ON NEW MEANINGS OF TRADITION. GLOBALIZATION, POLITICS AND QUESTIONS FOR ANTHROPOLOGY

WALDEMAR KULIGOWSKI

Abstract: In this paper I would like to present some problems of tradition in the context of globalization and politics, because this notion lies at the heart of contemporary anthropological reflections. In the vocabulary of studies on society and culture the words 'tradition' and 'traditional' belong to the most commonly used. Today, the current globalization processes have significantly transformed its meaning. On one hand, the tradition ceased to be a way of life or a system of social values, an issue generally failed to be brought to attention, but rather became a became specific field of symbolic battles, an object of pride and adoration, an element national and ethnic politics, interesting economic strategies and the part of popular culture. On the other hand, phenomena and processes such as "invented tradition" (Szacki, Hobsbawm), "conscious culture" (Fienup-Riordan) and "heritage work" (Clifford) become more and more evident. The article not only discusses the debate around the evolving understanding of the tradition, but also provides some examples of its new functioning: New Guinean *kela memb* ritual, laced g-string from southern Poland, London's royal wedding and dance houses movement from Hungary and Poland.

Key words: tradition, globalization, invented tradition, heritage work, dance houses movement, laced g-string from Koniaków.

As John Tomlinson suggested in his inspiring book *Globalization and Culture*: "Globalization lies at the heart of modern culture; cultural practices lie at the heart of globalization (...) This is not a reckless claim: it is not to say that globalization is the single determinant of modern cultural experience, nor that culture alone is the conceptual key that unlocks globalization's inner dynamic. It is not, therefore, to claim that the politics and economics of globalization yield to

a cultural account which takes conceptual precedence. But it is to maintain that the huge of transformative processes of our time that globalization described cannot be properly understood until they are grasped through the conceptual vocabulary of culture" (Tomlinson 1999: 1). In many (may be too many) academic works about globalization we can found very famous formulations – like "McWorld" (Benjamin Barber), Coca-colonization (David Howes), McDonaldization (George Ritzer) and even "McDisneyzation" (George Ritzer and Allan Liska) – and formulations not so famous – for example "flows", "networks", "interconnections", "informational superhighway". In this sense, globalization suggests a radical disassociation between "the global" (multinational corporations, the entertainment industry, virtual spaces of the Web) and "the local" (the sense of place, neighbourhood, ethnicity, and other old sources of cultural identity).

Today, world becomes a single, common place: the white spots on the map are gone, and there are probably no peoples left who have not been in contact with the modern, globalised world. But expectation of world homogenization in the image of the West, a world in which all cultures are one cultures, modernized, developed, speaking variously accented English, and fulfilling their obligations, their needs, and their dreams as producers and consumers in the "global village", has gone sour. From anthropological point of view the very important word in Tomlinson's "conceptual vocabulary of culture" is still tradition. *Traditio, traditionis* – this one, little, 'vintage' word. In this paper I would like to present some problems of tradition in the context of globalization, because this notion lies at the heart of contemporary anthropological reflections.

Polish creating and British inventing

Many people – and perhaps few anthropologists – still think of ethnology and cultural anthropology as the study of traditional cultures. Outside of anthropology, the 'tradition' word has taken on major cultural and political significance, as European citizens, for instance, debate issues of "traditional marriage" or "traditional food" and so on. Tradition is not just a term or concept of interests of ethnologists and anthropologists but to the general public.

Undoubtedly, in the vocabulary of studies on the society and culture, the words 'tradition' and 'traditional' belong to the most commonly used terms. The main reason is that each culture has its past and each element within culture has its roots. On account of the past, social memory and tradition – describing our attitude to things gone by in their own different ways – *ex nihilo* novelties seem to be present almost exclusively in futuristic prose. In conventional (and "traditional") views, the concept of tradition is wide. It embraces both the spiritual and material

aspect of culture, and most often involves a long-term historical approach within the dynamics of change. Many authors defined tradition as the basis component of culture, retaining knowledge obtained by the earlier generations and thanks to which new generations are not forced to begin from "zero degree of culture".

In their classical analysis of the concept of culture, Alfred L. Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn distinguished a certain type of definitions laying the greatest emphasis on problems of heritage and tradition (Kroeber – Kluckhohn 1952: 47–49). They quoted anthropologists who – like Edward Sapir, Bronisław Malinowski, Robert Lowie, Ralph Linton, Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess – claimed that culture is an "inherited assemblage of practices and beliefs", "the whole of social tradition", "social heritage" and that it "comprises inherited artefacts, goods, technical processes, ideas, customs, and values".

Nowadays, over 50 years after the publication of their paper, the concepts of culture and tradition require new perspectives. A fundamental change would be for these notions to go beyond the boundaries of the professional vocabulary of academic ethnology and become an element of a general social and popular debate, also within those societies that have been routinely described by scholars using these two concepts. In his famous article, a prominent American anthropologist, Marshall Sahlins wrote about the Kayapo inhabiting the tropical rainforests of Brazil. The natives that had only spoken their mother tongue until then, started to talk about the *cultura* at the end of the 1980s. The tendency is, incidentally, visible all over the world, with the Tibetans and the Hawaiians, the Kwakiutl and Inuit, the Kazakhs and the Mongols, the peoples of Bali and Kashmir recently discovering that "they have a 'culture'" (Sahlins 1993: 19). It seems difficult to find another concept in the intellectual glossary of any academic discipline that could boast of a similarly stunning career. The concept of culture has, beyond doubt, been globalised.

In my opinion, the concept of tradition has shared a similar fate (Kuligowski 2006). Just like the majority of societies functioned perfectly well throughout most of their history without the concept of culture, for a long time tradition was not a problem, either. People would not know their tradition, for they simply lived in it. Since they knew how they should live, there was no need to actually use the word 'tradition': things simply are as they are – scholars were talked to as children – and this is how it must be. However, the last decades of the 20th century and first years of 21st century caused tradition (the word itself or some local equivalent) to be on everyone's lips. Paraphrasing Sahlins one could claim that human societies found that they could not exactly be themselves without tradition. All now discover they have a 'tradition'. For centuries they may have hardly noticed it. For long centuries, but not today. The global spread of the

notion was taking place in specific conditions that were aptly captured by Polish sociologist Jerzy Szacki some years ago when he wrote that "tradition popularly appeared as something that *substitutes* for reason, absolving humans from the obligation of reflection. In actual fact, the problem is by no means that simple, which is best evidenced in the activity of the defenders of tradition themselves, aiming at (...) a maximum rationality of justifying tradition and designating it as an object of systematic reflection" (Szacki 1971: 165).

There are doubtless many such cases nowadays. Neither the Tibetans and the Hawaiians, nor the Kwakiutl and Inuit, nor the Kazakhs and the Mongols, nor the peoples of Bali and Kashmir want to have any tradition as such. They do not want to talk about their tradition normally and it is not enough to demonstrate it. Their own tradition cannot be left to its own devices any more: it is now an object of care, struggle, pride, sometimes even adoration. It exists in order to distinguish them from others (in many senses) and place them above others (on many levels). It is supposed to be a source of exclusive, even secret, knowledge and concrete financial benefits. The custody of tradition is now less and less frequently (and less eagerly) entrusted to anthropologists and other researchers coming from outside.

On the contrary, different communities deal with their own traditions, delegating their own specialists for that purpose, with markedly visible specific endeavours taken in the process, resulting in what Szacki referred to as the "created tradition" (Szacki 1971: 179), which – after a British historian Eric Hobsbawm – is now usually called the "invented tradition" (Hobsbawm 1983). Neither of the researchers meant regular processes of idealisation of selected elements of tradition, but rather the incorporation within tradition of certain behaviours, values and symbols which were never actually a part of it. When independent Ghana referred to its alleged Roman past, a problem emerged – as Szacki wrote – the essence of which "was not so much the relationship between a given model and the actual past of any given group of people, but rather its relation to the group's current needs and aspirations" (Szacki 1971: 182). The situation, by no means isolated, warrants a restatement of what I have already postulated above: the concept of tradition needs rethinking. The reflection discloses a number of critical contradictions that I would like to discuss below.

We are alive and we are different!

The first contradiction is fairly obvious. It is a well-known fact that local communities tend to use the concept of tradition in a positive sense, while often some of their members – and not only the youngest, brought up in the world of a mobile phones, hypermarkets, virtual realities and another kinds of technological *simulacrum* – are

of a different opinion. This is probably one of the reasons why tradition has now become a particularly meticulously cherished value. Tradition understood subjectively comprises not only cultural values, identified as the heritage of a local community, but also their evaluation. In this context, it is predominantly the values of the living, not the dead, which are significant; this is how the so-called heritage comes into being (Szacki 1971: 187). American cultural anthropologist, Ann Fienup-Riordan, argues that heritage is a self-conscious tradition, a certain "conscious culture" (Fienup-Riordan 2000: 167), reproduced in old and new public contexts, meant to protect those historical experiences that were lost. In this way heritage becomes a cultural buffer of localness over sub-local currents.

James Clifford, one of the key figures in reflexive shift in anthropological thinking, investigates the problem in a greater detail, analysing "heritage work". He writes: "Heritage work includes oral-historical research, cultural evocation and explanation (exhibits, festivals, publications, films, tourist sites), language description and pedagogy, community-based archeology, art production, marketing and criticism (...) Heritage projects participate in a range of public spheres, acting as (...) ways to reconnect with the past and say to others: 'We exist', 'We have deep roots here', 'We are different'." (Clifford 2004: 8) Very intense "heritage work" takes place in local communities all over the world. Clifford points to the fact that tradition understood in this way is never politically neutral and plays an important role in the movement revolving around identity and recognition. Heritage used to proclaim to others "We are alive and we are different" forces anthropologists to take a new type of actions.

Clifford refers to the example of the museum exhibition called "Looking both Ways" (Clifford 2004). The intention of the exhibition was to show the life of the Alutiiq, the indigenous people of Kodiak Island from the southern coast of Alaska. The exhibition presented the complicated continuity of the Alutiiq culture. Artefacts dating from over 100 years ago were accompanied by new objects, such as a mask commemorating the ecological disaster that struck the local community in the wake of the sinking of the "Exxon Valdez" tanker. Contacts with these artefacts aroused strong emotions among the Alutiiq, including the respect for their ancestors, the feeling of a bond between them, occasionally joy at locating something familiar. The success of the exhibition was mainly in showing the perception of the American anthropologist, in the "coordination" of the scientists and the natives, in the achievement of an equal status of both partners, in the attainment of the "outlook from both ways" declared in the exhibition's title. And even though Clifford wonders what happens to scientific freedom in such conditions, his overall assessment is positive. His evaluation is mainly determined by the conviction that in the globalisation era there simply cannot be any way other

than the unconditional recognition of another person's subjectivity. Dialogue in the global era still means not only the negotiation of a common version of reality but also the essential readiness to listen.

According to Szacki, Sahlins, Fienup-Riordan, Clifford and many other anthropologists, in our globalised world (and after the "clash of civilizations" and the "end of history") traditions became specific field of symbolic battles, an object of pride and adoration, an element national and ethnic politics, interesting economic strategies and popular culture. We can observe a vast spectrum of practices related to the forms, functioning strategies and the use of tradition. In this moment I would like to present three specific examples of new meanings of tradition. Geographically speaking, these examples are very different (highlands of New Guinea, southern Poland, and royal and metropolitan England), and their cultural significance is varied as well (from modernization, through revitalization, to invention of new traditions). I am of the opinion that these differences serve to illustrate the processes which cultural traditions are subject to in various parts of the world.

Modernization, revitalization and invention

Pamela J. Stewart and Andrew Strathern presented the ritual of *kela memb*, which may be interesting in this context. It is practiced by the people of the Hagen region in New Guinea (Stewart – Strathern 2007). The aim of this ritual is to ensure good fortune, fertility and success. During this ritual, red ochre pigment was used to paint special marks on pigs. The same ochre pigment was used during other important ceremonies, for example to ornament the highly prized pearl shells to be used in ceremonial exchanges. If despite such efforts the breeding would not go well, displeased ancestors were to blame and they had to be apologized to. When in the 1970's first cars appeared in the Hagen region, the *kela memb* ritual underwent a change – red ochre began to be used to paint the body of the car, and the cars were also adorned with flowers. Any breakdowns, similar to bad pig breeding in the earlier example, were attributed to displeased ancestors. This procedure, the researchers conclude, allowed the car to become part of the substantially oriented world of the Hagen community (Stewart – Strathern 2007: xvii).

Another example of modern strategies assumed with regards to tradition in globalised cultural conditions comes from southern Poland. Specifically, the Koniaków village, situated in the Silesian Beskids mountain range. During the early twentieth century, the village became famous for the lacework produced by local women. After World War II, the socialist government policy was to support folk culture; hence, local craftsmanship received special government support as

well. A lacework cooperative was founded and the table cloths, napkins, bonnets, liturgical robes, gloves, hats and laced ties sold very well throughout the country. A special order came for a giant napkin for the queen Elizabeth of England herself. A crisis could be seen after 1989: state patronage ended and handmade crafts couldn't withstand the competition of mass produced foreign goods. The lacework tradition began to fade. In 2003, a new product was shown for the first time: laced female g-string (afterwards, male g-string came as well) (Kuligowski 2007). The event was close to scandalous, it even divided the local lacework community and the National Commission of Artistry and Ethnography refused to recognize the g-string as a "traditional product". However, ethnographic research in Koniaków proved that the situation was much more complex than what was decided by the Commission. The g-strings were traditionally manufactured, with traditional materials, the lacework flowers were merely connected to form a new, different shape. Most of the lace makers claimed that work on such a product requires effort, ingenuity and talent. The g-strings were, in their opinion, an attempt to save tradition in a situation where nobody was willing to buy tablecloths and napkins anymore. Presently, the laced g-strings from Koniaków are available in on-line stores, which shows how the Internet may assist in the revitalization of fading tradition.

The third example is related to perhaps the largest media event in 2011, the "royal wedding of the century" on April 29, between Prince William Mountbatten-Windsor and Kate (Catherine Elizabeth) Middleton. The media allowed millions to see the marvelous and glamorous ceremony, cementing the mythology of the power and influence of the British Royal House and its rituals. However, back in the nineteenth century – an era without electronic media and celebrity gossip sites – the royal ceremonies in Great Britain had a much different form. Chronicles attest that such ceremonies were much closer to farce or a disaster. "In 1817, at the funeral of Princess Charlotte, the daughter of the Prince Regent, the undertakers were drunk", as we are informed by the American historian David Cannadine (Cannadine 1983: 117). Ten years later, during the memorial service of the duke of York, the Windsor Chapel was so humid, that most of the mourners ended up with catarrh, and the cold ultimately accounted for the demise of the bishop of London. During the coronation of King George IV in Westminster Hall in 1821, despite employing special security member, a series of fights broke out among the venerable guests. During the funeral of the very same George IV, the mourners behaved in a loud manner that was incompatible with the nature of the event; Wilhelm IV even left before the funeral finished. Queen Victoria's coronation in 1838 was not any better (the queen was 19 on that day). The order of the service was mixed up, and the archbishop had trouble fitting the

ring on the corpulent monarch's finger. Without delving deeper into the depths of historiographic detail, it needs to be stressed that the royal ceremonies only gained in prestige, splendor and pomp in the era of direct TV transmissions. The coronation of Queen Elizabeth II in 1953 marked a breakthrough. Media control became an important mobilizing and stimulating factor in this case. This stratum of relations between tradition and the media is seldom remembered.

On the margin of royal wedding I would like to notice something else. In Great Britain the end of April is a time for popular fertility rites: not sex between newlyweds, but group sex between many persons in the woods and fields. May Day – related to the Celtic and German ceremonies – is coming. For many British anarchists, new pagans and artists, May Day tradition was more important than royal ritual. In consequence, some groups organized alternative Royal Wedding with an elements of old tradition called May Day.

In this light, contemporary tradition is not a time machine to a different epoch, it's not a time capsule to preserve past values, behavior or standards. It constitutes the living cultural condition that is constantly updated as the social, legal, technological, political and economical factors change around it. The only type of tradition that is constant is a dead one. This view should be taken up not only by those who study culture, but also by the social and political activists for whom tradition very often is only a short-term tool in the struggle for privilege, funds or power.

In this moment, I would like to formulate some working conclusions. Firstly, tradition is not only a traditional subject of anthropologist studies, a domain pervaded with nostalgia, calm emotions and values that do not provoke emotions any more. The heritage that face today carries an enormous political and ethical potential. Its political dimension is realised in debates on values, the law and public space. The ethical dimension is, in turn, linked to the fact that any reflection upon tradition concerns "them" to the same degree as it concerns "us". The purely analytical approach is not sufficient anymore and a relation of dialogue must be established. The traditions that I discussed do not need to be discovered as much as they need to be reconciled. Therefore, secondly, tradition in the global reality requires us to be open, prepared to listen to others and revise our own vision of the world, as well as being ready for a severe criticism of our own world by others.

We should notice the reflexive nature of the traditions that surround us and make increasingly active attempts to co-create the common, globalised world. This is – in my view – the essence of contemporary "heritage work" that puts up a challenge for the work of anthropologists. The chief problem presented by the new meanings of tradition and "heritage work" phenomenon is how to place it within the other forms of common life: democracy, human rights, domestic law, freedom of speech, national policy and many more. Today, the most important

anthropological question is not still "What is tradition/traditional?", but rather "When, where, how, under what conditions is it?". I suggest this is a fundamental question for current anthropological research on tradition.

Artistic freedom and "postmodern naiveté"

In this context I would like to focus on the last example related to new meanings of tradition. A very special kind of meanings of tradition is generated on level of contemporary politics. Clear ties between politics and folklore date back to the beginning of the nineteenth century, the period of the rise of the first nation-states. This relationship should be treated today as an element of the history of modern Europe. The rise of nation-states required political legitimization, which was built on the basis of a belief in a national spirit, expressed in traditional texts of folklore. What was so intense in the nineteenth century, today only seems to be the past. I another sections an article I will be present contemporary strategies of manipulating tradition in the context of the dance house movement and folk music in Poland and Hungary.

Polish ethnomusicologist, Jan Stęszewski, points to the fact that folk music consists in creations intentionally derived from folklore, however, no longer created by the people or for the people; instead, they are created by "external authors, primarily to meet the demand of popular culture" (*Folk przeciwko kiczowi* 2000: 9). A special place in the history of Central European folk music is taken by the Hungarian táncházes movement – dance houses. The first dance house was established in May 1972 in Budapest (Sebő 1994). The following years were marked by a dynamic growth of the informal movement in most Hungarian cities (Taylor 2008: 133–134). The idea of táncház comes from Transylvania, where it was practiced in many villages inhabited by the Hungarian population: young people would gather in one house and danced to the accompaniment of a local band. Táncház in Budapest was a variation of the Transylvanian tradition: the young people of the town would gather every week in a rented hall to dance to music played on folk instruments. Their ambition was to break away from the artificial choreography of folk groups and to create a place for "social dance". Dancing was not performed on stage by professional dancers, but rather, it became a form of participation in a new community. It was also to be a return to the "nature" of dance as an amateur practice performed by ordinary people. Reference was made to the "clean source" of authentic folklore. It was a real "aesthetic revolution". In 2011, the "táncház method" was included in The List of Intangible Cultural Heritage by UNESCO, and it is considered "a Hungarian method for the transmission of intangible cultural heritage".

In socialist Hungary – as in other countries of the Eastern Bloc – cultural policy was the domain of the state. Hungarian authorities created a network of cultural centers, whose aim was to provide citizens with free or cheap access to culture, including folk culture. In 1957, the Institute for People's Culture, a new institution of a local-network character was introduced (Taylor 2008: 108). These institutions monopolized the thinking and activity in the field of folk culture. They also dealt with the folkloristic setting of socialist holidays and anniversaries. Their program tied in with the concept of folklorism. There is no doubt that the táncház movement was an alternative and opposition to the official cultural policy and to folklorism, which it promoted. Moreover, gatherings with music and folk dance also formed temporary empathic communities without the supervision of official institutions.

As I have mentioned, the idea of táncház came from Transylvania. There are many indications that this was not accidental. This region had a special status in the Hungarian national imaginary, especially after the Treaty of Trianon, by which Hungary lost two thirds of its territory, including Transylvania. Many politicians regarded the region as the "cradle of Hungarian civilization" (like the Highland Tatra Mountains to Slovak and Kresy to Polish nationalist culturology) (Kürti 2001: 15). Hungarian anthropologist, László Kürti, notes that one of the main attractions of táncház was "a coherent set of ideas offering a sense of national unity and identity to Hungarians" (Kürti 2001: 137). An alternative to socialist folklorism, the táncházes movement, therefore, also had a nationalist dimension. It was associated with the trauma following the treaty in Trianon, and with thinking in terms of the great Hungary. The reference to "clean source" would mean, therefore, not only the pursuit of authentic folklore, but also the pursuit of authentic Hungarian identity, which was fragmented after the First World War. Táncház is thus another example of the links between politics and folklore. In this case, however, it is not officially supported by the government, but is a bottom-up, spontaneous, or even civil relationship. In this context, the emergence of dance houses in Poland appears as a very interesting process.

The first Polish dance house was created in 1994 in Warsaw. Its founders were members of an association of a non-governmental-organization character under the name "Dom Tańca" (Eng. Dance House*)*. In 1998, the Dance House in Cracow was founded, and in 2000 it was founded in Poznan. The activities of all Polish dance houses have distinct characteristics in common. In the foreground is the organization of meetings, during which folk dances are learned to the accompaniment of music performed live on traditional instruments. The participants of such meetings are primarily young people, students and high school students. Dancing lessons are held mainly in student clubs or rooms made available by

small local theaters. The value around which the activities of the dance houses are focused is tradition. There is an important statement on the "Dom Tańca" association's website: "Our association was founded by a group of people fascinated by traditional Polish music *in crudo*, that is, in its original form, without styling and rearrangement" (domtanca 2014).

Tracing the short history of Polish movement of dance houses reveals the important role that the group Muzykanci (Eng. Musicians) played in it. The group, created by two cooperating marriages, was established in 1996. Already after a few years of performing, the musicians were awarded major Polish awards given to folk bands (GRAND PRIX New Tradition '99, GRAND PRIX Eurofolk '99, Folk Phonogram of the Year for the album "Muzykanci"). The band also toured throughout Europe. Its off-scene activity, however, is also important: the band organizes a festival of traditional music "Rozstaje" (Eng. Crossroads*)* (in 2013, the dance house of Visegrad performed at it). The musicians also make recordings during field work directly with rural musicians, mostly from the Lesser Poland, Galicia and Carpathian regions. A member of the group, Joanna Słowińska, conducted weekly meetings in the Dance House in Cracow, teaching the polka, oberek and czardas dances. Another member of the team, Jacek Hałas, founded the Dance House in Poznan. He conducts its meetings and is one of its leading musicians.

I have no doubt that the Polish band Muzykanci is modeled after the activities of another folk band, the Hungarian group Muzsikás. The similarity shows not only in the name, which has the same meaning in both languages and refers to countryside musicians. The activities of the Polish band exactly coincide with the activities of Muziskás. The Hungarian band was founded in 1973 (the same year as Mákvirág), and it specializes in the performance of songs from Transylvania, which confirms the special place of the region in Hungarian national cartography. International success began in 1979, when the group was joined by singer Márta Sebestyén. Most of their joint recordings made under the record label Hungaroton were later reissued in Western Europe. Members of the group declare they are true to the models established by old rural performers. They often visit rural areas in search of songs, melodies, themes and instruments. Therefore, in both cases, we are dealing with not only musical project, but also one creating culture, focused on an active conveying of tradition and rejection of artistic transformations, "styling and rearrangement". Clearly, remaining true to tradition, declared by the group, assumes, in this case, the selection and purification of tradition. Polish and Hungarian musicians, therefore, form part of the same current of manipulating tradition and folk culture. The modern meaning

of this manipulation with regard to Hungary has already been described. What cultural meanings does this manipulation have in Poland?

The functioning of Polish dance houses as well as part of the folk bands is the result of cultural transfer from Hungary. The subject of this transfer is not only a particular form, but also the ideology associated with it. The leaders of dance houses in Warsaw, Cracow and Poznan pose as guardians of tradition. It is significant that this protected tradition is invested in national and rustic discourse. The key concepts of the discourse created by the dance houses are: roots, tradition, authenticity, pride, national treasure, and heritage. The religious theme is also significant. In Polish dance houses, very often meetings related to the Catholic holidays are organized, such as, singing Christmas carols, singing during Lent, or Christmas dances. In recent years, numerous albums have been released containing songs of a religious character. They are labeled as the "music of our roots". It is worth mentioning that the ideological message is hidden behind the mask of fun, dancing, and spending time together.

Finally, the progressive polarization within the Polish folk music environment should be noticed. On the one hand, there are the artists, for whom artistic freedom is of primary importance. The archives of folk music are perceived by them as a source of inspiration and a starting point for further work. On the other hand, there are the bands associated with the dance houses, who opt for "being true" to tradition and focusing on recreating it. To them, the archives are a source of truth and the point of arrival. In one article, a representative of the dance houses made an explicit reference to this division. He pointed to "left-wing movements" as his ideological opponents, which use a "Marxist conceptual grid", and promote "pagan identities" (Kaznowski 2012: 5). He also pointed to the "postmodern naiveté" of musicians who value the preservation of (artistic) freedom above the preservation of (national) identity.

In the nineteenth century, folk tradition served the building of nation-states and the collective identifications they needed. Its contents were manipulated and adapted to the requirements of current politics, both national and cultural. The targets of manipulation remained unchanged. However, in the twenty-first century, it is not folk culture that is manipulated anymore, but rather the signs of folklore. It is the signs that are used in the development of contemporary cultural politics. Question formulated above – "When, where, how, under what conditions is tradition/traditional?" – become a crucial question.

June 2014

References:

Cannadine, David: 1983 – The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the "Invention of Tradition", c. 1820–1977. In: E. Hobsbawm – T. Ranger (eds.): *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 101–164.

Clifford, James: 2004 – Looking Several Ways. Anthropology and Native Heritage in Alaska. *Current Anthropology* 45: 1: 5–23.

domtanca – http://domtanca.art.pl/modules.php?name=Content&pa=showpage&pid=19 (Accessed 13th February 2014).

Fienup-Riordan, Ann: 2000 – *Hunting Tradition in a Changing World: Yup'ik Lives in Alaska Today*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Folk przeciw kiczowi. Z Janem Stęszewskim rozmawia Jakub Żmidziñski: 2000 – *Czas Kultury* 4: 8–15.

Hobsbawm, Eric: 1983 – Introduction: Inventing Traditions. In: E. Hobsbawm – T. Ranger (eds.): *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1–14.

Kaznowski, Piotr: 2012 – Muzyka naszych korzeni. *Christianitas* 50: 5–9.

Kroeber, Alfred L. – Kluckhohn, Clyde: 1952 – Culture. A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions. *Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archeology and Ethnology* XLVII: 1: 3–222.

Kuligowski, Waldemar: 2006 – Flows and spaces. Anthropological view on identities in a global world. *Ethnologia Polona* 27: 63–74.

Kuligowski, Waldemar: 2007 – *Antropologia współczesności. Wiele światów, jedno miejsce.* Kraków: Universitas.

Kürti, László: 2001 – *The Remote Borderland: Transylvania in the Hungarian Imagination.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Tomlinson, John: 1999 – *Globalization and Culture.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sahlins, Marshall: 1993 – Goodbye to Tristes Tropes: Ethnography in the Context of Modern World History. *Journal of Modern History* 65: 1–25.

Sebő, Ferenc: 1994 – *Népzenei olvasókönyv*. Budapest: Magyar Művelődési Intézet.

Stewart, Pamela. J. – Strathern, Andrew: 2007 – Series Editor's Preface. In: S. Bamford (ed.): *Embodying Modernity and Post-Modernity. Ritual, Praxis, and Social Change in Melanesia*. Durham: Carolina Academic Press: 3–8.

Szacki, Jerzy: 1971 – *Tradycja. Przegląd problematyki*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Taylor, Mary: 2008 – *The Politics of Culture: Folk Critique and Transformation of the State in Hungary*. Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press.

Contact: prof. UAM dr. hab. Waldemar Kuligowski, Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznañ, Poland; e-mail: walkul@amu.edu.pl, phone: +48 61 8294817.

O nových významech tradice. Globalizace, politika a otázky pro antropologii

Resumé: V tomto článku jsou představeny některé otázky spojené s otázkami tradice v kontextu globalizace a politiky, neboť tato problematika je jádrem současných antropologických debat. Ve slovníku věd o společnosti a kultuře patří výrazy „tradice“ a „tradiční“ k nejobvyklejším. Dnes probíhající procesy globalizace však zásadně změnily jejich význam. Na jedné straně tradice přestala být životním stylem nebo systémem sociálních hodnot, což je skutečnost, která je málokdy brána v úvahu, ale spíše se stala specifickým polem pro symbolické bitvy, objektem hrdosti a adorace, součástí národních a etnických politik, zajímavých ekonomických strategií a také součástí populární kultury. Na druhé straně se zintenzivňují fenomény a procesy, jako je „vymýšlení tradice“ (Szacki, Hobsbawm), „vědomá kultura“ (Fienup-Riordan) a „budování dědictví“ (Clifford). Článek nejen rozebírá debaty týkající se proměn chápání tradice, ale také nabízí několik příkladů jejího nového využití: rituál *kela memb* z Nové Guineje, krajkové spodní prádlo z jižního Polska, královská svatba v Londýně a hnutí „tanečních sálů“ v Maďarsku a Polsku.