Toronto Board of Education (Macauley Sutton, 1993). Furthermore, Toronto Board of Education meeting minutes from March of 1851 indicate that Turner, perhaps in an effort to maintain influence, joined the Toronto Board of Education's education committee for the district, School Section 3 (Macauley Sutton, 1993).

Even after Turner's death in 1866, his dedication to these causes continued. In his will he bequeathed another £2000 to Trinity College and £500 to Little Trinity Church that was intended for the expansion of the Church (Macauley Sutton, 1993; Hayes, 1991).

While the Schoolhouse was renamed after Enoch Turner during its restoration, relatively few historical details about his businesses, active involvement in LTC affairs, philanthropic support of the Anglican Church and faith-based education, as well as his participation within the Toronto Board of Education, feature prominently in ETSF’s schoolhouse narrative. This absence of historical detail about Turner’s life is an observation discussed in greater detail in chapter 6 of this study.
4.3: The Establishment of Little Trinity Church and Enoch Turner Schoolhouse

Location is significant within narratives about both the ETS and LTC, which strongly link the schoolhouse and church neighbourhood to a geographical and socio-economic place within the City of Toronto. Initially, at the turn of the 19th century, the land between the Don River and Berkley Street was Crown Land that formed a government park used to pasture horses and oxen belonging to the municipality (Pope, 1971). This neighbourhood, sometimes referred to as "the Liberties," and "the Park" underwent a significant transition in the 1830's and 40's (Macauley Sutton, 1993). By 1819, according to Pope (1971), "the Park was granted to trustees as endowment for a hospital (p. 19)," and within the next decade, streets began to develop in the southern end of the Park where industrial activities such as brick making and the burning of lime began to take place. Located on the margins of the city, close to industry, the site became populated by labourers and their families, mostly Protestant and Catholic immigrants from Ireland (Macauley Sutton, 1993). Considered to be one of the poorest neighbourhoods in the city, living conditions in the Park were insufficient and social problems such as “public drunkenness” were common (Pope, 1971). According to Pope (1971), cholera epidemics in the 1840's killed so many inhabitants, that, "bodies of the dead were stacked in sheds and mass graves covered whole areas of the park” (p.20), many of which were still being unearthed by redevelopment in lower Cabbage town in the mid to late 20th century (Pope, 1971).

The Park provided few social and educational amenities for its roughly 3000 inhabitants, especially for the Protestant Irish of which there were an estimated 2000 (City of Toronto, 1842). While St. Paul's Catholic Church on Power Street held mass for their constituents, Irish Protestants could not afford the pew rental system at St. James Cathedral, an Anglican Church situated at the corner of King and Church, which was some distance outside the neighbourhood (Hayes, 1991). Neither were there free schools in Ontario at the time. While the Common Schools Act of 1816 enabled residents of any town or village to establish a school and provided funding of up to fifty dollars for teacher salaries, parents were still required to pay tuition for their children to attend (Pope, 1971). The Act was revised in 1841, providing slightly more
funding for common schools to establish education boards and to improve the quality of teachers, but tuition fees were still beyond the reach of most low income families (Pope, 1971).

The frustrations felt by local inhabitants became evident when, on July 12th, 1842, at the neighbourhood's annual Orange Day Parade, an angry demonstration broke out among participants, who demanded that a Protestant Church and school be built for the community (Hayes, 1991). This day has often been cited by LTC and ETS historians as the founding day of Little Trinity Church, because on that date, the parade leaders were met by a number of wealthy and political community members, including Alderman Alexander Dixon, Bishop John Strachan, William Gooderham, and Enoch Turner, to broker and discuss the plans for a school and church in the Park (Hayes, 1991; Pope, 1971). While this is a popular narrative within the Church and Schoolhouse communities, church documents suggest that plans for a Protestant church in the Park were already being initiated by Alderman Dixon and Bishop Strachan, both of whom were motivated, most likely for strategic and political reasons, to secure the establishment of both school and church (Hayes, 1991).

John Strachan, who was appointed bishop in 1839 of the new Anglican Diocese of Toronto was particularly concerned about the lack of religious amenities in the Park and, on a broad level, about maintaining the "local superiority of the Church of England in both numbers and influence" (Hayes, 1991, p. 6) Modest declines in the numbers of Anglicans in the City of Toronto between the 1831 and 1841 census reports were worrisome for Strachan and he was eager to build two more churches in the City, one in the east end (in the Park), and the other in the west end between Spadina and York Street, south of present day Richmond Street (Hayes, 1991). In March of 1842, he reached out to the English Missionary Society, SPG, for a donation to begin building the churches. Alderman Dixon, who Strachan called, “The father and founder of Little Trinity Church," (Hayes, 1991) emigrated from Dublin Ireland in 1830 and established a successful retail business in Toronto, selling hardware and saddlery (Hayes, 1991). As Alderman of the St. Lawrence Ward, his influence and popularity was derived from his close association with the Orange Order and the Protestant faith (Hayes, 1991). According to LTC narratives (Hayes, 1991), Dixon, too, was concerned that Catholics had a Church in the Park,
while his constituents - which made up two thirds of the neighbourhood - did not (Hayes, 1991). For other participants such as Gooderham and Turner, their religious belief that social order would positively influence the stability and productivity of their local labour pool may have also contributed to their philanthropic interests in the Park (Macauley Sutton, 1993). Certainly these motivations and actions highlight a tangible connection between faith and place for which the marking of place with churches, had both social and political significance for communities and community actors.

Meeting minutes from that July 12th meeting indicate that Turner actively supported the need for a new church and school. After a resolution was made that a church, with schoolhouse attached, should be immediately constructed in, "the most central or convenient part of the neighbourhood," Turner put forward his own motion:

That the persons assembled at this meeting do hereby pledge themselves to contribute, according to the best of their ability, to work so highly conducive to the glory of God and the salvation of men; and that, in order to commence the undertaking without any loss of time, a subscription be immediately entered into. (Pope, 1971, p. 22)

Turner served as Treasurer on the Building Committee along with William Gooderham, Joseph Shuter, and Alderman Dixon (Hayes, 1991, Pope, 1971). The Church itself, which was built on land donated by the Bishop and Sir John Beverly Robinson, was completed in 1844, opening on February 14th of that year (Hayes, 1991, Pope, 1971). It afforded 250 free seats in the Vestry and rental pews that were able to accommodate an additional 200 people (Hayes, 1991).
However, despite this achievement, there were no additional funds available to build the free school that had been promised. With no formal space for a school, arrangements were made for the Church to serve as a temporary school space, although the newly hired Reverend, William Ripley, objected to the idea and wrote to the Toronto Board of Education requesting that a separate denominational school be created (Macauley Sutton, 1993). The Reverend's proposal was rejected by the Board and this setback, along with an emerging education crisis spurred by Toronto City Council's refusal to raise taxes to help fund common schools, may have prompted Enoch Turner to act on his original motion of 1842 (Pope, 1971). The City's non-compliance meant that Superintendent of Education, Egerton Ryerson, cut off the City's education subsidy (Pope, 1971). With no additional funding from the municipal authority, 15 common schools in Toronto were closed for one year (June 30, 1848 to June 30th of 1849). Despite this political stalemate, in August of 1848 it was announced in The Church, Little Trinity's bulletin, that, "Enoch Turner, Esq., already well known for his liberality, has volunteered to build a substantial brick schoolhouse at his own expense to be connected with the Church" (The Church, 1848, p.2).

In November of that year, the one room schoolhouse, situated behind Little Trinity Church, was completed and marked the opening of Toronto's first free school. The Church was, in many ways, defined by both its location within the Park and because of the free school that occupied its geographical footprint. These two sites were built to service a specific neighbourhood and the
Protestant community that lived within it and that common purpose connected to place and people became a reoccurring theme within LTC and ETS narratives. Although classes did not begin until the following January, Turner hosted a celebratory dinner for 140 local children (Hayes, 1991). For the next twelve years, the schoolhouse provided a Protestant Christian-based education to children of the Park, with the Reverend Ripley serving as the first schoolmaster until his death in 1849 (Hayes, 1991). Following further revisions of the Common Schools Act in 1850, which laid the foundation for the free school system in Ontario, the Toronto Board of Education took over management of the school, renting it from Little Trinity Church for £28 per year (Hayes, 1991). Between 1850 and 1887, when the larger Sackville Public School was built nearby, the schoolhouse provided free primary school education to both boys and girls (Macauley Sutton, 1993).

The opening of the schoolhouse as the first free school in Toronto along with the appointment of its earliest schoolmaster and the celebrations hosted by Turner for the Schoolhouse’s first pupils, feature very prominently in ETSF’s schoolhouse narrative, which is discussed further in Chapter 6 of this study. References to these historical details are found in most of the historical accounts and retellings found in documents sampled from the ETSF’s archive. Other aspects of the site’s history, including key characters and the socio-political events that lead to the establishment of the Church and Schoolhouse are less evenly covered in these documents. Document analysis in Chapter 6 compares heritage information objects produced by both the LTC and ETSF and identifies differences in each organization’s site narrative.

4.4: 20th Century History of ETS

By the late 19th century, the role of the schoolhouse and its relationship with the LTC shifted from that of free school for the Church’s congregation to an extension of the Church itself. This shift helped to facilitate Little Trinity’s reach into the neighbourhood and the services it provided to community members. While the ETS only operated as a free school for 30 years, the
remainder of its 150 year history was spent connected to the LTC in this other way. After the schoolhouse was closed by the Board of Education in 1887 and the building repatriated to Little Trinity Church, it served as a multifunctional space for the Church, serving both community outreach as well as internal needs (Pope, 1971). According to Church and Foundation narratives, the schoolhouse was used as both a food and clothing distribution center and a shelter for the poor during three global depressions in the 1890’s, 1913, and the 1930’s (“History of the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse,” 2015). It was also used as a Sunday school and recruitment center for both the Boer and First World War and in the latter half of the 20th century, the schoolhouse hosted concerts and various community activities such as debates and rummage sales (“History of the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse,” 2015). While use remained relatively continuous, schoolhouse narratives suggest that the building fell into a general state of disrepair by the 1950’s and 60’s. Written and photographic records belonging to the Church and Restoration Committee indicate that windows were broken and boarded up, the roof was leaking and needed to be replaced, floors were rotten and plaster walls were crumbling (Pope, 1968).

Figure 3: Enoch Turner Schoolhouse (Front Façade) Pre-Renovation (ca. 1968)

The Church's political and financial circumstances were, at this time, complicated. Attendance at Little Trinity Church diminished between 1920 and 1950 as a result of mismanagement and poor leadership by two successive reverends, and deteriorating buildings combined with mounting debt raised concerned amongst the local Anglican Diocese (Hayes, 1991). By the 1940's and 50's the diocese began re-evaluating the sustainability of some urban parishes, comparing urban church demographics with those in suburban areas which were experiencing a boom in
attendance among the middle class. According to Hayes (1991) a perception had developed among the diocesan Church Extension Committee that Corktown, like many other urban neighbourhoods in Toronto, was experiencing a demographic transition from residential to commercial/industrial and that residential populations were dwindling, even though census data for Corktown suggested otherwise. In 1943 for example, Canon George Luxton, rector of Grace Church-on-the-hill and member of the Extension Committee visited Little Trinity Church with the intent to "persuade a special vestry meeting at Little Trinity to move out to the suburbs" (Hayes, 1991).

In the spring of 1950, the Church's ailing Reverend, R.F. Widdows, submitted his resignation for the end of June of that same year and shortly thereafter, the Bishop of Toronto established a commission to evaluate Little Trinity's future (Hayes, 1991). During this time an offer was made to purchase the church property and a "For Sale" sign appeared on the front lawn of the site much to the surprise and anger of many congregation members (Hayes, 1991; Pope, 1971). The offer was considered at a vestry meeting on July 4th 1950 and the committee supported Widdows' recommendation to refuse the offer (Hayes, 1991). Despite these efforts the Bishop A.R. Beverley received conflicting perspectives even from members of the congregation on the future of the Church and so he appointed a temporary priest-in-charge to oversee the site for a three-year probationary period, after which the congregation would be absorbed into a larger, nearby church if conditions didn't improve (Hayes, 1991). While Little Trinity's situation did begin to improve in the mid to late 50's under new leadership, it was far from secure. These earlier events, coupled with a major fire that gutted Little Trinity's interior in 1961, prompted renewed calls by some members of Toronto's Anglican Diocese to close the Church (Pope, 1971). As a result, the priorities of Little Trinity's congregation remained focused on securing the Church's existence by supporting the large fundraising campaign needed to raise the nearly $230,000 required to restore the Church after the fire and to garner support from influential citizens such as Bishop Wilkinson; Nathan Phillips, the Mayor of Toronto; and Fred Gardiner, Chairman of Metropolitan Toronto to keep it open (Hayes, 1991; Pope, 1971). The presence of such political and environmental factors meant that the ETS’s place within this milieu became peripheral, certainly in terms of restoration priorities, even though it provided a temporary space for Church activities to continue amidst the rebuilding.
Over the course of the Church's history, the Corporation of Little Trinity acquired a number of satellite properties, many through endowments. These actions expanded the Church’s footprint in the neighbourhood and strengthened the Corporation’s association with both place and local history. This historical presence helped to define the Church’s identity and was later invoked in the mid-20th century as a justification for preservation and restoration. By the 1950's, the Corporation owned and maintained multiple buildings and properties along King and Power Street in addition to the Schoolhouse on Trinity Street, many of which were also in great need of repair and restoration. While these properties provided the Church with significant investments, they also exerted financial costs, requiring resources for operational upkeep. For example, Beverly Lodge (now referred to as Little Trinity House), located at 417 King Street, is a redbrick structure built in 1853 only four years after the schoolhouse was erected. It served as the Church's parsonage for 75 years, then as halfway house for the neighbourhood's poor, and was also damaged by fire requiring significant repairs (Hayes, 1991). The site is one of a few remaining LTC buildings and currently functions as a site for Church activities, including children’s programming, in addition to housing the LTC’s archives. Several other parish properties including 405, 407, and 409 King Street were in such a poor state of repair that the Church opted to have them demolished (Hayes, 1991).

These events likely crystalized divergent perspectives on the function and use of the schoolhouse within Little Trinity Church in the years leading up to and following the fire. According to Harry Robinson, Reverend of the Church from 1963 to 1978, "The vestry, at the time of the rebuilding of the church in 1961, considered the schoolhouse to be irreparable and sought to provide accommodation within the church to replace the schoolhouse. We have comparatively little use of the schoolhouse since that time" (Robinson, 1968, p.1). Despite this opinion, he acknowledged that there was "a wide base of public interest in the building for its historical value to the city" (Robinson, 1968, p.1), which lead the Corporation and a number of interested congregation members to consider other possibilities for the structure. While the Church felt that the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse was no longer safe to host Sunday school classes, it continued to be used as a rehearsal space and as concert room for music recitals (Hayes, 1991). There were
also appeals by various user groups, such as Schoolhouse Concerts, to renovate the building, but the Corporation felt that the scope of work was too great and extended beyond the priorities of the Church at that time. Having only recently petitioned the congregation and city for funds to restore the Church itself, and unable to commit the near $5,000.00 per year that was estimated to maintain the building going forward, Reverend Robinson felt a public fundraising campaign that was independent of the Church was the most reasonable option for the site and would be dependent upon, "finding some responsible group to take over the building for whatever purpose might be found suitable" (Robinson, 1968, p.1)

As a result, Little Trinity looked both internally, within the congregation, and externally, to the City's broader heritage community, to inform the future of the schoolhouse. This shift marked a significant turning point for the ETS, because it was the moment the schoolhouse began a transition towards heritage status. With that transition came a growing self-awareness of the site as not just as a building of historical character, but rather as a site of known and established cultural heritage. Records from the Little Trinity Archive indicate that John Pope, a congregation member and local historian, began to conduct research in the spring of 1968, reaching out to the Minister of another East End Church, Rev. H.N Bracken of St. Augustine's on Bayview Avenue, who agreed to conduct some preliminary research at the Synod Archives on Enoch Turner himself, the schoolhouse and the period of 1848 in Toronto (Pope, 1968). To raise the issue with the congregation, Robinson made the schoolhouse the focus of Little Trinity's 126th anniversary service, on June 2, 1968, and then the following year arranged a community meeting at the church to seek publicity for the site and gauge support within the heritage community (Pope, 1968). Representatives from Toronto's Historical Board, Provincial Heritage Foundation, Architectural Conservancy, and numerous historical societies, as well as interested users, such as Schoolhouse Concerts, and potential donors, including the Gooderham and Enoch Turner families, were invited to attend and review the renovation plan drafted by the architectural firm of Nightingale Quigley Inc. (Pope, 1969).

If the LTC’s financial accounts and political position within the Anglican Diocese had been more secure, would outcomes for the church’s ownership of the ETS have been different? Outlined
within this brief history is a long and deeply intertwined relationship between the LTC’s congregation and these two properties, which illustrates that the ETS was valuable not only in terms of its land value, but also its emotional and historical value. Therefore it is possible to speculate that if the Church’s circumstances had been more stable, the ETS might not have fallen into such extreme disrepair nor would ownership of the building have been transferred to an organization external to the Church. As the LTC did not take steps to secure heritage designation for its other historical properties, such as Little Trinity House, it is also possible that if LTC had retained ownership of the ETS, it would have remained undesignated and continued to serve the LTC community through existing church functions, such as a Sunday School and venue for religious concerts among others, which were consistent with the variety of uses highlighted in its early history.

4.5: Conclusion: Significance of ETS History in Exploring Heritage Narratives Connected to Place

The history of Little Trinity Church, the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse, and the community figures central to the development and stewardship of these sites, provides more than just a chronological timeline of associated milestones and events. Rather, this concise historical account further illuminates the many connection points between these sites and the places they occupy. It also serves as a reference point with which to explore and analyze operational documents as well as LTC and ETS narratives that were reflected in the heritage information objects selected for analysis within chapter 5 and 6 of this study. In particular, the historical detail provided within this chapter contributes useful information on community actors, as well as their interests and motivations, which are examined through van Dijk’s discourse analysis framework.

Chapter 5 further explores the LTC’s pattern of building management and the financial challenges that influenced its stewardship of the ETS through a textual analysis of operational records, including Church correspondence. In particular, this next chapter examines in greater
detail how the designation and heritage management decisions made by the LTC, its Restoration and Fundraising Committees in the late 1960’s and early 1970’s, as well as later decisions by the ETSF, influenced both the Schoolhouse’s functionality and its relationship with local communities.
Chapter 5
The Impact of Place-Related Heritage Narratives on ETS Heritage Management Practices

5.1: Introduction: Heritage Narratives and their Impact on ETS Space Utilization

An examination of the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse (ETS) through the archives of both the ETS Foundation and Little Trinity Church (LTC) provides insight into the social dynamics involved in both the genesis of community history during the transition from “building” to “historic site”, as well as throughout the management and interpretation of that site after designation. Situated within these time periods are examples of heritage narratives forming and interacting with each other, as well as evidence of their influence on the kinds of judgements and decisions that are made around the meaning of place and what characteristics of these become preserved and promoted. When explored through the frameworks of place identity and collective memory, the heterogeneity of the site, coupled with the diversity of local community interests involved, illuminates a contested terrain that is important for understanding the impact of heritage management decisions on community engagement.

Within this study, the selection and formalization of dominant heritage narratives and their integration into larger notions of collective memory and place identity are explored during the transition of the ETS from building to heritage site. Within this context of this study, heritage narratives are understood as the stories connected to and told about heritage. The contact zone formed by the ETS, in which layers of community interaction, such as the relationship between the Little Trinity Church and the ETS Foundation, occur through this shared connection to place is of particular interest. Within this context, the term contact zone is defined more literally than Pratt’s (1992) conceptualization (a site for linguistic and social encounters as understood within a framework of literary theory), as a social space created through the ETS’s locality and materiality in which different groups interact to negotiate and construct heritage meanings and narratives. The impact of heritage narratives on functionality are also explored through an
examination of the site’s dual use as museum and community and corporate rental space. What becomes evident from an analysis of the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse is that heritage, place identity and collective memory are dynamic and hybrid and that these processes expose inherent tensions between heritage site and community groups in which heritage and community do not always coexist easily. Heritage information, material artifacts such as records and interpretive documents produced by groups involved in the creation and management of heritage, provides an additional means of observing these social drivers of heritage production and the mechanisms by which connection to place are created and leveraged by various groups.

5.2: Case Analysis of the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse:

5.2.1: A Review of Key ETS Community Stakeholders

According to Mistral (2007), successful narratives of the past tend to follow the rules and conventions of storytelling, containing a beginning, end, and compelling characters and storyline. The processes by which heritage buildings, landscapes, and their stories are produced and become authorized, are as Tilley suggests, “inextricably bound up with the politics of identity, for ideas about both relate to whom we want to live with and whom we want to exclude, who belongs and who does not, to issues of class, ethnicity, gender, and sexuality” (Tilley, 2006, p.15).

Parallels can be found between other heritage contexts and the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse that are illustrative of tensions that can occur between multiple heritage narratives and their competing agendas. The communities that have engaged with Little Trinity Church and Enoch Turner Schoolhouse before, during, and after heritage designation, have been varied and multiple. As such, this study attempts to delineate some of these groups for further examination. In terms of its geographical community, the ETS and LTC are situated in an area of the city that
has historically been semi-industrial/commercial in nature with residential populations that occupy the lower end of the City’s socio-economic spectrum. For much of the 19th and early 20th century, this population consisted largely of Irish immigrants, however, Lower Cabbagetown has since become much less uniform. Up to and including the time of ETS’s historical designation, local populations accessed the schoolhouse largely through the Church’s social programming, which included Sunday school classes, rummage sales, wartime recruitment drives, a soup kitchen, and homeless shelter. While the urban poor of East Toronto was the intended user group for both buildings, their needs, interests, and stories are not so well understood within larger, more dominant heritage narratives that have driven policy, governance, and development at the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse heritage site. For the purposes of this study, several key communities are identified and discussed below. While these groups are central to the development and management of the ETS, they are by no means discrete or homogenous units.

5.2.1.1: Communities of Heritage Conservation and Public Education

The broader communities of heritage conservation and public education have also been engaged with the ETS over the course of the site’s more recent history, especially during the schoolhouse’s redevelopment and transition to heritage site in the late 1960’s and early 1970’s. Correspondence, between members of ETS Restoration Committee and the Church’s Reverend and Wardens indicate that the LTC had reached out to these communities in order to build legitimacy for their preservation efforts and consensus around functionality and future use. Committee reports and letters list the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, The Ontario Heritage Foundation, Toronto Historical Board, Ontario Heritage Society, Women’s Canadian Historical Society, the York Pioneer and Historical Society, Toronto Board of Education, Historic Sites Board of Ontario, and individual heritage professionals such as Professor Eric Arthur of Ryerson University, as strongly supporting the “authentic restoration” of the ETS site (ETS Restoration Committee, 1969, p.2). This community, one of professional practice and subject matter expertise, looked to promote local and regional cultural heritage and history through the lens of their own mandates and professional ideals. For example, according to a
report written by J. Pope, a LTC congregation member appointed to the Restoration committee, the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario wanted to see "other buildings in the area restored to join the Church and Schoolhouse in a pleasant and worthwhile effort in urban renewal” (Pope, 1970). The Toronto Board of Education expressed an interest in converting the Schoolhouse into a living history museum that could provide historical lessons to their elementary school audience (Gore, 1969).

5.2.1.2: Little Trinity Church Congregation

The congregation of Little Trinity Church, is a heterogeneous community, one that is significant within the context of this study. Many of the Church’s most active members have been wealthy or middle-class, well-educated, professionals; a tradition which dates back to the very first acts of philanthropy that were expressed by local businessmen such as Enoch Turner and William Gooderham, and upon which the Church and Schoolhouse were established over 170 years ago. Committees and working groups, such as the ETS Restoration Committee and Restoration Fund, were often highly organized, structured bodies that consisted of educated professionals, some of whom had political connections and business management expertise to draw from. LTC narratives indicate that over time, as congregation members gained financial resources and moved away from the neighbourhood, they would continue to maintain their connection to the LTC Church community and actively participated in the Church (Hayes, 1991). The Gooderham, Turner, and Chambers families, for example, formed what can be described as an expatriate community external to the immediate geographical and demographic community that the Church was intended to serve. These individuals in particular, had long familial relationships intertwined with the history of the church and schoolhouse and were passionate supporters of the restoration of both church and schoolhouse (Gooderham, 1969). For example, a letter of support written by N.W. Gooderham to the Director of the Historical Branch of the Department of Records and Archives in 1969 specifically mentions the Gooderham family’s engagement with the restoration initiative. As previously indicated, the Gooderham family had a long and deep relationship with both the church and schoolhouse, beginning with William Gooderham (1790 to 1881), a wealthy immigrant who, along with his brother-in-law James Worts, established a flour
mill and distillery in the Park in the early 1830's (Hayes, 1991). Gooderham was actively involved in the establishment of the Little Trinity Church and served as its Warden for 35 years (Hayes, 1991). Church narratives indicate that the industrialist was so engaged with Little Trinity Church that it was often informally referred to as "Gooderham's church," (Hayes, 1991, p. 7). While RC letters do not expressly define the interest of the Gooderhams, it is possible family tradition and identity may well have been drivers and A. Pope declared that, Mrs. N.W. Gooderham was “representing the Gooderham family in this project and she has consented to help with research” (ETS Restoration Committee, 1969, p.1). This involvement appears to have expanded significantly as Mrs. Gooderham later chaired and co-chaired the Restoration Fund Committee during its first two years before she resigned in October of 1971 (ETS Restoration Fundraising Committee, 1971).

5.2.1.3: The Sub-Communities of the RC, FC, and ETSF

Within the LTC community there have been smaller groups with distinct affiliations and interests that emerged out of the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse’s transition to heritage site. Little Trinity Church records indicate that in the late 1960’s, the Church began the process of evaluating the future of the schoolhouse by establishing a restoration committee, and appointing interested members from within the congregation to identify and consult with local stakeholders (Robinson, 1968; ETS Restoration Committee, 1969). While some of these members continued to identify with and represent the interests of the Church, the ETS Foundation, which evolved out of the Restoration and Fundraising Committees, developed as a separate community of interest and practice, one that was secular and more closely aligned with the heritage sector. When these individuals became actively involved in the restoration and repurpose of the schoolhouse, it was their interests and agendas that helped to shape the nature and function of this newly created heritage site.
In many ways, the geographical communities of the LTC and ETS had been engaged with the site through its life as an extension of the church quite differently before it became a heritage site. Two groups in particular - the neighbourhood’s urban poor who sought social supports from the Church between the latter half of the 19th and first half of the 20th centuries, as well as successive generations of Little Trinity Congregation members - would have experienced the ETS as a community hub rather than a museum. Heritage information describing the use of the Schoolhouse as a homeless shelter and a soup kitchen during the Great Depression, for example, allude to the accessibility and immediacy of the site to many of its most vulnerable neighbours. Documented recollections by prominent congregation members archived by the ETSF describe times when children attended Sunday school in the ETS and when the Congregation members regularly held meetings, recitals, and concerts in the space (Pope, 1968; 1971). Operational records from both the LTC and ETSF suggest that these patterns of use and engagement changed when the site became a living history museum.

5.2.2: Redevelopment of the ETS Site as Living History Museum

The politics of place identity are of particular interest to this study as well as their relationship to other social processes involved in production of community, cultural heritage, and collective memory. The way in which identities are produced and maintained can be understood through the lens of power relations, dominance, and resistance as they relate to the acts of knowledge keeping and production (Creswell, 2004; Tilley, 2006). Tilley (2006) suggests that within the museum and cultural heritage context, the creation of place identity by community and heritage actors can be seen as an active process that requires planning, maintenance, surveillance, and reconstruction. For example, local and regional heritage groups, tourist boards, city planners, and political parties are often involved in the selection of heritage sites and museum objects and attempt to emphasize their significance through marketing and policies. According to Tilley (2006), “Fostering a sense of landscape and place requires its deliberate re-representation” (p. 14). These re-representations are, by their nature, selective decisions grounded in judgements about the value and meaning of different aspects of both the past and present (White and Short, 2010; Graham et al. 2000). In their study of place narratives within heritage management of
post-modernist development in the United Kingdom, While and Short (2011) refer to the hybrid nature of built environments as being in tension with the development of a shared sense of community and place identity because of their innate heterogeneity resulting from successive waves of development, redevelopment, modification, and change (While and Short, 2011). While and Short (2011) conceptualize hybridity and heterogeneity both in terms of single buildings that are occupied and modified by different users over time as well as built landscapes and streetscapes that consist of a mix of buildings that represent different eras, styles, and functions. Within the context of the ETS, the significance of function in the development of place identity and heritage narratives connected to place is particularly evident. The notion of a place for particular activities, such as museum practice, living history reenactment, education, event management, and religious practice, highlights tensions between various aspects of ETS history. Place making strategies and local planning frameworks intended to legitimize and promote “heritage” tend to flatten or selectively promote specific aspects or attributes within that hybrid environment in order to create a relatively coherent spatial identity (While and Short, 2011).

The establishment of the ETS Restoration Committee by LTC Reverend Harry Robinson in late 1968, marked the beginning of a more formal and earnest approach to the restoration and redevelopment of the Schoolhouse. This committee was later incorporated in the beginning of 1970, as the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse Restoration Fund, to manage the fundraising campaign for the ETS restoration. Documents from within the archival sample suggest that membership in both committees was structured and selective. For example, the earlier Restoration Committee members included: Mrs. N.W. Gooderham (chairman and later co-chairman of the Restoration Fund) representing Gooderham family interests; Mr. J.D. Pope (Secretary) who was an LTC congregation member and local historian; Mr. J.F. Kennedy (Treasurer) who sat on the Board of Directors of the Schoolhouse Concerts Group; Mr. Garnet Quigley (Architect), and Prof. Eric Arthur (Consultant) (Restoration Committee, ca. 1970). The committee-at-large included Lady Robinson, Mrs. J.B. Gooderham, Mr. C.D. Ferguson and Mr. and Mrs. W.J. Foley who also sat on the Schoolhouse Concerts Board (Restoration Committee, ca. 1970). Significant characteristics of both the Restoration and Fundraising groups were their highly structured approach to managing the restoration project as well as the high socio-economic status of their
membership. Through their networking efforts these committees were able to secure several high profile patrons for the restoration campaign which included Nathan Philips, Mayor William Dennison, and John P. Robarts (ETSF, 1972). While the archival sample did not contain evidence of the membership selection process, it is likely given the relationship between committee members and the LTC that members either heard about and volunteered directly from the Church’s congregation or were referred by members of the Church’s network of supporters (Robinson, 1970). Despite the grassroots nature of this effort, the small size and selective membership of these committees would have filtered restoration and redevelopment decisions through a relatively narrow set of preferences and perspectives. As Watson (2007) suggests, “Even museums that are established and run by volunteers with little or no professional input face difficulties. Trustees and others are often representative of a small selection of the population, often older, wealthier and with higher formal levels of education than many of the rest” (p. 10).

The Restoration Committee moved the Church's intentions forward by discussing the restoration plans drafted by Architect Garnet Quigley with key stakeholders from both the heritage sector as well as those aligned with the schoolhouse identity, namely the Toronto Board of Education (Pope, 1970). Through these initial consultations, the Committee not only began organizing and developing their restoration fundraising campaign, but also began to explore possible uses for the schoolhouse (ETS Restoration Committee, 1969). These conversations provide insight into the interests and motivations of various community groups and provide important information about which interests and ideas were promoted and which were deprioritized in the production of a cohesive ETS heritage narrative.

As one of the Restoration Committee's first objectives, it coordinated and hosted a consultation meeting with leading heritage organizations, historical societies, and interested user groups to gain support for the restoration efforts and to discuss the future of the schoolhouse (Robinson, 1968). A scan of LTC and ETSF archival records produced over forty documents, including letters, reports, and proposals that reference consultation with these organizations (ETS Restoration Committee, 1969; Pope, 1968; Pope, 1969b Robinson, 1968). A closer examination
of LTC correspondence suggests that the Church’s management felt it necessary to gain approval for restoration plans from the congregation and synod authorities, and before doing so, the Church sought the legitimization of restoration plans by professionals within the heritage community (Robinson, 1968; Pope, 1969a). These professionals served as knowledge-keepers of heritage management practices and their endorsement conveyed a sense of authority and respectability to the plans put forward to the LTC’s Wardens and Vestry. Furthermore, they demonstrated the Church’s desire for and actions towards strategic consultation. Evidence found in the archival samples from LTC and ETSF suggests that the church’s congregation and external groups were engaged in redevelopment discussions separately, and that for external consultations, the Church selectively identified and invited individuals and institutions, consisting of heritage supporters as well as potential users of the site, each with a specific vision for redevelopment (Pope, 1969a). By reaching out to the heritage community however, the LTC’s proposals for restoration and future use became subject to and shaped and bound by the perspectives of these organizations, creating a hierarchy of priority that was at times in tension with other ideas. Archival records from the ETS and LTC archives (in particular, Restoration Committee reports from November and December of 1969) indicate that the architectural proposals drafted by the Restoration Committee's architect, Garnet & Quigley, had to be examined, and in some cases approved, by multiple heritage stakeholders including Professor E. Arthur, who served as the project’s local history consultant, the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, and the Ontario Heritage Foundation, among others (ETS Restoration Committee, 1969a; 1969d; 1969e). The Committee also shared the restoration proposal for the interior of the schoolhouse with the Toronto Board of Education. A Restoration Fund report, most likely produced in 1970, at or around the time when the schoolhouse became a designated heritage site, articulated the Board’s interest in and preference for an "authentic restoration." According to the report:

Mr. Graham Gore and Mr. W.A. Sweetman of the Board of Education are enthusiastic about an authentic restoration of the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse. When it has been restored they see it used by the children of this city for an experience in 'living history.' They would send classes there each day to participate in pre-Confederation schooling. The Board would pay so much per head per child (at present it's 25 cents). This would be a regular source of income (ETS Restoration Fund, ca. 1970).
Living history or open-air museums rose in popularity during the mid-20th century in North America, peaking around the time of the ETS restoration (Young, 2007). Their proliferation within Canada around the mid to late 1960’s was partially a result of federal and provincial funding made available for centennial initiatives. These museums focused on the re-creation of past environments and relied on demonstration along with nostalgic reflection on pre-industrial activities that often reflected 1950’s values and ideals (Leon & Piaff, 1989; Butler, 2002). The proposed museum would represent the ETS as a mid-19th century Ontario schoolhouse and thereby focus on a roughly 30-year period in the site’s 170-year history. In many ways, the selection of this narrow restoration window enabled the Committee to create a unified and coherent narrative and place identity for the ETS. This strategy, according to While and Short’s theory (2011), helped the site fit into existing local planning frameworks and place-making strategies.

Records pertaining to the restoration itself were numerous and found within both ETS and LTC archival samples. They consisted of legal documents, correspondence between the architects, contractors, Restoration Fund Committee members and researchers, as well as architectural drawings and quotes. The ETS Restoration Fund and Foundation expended significant resources and energy to ensure that the restoration of the schoolhouse was based on thorough research and that significant features and materials reflected the time period that they had selected (Gordon, 1989; Gordon and de Fort-Menares, 1989; Quigley, 1971b). Period masonry techniques were employed to fix exterior brick walls and hand-blown glass windows were imported from the United States (Quigley, 1971a). General 19th century schoolhouse furnishings, such as the teacher and pupil desks, were also researched and either recreated by artisans using period methods and specifications or purchased at antique auctions or from other heritage groups (ETSF, 1972a). These actions are illustrative of the process by which the site’s place identity was actively selected, reconstructed and manipulated by those involved. Furthermore, the intentional treatment of interior and exterior elements demonstrates that place identity encompasses more than geography and that material culture, defined as the physical evidence of culture in the objects and architecture they produce, connected to place is also constructed through this
process. Other such examples include the collection of 19th century schoolbooks and educational resources that the ETSF accessioned throughout its ownership of the site. These materials served not only as artifacts for the recreation of the 19th century schoolhouse setting, but also provided content for interpretive programming that could be enacted through the living history performances delivered at the school house thereby reinforcing the connection to place, identity and heritage.

The proposal that envisioned ETS as a living history museum was clearly supported by at least some members of the ETS committee as well as the larger heritage community that LTC had consulted with. In principle, it was reflective of the values and practices of the heritage management profession and represented the kind of urban renewal desired by organizations such as the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario. For example, fundraising documents suggest that the restored schoolhouse would, "become an integral part of the community and an inspiration for urban renewal. Little Trinity Square can become a jewel in the midst of a scarred and blighted area, saving the past and serving the future" (ETSRF, 1970). Despite this alignment, there is some suggestion that the museum model was not entirely reflective of the needs of the local community, which is apparent in the language used to rationalize and promote future plans for the schoolhouse. For example, in a document produced by the ETSRF dated March 25th 1970, most likely as a fundraising letter sent out to prospective donors, the Fund stated that:

The building [ETS] will not become a museum piece but its future uses will be varied and vital. The Board of Education is interested in restoring the east schoolroom and allowing visiting schoolchildren to experience for one-half day, the classroom as it was in 1848. The building will be available for wide community use, the Wellington Flute Band, concerts, theatre workshop, lectures, nursery-school and health clinics" (ETSRF, 1970).

A review of Restoration Committee Reports and fundraising documents from the transition provide a detailed list of possible post-restoration functions for the schoolhouse that included: extra space for the Board of Education’s nearby Sackville Public School, which was looking for gym space for afterschool programming and pre-kindergarten classes; rental space in the West
Hall for local business and community organizations; auction sales; dances; theatre space for concerts, debates, recitals, and rehearsals; LTC space for their Junior congregation assemblies and youth activities; and a community hall (ETSRC, 1969a).

This multi-functional approach was outlined in the Restoration Committee’s proposal submitted to LTC’s Vestry for review in January of 1970 (ETSRC, 1970). With that endorsement, the document, supported by the Bishop of Toronto, was escalated to the Toronto Synod Trusts Committee, which later confirmed the Vestry's resolution on February 3rd, 1970 (LTC, 1970). However, by the time ownership of the ETS was legally transferred to the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse Foundation in 1971, the schoolhouse had become formalized as a heritage museum and over time, its functionality narrowed to largely interpretive programming and venue rental.

According to Watson (2007), many museums and heritage sites identify or select the communities that they want to work with and exercise the power to represent those groups. Within the ETS context, the Foundation’s intentional selection of the museum function, coupled with the careful restoration of the site to represent the mid-19th era when it briefly functioned as a free school, is evidence of the communities they wished to engage with. While not insincere, it is very likely that the redevelopment proposal’s outline of ETS’s functionality was intentionally framed in broad terms in order to maximum funding opportunities and to attempt to reflect the many interests of different stakeholders including the LTC congregation, local theatre groups such as Schoolhouse Concerts, heritage organizations, and the Toronto District Schoolboard as well as the perspectives and motivations of the various members of the restoration committee. Overtime, the reality of a dynamic funding environment and the interests of successive waves of leadership within the ETSF meant that this grand vision would have been difficult to maintain and fund.

Several user groups that were closely affiliated with the Church and its congregation, had expressed an early interest in the schoolhouse. In particular, Schoolhouse Concerts (SC), a
religious organization that partnered with LTC in 1965 to deliver Christian entertainment in the form of music concerts and theatrical plays, had approached LTC on at least two separate occasions to discuss the possibility of restoration (Robinson, 1968). This group was closely affiliated with LTC, implementing much of the Church’s Christian entertainment - mostly dramatic and concert programming (Schoolhouse Concerts, 1968). It is likely that the group relied heavily on the schoolhouse as a rehearsal and concert space, because during a 1968 board meeting, the committee agreed that Schoolhouse Concerts should repay the Church for money spent repairing the roof of the Schoolhouse earlier that year (Schoolhouse Concerts, 1968b). Partial correspondence from 1968 between the Reverend Harry Robinson and the Chairman of the Schoolhouse Concerts, J. F. Kennedy, also suggests Schoolhouse Concerts had inquired about the possibility of renovating the space and formalizing their relationship with the schoolhouse building (Robinson, 1968). In that document, Reverend Robinson acknowledged, "The Church is not in a position to maintain the building upon renovation and is therefore dependent upon finding some responsible group to take over the building for whatever purpose might be found suitable. The question is whether the Schoolhouse Concerts is such a group” (Robinson, 1968). Some members of the Restoration Committee supported this group’s access to ETS. For example, in a Restoration Committee memo dated March 20th 1968, A. Pope indicates, "I should add that the Schoolhouse Concerts is a group of professional musicians and actors and supporters who are striving to present a Christian exposition of the arts. They have city-wide support from evangelicals. It is our intention to put the restored schoolhouse to Christian use." Clearly for some RC and LTC congregation members, the function of ETS as a religious space, one that was aligned with the values and priorities of both the Church and City’s wider Christian community, was important. Maintaining the religious aspect of the site’s place identity was significant enough that LTC negotiated one third of seats on the ETSF board of directors be reserved for Church representatives. For some members of the LTC congregation, the place identity of ETS and LTC were so heavily intertwined that even after legal ownership of the ETS was transferred to the ETSF foundation in 1971, any future programming at the site, including space rentals, would need to be sensitive to and reflective of the Church’s ideological position.
The tensions between competing functional priorities are particularly evident in the committee's decision about stage design in the restoration of the Schoolhouse's West Hall. The committee reports of November 21st, December 5th, and December 12th, 1969 indicate that a lengthy discussion was occurring over the placement of a stage, suggesting that accommodations for potential theatre usage of the West Hall were being challenged by both committee members and heritage community stakeholders. While the original proposals being prepared by the architect were to include a stage in the west end of the Hall, the Architectural Conservancy wanted the West Hall restored to its original beauty and indicated that, "they would have reservations" about the Garnet & Quigley design (ETSRC, 1969e). The committee report bluntly concluded that they would require the "support of the Conservancy, which is a prerequisite to a successful public campaign for restoration" (ETSRC, 1969e). The committee then had to seek feedback from theatrical experts to find work-around solutions for a moveable, mid-center stage, even though the shape of the ceiling in that part of the structure provided inadequate headroom and wing space (ETSRC, 1969d). One solution put forward by the architect was to raise a portion of the roof to accommodate the addition of a center stage, however the committee reported that this plan could raise “controversies” and felt that it would need to be reviewed and approved by Professor Arthur, who indeed expressed doubts (ETSRC, 1969a). Within this situation, dominant discourses of place were granted through a layering of reviews and approvals as well as conservation practices and policies. Building upon While and Short (2011) and Smith (2006), this process translates into heritage planning and design interventions that reflect and reinforce, the meanings, experiences, and associations that are linked to dominant heritage narratives and imaginings. Essentially the stage, which was reflective of emerging community uses in recent decades, countered the “authentic restoration” of the ETS as a 19th century schoolhouse.

In correspondence between members of the Restoration Committee and the LTC, another user group, the University Alumnae Dramatic Group, is referenced. The Alumnae Dramatic Group approached Little Trinity about entering into a lease agreement after the site had been restored. According to correspondence between one RC member and the Chairman of The Schoolhouse Concerts on September 17th 1969, the Committee representative indicated that the Dramatic Club had made a tentative offer to refurbish the interior of the building and enter into a long term lease (Pope, 1969a). Reverend Harry Robinson was in the process of investigating the viability
of their proposal at this time, which was concerning to some members of the Restoration Committee (Robinson, 1969). In the letter addressed to the Church on behalf of the Restoration Committee, two members advised that the restoration campaign be launched before LTC entered into a binding agreement with the University Alumnae Dramatic Group (Pope and Gay, 1969). They suggested that this would place the Corporation in a better position to ensure that the Church maintained "reasonable access and use of the building in the years ahead" ((Pope and Gay, 1969, p.2). Furthermore, it was suggested that there were some members of the congregation who, "were fearful of the University Alumnae proposals and would not take kindly to their acceptance unless other ideas were given full consideration" (Pope and Gay, 1969, p.2). This suggests that in the eyes of the Restoration Committee, a long term lease by this organization was an arrangement of last resort and if the fundraising campaign was successful in providing maintenance capital, then such a lease would become unnecessary in the view of the Restoration Committee. Within that same communication, the committee indicated that a multi-use restoration was preferable and that "emphasis should not be placed on theatre/concert or church use" and that planning should instead be centered around "modular lines for flexibility and maximum use by the community-at-large, with an eye to revenue potential" (ETSRC, 1969a). This recommendation was surprising considering that the museum functionality later eclipsed many other uses, including the theatre option, and ultimately contradicted the Committee’s multi-use platform. Moreover, the preference of certain entertainment purveyors above others, such as that of the Schoolhouse Concerts group before the University Alumni may have been a result of support from some Restoration Committee members, such as John Pope, who represented the interests and values of the church and congregation within the ETS redevelopment movement. Whether or not these recommendations were simply a strategy to counter other redevelopment options in order to preserve and position the museum proposal for future consideration or perhaps was reflective of a Committee whose members did not unanimously support the mixed use plan is speculative. Regardless, archival records document that planning decisions resulted in the selection of the museum option by the time ownership of the schoolhouse was transferred to the ETS Foundation.

What becomes evident within these debates is the priority given to a specific heritage narrative that valued the free school history of the site and related functionality of a living history museum
over the interests and place identities of other user groups, including the Church and various musical and theatrical groups that had occupied the ETS site before it was designated as a heritage site. Emphasis on an ‘authentic’ reconstruction of the schoolhouse tied to its historic interpretation was a negotiated process involving a range of influential stakeholders that actively shaped the future of the site (Crooke, 2010). According to Crooke (2010), “Within the community there is a hierarchy of those who are most active, assume leadership, and defend cultural markers (p.19).” In the case of the ETS, the Restoration and Fundraising committees, followed by the ETS Foundation, became the active drivers of the heritage narrative that would come to define the schoolhouse after its redevelopment. Decisions about functionality resulted in tangible implications for the ETS. By selecting the museum function, the relationship between Church and ETS Foundation changed over time and a degree of institutional alienation occurred, resulting in later tensions between communities and place narratives.

5.2.3: An Examination of the Relationship between LTC and ETSF

The ETSF’s relationship with the LTC Corporation and its congregation changed after the schoolhouse transitioned to a heritage site in 1971. The change is reflective of the social processes involved in the construction of community heritage. The negotiation and renegotiation of power dynamics become evident through an exploration of contested space involving Little Trinity Church and ETSF and reveal the challenges of museum and community co-involvement. The interaction between these two entities over schoolhouse programming and ongoing support and engagement strategies provides further evidence of the heterogeneity of place identity development within heritage environments that involve multiple community stakeholders.

The Church formally transferred ownership of the Schoolhouse to the ETS Foundation on December 13, 1971. The Foundation’s Board of Directors included 12 members (later expanded to 15), one third of which were appointed by Little Trinity Church. Some of the individuals who had served on the ETS Restoration and Fundraising Committees were elected to the new
Foundation, which became responsible for the ongoing preservation and redevelopment of the schoolhouse after the restoration was implemented. An early iteration of the Board’s statement of purpose identified five main objectives for the Foundation and the ETS heritage site which included:

1. To operate the schoolroom as a schoolhouse museum for the purpose of presenting lessons in living history
2. To stimulate use of schoolhouse facilities by the entire community
3. To plan and develop contemporary cultural programs to be offered to local community groups and to other persons in Toronto and central Ontario;
4. To expand Foundation membership as a means of encouraging the knowledge and use of the schoolhouse facilities and to sponsor its programs;
5. To Develop the use of the Schoolhouse facilities as a source of revenue, and to seek other financial support for the Foundation

(ETSF, 1974, p.1)

The ordering of these objectives can be interpreted as a reflection of the centrality of the museum function and free school narrative to the construction of the Foundation’s place identity. Furthermore, it establishes that the site’s museum-focused mandate was formally selected by the time the Foundation took ownership of the ETS. The prioritizing of the museum function resulted in a number of implications for the relationship between the Schoolhouse, Foundation, and the LTC Community, which are evident at multiple times throughout the history of the Foundation’s ownership of the ETS.

For over 130 years, there had been very little delineation between the two sites and generations of LTC congregation members had experienced facilitated access to the schoolhouse through the Church’s administration. Many LTC congregation members attended Sunday school in the ETS, while still others would have used it as a meeting place for Church groups, gatherings, and special functions. This pattern of use was altered when the Foundation assumed control of the site and archival records suggest that the transition may have been a challenging one for some within the LTC community, particularly for those whose memories of the ETS were still rooted
in the historic relationship. As a secularized and independent entity, the Foundation would also have struggled to redefine and maintain both its identity and its new relationship with the LTC. A Church memo, drafted shortly after the transition, reflects tensions that existed at that time. Issued to the LTC congregation by the Church’s Wardens, the memo clearly outlines the new relationship, reminding the LTC community that the Foundation was bearing the financial burden of managing and maintaining the schoolhouse and that they were independent of the Church. As such, the Wardens state that the Church had, “no ‘right’ to the use of the Schoolhouse other than at reduced rates enjoyed by community and other non-profit organizations” (LTC, ca. 1973-74, p.1). The memo further clarifies that the Church’s minority position on the Board of Directors was one of policy-making only with no direct control over programming or daily operations of the site. This suggests that there may have been an assumption among some members of the congregation that the Church had retained or was still entitled to influence over these areas of ETS operations. The document not only articulates the guiding principle behind the establishment of the restoration efforts and the establishment of the site, but highlights this message as a way of emphasizing it for the congregation:

The Guiding principle behind the efforts to save the building a few years ago was to maintain the Schoolhouse primarily for the benefit of the people of Toronto, with a special concern for the needs of the local community (LTC, ca. 1973-74, p.1).

The Warden’s message concluded with the following directions:

Members of the congregation should never attempt to reprimand or argue with the Schoolhouse Manager. He is responsible to the Schoolhouse Board of Directors (not the Church). Any complaints should be directed to representatives of Little Trinity on the Management Committee responsible for the day-to-day operation of the Schoolhouse. The Church Office should not be brought into these matters (LTC, ca. 1973-74, p.1).

This statement provides further insight into the relationship and power dynamic between the Church and Foundation. The Warden’s message suggests that tensions existed between
congregation members and the Foundation relating to access and programming, but also alludes to the power and influence the Church held in relation to the Foundation through its proximity to the Schoolhouse and the engagement of its members. Essentially the memo indicates an effort on the part of the LTC’s administration to respect the authority and governance of the Foundation by clarifying ETS policies and processes.

The nature of the Foundation and its mandate would have, in an operational sense, alienated the ETS from the Church and the legal conveyance of the site to the Foundation meant that it bore sole responsibility for maintaining a museum and a historic site without the security of the Church and its existing infrastructure and resources. As such, the Foundation’s Board was responsible for maintaining all community programming as well as other resource intensive practices such as research, interpretation, staffing, curation and collections management, which were required to maintain the heritage narrative in the museum. This translated to a reliance on rental profits that further limited LTC’s access to the site. Restoration and Fundraising Committee documents from the late 1960’s and early 70’s envisioned that the Schoolhouse would provide free community meeting space, however, the reality of the Foundation’s financial constraints meant that even the LTC was required to pay for space. An ETSF rental policy document dated January 1991, illustrates the tension between the Foundation’s objective to serve as a community space and the need to preserve its primary revenue stream:

The Schoolhouse receives continuous requests for free rentals from non-profit groups and we try to honour these when possible since gifts from the donating public, at least in part, allow us to give something back to that same larger community, with some limitations. Last year, for example, had we said yes to all these requests the schoolhouse would have lost over $20,000 in revenue. As it was, the Schoolhouse gave approximately $10,000 in free or reduced rentals, including Little Trinity Church, on a number of occasions.

The Schoolhouse is also a non-profit organization. Therefore it is necessary to exercise a realistic plan with respect to free usage and/or reduced rental rates, particularly on weekends, so as not to jeopardize our own financial position. The Schoolhouse has a special historic relationship with Little Trinity Church and we
want to continue to recognize that while at the same time being responsible regarding our own financial needs. We also want to assist community groups who request space from time to time (ETSF, 1991a, p.1).

The need for a mutually beneficial LTC/ETSF relationship was a reoccurring theme that permeated documents produced throughout the ETSF’s ownership and management of the schoolhouse. The shared historical connection between the Church and the Schoolhouse in many ways challenged the ETSF’s schoolhouse identity construct, but also provided the Foundation with a local community to draw membership and volunteers from. Just six years after the establishment of the ETSF, its Board President acknowledged in a letter to Little Trinity, “From a positive viewpoint I think we both have a lot to contribute, i.e. the talent of the Little Trinity members and the Schoolhouse building for utilizing that talent” (Malloy, 1977, p.2). The LTC and ETSF archival samples provide two formal reports, written 7 years apart, that acknowledge the tensions between these two organizations and explore the need for a more mutually supportive and collaborative relationship. In 1981, the president of the ETSF Board engaged the consultation firm of Peat, Marwick & Partners to develop a report on future development and programming within the ETS as a heritage and museum site. This report looked at and commented on the connection between the LTC, among other topics. The second report, “Proposal for a Blueprint for Action,” was written by Dean Malloy (former ETSF President) in 1988 as part of a strategy plan for the ETS Foundation. Malloy’s report stressed the unique legal relationship that existed as a result of the terms of condition that were negotiated by the LTC during the transfer of ownership in 1971. Malloy acknowledged that, “It is clearly in the Schoolhouse’s best interest to continue the good relationship that it enjoys [with the LTC] and to further develop it” (Malloy, 1988, p.9). Less than 10 years after the Foundation assumed management of the site, correspondence between the Foundation and LTC suggests that financial challenges including outstanding loans and tax arrears, coupled with a lack of board participation, prompted the LTC to reassess its arrangement with the Foundation and to consider transferring ownership back to the Church. A letter from Reverend Harry Robinson to the ETSF Board highlights the LTC’s main concerns about the sustainability of the site and their desire to be more involved in programming:
We are very much aware that in the early days of the Foundation the autonomy of the Schoolhouse was threatened by the proximity of Little Trinity Church and the involvement of many members of our congregation. For that reason we tried to be sympathetic with the essential need of the Foundation to be as independent of the Church as possible. We now feel however, that the future of the schoolhouse and the future of the Church are locked very closely together and the closest kind of participation and involvement with the other is necessary for both (Robinson, 1977, p.1).

While there are practical concerns reflected in the Church’s statement, relating to the financial viability of the site, LTC archival records demonstrate a shift in perceived value and interest in the Schoolhouse on the part of Church Administrators, which extends beyond mere survival of the site. Within this exchange, “place” becomes central to the struggle over ownership of built heritage and the politics involved in negotiating shared resources for the performance of collective memory and reconstruction of identity narratives. The challenge of constructing and maintaining a unified and cohesive identity in a hybridized environment such as the Schoolhouse, which encompassed shared history with the Church, physical changes to the structure over time, as well as different functions and user groups, was significant for the ETS Foundation, especially considering the organization’s financial vulnerabilities that made it less resilient to internal Board dynamics and external demands from the Church. Evidence of this struggle can be found in an ETSF memorandum to the LTC’s Reverend, in which the Board’s president suggests, “I very much like the idea of the Church being more involved with the program of the schoolhouse because whether we like it or not, in the minds of a lot of people we are still identified as one and the same operation” (Malloy, 1977, p.2).

The struggles faced by the Foundation are also evident in the often contradictory approaches to membership engagement and museum programming. Membership in the ETS was both a community engagement strategy and a revenue tool for the Foundation. Membership fees were collected annually and members were encouraged to volunteer at ETS events as well as through the children’s school-day program, which was central to the Foundation’s mandate and heritage narrative. According to an ETSF subcommittee report from January 1991, the Finance and Fundraising group identified that, “the ongoing success of any organization is dependent upon its
core supports” (ETSF, 1991b, p.3). The proximity of the two buildings to each other and the interconnectedness of their histories meant that the largest pool of potential members could be drawn from the LTC congregation, and yet Board records from the ETSF archive suggest that the Foundation struggled to meet its membership targets. According to an ETSF Financial report from November 1988, membership fees amounted to $1755.00 in revenue, while rental income consisted of $60,609.00 (ETSF, 1988, p.3).

5.2.4: An Examination of Competing Narratives within the ETS and their Impact on ETS Utilization

The impact of heritage narratives on functionality can be explored through an examination of the Schoolhouse’s dual role as both museum space and community and corporate rental space. What becomes evident from an analysis of archival documents relating to these uses is that underlying heritage and place identity processes are inherent tensions between heritage management and community layers.

Within a decade of the establishment of the ETSF and the ETS heritage redevelopment, rental revenue became the main source of income for the Foundation. Board reports from the late 1970’s through to the 1990’s suggest that rental income consistently eclipsed other more variable sources such as grant funding, donations, special events, and even educational programming. For example, financial statements from 1987 and 1991 indicated that of the 4 main revenue sources relied upon by the Foundation, which included grants, donations, rentals, classes (museum programming), and memberships, less than 1% of revenue was generated by the museum’s interpretive programming which included adult and youth classes compared with over 55% of revenue produced by rental business, much of which consisted of weddings and parties. These documents also suggest that maintaining the ETS’s museum mandate was resource intensive, requiring funds to cover the salary of a curator to develop programming, carry out collections management, and conduct research. According to an internal ETSF rental memo,
Board acknowledged that, “Schoolhouse rentals are an essential source of funding necessary to cover budgeted items relating to both capital and operating costs. Rental revenue, and all other revenues, are increasingly difficult to secure” (ETSF, 1991a, p2). Furthermore, the Foundation had acquired loans during the restoration of the Schoolhouse as well as through the ongoing maintenance and development of the site, which needed to be amortized. In the same ETSF rental policy statement from 1991, the Foundation indicates they had spent roughly $250,000 in costs related to the continuous upkeep of the building and that both capital costs and operating costs continued to increase yearly (ETSF, 1991a). All these costs elevated the reliance on and significance of the rental side of the ETS site, which at times conflicted with the mandate and heritage narrative constructed by the Foundation. How the ETS negotiated these conflicts provides insight into the ETSF’s priorities and their political relationships with other community stakeholders.

Records from the ETSF archive suggest that throughout the 1980’s and 1990’s the Foundation sought to maximize the number of rentals in the West Hall of the ETS building, which increasingly spilled over into the Schoolhouse. In these instances, the museum space itself was often utilized as a wedding chapel and for storage, among other purposes. Administrative reports from the ETSF archive indicated that staff actively marketed the rental function of the site in such venues as Bridal Shows and community newspapers in an effort to increase bookings. ETSF Board minutes from July of 1987 make direct mention of the growing challenge of balancing these two functions:

Use of Schoolhouse: There was some discussion on the necessity for the Schoolhouse to operate as an effective museum center as well as an income producing rental facility. The tension between the two uses was noted but no other alternative is known (ETSF, 1987, p.4).

Museum staff reported a number of incidences in which they felt the commercial use of the museum space compromised the care and integrity of the museum collection and Schoolroom. For example, in a curatorial report from May 1988, museum staff indicate that a pine stool
belonging to the ETS museum collection was removed from the space during a rental party and was returned two days later in a completely modified state. According to the curator, someone had attempted to “fix” the stool by replacing missing rungs and coating it with varnish. The author goes on to state that, “now that this artifact has been severely damaged it is no longer in keeping with the Schoolroom and has been removed until a solution can be found to remove the varnish” (Warrack, 1988, p.3). In this situation, the artifact was no longer able to support the historic 1848 schoolhouse narrative and was therefore removed so as not to compromise that narrative. Another curatorial report from October 1991 also attempts to address the perceived negative impact of rental business upon the museological objectives of the ETS (Macauley Sutton, 1991). Within this situation, staff were receiving requests from renters and caterers to use the Schoolroom museum as storage for equipment and coat racks during functions. This report brings to light the types of the incidences being reported, but perhaps more importantly, how it frames the risks associated with these activities. Within this dialogue the Curator states:

I believe it important for the Board to be aware of this increased use of the schoolroom and the results of that use, not only in terms of wear and tear on the furnishings, but also of importance – a changing perception of the schoolroom and its significance, which is held by the public. The Enoch Turner Schoolhouse is a very significant historic site, it is recognized as such by museum professionals, educators, and historians (among others), and should be respected as such by all. It is all we have and I believe it important that we question the use of the schoolroom and the direction in which we may easily find ourselves going. I would like to request that the Board of Directors have a policy on the use of the schoolroom, specifically that it not be used for storage (Macauley Sutton, 1991, p.2).

For the author, the central issue regarding alternative use of schoolroom space is connected to its identity as a historic site and more specifically, a historic classroom. The issue of storage is particularly offensive for the Curator because it represents the antithesis of museological and heritage functions. Within the context of the ETS, use is connected to the power and authority of the museum community of practice that maintains that narrative and the knowledge associated with it. As such, the relegation of the schoolhouse to a storage space for other activities is perceived as a lack of respect by the Curator. Through these actions, one group’s appreciation for heritage as an educational experience is being compromised and disrespected by another
group’s interest in heritage as an attractive backdrop. There is also a perceived instrumentalization of heritage which the Curator considers to be undermining the significance of the site. Within this context, the importance of function in the construction of place is intermeshed with the values associated with heritage management, which are fundamental to the Schoolhouse. The Curator suggests that without vigilance and careful maintenance of that identity through the protection of the site’s existing heritage narrative, the Schoolhouse and by extension the Foundation, would be marginalized as a result of the shift in public perception of the site as a rental venue rather than museum.

Evidence of a shift in functional priorities highlighted by these documents can also be found in operational records from the ETSF archives. For example, financial records from 1991 indicate that the salary paid to the Schoolhouse’s administrator, who was responsible for the rental operation of the ETS, was $6000.00 higher than that of Curator/General Manager (ETSF, 1991c). This was a reverse from the first decade of the Foundation’s management, in which rental operations had been maintained by an administrative assistant. The early job description of this support staff role was to assist with the coordination of special events, rentals, and museum programming (Malloy, 1988b). However, over time, the position had become much more specialized and autonomous, providing less support to the Curator/General Manager. With an increase in rental business, many of the special event coordination and program support responsibilities shifted back to the portfolio of the Curator, which appears to have created tension within the ETS’s working environment. For example, in a memo to ETSF Board of Directors dating from the latter half of 1987, the Curator/General Manager expressed concern that the general work environment in the Schoolhouse was negative, resulting in part from a lack of updated staff job descriptions. In early 1988, the Curator also makes the following request, which alludes to inherent tensions within the dual function of the ETS:

> When the Board is drawing up our new descriptions I would ask that you please go back to the museum’s statement of purpose and start from there. What does the museum mean to you? I feel the Schoolhouse is a unique and important historic site and museum in the City of Toronto. We offer a fine quality education program, but could offer so much more with displays and a full public education program. I fully
realize this would mean not only a major financial commitment, but also a commitment back to a museum function. It is very unfortunate that all decisions come down to dollars and cents. However museums are not there to make money, but to serve the public the best they can (Warrack, 1988, p.1).

Within this statement, the uniqueness or “otherness” of the site is tied to judgements on the value of certain aspects of its history and materiality. The curator feels he need to prioritize the museum functionality of the schoolhouse and emphasize its perceived contribution to the betterment of the city’s population. It also provides further evidence of an operational shift towards further investment in the site’s rental business that was in conflict with the museum mandate and its functional imperatives. In this way, the ETS can be viewed as a microcosm in which larger conflicts between conservation and development are played out on a much smaller scale, within the internal ETSF environment. What becomes evident in this interaction is that even within the ETSF organization, identity and values are hybrid and negotiated. There is a layering of extra-local interests at play, in which museum staff attempt to protect and position their interests in response to other emerging priorities and values such as the rental operations. One interesting update from the ETSF’s Promotion Committee that was recorded in Board minutes from the fall of 1991, provides a further example of how the site’s identity was being reshaped and marketed as an event venue. The report apprises the Board that their funding application to the Ontario Heritage Foundation’s Publication Awards Program for the production of a new site brochure was denied because the content of the document, “sounded too much like promotion, rather than history” (Macauley Sutton, 1991, p.2). Thus, even within the regional museum community, which the ETSF aligned itself with and attempted to operate within, their messages did not always equate with dominant heritage discourses that regulated practices through the institutional authority and legitimization conferred by grant funding. This, through the lens of the Committee’s report, was a blow to ETSF’s ability to demonstrate to a wider audience how they functioned as a museum, which included research and education.

As part of the ETS’s mandate to serve local communities, the Foundation coordinated and hosted many annual and ad hoc special events in the schoolhouse. These events provide an interesting profile of the communities that the ETS attempted to engage with. Many of the activities
provided nostalgic references to past eras that identified strongly with specific places and histories. The annual Founder’s Day Dinner, Robbie Burns and St. Patrick’s Day celebrations are examples of the kind of programming that would address those of British ancestry and who had the means and social capital to participate. They reflected modern middle-class values and facilitated what Tilley (2006) identifies as a sense of belonging through the performance and re-representation of urban and rural lifestyles that are no longer visible or tangible in daily life. In 1988 alone, there were over 10 large events some of which, including the 140th anniversary of the Schoolhouse and the Robbie Burns Day Reception, were co-produced with Little Trinity Church (ETSF, 1987c). These social functions served a variety of purposes for the Foundation, which included community engagement and membership sales opportunities, but also embodied the potential for revenue generation in the view of some Board members. Records from the ETSF archives suggest that there was an attempt in the late 1980’s to superimpose the Foundation’s rental model, which had been quite successful, on the production of special events. Meeting minutes from the ETSF’s Program and Publicity Committee indicate that Board members were concerned that rental opportunities might plateau as space usage reached the uppermost limits of its capacity. In that meeting, several committee members felt that it was essential that, “(1) Special Events take some responsibility to produce earned revenue; and (2) that organizers of special events be aware of the space limitations vis-à-vis rental possibilities” (ETSF, 1987b, p.2). As such, community activities, which in theory were being driven by the site’s community engagement mandate, were now being evaluated through a cost-benefit framework that translated their value into monetary terms that could be compared against equivalent rental opportunities. While there is little archival evidence to suggest that community programming was drastically reduced or altered as a result of this paradigm shift, there were some events that the Board did choose to discontinue citing a lack of sustainability and others such as auctions and fine art shows, in which the Foundation received a portion of the net sales, that were lauded as highly successful and renewed over multiple years.

Certainly the prioritizing of the rental model over both museum and community programming illustrates the inherent struggles involved in maintaining an independent heritage site, where funding is both variable and limited. Such data challenges the very notion of an ‘independent’ heritage site because heritage is a dynamic and inherently selective process that is continually
affirmed in relation to the needs and priorities of its most active and dominant stakeholders. In the case of the ETSF, as illustrated in the archival documents sampled from the Foundation and LTC, the site’s longstanding relationship with the LTC resulted in implications for the ETSF’s autonomy in terms of ongoing heritage programming and interpretation as well as site identity. Correspondence between Church and ETSF officials in the late 1980’s provides insight into the influence exerted over programming at the ETS, whereby events and programming needed to reflect the values of the Church and that ETS staff were asked to defer to the church when in doubt. Furthermore, pressure from internal heritage staff who were concerned about the growth and expansion of ETS’s rental activity, placed pressure on the organization to reaffirm and redirect its mandate and resources back to a focus on education. External funding also limited the independence of the site and influenced the allocation of resources as well as strategic priorities. For example, grant funding from profit and non-profit foundations, government bodies such as the museum and heritage branches, or from other sectors such as Citizenship and Immigration, are often accompanied by explicit guidelines for the allocation of funds and what deliverables and outcomes needed to be met through the grant. Small heritage organizations such as the ETS are required to accept the terms and conditions set by these external partners in order to compete for and win funding, but that can stretch the resources of these small-scale institutions and drive practice and programming. One such example found in the ETSF archive is that of the Museum Operating Grant which the ETSF received over multiple years. This fund contributed towards the ETS operational budget, but also required the site to adopt a series of museological standards and practices that required further investment of human and capital resources. In the case of the Museum Operating Grant, this fund did not provide adequate coverage for the site’s operational budget and substantial line of credit and so multiple grant sources were sought in an effort to meet budget needs. Multi-source funding is certainly not uncommon for heritage and indeed other non-profit organizations, but it can translate into an amplification of resource needs and can stretch organizations beyond their mandate and strategic direction. Such factors create numerous challenges for heritage sites, and in particular, those which are owned and operated by non-profit community organizations and heritage foundations.
5.3: Conclusion: A Review ETS Heritage Narratives and Space Management by ETS Community Members

Much like other examples of built heritage, the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse is a mixed assemblage of functions, histories, and stakeholders with the capacity to elicit multiple meanings and emotive possibilities. Documents from the LTC and ETSF archives provide insight into the processes by which community heritage at the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse was formalized, maintained, and incorporated into larger notions of collective memory and place identity. What becomes evident through an analysis of records pertaining to the Restoration and Fundraising Committees is that the nature of local heritage discourse influenced what aspects of the site’s history and materiality were preserved and promoted. By emphasizing the free school narrative, dominant heritage actors were able to establish a coherent sense of place and align divergent histories with re-development plans. This resulted in the minimization of more divergent and/or complicated aspects and associations, such as the ETS’s history of Christian Education and its rental business. It also led to a deprioritizing of functions associated with theatrical programming at the site and certain stakeholders such as Christian dramatic and concert groups which occupied the schoolhouse prior to its redevelopment. Preservation and re-development decisions also had further implications for ongoing community relationships and engagement. Interactions between the ETS Foundation and Little Trinity Church are particularly emblematic of the political maneuvering and power dynamics at play between community stakeholders over such issues as heritage access and representation. The impact of heritage narratives on functionality are also evident in operational documents related to the site’s dual use as museum, community, and corporate rental space. Within this milieu, tensions between the heritage promotion and consumption associated with rental business and the goals and practices of conservation, preservation, and interpretation become evident. These challenges serve to illuminate the layers of identity and interest amongst internal and external stakeholders and suggests that the hybridity of heritage can produce discord between heritage programming and community.

The next section builds upon these observations by exploring the mechanisms involved in the construction of place within ETS heritage narratives through an analysis of heritage information
produced by the ETSF and LTC and stored with their respective archives. By examining which historical elements were researched, cited, archived, and represented within official narratives, observations were made about the values and interests of various community groups and the amount of power they are able to exert within these relationships.
Chapter 6
Heritage Information as Evidence of ETS Heritage Narrative Construction and Management Practices

6.1: Introduction: An Overview of Heritage Information and Heritage Information Objects

Examining the production and reinterpretation of heritage information within the ETS context enables this study to more thoroughly explore the construction of heritage narratives rooted in place by identifying what information is produced and promoted through heritage management practices. Documents sampled from the ETSF and LTC archives were sorted into two major temporal categories representing the transitional period when the site was under redevelopment and the post-heritage designation period, when the schoolhouse was operated by the ETSF. The sample included information produced as a byproduct of research conducted on the schoolhouse as well as interpretative documents outlining the ETS narrative, which were crafted from this research. Heritage information objects are the material traces of heritage information and consist of historical records, data, photographs, artifacts, programming materials and ephemera that are intentionally collected for the purposes of establishing and maintaining a community’s heritage. The term builds off of notions of objects as documents from material culture theory (Kaplan, 1994; Pearce, 1990) and definitions of the term document developed by such scholars as Briet (1951), Otlet (1990), and Buckland (1997) – namely that a document is any source of information (including objects) that can and are intended be used for reference or study. Employing the term heritage information object brings together the materiality of heritage information as both an artifact produced as a by-product of social processes as well as a document which acts as a source of information in material form. What becomes evident through an examination of heritage information objects belonging to the ETSF and LTC, is that these documents provide evidence of and a platform form for heritage management by local community actors.
6.2: A Review of ETSF Heritage Information Accumulated by ETS Community Members

According to Moore and Pell (2010), archives, and by extension the archival practices of selecting, sorting, and maintaining records collections, facilitate the interaction and participation of different groups in dominant cultural discourses by providing evidence and establishing linkages for the construction and maintenance of identity and place. The materiality of the archive itself, creates a physical means by which groups are able to assert independence and by “maintaining control over its works, ideas and history, emergent publics are able to strategically represent themselves” (Moore & Pell, 2010, p.261). For the RFC and ETSF, establishing a research and operational records collection for the ETS site was important for the purposes of establishing credibility within local and regional heritage, museological, and planning frameworks as well as autonomy within its relationship with Little Trinity Church. If the archive can be utilized by groups to establish a distinct status and legitimacy in the views of other groups and communities, then as Patrick Joyce (1999) suggests, “The archive is always a place where authority resides” (p.38). Therefore, exploring and understanding power within the ETSF archive is necessary for mapping the relationships between different community groups involved in the production of heritage information and narratives. Jacques Derrida (1996) has claimed that, “there is no political power without control of the archive,” (p.4) and that power extends not only to participation in and access to records collections, but also to the archive’s constitution and interpretation.

Heritage information found in the ETSF archives indicate that research activity was an episodic practice that occurred throughout the ETS’s transition period from building to heritage site and into later decades under the management of the ETS Foundation. The care and intention involved in amassing this information suggests that it served as a valuable resource for the creation of ETS narratives, both about the schoolhouse, and for interpretive programming at the schoolhouse for adults and youth. The Foundation kept a variety of paper-based heritage resources, including primary research conducted by staff that included but was not limited to reproduced photographs of buildings and streetscapes, 19th century advertisements, copies of 19th century maps, lists of records and photographs ordered from other archives such as the
Archives of Ontario and City of Toronto, photocopies of original church records including birth, death and baptismal records, assessment rolls, wills, deeds, census data, 19th century schoolboard records, and handwritten research notes, most of which are undated and produced by unknown authors. There are also numerous secondary sources of heritage information in the archive, including annotated bibliographies of 19th and 20th century architectural, geographical, and education related books, newspaper articles, photocopied excerpts from books and journals as well as catalogues and program guides from museum and archival exhibitions that related to 19th century Toronto. The sample also contains five binders of photographic slides of images of Toronto architecture, drawings, paintings, and advertisements that depict and/or illuminate aspects of 19th century life in Toronto, as well as slides of staff carrying out programming and events, and of the participants in the ETSF’s Children’s School-Day program. Common to most if not all of these records is that they are the product of 19th and 20th century systems and groups and are very much rooted in materiality and geographic location. Early 19th century documents, such as census rolls and deeds, were designed to count, value and/or assign tangible property, such as the buildings and chattel that were owned by individuals and kept or built on land within bounded areas such as municipal wards. Birth, death, and baptismal records also linked people to specific neighbourhoods because they were produced by individual parishes. Many other records belonging to the ETSF’s heritage information assemblage such as the paintings, sketches, photographs, photographic slides, and historical 19th century atlases and histories of Toronto, which were collected by members of the ETSF, represented and reflected materiality in the form of architecture, artifacts, costumes, landscapes and people.

Moore and Pell (2010) suggest that connection to place is significant for local community archives because of the meaning that contemporary groups are able to derive from such details about the past. These shared perceptions of what Olick refers to as historical memory, that which reaches contemporary groups through historical records, are therefore central to the cohesiveness of community identity. As such, the archive becomes strategically important for development of the “relationship between place and discourse, and the ways in which these coalesce as resources for the formation of emergent publics” (Moore & Pell, 2010, p. 260). In the case of the ETS, groups such as the RC/RF and later ETSF, the connection to the building and its immediate geographic location were central to the ETS identity and conceptualization of
its history. Similar to the case examples of local Vancouver community archives, such as the For
Hope in Shadows and Friends of the Woodward’s Squat, described by Moore and Pell (2010),
the creation of the ETSF archive provided these groups with evidence of the historical continuity
of the site and its contribution to a struggling and marginalized community. This connection
enabled the RC/RF and ETSF to articulate both the value of the site and a new understanding of
its inheritance by the “People of Toronto.” It was also an opportunity for both the ETS groups
and the LTC to reimagine the neighbourhood surrounding the site as something more positive
than the impoverished and gritty reputation that it had maintained for well over a century and a
half.

The heritage information contained within the ETSF’s archives was accumulated over different
time periods throughout the history of the site by different ETSF staff and affiliates. During the
transition, some research was conducted by members of the LTC’s congregation as well as
church and diocese staff, junior league volunteers, and School Board staff in order to clarify the
significance of the site and to build a persuasive story for future heritage designation and
fundraising. Administrative records suggest that, after the restoration, heritage research and
information gathering became less of a collective and decentralized process carried out by
multiple organizations and more centrally coordinated by staff and volunteers within the ETS
Foundation. By the mid to late 1970’s, research records appear to have been produced by ETSF
curators and interns, visiting researchers and volunteers for a number of specific purposes
including to fulfil the museum mandate and to build interpretive programming for adult and
youth classes. One aspect of authority within cultural heritage institutions is established by
positioning the archive as significant to researchers and academics. According to Moore and
Pell (2010), “Historians (and others) are both attracted to undiscovered textual territory, and
legitimized by the use of new and original sources. This credibility is circular as the resulting
work is validated by the use of primary documents, while the archive achieves recognition by its
use in a formalized history” (p.262). Within this context the value of the ETS archive increased
through the accessing of heritage information by external users, especially academic users, which
legitimized the authority and identity of the site. While the archive provides both the content and
physical space through which meanings are created and new and existing heritage narratives are
shaped, these processes are constrained by the challenge of finding information. While heritage
information can include examples of heritage narratives, there is a distinction between heritage information and heritage narrative based on intentionality. Within an assemblage of heritage information, narratives become secondary resources for the production and reworking of future narratives. Within small heritage sites and community archives, a lack of resources including physical space, staffing, and funding often limit access to records and information because heritage information is uncatalogued, stored offsite, etc.

Despite the diversity of subjects, themes, and documents found within the ETSF archival sample, what was missing and/or subdued within this collection were the voices of local inhabitants and first-hand recollections of the site by community members including the LTC congregation, as well as information documenting 20th century stories and histories. Oral histories and photographs, are two examples of document types that might convey these stories. While research methodology documents included several articles discussing oral histories and providing directions for conducting oral histories, the ETSF sample did not yield any examples of such research. According to Carter (2006), gaps and silences in archival information can provide evidence of power and dominant narratives, because the groups creating archives are often aligned with the state and its apparatus, thereby replicating existing biases against more marginalized groups. Without a complete survey of the ETSF archive, it is difficult to determine whether this is also the case with the ETS. However, characteristics of the ETSF heritage information assemblage analyzed within this study are in some instances aligned with Carter’s observations. Early 19th century inhabitants of the Park (contemporary Lower Cabbagetown) as well as the homeless and low-income residents, who accessed the site when it was operated by the Church as a shelter and soup kitchen throughout much of the 20th century, would have experienced multiple barriers (i.e. lack of financial resources, education, or other skills) to participating in the site’s redevelopment, compared to members of the RC/RF and ETSF. Therefore, with access to the past restricted by the written word, these groups would have experienced barriers to telling their own stories about the site or even being recorded in that history through municipal and community record-keeping practices. Furthermore, Carter (2006) suggests that those in charge of managing archives, whether at the local or state level, are constantly making choices about what information to include and what to exclude. As such, the missing perspectives of LTC congregation members as well as an absence of 20th century stories
and history, might have been the result of decisions made by dominant actors driven by specific interests and goals as well as resource limitations, such as staffing and funding restrictions.

There is some evidence that research was at times either driven by or aligned with the individual interests of the researchers resulting in certain deposits of heritage information within the archive. For example, there are a number of research folders that contain religious research relating to local churches and religious activity in 19th century Toronto. Much of that information was gathered in the later 1970’s and early 1980’s during the tenure of two curators who had academic backgrounds and/or interests in Theology. Religious research documents were also gathered before and during the transition by the Church and members of the restoration committee that were representing its interests.

One of the earliest actions initiated by members of the Restoration committee was to begin researching the history of the Schoolhouse (Pope, 1968). The purpose of this activity was to establish the architectural and historical significance of the site for both the LTC and other stakeholders, to aid in the physical restoration, and to justify the need for an extensive redevelopment of the site. The RC, FC, and later the Foundation were very intentional in using research and documentary evidence to inform restoration decisions including the re-creation of décor and furnishings from the time period that they were trying to represent. During the redevelopment of the schoolhouse, researchers were also searching through a number of historical reference guides from the late 19th and early 20th century looking for references to the Schoolhouse, Turner himself, and early schools in Toronto. One such work, *Robertson’s landmarks of Toronto – 1896* consisted of a collection of historical sketches of the old town of York from 1792 to 1833 and of Toronto from 1834 to 1895. Correspondence between church and Restoration Committee members indicates that research was a collective effort participated in by a number of interested stakeholders including members of the Junior League of Toronto and the Toronto Board of Education. Staff from the Board of Education surveyed their archives looking for administrative records relating to the Schoolhouse in the mid to late 1800’s when it was managed by the schoolboard (Gore, 1969). The Junior League conducted research on the schoolroom’s interior furnishings including lighting, which, according to the restoration
architect, Garnet and Quigley, would be used to recreate the historic schoolhouse: “we will be arranging meetings in January to discuss these problems so that the whole of the interior is pulled together in a consistent and sympathetic way relevant to the period circa 1850” (Quigley, 1971, p.1). Such practices were instrumental in demonstrating adherence to the authenticity paradigm maintained by local and regional heritage and museological policies. An example of such policy is illustrated in museum operating grant guidelines published by the Heritage Branch of the Ministry of Citizenship and Culture, which required applicants to develop and implement conservation, collections management and public programming policies to be eligible for grant funding (Heritage Branch MCC, 1987). This policy document indicated that heritage properties chosen for historic house museums or restored museums should be restored based on academic research and follow practices outlined in the Ministry’s policy on heritage structure investigation (Heritage Branch MCC, 1987). The Ontario Museum Association (OMA)’s recommendations to the Ministry of Culture and Recreation also suggested that the rating system for grant applications include such criteria as “scale and quality of research” as well as “excellence of operation, including care of collections, efficiency of administration and programmes” (OMA, 1974, p.55). Records from the LTC archives suggest that prior to this research, there was some general awareness of the Schoolhouse’s importance as an early free school, however not much more had been concretely established. There was a strategic need for the LTC to ground the site’s historic aura in more tangible, evidence-based research that was characteristic of heritage discourses codified within museum and heritage management practice. Some of the earliest research records connected with the schoolhouse date from the spring of 1968 when the Restoration committee sent a letter to the Minister of St. Augustine’s Church on Bayview Avenue, appealing for help in the search for records related to Enoch Turner and the time period of 1848 when the schoolhouse was constructed (Pope, 1968). Other early interests included disputes within Little Trinity between the death of the Church’s first reverend, William Ripley in 1849, and the appointment of the third incumbent, reverend Alexander Sanson in 1952 (Pope, 1968). Church narratives had referred to conflict between the LTC’s two church wardens, William Gooderham and Enoch Turner, and the Church’s second leader, Reverend Richard Mitchelle (Hayes, 1991). The author of the letter indicates that the research was to be included in a brochure that would accompany a restoration proposal drafted by the Church’s architect, Garnet Quigley (Pope, 1968). The intent was that the brochure would also be ready for distribution by Sunday, June 2nd, which was the 126th anniversary of the Little Trinity Church
(Pope, 1968). This was a high profile event for the Church providing an opportunity to showcase the proposed restoration and gain support from members of the congregation as well as other influential attendees including the Lieutenant-Governor and representatives of a number of historical societies and Irish lodges.

These initial acts are reflective of the motivations behind early research and archival activity within the RC/RF and ETSF, which centered on the deliberate amassing of information for the purpose of establishing significance and shaping identity. They align with Schwartz’s (2006) conceptualization of the archive not as a “repository of knowledge,” but rather as a repository of information which constitutes the building blocks of knowledge and meaning. As such, archives are, “not passive storehouses of old stuff, but active sites where social power is negotiated, contested, and confirmed” (Schwartz, 2006, p.3). The ETSF archive sample provides insight into the wide array of research subjects that were of interest to the Foundation, its stakeholders, and staff. How this information was translated into heritage narratives grounded in place provides further evidence of the social drivers involved in the creation, ownership and regulation of local heritage.

6.3: Analysis of ETS Heritage Information Objects (HIO)

An analysis of five ETS information objects, two dating from the restoration phase of the site and three produced during the management of the ETSF between 1974 and 1993, provide insight to the heritage information archived in the ETSF. These items were created by members of the LTC and ETSF communities who were actively engaged in the redevelopment and management of the site and were selected because they represent the schoolhouse narrative from different perspectives and points in time. They also support a deeper understanding about the meaning and place-making decisions that occurred and were reflected in the stories and interpretive materials produced. According to Tilley (2006) uniqueness/singularity, and nostalgia are common elements in the constructing of place identity, which are often positioned as both
prospective and aspirational. All five of the HIO analyzed within this research project exhibit the incorporation of these elements.

6.3.1: Heritage Information Object-1: *York Pioneer*

The first information object reviewed within this study was published in the York Pioneer in 1971, before ownership of the schoolhouse was formally transferred to the ETSF. The Pioneer was a publication produced by the York Pioneer & Historical Society, a longstanding historical organization first incorporated in 1869. Affiliated with the Ontario Historical Society, membership was open to both citizens and organizations and as such would have provided the ETS Restoration Committee with a mixed audience of heritage professionals and citizens with a strong interest in local history. The tone and content of the eight-page article suggests that its intent was to raise awareness of the schoolhouse, establish its historical significance, and to promote the fundraising campaign. The historical information incorporated into this article reflects a number of sources including: Toronto Schoolboard records; Church and Diocesan archival record pertaining to the building of the church and schoolhouse as well as key actors such as Enoch Turner; Reverend William Ripley; census data; council minutes; and legislation originating from the provincial and municipal archives. This information was transferred into the records of the ETSF in the form of handwritten notes, photocopies, transcripts and photographs. These sources were not only selected and archived for the article published in the York Pioneer, but as a resource for later use by supporters of the ETS.

The narrative within this York Pioneer article represents one of the earliest historical accounts of the ETS to be found within both the ETSF and LTC archive samples. This account provided a reference for the restoration campaign and media coverage surrounding the redevelopment of the site. The largest and most detailed topic/theme addressed within Pope’s (1971) article is that of the free school history of the ETS, which continues across approximately three pages. Within this section, the author presents an account of the political climate and legislative decisions that
contributed to the education crisis in 1848 and to Enoch Turner’s philanthropic act to finance the schoolhouse himself. The article also provides a description of the opening celebration held in the schoolhouse, in which the pupils were treated to a dinner consisting of “roast beef and plum pudding, plum cake and apples” (p.23). The body of the article provides a chronological account of the ETS from its construction in 1848 through to the efforts to restore the site. While this account does acknowledge the site’s other functions, they appear only briefly suggesting that they were less important for heritage purposes.

The story both begins and ends with a mention of the restoration efforts and the introduction in particular is direct in mentioning the campaign’s funding target. The article’s first page also contains a photo of the Schoolhouse’s front façade, depicting a dilapidated structure with boarded windows and missing brickwork along the roofline. Clearly visible in this image is a plaque from the Historic Sites Board that commemorates the Schoolhouse’s historical significance. After charting the history of the site, the author returns to the materiality of the Schoolhouse towards the end of the narrative by discussing many of the restoration priorities such as fixing the exterior brick, replacing windows and finials, repairing the foundation, and interior refurbishment. These plans are legitimized through an acknowledgement of the heritage professionals and organizations involved in or supportive of the project, and detailed description of the heritage designation ceremony and the wording on the commemorative plaque.

In the case of the *York Pioneer* article, place is created by linking select aspects of the site’s history and functionality to contemporary social values. Within the narrative constructed by Pope, the schoolhouse time period becomes the anchor or focal point around which people, the city, and major events happened and are understood. According to Cosgrove (2006) heritage landscapes serve an important function in the maintenance of social and personal identity. These sites by their very nature, anchor and maintain that identity in physical places as a counterpoint to the flux of modernity, to freeze time and change and to provide an experience that Tilley (2006) describes as “traditionally authentic” (p.19). This study refines Cosgrove by exploring the complexity of the relationship between stasis and change, providing examples of how these two processes co-exist. By focusing on the site’s schoolhouse period, the building became an
anchor point, something tangible in a flow of change present within the narrative and illustrated through the brief chronological description of uses, characters, events, and building modifications that occurred after 1887. The hybridity of the site was flattened by highlighting the schoolhouse narrative and functionality, while other uses and histories were blurred and de-emphasized to the point that they provided more of a colourful backdrop for the characters and plot. Efforts to create stasis by emphasizing the schoolhouse time period while also making connections to the present, suggests an aversion to change and hybridity not articulated by Cosgrove’s statement. The de-emphasis of change illustrated within the narrative further reinforces the attempt at stasis. This was accomplished by language and intentional curation of historical content. For example, nomenclature used to refer to the heritage site was consistent and deliberate within this article, reflecting an identity that the Restoration and Fundraising Committees had already selected and begun to construct in response to research and dialogue with the heritage/museum community. In particular, the building was most commonly referred to as either the “Schoolhouse” or the “Enoch Turner Schoolhouse,” phrases that immediately reinforce for the reader the connection between the site and its schoolhouse history. The article's most detailed accounts of historical events relate to the schoolhouse period between 1848 and 1887, which were used to establish the uniqueness of the ETS. The modality of text utilizes absolute terms to describe the ETS as the first free school in Toronto and the province and materiality of place is conveyed through the author’s favourable description of the site’s Gothic Revival architectural style. This description also aligns with dominant heritage and architectural discourses that emphasize tangible forms and features of built heritage, especially those that are unique and distinct from other aspects of built landscape assemblages.

Incorporated within the story are one-paragraph biographies of two main characters, Enoch Turner and Reverend William Ripley, who were central to the schoolhouse identity. The description of Turner is surprisingly brief and provides few details beyond family recollections passed down to Turner’s surviving great grand-nieces. The biography describes Turner as a compassionate man who loved children and animals, feeding his horses beer at “the end of a hard day” (Pope, 1971, p. 23). This particular description of Turner, almost folkloric in nature, is replicated in a number of later stories, including heritage information items three, four, and five, and appears to have been useful for the construction of a likeable character that was central to the
identity of the ETS. William Ripley’s character is also present in subsequent narrative samples three and five, where he is cited as the School’s first headmaster. Other more briefly introduced characters included Egerton Ryerson, William Gooderham, and Bishop Strachan who were also connected to the origins of both the schoolhouse and church as well as contemporary actors such as the patrons of the restoration efforts including N.W. Gooderham, Professor Eric Arthur, and Garnet Quigley, the restoration’s architect. Highlighting both past and contemporary figures within the lifespan of the schoolhouse creates a sense of continuity with the past and carries through the themes and values central to the schoolhouse narrative. This is further evidence both temporal flow and stasis within the storyline. Values identified in the article include service to the community and generosity, which are woven into themes of heritage preservation, grass-roots advocacy, education, and philanthropy. The concept of meritocracy, the notion that individuals can achieve success through their own hard work and dedication is woven throughout the story and serves to reinforce the aforementioned values. Written by an active member of the LTC’s congregation, the article is sympathetic to the relationship between the Church and schoolhouse and provides a relatively detailed account of that relationship after the building reverted back to LTC from the Toronto Schoolboard in the late 1800’s. The author describes how, during this time, the Schoolhouse served a number of vital purposes within the community including operating as a welfare center, food bank, and wartime recruitment centre. There are also nostalgic references to the contributions made by members of the Little Trinity Congregation, who donated funds and labour in the 1950’s to maintain and refurbish the site. Returning to Cosgrove’s assertion that heritage sites and landscapes maintain identity as a counterpoint to the flux of modernity, this observation suggests an opportunity to strengthen the value of Cosgrove’s work by defining the role of the site in that process. In this instance, it is the values described by the author that persist and become affirmed rather than the physical site itself. Instead the physical site manifests these values. Pope (1971, p. 25) recalls, “It was a time of work parties, toy sales, Sunday School and community activities – a movement forward.” Interestingly, the article also attempted to negotiate a rather difficult aspect of the Schoolhouse’s pre-renovation situation, namely the dilapidated condition of the building and the Church’s decision to transfer ownership to an external organization. Pope mentions that after the severe fire that gutted the Church in 1961, church services were relocated to the schoolhouse. In particular, the author outlines the challenging political and financial circumstances that contributed to the decline of
the Schoolhouse’s physical condition and the Church’s decision. One sentence was particularly sympathetic, suggesting:

The church was unable to look after the schoolhouse. Rather than have it succumb to the wrecking crew, the congregation, under the leadership of the Reverend Harry Robinson, agreed to turn the building over to a public trust for maintenance on the condition that enough money be raised for an authentic and practical restoration. (Pope, 1971, p.25)

The statement implies that the decision to give up the schoolhouse was reluctantly made and the phrase “unable to look after” positions the Church as a trustee or guardian of the site rather than simply an “owner.” While this account represented the official position of the LTC, it also conflicts with some internal Church records from the late 1960’s in which the Schoolhouse was, as times, referred to as a low priority and a drain on resources by LTC Officials. The observation derived from this dichotomy suggests an attempt at idealizing or simplifying a rather more complex relationship between LTC and ETS for the purpose of the narrative being formed.

The HIO also provides numerous references to the local population that was served by both the Church and Schoolhouse. These communities are referenced by socio-economic status, religion and faith, either Protestant or Catholic, but not by name. Within the historical component of the narrative, the communities constitute the problem that establishes the need for a Church and Schoolhouse. They are referenced mainly as “the poor” or “the destitute” and one statement paints a particularly vivid (if not also one-sided) picture of the neighbourhood’s inhabitants:

This populous neighbourhood was the poorest part of the city. The Irish – Catholic and Protestant alike – lived in rude huts. Drunkenness was common. During the Cholera epidemics of the 1840’s, bodies of the dead were stacked in sheds and mass graves covered whole areas of the Park. (Pope, 1971, p. 20)
The language used to describe these communities was homogenizing and provided limited
details about the populations, beyond a general acknowledgement of disadvantage and suffering.
Ultimately these descriptions provide more of a social panorama for the scene’s backdrop, a
central problem for the advancement of plot. They solidify the Schoolhouse’s sense of place
through values of community service and support. One interesting example can be found in the
account of the 1842 protest that culminated in the promise of a Church and schoolhouse for the
Park’s inhabitants by a group of wealthy and influential individuals representing business, local
government, and the nearby Anglican Diocese. While the article specifically names eight of
these powerful community members, including Enoch Turner, the marchers themselves go
unnamed, referred to only by their group identity as Irish Protestants. This description is
reflective of several social and historic factors, namely a privileging of white, wealthy males,
which is certainly not unique to ETSF, but also of the ability of a group of people to draw their
power from the unnamed nature of their collective. More importantly however, is that the
passage is demonstrative that these practices and preferences materially existed when the article
was written.

6.3.2: Heritage Information Object-2: Press Release

The second HIO, found within the ETSF archive sample, consists of an ETSF press release,
which was intended to mark the opening of the restored ETS heritage site in 1972. This
document is promotional in style and while meant to reach a broad audience, it contains specific
information of particular interest to elementary school teachers, heritage volunteers, prospective
donors, as well as organizations, community groups, and individuals looking for event space to
rent. This is a brief story consisting of two pages of short paragraphs that alternate between
historical aspects of the site and contemporary details about the museum and restoration. As a
press release, the author had to distill content down into the most essential and strategic
information necessary to convey the intended message. This provides insight into what aspects
of the site’s history were selected and prioritized.
The content of the release provides only select examples of historic information, including a brief mention of the geographic location and the age of the site. Only historical references central to the schoolhouse identity and function of the site are included. While no historical figures are referenced, the ETSF’s Board of Directors are individually identified along with the opening ceremony’s VIP guests and key supporters including funders and heritage organizations. This positioning serves the main theme of the release, namely the restoration and reopening of the schoolhouse and its primary role as living history museum for school-age children. In particular, the author drew on a nostalgic connection with the past through the themes of education and living history. One statement explains, "An old-fashioned teacher will demonstrate what it was like when their great-great grandparents went to school" (ETSF, 1972, p.1). This statement serves as an intergenerational bridge that draws from the collective memory of grade school experiences, both remembered and handed down from previous generations. To further enrich this nostalgic connection, the author describes the site’s recreated furnishings including 19th century writing desks, décor, and costume that reinforce the living history and historic house museum framework popular within heritage management discourse during the years following Canada’s centennial celebrations (Ministry of Culture and communications, 1990; Jolliffe, 1983). By alternating between past and present, the article flattened time and brought the past and present together in a way that spoke to contemporary interests and values around education. The author employees a declarative tone to explain that, “the building has taken on the 'new look' of restoration - just as it was a century and a quarter ago” (ETSF, 1972, p.1). Such statements speak to performative and processional aspects of the site’s function as conveyed in statements such as “we are told that eight hostesses in period costumes will attend and that the governor general will visit the first school visit - a classroom of twenty-five pupils seated at recreated period desks” (ETSF, 1972, p.1). According to Tilley (2006), social identity is almost always performed in specific contexts, as demonstrated in the Foundation’s press release, which are grounded in “material points of reference in the form of landscapes, places, artefacts and other persons” (p.21). Place-related activities help to solidify and demonstrate collective identities to other groups and communities through an identification with the material environment and specific histories associated with those structures, landscapes and artefacts (Tilley, 2006, p. 14). As such, these enactments, constituted from conventional and familiar contexts, provided an accessible means of facilitating nostalgic experiences connected with the
ETS’s materiality. Essentially it promotes a nostalgia among the younger students for a time period that they never experienced.

Language employed with this text also provides insight into how place identity was developed and shaped throughout narrative. For example, references to the schoolhouse change from sympathetic terms such as "the old building," during pre-restoration descriptions of the site to that of "fascinating historical site" and "the restored building" during post-restoration sections. This change marks a reconceptualization of the schoolhouse and an adoption of dominant heritage management discourse. Through this transition the schoolhouse is rebranded as a formal and legitimate heritage institution. There is also an incorporation of military language to describe the ceremonial opening of the site in which an "Honour guard of 18 children from present-day schools” were represented at the event (ETSF, 1972, p.1). Local area schools such as Park, Sackville and Regent Park were specifically named, most likely because of their proximity to ETS and the communities they represented, which drew modern day parallels with Enoch Turner’s opening dinner and aligned the Foundation’s actions and interests with those of their central protagonist. Language like "Toronto's oldest school" and "first free school" were used as descriptors to demonstrate the significance and uniqueness of the site.

6.3.3: Heritage Information Object-3: ETSF Interpretive Brochure-1

The third HIO consists of a one-page, post-renovation, interpretive document that dates to approximately 1974-75 during the tenure of Stephen Magwood, one of the ETSF’s earliest curators. This narrative, found in the ETSF archival sample, is presented in brochure/newsletter format and provides a brief history of the Schoolhouse and a summary of its contemporary functions including information about both rental and heritage programming. The nature and structure of the document’s content was consistent with site promotion, suggesting that the flyer was designed to raise interest in the building through increased awareness of historical significance and program opportunities. Its audience was likely diverse including teachers,
parents, local citizens, and tourists interested in history, and/or rental opportunities, as well as youth and adult programming. Interspersed amongst the text are black and white photos of three local figures associated with the history of the site -- Enoch Turner, William Ripley, and Egerton Ryerson -- all of whom were directly connected to the schoolhouse storyline and the 1848 to 1887 time period being re-represented by the ETSF. The picture of Enoch Turner is the largest of the three and is positioned next to a sketch of the building’s front façade. This arrangement helped to reinforce the schoolhouse function, its founder and the building’s material form.

This narrative brochure refers to the site as the Enoch Turner School, which has become its official name. Archival research found within the ETSF’s heritage information assemblage, conducted by the Restoration Committee and its partners during the redevelopment phase of the ETS, indicates that the schoolhouse was originally named “Trinity Street School” (Pope, 1971). As such, when the site underwent redevelopment in the late 1960’s and early 70’s, it was renamed after Enoch Turner (which occurred prior to the production of this document by the ETSF). While no LTC/ETSF records were found to explain this change, renaming the site would have provided a number of strategic benefits during the heritage designation and restoration process. One such benefit to the Restoration Committee and Foundation is the way the name change enabled a greater distinction between the Little Trinity Church and the Schoolhouse, facilitating the creation of a more independent identity. This would have been helpful for the LTC during the restoration phase when the LTC Corporation needed to distance themselves from fundraising efforts. A second benefit was that it allowed the RC and ETSF to craft a coherent schoolhouse narrative through an emphasis on the contributions of individual characters such as Enoch Turner, who demonstrated the values of local activism and philanthropy -- values the ETSF equally sought to valorize among the schoolhouse supporters to secure ongoing donations and future engagement. Adjacent to either side of the illustration are short captions that draw attention to important aspects of the site’s place identity. Written in larger font than the body of the text are the address of the Schoolhouse, “Trinity & King St. East,” and “Toronto’s Oldest School Building.” These captions convey very clearly a sense of uniqueness that was tied to location and materiality. The title "Welcome to the Enoch Turner School – 1848,” written in flowing script across the left corner of the page, helps to frame the image of the schoolhouse and further reinforce its Victorian schoolhouse identity.
The brochure’s language provides further insight into how the ETSF envisioned and conveyed a sense of place and collective memory through the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse. The site’s significance was made clear within the first sentence of the document which describes the ETS as both a “monument” and one of a few remaining buildings of “merit” within the city. These descriptors would have aligned with the language repertoire entrenched in dominant heritage discourses of museum and heritage professions and regulatory bodies, thereby creating a sense of legitimacy for the schoolhouse, especially for a non-professional audience, with no direct access to these institutional currencies. For example, this statement about the ETS follows the Heritage Branch of the Ministry of Citizenship and Culture’s criteria for museum planning which describes “heritage significance” in material terms as the “historical, architectural and archeological importance of the property” (Heritage Branch MCC, 1987). Within this same statement about the ETS, use of the pronoun “our,” the possessive form of “we,” before the noun “city” engendered a collective sense of localness and ownership over that materiality. A nostalgic connection to the past is also facilitated by the use of language and statements that serve to fix time and connect the past and the present. For example, towards the end of the brochure, the author states in a declarative tone, "once more the schoolroom comes alive with the noise of youngsters who come from all over metro to attend classes in living history” (ETSF, ca. 1974/75). Use of the phrases “once more” and “comes alive” root the site in its schoolhouse history and imply a return to a natural and “correct” state of use.

The body of the brochure’s text is structured in a similar way to that of the other narrative examples and follows a rather linear/chronological ordering of events. The plot, which focuses on the history of the schoolhouse from its construction in 1848 to the eventual restoration and redevelopment, is punctuated by short biographical paragraphs describing key characters. Relatively little information is provided for these individuals beyond the year of their birth and death as well as their contribution and/or impact on the Schoolhouse’s development. Only the central theme of the site’s free-school history is expressed within this story and there are very few and/or brief references to the socio-economic living conditions of the neighbourhood’s inhabitants and long relationship between the Church and the schoolhouse compared to the first
narrative. For example, while the author indicates that Enoch Turner financed the building of the Schoolhouse, there is no mention that the LTC provided the land on which it was built. Towards the end of the article, when the author outlines contemporary restoration initiatives, the role of the LTC congregation in supporting the fundraising and restoration efforts is also omitted. The list of “concerned groups” identified in the narrative as spearheading the preservation efforts includes the Junior League and Schoolhouse Concerts, but not the Church or congregation. Such omissions suggest that the Church’s historical and contemporary relationship with the Schoolhouse was deprioritized within this period. The brochure was created not long after the ETSF had assumed legal title of the schoolhouse and as such, the prioritizing of the schoolhouse narrative above other aspects of the building’s history might have been an attempt to unify the site’s long and varied history while also establishing greater autonomy from Little Trinity Church. The flyer draws on much the same heritage information and schoolhouse themes that are presented in the 1971 York Pioneer article. Specific details about the 1846 education crisis, the protest in 1842 that lead to the construction of the school, and details about the site’s first schoolmaster are all incorporated. In fact, some content, such as the representation of Enoch Turner as a kind and generous man who loved children and animals, including the tale of him feeding beer to his horses, are reproduced verbatim from Pope’s (1971) article. These details, unlike the Church’s interconnected history, form a central storyline that emphasizes the free-school era and functionality that became the central focus of the ETS museum’s interpretive programming.

6.3.4: Heritage Information Object-4: ETSF Interpretive Brochure-2

The fourth document selected from the ETSF archival sample consists of a second post-renovation, interpretive brochure produced by the ETSF that dates to approximately the 1980’s. Following a similar format as the previous brochure, this informational document provides an overview of the history of the schoolhouse for a broad audience including teachers, the general public, prospective members, walk-ins and tourists. Certain cultural references, such as "the Great Famine," (Ireland's mid-19th century famine) are imbedded within the body of text and suggest that the intended audience had some understanding of, or familiarity with, Irish
immigrant history. More highly structured than the first brochure, text is grouped into bounded columns, each containing visual material such as 19th-century photos, paintings, and illustrations, as well as sketches of the schoolhouse’s front façade and floorplan. The four images arranged on the front page include a photograph of Enoch Turner positioned under the first column, which was likely the same portrait presented in earlier narrative examples, a large drawing of the Gooderham and Worts windmill, a large sketch of the schoolhouse façade, and a 19th-century painting of children. With the exception of the ETS sketch, these images were reproduced from archival collections belonging to the Toronto Public Library, Toronto Archives, and LTC archive. These images were collected within the ETSF archive on photographic slides. All four images align with the schoolhouse narrative maintained by the ETSF and contributed to its sense of place. For example, Enoch Turner was the central figure in the development of the schoolhouse and as the heritage site’s namesake, his story and image provide human, moral, and historical elements to the site’s story. Juxtaposed against these unnamed illustrations of children, the photograph of Turner contributes to the sense of singularity and uniqueness. The Gooderham and Worts windmill landscape provides a scenic and idealized 19th century backdrop for the story and the stylized illustration of Victorian-era children reading also reinforced the schoolhouse history and function through a nostalgic imagining of 19th century life and values. The visual content on the back page of the brochure contains analogous images of studious children and rural landscapes all of which reinforce the narrative’s storyline that charted the development of the schoolhouse and its significance to Toronto’s education history.

Information used to reconstruct the 19th century history of Lower Cabbagetown, York, and Toronto, which constitutes the first section of the article, was derived from a number of sources including census data, photographs, photographic slides, and church records. Some of this information had already been collected during the Schoolhouse’s restoration phase and some of it was likely produced for the brochure as part of continued research activity by the ETSF. ETSF board meeting minutes from this time period indicate that the Foundation’s curator had been applying for government grants, including the Ministry of Culture and Recreation in order to draft an updated brochure for the Schoolhouse and that he had tasked volunteers and an intern with responsibility for gathering additional research material on. Continuous research and educational programming were required to maintain the ETS’s museum mandate and
responsibilities as promoted by contemporary museum policy frameworks, such as those imbedded in the government’s museum operating grant criteria. An example of such policy is found in a policy report drafted by the Council of the Ontario Museum Association for the Ministry of Culture and Recreation in 1987, which recommended that “scale and quality of research” (p. 21) be considered as a measure for rating government interest in the calculation of operating grant allocations for Ontario museums. Another earlier, example is found in the Ministry of Citizenship and Culture’s guidelines for museum operating grant applications. This publication suggested that museums develop a public program policy, grounded in research, which designed and implemented collection, exhibit, and educational programs to illustrate the site and/or community’s “geographical, historical, or cultural uniqueness” (Heritage Branch MCC, 1974, p. 7).

Unlike the other heritage information samples reviewed within this study, the content of this document is structured thematically, with the themes arranged in chronological order. The topics incorporated into the narrative include: “The Kings Park” that chronicles the development of the neighbourhood in which the site is located; “A Schoolhouse for Trinity Street” that charts the development of the schoolhouse and the history of the free-school movement; “The Schoolhouse Serves”, which includes the post-school history of the site; “Restored and Revitalized”, which describe the near demolition of the ETS and the fight to save the schoolhouse; and finally, the “You Can Join Us!” section that provides membership information including benefits of and opportunities for members.

This iteration of the schoolhouse narrative provides a similar, although considerably briefer, retelling of the site’s history compared with that of the 1971 York Pioneer article. Unlike the press release and first interpretive brochure, this document acknowledges the long-standing relationship between the schoolhouse and the LTC, incorporating the role of the schoolhouse in the history of the LTC after the site was transferred back to the Church in 1887. One such statement also connects that relationship to the religious beliefs of Enoch Turner himself:
The life of Enoch Turner’s Schoolhouse has always been linked with the ministry of the Little Trinity Parish. Enoch Turner was a good churchman, even a warden for eight years...Since the beginning Little Trinity’s Sunday School has met in the schoolhouse (ETSF, ca. 1980).

The reappearance of Church history into the schoolhouse narrative coincided to some extent with the ETSF’s reassessment of its relationship with the LTC beginning in the 1980’s. ETSF Board minutes and reports discuss the strategic importance of developing a stronger, more collaborative, relationship with the LTC. One report in particular, identifies increased membership sales as a Foundation priority and points to the LTC congregation as a potential source of membership (Malloy, 1988; 1987a). Re-engaging that community through a shared connection to place and collective memory likely provided a platform for such an inclusion strategy.

Common elements shared with the other ETS histories include the description of the schoolhouse’s geographical location, brief reference to its neighbourhood and constituents, as well as the events that contributed to the building of the Church and Schoolhouse. Once again, the article specifies the “notables” involved in the establishment of the church and school, including Turner, Bishop Strachan, Alderman Dixon, and Gooderham and Worts, but does not identify the protestors who confronted them during the Orange Day Parade in 1842. Those actors are defined broadly and homogenously as in earlier histories, however within this iteration, the reader is provided with some additional description. For example, the author refers to the protestors as, “Protestant Irish” who were “too proud and poor” to attend services at the larger, St James Cathedral and to pay the tuition fees required to send their children to the city’s common schools. This slight elaboration adds complexity to the spirit and struggles of 19th century Lower Cabbagetown residents, while also building nostalgic connections to contemporary restoration efforts and subsequent heritage programming by drawing parallels between these periods through such themes and values as community engagement and advocacy. The political clashes that lead to the 1848 Education Crisis were repurposed verbatim as was the description of Enoch Turner as a benevolent philanthropist, who loved children but had none of his own. Framing Enoch Turner in such a way created an endearing personality that was useful
for the construction of positive and aspirational elements required to establish a strong sense of place. The brochure also repurposes earlier written accounts of the preservation efforts and restoration, but provides a more sympathetic account of the LTC’s role in that intervention, similar to the references provided in the 1971 York Pioneer article. What is notable in this iteration is the manner in which contemporary programming is framed within the schoolhouse narrative. Within this context a connection is made between the site’s youth and adult programming and positive social impacts on the surrounding community at large. The brochure describes the restoration of LTC and the schoolhouse as a catalyst for neighbourhood revitalization and an active place for new meaning-making through educational programming based on local history. Similar to the previous stories, time is both flattened and frozen through the performative acts associated with the site’s living history function. This brochure also employs phrases such as “the old schoolhouse is once more alive” to give meaning and purpose to the ETSF’s ongoing management and site programming and by linking the historic schoolhouse function with contemporary values of community engagement and education.

6.3.5: Heritage Information Object-5: York Pioneer - 1993

The final document analyzed within this study, is a twelve-page article published in the York Pioneer in 1993, over two decades after the first publication by John Pope of the LTC’s Restoration Committee. Found in the LTC archive sample, the article is written by Jane Macauley Sutton who served as curator of the ETS in the early 1990’s. The article is a departure from previous iterations of the schoolhouse narrative because it provides a detailed biography of Enoch Turner that positions him as an influential and important figure in the history of Toronto. The article follows a more academic format that includes detailed footnotes and citations, unlike earlier sample texts, which align it more closely with the ETSF’s strategic priorities to produce and facilitate research as an aspect of its museological function. Sutton constructs an extensive account of Enoch Turner and his family, property, friends, and interests. Some of the information contained in the article is not present in earlier narratives, suggesting that new research and topics were being incorporated. Content is divided into sections consisting of chronologically arranged themes, which include a description of Enoch’s early life, his
immigration to Canada and the challenges that he faced as a new immigrant and business owner. These details also reflect a shift in Canadian national heritage discourse such as the expansion of immigrant narratives beyond the British as well as the notion of immigrants improving their situation by coming to Canada. This is as much a national narrative as a heritage discourse. Sutton provides a relatively detailed account of the fire that destroyed Turner’s first brewing facilities that would have left him destitute if not for the generosity and support of the local community. This story mirrors Enoch’s own acts of philanthropy and reinforces the values of generosity and community engagement that became a part of the schoolhouse narrative and the message conveyed through it by the ETSF. The next theme, “Life in Vale Pleasant” attempts to provide more information about the Brewer’s first years in York and his close friends and tenants, which included several escaped slaves, Alfred Blackburn and his wife, who were originally from the United States. This information is unique compared to the other narrative samples because it provided the only other attempt to introduce non-dominant groups into a narrative besides the Irish Protestants. While the theme of Enoch as the “benevolent brewer” persists within the text, including the legendary tale of Enoch feeding beer to his horses after a hard day’s work, attempts to introduce new and diverse characters, including Turner’s spouses and step-children (which are mentioned for the first time), into the larger schoolhouse narrative suggests a willingness to engage with new, more diverse topics and perspectives that stretch beyond the traditional “great man” perspectives that favoured the individual acts of dominant characters. While this strategy attempts to provide a social history of Enoch Turner and the schoolhouse by humanizing a great figure through the expansion of his life and the addition of complexity to his character, it also illustrates the struggle of the ETSF to overcome the “great man” account of history because he ultimately remains the main character of the story.

This is a more nuanced article that provides a more fulsome picture of Enoch Turner and the history of the Schoolhouse than had been previously demonstrated in the narratives reviewed within this study. The author acknowledges that Enoch Turner’s interests were not entirely rooted in secular education, a fact never specifically addressed in earlier iterations of the schoolhouse narrative. Instead, the author outlines Turner’s numerous financial contributions to the LTC and other Anglican institutions such as the University of Toronto’s Trinity College. The reader is afforded a more three-dimensional view of a man who was both passionate about
his religious beliefs and strategic in the management of his philanthropic pursuits. For example, Sutton notes that Vestry Minutes from 1852, which had been gathered during the restoration phase of the ETS redevelopment, hinted at “unhappy differences” between the Reverend Mitchele, the Church’s third incumbent, and the LTC’s Church Wardens, William Gooderham and Enoch Turner. While the nature of the disagreement is not identified within the Church’s records, Sutton suggests that it corresponded with the rental of the Schoolhouse to the Toronto Schoolboard. Toronto Schoolboard records indicated that Turner joined a new Schoolboard committee in the area along with James Worts and Church records indicate that within three months of that 1852 Vestry Meeting, Mitchele had left Little Trinity Church due to the pressure exerted by Gooderham and Turner (Macauley Sutton, 1993). This more complex understanding of Turner is a departure from the traditional Schoolhouse representation of him as the generous and kind-hearted philanthropist and demonstrates an engagement with new and more complex historical information that came at a time when the ETSF’s identity had been solidified and entrenched in the schoolhouse narrative for over twenty years. The infusion of new information and discussion would have enabled the Foundation to open up new dialogues that refreshed the ETS history and aligned discussion and values with emerging museological and heritage discourses that were beginning to address alternative and subordinate histories (Crooke, 2010; Wateron & Watson, 2013; Waterton and Smith, 2010; Tigert, 2000).

6.4: Conclusion: Observations and Comparisons of Heritage Information Objects

When compared, all five heritage information objects include common themes and elements which are significant for the development and maintenance of the ETS’s place-based identity. Central to all stories is the free-school history of the site and its social and architectural significance within the city and province. The themes of grassroots community activism and the restoration of the schoolhouse are also common to all narratives, suggesting that meritocracy and philanthropy were valued at each of the temporal periods represented by the sampled narratives. According to Misztal (2007), “successful narratives about the past must have a beginning and an end, an interesting storyline and impressive heroes” (p.380), which corresponds with all of the ETS stories. The historical founding of the schoolhouse in the midst of 19th century social
reform by the honorable and successful protagonist, Enoch Turner, followed by a long and varied history of the picturesque little gothic schoolhouse marked by the threat of the building’s demolition in the late 1960’s, saved through the intervention of concerned local groups who raised funds to restored the site to its former glory, all provide engaging material for the creation of the ETS narrative. What these stories also suggest is that different historical details were incorporated, removed or otherwise shaped depending on the needs, motivations and interests of the groups authoring the texts. For example, both early and later narratives produced from research by the RC/RF and ETSF groups were shaped by existing dominant heritage discourses that emphasized tangible aspects of heritage. These discourses imbedded in municipal and provincial heritage and city planning/designation policies, determined historical significance based on criteria such as architectural uniqueness, wealthy and/or famous inhabitants, unique functions, and/or historic events. As such, by focusing on the free-school aspect of the ETS’s history, the groups who exerted control over the site’s identity and narrative, including the RC/RF and ETSF, were able to translate the historical information that they had formalized through research and archival practices into a cohesive representation that met these external measures and allowed them currency and authority within that system. According to While and Short (2010), “Place making strategies tend to present ‘heritage’ in terms of reasonably coherent spatial identities. Certain heritage meanings might be promoted over others for various reasons, with judgements being made about how the past should be represented” (p. 5). In the case of the ETS narrative samples, each demonstrated the selection and promotion of specific historical aspects and information over other aspects in order to shape, maintain, and reshape identity based on needs and motivations. Between the first, second, third, and fourth samples, there were shifts between the incorporation of the LTC’s relationship with and support for the schoolhouse and the deprioritizing of these details that corresponded with efforts to either gain independence from the Church or to rebuild that relationship that occurred at different times throughout the post-renovation history of the site.

These representations are also indicative of systems of power that are represented and replicated by the hegemony of groups and systems both contemporary and historical that filtered what information was produced both about and for different groups. While and Short (2010) suggest that, “Local heritage narratives are necessarily rooted in the history and materiality of sites and
places. They are also invariably highly selective, prioritizing certain histories, meanings, associations – and material artifacts – over others, and thereby privileging certain pasts, presents and futures” (p.6). In the case of the sample information items, each were produced by dominant groups that included the LTC, RC/RF, and ETSF and variances between historical content reflect the power leveraged by these groups at the times when they were produced. This would explain why for example, LTC history was incorporated in the first narrative at a time when the RC committee was represented by congregation members that reported to the Church’s Reverend, but absent from the third story, when the ETSF maintained ownership and control over the ETS and its interpretive programming. This would also explain why throughout all narratives, perhaps to a lesser degree in the fourth and fifth, there is a tendency to collectivize marginalized populations that both interacted with and received services or support through the ETS over its lengthy history, and individualize wealthy and influential characters, who for the most part, consisted of wealthy and politically influential white men of British and Irish decent. This bias would also have been transferred across temporal spans into the contemporary LTC and ETSF archives by the historic systems that gathered social and economic information based on these same power dynamics.

The ETS information item samples and the assemblage they are derived from also provide evidence for how heritage information changes over time, suggesting that they are dynamic in nature. ETS heritage information was gathered and archived by various groups as well as by members of the RC and ETSF and was deposited within the ETSF archive. That information had a number of trajectories at the beginning of its life cycle as heritage information, being accessioned from many different sources and drawn upon at various times during the redevelopment of the site and throughout the history of the ETSF for a variety of purposes including content for fundraising and community outreach, marketing, and interpretive programming and course content, and functioning as a resource library for restoration initiatives, researchers, and site staff. This conglomerate of information speaks to the durability and persistence of material records as well as how they become integrated organizationally, systematically, socially, and ideologically by groups and organizations. The matter of durability is particularly significant in the context of local and community heritage sites because of the funding and resource constraints that are often faced by these small-scale institutions. In the case
of the ETSF, the assemblage is neither digitized nor catalogued and has been reduced in size over time, with a number of artifacts deaccessioned and transferred to the OHT. The remaining collection is currently in temporary storage within OHT and so its future remains somewhat unclear. As such, this research suggests that the persistence of heritage information may become more difficult over time as it is influenced by a number of variables including funding constraints, shifts in organizational mandate, or broader changes in heritage and museum management policies.
7.1: Introduction

Much like other heritage sites, the ETS is a dynamic assemblage of uses, histories, and architectural interventions that have occurred over the length of its 170-year lifespan. This research study explored the social processes involved in the production of heritage and to understand how decisions about what is preserved impact the relationships between communities and their local heritage landscapes and structures. In particular the research design answered the following two questions: How is the connection between a community and a built space shaped by heritage designation? Which community members, whether individuals or groups, are involved in the production of heritage information and how is that information selected, codified, communicated, and otherwise promoted through heritage management systems including planning and conservation policy frameworks?

The ETS provided a compelling case through which to examine these linkages because of its strong connection to local groups who were deeply committed to its restoration and preservation. Their governance and stewardship produced a comprehensive collection of archival records related to the ETS’s transition from building to heritage site as well as its ongoing operations as a living history museum and rental facility. These records yielded a considerable amount of information on community interactions and decision-making that shaped the site’s heritage narrative and sense of place.
The first section of this study reviewed archival records for evidence of heritage management and examined those actions within their social and political contexts. The selection and formalization of dominant heritage narratives during the designation and redevelopment phase the schoolhouse, as well as the relationship between function and heritage narrative construction from redevelopment through to the ownership and management of the site by the ETSF, was the focus of this analysis. The connection between place and function or “place for activity”, such as the ETS as a place for museum work or religious practice, was explored here and served to highlight tensions between different functions and their users. In particular, research reviewed operational records such as committee meeting minutes and correspondence between different users such as the LTC, RC/RF Committees and other stakeholders such as the Toronto Board of Education, heritage groups and organizations, as well as the City of Toronto, and looked for evidence of decision-making, conflict, and interactions between groups and stakeholders, how membership in groups was determined and how groups operated both internally and in relation to each other. Observations were grouped into three main discussions that focused on the following themes: the work of the ETS Restoration Committee and the selection of the museum paradigm; the Church and ETSF relationship; and the dual, sometimes competing functions, of the ETS’s museum and rental operations.

The second section of this study explored heritage information assemblages to understand how heritage decisions and control were reflected in the archives and narratives produced by both the ETSF and LTC. Of particular interest was the development and management of place and shared memory by heritage and community actors. This was accomplished by first examining how heritage information was gathered and stored as well as an examination of which groups were involved in that process. The second section analyzed sample texts from the ETSF archive to understand how select heritage information was incorporated into interpretive content and how those decisions contributed to larger ETS narratives. Five documents which represented different time periods within the redevelopment and ETSF management phases of the site were selected for analysis using tools adapted from discourse and narrative analysis methodology.
7.3: ETS Case Analysis Findings

7.3.1: Finding 1: Dominant Heritage Policy Discourses Influenced Heritage Redevelopment Decisions within the ETS

The study’s first finding concludes that dominant local and regional heritage and planning discourses influenced which of the ETS’s heritage attributes and histories were preserved and promoted. These discourses valued restoration strategies that prioritized tangible elements of heritage, namely Victorian-era architecture, that were able to demonstrate “authentic” representations of that past. Evidence-based heritage practices, such as historical research, were necessary to demonstrate adherence to authenticity and to justify the significance of site as worthy of preservation. These heritage and museum policy frameworks serve to shape not only what buildings are restored, but how they are restored, which in turn has implications on functionality by restricting building modifications that fall outside of the approved historical re-representation. In the case of the ETS, early records from the LTC archive suggested that the adoption of and adherence to heritage and museum frameworks began during the early stages of the ETS redevelopment and continued to shape function and practice throughout this transition phase as well as during the management of the site by the ETSF. Records from the LTC archive indicate that the Church’s restoration committee actively engaged heritage and museum organizations during the planning and proposal stages of the ETS restoration project and that historical research was used to demonstrate the connection between the building and the history of Toronto’s 19th century public school system.

Unique historical attributes such as Enoch Turner and the free-school period were central to the RC, RF, and later ETSF’s case for support, and by emphasizing the free-school narrative, these groups were able to reduce the site’s hybridity and create a more coherent and cohesive place identity connected to education. Furthermore, heritage information, produced and archived
within the ETSF archive, demonstrated the participation of community groups in dominant heritage practices such as historical research and interpretation. ETS narrative texts, sampled within this study, provide not only evidence of the selective re-representation of heritage attributes and histories, but also of the language and practices which reflected and embodied the authority of dominant heritage discourses and membership within those communities. Decisions about the site’s redevelopment and functionality were also controlled and shaped by heritage and museum discourses. Correspondence between the LTC and its committees as well as ETSF board minutes suggest that redevelopment decisions such as the purchasing of building materials, furnishings, and fixtures required review and approval by heritage professionals who ensured that adherence to the building’s 19th century design aesthetic were followed. The decision made by the RC not to construct a permanent stage in the building’s West Hall, was one such example of the impact of heritage discourse on use. In this case, it was determined that a permanent stage would conflict with the authentic restoration of the site and so it was not installed despite its usefulness to certain user groups such as the Schoolhouse Concerts. Such observations challenge the assumption that museum and heritage practices are aligned with the communities that they are meant to serve, suggesting instead that heritage and community do not always coexist easily at the local level.

7.3.2: Finding 2: Preservation and Re-Development Strategies Connected Place Influenced Ongoing ETS Stakeholder Relations

The second conclusion made by this study contends that preservation and re-development strategies rooted in place can result in further implications for the ongoing relationships between community groups and stakeholders. In the case of the ETS, selection of the museum function and the prioritizing of the 19th century free-school history addressed several urgent needs of the RC/RF and ETSF. In particular, it developed a unique and defined place identity that was more easily incorporated into a central historical ETS narrative. It also aligned with existing heritage design and aesthetic paradigms that derived value and significance from such criteria as unique or unaltered architectural elements, historical and political events and/or influential citizens occurring at the site. However, by prioritizing specific functional and historical elements, the
RC/RF and ETSF changed the way that certain community groups accessed the ETS site, both the physical site and the mean-making that occurred within that space, which in turn resulted in implications for how these groups collectively understood their own connection to that history, especially over time as direct experience gave way to historical memory. For example, the 19th century schoolhouse museum paradigm created a separation between the site and the LTC congregation in terms of mandate and organizational responsibilities. Memorandums to the LTC congregation advising members of the need to follow specific processes for accessing the schoolhouse space, and of their limited right to that space, highlight this divide as does internal Church correspondence from the late 1980’s when Church officials considered reabsorbing the schoolhouse because of its importance to the identity of the Church. Essentially, the institutional separation of the LTC and ETS altered the way in which members had accessed the site and at times generated a tension that was reflected in the operational records found within the ETSF and LTC archival samples. That change in function and mandate, along with the legal transfer of ownership of the ETS resulted in an estranged relationship between the two organizations that deepened the ETSF’s reliance on external funding sources such as government grants and rental income. The need to grow and maintain a steady source of revenue is an ever present challenge for many museums and heritage sites, especially those operated by historical societies and non-profit foundations. In the case of the ETS, ETSF board minutes and correspondence suggest that the rental opportunities afforded by the site’s facilities and location were sometimes in conflict with museum operations and community access. Changes in the salary ratio between curator and rental administer positions, as well as incidences where museum/heritage staff raised concerns about the use of the schoolhouse by renters were key examples discussed.

By exploring the interaction between museum/heritage practices and community, this study contributes to critical heritage discourses that are beginning to address what While and Short (2010) identify as the tension between heritage promotion and the goals and practices of conservation and preservation. While there is a large body of literature that explores the conflicts between conservation and commercial redevelopment, there has been comparatively less discussion about these “internal” struggles within the heritage profession. As such, understanding how heritage is selected, produced, and privileged, by specific groups and why, is central to understanding such tensions. This study contributes primary and secondary evidence
of internal struggles by both groups and individuals involved in the maintenance and production of ETS heritage at site level through an exploration of operational records and heritage materials found in the LTC and ETS archives.

7.3.3: Finding 3: Heritage Information Provides Evidence of the Development of Place-Related ETS Heritage Narratives

The final conclusion made by this research presents heritage information assemblages and the representation of that information within heritage interpretive documents as evidence of the processes by which place identity and collective memory are created. ETS heritage information object samples demonstrate the selection and promotion of specific historical details, such as the free school history, the site’s neo-gothic architecture, and its patron Enoch Turner, in order to construct, maintain, and reshape identity based on the needs and interests of dominant groups including the management, planning, and policy discourses produced by heritage and museum professions at both local and regional levels. This heritage information was used to demonstrate uniqueness and singularity, a nostalgic connection to the past, and was prospective and aspirational in nature; key elements involved in the conversion of site into “place.” The ETSF archive served as a repository for heritage information and space for the formalization of narratives. The assemblage provides a reservoir of historical details that RC/RF and ETSF drew upon to shape and reshape the schoolhouse narrative in response to external and internal interests and pressures.

A deeper reading of the content and organization of heritage information and narratives also provided further insight into power dynamics and relationships exhibited by various groups and stakeholders interacting through the materiality of built heritage. When the content of select ETS texts are compared, differences in the way historical events and details were presented and interpreted can be identified and linked to observations made through the analysis of operational records presented in the first section of the study. For example, the first and fourth narrative texts, dating to 1971 and mid-1980’s respectively, incorporate more LTC history and are more
sympathetic to the contributions of the Church and congregation than other narratives produced in the mid 1970’s. Operational records including ETSF board minutes and correspondence between LTC officials and with ETSF board members suggest that during these periods, the Church had comparatively more influence over the Schoolhouse than at other times. For instance, the first article was written by a congregation member at a time when the schoolhouse was still owned by the Church and the latter was written at time when the ETSF struggled financially and was attempting to build a stronger relationship with the Church in order to gain new members. Such linkages help to identify factors that shape local heritage decisions and illuminate the ways in which local actors and policy and planning frameworks intersect during that process.

An analysis of heritage information assemblages and the narratives from which they are derived, provides a means of comparing and triangulating observations made from the analysis of operational and institutional records produced by both the LTC and ETSF. They also help to move critical heritage discourse beyond discussions of commercial redevelopment and heritage policy discourse based on fuzzy assumptions about the meaning of place and collective memory by exploring the processes involved in the genesis of place-related identity at the individual site level.

7.4: Future Research: Recommendations and Opportunities for the Fields of Information and Heritage Studies

The research undertaken for this thesis has highlighted a number of topics for which additional research would be beneficial.

A review of existing heritage literature has identified several areas in which critical analysis and further discussion is needed, such as the connection between place identity and heritage conservation/preservation decisions as well as the factors involved in the development of place
identity and its contribution to heritage site narratives. While these topics have been addressed by the research in this study, the scale of this discussion needs to be extensive and multifaceted even at the local community heritage level. Future research within the ETS context would also be useful for exploring the link between place identity and heritage policy through the measurement and evaluation of how heritage management systems, namely the Ontario Heritage Trust and the City of Toronto’s municipal cultural and planning policy framework select, legitimize, and promote locally produced heritage information. Therefore in order to contribute to achievable heritage policy and development strategies, there is a need for more case studies at the local level to allow for further evaluation of the local dimensions of the subject.

In terms of this research project, resource and timeline limitations meant that archival documents pertaining to the site’s second transition when ownership was transferred to the OHT, were not included in the project design. Future research could extend analysis to the latest phase and compare with the findings outlined in this thesis. Such analysis could provide insight into how place identity continues to be shaped under dominant narratives embodied in the OHT and explore how power is now being negotiated between the ETSF, LTC, and OHT. Furthermore, observations made through the study of heritage information assemblages could be extended and deepened by applying other research methodologies. For example, computer-aided content analysis or relational tools such as cognitive mapping could be used to explore the shift in definitions and meanings over time and across different individuals and groups. The decision to narrow the scope of analysis and description to select types of heritage information, namely research and interpretive documents, was useful for the research aims of this study, but future research could potentially refine or redefine the term heritage information by examining and identifying new forms as well as by examining how heritage information intersects with other documents and records. Future studies might also, for example, explore community impact and engagement by conducting perception studies or gathering oral histories that articulate current meaning and place-making at both the individual and group levels, especially since human studies were not part of this research study.
7.5: Original Contribution and Significance to the Fields of Information and Heritage Studies

Critical heritage discourses have made significant contributions to their field by challenging assumptions within urban regeneration, place-making, and heritage conservation and planning strategies, especially those that relate to the selection and validation of what eventually becomes designated as ‘heritage’ (Graham et al. 2000; While and Short, 2011; Waterton and Smith, 2010). Dynamics of power and social injustice have also been identified and discussed especially in the context of community heritage and interpretive practice (Crooke, 2010; Prangnell et al. 2010). This study has contributed to these ongoing debates and discourses by both deepening our understanding of the connection between place identity and heritage narratives as well as by exploring novel research approaches and data pools, namely through an examination of heritage information within systems of heritage management.

For the fields of heritage and museum studies, such research provides an important perspective on the inherently social and selective nature of heritage management practices. Understanding how heritage decisions impact community engagement may have implications for a site’s social relevance and long-term sustainability. This is especially likely for local heritage sites and museums which are particularly vulnerable to changing neighbourhood demographics and fluctuations in revenue/funding streams. In terms of contributing to the broader community of professional practice, these contributions to critical heritage discourse serve as a lens through which heritage and museum professionals can reflect on choices made in the name of cultural heritage and to assess the likelihood and desirability of the social outcomes of those decisions. It encourages stronger assessments of preservation and redevelopment strategies and policy that are based on nuanced and comprehensive understandings of collective memory and place identity which challenge more shallow assumptions of the intrinsic value of heritage.
This study also provides a start of a history of heritage information by exploring and observing how heritage information persists and becomes imbedded organizationally, systemically, socially and ideologically. The case analysis of the ETS suggests that heritage information is not static, but shifts over time and that it exhibits both contexts and interplay. It is this contribution to Information Studies that provides both insight into and raises questions about the durability and persistence of records over time, thereby intersecting with such archival and informational discourses as the totalizing archive. The ETS case analysis also highlights the value of archival research and institutional archives as a way of exploring and understanding institutional practice as it manifests through time. Church and Foundation archives yielded a large amount of data not only about internal operations, but more importantly, about the underlying social interactions through which operational decisions and practices were made. The amount and quality of data collected for this study would have been difficult, if not impossible, to obtain through other forms of collection, such as interviews or oral histories, given the age of the sites and their long history of management. Therefore as assemblages and repositories of archival information, these archives enable both organizations to reflect on and interpret their own institutional histories.
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Endnotes

i. The notion of identity has also been extensively studied within other contexts, such as the fields of cultural geography, post-colonial, migration, and gender studies by scholars including Butler (1995), Hooks (1990), Williams (1995), and Hall (1996). Within this study, I hone in on one specific and focused context for a model that includes concepts of identity drawn primarily from psychology scholarship. Studies from the field of Psychology focus on a similar population to that of the ETS (not diasporic, such as those examined in the aforementioned fields, or gender-focused such as the work of Hooks).

ii. There is an expansive body of scholarly work dating back to the 1950’s that addresses notions of heritage interpretation. While a review of this literature is beyond the scope of this thesis, further suggested reading to explore public interpretation, further includes:


iii. See above (endnote i)
Appendix I
ETSF Financial Records

Table 1: ETSF Revenue for 1987 & 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YTD Revenue from Grants</td>
<td>$27,573.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue from fundraising &amp;</td>
<td>$10,874.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>donations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTD Revenue from rentals</td>
<td>$60,609.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,609.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTD Revenue from classes</td>
<td>$4,997.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTD Revenue from membership</td>
<td>$1,755.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>