

Cultural Preservation and Experiential Reconstruction

Archives, Museums, Living Traditions, and Community Authority

Wanhong HUANG
huangwanhong@serendip.ngo

Working draft, August 31, 2026

Abstract

Cultural preservation joins several operations that deserve separate evaluation: retaining traces, maintaining provenance, enabling interpretation, reconstructing experiential conditions, supporting practical learning, sustaining responsive relations, forming successors, and governing future access. This paper develops a preliminary architecture for comparing those operations without reducing them to a single preservation score. The philosophical and domain review connects heritage as cultural process, archival selection and silence, contextual museum learning, digital reconstruction, situated practice, tacit knowledge, and community authority. A typed formal model then represents a source configuration, a selection map, a condition-bearing trace record, a present reconstruction, target-specific outcomes, and living succession. Three limited results follow. First, a many-to-one trace map cannot identify every source feature. Second, any point reconstruction faces a lower bound determined by variation among source configurations compatible with the evidence. Third, trace persistence, experiential accessibility, practical learning, relational responsiveness, successor formation, and affected-community agency remain logically independent without additional bridge premises. The paper proposes an auditable reconstruction-warrant record and an admissible-design intersection joining technical, evidential, authorization, care, and rights conditions. Constructed cases clarify how the architecture guides inquiry while leaving historical accuracy, educational efficacy, cultural legitimacy, and ethical permission open to evidence and community-specific procedures. The contribution is a revisable diagnostic framework for plural preservation portfolios.

Keywords: cultural preservation; experiential reconstruction; archives; museums; living heritage; community authority; digital heritage; successor formation

Discussion Paper Note

This paper is a preliminary discussion paper intended to share an evolving idea and invite further dialogue, criticism, revision, and independent development.

The author claims responsibility for the definitions, formal constructions, taxonomy, arguments, selection of material, and conclusions presented here. Similar or related ideas may have appeared in other intellectual, cultural, or disciplinary traditions. Any legal rights retained in this work are intended to support attribution, responsible use, and protection against exploitative or harmful appropriation, while preserving legitimate inquiry, criticism, revision, and further development.

The arguments should be understood as provisional and historically situated. Readers are encouraged to question, revise, extend, reinterpret, or independently develop the ideas presented here. Acknowledgment of this paper as one point of encounter is appreciated where appropriate, while epistemic ownership over independently developed ideas remains with their contributors.

Responsible Use and Rights Reservation

The author encourages good-faith discussion, criticism, independent development, and responsible use of the knowledge presented in this work. Responsibility for lawful and ethically appropriate use remains with each user.

The author expressly reserves all rights and remedies available under applicable law with respect to unlawful conduct, harmful or abusive exploitation, improper commercial appropriation, infringement of applicable intellectual-property or other legal rights, and conduct contrary to applicable national, regional, or international law.

This reservation preserves the ability to respond to misuse and harmful appropriation. Legitimate academic inquiry, criticism, independent reasoning, and further development remain encouraged.

Notices

Status. This is a working draft circulated for discussion. Its claims, formal objects, and section numbering remain open to revision.

Licence. This work is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial 4.0 International Licence (CC BY-NC 4.0), subject to the rights reservation stated on the preceding page.

Statement on the use of language models. Drafting, literature search, structural review, and argumentative criticism were conducted in dialogue with ChatGPT (OpenAI). The author bears responsibility for the claims, definitions, formal constructions, selection of material, argument, and position taken. References included in the bibliography were checked against publisher, institutional, journal, DOI, or library records during preparation.

Companion papers. The present paper extends a research programme on co-experience and knowledge continuity. One companion paper develops a formal account of mediated co-experience and knowledge transmission; another examines the distribution of power and responsibility in that transmission. The present inquiry specializes those distinctions for archives, museums, reconstructions, living traditions, and governed access.

Suggested citation. Huang, W. *Cultural Preservation and Experiential Reconstruction: Archives, Museums, Living Traditions, and Community Authority*. Working draft, 2026.

Contents

1	Introduction	6
2	Cultural Preservation as a Compound Research Object	7
3	Heritage, Memory, and Interpretive Mediation	8
4	Archival Selection, Provenance, and Community Stewardship	9
5	Museums as Contextual and Participatory Knowledge Environments	10
6	Experiential Reconstruction and Digital Heritage	12
7	Living Traditions, Practice, and Successor Formation	13
8	Community Authority and Governed Access	14
9	Formal Objects and Preservation Pipeline	16
9.1	Source Configuration	16
9.2	Selection and Condition-Bearing Traces	17
9.3	Reconstruction and Present Outcome	17
10	Identification and Reconstruction Warrant	18
10.1	Trace-Only Identification	18
10.2	Compatible Sources and Error Bounds	18
10.3	Reconstruction-Warrant Record	19
11	Outcome Profiles and Operation Independence	20
12	Admissible Reconstruction and Living Succession	21
12.1	Constrained Design Space	22
12.2	Successor Relation and Temporal Depth	22
12.3	Partial Portfolio Comparison	23
13	Comparative Mechanism Cases	23
13.1	Community Sound Archive	23
13.2	Difficult-Heritage Museum Reconstruction	24
13.3	Craft Reconstruction Programme	25

13.4 Restricted-Transmission Collection	25
14 Objections and Revision Boundaries	26
14.1 Redundant Formalization	26
14.2 Cultural Essentialism	27
14.3 Technological Solutionism	27
14.4 Reconstruction Pessimism	27
14.5 Metric Reduction	28
14.6 Community Simplification	28
14.7 Restriction and Public Accountability	28
14.8 Religious and Tradition-Specific Overreach	28
15 Research Design and Evidence Gates	29
15.1 Participatory Target and Source Construction	30
15.2 Comparative Reconstruction Study	30
15.3 Longitudinal Succession and Institutional Change	30
15.4 Revision and Abandonment Conditions	31
16 Conclusion	31

1 Introduction

This section defines the paper’s compound research object, states its provisional position, and locates the formal contribution within a broader philosophical and institutional inquiry. The discussion proceeds from a practical tension to the paper’s method, contribution, and structure.

Cultural preservation often appears as a single aspiration, yet the institutions and relationships assembled under that phrase perform markedly different operations. An archive may retain documents for centuries while offering limited access to the practical situation in which they mattered. A museum may create a vivid encounter while adding present-day design elements that exceed the surviving evidence. A workshop may transmit embodied competence while leaving sparse durable documentation. A community may protect a practice by limiting access, while a public institution may understand access as its central duty. Each activity can carry genuine value. Their differences become obscure when preservation is treated as one scalar property.

The paper develops a plural architecture. It distinguishes trace retention, provenance and interpretability, experiential accessibility, practical learning, relational responsiveness, successor formation, and affected-community agency. These dimensions describe operations and outcomes under declared targets, populations, and time horizons while leaving any universal hierarchy open. A responsible preservation portfolio can combine several operations, distribute authority among several parties, and retain explicit uncertainty about source history and future effects.

The analysis draws on seven bodies of work. Heritage studies presents heritage as a present cultural process that exceeds a neutral container of inherited objects [23, 13]. Archival scholarship identifies selection, appraisal, description, custody, and silence as constitutive exercises of power [26, 21, 5]. Community-archive and radical-empathy approaches foreground participation, affect, care, and the standing of record subjects [8, 3]. Museum research treats learning as personal, sociocultural, physical, participatory, and temporally extended [6, 22, 16]. Digital-heritage principles connect visualization with documentation, transparency, and intellectual integrity [15], while empirical research reports heterogeneous learning effects across augmented and virtual museum environments [19, 30]. Living-heritage, situated-learning, tacit-knowledge, ritual, and disciplinary traditions locate continuity partly in practice, participation, re-creation, and successor formation [27, 14, 18, 4, 2, 1].

The paper uses those literatures as antecedents and constraints. Its proposed contribution is architectural. A typed model represents a prior or living source configuration, a selection map, a condition-bearing trace, auxiliary evidence, a reconstruction design, a present context, participants, target-specific outcomes, and succession relations. The model yields exact information-loss consequences, conditional reconstruction warrants, and open empirical hypotheses. Mathematical derivations remain limited to the declared model. Historical adequacy, cultural legitimacy, educational efficacy, and ethical permission require additional evidence and procedures.

The manuscript has four movements. Sections 2–8 construct the philosophical and domain-specific problem. Sections 9–12 introduce and derive the formal architecture. Section 13 applies the architecture to four constructed mechanism cases. Sections 14–15 present objections, evidence gates, and revision conditions before the conclusion consolidates the position.

Table 1: Preservation operations, immediate objects, and principal warrant questions

Operation	Immediate object	Characteristic mechanism	Principal warrant
Trace retention	Documents, objects, recordings, metadata	Selection, storage, conservation, migration	Persistence, provenance, legibility, represented absence
Interpretive mediation	Accounts, catalogues, exhibitions, narratives	Description, contextualization, comparison, argument	Source support, alternatives, positionality, contestability
Experiential reconstruction	Present designed configuration	Spatial, sensory, interactive, performative, or adaptive arrangement	Target fidelity, disclosure, uncertainty, learning evidence
Practical transmission	Competence and judgment	Guided practice, correction, participation, repetition	Performance, transfer, situated applicability, care
Relational participation	Responsive roles and obligations	Interaction, feedback, recognition, mutual adjustment	Standing, reciprocity, power, continuity of response
Living succession	Capacity to form later practitioners	Successive learning and teaching relations	Competence thresholds, authority, durability, revision
Governed access	Future conditions of use	Consent, restriction, stewardship, review, benefit sharing	Legitimate authority, proportionality, safety, revisability

2 Cultural Preservation as a Compound Research Object

This section decomposes cultural preservation into operations with distinct objects, mechanisms, and warrants. It first presents an operation map, then defines experiential reconstruction and cultural generativity as target-relative analytic terms.

Table 1 separates operations that institutions frequently combine. The separation serves analysis across administrative groupings. One project may preserve records, convene community interpretation, build an interactive installation, support apprentices, and revise access rules. Evaluation becomes more precise when each operation carries an explicit target and warrant.

Definition 2.1 (Experiential reconstruction). *Experiential reconstruction is the deliberate construction of a present configuration from traces, auxiliary evidence, design choices, institutional conditions, participants, and governance rules in order to support a declared form of inquiry, understanding, practice, or participation related to a prior or living cultural configuration.*

The definition places the reconstruction in the present. It can be historically disciplined without becoming a recovered past event. It can also yield real knowledge whose object is narrower or differently typed than historical identity. A spatial reconstruction may improve understanding of movement constraints; a role-play may expose coordination pressures; a craft workshop may develop sensorimotor discrimination. Each outcome needs a target-specific claim.

Definition 2.2 (Cultural generativity). *Cultural generativity is the target-relative capacity of a preservation arrangement to support new warranted understanding, competence, interpretation, relation, or successor-forming activity among specified participants across a declared horizon.*

The term is proposed as an internal diagnostic. It remains neutral among novelty, continuity, expansion, restraint, and differentiated access. Reproduction, adaptation, interruption, privacy, refusal, and transformation can each be culturally meaningful. The diagnostic asks which future capacities an arrangement supports, for whom, through which authority, and under which costs.

Claim 2.3 (Plural preservation profile). *Assessment of a preservation arrangement should retain its distinct trace, interpretive, experiential, practical, relational, successor-forming, and governance effects until a context-specific decision rule is publicly justified.*

This working normative claim guards against premature aggregation. A large visitor count cannot automatically compensate for weak provenance. Extensive digitization cannot automatically settle authority. Strong successor formation cannot automatically settle the treatment of dissenters or excluded groups. Aggregation may serve a particular decision, but its weights then become part of the decision’s normative substance.

3 Heritage, Memory, and Interpretive Mediation

This section establishes the interpretive setting for the model. It connects heritage as present practice, historical distance, difficult memory, and authenticity, then states the consequences for reconstruction claims.

Heritage studies has shifted attention from inherited things alone to the cultural work through which selected pasts acquire present authority. Smith’s critique of an “authorized heritage discourse” emphasizes the institutional values that privilege monumentality, expertise, and national narratives [23]. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett describes intangible heritage as a form of cultural production that transforms practices through designation, documentation, and display [13]. These approaches imply that preservation changes the field it seeks to preserve. Recognition can supply resources and continuity while also reorganizing performance, audience, ownership, and self-description.

Historical distance can support understanding. Ricoeur’s account of distancing treats inscription and interpretation as productive conditions for meaning beyond an original event [20]. The implication for preservation is double. Surviving traces can support later insight precisely because they travel beyond an originating situation. Their travel also loosens the relation between original use, present interpretation, and future appropriation. Provenance and interpretive accountability therefore matter alongside availability.

Difficult heritage makes this double relation especially visible. Macdonald studies the public negotiation of troubling pasts and the institutional labour through which societies stage responsibility, memory, and identity [17]. A museum reconstruction of violence, dispossession, or complicity can create present understanding. It can also aestheticize suffering, distribute voice unevenly, or create a false sense of experiential access. A responsible design declares its target. It may aim to clarify sequences, institutional mechanisms, spatial constraints, contested testimony, or present consequences. It should avoid converting intensity of response into evidence of historical identity.

The Nara Document links authenticity judgments to the cultural contexts in which value is understood, while recognizing diversity in forms, materials, uses, traditions, techniques, locations, spirit, and feeling [9]. This plural orientation resists a universal authenticity metric. It also creates a practical obligation: a project must state which property it evaluates and whose standards make that property salient. Material authenticity, procedural fidelity, continuity of use, authorized practice, sensory plausibility, and interpretive honesty can diverge.

Table 2: Antecedent concepts and their roles in the proposed architecture

Literature area	Inherited insight	Architectural consequence
Critical heritage studies	Heritage is an active present process shaped by institutional authority	Represent selection, designation, and interpretation as operations with agents and policies
Historical interpretation	Distance and inscription enable later interpretation	Separate transportable traces from originating situations and present outcomes
Difficult heritage	Public memory distributes responsibility, voice, and affect	Include affected parties, risk, alternatives, and contestation in warrants
Contextual authenticity	Relevant values and evidence vary across cultural settings	Index fidelity to declared targets and authorized evaluative standards
Living heritage	Practice is recreated through communities and environments	Model participation and successor formation beyond object retention

Table 2 records how prior work constrains the proposed model. The architecture supplies a common descriptive surface on which these theories and their disputes can declare objects, evidence, and authority.

4 Archival Selection, Provenance, and Community Stewardship

This section analyses the operations that create and maintain trace records. It moves from archival power and silence to provenance, community archives, care, and governed access, thereby preparing the selection map used later.

An archive is produced through survival, collection, appraisal, description, classification, conservation, access, and use. Trouillot locates historical silences at moments of fact creation, archival assembly, narrative retrieval, and retrospective significance [26]. Schwartz and Cook describe archives as institutions that shape collective memory and social power [21]; Cook later traces archival theory’s movement toward community, participation, and plural provenance [5]. These accounts support a central modelling decision: the trace is a partial output of historically situated selection operations.

Provenance carries more than a name of origin. For reconstruction, it should include relations among creators, record subjects, custodians, transformations, description decisions, migrations, exclusions, access decisions, and later uses. A digital surrogate introduces further events: capture settings, compression, colour treatment, segmentation, metadata mapping, software migration, and interface presentation. Recording those events cannot recover every missing condition. It can expose the path through which a current object became available.

Community archives challenge custodial arrangements in which external institutions alone define value, access, and description. Flinn, Stevens, and Shepherd present independent and community-led archives as interventions in mainstream heritage practice and identity formation [8]. Caswell and Cifor propose radical empathy as an archival orientation to relationships among creators, subjects, users, and communities [3]. The First Archivists Circle protocols articulate Indigenous concerns involving sovereignty, culturally responsive care, attribution, secret or sacred materials, and community participation [7]. These contributions broaden provenance into a relational and

Table 3: Archival stages, selective effects, and reconstruction consequences

Stage	Selective effect	Reconstruction consequence	Accountability record
Creation	Roles and resources shape what becomes recordable	Unrecorded practice may appear absent	Creator, subject, purpose, setting, known exclusion
Appraisal	Retention criteria privilege selected futures	Later evidence space inherits institutional values	Policy, decision maker, rationale, rejected classes
Description	Categories structure discovery and interpretation	Interfaces can stabilize contested names and relations	Vocabulary, revision history, community alternatives
Custody	Control affects integrity, access, and authority	Availability can diverge from permission	Custodial history, rights, restrictions, review date
Digitization	Capture and transformation alter perceptible features	Surrogates can invite unsupported equivalence	Equipment, settings, edits, loss, file relations
Use	Citation, exhibition, and reuse create further context	Repetition can naturalize one interpretation	Use history, claims, disputes, corrections

ethical record.

Table 3 converts archival critique into reconstruction requirements. The Society of American Archivists’ ethical code and the International Council on Archives’ code further connect access with privacy, rights, professional judgment, and public trust [24, 12]. Public accessibility and responsible stewardship can therefore pull in different directions. Materials concerning living people, sacred knowledge, vulnerable sites, community conflict, or histories of extraction may warrant graduated access, time limits, mediated use, or refusal.

The governing question concerns standing and procedure. “Community” may refer to residents, practitioners, descendants, record subjects, language groups, religious authorities, political institutions, or internally contested coalitions. Each grouping may contain dissent and unequal power. A community label cannot close inquiry. A defensible process identifies affected parties, kinds of standing, decision scope, representation, conflict procedures, reasons, review intervals, and routes for later revision.

The archival analysis yields three requirements for later formalization. First, selection policy belongs inside the trace-production map. Second, a trace record should carry provenance, uncertainty, known absence, restriction, and revision information. Third, auxiliary evidence can improve identification while remaining subject to authority and care conditions. Information gain and permission are distinct dimensions.

5 Museums as Contextual and Participatory Knowledge Environments

This section examines the museum as a present knowledge environment. It connects institutional purpose, contextual learning, participation, co-curation, and the distribution of interpretive authority, then translates those connections into outcome distinctions.

Table 4: Museum mechanisms and distinguishable outcome targets

Mechanism	Immediate participant activity	Candidate outcome	Evidence requirement
Object encounter	Observation, comparison, attention to material features	Perceptual discrimination and material understanding	Task-sensitive observation and later recall or application
Spatial exhibition	Movement through arranged sequences and contrasts	Spatial, causal, or chronological orientation	Path data joined with target-specific comprehension
Facilitated dialogue	Questioning, explanation, disagreement, testimony	Interpretive differentiation and perspective coordination	Discourse analysis, participant report, later reasoning
Interactive reconstruction	Choice, manipulation, role enactment, feedback	Constraint recognition and procedural understanding	Comparison condition, transfer task, design disclosure
Co-curation	Selection, description, authority negotiation	Agency, institutional learning, revised representation	Decision trace, resource distribution, participant evaluation
Community programme	Repeated relation and joint practice	Trust, competence, participation, possible succession	Longitudinal relational and practical evidence

The International Council of Museums defines a museum as a permanent, accessible, inclusive, and ethical institution that researches, collects, conserves, interprets, and exhibits heritage while offering varied experiences for education, enjoyment, reflection, and knowledge sharing [10]. Its 2026 Code of Ethics organizes professional duties around collections, communities, public engagement, governance, accessibility, sustainability, and accountability [11]. These documents position the museum as more than a storage site. It is an institution that arranges relations among objects, evidence, expertise, publics, and affected communities.

Contextual museum-learning research treats learning as an interaction among personal histories, sociocultural processes, physical settings, and later experiences [6]. This approach resists the assumption that a visitor receives a fixed informational payload. Prior knowledge, motivation, companions, spatial movement, sensory attention, facilitation, institutional framing, and post-visit activity shape what becomes learnable. Visitor outcomes can therefore include recall, conceptual reorganization, spatial understanding, interpretive differentiation, affective orientation, dialogue, practical interest, and later participation. These outcomes require separate measures and time horizons.

Participatory museum practice changes the visitor’s role. Simon describes designs in which participants contribute, collaborate, and co-create alongside their reception of institutional content [22]. Lonetree’s account of decolonizing museums emphasizes collaboration with Indigenous communities, truth-telling about colonial histories, and attention to healing and community needs [16]. Participation can redistribute voice and improve relevance. It can also be symbolic, extractive, or limited to choices preselected by the institution. A participation claim should therefore specify decision rights, resource control, authorship, veto or refusal capacity, compensation, and the durability of the relationship.

Table 4 identifies mechanisms whose effects can be conflated by general satisfaction measures. Enjoyment can coexist with misunderstanding. Emotional intensity can coexist with weak transfer.

Table 5: Reconstruction media, epistemic affordances, and characteristic vulnerabilities

Reconstruction form	Primary affordance	Characteristic vulnerability	Useful disclosure
Spatial replica	Scale, movement, visibility, material constraint	Apparent completeness and uncertain details	Source map, conjectural zones, material substitutions
Sensory composition	Sound, light, texture, atmosphere	Affective certainty exceeding evidence	Sampling, editing, alternatives, uncertainty range
Role enactment	Decision pressure, coordination, perspective comparison	Simplified agency and imposed identity	Role construction, exclusions, debriefing, refusal options
Interactive simulation	Counterfactual action and system response	Rules encode hidden historical claims	State variables, transition rules, calibrated and invented elements
AR or VR environment	Immersion, spatial access, repeatable variation	Presence conflated with authenticity or learning	Model provenance, interface effects, comparison condition
Adaptive reconstruction	Personalized sequence, feedback, accessibility	Opaque inference, profiling, divergent presentations	Adaptation logic, data use, audit, accessible alternatives
Living workshop	Material practice, correction, social response	Institutional staging and compressed learning horizon	Teacher standing, practice context, competence threshold, limits

Institutional participation can coexist with limited decision power. Conversely, a quiet archival encounter can generate durable inquiry even when immediate engagement metrics are modest.

The museum can be represented as a designed present co-experience. Curators, facilitators, participants, objects, interfaces, spatial arrangements, and institutional norms interact during an event. The event may generate knowledge unavailable from isolated textual traces because spatial and social relations become available for inquiry. This added generativity remains a property of the present arrangement. Its relation to a historical target depends on sources, disclosed transformations, and the size of the unresolved identification set.

6 Experiential Reconstruction and Digital Heritage

This section classifies reconstruction media and specifies their epistemic opportunities and characteristic risks. It proceeds from a media continuum to documentation requirements, then distinguishes engagement, learning, and historical warrant.

Experiential reconstruction includes physical replicas, staged environments, guided enactments, role-play, soundscapes, augmented reality, virtual reality, interactive simulations, and adaptive systems. The relevant distinction concerns the relation among evidence, design, participant action, and output. A high-resolution visual display can remain passive. A low-technology workshop can create extensive feedback and practical learning. Technical sophistication therefore serves as one design variable among many.

Table 5 links each medium to an epistemic affordance and a disclosure duty. The London Charter requires computer-based heritage visualization to document its knowledge sources, reasoning,

methods, and outcomes so that users can evaluate intellectual integrity [15]. This requirement is often discussed as paradata. A robust paradata record identifies directly sourced elements, inferences, analogies, creative supplements, active alternatives, technical transformations, authorship, and revision history.

Digital environments can support spatial reasoning, manipulation, repeatable trials, inaccessible-site access, and combinations of visual, auditory, and textual evidence. Pujol Tost and Economou emphasize the interpretive and social design challenges of virtual museums [19]. Zhou, Chen, and Wang’s meta-analysis reports positive average learning effects for AR and VR in museum contexts while identifying variation related to design and study conditions [30]. Such findings motivate empirical inquiry at the level of design, target, and context. Effects may depend on guidance, novelty, cognitive load, prior knowledge, accessibility, collaboration, target type, and duration.

Three distinctions discipline evaluation. First, engagement concerns attention, interest, presence, or voluntary continuation. Second, learning concerns a target-specific change in understanding or capacity. Third, transfer concerns performance beyond the designed environment. A fourth distinction concerns historical warrant: the evidential relation between reconstructed features and the source target. High engagement, learning, and transfer can occur in a historically speculative simulation. Strong source discipline can occur in an environment with modest immediate engagement.

Adaptive and generative systems intensify both possibility and risk. A system can vary explanatory level, sensory modality, language, pace, or interaction path in response to participant needs. It can also generate unrecorded divergence, conceal the basis of a representation, reproduce stereotypes, or personalize culturally restricted material. A 2026 review of generative AI in cultural heritage identifies research growth alongside needs involving transparency, evaluation, ethics, governance, and long-term preservation [25]. For the present architecture, every adaptive output belongs to the provenance graph and every personalization rule belongs to the governance record.

Digital preservation can itself fossilize a contingent interface. File survival leaves executability, intelligibility, accessibility, and legitimate future use as separate achievements. Source files, dependencies, documentation, emulation plans, data models, licenses, decision histories, and community review procedures may all become preservation objects. An experiential reconstruction therefore creates a new archival responsibility at the same moment that it interprets an older archive.

7 Living Traditions, Practice, and Successor Formation

This section develops the practical and relational dimensions of continuity. It joins the living-heritage framework with situated learning, tacit knowledge, and practice theory, then introduces successor formation as a temporal capacity.

The 2003 UNESCO Convention defines intangible cultural heritage through practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills, instruments, objects, artefacts, and cultural spaces recognized by communities, groups, and in some cases individuals. It emphasizes intergenerational transmission and continual recreation in response to environment, interaction with nature, and history [27]. The formulation treats continuity as active re-creation. It also places recognition by relevant communities inside the object of safeguarding.

Situated-learning theory locates learning in participation within social practice. Lave and Wenger describe movement through changing forms of participation in communities of practice [14]. Polanyi’s discussion of tacit knowing and Collins’s taxonomy of tacit knowledge emphasize capacities whose

acquisition exceeds explicit verbal instruction [18, 4]. Demonstration, imitation, correction, attention, timing, bodily adjustment, material resistance, and evaluative judgment can carry knowledge that a textual archive only partially represents.

Practice also carries authority and discipline. Bell analyses ritualization as strategic differentiation within social fields [2]. Asad treats religious tradition through historically formed discourses, disciplines, embodied practices, and power [1]. These approaches warn against describing transmission as a neutral transfer of information. Teacher–learner relations can support competence, belonging, interpretation, and ethical formation. They can also reproduce hierarchy, exclusion, dependency, or abuse. Tradition-specific analysis therefore requires primary sources, practitioner knowledge, historical context, and procedures for criticism.

A minimal transmission object includes at least five components: articulated teachings or descriptions; ordered practice; an interpretive grammar for recognizing relevant differences; norms governing use and relation; and a capacity to guide later learners. The fifth component introduces a generational criterion. A learner who performs competently may still lack the judgment, authorization, resources, or disposition required to form a successor.

Definition 7.1 (Successor-forming capacity). *Successor-forming capacity is the target- and threshold-indexed ability of a participant or collective to support another participant’s attainment of declared competence through an authorized, evidenced, and temporally situated relation.*

This definition avoids equating succession with biological descent, institutional office, or exact replication. A successor can transform a practice within accepted bounds. A collective can distribute teaching among several actors. Some traditions may withhold successor status from an externally designed evaluation. The formal model therefore represents a declared relation and keeps its authority conditions explicit.

Living practice and durable traces can complement one another. Records can support memory, dispersed learning, legal claims, reflection, and recovery after interruption. Practitioners can interpret records, identify omissions, correct descriptions, and renew relevance. Their relation is recursively productive: practices create records; records alter later practice; later practice revises records. Preservation policy should therefore support feedback between documentary and living infrastructures where communities judge that feedback appropriate.

8 Community Authority and Governed Access

This section develops the normative conditions that shape admissible preservation. It distinguishes authority, affectedness, rights, care, access, restriction, and revision, then formulates a procedural account suited to plural and contested communities.

UNESCO’s Ethical Principles for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage emphasize community participation, free prior sustained and informed consent, customary practices governing access, respect for diversity, and attention to sustainable development [28]. The Operational Directives likewise assign communities, groups, and individuals central roles in safeguarding and programme implementation [29]. These principles provide a governance baseline. Application still requires interpretation of representation, disagreement, legal frameworks, historical extraction, and changing generations.

Authority has several sources. Creators may hold rights or knowledge about intended use. Record

Table 6: Governance dimensions for cultural traces and reconstructions

Dimension	Required specification	Recurrent conflict	Review evidence
Standing	Parties, roles, affected interests, source of authority	Expertise, descent, practice, subjecthood, citizenship	Membership record, reasons, dissent statement
Decision scope	Collection, description, display, reuse, adaptation, succession	One mandate extended beyond its basis	Written scope, term, delegated powers
Access tier	Public, registered, mediated, community, role-limited, closed	Education and accountability versus protection	Risk assessment, use history, appeal record
Benefit and burden	Funding, credit, labour, revenue, exposure, harm	Institutional gain and community cost	Distributional audit, agreements, participant report
Contestability	Correction, alternative account, withdrawal, appeal	Institutional finality and unstable public record	Version history, reasons, response time
Intergenerational revision	Review date, successor body, archival memory	Current authorization and future autonomy	Sunset clause, review procedure, preserved dissent

subjects may bear privacy, dignity, or safety interests. Practitioners may hold competence and tradition-specific standing. Descendants may inherit responsibilities or injuries. Custodians may hold legal and conservation duties. Researchers may hold evidential expertise. Publics may hold interests in accountability and access. States may exercise legal jurisdiction. These forms of standing can overlap and conflict.

Open access can support education, accountability, diasporic reconnection, independent research, and recovery from institutional neglect. Restriction can support privacy, sacred obligations, vulnerable communities, ecological protection, and resistance to commercial appropriation. Each can also be misused. Openness can enable extraction or decontextualization. Restriction can entrench internal domination, conceal abuse, or monopolize shared history. Responsible governance therefore needs substantive reasons, proportionality, differentiated access, appeal, time horizons, and revision.

Table 6 turns the broad language of community authority into auditable dimensions. It supports a procedural working claim: authoritative presentation requires a recorded basis of standing, a bounded decision scope, a path for contestation, and a future review mechanism. The claim leaves room for urgent restrictions and confidential decisions, while requiring that the governance form itself become accountable to appropriate parties.

Internal plurality deserves special attention. A project may encounter elders and youth, residents and diaspora, practitioners and former practitioners, recognized leaders and dissidents, or groups differently affected by gender, caste, class, disability, colonial rule, and migration. Mechanical majority rule may expose minorities; inherited authority may suppress criticism; external institutional selection may reproduce colonial hierarchy. A governance design should map these risks and treat “community consultation” as the beginning of an ethical process.

The normative analysis prepares a constrained model. Technical feasibility identifies what a project can construct. Evidential standards identify which claims the sources can support. Authorization identifies applicable permissions and standing. Care identifies foreseeable harms and responsibilities.

Table 7: Symbol register for the preservation and reconstruction model

Symbol	Type	Interpretation
$x \in \mathcal{X}$	Source configuration	Typed actors, relations, practices, materials, norms, histories, and stakes
$S_\eta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$	Selection map	Trace production under archival, documentary, or collection policy η
$z \in \mathcal{Z}$	Trace object	Selected documents, recordings, objects, data, and metadata
$a \in \mathcal{A}$	Auxiliary evidence	Testimony, provenance, analysis, parallel records, later observation
$d \in \mathcal{D}$	Reconstruction design	Exhibit, replica, workshop, enactment, AR/VR environment, or simulation
$c \in \mathcal{C}_t$	Present context	Institutional, spatial, social, political, technical, and material conditions
$u \in \mathcal{U}_t$	Present participants	Visitors, learners, practitioners, curators, facilitators, affected parties
R_d	Reconstruction operator	Design-dependent construction of a present experiential configuration
$q \in \mathcal{Q}$	Evaluation target	Declared feature, understanding, competence, inquiry, or succession capacity
$g_q : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_q$	Source-feature map	Target-relevant property of a source configuration
L_q	Outcome map	Target-indexed present learning, practice, or participation result

Rights identify legal and moral constraints. A design becomes presently admissible only through their conjunction under declared procedures.

9 Formal Objects and Preservation Pipeline

This section introduces the mathematical objects in dependency order. It begins with typed source configurations, then defines selection, trace records, reconstruction, and present outcomes. The notation is an analytic grammar whose empirical interpretation must be supplied in each application.

Table 7 separates three types that ordinary heritage language can merge: source features in $\mathcal{Y}_q$, reconstructed present configurations in $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_t$, and participant outcomes in $\mathcal{O}_q$. A comparison across these types requires an explicit map or measurement model.

9.1 Source Configuration

This subsection defines the model’s source object and its target dependence. The construction represents selected relations within an inquiry while preserving the openness and internal plurality of cultural life.

Let

$$x = (A, R, P, M, N, H, V) \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (1)$$

where A contains typed actors and roles, R relations and feedback, P practices and action sequences, M material and spatial conditions, N norms and interpretive grammars, H histories and provenance,

and V vulnerabilities, stakes, and contested values. The tuple is target-indexed in application. A study of building acoustics and a study of ritual authority will construct different relevant state spaces even when they concern the same named site or practice.

Assumption 9.1 (Analytic source construction). *Every $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is an inquiry-specific representation. Its variables and boundaries are selected for a declared target q , population, place, and temporal horizon.*

This assumption prevents the tuple from being interpreted as an exhaustive encoding of a culture. Relevant actors can dispute its variables and boundaries. Model revision is therefore part of the research procedure.

9.2 Selection and Condition-Bearing Traces

This subsection represents the creation of traces as a policy-bearing transformation. It then augments the trace with the conditions required for interpretation, governance, and later revision.

Let $S_\eta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ be a selection and trace-production map under policy η . The policy may include recording capability, appraisal, classification, custody, digitization, preservation, and accident. For a source configuration x , the retained trace is

$$z = S_\eta(x). \quad (2)$$

The deterministic notation isolates an information relation. Stochastic, strategic, distributed, and historically changing selection can be represented by a Markov kernel or a sequence of maps when an application requires them.

For each trace, define a condition-bearing record

$$\Gamma(z) = (z, G^{\text{prov}}, \eta, \text{ctx}, \text{unc}, \text{miss}, \text{restr}, \text{rev}). \quad (3)$$

Here G^{prov} is a provenance and transformation graph; ctx records formation and use context; unc uncertainty; miss known absences and silence mechanisms; restr applicable access, privacy, sacred, safety, legal, and community conditions; and rev revision and contestation history. Completeness is itself an auditable claim. The record documents known conditions while leaving unknown losses visible as uncertainty.

9.3 Reconstruction and Present Outcome

This subsection defines the constructive middle of the pipeline and its present outcome. The construction makes design, context, participants, and auxiliary evidence explicit inputs.

Let

$$R_d : \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{C}_t \times \mathcal{U}_t \longrightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}_t$$

be the reconstruction operator associated with design d . The full trajectory is

$$x \xrightarrow{S_\eta} z \xrightarrow{(a,d,c,u)} \hat{x}_{d,t} = R_d(z, a, c, u) \xrightarrow{L_q} o_{q,d,t}. \quad (4)$$

The middle arrow combines evidence with present construction. Interface choices, spatial layout, facilitator behaviour, participant history, institutional framing, and governance rules can change $\hat{x}_{d,t}$ even when z remains fixed.

The outcome

$$o_{q,d,t} = L_q(R_d(z, a, c, u), u) \in \mathcal{O}_q \quad (5)$$

belongs to a present outcome space. It may represent understanding, discrimination, competence, perspective coordination, participation, or a successor-forming capacity. Connecting $o_{q,d,t}$ to the historical feature $g_q(x)$ requires a declared comparison model. Present epistemic value and historical identification therefore enter as distinct questions.

10 Identification and Reconstruction Warrant

This section derives the model's information limits and converts them into an auditable warrant. It first proves a trace-only non-recovery result, then defines compatible-source sets and a diameter lower bound, and finally specifies a reconstruction certificate.

10.1 Trace-Only Identification

This subsection isolates the relation between selection and a declared source feature. The result concerns exact identification within the model; evaluation of the trace remains a separate inquiry.

Proposition 10.1 (Trace-fibre identification condition). *Let $S_\eta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ and $g_q : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_q$. A map $r_q : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_q$ satisfying $r_q \circ S_\eta = g_q$ on a domain $D \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ exists exactly when g_q is constant on every nonempty fibre $S_\eta^{-1}(z) \cap D$.*

Proof. Assume $r_q \circ S_\eta = g_q$ on D . For any $x, x' \in D$ with $S_\eta(x) = S_\eta(x')$, functionality of r_q gives

$$g_q(x) = r_q(S_\eta(x)) = r_q(S_\eta(x')) = g_q(x').$$

Thus g_q is constant on every fibre. Conversely, assume fibre constancy. For every $z \in S_\eta(D)$, select any $x_z \in S_\eta^{-1}(z) \cap D$ and set $r_q(z) = g_q(x_z)$. Fibre constancy makes this value independent of the selected representative. Extend r_q arbitrarily outside $S_\eta(D)$. Then $r_q(S_\eta(x)) = g_q(x)$ for every $x \in D$. $\square$

The proposition shows why preservation adequacy must be indexed to a feature. A trace can identify one property while leaving another underdetermined. Architectural plans may constrain room geometry while leaving sound, social use, or ritual authority uncertain. A recipe may constrain ingredient order while leaving sensorimotor judgment and teaching practice uncertain.

Remark 10.2 (Interpretive boundary). *Failure of trace-only identification establishes an information limit for g_q under S_η . The trace can still support inquiry, remembrance, accountability, artistic work, practical recovery, and present knowledge under appropriately stated claims.*

10.2 Compatible Sources and Error Bounds

This subsection adds auxiliary evidence and derives a quantitative constraint on point reconstruction. The result identifies when a declared tolerance can be supported uniformly across configurations compatible with the evidence.

Given trace z and auxiliary evidence a , define

$$\mathcal{I}_\eta(z, a) = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : S_\eta(x) = z, \text{ } x \text{ satisfies } a\}. \quad (6)$$

An empty set indicates inconsistency among evidence, selection assumptions, and the source model. A narrow set may reflect informative evidence or an artificially restrictive model. Source-model criticism therefore accompanies computation.

Let d_q be a metric or declared discrepancy on $\mathcal{Y}_q$. The target-feature diameter of the identification set is

$$D_q(z, a) = \text{diam}_{d_q} g_q(\mathcal{I}_\eta(z, a)) = \sup_{x, x' \in \mathcal{I}_\eta(z, a)} d_q(g_q(x), g_q(x')). \quad (7)$$

Proposition 10.3 (Point-reconstruction lower bound). *Assume $\mathcal{I}_\eta(z, a)$ is nonempty and d_q satisfies the triangle inequality. For every point reconstruction $\hat{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_q$,*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{I}_\eta(z, a)} d_q(\hat{y}, g_q(x)) \geq \frac{1}{2} D_q(z, a). \quad (8)$$

Proof. For any $x, x' \in \mathcal{I}_\eta(z, a)$, the triangle inequality gives

$$d_q(g_q(x), g_q(x')) \leq d_q(g_q(x), \hat{y}) + d_q(\hat{y}, g_q(x')).$$

At least one term on the right is at least half the left side. Taking the supremum over compatible pairs yields Equation (8). $\square$

Definition 10.4 (Uniform reconstruction support). *A target claim $\hat{y}_{q,d} \in \mathcal{Y}_q$ is uniformly ε_q -supported over $\mathcal{I}_\eta(z, a)$ when*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{I}_\eta(z, a)} d_q(\hat{y}_{q,d}, g_q(x)) \leq \varepsilon_q. \quad (9)$$

Equations (8) and (9) imply the necessary condition $D_q(z, a) \leq 2\varepsilon_q$. Auxiliary evidence can shrink the compatible-source set and lower the bound. The process of obtaining, using, or disclosing that evidence remains subject to rights, authority, and care.

10.3 Reconstruction-Warrant Record

This subsection converts the identification analysis into a documentation object. The record supports scholarly audit, public interpretation, community governance, and later revision.

For a public or scholarly claim h , define

$$\mathcal{W}(h) = (q, z, a, \mathcal{I}_\eta, d, \hat{y}, \varepsilon, \text{src}, \text{inf}, \text{cre}, \text{alt}, \text{auth}, \text{risk}, \text{rev}). \quad (10)$$

The fields distinguish source-supported components (src), inferences (inf), creative supplementation (cre), live alternatives (alt), applicable authority (auth), risks and safeguards (risk), and revision routes (rev).

Table 8 supplies a durable format for paradata and governance. Completion creates transparency while adequacy remains open to audit. Each field can be partial, disputed, or strategically framed. Its value lies in making claims and omissions available for targeted criticism.

Table 8: Reconstruction-warrant fields and audit functions

Field	Recorded content	Audit function
$q, \widehat{y}, \varepsilon$	Target, claim, discrepancy, tolerance	Prevents global authenticity language from replacing a feature claim
$z, a, \mathcal{I}_\eta$	Traces, auxiliary evidence, compatible source range	Exposes evidence dependence and unresolved alternatives
d	Design rules, interface, spatial arrangement, facilitation	Makes present construction inspectable
src, inf, cre	Directly sourced, inferred, and creatively supplied elements	Separates evidential levels within one experience
alt	Materially live alternatives and sensitivity results	Preserves uncertainty and supports comparison
auth	Standing, permission, dissent, decision scope	Connects representation with legitimate governance
risk, rev	Foreseeable harm, safeguards, monitoring, correction	Supports care, contestability, and future change

11 Outcome Profiles and Operation Independence

This section defines a plural evaluation profile and proves selected independence relations. It then adds empirical contrasts for present learning while maintaining the distinction between causal outcome evidence and source identification.

For preservation operation $\mathcal{P}_j$, target q , horizon H , and affected-population partition B , define

$$\Omega_{q,H,B}(\mathcal{P}_j) = (\tau_j, \pi_j, \epsilon_j, \lambda_j, \rho_j, \sigma_j, \alpha_j)_{q,H,B}, \quad (11)$$

where τ denotes trace persistence, π provenance and interpretability, ϵ experiential accessibility, λ practical learning, ρ relational responsiveness, σ successor formation, and α affected-participant agency. A coordinate may be an interval, qualitative evidence grade, or validated measure. Results should remain distributed across B when aggregation would conceal unequal benefits or harms.

Table 9 provides candidate operational directions. Each application should construct and justify its measures, population partition, threshold, time horizon, and uncertainty.

Proposition 11.1 (Selected operation independence). *In the idealized binary profile space $\{0, 1\}^7$, trace persistence with provenance entails none of experiential accessibility, practical learning, relational responsiveness, or successor formation. Experiential, practical, and relational success does not entail successor formation. Successor formation does not entail durable trace persistence.*

Proof. Consider the admissible witness profiles

$$\Omega(A) = (1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1), \quad (12)$$

$$\Omega(B) = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1), \quad (13)$$

$$\Omega(C) = (0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1). \quad (14)$$

Profile A represents a well-governed and interpretable trace archive with limited experiential and practical access. It refutes implications from $(\tau = 1 \wedge \pi = 1)$ to ϵ , λ , ρ , or σ . Profile B represents a documented interactive reconstruction with practical and relational outcomes during the programme and absent successor formation within H . It refutes $(\epsilon = 1 \wedge \lambda = 1 \wedge \rho = 1) \Rightarrow \sigma = 1$. Profile C represents living successor practice with sparse durable traces. It refutes $\sigma = 1 \Rightarrow \tau = 1$. $\square$

Table 9: Outcome coordinates, candidate indicators, and interpretation cautions

Coordinate	Construct	Candidate indicator	Interpretation caution
τ	Trace persistence	Integrity, redundancy, migration, recovery test	Survival can preserve an uninterpretable object
π	Provenance and interpretability	Transformation graph, contextual record, revision use	Documentation can retain institutional bias
ϵ	Experiential accessibility	Usable modalities, spatial access, participant engagement	Presence and intensity differ from understanding
λ	Practical learning	Performance, transfer, delayed application, correction	Short tasks can miss situated judgment
ρ	Relational responsiveness	Feedback, mutual adjustment, durable contact, accountability	Interaction can remain asymmetric or scripted
σ	Successor formation	Later teaching relation, competence threshold, continuity	Recognition and authority vary by practice
α	Affected-participant agency	Decision rights, resources, refusal, revision, benefit	Formal consultation can overstate effective power

The witnesses establish logical separation inside the declared space. Empirical prevalence, causal relations, and desirability remain open. In real settings, coordinates may support each other. Documentation can strengthen teaching; repeated practice can improve archival description; community authority can improve provenance and participation. Such bridges should become explicit hypotheses.

When a comparison design and potential-outcome semantics are defensible, a target-specific present-outcome contrast can be written as

$$\Delta_q(d, d_0 \mid z, a, c) = \mathbb{E}[O_q(d) - O_q(d_0) \mid z, a, c]. \quad (15)$$

Here d_0 is a comparison design, such as a static exhibit, text-only resource, alternative facilitation method, or delayed intervention. Selection into participation, interference among visitors, facilitator effects, attrition, novelty, and institutional context can complicate interpretation.

Hypothesis 11.2 (Target-specific option expansion). *For selected targets involving spatial constraint, procedural coordination, or material feedback, a well-governed interactive design can yield a positive $\Delta_q(d, d_0 \mid z, a, c)$ relative to a static-trace comparison. Effect size, distribution, transfer, and durability depend on design and population.*

A positive contrast supports a present educational claim under the study design. Equation (8) still governs source-feature identification. The two results answer different questions.

12 Admissible Reconstruction and Living Succession

This section joins the epistemic architecture to governance and time. It first defines the admissible design set, then models successor depth, and finally introduces a partial comparison rule for preservation portfolios.

12.1 Constrained Design Space

This subsection represents admissibility as the conjunction of several independently specified conditions. The intersection makes tradeoffs and impasses visible without converting one constraint into a proxy for all others.

At time t , let

$$\mathcal{D}_{q,t}^{\text{adm}} = \mathcal{D}_t^{\text{tech}} \cap \mathcal{D}_{q,t}^{\text{evid}} \cap \mathcal{D}_t^{\text{auth}} \cap \mathcal{D}_t^{\text{care}} \cap \mathcal{D}_t^{\text{rights}}. \quad (16)$$

The five sets contain technically feasible designs, designs meeting declared evidential thresholds for q , designs within applicable authorization, designs meeting care and harm safeguards, and designs consistent with applicable rights and law.

Claim 12.1 (Present admissibility). *A public reconstruction offered with target claim q should be selected from $\mathcal{D}_{q,t}^{\text{adm}}$ under procedures that record how each component set was constructed and by whom.*

This is a working normative claim. An empty intersection identifies a present impasse under current evidence, authority, safeguards, technology, and rights interpretation. It can motivate new evidence, a narrower target, a less invasive design, different governance, or postponement. It cannot by itself authorize silent removal of a constraint.

12.2 Successor Relation and Temporal Depth

This subsection represents the formation of later capable participants. The model separates immediate learning from a chain in which later participants can support further competence.

Write

$$i \xrightarrow{q,\theta,t} j$$

when participant j reaches declared competence threshold θ for target q through a relation in which i materially participates at time t , under the applicable evidence and authority model. For initial participants A_0 , define successor depth over horizon H as

$$d_{q,\theta,H}(A_0) = \sup\{n : \exists u_0 \rightarrow u_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow u_n, u_0 \in A_0, t_n - t_0 \leq H\}. \quad (17)$$

The quantity is descriptive and target-relative. It may be estimated as an interval when lineage evidence is incomplete. Collective instruction can be represented with hyperedges or bipartite teaching events. Interrupted, lateral, or cyclical transmission may require richer temporal graphs. Authority to recognize competence remains external to the graph and must be specified by the relevant practice.

Proposition 12.2 (Immediate learning and successor depth). *A positive immediate learning outcome $\lambda > 0$ places no positive lower bound on $d_{q,\theta,H}(A_0)$ without a bridge premise connecting the learned capacity, opportunity, authority, and later teaching relation.*

Proof. Construct an intervention in which participants meet the immediate performance criterion and have no later opportunity, authorization, resources, or willing learner within H . Then $\lambda > 0$ and $d_{q,\theta,H}(A_0) = 0$. A positive lower bound therefore requires additional premises. $\square$

The bridge premises are substantively important. They can include sustained participation, advanced competence, teacher support, material access, institutional recognition, safety, economic viability, language access, and willingness. A preservation programme concerned with succession should measure these mechanisms directly; short-term learning alone underdetermines succession.

12.3 Partial Portfolio Comparison

This subsection defines a modest comparison rule that preserves plural values and permits incomparability. The rule supports transparent local decisions while withholding a universal preservation ranking.

For a declared coordinate subset $K_q \subseteq \{\tau, \pi, \epsilon, \lambda, \rho, \sigma, \alpha\}$, define

$$P \succeq_{K_q} P' \iff \Omega_k(P) \geq \Omega_k(P') \text{ for every } k \in K_q. \quad (18)$$

Strict target dominance additionally requires strict inequality on at least one coordinate. Many portfolios will remain incomparable. Policy choice can then consider costs, uncertainty, distribution, rights, authority, risk, reversibility, and complementary combinations.

Open Problem 12.3 (Portfolio choice under plural authority). *Develop a decision procedure that compares preservation portfolios across uncertain profiles and affected populations while representing rights constraints, contested standing, option value, irreversible loss, and intergenerational revision.*

The open problem marks a limit of the present paper. A social welfare function or fixed coordinate weighting would add major normative commitments. Participatory multi-criteria procedures, robust decision methods, and rights-constrained portfolio analysis are candidate directions, each requiring criticism and empirical testing.

13 Comparative Mechanism Cases

This section applies the architecture to four constructed analytic cases, each independent of any actual institution. Each case identifies its target, mechanism, warrant, outcome profile, authority structure, and evidence gap.

Table 10 previews the comparison. The cases deliberately produce different profiles. Their purpose is to show how the model redirects discussion from a general judgment of preservation quality to evidence about mechanisms and authority.

13.1 Community Sound Archive

This subsection examines a community-governed archive containing recordings, interviews, catalogues, and performance histories. It traces how documentary recovery can strengthen provenance and agency while leaving practical and successor-forming effects open.

Suppose recordings made across several decades reside in an external institution under sparse inherited descriptions. A community partnership seeks repatriated copies, revised names, performer attribution, local-language metadata, and tiered access. The project constructs a provenance graph

Table 10: Constructed cases and their principal diagnostic contrasts

Case	Declared target	Strongest prospective coordinate	Central unresolved warrant
Community sound archive	Recovery of locally described performance histories	τ, π, α	Representation, access tiers, later community revision
Difficult-heritage museum	Understanding institutional sequence and constrained choice	ϵ, ρ	Emotional intensity, source alternatives, affected-party standing
Craft reconstruction programme	Material discrimination and guided practical competence	λ, ρ , possible σ	Teacher standing, transfer, economic and material continuity
Restricted-transmission collection	Responsible retention under differentiated access	τ, π, α under authorized governance	Internal dissent, oversight, future authority, public accountability

joining recording events, performers, record subjects, collectors, institutional transfers, digitization decisions, and later community commentary.

The immediate operation is primarily archival. Its profile may improve in τ through redundant preservation, π through contextual description, and α through community decision rights. Practical learning λ and successor formation σ require further mechanisms. Musicians may use the recordings in workshops; families may contribute alternative histories; teachers may build a programme around selected materials. Those developments are empirical possibilities whose relation to repatriation requires study.

The identification analysis focuses on a declared feature. If the target is performance order, recordings and testimony may narrow $\mathcal{I}_\eta(z, a)$. If the target is the social authority that governed performance, identical recordings may remain compatible with divergent role structures. The warrant record should preserve both the improved evidence and the residual diameter for each target.

Authority remains dynamic. Different performers, families, age groups, and local institutions may disagree about names, access, commercial reuse, or the presentation of historically sensitive events. A tiered process could distinguish public excerpts, registered research access, family-mediated materials, and restricted items. Reasons, dissent, use history, and review dates become part of $\Gamma(z)$ alongside administrative records.

13.2 Difficult-Heritage Museum Reconstruction

This subsection analyses a museum environment designed to clarify the institutional production of a harmful historical event. It separates spatial and causal learning from historical re-entry and tests the relation among intensity, understanding, and authority.

Suppose an exhibition reconstructs a sequence of rooms through which officials, records, and affected persons moved. The design combines plans, testimony, administrative documents, ambient sound, and a guided decision exercise. Its target q is understanding how spatial separation, documentation, and role constraints enabled institutional action. The target excludes a claim that visitors experience the event as historical participants did.

The reconstruction can create an epistemic object unavailable from separate traces. Visitors can

examine sight lines, delays, bottlenecks, information asymmetries, and moments where institutional choice remained possible. Facilitated discussion can compare testimony and administrative categories. These present activities may increase ϵ and ρ , and perhaps a target-specific conceptual outcome in λ .

The warrant must distinguish measured geometry, inferred room use, composed audio, selected testimony, and pedagogical role rules. Alternative reconstructions can expose uncertainty: different queue lengths, room assignments, levels of official knowledge, and participant choices may yield divergent interpretations. Reporting sensitivity to those alternatives is more informative than presenting a single seamless environment.

Affected-party standing shapes design and debriefing. Descendants, survivor groups, staff, historians, educators, and local publics can hold different responsibilities and vulnerabilities. Emotional response should be monitored as an outcome and a risk, while reasoning and transfer tasks assess the project's central knowledge claim independently of emotional intensity.

13.3 Craft Reconstruction Programme

This subsection considers a combined archive, replica, and guided workshop for a craft practice. It demonstrates how experiential reconstruction can support present competence and how succession demands a longer relational horizon.

Suppose a project possesses object measurements, tool marks, photographs, partial manuals, oral testimony, and access to living practitioners whose methods vary. It creates replica tools and materials, documents uncertainty, and offers repeated workshops. The source target $g_q(x)$ concerns selected constraints on material preparation and action sequence. The present outcome target concerns participants' ability to perceive material states and adjust technique.

The programme should maintain separate warrants. Historical reconstruction uses $\mathcal{W}(h)$ to record which tool forms and sequences are directly sourced, inferred, practitioner-supplied, or experimentally developed. Practical learning uses performance tasks, delayed retention, novel materials, and expert evaluation. The resulting contemporary technique may combine historical evidence with present experimentation. That combination can be valuable while preserving its composite provenance.

Successor formation appears only when some participants acquire sufficient competence, judgment, opportunity, and standing to guide later learners. A short museum workshop can yield $\lambda > 0$ and $d_{q,\theta,H} = 0$. A multi-year apprenticeship may yield greater depth while reaching fewer initial participants. A portfolio can combine public workshops, advanced practice, practitioner support, documentation, and material-supply programmes, with each intervention serving its declared target.

Economic and ecological conditions enter the source and present contexts. Materials may be scarce, regulated, unsafe, or connected to contested land use. Practitioners may face uncompensated teaching demands. A technically and educationally effective reconstruction can fall outside $\mathcal{D}_{q,t}^{\text{adm}}$ if it violates rights, care, or authorization conditions. Alternative materials or narrower demonstrations may reopen the feasible intersection.

13.4 Restricted-Transmission Collection

This subsection examines a collection whose contents have differentiated sacred, personal, or role-specific access conditions. It uses the case to clarify how preservation and restriction can coexist

within an accountable architecture.

Suppose an institution holds recordings, images, and descriptions acquired under earlier research practices. Current practitioners identify some items as public, some as appropriate for initiated roles, some as family-governed, and some as unsuitable for digitization or display. The archive also contains evidence relevant to histories of extraction and institutional accountability.

A governed response can separate preservation from disclosure. Integrity checks, encrypted storage, minimal preservation metadata, and restricted custodial procedures may support τ and π without broad access. Public catalogue records may acknowledge the existence and governance status of an item while withholding sensitive content. Researchers can receive mediated descriptions or aggregate information where relevant authority permits it.

Internal dissent creates the central difficulty. Some participants may seek wider access for cultural renewal; others may identify disclosure as harmful. Former members or people disadvantaged by established authorities may seek evidence concerning abuse. Resolution requires a standing map, differentiated claims, applicable rights, risk analysis, preservation of dissent, independent review where appropriate, and time-indexed decisions.

The case also clarifies the limits of formalization. Construction of $\mathcal{D}_t^{\text{auth}}$ is a normative and institutional process whose legitimacy depends on history, law, representation, accountability, and the substance of the practice. The set notation records this dependency and directs inquiry to its substantive resolution.

14 Objections and Revision Boundaries

This section tests the framework against conceptual, political, and methodological objections. Each objection identifies a possible failure mode and its corresponding revision obligation.

14.1 Redundant Formalization

This subsection considers whether the equations merely restate familiar archival and heritage insights. The response identifies the formal model's limited added value and its abandonment condition.

Scholars and practitioners already know that archives select, reconstructions interpret, museums mediate, and communities govern. Formal notation can obscure these established insights or give them unwarranted authority. The model earns its place only when it exposes dependencies that prose leaves easy to merge. The trace-fibre proposition separates identification from value. The diameter bound links unresolved alternatives to a minimum point-estimation error. The profile witnesses prevent one operation from serving as a logical proxy for another. The admissible-set intersection records the conjunction of epistemic and governance conditions.

These gains are modest. If applications find the notation harder to audit than a well-designed provenance record and qualitative matrix, the formal layer should be reduced. Mathematical compactness serves disciplined comparison; theoretical maturity depends on conceptual, empirical, and normative performance.

14.2 Cultural Essentialism

This subsection examines the risk that $x \in \mathcal{X}$ turns dynamic and contested cultural life into a bounded object. The response specifies target indexing, participant contestation, and model revision as safeguards.

Any source configuration selects actors, practices, norms, and histories. It may reproduce official classifications or imply that one coherent culture existed before documentation. Assumption 9.1 therefore makes the source state an inquiry-specific construction. Applications should list excluded actors, internal disagreement, spatial and temporal boundaries, and alternative state descriptions. Challenges to the state space count as substantive research contributions.

The term “living tradition” also carries risk. It can naturalize inherited authority, romanticize continuity, or conceal innovation and conflict. The framework treats reproduction and generativity as open relations. Interruption, hybridization, refusal, and deliberate transformation may be central outcomes. Tradition-specific claims require historical and practitioner-grounded work.

14.3 Technological Solutionism

This subsection addresses the possibility that experiential reconstruction privileges immersive technology and redirects resources from living people and institutions. The response repositions technology inside a comparative portfolio.

Immersive systems can attract funding and public attention while maintenance, community governance, language work, practitioner livelihoods, conservation, and archival description remain under-resourced. The model places AR, VR, and generative systems in the same design space as facilitated dialogue, physical replicas, apprenticeships, and access reform. Their priority depends on a target-specific profile, opportunity costs, accessibility, maintainability, and admissibility.

A portfolio comparison should include the counterfactual use of resources. A technically impressive reconstruction may be dominated by a simpler intervention on the declared coordinates. Another may add unique spatial or accessibility benefits and complement living programmes. Comparative evidence should include long-term maintenance and the preservation burden created by the system itself.

14.4 Reconstruction Pessimism

This subsection considers the opposite risk: information-loss results may encourage excessive scepticism about learning from traces. The response separates exact recovery from constructive present knowledge.

The non-invertibility result is feature-specific. A many-to-one selection map blocks exact identification only when target-relevant variation exists within a fibre. Auxiliary evidence, scientific analysis, testimony, comparative history, experimental reconstruction, and living practice can narrow the identification set. Some targets may be robust across all compatible configurations.

More importantly, present reconstructions can generate knowledge about constraints, mechanisms, alternatives, materials, spatial relations, interpretive disagreement, and the reconstruction process itself. Their epistemic value can remain independent of recreating a total historical experience. The framework supports constructive inquiry by requiring accurate claim typing.

14.5 Metric Reduction

This subsection addresses the danger that the outcome profile converts contested values into apparently objective coordinates. The response constrains measurement and preserves qualitative evidence and incomparability.

Coordinates such as agency, relational responsiveness, and successor formation contain normative and interpretive judgments. A scalar measure can conceal disagreements about who counts, which threshold matters, and who bears costs. Equation (11) allows intervals and qualitative evidence grades. Population partition B preserves distribution. Coordinate definitions, weights, and thresholds should be public and revisable. Incomparability is an informative result when values or evidence resist aggregation.

14.6 Community Simplification

This subsection tests the authority model against internal conflict and strategic representation. The response distinguishes affectedness, standing, decision scope, and accountability.

Institutional actors may select convenient representatives or transfer broad authority to a small group. Established community leaders may suppress vulnerable members. External experts may discount locally grounded knowledge. The governance table requires a role-specific map of standing and scope. It also calls for preserved dissent, appeal, review, resource disclosure, and distributional analysis. These procedures remain vulnerable to power. Independent evaluation and long-term relationship may be necessary.

14.7 Restriction and Public Accountability

This subsection examines conflicts between culturally grounded restriction and demands for public evidence. The response treats them as rights and standing conflicts requiring differentiated procedures.

Some materials carry both restricted cultural status and evidence concerning public wrongdoing. Blanket openness can produce injury; blanket closure can protect institutions or powerful actors. The admissible-set model requires item- and claim-specific analysis. Possible arrangements include independent confidential review, redacted evidence, mediated testimony, temporal restriction, role-separated custody, and appeal. Their legitimacy depends on legal context, risk, the interests of affected persons, and meaningful oversight.

14.8 Religious and Tradition-Specific Overreach

This subsection limits the general model's use in religious or esoteric contexts. The response establishes evidence and review requirements for any concrete application.

The paper uses ritual and disciplinary theory only to identify structural dimensions of practice, embodiment, authority, and transmission. Concrete analysis should establish the theology, internal law, legitimacy, and pedagogical structure of a particular tradition through relevant primary sources, historical scholarship, practitioner knowledge, internal disagreement, and appropriate review. Terms such as initiation, lineage, sacredness, orthodoxy, and mastery carry tradition-specific meanings

Table 11: Evidence gates for an experiential reconstruction research programme

Gate	Required work	Advancement condition	Revision signal
Target definition	Specify q , population, horizon, source boundary, outcome type	Relevant parties understand and can contest the target	Persistent equivocation among identity, learning, practice, and succession
Archival audit	Build $\Gamma(z)$ and map selection, provenance, absence, and restrictions	Material transformations and major uncertainties are traceable	Unrecorded provenance changes substantive conclusions
Authority design	Map standing, scope, dissent, rights, care, and review	Applicable authorization and safeguards are documented	Excluded affected parties or unsafe disclosure
Reconstruction warrant	Complete $\mathcal{W}(h)$ and compare live alternatives	Sources, inference, creation, tolerance, and alternatives are inspectable	Seamless presentation conceals material underdetermination
Outcome study	Validate measures and compare designs for declared O_q	Effects, uncertainty, distribution, and limitations are reportable	Engagement measures substitute for target outcomes
Transfer study	Test delayed and novel-context performance	Target-relevant capacity persists beyond the installation	Effect depends on interface familiarity or immediate prompting
Succession study	Observe later participation and teaching relations	Competence, authority, opportunity, and later formation are evidenced	Short-term learning is used as a succession proxy
Governance review	Audit benefit, burden, use, disputes, and revision	Decisions remain accountable to current affected parties	Authority or risk conditions materially change

that lie beyond the abstract model.

15 Research Design and Evidence Gates

This section converts the architecture into a staged research programme. It specifies preparatory, evidential, participatory, comparative, longitudinal, and governance work, followed by conditions that should trigger revision or abandonment.

Table 11 orders research by dependency. Target definition, archival audit, and authority design should precede later-stage technological construction when those stages can materially change admissibility.

15.1 Participatory Target and Source Construction

This subsection specifies the initial research object. Its aim is to make the source state, target, affected population, and unresolved disagreement explicit before selecting a reconstruction medium.

Researchers should begin with workshops, interviews, archival review, and institutional analysis appropriate to the context. Outputs include alternative formulations of q , a typed actor and standing map, source boundaries, known exclusions, use scenarios, risk scenarios, and a provisional outcome profile. Disagreement should remain visible. Participants may endorse different projects, such as accountability, language learning, practitioner livelihood, public education, or restricted continuity.

The source audit constructs $\Gamma(z)$ through archival history, collection records, technical analysis, testimony, and community description. Sampling should attend to silences produced at record creation and later institutional stages. Negative cases are especially valuable: missing records, contradictory testimony, failed digitizations, disputed names, rejected categories, inaccessible materials, and prior harmful reuse.

15.2 Comparative Reconstruction Study

This subsection defines an empirical design for target-specific present outcomes. It emphasizes comparison, process evidence, transfer, and heterogeneous effects.

A study can compare several designs built from a common evidence base: a trace-centred resource, a contextualized multimedia presentation, an interactive spatial reconstruction, and a facilitated practice or dialogue condition. Randomization may be suitable in some museum-learning settings. Matched comparison, interrupted time series, qualitative process tracing, or participatory case comparison may be more appropriate elsewhere. The intervention should be sufficiently documented for replication and criticism.

Measures should follow the target. Spatial understanding may use map reconstruction or navigation reasoning. Procedural knowledge may use ordered explanation and fault diagnosis. Practical competence may use performance with novel material and expert evaluation. Interpretive differentiation may use recognition of source conflict and alternative accounts. Relational responsiveness may require discourse, feedback, and later participation evidence. Accessibility and adverse effects should be assessed across relevant participant groups.

Process evidence helps identify mechanisms. Interaction logs, observation, think-aloud data, facilitator records, interviews, and design variants can reveal whether participants learned through spatial constraint, feedback, social explanation, novelty, or prior familiarity. A positive average effect with unknown mechanism supports a narrower conclusion than a replicated mechanism across settings.

15.3 Longitudinal Succession and Institutional Change

This subsection extends evaluation beyond immediate visitor outcomes. It focuses on later practice, successor relations, archival revision, and changes in authority or institutional procedure.

Longitudinal work should examine continued participation, competence development, teaching opportunities, resource access, and later learner formation. It should also track whether community contributors retain decision power, whether descriptions are revised, whether benefits and burdens match agreements, and whether the reconstruction changes public or institutional practice. A useful

horizon may span years and extend beyond a single grant cycle.

Successor evidence should remain target-specific. A participant may become able to demonstrate a technique, interpret its history, maintain materials, teach beginners, adjudicate advanced quality, or hold recognized authority. These are distinct thresholds. The research record should state whose recognition matters and preserve contestation over that judgment.

15.4 Revision and Abandonment Conditions

This subsection defines signals that should narrow, revise, suspend, or abandon the framework or a particular application. Such conditions preserve the discussion paper’s revisable status.

The formal architecture should be revised if source-feature spaces cannot be specified without severe distortion, if communities find the operation categories harmful or unusable, if provenance graphs conceal more than they reveal, or if profile coordinates systematically invite premature ranking. A specific reconstruction should be narrowed or suspended when material provenance changes its central claims, authorization is withdrawn under applicable procedures, harms exceed safeguards, maintenance becomes unsustainable, or comparative evidence shows a safer and more effective portfolio.

The strongest version of the paper’s position would be defeated if the proposed distinctions repeatedly fail to add practical or explanatory value across applications. A weaker version may survive as a documentation checklist. Conversely, successful applications would show that the architecture improves claim precision, makes uncertainty and creative supplementation legible, supports affected-party agency, and helps institutions combine documentary, experiential, practical, and successor-forming operations.

16 Conclusion

This section consolidates the paper’s philosophical position, formal results, governance conditions, and empirical agenda. It closes by stating the framework’s intended scale and principal revision boundary.

Cultural preservation is best approached as a portfolio of operations whose objects and warrants differ. Archives preserve selected traces and the conditions of their formation. Museums construct present environments for interpretation and participation. Experiential reconstructions create designed encounters from evidence, inference, creative supplementation, context, and participant action. Living traditions sustain practice through relations that may form later successors. Governance determines which uses, disclosures, adaptations, and futures are admissible.

The formal architecture makes four contributions at this preliminary stage. The typed pipeline separates source configuration, trace, reconstruction, and present outcome. The trace-fibre proposition states the condition under which a selected feature can be recovered from a trace. The compatible-source diameter supplies a lower bound on point-reconstruction error and motivates an explicit warrant record. The plural profile and its countermodels distinguish trace persistence, experiential accessibility, practical learning, relational responsiveness, successor formation, and affected-participant agency. The admissible-set intersection then connects design with evidence, authority, care, and rights.

These results are modest by design. They guide claim formation and research; historical truth and cultural legitimacy continue to require substantive evidence and authority. A reconstruction can generate valuable present knowledge while its relation to a past remains bounded and disclosed. A rich archive can support future inquiry while requiring further practical and relational infrastructure. A living practice can sustain successors while benefiting from more durable traces. A restriction can protect meaningful obligations while remaining accountable to affected persons and public rights under appropriate procedures.

Future work should test the architecture through participatory archival projects, museum comparisons, reconstruction paradata, practical-learning studies, longitudinal successor research, and rights-sensitive governance review. The most important outcome would be improved institutional judgment: clearer targets, more faithful uncertainty, stronger provenance, visible creative contribution, better evidence, and authority that remains accountable across generations.

References

- [1] Talal Asad. *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1993.
- [2] Catherine Bell. *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*. Oxford University Press, New York, 1997.
- [3] Michelle Caswell and Marika Cifor. From human rights to feminist ethics: Radical empathy in the archives. *Archivaria*, 81:23–43, 2016.
- [4] Harry Collins. *Tacit and Explicit Knowledge*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2010.
- [5] Terry Cook. Evidence, memory, identity, and community: Four shifting archival paradigms. *Archival Science*, 13(2–3):95–120, 2013.
- [6] John H. Falk and Lynn D. Dierking. *The Museum Experience Revisited*. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, CA, 2013.
- [7] First Archivists Circle. Protocols for native american archival materials. Professional protocols; endorsed by the Society of American Archivists in 2018, 2007.
- [8] Andrew Flinn, Mary Stevens, and Elizabeth Shepherd. Whose memories, whose archives? independent community archives, autonomy and the mainstream. *Archival Science*, 9(1–2):71–86, 2009.
- [9] ICOMOS. The nara document on authenticity. Nara Conference on Authenticity in Relation to the World Heritage Convention, 1994.
- [10] International Council of Museums. Museum definition. Adopted by the Extraordinary General Assembly, Prague, 24 August 2022, 2022.
- [11] International Council of Museums. ICOM code of ethics for museums. Adopted by the 41st Ordinary General Assembly, Paris, 25 June 2026, 2026.
- [12] International Council on Archives. Code of ethics. Adopted 6 September 1996, 1996.
- [13] Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett. Intangible heritage as metacultural production. *Museum International*, 56(1–2):52–65, 2004.
- [14] Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [15] London Charter. The london charter for the computer-based visualisation of cultural heritage. Version 2.1, 2009. Documentation principle at <https://www.london-charter.org/documentation.html>.
- [16] Amy Lonetree. *Decolonizing Museums: Representing Native America in National and Tribal Museums*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 2012.
- [17] Sharon Macdonald. *Difficult Heritage: Negotiating the Nazi Past in Nuremberg and Beyond*. Routledge, Abingdon, 2009.

- [18] Michael Polanyi. *The Tacit Dimension*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2009. First published 1966.
- [19] Laia Pujol Tost and Maria Economou. Worth a thousand words? the usefulness of immersive virtual reality for learning in cultural heritage settings. *International Journal of Architectural Computing*, 7(1), 2009.
- [20] Paul Ricoeur. The hermeneutical function of distancing. In John B. Thompson, editor, *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*, pages 93–106. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [21] Joan M. Schwartz and Terry Cook. Archives, records, and power: The making of modern memory. *Archival Science*, 2:1–19, 2002.
- [22] Nina Simon. *The Participatory Museum*. Museum 2.0, Santa Cruz, CA, 2010.
- [23] Laura Jane Smith. *Uses of Heritage*. Routledge, Abingdon, 2006.
- [24] Society of American Archivists. Core values statement and code of ethics, 2025. Revised August 2025.
- [25] Yue-Cheng Tan, Ling-Hui Yang, and Bin Wang. Community-engaged digital safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage: A review of methods and challenges. *npj Heritage Science*, 14:184, 2026.
- [26] Michel-Rolph Trouillot. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Beacon Press, Boston, 1995.
- [27] UNESCO. Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage. Official convention text, 2003. Accessed 2026-08-31.
- [28] UNESCO. Ethical principles for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. Endorsed by the Intergovernmental Committee at its tenth session, 2015. Accessed 2026-08-31.
- [29] UNESCO. Operational directives for the implementation of the convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage. Tenth General Assembly edition, 2024. Accessed 2026-08-31.
- [30] Yuting Zhou, Juanjuan Chen, and Minhong Wang. A meta-analytic review on incorporating virtual and augmented reality in museum learning. *Educational Research Review*, 36:100454, 2022.