DOI: https://doi.org/10.12797/Politeja.15.2018.52.02

Łukasz BUKOWIECKI
University of Warsaw
l.m.bukowiecki@gmail.com

WHAT IS MISSING AND WHO MISSES IT?

THE HIDDEN HERITAGE OF MODERNITY AT OPEN-AIR MUSEUMS IN SWEDEN AND POLAND

ABSTRACT The idea of a permanent public exhibition of translocated pieces of pre-modern folk architecture with their equipment and surroundings emerged fully implemented for the first time on 11 October 1891, when Arthur Hazelius' Skansen was opened to the public. In many aspects this bottom-up project, by using a 'translocative' method of the conservation of monuments and introducing the idea of a 'living museum', was ahead of its time, and, hence, very attractive for its followers all over Europe. The origins of the Polish adoption of the Skansen model are associated with the activity of the socially engaged intelligentsia even before Poland regained its independence in 1918. However, a Polish *skansen*-boom erupted only in the 1960s and 1970s under the rule of the Polish People's Republic. Nowadays, Sweden is becoming more and more a 'late' welfare state, Poland is no longer a communist country, and post-modern Europe misses its modernity perhaps even more strongly than modern Europe yearned for the 'good old (pre-modern) days'. Nevertheless, the basic hidden modern determinants composing the Skansen itself as well as the Skansen model are still in force and matter.

Key words: heritage, modernity, nostalgia, open-air museum

As early as in the late 1980s, the growth of heritage in Europe has been perceived not only as a favorably appreciated process of 'saving the past for the future', but also as a serious and complex problem with the present. The professional critique of the so-called 'heritage industry' has been developing for about 40 years now and has resulted in the

rich production of literature on – in short – cultural history for sale. Within this field one could observe an increasing attention to the fetishism of (reconstructed, imagined, or just invented) authenticity (of objects, practices, places, identities, etc.), to the aestheticization of spaces (especially by 'theming' and redesigning them for tourists' pleasure and entertainment) and to the commodification of the past as a resource of artefacts, images and stories for the consumption of spectacle.

Thanks to David Lowenthal's works the above-mentioned heritage critique has been accompanied by repetitive expressions of a kind of a utopian wish for a pure (disinterested), true (objective) and third-person (neutral) history as an 'enterprise' opposite to heritage in an exclusive dichotomy of these two 'routes to the past' which are animated by contrary aims and *rely on antithetical modes of persuasion*.[1] As Lowenthal argued in the preface of his famous book *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*: *heritage is not history at all; while it borrows from and enlivens historical study, heritage is not an inquiry into the past but a celebration of it, not an effort to know what actually happened but a profession of faith in a past tailored to present-day purposes*.[2]

Regardless of whether one agrees with Lowenthal's distinction between heritage and history or not, there is no doubt that such scientific debates usually have only a slight impact on the current cultural reality outside the academia. That is why long-noticed and wide-discussed problems with growing production and consumption of heritage (and/or history) may still be faced nowadays without any commonly accepted practical solutions offered. The problem was not solved even by the fact that the critical approach to heritage protection has been supported by numerous voices expressing self-reflection of heritage managers. They were, and often still are, willing to share their Cassandrian prophesies of 'over-heritageization' on a general and – at the same time – rather theoretical level, concerning all allegedly dire consequences of flattering nostalgia in popular culture for contemporary, mostly European, societies. However, it is peculiar that they are still usually not able (or not likely) to apply their own diagnosis. Hence, such deliberation does usually not cause any actual change in their own field of care, in terms of both their primary affiliation and local environment.

One of the most commonly cited ironic predictions on heritage-in-danger which is becoming more and more a danger itself, assigned to a former director of the Science Museum in London Neil Cossons and quoted by a British cultural historian Robert Hewison in his book *The Heritage Industry* in 1987, runs as follows: *You can't project that sort of rate of growth* [in heritage – Ł.B.] *much further before the whole country becomes one big open air museum, and you just join it as you get off at Heathrow*.[3]

The British sociologist John Urry, who cited the above-mentioned words in his bestseller *The Tourist Gaze* (three editions and about ten reprints), commented on

[1] All cited expressions come from: D. Lowenthal, *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*, Cambridge 1998, pp. X-XI and 121.

[2] Ibid., p. X.

[3] R. Hewison, *The Heritage Industry*, London 1987, p. 24, cited after: J. Urry, J. Larsen, *The Tourist Gaze 3.0*, London 2011, pp. 135-137.

them in the paragraph about *the causes of the contemporary fascination with gazing upon the historical or what is often seen as heritage*[4] by using a memorable maxim: *The seventeenth-century disease of nostalgia seems to have become a contemporary epidemic*.[5]

It needs to be highlighted that the British Isles were, of course, not the actual origin of this epidemic, nor the only site of its outbreak, hence no 'sanitary cordon' could protect continental Europe from nostalgia-based heritage growth. Almost all European powers and societies had become infected with this 'contemporary epidemic' for many decades before the insular critique arose. As David Lowenthal claimed, *We value our heritage most when it seems at risk*,[6] and Europe was the very first place where such a nostalgic attitude to the past, perceived as an 'endangered' common good, had – due to many reasons – circumstances to be established and disseminated. That is why *the language of heritage that suffuses the world is* [still – Ł.B.] *mainly Western*,[7] even though *what is involved* [in modern heritage concern – Ł.B.] *is a cluster of trends whose premises, promises, and problems are truly global*.[8] Nobody had realized *in time* that Proustian madeleine cake might be poisonous if overdosed.

What is more, this epidemic of nostalgia has been accompanied by another 'lifestyle disease': a disease of looking away from the present. When Martin Selby reconstructed materialist perspectives on urban tourism as the cultural logic of capitalism, he summarized it as follows: *It is argued, therefore, that the commodification of local history and culture diverts attention from the present, as nostalgia is seen as a response to an unhealthy present*.[9]

However, it is only one side of the issue. Scholars, concerned with looking for hidden ideologies so as to discover it, often just skip the cover itself, neglecting it as a part of a fake reality. After all, one can even propose just the opposite statement to the one cited above: focusing on the present makes one look away from the history of forms of the commodification of heritage.

There is no need to repeat all the argumentation against contemporary wide-spread nostalgia nor to find possible ways of defending and appreciating it. Both ways, despite being contradictory to each other, are based on the same assumption that one has the right or even the obligation to assess social phenomenon by examining them in terms of their 'correctness' or 'wrongness'.

Instead of such a prescriptive approach to cultural practices, a more descriptive perspective based on the cultural history approach is to be proposed. There is no place to recall a detailed history of nostalgia in Europe here. In brief, the production of the imagined past, often commodified and used instrumentally, became an important and

4 Ibid., p. 135.

5 Ibid., p. 137.

6 D. Lowenthal, *The Heritage Crusade*..., p. 24.

7 Ibid., p. 5.

8 Ibid., p. 6.

9 See: M. Selby, *Understanding Urban Tourism. Image, Culture and Experience*, London–New York 2004, p. 48.

meaningful part of the present in European societies about two hundred years ago, as a result of democratization of sentimentality. It may be regarded as one of the persistent achievements of the European Enlightenment, when citizens emerged as new political subjects, new actors of history and, finally, new consumers of the past.[10] Thus, the researchers' duty is to reconstruct and interpret the genealogy of these processes for the better and more balanced understanding of social and cultural practices concerning longing for the past and protecting of what remains.

At approximately the same time as when a huge debate on the scale and limits of heritage emerged among Western heritage professionals, Poland started to radically and rapidly change under systemic transformation processes on its way from communism to capitalism and democracy. The cultural dimension of these processes was noticed early by a Polish renowned theoretician and feminist critic of literature, Maria Janion, who, in the early 1990s manifested, maybe even a bit too exaggeratedly, the end of the romantic paradigm of Polish culture. According to Janion's predictions at that time, this traditional Polish type of common sense would be totally, or at least partially, as her less radical colleagues claimed, replaced by a 'free market of dreams'.[11]

In the 1990s it might have seemed that Poland had commenced a new era of ongoing modernization in which nostalgia or some sort of longing would become nothing more than entertainment. In this intellectual climate, sort of reset in social relationship to heritage was expected and a debate on that topic emerged among Polish scholars, too. For instance, the Polish anthropologist, ethnographer and art critic Aleksander Jackowski, known especially for his understanding approach to 'the art called naive', raised the question of changing the role and meaning of ethnographic museums in his essay "Czy wymyślilibyśmy dzisiaj muzea etnograficzne?" (Would we invent ethnographic museums today?), published in 1993. He wrote: *museums, including ethnographic museums, as institutions can be located somewhere between a cemetery and Disneyland. Between a place that gives us a sense of connection with the past, a national or cultural identity, and a place where we have fun learning and learn by having fun*.[12]

This somewhat careful diagnosis, articulated when there was even no actual theme park in Poland, may be developed into the thesis that the metaphors of 'cemetery' and 'Disneyland' define our 'horizon of expectations' for heritage nowadays, as well as its abilities and opportunities. It also unconsciously corresponds to David Lowenthal's remarks on the 'vernacular bents' of heritage industry, which also come from 1990s but were made from the Western perspective: *Like its new clientele, the past doted on is populist. Formerly about grand monuments, unique treasures, and great heroes, heritage now also touts the typical and evokes the vernacular. The homes and haunts of Everyman*

[10] See: B. Anderson, *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London 1983. See also: D. Lowenthal, *The Heritage Crusade*..., pp. 60-63 (section "From Community to Nation").

[11] See: M. Janion, "Wolny rynek marzeń", in eadem, *Projekt krytyki fantazmatycznej. Szkice o egzystencjach ludzi i duchów*, Warszawa 1991, pp. 5-6.

[12] A. Jackowski, "Czy wymyślilibyśmy dzisiaj muzea etnograficzne?", *Śląskie Prace Etnograficzne*, vol. 2 (1993), p. 27 [transl. – Ł.B.].

and Everywoman have spread from Scandinavian open-air museums into historical theme parks the world over.[13]

In light of both citations from the opposite sides of the former Iron Curtain, an open-air museum may be used as one of crucial figures for understanding the condition of heritage in unifying Europe at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries, or to put it in other words: a common European heritage in the making. To mention just four of the most important dimensions of such heritage: its spatiality (in case of open-air museums the suggested links to a cemetery or a theme park are more literal than in case of other heritage institutions), its totalness (both in terms of the-whole-country-like preservation scope and diffusion of the idea over the world), its commodification (theming, Disneyization[14]) and its vernacularity (ordinary people as the main protagonists of the exhibitions as well as their target audience).

The proposed subject of study is the cultural history of open-air museums in two countries: Sweden and Poland. The former is the place of origin of this 'genre' of museums where it was invented at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries and popularized in the first half of the 20th century. The latter is where the model of open-air museums was adopted in a very unobvious way in the mid-1900s and where, thanks to the European Union funds, many such museums have increasingly become similar to the Swedish pattern over a 10-15 year period.

The historical background presented in the paper is based on data collected in subject literature. For instance, the Scandinavian beginnings of the open-air museums and their diffusion to other parts of the world was described in details by Sten Renzthog, a retired director of one of the Swedish leading open-air museums – Jamtli in Östersund, in his monograph *Open Air Museums. The History and Future of a Visionary Idea.*[15] The problems of the adoption of this idea in Poland were widely discussed in 1970s and 1980s by representatives of so-called skansen museology (or skansenology[16]) who were usually at the same time theoreticians and teachers of monument protection (rooted in art history and/or ethnography), museum practitioners (directors, curators, researchers) and cultural policy makers. Among their publications is a collective volume *Open-Air Museums in Poland*[17] from 1981, coedited i.a. by Franciszek Midura, a 'skansenologist' from the then Polish ministry of culture, and a monograph *Muzea*

13 D. Lowenthal, *The Heritage Crusade*..., p. 14.

14 See: A. Bryman, "The Disneyization of Society", *The Sociological Review*, vol. 47, no. 1 (1999), pp. 25-47, at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-954X.00161>; idem, *The Disneyization of Society*, Thousand Oaks 2004; Ł. Bukowiecki, "Between a Cemetery and Disneyland: A Cultural History of the Sądecki Ethnographic Park", in W. Szymański, M. Ujma (eds.), *Pany chłopy chłopy pany. Masters peasants peasants masters*, transl. by E. Kowal, Nowy Sącz 2016, pp. 95-107.

15 S. Rentzhog, *Open Air Museums. The History and Future of a Visionary Idea*, transl. by S.V. Airey, Östersund 2007.

16 See: ibid., pp. 194-203.

17 J. Czajkowski, M. Czajnik, F. Midura (eds.), *Open-Air Museums in Poland*, transl. by E. Goździak, J. Rogalińska, Poznań 1981.

na wolnym powietrzu w Europie[18] (*Open-air museums in Europe*) by Jerzy Czajkowski, a director (1973-1999) of the biggest and most important Polish open-air museum in Sanok.

Contrary to the above-mentioned existing literature of the subject, which has usually been produced by active or retired museum professionals and focused on local, regional or national experiences, the perspective of conceptualizing open-air museums in this article will be developed from the possibly external point of view, so as to see the big picture of cultural contexts of the issue and to find its connections to social processes on the supranational level, such as rapid and irreversible transformations of landscapes and lifestyles in 19th- and 20th-century Europe.[19]

An argument to be defended in this paper is that open-air museums may be described as markers of (mainly) European modernization as an ongoing, cumulative, endless operation linking the past with the future. The process of modernization has affected changes in daily life practices, social structure, cultural landscape and official state ideologies for more than one hundred years in Europe. It was also responsible for the institutionalization of new understanding of time, space, individual being and collectiveness, which all together influenced the modern notion of heritage.[20] Actions aimed at 'keeping the past', such as collecting, preserving, exhibiting and describing objects, which are typical for institutions devoted to heritage protection and interpretation, including open-air museums, may be therefore recognized as an integral part of the process of modernization.

The paper is especially focused on the process of translocation, which is characteristic for open-air museums. The translocation will be understood in three ways: in its literal meaning as a process of demolition, transfer (in pieces) and reconstruction (in a new place) of historic buildings (mainly those of folk architecture), and additionally in two metaphorical meanings: as a dissemination of the Swedish model of open-air

[18] J. Czajkowski, *Muzea na wolnym powietrzu w Europie. Historia – dzień dzisiejszy – perspektywy*, Rzeszów–Sanok 1984.

[19] This article may be regarded as a continuation of my book devoted to the history and cultural analysis of the Skansen in Stockholm and the Museum of Folk Architecture in Sanok. See: Ł. Bukowiecki, *Czas przeszły zatrzymany. Kulturowa historia skansenów w Szwecji i w Polsce*, Warszawa 2015.

[20] It is often suggested that the concept of heritage is just of modern nature and therefore cannot be applied to describe any pre-modern, or even pre-20th century phenomenon. Heritage meanings' evolution, including the expansion of boundaries of the officially accepted definitions of heritage, is clearly presented by Krzysztof Kowalski in his book *O istocie dziedzictwa europejskiego – rozważania* (Kraków 2013, pp. 20-32). On the other hand, some scholars argue that heritage may be understood as an ahistorical descriptive category of any products *shaped from history* and *filtered with reference to the present, whenever that 'present' actually is*, because *every society has had a relationship with its past, even those that have chosen to ignore it* – D.C. Harvey, "Heritage Pasts and Heritage Presents: Temporality, Meaning and the Scope of Heritage Studies", *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, vol. 7, no. 4 (2001), pp. 319-338, at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13581650120105534>. In this paper the modern transformation in scale, scope and access to heritage is respectfully acknowledged, but at the same time 'heritage' is used as an analytical term for describing social relations with the past, even in cases for which this usage may be perceived as sort of an anachronism. In this sense, the paper is also about the heritage of heritage.

museums in Europe (translocation of Swedish invention abroad) and as an open-air museums' user-experience of the travel-in-time effect (the translocation of the audience in time). All those three levels of translocation will be described and discussed, including their European dimension.

The story begins about 125 years ago in Sweden.

THE SKANSEN AS A MODERN INVENTION

When Arthur Hazelius, the visionary Swedish ethnographer and pioneer of the worldwide ethnographic-museum movement, decided to open his new invention, the Skansen, to the public on Sunday, 11 October 1891, it was probably not a perfect day for outdoor activities on Djurgården island on the outskirts of Stockholm. However, that was the time and place when and where the idea of the open-air ethnographic museum as a permanent public exhibition of translocated pieces of pre-modern folk architecture with their equipment and surroundings emerged fully implemented for the first time in history.[21]

It took about 5 years to create this first open-air museum in the former royal park and hunting ground, before Hazelius' dream of the Skansen came true. The first building acquired with the intention of translocation and exhibiting in the Skansen near Stockholm, the so-called Mora cottage from the Swedish province of Dalarna, was bought by Hazelius in 1885.

In many aspects the project was definitely ahead of its time. First of all, the Skansen was probably the first 'living museum' in the world, where actors dressed in historical costumes and performed components of 'intangible heritage', as one would say today, are as important as exhibited material objects (artefacts). Living museums, still commonly opened and visited, serve as a background for performances of social practices and traditional daily routines at home and at work, festive events and holiday customs, performing arts and traditional craftsmanship, which are all united by one common feature. They are perceived – by museum staff as well as by visitors – as being in danger of extinction. The social process of the construction of heritage is similar to the one concerning material objects, including entire buildings regarded as 'relicts in danger' which have to be rescued and preserved.

[21] Just a first few years after the Skansen was created, thanks to other pioneers who took after Hazelius (or just competed with him), more open-air museums emerged in Northern Europe. To mention only the most important examples: in 1892 Georg Karlin opened his Kulturen in Lund, an open-air museum devoted to the Swedish region of Skåne; in 1894 Hans Aall transformed a collection of folk architecture designed by Christian Holst (1884-1888) at the Royal Manor on Bygdø in Kristiania (Oslo) into a first open-air museum in Norway (Norsk Folkemuseum, Bygdøy, opened to the public in 1902) and Anders Sandvig started collecting objects for his future Maihaugen in Lillehammer (inaugurated in 1904); in 1897 Bernard Olsen created the first Danish open-air museum in Kongens Have in Copenhagen, which in 1901 was moved to its present location in Lyngby near Copenhagen (Frilandsmuseet); also in 1901, the first open-air museum in Finland was opened in Turku.

Moreover, Hazelius' Skansen did mark the beginning of the open-air museums movement which later became very popular in Scandinavia and spread all over Europe together with a 'translocative' method of conservation of historic buildings. Dozens of translocated pieces of folk architecture which were removed from their 'natural' environment to the Skansen and many other open-air museums opened later all over the world, tell the same, or at least similar, story. Certainly, the value of open-air museums, compared to theme parks for example, is the fact that they preserve (and at the same time re-use) the authentic materiality of historic (mostly wooden) buildings.

On the other hand, the process of the demolition, translocation and reconstruction of the object results in the situation that the exhibited building still has its original provenience and form, but at the same time it definitely loses its original meaning, taken out of its primary environment and deprived of its original functions. Thanks to many scrupulous conservatory practices and accurate interior design, such a translocated form of house 'looks like before' (or even better: it looks like we think it should have looked like in the past); however, it is no longer a literal home for anyone only because it was taken from its primary context of private property, peripheral countryside and productive, agricultural pre-modernity.

In other words, translocated forms are 'destructed to be preserved'. Are they empty then? Certainly not, because the translocation of forms is assisted by a translation of meaning. This translation is done on a few levels: from the private property to the public exhibition, from pre-modern production to modern consumption, from the peripheries to the local, regional or national centers (of powers, elites and common interests), from folk culture to mass, urban and national culture.

Arthur Hazelius, with his unique balance of pragmatism and idealism, prepared a new urban attraction using the countryside 'bricks' (or logs, to say it precisely) and purely modern 'glue' between them. The Skansen, connected and adapted three important social phenomena, which started to gradually emerge in the second half of the 19th century in Europe: the building processes of modern nations, the cultural heritage protection movement and – last but not least – the beginnings of the mass entertainment industry.

By opening the Skansen, Hazelius wanted to show the Swedishness of Sweden to the Swedes by – according to him – 'living brush strokes'. The metaphor of creating the exhibition in a form of impressive (and impressing) for its visitors image of something as intangible and ideal as national community and its discovered (or invented) hidden values with the tools of tangible pieces of folk architecture may be helpful to understand how to perceive and assess the meaning of the museum. It could be regarded as one of the oldest proto-narrative museums; however, with a very specific role of a narrator, who was at the same time omniscient and silent. The voice of the museum was naturalized in Michel de Certeau's very carefully composed 'spatial story'.[22]

Who was the narrator of this story? Probably the man, for sure – the teacher. More precisely, it is possible to reconstruct three forms of the narrator which are (or at least

[22] See: M. de Certeau, "Spatial Stories", in idem, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, transl. by S. Rendall, Berkeley 1984, pp. 115-130.

used to be) present at the Skansen and at the same time were, among many others, very important in the storytelling culture of the 19th century. They are the following: the ethnographer/discoverer (who finds and descripts new aspects of culture), literary realism writer (who is trusted to know and tell the truth) and the national revivalist (who use the narration for a social mobilization, especially in nation building process).

The connection between the creation of open-air museums and nationalism is so close and strong that even a century after the opening of the Skansen not only consumers, but also the producers of heritage institutions of such kinds are taught to treat folk culture as a part, or a dimension, of a particular national culture. As Sten Rentzhog mentioned, *in the wave of enthusiasm after the fall of Communism, a grandiose scheme was put forward for a joint open air museum somewhere in Central Europe, with original buildings from all European countries. But there was nobody to take charge of such a proposal*.[23]

Rentzhog comments upon this situation by adding rhetorical questions which lead to an obvious conclusion: *Why not develop thematic open air museums, on, for example, herding or fishing communities from different countries? Why not* [create – Ł.B.] *one showing the amazing similarities to be found in the vernacular architecture of mountain districts? The strangest thing, actually, is the absence of this type of museum. Open air museums have remained a national affair*.[24]

However, it seems that open-air museums respond to class-structured demands and expectations as well as the ones connected to the national identity. Coming back to the Skansen, its target audience was, from the beginning, supposed to be first of all a Stockholm middle class, which was also an intended group of Hazelius' previous ethnographic (indoor) exhibitions: the Scandinavian Ethnographic Collection (opened in 1873 in the Stockholm city centre) and the Nordic Museum, the building of which had started 3 years before the Skansen opened, and lasted almost 20 years up to 1907, 6 years after Hazelius' death.

The Skansen, presenting reconstructed and reanimated wooden cottages and farms from all parts of the country located in one place in the capital city, was successful among mass audience as an attractive 'time machine' involved in production of common identity. But during the first few years of its history, the Skansen was mainly an attraction only for Stockholm inhabitants.

The situation changed radically in 1897, when Djurgården island hosted the Universal Exhibition of Arts and Industry in Stockholm. The Expo was accompanied by two important infrastructural facilities: a new functional, modern bridge connecting the Stockholm district of Östermalm with the island, and a funicular railway between the exhibition site and the Skansen. An essence of Swedishness in miniature on Djurgården island was no longer solely a destination for Sunday trips for Stockholm inhabitants, looking for an oasis of countryside and nature. Since 1897, the Skansen has

[23] S. Rentzhog, *Open Air Museums*..., p. 41.

[24] Ibid.

become a tourist attraction for visitors from outside the city, and even from outside the country – mainly: middle-class tourists.

If it is to be agreed that something what defines Europe is often a self-critique and ideological pluralism that leads to many contradictions, the Skansen could be perceived as a very European institution. It is the ambiguous site of the manifestation of contradictory ideas. On the one hand, its goal was to show the image of Swedishness to newcomers visiting the Expo, or, to put it in other words: to re-write folk culture using the code of national culture. On the other hand, regardless of the place of origin, language used and religion worshiped, everyone could find this rural idyll of the Skansen familiar to some extent, and, hence, very attractive to follow.

Thanks to that, Hazelius should have not been worried about the future of his invention. Indeed, when the founder of the Skansen died in 1901, it was not closed but transformed into the public institution which was later developed many times, improving its collection by further translocations up to the 1970s. To say more, Hazelius was buried with honors at the Skansen.

THE SKANSEN MODEL AND ITS POLISH ADOPTION

At the turn of the 19th and 20th century, when the Skansen became the symbolic and a real tomb of his founder, this very Swedish late-19th century idea of creating open-air ethnographic museums spread all over Scandinavia and reached the southern shores of the Baltic Sea, so as to be disseminated throughout Europe. Up to 1918, about 100 such museums were founded all over the continent and the popularity of the Skansen-like institutions was based on the attractive ways in which they legitimized the national claims to the territory with its natural and cultural landscape. After the Great War, post-Versailles Europe was divided into nation-states and there was a strong need for institutions supporting (self)formation of nations, which resulted in the increase in popularity and rapid development of an easy-adaptable and widely acceptable format of an open-air ethnographic museum which in this paper is to be called the Skansen model.

That would be the second – metaphorical but still, say, 'spatial' – dimension of translocation. In this perspective, the translocated 'object' would be Hazelius' original invention of the Skansen in Stockholm, and the translocation process of re-writing would affect local embodiments of this idea, disseminated across the whole Europe, as well as in the rest of the world. European dissemination of the Skansen model was done without any top down management, thanks to local cultural elites on regional or national level, who found the idea attractive. Open-air museums' assumptions were always adapted to local conditions and circumstances, but the essential architecture of the model (including the fact that the architecture is essential!) is common. It may be therefore regarded as a distributed or shared European 'infrastructure' for heritage protection.

Today there are more than 2,000 open-air museums in Europe, mainly located in Nordic countries (more than 1,700). However, quite a lot of them can also be found

in Central Europe. In the former communist countries of that region, such institutions were willingly opened after World War II as an answer to the rapid modernization affecting radical social change, as well as a manifestation of the official state ideology of that time, linking national identity with class consciousness of peasants and workers who constituted the folk and/or 'the people'.

The Skansen model was not implemented in Poland as an equal copy of its domestic version from Sweden. By the way, there is a noteworthy peculiarity in Polish adoption of the name of Skansen. Namely, a given name of Stockholm ethnographic park was adopted in Poland as an unofficial but commonly used generic name for open-air museums, which results in fact that each Polish open-air museum may be (informally) called a *skansen*. At the same time lots of people do not know the origin of this name. What is more, in Swedish the name Skansen has been always reserved exclusively only for the open-air museum founded by Hazelius on Djurgården island. For each of the other Swedish open-air museums – and there are more than one thousand of them at the moment! – the term in Swedish is a *friluftsmuseum*, literally, an open-air museum. It all together makes the word 'skansen' probably the most popular and at the same time least consciously borrowed Swedish word in Polish language.

A brief overview of the development of open-air museums in Sweden and in Poland is to be made, as well as a summary of the main differences in historical background in Sweden and in Poland. Firstly, in Sweden there is a main, central open-air museum in the capital (the Skansen) and about 1,000 local open-air museums which are mostly bottom-up locally-rooted and socially-driven initiatives, while in Poland there are about 30 main regional open-air museums, established mainly in 1960s and 1970s as a result of a rather top-down process initiated by heritage professionals (art historians, ethnographers, monument conservators, museum managers, etc.) and supported by state authorities, with no open-air museum in the capital and several dozen small, local open-air museums which are non-public in terms of management.

Secondly, the exhibitions in Swedish open-air museums are generally focused on both material artefacts and performances, which makes such a museum 'a living history site', designed with attention to the quality of entertainment of the audience, while the main objective of Polish open-air museum seems to be a care for the preservation of material objects and their scientific documentation, thus they remain 'shelters' for endangered architecture and other material artefacts. There was a very rare and very late introduction to the 'living history' approach in Polish *skansens* after 1989, despite the fact it was an important component of Hazelius' original idea.

Thirdly, there are some crucial differences in the social and cultural contexts of founding and functioning of open-air museums in Sweden and in Poland. The most obvious difference is that of time, when the history of museums of such kind began as a widely accepted and somehow politically supported movement in these two countries: the late 19th century versus the second half of the 20th century. However, there are more serious distinctions of qualitative type in historical background. To list some of the most important ones: (1) a land use in the countryside (the 19th century agrarian reforms connected to the Great Commasation in Sweden versus the very late en-

franchisement of peasants on small allotments in Poland); (2) common beliefs about the nature of the national community and the cultural domination of social groups in the society (urban middle-class in Sweden versus post-gentry intelligentsia in Poland); (3) the traditional (self)recognition of peasants (inclusive in Sweden and strictly exclusive in Poland).

The very origins of the Polish adoption of the Skansen idea are associated with the activity of the Polish socially engaged intelligentsia even before Poland regained its independence in 1918 after more than 120 years of so-called Partitions (between Russia, Prussia and Austria). By the beginning of World War II, despite several attempts and numerous plans, only two small, family-driven, peripherally located open-air museums had been opened. The first one was founded in 1906 in the small Kaszubian village of Wdzydze Kiszewskie (approximately 75 km from Gdańsk) by a couple of local cultural activists Teodora and Izydor Gulgowski. The second one was opened to the public after 8 years of preparations in 1927 in the small town of Nowogród Łomżyński in the Kurpie region (about 150 km north-east of Warsaw) as a bottom-up initiative by the ethnographer Adam Chętnik and his wife Zofia.

The political, economic, social and cultural background for open-air ethnographic museums, as well as the circumstances of the adoption of a Skansen-like past mastering, spectacularly changed in Poland after World War II. On the one hand, the country was undergoing dynamic industrialization and urbanization. On the other, rural areas were being modernized through agricultural reforms, electrification, illiteracy campaigns and establishing new professional career opportunities for people coming from the countryside to advance in the society. It all together allowed wider groups of citizens to look at 'the former countryside' from a distance – either with pride from the progress that was under way (in the authorities and their supporters' view) or with a growing sense of nostalgia for the lost pre-modernity that one would like to 'go to the countryside' to see.

It was approximately in the mid-1960s, when the effects of modernization, that had never been seen before on such a scale, became clearly visible. It is instructive to consider the correlation between demographic processes and initiatives to protect the Polish peasants' culture, both proving radical social changes that were taking place in Poland then. Namely, in 1966 for the first time in Polish history the number of city dwellers exceeded the number of people living in the countryside[25] and only two years later the Folk Architecture Museum in Sanok, the largest and the most prominent open-air museum in Poland, was opened to the public.

The open-air museum in Sanok had been planned since the late 1950s and designed as a model for other Polish museums of this kind. Indeed, its opening in 1968 was sort of a breakthrough and, in the mid-1960s and 1970s, a Polish *skansen*-boom erupted. Over the next two decades, more than 30 new ethnographic regional parks were estab-

[25] See: G. Węcławowicz, M. Łotocka, A. Baucz (eds.), *Rozwój miast w Polsce. Raport wprowadzający Ministerstwa Rozwoju Regionalnego opracowany na potrzeby przygotowania przeglądu OECD krajowej polityki miejskiej w Polsce*, Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego, Warszawa 2010, p. 10, at <http://eregion.wzp.pl/sites/default/files/rozwoj_miast_w_polsce_0.pdf>, 1 June 2016.

lished in Poland: four in 1950s, twelve in 1960s and eighteen in 1970s. Thus, it is not surprising that in the late 1970s *skansens* were officially regarded as the most dynamically developing type of museums in Poland.[26]

These new regional *skansens* (but without any main central Skansen-like museum!) were expected to present – in a historical perspective – the development of standards of living and working of ordinary people, so as to persuade citizens not to yearn for 'the good old days' – which was of course full of paradoxes. On the one hand, any form of bottom-up nostalgia was officially criticized and almost forbidden as communism was considered the best and final form of political, economic and social regime. On the other hand, many experts and practitioners of, say, heritage protection were involved in the preservation of the wooden folk architecture in *skansens* and many visitors to *skansens* used it as a space for individual escapism.

What is more, despite the fact that the impetus of establishing open-air museums in Poland started to decline in the 1980s, after 1989 the word 'skansen' made a surprising career in the Polish public discourse in a metaphorical sense, as *a synonym for everything outdated, backward, old-fashioned and just bad*.[27] Consequently, as the general name of the open-air type of museum and as a journalistic cliché, 'skansen' is probably used more often in Polish than in Swedish at the moment.

THE SKANSEN AND THE *SKANSENS* IN LATE MODERNITY

While assessing the contemporary conditions of open-air museums, the social changes and dynamics of cultural memory in the 20th and 21st century in Sweden and in Poland (as well as in the whole Europe and in the world) should be taken into account. That would be the third, 'temporal' dimension of translocation (after the literal one and the dissemination of the Skansen model in Europe). Taking this perspective, the Skansen itself as well as the Skansen model adopted elsewhere would be historical forms of dealing with heritage translocated in time. In that sense, a given open-air museum still carries its set of values, ideas, intentions, affects, and imaginaries accompanying its beginnings; hence, it allows a contemporary audience to travel in time not only to the period which is presented on the exhibition, but also to the times when the museum was founded.

The imaginaries of traditional countryside Swedish daily-life presented in the Skansen were based on the nostalgia of the late-19th and early-20th century middle class. The initial impulse for creating the open-air exhibition on Djurgården island was the aim to preserve and present folk culture as a national 'treasure' in danger.

---

[26] See: F. Midura, "Wstęp", in J. Czajkowski, M. Czajnik, F. Midura (eds.), *Muzea skansenowskie w Polsce*, Poznań 1979, p. 9.

[27] See: H.M. Łopatyńska, "Rola mediów w kreowaniu wizerunku muzeów jako instytucji przekazujących dziedzictwo kulturowe", *Biuletyn Stowarzyszenia Muzeów na Wolnym Powietrzu w Polsce*, no. 11 (2009), pp. 33-39.

Nowadays, those intentions could also be seen as a manifestation of historically conditioned (or even determined) and culturally mediated class projections from the past. In this term, an affection towards nature and the countryside, resulting in the interest in folk culture protection, could be described as a form of obtaining and confirming the dominant position of the middle class in the society. Such a statement seems to be controversial at first glance, but two Swedish ethnologists, Jonas Frykman and Orvar Löfgren, presented convincing arguments on this topic as early as the late 1970s, when their book *Den kultiverade människan* was published in Sweden (the English version was released in 1987, and the Polish one in 2007).[28]

To put it briefly (and perhaps even stronger than Frykman and Löfgren), the Skansen in some sense anticipated the concept of *folkhemmet* – 'the people's home', which was the ideological background for the introduction of the welfare state system in Sweden in the 1930s. When the welfare state embodied the ideas of *folkhemmet* and was put it into practice, for about 40 years the Skansen had reflected and made visible its genealogy, but also had taken part in the creation of social reality which led to an almost revolutionary change.

At the moment *folkhemmet* seems to be a home after (or still under) renovation,[29] as well as many other components of historical reality in which the Skansen model was born and raised. Without going into the details of the tremendous intellectual debates in Sweden and Poland, it may be argued that Sweden is becoming more and more of a 'late' welfare state,[30] Poland is no longer a post-communist state, and post-modern (late-modern) Europe misses its modernity perhaps even stronger than modern Europe yearned for the good old pre-modern days.

In Poland many things have changed since the *skansen*-boom. Nowadays, Polish *skansens* are still often perceived as post-communist relics of old-style cultural policy focused on the dissemination of state (mono)culture. At the same time, they are being transformed into local tourist attractions and re-animated, or even animated for the first time in their history, as during the Polish People's Republic they were used mostly as museums of premodern architecture, not life. Introducing living-museum attractions, they are becoming more and more open to the nostalgic mood of their visitors and they are gradually getting closer to the original model invented by Hazelius about 125 years ago.

The opening of several small town sectors in Polish open-air museums in the late first and early second decade of the 21st century – such as the Galician Town in Nowy

[28] See: J. Frykman, O. Löfgren, *Den kultiverade människan*, Lund 1979. English translation: *Culture Builders. A Historical Anthropology of Middle-class Life*, transl. by A. Crozier, New Brunswick 1987. Polish translation: *Narodziny człowieka kulturalnego. Studium z antropologii historycznej szwedzkiej klasy średniej*, transl. by G. Sokół, Kęty 2007.

[29] See: W. Anioł, "Dom Ludu po renowacji", in idem, *Szlak Norden. Modernizacja po skandynawsku*, Warszawa 2013, pp. 217-249.

[30] Since the 1990s there have been some theories suggesting the end or collapse of the Nordic welfare state model in the public discourse in Europe due to the evolution of the Scandinavian development model after 1990, but the main principles of Swedish social policy have remained. See: ibid.

Sącz, the Galician Town Square in Sanok and the Provincial Central-European Town in Lublin – may be a symptom of the next stage of the modernization process (this time the global one), in which the role of great global cities is on the rise, while the importance of small and medium towns is declining, and people are beginning to miss their character and atmosphere.

But the Skansen and the Polish *skansens*, as well as open-air museums in other countries, remain. Of course, they have often been subjected to lifting, changes and extensions, which demands a detailed documentation elsewhere, but basic 'modern' determinants of the Skansen model are still in force. It is still a mass-audience 'time-machine' dedicated to transforming national and regional claims as well as class projections into a transparent and unquestionable nature. And at the same time, of course, it is still an open, widely adaptable and inclusive media format.

What is more, revisiting the Skansen model, namely exploring its own historical dynamics, also has the potential to become a very useful tool to learn the European logic of space making and dealing with the ambiguous concept of locality – as something at the same time very universal (in the macroscale) and very specific (at the microscale). The exhibitions of open-air museums in Sweden, Poland and other European countries, if re-written critically, may show not only historical or ethnographical regions, but also ways of 'bordering' them. The translocation process, in its literal meaning, is always, after all, based on 'inventing' regions and delimitation of their borders, which all together defines the 'range' of the museum interest. It may include whole countries, regions or other administrative units as well as subnational entities (e.g. Lesser Poland), cross-border historical regions (e.g. Galicia) or multi-state areas (e.g. Central Europe or Scandinavia). If we compare them and see them together, at the end of the day nothing other than 'Europe united in diversity' may become a theme of the open-air museums.

At the same time, the Swedish Skansen and the Polish *skansens*, if explored carefully, could tell the European story about modernity and modernization. As it has been already claimed, open-air museums may be recognized as institutional indicators of modernization. Where and when such museums appear is where and when modernization is happening. Furthermore, the very process of 'rescuing' the remnants of a 'disappearing order' (e.g. traditional wooden architecture or peasant culture) is a part of that modernization. It always occurs according to the rules set by the 'rescuers' (monument conservators, museum managers, ethnographers, art historians as well as their political patrons and the public), and it confirms a relationship of dominance between them and whatever they consider worthy of rescuing.

Taking the above-mentioned into consideration, it becomes clear that the connections between museums (not only of the open-air kind) and history calls for attention and understanding. These relations may be examined at several, at least three, levels.

The first one is the historical aspect of the museum presentation itself, considered both from the perspective of the collection and the audience. On the one hand, it is a history of the institution's foundation, development and maintenance (collecting, exhibiting, organizing events and programmes, as well as staff and location changes, etc.). On the other hand, it means the history of institutional effect on the visitors, as well as

the shaping of the culture of memory (especially when the museum narrative appears in book format or if an exhibition becomes a film setting etc.).

The second level is the history of the subject of exhibition as a result of the objective dynamics in the presented world as well as the historical changeability of the ways of its social perception. In this context, the selection of the moment and the mode of 'arresting the time' made by the museum for its exhibition is worth exploring because this choice is always necessary, although it is not always consciously undertaken and applied consistently.

The last, third, level is the historicity of cultural policy environment, which is reflected in changing contexts of opening and functioning (and sometimes also closing) of museums. To mention just a few crucial aspects here: models of local, regional, national and international cultural policy; social processes of constructing and valorization of heritage; manifestations of ideological instrumentalization of cultural activity; technologies of protection of the accumulated collection and of making it visible and accessible for the public; the budget of free time for leisure in society and practices of its use.

***

Let me finish by returning to the witty sentence about the heritage growth anti-utopia, when *the whole country becomes one big open air museum, and you just join it as you get off at Heathrow*, quoted in the introduction. I would like to pay attention to a rather underestimated and perhaps even unconsciously used component of this phrase, namely an airport terminal, which may be related to Marc Augé's notion of the 'non-place' as a (super)modern transitional space dedicated only (or mainly) for movement of people and goods, and therefore vanished from any relations to the history, identity and locality.[31]

The presence of an iconic example of an Augéan 'non-place', the Heathrow terminal, in the vision of the transformation of Great Britain into a country-covering open-air museum confirms, once again, the tight relationship between heritage protection and (super)modernity. Moreover, it also reminds us who 'misses', or who is allowed to 'experience' heritage. Open-air museums, as well as other institutions protecting the remains from the past, are nowadays dedicated mainly to 'people from the outside', rather than inhabitants. As the main target group of open-air museums may be, thus, indicated a very heterogeneous group of post-nostalgia tourists, who are able to yearn for something which they did not experience nor lose themselves, including both pre-industrial and pre-nation-state premodernity and early-modern ways of their 'heritageization'.

A travel through Augéan non-places is, of course, not the only way of separating people from things, which favors contemporary nostalgia. This goal is also achieved by many other means, such as literal translocation of objects, place marketing, inventing 'destinations' for tourists and – last but not least – professionalization of the gaze. The

[31] See: M. Augé, *Non-Places. Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*, transl. by J. Howe, London–New York 1995.

point of view established by heritage professionals becomes the only one authorized as 'authentic' one, and it has often almost nothing in common with traditional 'local knowledge' of people who used to live immersed in 'heritage' before it actually became heritage. That is why one day you could wake up in your own village or town just to realize that you are living on a cemetery or in Disneyland. The only way out, then, will be to pass through the closest airport terminal.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson B., *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London 1983.

Anioł W., "Dom Ludu po renowacji", in W. Anioł, *Szlak Norden. Modernizacja po skandynawsku*, Warszawa 2013.

Augé M., *Non-Places. Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*, transl. by J. Howe, London–New York 1995.

Bryman A., "The Disneyization of Society", *The Sociological Review*, vol. 47, no. 1 (1999), at <http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1111/1467-954X.00161>.

Bryman A., *The Disneyization of Society*, Thousand Oaks 2004.

Bukowiecki Ł., "Between a Cemetery and Disneyland: A Cultural History of the Sądecki Ethnographic Park", in W. Szymański, M. Ujma (eds.), *Pany chłopy chłopy pany. Masters peasants peasants masters*, transl. by E. Kowal, Nowy Sącz 2016.

Bukowiecki Ł., *Czas przeszły zatrzymany. Kulturowa historia skansenów w Szwecji i w Polsce*, Warszawa 2015.

Certeau M. de, "Spatial Stories", in M. de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, transl. by S. Rendall, Berkeley 1984.

Czajkowski J., *Muzea na wolnym powietrzu w Europie. Historia – dzień dzisiejszy – perspektywy*, Rzeszów–Sanok 1984.

Czajkowski J., Czajnik M., Midura F. (eds.), *Open-Air Museums in Poland*, transl. by E. Goździak, J. Rogalińska, Poznań 1981.

Frykman J., Löfgren O., *Den kultiverade människan*, Lund 1979 [Eng. *Culture Builders. A Historical Anthropology of Middle-class Life*, transl. by A. Crozier, New Brunswick 1987; Pl. *Narodziny człowieka kulturalnego. Studium z antropologii historycznej szwedzkiej klasy średniej*, transl. by G. Sokół, Kęty 2007].

Harvey D.C., "Heritage Pasts and Heritage Presents: Temporality, Meaning and the Scope of Heritage Studies", *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, vol. 7, no. 4 (2001), at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13581650120105534>.

Jackowski A., "Czy wymyślilibyśmy dzisiaj muzea etnograficzne?", *Śląskie Prace Etnograficzne*, vol. 2 (1993).

Janion M., *Projekt krytyki fantazmatycznej. Szkice o egzystencjach ludzi i duchów*, Warszawa 1991.

Kowalski K., *O istocie dziedzictwa europejskiego – rozważania*, Kraków 2013.

Łopatyńska H.M., "Rola mediów w kreowaniu wizerunku muzeów jako instytucji przekazujących dziedzictwo kulturowe", *Biuletyn Stowarzyszenia Muzeów na Wolnym Powietrzu w Polsce*, no. 11 (2009).

Lowenthal D., *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*, Cambridge 1998.

Midura F., "Wstęp", in J. Czajkowski, M. Czajnik, F. Midura (eds.), *Muzea skansenowskie w Polsce*, Poznań 1979.

Rentzhog S., *Open Air Museums. The History and Future of a Visionary Idea*, transl. by S.V. Airey, Östersund 2007.

Selby M., *Understanding Urban Tourism. Image, Culture and Experience*, London–New York 2004.

Urry J., Larsen J., *The Tourist Gaze 3.0*, London 2011.

Węcławowicz G., Łotocka M., Baucz A. (eds.), *Rozwój miast w Polsce. Raport wprowadzający Ministerstwa Rozwoju Regionalnego opracowany na potrzeby przygotowania przeglądu OECD krajowej polityki miejskiej w Polsce*, Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego, Warszawa 2010, at <http://eregion.wzp.pl/sites/default/files/rozwoj_miast_w_polsce_0.pdf>.

Łukasz BUKOWIECKI is a PhD candidate, cultural studies researcher and cultural historian affiliated with the Institute of Polish Culture at the University of Warsaw, Poland. In 2015 he published a monograph devoted to the cultural history and social function of open-air museums in Sweden and Poland (*Czas przeszły zatrzymany. Kulturowa historia skansenów w Szwecji i w Polsce*, Warszawa 2015). He has also contributed articles to the main Polish academic journals in the humanities, including *Teksty Drugie*, *Przegląd Humanistyczny* and *Kultura Współczesna*. His main fields of interest include: cultural heritage protection and history of its institutionalization, urban culture, 'northern neighbourhood' of Central Europe, Warsaw cultural history.