

Europe, Identity Politics and the Production of Cultural Heritage

Reinhard Johler

Tradition and Cultural Heritage have become the main path for the world-wide production of identity during the late 20th century. Especially in Europe, this process (running under the banner of an all-beseached “unity in diversity”) has led to an astonishing and successful propagation of the “local”, the “differentiable”, and supposedly “rooted”. This can be seen in innumerable museum openings, the creation of regional food-stuffs, the care of one’s own typical landscape and a conspicuous revival of customs. The mobilisation of this cultural heritage and the multifarious revivals of regional traditions have complex causes. But especially it is worth taking a closer look at the European Union from an ethnological point of view and to see it as a mighty agency of culture and to understand it as an important manufacturer of European difference, because the articulation of a shared European identity consciously stresses cultural distinction. This self-image of the EU, as well as the effects of the innumerable EU subsidies are topics which will be discussed in this essay.

Professor Reinhard Johler, Ludwig-Uhland-Institut für Empirische Kulturwissenschaft, Universität Tübingen, Schloss, D-72070 Tübingen, Germany, e-mail: Reinhard.Johler@uni-tuebingen.de

Local and Global: The Production of Cultural Heritage

The “Global House”, compared to the nearby “European Pavilion”, at the last World Exhibition in Hannover was a great success. In that “Global House” the Austrian region Vorarlberg contributed one of the visionary models concerning “the future of work”. The project “Nature and Life in the Bregenzerwald” presented a curious mix of modern, open-minded design and regional and traditional culture, underlined by several performances in folk costume, which was obviously a conscious contrast for the audience. And yet this contrast showed exactly what the project was about: It was ecologically and (European networked) consumer oriented example of a regional “bottom up” development, which had actually contributed to structural improvements in the commerce, agriculture and tourism of the valley and it was sustained in this valley by a multifaceted and intense search for “cultural roots”. There, “cultural heritage” has come to be associated with nature-based agriculture; low transport, small scale handicraft production; a cultural landscape defined

as “natural”; and, a newly re-discovered local folk culture, branded with the seal of authenticity. In other words: a reinforcement of regional identity was the driving force and the aim of this regional development presented in the “Global House”.

In this exhibition, especially “typical” products such as cheese and wood were meant not only to represent regional identity, but also to enable the region to gain access to niches of the European market. These products demonstrated, therefore, the “local roots”, the Own and the identity of the valley. In short, they represented the now-so-important “cultural heritage”, with the aid of which local producers hope to succeed in the global market.

This Austrian example is anything but an exception. Muriel Faure for example recently showed how a local kind of cheese was transformed into an “objet culturel” and became a symbol of the French “Alpes du Nord” (Faure 1999). Similar activities can be observed in Sweden (Svensson 1998), Spain, Italy, Greece (Caftanzoglou-Konvani 1997) or even (with a Celtic twist) in rural development in the north of Scotland (Gray 2000; Gray 2002). It is no coincidence that Jane Nadel-Klein gave her ethnographic study on the cultural consequences of the economic crisis of north Atlantic fishing industry the meaningful title “Fishing for Heritage”. With this title she emphasized the intense “creation of Scottish heritage” which one can currently observe (Nadel-Klein 2002).

It is, therefore, with good reason that one could speak of a “Heritage Crusade” in the sense that David Lowenthal describes it. And no doubt his observations are accurate when he says that, all of a sudden, “Heritage is everywhere – in everything from galaxies to genes. It is the chief focus of patriotism and a prime lure of tourism. One can barely move without bumping into a heritage site. Every legacy is cherished. From ethnic roots to history theme parks, Hollywood to the Holocaust, the whole world is busy lauding – or lamenting – some past, be it fact or fiction” (Lowenthal 1998: XIII).

This is not the place to discuss Lowenthal's analysis in detail. And although it is true that “tradition” and “cultural heritage” have become the main path world wide for the production of identity in the late 20th century (cfr. Bendix 2000; Boniface-Fowler 1993; Chevallier 2000), this general development is still worth investigating in detail to determine more precisely its agencies or causes. In this essay I want to deal with the European Union as a powerful European everyday-life-influencing “manufacturer” of “tradition” and “cultural heritage”. But, at the same time, it seems equally important in this context to address the role of European ethnologists: both in the past when they were functioning as the constructors of tradition and cultural heritage and at the present as participants in the process of Europeanisation (Borneman-Fowler 1997) – a process that changes deeply what cultural heritage is.

Cultural Heritage and European Ethnology

It was not so much the terminology, but rather the content which was clear to our ethnological forefathers: "tradition" and "cultural heritage" to them were not only concepts and central themes of study, but something real and tangible, something that was existing in the "real world" (Bausinger 1969).

Within this frame of mind, "tradition" and "cultural heritage" always referred to the Own as something original, something typical, something distinguishable, something come from the past. "Tradition", as well as "cultural heritage", were seen as static monuments, which fundamentally shaped the usually ethnically or nationally conceptualised "folk cultures" (customs, folk costume, farmhouses, folk music or folk art). This search led the researchers into a pre-industrial past, for in the present time "tradition" and "cultural heritage" seemed to be fundamentally endangered by the processes of modernisation and to exist only as relics remembering an earlier time in certain areas of refuge.

It was this theoretical basis that determined the role and tasks of ethnologists. Their inherently ethnic view of their own culture led them to become constructors of a long gone "authentic" heritage. They saw themselves as researchers and saviours of this cultural heritage as whose role was that of an influential protector. In these efforts, early ethnologists were extremely successful and a shining example for the broader public. Seen in this context, the efforts of UNESCO, the European council, as well as the goals of the "European Center for Traditional Culture", founded in Budapest in 1996 (Verebély 1997), may sound familiar. The fact that Europe is mentioned in the title of this institution is no coincidence. It has to do with EU subsidies, and this is a point we will return to later. At present it is more important for us to note that the "Europe" of the late nineteenth century was, to the early ethnologists, modern, urbane and a place of international high culture, which stood in stark contrast to local tradition and national cultural heritage. The presently propagated "Euroculture" by the EU shows an interesting continuity with this earlier vision, an important point to emphasize here. It too is seen as a primarily economically motivated, uniform and hegemonical culture which is a threat to the local, regional and national variety in Europe.

We do not agree with this interpretation – not for the present-day Europe nor for the European past. But its popularity comes directly from the ethnologic train of thought which, as mentioned earlier, saw "tradition" and "cultural heritage" to be static and pure. In other words, "tradition" and "cultural heritage" were constructed as "authentic" original forms of "folk culture". The process of modernisation was seen as a threat and was denied as "folklorism" (Moser 1962; Bausinger 1969). But this mindset blocked the perspective on cultural changes and the currently so important commodification of cultu-

ral heritage (Kockel 2002) and thus has made it difficult to understand how the present situation has developed.

The Process of Europeanisation

Let us, therefore, broaden our perspective by returning to the Austrian example presented at the EXPO in Hannover. The protagonists presented the project "Nature and Life in the Bregenzerwald" as a counter-movement, as an antithesis to uniform Europeanisation. The truth, of course, was far more complex. The fact that the term "Europeanisation" was so present in the local context was not simply a coincidence: these projects were directly financed with European subsidies and in the valley there is a quite strong and visible local EU infrastructure¹. And, especially, the rhetoric, the contents, the intention and the goal of "Nature and Life in the Bregenzerwald" lead us directly to its real basis: the European LEADER programmes for the development of economically disadvantaged rural areas. Networking and "Europe wide performance" are expected just as much as the mobilisation of "cultural heritage"². In the valley this is realised by a similar initiative, the "rural market place", an Internet project encompassing western Greece, the Rhone Alps and Andalusia³. Culturally manufactured regional differences are seen as a chance for tourism and economic development. Defining, or better re-working "cultural heritage" is therefore a central policy goal. And Ann-Kristin Eckmann is surely right when she notes that "the role of traditional culture" became in Sweden – and one could add in the whole western Europe – "a guiding metaphor in a process of regional transition" by these European programmes (Ekman 1999).

In many parts of Europe one can observe a massive mobilisation of "cultural heritage". The "local" became musealised (the real social life of the local becomes like a museum) (Albertin 1999), regional foodstuffs are extremely popular (Tschofen 2002) and trade fairs, farmers markets, regional festivals and customs are revitalised in many places all over Europe (Boissevain 1992). This, no doubt, has to do with a defending of, but much more with the re-defining, of identity. Europe, or rather the EU, takes on a key role that should not be underestimated in the mobilisation of cultural heritage and has thus become one of the foremost agencies in the definition of "cultural heritage" in Europe. One could say, as Susan J. Smith remarked, that the presence of

¹ Till now the Europeanisation of local elites and the set-up of local EU-infrastructures have not been analysed – see Martin 1993.

² See for this local initiative (Käsestrasse Bregenzerwald) <<http://www.kaesestrasse.at/>>

³ For the "Rural Market Place" cfr. <<http://www.rmp.at>>.

Europe has made the sameness and difference of social life to our prime political interest (Smith 1999). But this diagnosis should be seen from different angles: the EU seems successful when it concerns itself with the success of local and regional diversity. But it has generally failed, as the lack of interest in the "European Pavilion" at the EXPO in Hannover proved, in the creation of "sameness", the establishment of a common, identity-shaping "European culture".

This apparent contradiction should, however, not stop us from seeing the many – in EU-speak – "EU-Success-Stories"⁴. These not only include the already mentioned project in the Bregenzerwald. The EU primarily subsidises projects aiming to support processes of economic homogenisation. Culturally, however, its subsidy programmes have contributed massively to the production of difference in Europe. Observing this on a local, as well as on a European level, greatly improves ones ethnologic understanding of the present, but also shows that "tradition" and "cultural heritage" have become important factors in powerful EU policy making in the process of "Building Europe" (Shore 2000).

These EU subsidy programmes cannot be explained in detail here, but it should be noted that they all accord a high significance to "cultural heritage" at a European and national as well as at a regional level. The endowment programme for Art, "Culture 2000", encompasses the duty to "make the cultural heritage of Europe more accessible to all". In their structural and regional politics, the LEADER programmes, a suite of development programmes for disadvantaged rural and urban areas, include subsidies that are conditional on the exploitation of "cultural heritage" as a possible resource for planning and a potential for development. And even "Agenda 2000", the EU's agrarian programme for the development of rural space, targets the maintenance of "cultural heritage" through a combination of subsidies for promoting different "cultures" and "traditions".

One should not forget that there are tens of thousands well financed projects across Europe pursuing directly, or at least rhetorically, one or more of these EU-programmes. These subsidy programmes have given many small groups and actors political power to establish a new relationship with their nation, which can hardly be overestimated. And they have led to a massive mobilisation of "cultural heritage" and increased the emphasis on cultural heterogeneity (cfr. Ray 1997; Jöhler 2001). This intense culturalisation of Europe may appear to contradict economic homogenisation at first glance. So what are the intentions connected to it, according to the "Treaty of Maast-

⁴ In the political rhetoric and propaganda of the European Union the so-called "success stories" are extremely important. Compare for the EU-regional politics <http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/regional_policy>.

richt"⁵ and the "Declaration of Cork" in which the protection and promotion of "traditions" and "cultural heritage" are mentioned?

The EU subsidises "cultural heritage" in order to achieve political, cultural and economic goals. Politically, pronounced regionality weakens the nation states and turns the EU into a protector of heterogeneous culture (Bausinger 1994; Kockel 1999). This intention is closely tied to the cultural goals and the development of a "new European Identity". Since the early 1980's the EU has been trying hard – as was determined in the "Treaty of Maastricht" – to directly address the "European citizen", and actually to create "the European" characterised by a shared European culture, history and identity. Both intentions have had an earlier career of their own as political slogans, namely of a "Citizens Europe" (Shore 1993; Shore-Black 1994), and of "Unity in Diversity" (McDonald 1996). Both are intended to signify, and ultimately engender, a common "Euroculture", thought to be created through mutual respect as well as the financial support to the many national, regional and local cultures – in other word, through diversity proclaimed as typical for Europe.

The EU institutions see this diversity – and that is the economic goal of the EU-propagation of the "cultural heritage" – as an economic opportunity. Local traditions and cultural heritage are seen as the specific basis for the economic development of tourism or agricultural production. This "heritage policy", as it is practised by the European Union must be seen as an instrument for European "politics of identity". It turns the recent construction of regional or local cultural heritages into a central political issue, and, as a consequence, heterogenises Europe. Supported by the EU, innumerable people are seeking cultural or historical uniqueness, simultaneously and in direct competition with each other. This has lead to a definite bureaucratisation of culture, identity and "cultural heritage". Moreover, the local has been made suitable for the global arena. It has become a specific, well-known and most importantly consumable part of the new "world culture".

⁵ In 1974, the European Parliament adopted an initial resolution which mentioned the need for Community action in the cultural sphere, particularly action to protect cultural heritage. Since 1993, the Treaty establishing the European Community has provided a legal basis specifically for activities concerning the preservation and enhancement of cultural heritage. Article 151 of the Treaty stipulates that the Community must support and supplement action by the Member States in order to conserve and safeguard cultural heritage of European significance. The action initially taken by the Community was limited to supporting the restoration of "built heritage". Since then, the Community has taken action with regard to movable and immovable heritage (museums, collections, libraries and archives); archaeological and architectural heritage; natural heritage (landscapes and sites of natural interest); linguistic and gastronomic heritage, and traditional occupations. Community action of this kind deals with both the cultural and economic aspects of heritage.

Cultural Heritage and the Future of European Ethnology

One may find this process encouraging or regrettable, but as European ethnologists, we should not ignore it. For our perspective on “tradition” and “cultural heritage” this has two consequences: the first concerns the EU and its promotion of “Euroculture”, “like the people of Europe”, Thomas Wilson once said, “anthropologists can either make their war or their peace with it, but cannot ignore it” (Wilson 1993; Wilson 1998). I think our ethnological perspective must include not only the view onto the local of everyday life but also the scrutiny of the big and powerful institutions. EU-Europe must be included in a discipline that carries the word “Europe” in its very name (Johler 2002a).

As a second consequence, “tradition” and “cultural heritage” can no longer be taken out of their local context to be understood (Giddens 1994). In late modernity they have become the issue of many disputes in the controversial “politics of identity”, and they are rare goods in the field of global economy (Navrud-Ready 2002; Rizzo-Towse 2002). It is this that will demand new thoughts and ideas from European ethnologists as well as a new and more dynamic concept of “cultural heritage”.

Conclusions

One thing is certain: the EU is no longer merely a political “macro-concept”, but has – not least by virtue of the propagation of “cultural heritage” – already found its way into the local everyday life of its citizens, and the forthcoming EU expansion will also familiarize Central and Middle Europe with this new European “pattern”. This Europeanization process, however, also presents European ethnology with new challenges. It will have to adopt a stronger comparative position than has hitherto been the case. Above all, this “new” European ethnology should initiate a “European ethnological dialogue” presenting the possibility of carrying out, on an international level, debates hitherto largely restricted to the “national schools” of the discipline. An increase in scholarly exchanges between Lithuanian ethnology and German Volkskunde would, at any rate, be an important contribution to such a European “network of perspectives” (Hannerz).

This article is based on “The EU as a Manufacturer of Tradition and Cultural Heritage” which first appeared in: Kockel Ullrich (ed.). 2002. *Culture and Economy. Contemporary Perspectives*: 223–232. Aldershot-Burlington/VT.: Ashgate.

References

- Albertin Lothar. 1999. Regionale kulturelle Identität. Selbstgenügsames Refugium oder europäisches Handlungselement, Viehoff R., Segers R. T. (Hg.). *Kultur – Identität – Europa. Über die Schwierigkeiten und Möglichkeiten einer Konstruktion*: 321–332. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.
- Bausinger Hermann. 1966. Zur Kritik der Folklorismus-Kritik, *Populus Revisus. Beiträge zur Erforschung der Gegenwart*: 61–76. Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde.
- Bausinger Hermann. 1969a. Folklorismus in Europa. Eine Umfrage, *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 65: 1–55.
- Bausinger Hermann. 1969b. Kritik der Tradition. Anmerkungen zur Situation der Volkskunde, *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 65: 232–250.
- Bausinger Hermann. 1994. Region – Kultur – EG, *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 48/97: 113–140.
- Bendix Regina. 2000. Heredity, Hybridity and Heritage from One Fin de Siècle to the Next, Anttonen P. J. (ed.). *Folklore, Heritage Politics and Ethnic Diversity. A Festschrift for Barbro Klein*: 37–54. Tumba: The Multicultural Centre.
- Boissevain Jeremy (ed.). 1992. *Revitalizing European Rituals*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Boniface Priscilla, Fowler Peter. 1993. *Heritage and Tourism in the "Global Village"*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Borneman John, Fowler Nick. 1997. Europeanization, *Annual Review of Anthropology* 2: 487–514.
- Caftanzoglou Roxane, Kovani Helen. 1997. Cultural Identities and Integration in Rural Greece, *Sociologia Ruralis* 37: 240–254.
- Chevallier Denis (ed.). 2000. *Vives campagnes. Le patrimoine rural, projet de société*. Paris: Édition Autrement.
- Ekman Ann-Kristin. 1999. The Revival of Cultural Celebrations in Regional Sweden. Aspects of Tradition and Transition, *Sociologia Ruralis* 39: 280–293.
- Faure Muriel. 1999. Un produit "affiné" en objet culturel. Le fromage beaufort dans les Alpes du Nord, *Terrain* 33: 81–92.
- Giddens Anthony. 1994. Living in a Post-Traditional Society, Beck U., Giddens A., Lash S. (eds.). *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*: 201–234. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Goddard Victoria A., Llobera Josep R., Shore Cris (eds.). 1996. *The Anthropology of Europe. Identities and Boundaries in Conflict*. Oxford: Berg.
- Gray John. 2000. Rural Space in Scotland. From Rural Fundamentalism to Rural Development, *Anthropological Journal on European Cultures* 9: 53–79.
- Gray John N. 2002. *At Home in the Hills. Sense of Place in the Scottish Borders*. Oxford: Berg.

- Johler Reinhard. 2000. Ethnological Aspects of "Rooting" Europe in a "De-Ritualised" European Union, Bendix R., Roodenburg H. (Hg.). *Managing Ethnicity. Perspectives from Folklore Studies, History and Anthropology*: 171–184. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Johler Reinhard. 2001. "Wir müssen Landschaft produzieren": Die Europäische Union und ihre 'politics of landscape and nature', Brednich R. W., Schneider A., Werner U. (Hg.). *Natur – Kultur. Volkskundliche Perspektiven auf Mensch und Umwelt*. 32. Kongreß der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde in Halle v. 27. 9. – 1. 10. 1999: 77–90. New York-München-Berlin: Waxmann.
- Johler Reinhard. 2002a. Wieviel Europa braucht die Europäische Ethnologie? Die Volkskunden in Europa und die "Wende", Köstlin K., Niedermüller P., Nikitsch H. (Hg.). *Die Wende als Wende? Orientierungen Europäischer Ethnologien nach 1989* (= Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Ethnologie 23): 150–165. Wien: Verlag des Instituts für Europäische Ethnologie in Wien.
- Johler Reinhard. 2002b. Local Europa. The Production of Cultural Heritage and the Europeanisation of Places, *Ethnologia Europaea* (in print).
- Kockel Ullrich. 1999. *Borderline Cases. The Ethnic Frontiers of European Integration*. Liverpool: University Press.
- Kockel Ullrich. 2002. *Regional Culture and Economic Development. Explorations in European Ethnology*. Aldershot-Burlington/VT.: Ashgate.
- Lowenthal David. 1998. *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Macdonald Sharon. 1993. Identity Complexes in Western Europe: Social Anthropological Perspectives, Macdonald Sh. (ed.). *Inside European Identities. Ethnography in Western Europe*: 1–26. Providence/Oxford: Berg.
- Martin S. 1993. The Europeanization of Local Authorities – Challenges for Rural Areas, *Journal of Rural Studies* 9: 153–165.
- McDonald Maryon. 1996. "Unity in Diversity". Some Tensions in the Construction of Europe, *Social Anthropology* 3: 47–60.
- Moser Hans. 1962. Vom Folklorismus in unserer Zeit, *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 58: 177–209.
- Nadel-Klein Jane. 2002. *Fishing for Heritage. Modernity and Loss Along the Scottish Coast*. Oxford: Berg.
- Navrud Stale, Ready Richard C. (eds.). 2002a. *Valuing Environmental Valuation Techniques to Historic Buildings, Monuments and Artefacts*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Navrud Stale, Ready Richard C. (eds.). 2002b. *Valuing Cultural Heritage. Applying Environmental Valuation Techniques to Historic Buildings, Monuments and Artefacts*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Ray Christopher. 1997. Towards a Theory of the Dialectic of Local Rural Development Within the European Union, *Sociologia Ruralis* 37: 345–362.
- Rizzo Ilde, Towse Ruth (eds.). 2002. *The Economics of Heritage. A Study in the Political Economy of Culture in Sicily*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Shore Cris. 1993. Inventing the People's Europe: Critical Approaches to European Communities and the Construction of Europe, *Man* 28: 779–800.
- Shore Cris, Black Annabel. 1994. Citizens' Europe and the Construction of European Identity, Goddard V. A., Llobera J. R. u. Shore C. (eds.). *The Anthropology of Europe. Identity and Boundaries in Conflict*: 275–298. Oxford: Berg.
- Shore Cris. 2000. *Building Europe: The Cultural Politics of European Integration*. London: Routledge.
- Smith Susan J. 1999. The Cultural Politics of Difference, Massey D., Allen J. and Sarre P. (eds.). *Human Geography Today*: 129–150. Cambridge: Polity.
- Svensson Brigitta. 1998. The Nature of Cultural Heritage Sites, *Ethnologia Europaea* 28: 5–16.
- Tschofen Bernhard. 2002. Celebrating Origins: Local Food and Global Knowledge. Comments on the Possibilities of Food Studies in the Age of the World-Wide-Web, Lysaght P. (ed.). *Food and Celebration. From Fasting to Feasting*: 101–112. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU.
- Verebély Kinscö. 1997. Europäisches Folklore-Zentrum in Budapest, *Hessische Blätter für Volkskunde* 32: 157–161.
- Wilson Thomas M. 1993. An Anthropology of the European Community, Wilson T. W., Smith M. E. (eds.). *Cultural Change and the New Europe. Perspectives on the European Community*: 1–23. Boulder-San Francisco-Oxford: Westview.
- Wilson Thomas M. 1998. An Anthropology of the European Union, from Above and Below, Parman S. (ed.). *Europe in the Anthropological Imagination*: 148–156. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Europa, identiteto politika ir kultūros paveldo konstravimas

Reinhard Johler

Santrauka

Šio straipsnio tema renkuosi Europos Sąjungą – ES, kaip „tradicijos“ ir „kultūros paveldo“ „gamintoją“, galingai veikiančią kasdienį Europos gyvenimą. Taip pat, mano manymu, ne mažiau svarbu šiame kontekste panagrinėti Europos etnologų vaidmenį: tiek tą, kurį jie atliko anksčiau kaip tradicijos ir kultūros paveldo konstruotojai, tiek ir tą, kurį jie vaidina šiandien kaip europeizacijos proceso dalyviai. Šis procesas labai stipriai keičia kultūros paveldą.

Mūsų etnologijos pirmtakams abejonių nekėlė terminija, tačiau dar aiškesnis jiems atrodė jos turinys: „tradicija“ ir „kultūros paveldas“ laikyti ne vien sąvokomis ir pagrindinėmis tyrinėjimo temomis; tradicija ir paveldas buvo realūs ir apčiuopiami dalykai, tai yra tai, kas egzistavo realiame pasaulyje. Į tradiciją ir kultūros paveldą žvelgta kaip į statiškus paminklus, iš pagrindų formavusius dažniausiai etniniu ar tautiniu požiūriu konceptualizuojamas „liaudies kultūras“ (papročiai, tautiniai drabužiai, kaimo trobos, liaudies muzika ir menas). Šis kelias vedė tyrinėtojus į priešindustrinę praeitį, nes dabartis savo modernizacija tarsi fundamentaliai grėsė „tradicijai“ ir „kultūros paveldui“, kurie egzistavo tik kaip kur ne kur prieglobstį radę praėjusius laikus menantys reliktai. Šis iš tikrųjų etninis požiūris į savo kultūrą vertė etnologus tapti seniai išnykusio, „autentiško“ paveldo konstruktoriais ir laikyti save šio kultūros paveldo gelbėtojais ar įtakingais gynėjais. Pasak senųjų etnologų, XIX amžiaus pabaigos Europa buvo moderni urbanizuota aukštos tarptautinės kultūros vieta. Ji sudarė didelį kontrastą vietinėms tradicijoms ir tautinių kultūrų paveldui. Šiuo metu ES propaguojama „eurokultūra“ yra įdomi šio ankstyvojo varianto tąsa. Ji irgi laikoma visų pirma ekonomiškai motyvuota, vienaarūšė ir homogenizuota kultūra, keliančia grėsmę Europos vietinei, regioninei ir tautinei įvairovei.

Apžvelkime, pavyzdžiui, Hanoverio EXPO pristatytą Austrijos projektą „Bregenzerwaldo gamta ir gyvenimas“. Šalininkai pateikė jį kaip kontrastą ar vienaarūšės europeizacijos antitezę. Be abejonės, iš tikrųjų viskas atrodė daug sudėtingiau. Tai, kad terminas „europeizacija“ aiškiai figūravo vietiniame kontekste, nebuvo vien grynas sutapimas: lėšas projektams finansuoti tiesio-

giai skyrė Europa, o Bregenzerwaldo slėnyje veikė labai stipri ir akivaizdi vietinė ES infrastruktūra. Būtent iš „Bregenzerwaldo gamtos ir gyvenimo“ projekto retorikos, turinio, tikslo ir siekio nustatėme jo tikrąjį pagrindą. Jo turinį sudarė Europos LEADER programos, skirtos ekonominiu požiūriu atsilikusioms kaimo vietovėms remti.

Tai, kas lokalu, buvo sumuziejinta. Visoje Europoje vyksta regioninio maisto ir mugių, ūkininkų turgų, regioninių švenčių ir papročių gaivinimas. Ši veikla itin populiarė. Tai, be abejonės, susiję su tapatumo gynimu, bet dar labiau su jo pakartotiniu apibrėžimu. Europa ar, tikriau sakant, ES imasi pagrindinio vaidmens siekiant mobilizuoti kultūros paveldą, ir šito negalima ignoruoti. Taigi ES virto Europos „kultūros paveldo“ apibrėžimo viena pačių svarbiausių agentūrų. Galima sakyti, kad Europos (ES) buvimas pavertė socialinio gyvenimo tapatingumą ir skirtingumą mūsų svarbiausiu politiniu interesu. Tačiau šią diagnozę reikėtų įvertinti iš skirtingų pozicijų: ES, atrodo, sekasi kurti lokalinę ir regioninę įvairovę. Tačiau jai apskritai nesiseka kurti „tapatingumą“, įtvirtinti bendrą, tapatumą formuojančią „Europos kultūrą“. Tai įrodė nepakankamas lankytojų dėmesys „Europos paviljonui“ Hanoverio EXPO.

ES pirmiausia finansuoja tuos projektus, kuriais siekiama paremti ekonomikos homogenizacijos procesus. Tačiau kultūros požiūriu ES subsidijos labai smarkiai pradėjo kurti skirtumus Europoje. Visoje Europoje veikia dešimtys tūkstančių gerai finansuojamų projektų. Jie tiesiogiai ar bent jau gražiais žodžiais vykdo vieną ar daugiau tokių ES programų. Šios finansinės paramos programos suteikė daugeliui mažų grupelių ir veikėjų politinės jėgos naujiems santykiams savo tautose kurti – šis darbas iš tikrųjų labai reikšmingas. Jis masiškai mobilizavo „kultūros paveldą“ ir dar labiau akcentavo kultūrinę heterogeniškumą. Iš pirmo žvilgsnio atrodo, kad ši intensyvi Europos kultūrizacija prieštarauja ekonominei homogenizacijai. Taigi ko iš tikrųjų siekiama apie tradicijų ir kultūros paveldo apsaugą bei skatinimą užsimenančiomis „Mastrichto sutartimi“ ir „Korko deklaracija“?

ES finansiškai remia „kultūros paveldus“, siekdama politinių, kultūrinių ir ekonominių tikslų. Politikos požiūriu ryškus regionalumas silpnina tautines valstybes ir paverčia ES heterogeniškos kultūros gynėja. Šis ketinimas glaudžiai susijęs su naujojo Europos identiteto kultūriniais tikslais ir plėtra. Nuo devintojo dešimtmečio pradžios ES atkakliai mėgina – kaip numatyta „Mastrichto sutartyje“ – kreiptis tiesiai į „Europos pilietį“, o iš tikrųjų sukurti „eu-

ropietį“, įsisavinusį bendraeuropinę kultūrą, istoriją ir tapatumą. Abu ketinimai, politinių šūkių pavidalu teigę „piliečių Europą“ ir „įvairovės vienovę“, anksčiau yra buvę apyvartoje. Abu skirti žymėti, o galų gale sužadinti visiems europiečiams bendrą „eurokultūrą“. Manoma, kad abu tikslus įmanoma pasiekti skatinant visos daugybės nacionalinių, regioninių ir vietinių kultūrų abipusę pagarbą ir teikiant joms finansinę pagalbą, kitaip sakant, pasitelkus Europai tipišką įvairovę.

ES institucijos šią įvairovę laiko ekonominiu požiūriu palankią proga, o tai ir yra ES varomos „kultūros paveldo“ propagandos ekonominis tikslas. Ir vietines tradicijas, ir kultūros paveldą šios institucijos laiko specifiniu pagrindu, kuriuo remiantis vyksta turizmo ar žemės ūkio produkcijos ekonominė plėtra. Šitokią ES praktikuojamą paveldo politiką reikėtų laikyti Europos tapatumo politikos įrankiu. Jis neseniai vykdytą regioninių ar lokalių kultūros paveldų konstravimą paverčia svarbiausiu politiniu klausimu, taigi heterogenizuoja Europą. Europos Sąjungos remiama nesuskaičiuojama daugybė žmonių siekia kultūrinio ar istorinio unikalumo, ir tuo pat metu žmonės vieni su kitais tiesiogiai konkuruoja. Dėl to kultūra, tapatumas ir kultūros paveldas kiek suburokratėjo. Be to, lokalumas tapo pritaikytas globaliai arenai. Jis virto specifine, gerai pažįstama ir – svarbiausia – tinkama vartoti naujosios „pasaulio kultūros“ dalimi.

Galbūt šis procesas kai kam pasirodys įkvepiantis, o kai kam apgailaustautinas. Tačiau mes, Europos etnologai, neturėtume jo ignoruoti. Mūsų požiūrį į tradiciją ir kultūros paveldą šis procesas paveiks dvejopai: pirmoji pasekmė bus susijusi su ES ir jos proteguojama „eurokultūra“ (ne tik išsižiūrint į kasdienybės lokalumą, bet ir imantis didelių bei galingų institucijų kruopštaus ištyrimo). Antroji pasekmė bus šitokia: siekdami suprasti „tradiciją“ ir „kultūros paveldą“, jau negalėsime jų išplėsti iš vietinio konteksto. Vėlyvosios modernybės laikais apie tradiciją ir kultūros paveldą daug diskutuota gvildenant prieštaringą identiteto politikos temą. Tradicija ir kultūros paveldas – retos prekės globalios ekonomikos srityje. Kaip tik dėl to iš mūsų, Europos etnologų, bus pareikalauta naujų minčių ir idėjų, taip pat naujos dinaminės „kultūros paveldo“ koncepcijos.

Taigi ES jau nėra vien politinė makrokonceptija, ji jau prasimušė – aktyviai propaguodama kultūros paveldą – į savo piliečių kasdienį lokalumą. Tolesnė ES ekspansija supažindins ir Centrinę bei Vidurio Europą su šiuo naujuoju europietišku „modeliu“. Tačiau šitoks europeizacijos procesas meta iššūkį Europos etnologijai. Jai teks užimti tvirtesnę negu anksčiau lyginamąją

poziciją. Tačiau svarbiausia, kad ši „naujoji“ Europos etnologija inicijuotų „Europos etnologinį dialogą“, leidžiantį tarptautiniu mastu aptarti tokius klausimus, kokius anksčiau paprastai aptarinėdavo tik atskiros etnologijos „nacionalinės mokyklos“.

Gauta 2002 m. rugsėjo mėn.