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Feel the Love – the visual presentation of large technology heritage
Alison Wain
Centre for Creative and Cultural Research, University of Canberra, Australia

Introduction
The ways in which producers of large technology heritage choose to present their objects from a visual and aesthetic point of view are highly varied, and they are influenced by factors including personal preference, philosophy, available skills and straight cost. Broadly though, they can be grouped into four distinct styles, which will be referred to in this article as “As Found”, “Working Clothes”, “Former Glory” and “Creative Customising”. This article will explore what values these styles reflect, what aspects of significance they enhance or let go, how visitors respond to them, and their impacts on the costs of saving Big Stuff in tight economic times.

The article will draw on a recent study of producer and visitor responses to large technology heritage in Australia, which investigated how producers felt about different presentation styles, and how their visitors responded to and interpreted those same styles. 368 visitors participated in short, semi-structured interviews, and 83 people involved with the production or management of large technology heritage participated in longer, open interviews. The interviews were conducted at eight sites in Australia that display large technology heritage and, for comparison, a leisure site that does not have heritage displays.

Different approaches, different responses
Humans are very visually focused, devoting as much as 50% of their brains to visual processing (Anderson 2010, p. 33). They respond to the appearance of things very strongly, and very immediately, and the way something is presented carries huge amounts of subliminal information – as advertisers know only too well. For this reason the way in which producers of large technology heritage choose to present their objects visually can be expected to have a major impact on the way their audiences respond to them.

Very often, and not unnaturally, producers aim to give their visitors the experience that they would like to have themselves, and the type of information they would like

---

1 For details of the study, including the methodology and quantitative and qualitative analyses, see the author’s forthcoming thesis: A. Wain, 2012, Size Matters: Seeing the Values in Large Technology Heritage, PhD thesis, Australian National University.
2 The sites are listed below, along with the abbreviations subsequently used in the paper:
   • Western Australian Museum --- Maritime (WA Maritime Museum)
   • Australian War Memorial (Memorial)
   • Melbourne Museum (Melbourne Museum)
   • Scienceworks (Scienceworks)
   • Puffing Billy (Puffing Billy)
   • Campbelltown Steam and Machinery Museum (Campbelltown Museum)
   • Automobile Restorers Association Gold Coast (Gold Coast car show)
   • Darling Harbour – interviews were conducted in an area of Darling Harbour where no large technology heritage is displayed (Darling Harbour)
   • A pilot study was also conducted at the National Museum of Australia (NMA).
to find when they go as visitors to large technology heritage displays. These are the experiences and the information that they find compelling, and that they regard as an essential part of a high quality experience. Large technology heritage producers can, however, have a very different view from their visitors of the objects on which they work, and they can sometimes forget that what makes them feel comfortable, happy and engaged may not do the same for their visitors. Even with the best of intentions it is hard to see with other people’s eyes, and producers can be blissfully unaware that the displays that seem to them so accessible, clear and welcoming, may seem to other people inaccessible, obscure and alienating.

Visitors themselves come from many different backgrounds, and range from people with extensive knowledge relevant to the objects on display (many visitors are themselves producers of large technology heritage displays in other contexts) to people such as children, who may lack even a frame of reference with which to connect the objects they are seeing. This means that a single way of presenting objects is unlikely to engage all visitors equally – different visitors, just like different producers, will have different preferences.

What visitors do often share, though, is a love of variety. Humans seem to require a certain level of novelty to feel interested and satisfied, and will actively seek out situations that provide it. Drawing on psychological research, John Falk and Lynn Dierking have commented that:

> Curiosity… is driven by the need for stimulation… the desire to promote, then satisfy, curiosity aptly characterizes the motivation behind most free choice learning… and is a major factor in determining whether environments are appealing. Environments that have “mystery”, provide a moderate sense of the unknown, are complex, and invite exploration are far more desirable than those without those qualities (Falk and Dierking, 2000, p. 115).

Variety in the presentation of large technology heritage objects is therefore an important factor for engaging a range of visitors in the first place, for keeping them interested as they tour a museum or site, and for encouraging them to return in the future. This need for variety means that all the presentation approaches mentioned above have value, and all can be useful in different situations to present aspects of the past in innovative and engaging ways. With this in mind, we will explore the opportunities and challenges offered by the “As Found”, “Working Clothes”, “Former Glory” and “Creative Customising” styles of large technology heritage presentation.³

To assist the reader, Figure 1 is a visual summary of the paths typically taken to achieve these different presentation styles, while Table 1 (below) lists the pros and

---

³ It should be noted that this article focuses on visual presentation, not operational presentation. Choosing to make a machine operational is a separate decision to the choice of visual presentation, and with the exception of the “As Found” presentation it is possible to use all of the four presentation styles discussed in this article for both static and operational technology displays.
cons of the four approaches from display and logistical points of view.

Figure 1: A flowchart illustrating typical object treatment paths taken to achieve the four presentation styles.

Table 1: The pros and cons of the four presentation styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation style</th>
<th>Good for ...</th>
<th>Bad for ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As Found</td>
<td>Preserves historic evidence Economical</td>
<td>Rarely engages visitors (looks uncared for)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Clothes</td>
<td>Engages most visitors (looks cared for and interesting)</td>
<td>Can be interpreted as poorly finished and unprofessional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carries affective sense of authenticity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preserves some historic evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level and cost of treatment can be varied to suit the resources available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Glory</td>
<td>Can express individuality</td>
<td>Does not preserve much historic evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engages many visitors (looks pretty)</td>
<td>Can lack sense of authenticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Customising</td>
<td>Engages visitors (can spark new ideas) Expresses individuality Uses the past as inspiration</td>
<td>Expensive but level and cost of treatment can be varied to suit the resources available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Style 1: As Found

Figure 2: The cranes on the slipway adjacent to the HMAS Ovens submarine at the WA Maritime Museum. The cranes are presented “As Found”. *Image: A Wain, 2008.*

The big plus with the “As Found” approach is that it protects the historical evidence contained in the fabric of an object. The object may be stabilised, but is otherwise preserved largely unchanged to retain as much evidence as possible of every period in the object’s life. This means that the object retains the microscopic and analytical clues that can allow future researchers to discover in more detail where the object has been, what it has done, and how it has changed throughout its life. Such detective work can uncover stories that are a rich source of interpretive material, and when it is engagingly presented, visitors are often just as fascinated by the detective work as by the object itself.

The “As Found” approach can verify an object’s authenticity, and support visitors’ emotional response to it as a “bridge to the past”. Michael Brevenholt, Education
Officer at the WA Maritime Museum, spoke of the impact of knowing that the fabric of an historic boat was original:

[These planks] have been places, they have seen things... you think about all the hundreds if not thousands of people who have touched that object during the course of its life, the lives of the owners. It may not be an important person, sometimes just the ordinary people that have touched it or used it. What were their lives like? And it becomes something that can transport you to the past.

The downside of the “As Found” presentation is that the period of the object’s history that will be most visually evident is the period of neglect and deterioration that occurs at the end of the service lives of almost all large technology objects, as their technology becomes obsolete and they are sold off or dumped. During this period they are rarely considered either interesting or valuable and they are allowed to become dilapidated, which means they no longer look anything like they would have done while in service. Not only is it hard for visitors to imagine an object in this condition fulfilling its original service functions, but the object looks as though no-one values it. A trained eye -- and good analytical equipment -- can see and interpret the historic evidence, but the average visitor can see only an object that appears to be unloved and uncared for.

This is important because the subliminal message conveyed by an appearance of neglect is that the object is not worthy of better care, which suggests that it is neither significant nor valued. The question this raises for visitors is, if the object is not loved or valued by anyone else, why should they treat it any differently? John White, senior curator of large technology at the Australian War Memorial described an incident that demonstrates how strongly the condition of an object can influence people’s behavior and attitudes towards it:

We have had items which have been important and have come through customs from New Guinea, and customs inspectors have chopped holes in them so that the [fumigation] gas that kills possible bugs can invade the structure more thoroughly. And you look at it and just say "but there were so many easier ways of doing it". But of course all they could see was that it is a damaged object and another few holes isn't going to make a difference.

A further problem with objects that appear uncared for is that, as Elaine Gurian notes, “…visitors can deduce from their experience what we, the producers of exhibitions, think and feel about them”(Heumann Gurian 1991, p. 176). Graham Black similarly notes that the professionalism and level of maintenance of a presentation demonstrates the regard an organisation has for its visitors (Black 2005, p. 35). If a large technology object looks as though it is not valued, the implication is that the organization displaying it does not value its visitors enough to invest in creating a worthwhile experience for them. The presentation of a particular genre of objects in a way that is noticeably less professional and less well-maintained than the rest of the displays may also suggest that that type of heritage (and those
who value it) are not as worthy of professional attention and representation as those who value better maintained heritage.

From a display point of view, therefore, the “As Found” presentation preserves historic evidence and originality, but is hard for visitors to relate to and understand. From a logistical point of view, if weatherproof storage is available the “As Found” presentation is very economical as treatment is generally restricted to cleaning and stabilization. This is consequently a good approach when saving Big Stuff in tight economic times, and can be used either as an end in itself or as an intermediate step until further funding is identified.

Style 2: Working Clothes

Figure 3: Owner Andrew McVey (left) with his “Warragul “steam traction engine at the Campbelltown Museum Oil Steam and Kerosene Field Day in May 2008. The engine is operational and is presented in its “Working Clothes”. Image: A Wain, 2008.

The “Working Clothes” approach was articulated most clearly by producers at the Campbelltown Museum, a club of private owners who exhibit predominantly working machinery at a rural site. Ray Graf, a private owner of small electrical locomotives at the Campbelltown Museum explained it like this:
I don't know where it came from, but ["working clothes"] is an expression used. In other words cleaned, maybe not polished, but cleaned and looking all right, as against leaving it covered in gunge. Versus the other extent of cleaning and painting it better than new.

The “Working Clothes” approach had great appeal for the many visitors in the Australian study who expressed the desire to see objects displayed looking as they would have done when they were in regular service. Statistical analysis showed that the majority of visitors of both genders, in all age groups, all occupation groups and at all interview sites (with the exception of the Gold Coast car show) preferred to see objects showing marks of age and use that reflected their service lives. Those visitors who did want to see objects restored to look new were more commonly male than female, but even these were in the minority, as 67% of males interviewed preferred not to see objects restored to look new (Wain 2012, p. 115).

These people tended to see marks of age and wear as honourable scars, evidence of the objects’ achievements and hard working lives:

I think they have more of a sense of age and having had a working life when you can actually see a bit of wear and tear on them. Not dilapidated, but they don’t have to be spanking new.  

Restored as new they don’t look as if they’ve done it. Being nice and shiny – well, it hasn’t done anything yet.

Another visitor clarified that it was not in itself important whether the object looked new or well-used, as long as the condition of the object reflected and helped visitors relate to the service life of the object.

I think it depends what their purpose in being displayed is. So in the case of [the Parry Endeavour yacht], you would remove its history if you restore it. Whereas Australia II, you can take it looking shiny, and that’s how it looked when it was racing so I think it’s right to display it polished up again.

Areas of damage and modification can also have a profound affective impact, as people often use this physical evidence to help them visualise historical events for themselves. Such visualisations can generate an emotional response that makes the

---

4 Quotations in this paper that are reproduced from visitors interviewed during the study sites are footnoted with the site name, case number, gender, age range and occupation of the visitor quoted (see for example note 5 below).


6 Memorial 316: Male, 56–65, store-person.

7 Darling Harbour 411: Male, 46–55, interviewee did not provide job details when asked, instead merely describing himself as “not mechanical”. He was speaking of the Parry Endeavour, a yacht used by John Sanders to make a record breaking triple circumnavigation of the world in 1986–1988, and Australia II, the yacht that carried an Australian team to victory in the America’s Cup in 1983.
experience feel vivid, memorable and personally relevant, as noted by a visitor to the Memorial:

You get an idea of how close the pilot came to death when you see all the machine-gun marks and the bullets.\(^8\)

The “Working Clothes” presentation is unusual in that it can be the end result of several quite different processes (see Figure 1). The other presentation styles discussed in this article typically follow a single, linear path from found object to display presentation, but the “Working Clothes” presentation can be the outcome of three different treatment paths:

- minor restoration to a cared-for appearance;
- refurbishment to a “new” appearance followed by artificial distressing to recreate the “Working Clothes” look;\(^9\)
- refurbishment to a “new” appearance followed by operational use that recreates the “Working Clothes” look through patterns of use similar to those from the object’s service life.

The downside of the “Working Clothes” approach is that the refurbishment required to take an object from a dilapidated to a used-but-cared-for appearance will inevitably destroy some of the physical evidence of the object’s history. This can be mitigated to some extent by detailed written and photographic documentation, as well as by the retention of samples of materials removed from the object. The other downside of the approach is that it does not provide the glamorous finish that some producers and visitors do want. Deciding whether these issues are relevant means assessing the significance of the object in question, as well as its intended use as heritage.

From a display point of view, therefore, the “Working Clothes” presentation is excellent for projecting a sense of authenticity and promoting visitor engagement, and depending on the level of restoration undertaken it can preserve substantial amounts of historic evidence. For many producers, however, the “Working Clothes” presentation connotes an unfinished job or lack of maintenance, and regardless of visitor response to it, they may personally see it as disappointing and unprofessional.

From a logistical point of view the different paths that can lead to a “Working Clothes” presentation make it a particularly flexible approach, offering the option of minimal restoration in tight economic times, or more extensive restoration if more funds are available. The option of restoring to a robust, weatherproof finish and then letting a “used” appearance develop through normal processes of weathering and

\(^8\) Memorial 266: Female, 46–55, ferry master.
\(^9\) While distressing is often equated with faking age, Ian MacLeod – Executive Director of Collection Management and Conservation at the WA Maritime Museum – pointed out that it is no more dishonest to repaint an object with a coating that looks aged than a coating that looks new. “If you had a large object and you had to repaint it I see nothing wrong...in putting on a surface finish that looks old. It is quite legitimate. And in fact it can actually go a long way to enhancing the visitor experience in understanding the nature of the object... That was the problem I had with a lot of the exhibitions at Victoria Key. [The boat] Lady Forrest looks as though she is brand-new. She is not! She is old! Let her look old!”
use is a practical way of reducing ongoing maintenance costs, particularly for objects that are stored and operated predominantly outdoors.

**Style 3: Former Glory**

![Figure 4: A car restored to its “Former Glory” at the Gold Coast car show in 2009. Image: A. Wain, 2009.](image)

The “Former Glory” approach focuses on the visual beauty and impressiveness of the object. The object is generally returned to the condition the owner feels it would have been in when it was new, with gleaming paintwork, brightly polished metal surfaces, and any modifications returned to original specifications.

This approach was particularly popular at the Gold Coast car show, and it was noticeable that the preferences of producers and visitors were more closely aligned here than at any of the other sites, with both groups preferring the objects to have a highly restored, visually beautiful finish. This approach is also being used for the restoration of a Daimler at the NMA, to represent the earliest period of its use when it was one of a fleet of cars used to carry Queen Elizabeth II and Prince Phillip during their 1954 Australian tour. Although this means destroying evidence of its later service roles, its role in the Royal Tour is the story the NMA wishes to tell, and the

---

museum feels that this story can best be told by restoring the vehicle to its “Former Glory”.

The downside of the “Former Glory” approach is that, for many visitors a highly restored appearance renders the authenticity of an object suspect. Visitors interviewed in the Australian study felt that highly restored objects were less trustworthy and evocative than those that looked their age:

I prefer it when they look old. Because [if it is restored] I don’t know whether it is real.\textsuperscript{11}

Don’t paint over it for heavens sake... It’s a museum after all, it’s not an artistic place. It doesn’t have to be spotless and clean and beautifully presented... They should remain genuine rather than pretty.\textsuperscript{12}

If it looks brand-new then I don’t have a connection with the way it was and the way it used to operate. If it looks like it has just come out of a factory, then it doesn’t have the age associated with its actual physical place in time.\textsuperscript{13}

One reason that the Former Glory approach may have this effect on many visitors may be because objects are often restored to a higher finish than they would have had even when they were new. As Fred Vanags, an experienced steam machinery operator\textsuperscript{14} commented:

You see a lot of machines that have been restored and painted up and they go right to the “n”th degree of filling little deformities in the casting with body putty and then they make it look sparkling new. Well, when they were manufactured they were never like that, they were just roughcast and normally a coat of paint was thrown over them and then they went off to work. Tractors particularly are the ones that are over-restored – they never looked like that when they came out of the factory, never ever.

This issue of trustworthiness did not arise at the Gold Coast car show because the most significant thing about the objects to the majority of people there was not the objects’ past lives as ordinary cars, but their new lives as “special” cars. For this community the histories of the restoration processes and the people who did them were more significant than the histories of the cars themselves. One visitor at the Gold Coast car show, asked whether the most interesting time in the cars’ lives was when they were brand new, working, at a special event or any other time, replied:

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{footnotes}
\item[12] Memorial 281: Male, >65, printer.
\item[13] Scienceworks 112: Female, 26–35, mechanical engineer and teacher.
\item[14] Fred Vanags maintains and operates both his own steam heritage steam machinery, and machinery belonging to the Campbelltown Museum and the Maitland City Council. He was interviewed as a heritage producer during fieldwork at the Campbelltown Museum.
\end{footnotes}
\end{footnotesize}
Oh, no no. Restored. Because of the effort that is put into them.\textsuperscript{15}

A visiting couple, when asked if they like to see the cars restored to look new, responded that they liked to see a variety of imaginative presentation styles:

\textbf{Male visitor:} [I like] some to be back to the original, but some to be customized or whatever.

\textbf{Female visitor:} I suppose it is to see what people’s imagination brings them back to, because it’s a lot personal as to how they bring them back.

\textbf{Male visitor:} Their own style, the owner’s style.\textsuperscript{16}

From a display point of view the “Former Glory” presentation scores highly on physical attractiveness, with many producers and some visitors (particularly in the car genre) relishing the input of effort and imagination by the objects’ current owners, and seeing the beautiful finish as evidence of a job well done. The majority of visitors outside the car genre, however, feel that the history of the object has been lost or obscured by the high level of restoration, and that the object has lost much of its feeling of authenticity and emotional affectiveness.

From a logistical point of view the “Former Glory” approach tends to be expensive, as it not only requires extensive initial cleaning, stabilization and refurbishment (including the repair or replacement of most or all damaged parts), but high ongoing maintenance costs to keep it looking in top condition. This makes it a challenging style to adopt in tight economic times.

\textbf{Style 4: Creative Customising}

\textsuperscript{15} Gold Coast car show 243: Male, 56–65, plumber.

\textsuperscript{16} Gold Coast car show 221: Female, 46–55, administration officer. Male, 46–55, upholsterer.
Figure 5: The fun of “Creative Customising”. These hot rods, photographed at a show at Uraidla in South Australia, combine body styles of the 1930s-50s with modern paints and accessories. Image: U.K. Frederick.

The “Creative Customising” approach is very different from the “As Found” and “Working Clothes” styles, being focused more on the present than the past. In this it overlaps with the interest in the present shown at the Gold Coast car show, but whereas producers at the Gold Coast car show generally expressed their personal taste and imagination within the boundaries set by the original makes and models of their cars, car customisers see no such limits.17

The big plus of “Creative Customising” is that it uses the past as a source of ideas and inspiration for the present. Raphael Samuel notes that the blending of old and modern is often belittled as being obsessed by style over substance, or worse is accused of being a “fraudulent” use of the past, but he points out that its juxtaposition of the old and the new generates excitement and creates the imaginative space for new ideas (Samuel 1994, pp. 112–114.). Andrew Warren and Chris Gibson, in their study of custom-car culture in the Australian city of Wollongong, similarly commented that car customising was usually ignored in mainstream assessments of artistic activities and industries, despite the fact that it

...was a careful and richly creative process: ideas and designs were firstly hatched amongst social groups, informed by personal tastes and feelings; then in performing custom car work technical knowledge about mechanics, electrical wiring, painting, metal fabrication, and upholstery became requisite

17 It should be noted that while creative customising is an approach that could potentially be used with any historic object, in Australia it is most commonly used on cars.
— but only towards ends that emphasised idiosyncratic personal expressions and aesthetic preferences (Warren and Gibson, 2011, pp. 2706–7, 2715).

The downside of “Creative Customising” is that it can lead to misunderstandings about what is from the past and what is from the present. Col Ogilvie, engineering conservation consultant at the NMA, illustrated these concerns with a story from his days as a private car restorer:

I did a Holden for a bloke years ago, an FC Holden, and the only thing about it that was FC was the body shape. Everything else — it had a V-6, V-8, an engine in it. It had all the front end out of a HR, and the diff out of something else, you know. It was all a compromise. It wasn’t an object of beauty for me as in an FC Holden. But it was an object of beauty to him because it represented what he wanted. He wanted a very fast–looking, going FC Holden. His interpretation of an object restoration is not the same as mine. [To me] his was an object conversion. But to him, it was a restoration. Difficult.

It must be remembered — and acknowledged — that “Creative Customising” does not result in an historic or original object. It can be culturally authentic, in that it continues a tradition of mechanical skills, love of machinery, ingenuity and imagination from the past into the future but the result of combining an FC Holden body with components from other models or makes of cars is not a restored FC Holden but something new. It can be something thrilling, and something that will inspire both its owner and visitors, but it does not reflect the history of the various cars its components came from, or say anything about the lives of people at the time those cars were originally produced and used.

Like the “Former Glory” presentation, the “Creative Customising” approach rates highly on physical attractiveness and is much appreciated by producers and visitors for the effort, imagination and fun embodied in its new creations. “Creative Customising” deserves recognition for the way in which it takes elements of the past and gives them a new meaning in the present, but it is important that its products are recognized as new contributions to a continuing cultural evolution, and not mistaken for representations of past products and ways of life.

From a logistical point of view the “Creative Customising” approach is somewhat similar to the “Former Glory” presentation, as the high finish and extensive modifications that are characteristic of the approach are expensive both to produce and to maintain. The freedom to create new forms and juxtapositions, however, offers producers a lot of flexibility, giving customisers more opportunity to tailor their creative choices to their means.

Creativity is a vital part of living cultural traditions, and while the tangible products of such creativity may change over time, they remain authentic expressions of the cultural tradition that gave rise to them. Zancheti et al (2009) note that cities are cases where the fabric of the past is constantly reconstructed and re-interpreted by new generations, and that this process is an essential element in maintaining the authentic life of the city.
Conclusion
Many producers of large technology heritage have a preferred display style, one that appeals to their personal preferences and satisfies criteria of quality and appropriateness that they draw from their backgrounds and training. Producers tend to use their preferred presentation style for all the objects they care for, without finding out whether this is a style of presentation that will appeal to their visitors, will be acceptable to other stakeholders, or will complement and add variety to the presentation styles used for other objects in the same display.

By abstracting heritage presentation approaches from this personal context, it is possible to analyse them more dispassionately as styles that connote different ideas, portray different messages, and achieve different outcomes. The four styles discussed above are ordered in this article into a sequence that moves broadly from reverence for the past, through recreation of the past, to using the past as a jumping-off point for the future. None of these methods of presentation are the “right” way to do things, and none of them are the “wrong” way – they all have a valid place in the display “armoury”. Looking at them in this way can allow producers to choose a style for the job at hand, rather than just a style that suits their personal or professional preference or comfort zone.

The thing that is important in all of them, though, and that stood out in the Australian interviews, is the importance of conveying the idea that an object is valued, cared for and loved. An object that says “I am loved” immediately attracts attention, as people gather curiously around it to find out what is so interesting, and why it is loved. An object that looks unloved sends a message that it holds nothing of interest and is not worth looking at. Some objects that are cared for but not restored at all send the message “I am loved” very successfully – as is demonstrated by a number of the relics in the Australian War Memorial that are displayed using the “As Found” presentation style but interpreted and maintained with obvious care and thoughtfulness. By contrast some quite highly restored objects at the Scienceworks campus of Museum Victoria send the message “I am not loved” because they are displayed in a dusty outlying garage, with small, dull signboards. Many privately owned large technology heritage items convey the message “I am loved” because their owners are there with them in displays, actively demonstrating their interest and passion. If we want to make our objects as interesting to our visitors as they are to us, we have to show them our passion in ways that they can understand even if they do not share our backgrounds or expertise, and one way we can do this is by showing them how much we care for our objects. It is vital that we help them to “feel the love”.
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