

Ł U C J A P I E K A R S K A

# Who Creates Our Heritage?

A BROCHURE  
*to* STIMULATE  
THE MIND



ŁUCJA PIEKARSKA

# Who Creates Our Heritage?

TRANSLATED BY SØREN GAUGER

---

## Introduction

JOANNA ORLIK

A BROCHURE  
*to* STIMULATE  
THE MIND



## **Introduction**

JOANNA ORLIK

Here at the Małopolska Institute of Culture, we have long been using the motto: “Culture gets passed around or does not exist at all.” Culture means heritage, too. So heritage gets passed around or does not exist at all. Is that a fact? Where did we get this idea? What does it mean?

“Passing around” is movement. Passed by word of mouth. Recalling; mentioning; transforming. Drawing from the past to find new meanings for the present; new motivation; incentive to love. Heritage requires renewal; taking a fresh look; rereading. Repetition alone will not do. It engenders permanence and a sense of security but also trivializes contact with what has passed and makes heritage become thin; pale; featureless. Perhaps even dead? Or maybe vivid and forceful but devoid of nuances or depth; one-dimensional. and this, after all, is not our goal.

In a culture institution we seek tools to protect heritage from oversimplification. This can work when pictures from the past begin to resonate with subjects that consume us at present, with which we live as a society, which are vital to us. Yet who are “we”? a community of Polish-speakers?

Citizens of this country with an ID number? Or perhaps a group attached to certain values?

In Małopolska, I would like to speak to the region's inhabitants. To all those who call this voivodeship their place of residence, regardless of whether they live in the capital city, Krakow, or somewhere near the border with Slovakia, in a small town way off the main roads. Speaking to everyone means that a message should be worded so that a big-city dweller and a rural inhabitant feel as if they are being addressed. If heritage is to be common, we need all kinds of colors in its mosaic, ones that give each of us a flash of a remarkable story; an emotional connection; a sudden sense of "I know that." and that they can—and want to!—find a piece of themselves while differing from one another in our experiences, ways of life, and convictions.







Ł U C J A P I E K A R S K A

# Who Creates Our Heritage?

A BROCHURE  
*to* STIMULATE  
THE MIND



**WHO INHABITS  
OUR PAST?**



We have grown accustomed to thinking of heritage as monolithic and set in stone. We think of monuments, traditions, symbols, and stories that give us insight into the past. We search it for answers to questions like: Who are we? Where did we come from? How should we understand our place in the world? We think and feel that our shared belonging to certain collectives—be they a nation, region, organization, or family—comes from certain events, experiences, and views which express something specific and vital to us, as they describe an “us” that is joined, accepted, and experienced. Based on a sense of belonging to a shared past, we create our present-day image.

There is a certain paradox here: if we should seek the reflections and roots of our present-day identity in images from the past, we must suppose that this process runs not only from the past forward, but also, and perhaps primarily, it comes to a head in our gaze cast backward. The past shapes us, and yet we also shape ourselves in how we choose to interpret the past. If, then, it is to serve as a looking glass for the present, we are standing “in between”: the past has already happened, yet how we remember it occurs in the present.

Furthermore, if we are to survey the past at all, it is not enough to recall facts and documents—we must “populate” the past; imagine it as a place where real people once lived.<sup>1</sup> This happens when, in thinking and speaking of our ancestors, we make reference to their experiences, decisions, and viewpoints. and if we feel a strong emotional connection with them, it is because we are tied by a special bond: in those tales of the past we see a tale about ourselves.

If, then, in contemplating the past we speak of heritage and not history, then in a certain sense (but only in a certain sense!) it is a bit less important what actually happened—let the historians worry about that, and all will be well if they do so honestly, following the rules of their discipline. In heritage, much more important than what actually happened is whether and how we talk about it today. While history scientifically records, verifies, documents, describes, and analyzes past events, heritage is based on the imaginings that have sprouted up around us and that we want to remember. Here the study of reality gives way to its collective experience.<sup>2</sup>

When the past seems near to us—in our emotions and imaginations—this is a sign that we are leaving history and entering the domain of heritage, which is not at all a construct given to us for good. It is an activity—an activity that builds meanings and interpretations but also defines; makes choices; builds relationships and bonds. It serves us as a tool for communally experiencing the past. It is not a collection of historical facts but an unfinished, ongoing process. Thus, if we reach into the past and want to understand ourselves, we have to ask what in the past will be our point of reference.

PUTTING THE  
WORLD IN  
ORDER—THE  
MYTHIFICATION  
OF REALITY





We often stumble across a thought pattern that suggests that, because we have inherited certain cultural texts, symbols, monuments, and memories of events, we should “automatically” accept them and shower them with respect. Here we come to a very interesting question: If heritage is something we inherit, are there any civil laws to determine the rules of the laws and obligations arising from inheritance? Can heritage be accepted or denied? and if so, do we receive it with the benevolence of a stock-taker, with all its debts and credits? Should we inventory it and decide which parts are our values and points of reference and which to throw in the trash?

We know very well that we cannot take the whole of the past en bloc, because this would be equivalent to attempting to create a map on a 1:1 scale, which, as in Borges’s famous story, would cover precisely the entire territory of the empire. Thus, heritage always comes from a selection of sorts. One pioneer of contemporary heritage thought, Gregory Ashworth, has even stated that the essence of heritage is using the past for contemporary social and political aims. By his approach, heritage is “everything that our contemporaries choose from the past, which they create themselves for the purposes of the present or to

pass down for posterity.”<sup>3</sup> Heritage, then, clearly emerges as a process, not a kind of resource.<sup>4</sup>

Paging through the past events that have formed us, we can easily perceive that we structure what defines us as a group according to what we feel are important criteria for understanding the aim and meaning of the communities to which we belong. These are the same categories which, although they can be read as a narrative about the past, pertain to what is happening here and now. Heritage always therefore plays itself out both in past events and at every moment that we go back to them. Commemorating something or someone always involves an act of the will, one that takes place now—in this sense, heritage is far more the domain of the present than the past.

The past supplies a wide range of symbolic resources, helping communities imagine themselves, both then and now, and seeing the past as infused with value and meaning. This inserts us, as individuals and groups, into a mythical vision of reality. In a famous piece on the presence of myth, Leszek Kołakowski stressed that the mythification of reality allows us to believe “that what is past is retained—as far as values are concerned—in what endures; that facts are not merely facts but are building blocks of a universe of values which it is possible to salvage despite the irreversible flow of events.”<sup>5</sup> Thus understood, myth becomes part of our way of thinking, giving structure to our understanding of reality and allowing us to view it as meaningful and significant. We think in categories that allow us to set the world in order. This means heritage is socially experienced and sensed as the most enduring and unchanging part of culture.<sup>6</sup>

The mythification of reality, whether presently experienced or reconstructed, involves structuring its diversity

in a way that allows us to join disparate fragments into a sensible narrative. This is the construction of stories, some of which succeed in passing down the content we want: people turn into heroes, and the audience of the stories follows their adventures, during which they struggle against external adversity and internal weakness.

Many stories are used in heritage; a major role is played not only by their telling, interpretation, and rereading, but also by making new ones to respond to the new needs of society. In an effective political platform, these needs are accurately assessed, as it is voters who are listening to these tales of various fragments. The thing is that, unlike in history, in heritage the truth is not what is most important; at the very least, it is handled differently from academic efforts to reconstruct and understand the past. Historical sources and documents are a pretext here for creating social images, which sometimes can become narratives that root themselves deeply in our collective narratives, expressing the “truth” about us and what we believe constitutes our identities.

If, then, we speak of heritage as a social construct, we must ask how representations of the past are created. Whom or what do we task with their commemoration? What events, figures, or symbols serve us to construct a communal image of the past? Who can and should decide upon their modern-day interpretations?

In posing these questions, we have to realize that the representation and interpretation of the past (and thus the explanation of its meaning today) will always involve exerting power over our collective imagination. Therefore, we have to ask ourselves: Who has the power to give meaning to symbols? Who has the authority to legitimize heritage and the meanings we ascribe to it?



**IN WHOSE VOICE  
DOES HERITAGE  
SPEAK?**



The concept of heritage is an “invention” of the nineteenth century.<sup>7</sup> This was needed to form nations, conceived as communities of ideas and emotions, allowing people to attach the fates of individuals to the fates of the collective and thus to mobilize them to work in solidarity to protect joint interests.<sup>8</sup> If the nation was to imagine itself as such, it needed to be bound by centrally defined heritage (this is one reason why this period gave rise to national museum collections).<sup>9</sup>

In its contemporary definition, heritage is no longer limited to building national identities—we treat it more as a support for and source of political ideas as well as a vital resource for achieving economic development and social cohesion. Ways of defining heritage and managing its content have changed as well. The democratization of heritage, conceived in part as strengthening the participation of non-experts in its interpretation processes and maintaining its diversity, is an increasingly popular trend.

The Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society, signed by Poland

in May 2021 and better known as the Faro Convention, takes a wide approach to heritage, not restricting its chronological or formal limits. It defines cultural heritage as a “group of resources inherited from the past which people identify, independently of ownership, as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge, and traditions.”<sup>10</sup> as such, varied and often disparate ways of understanding and using heritage gain approval, while equating material and non-material heritage allows us to place diverse, often local practices in its scope.

Introducing such a broad concept of heritage means it is not clear who in fact could (and should) define what it is and what parts of it will enter the public discourse. If, however, we accept the sociologists’ vision of the inextricable bonds between giving something significance and wielding power, we must ask ourselves: Who controls its significance? and can it be controlled? This question more pertains to what we call material heritage. In terms of non-material heritage, things are not so simple: it would be difficult (or even illogical) to imagine a centralized catalog of meanings individuals have given to their choices and cultural practices. These change, constantly being reinterpreted and negotiated; people introduce their own new content and ways of understanding them. They are forever being contextualized; processed; reused.

The concept of heritage, conceived as a dynamic social construct, means it is susceptible to change; it can (and incessantly does!) experience modifications and negotiations through mutual interactions and exchanges in society. This is why the next important question we should ask ourselves as a society is: From whose perspective is “our” story told?



The answer to this question is not plain to see, yet, if we have a look at the key terms used with regard to non-material heritage, we understand how social change is made visible in the discourse on heritage. Unlike the official heritage, controlled by the dominant group, we might say that non-material heritage is closer to us, more personal, and far more diversified than the official narratives; most importantly, it is always focused on the person. This is an attempt to throw a bridge between an official, remote, abstract heritage and ourselves—the people who are its audience and co-creators.

Non-material heritage is essentially always built around individual human fates and affairs. One of its main traits is shifting the emphasis from a homogeneously understood, abstract collective to individual people and their stories. This creates direct, more comprehensible points of reference to the past. Interactions, emotions, choices, and experiences of concrete people become the focus.

The domain of non-material heritage is dynamic, and it appears to be scattered (that is, decentralized), which allows it to maintain a greater degree of heteroglossia, as its scope permits us to take into account numerous perspectives which are, if not equal, then at least coexisting. It is this non-material heritage that gives existence to groups that were marginalized for years in the official narratives; it provides a chance to give voice to all those who were not heard before. Some may speak of polyphony, yet we should be cautious here; in heritage we are more dealing with dissonant voices, though it is probably sometimes possible to achieve a harmonious effect.

We must realize that heritage has massive potential to integrate; on the other hand, it would be hard to say it is harmonious and binding at its core. We are generally

dealing with different readings of past facts, events, or images. This is why we need to keep reminding ourselves that, apart from establishing historical facts, we need—perhaps most urgently of all—memory not only of what has transpired but also to know by whom and how it has been and is remembered.

In examining Polish disputes over history in the early twenty-first century, Robert Traba has aptly pointed out that “a polyphony of memory (...) does not mean forgetting ‘bad experiences,’ hatred, personal dramas. We have to find space for ‘bad memories’ in us, along with forgiveness, compromise, and openness. We have to reconcile competing memories.”<sup>11</sup> Here we can see perhaps one of the most vital functions of heritage: taking the heteroglossia of memories and testimonies and creating something we can feel and recognize as “us.”

Of course, this integrating function of heritage does not mean we become a homogeneous group; it just means that through constant dialogue and discovering places that have been consciously forgotten,<sup>12</sup> heritage will serve as an expression and foundation for being in the world based on values like freedom, peace, and unity. Unfortunately, as Krzysztof Kowalski has noted, “the exact reverse is also possible. Then heritage can give expression to xenophobia, contempt, and violence.”<sup>13</sup>

We ought not to lose sight of this warning, recalling that heritage is the domain of our own emotional and normative decisions.<sup>14</sup>

# CIVIC EXERCISES



The essence of a civic society is asking ourselves who we are, why we make joint actions, and where we hope they will take us. In asking about the shape and meaning of our communities, we cannot thoughtlessly adopt such a gigantic realm like heritage, with all its attendant meanings. It cannot come down to merely taking those things from the past that will serve our current political or economic aims.

In a contemporary, globalized world, we increasingly sense an ontological uncertainty—a tension between tradition, giving us a feeling of continuity and tried-and-true (tacitly: foolproof) models of operating and opening up to what is new and unexplored (and thus risky, filled with uncertainty). There is no unequivocal response to the anxieties of the present, though there are various propositions for soothing them. One of these, using heritage in its highly mythified form, is populism—a way of conducting politics that aims to weaken a sense of ontological security, understood as a feeling of being grounded and trusting the reality all around. and yet, despite the superficial attractiveness of this way of “harnessing” reality, it is a vision of constant endurance with which it is hard

to reconcile a need for agency and a responsible shaping of the future.

Of course, given the tangible lack of security, we need a feeling of rootedness, but this must be confirmed in the past, which does not imprison us in a time and place; does not halt our capacity and will to reshape the world to conform with changing social, environmental, and political conditions. We should try to think about heritage, though this may seem a vision born of Tolkien, as a force that gives us both roots and wings.

Let us have a look at the tasks that cultural institutions can (and should!) perform if we want the past to become fuel and a bottomless source of inspiration for building the future.

### *Concretization*

I suggest making the “concrete” a key concept in how we consider heritage.

One of the main causes of misunderstanding and discrimination in society, though this is an inevitable paradox of the system of democratic representation, is treating individuals as part of a group seen as a homogeneous whole. The problem of many minority groups is that the individuals they include do not want to be treated as models of one type, with a defined set of traits. This is because, much as with all the other members of social groups, they include people of varying statuses and individual characters. and while it may be handy and useful for a system of power to make a unified group (“in whose name” it speaks), the key is to undermine this homogeneous image of groups, both in the past and in the social present. For the institution, this will make the pictures of the past

it creates appeal to concrete people with concrete faces, names, social statuses, etc.

On a linguistic level we sometimes make use of a “collective number”: grammatically, this is the singular, but we use it to describe a group or type of people, for instance when we speak of a “high body count” or “the Polish peasant and his tales.” One important role of the cultural institution could be to take such uniform terms and tease out individualizing traits, making some things concrete, to show that there was not some different species of “people of the past,” much as we would not call ourselves “people of the present.” Let us try to see them in similar categories as we do ourselves, in the sense that their lives were as diverse as each and every one of ours. We have as many dilemmas; decisions; emotions, and yet we try to pigeon-hole some serf, for instance, in a generic image or as an extra on the stage of history... after all, these people were not cut from a single type of cloth!

If, in the museum, we come across a tale of a person with a certain face and we find out what impact they had on the past and on history, then in fact we are not prone to say that we ourselves have no such impact. This concretization and conversation about how we can shape our destiny is something we sorely need as a society.

The key is to present the past as places where real people lived. People who had concrete conditions for their actions and dilemmas. It is from this perspective, of human existence and not of heroic tales, that we seek connections and support for our present day actions. This is a basic civic exercise.

## *Creating the Opportunity*

Often, when carrying out heritage projects, we hear tales of those who had no chance to share their memories of events they witnessed. Then we are dealing with individual heritage, which translates into collective heritage. This is also true in the respect that it is only the institutional context that gives voice to stories that have remained untold for decades, as if only the presence of the institution could guarantee that the story entrusted to it would not fade into oblivion.

The point here, of course, is not that all cultural institutions need to deal strictly with listening to stories people have “never told before.” Yet we should strive to create opportunities for these stories to be told and heard. Going through dozens of such situations, we clearly see how we, as a society, have an enormous backlog of unspoken issues, and nor is the point to make a frontal attack on visions of the past whose principle (and selection!) we oppose, but simply to reflect upon the diversity of human fates, experiences, and perspectives.

It is vastly important that, as far as possible, we abandon the unconditional commemoration of a single, centrally established vision of the past and begin thinking of participants and witnesses of historical events as people, not members or representatives of glorified or condemned groups. After all, each one of them can be described by categories other than their belonging to a group. This is not only a chance for greater unity but also to forge relations both with the past and with its various contemporary approaches.

As it is not possible (or sensible!) to create a precise and unequivocal map of the past, we can take a look at those



places which an old map would surely label *hic sunt leones*... It is all those places and stories that we think we know took place, though in fact we do not know, as we have not looked into them... In a democratic heritage all the minority voices are vital, not only because they have been ignored and now are slowly being given the chance to enter the discourse, but also because we simply know nothing about them. It is, on the one hand, our moral obligation to finally include the perspectives of women, children, and national and social minority groups in the discourse of Polish heritage. On the other hand, since we have some undiscovered territories, we simply lack a gigantic quantity of knowledge about ourselves. The only question is: What are our opportunities for discovering such *hic sunt leones*?

Cultural institutions can and should be forever shattering the outwardly homogeneous image of the past. The sum of our actions, however small, might be translated into a fuller and richer knowledge of ourselves as a society. Let us create opportunities for “gathering round.”

### *Shared Experience*

The basic model of time used in history and heritage is linear. This is the time of stories. It is vital for civilization, because if heritage is a story about us, it is not only a tale about the fact that we come from somewhere but also that we are headed someplace and that we are on the right track. A linear story starts somewhere and sets off in some direction. In this way, we build a sense of the continuity of our experiences and identities.

Official heritage uses the linearity of stories to give us something unconditional and homogeneous. We wish to believe that our ancestors were heroes; we want to be bolstered by

the sublime ideas passed down through generations; we need this mythical story of our special place in the world.

Yet, as people, we do not always experience time in a linear way. There is also pendular time, the alternating days and nights; there is cyclical time, the seasons of the year; sacred time, marked off by the rhythm and experience of religious holidays. Non-material heritage, with its traditions, customs, rites, rituals, sounds, dances, games, entertainments, sayings, meals, costumes, and smells, gives us the chance to recreate those other models of time that coexist with the linear model. With its vast diversity, it also allows us to think of life in terms other than those that are officially accepted. It allows us to think about our own life in strictly biographical terms and perceive how it is intertwined.

Non-material heritage lets us scatter the tale, to give it a different dynamic. It need not be a story with a beginning and an end; it is something that happens. Heritage is important to our understanding of identity processes; this is why it is not provided—it is made. In this sense, creating the chance to truly experience heritage, recognizing what it is made of and how we help create it, is an enormous promise cultural institutions make to forge living relationships with both the past and the present.

### *Interpreting*

The most important thing in heritage is that we understand that building and constructing meanings occurs in the spaces “in between.” In between the exhibits and the museum-goers; in between the past and the present; in between two people.

We should look at heritage as a borderline space between the past and the present; as a kind of time zone seemingly in the past but always there in the present, something like

the present perfect tense in grammar. We can find certain attributes of a rite of passage in it, where an old status has been annulled, but a new one has not yet been ascribed; when something is not yet “here” but is no longer “there,”<sup>15</sup> like a bride taking her vows: no longer a girl, but not yet a wife. Heritage occurs in precisely this special time of passage; it is the past which has already happened, but it is not yet a story we have assimilated as part of our identity.

The whole essence of heritage stretches between representation and interpretation. Representation means we know something is tied to the past, with which we no longer have direct contact. We only have its fragments, material or otherwise. In other words, we are dealing not with a document or reminder of the past but with a representation of sorts, often accidental, and to get to its meaning we use interpretation.

Interpretation is everything that occurs in between—we might speak of an exchange and construction of meanings. as such, we should always recall that in the sphere of heritage we find out not only what transpired (at Grunwald, for instance), but, through this narrative of the event in place of any other (a proud tale of “two drawn swords”<sup>16</sup>), we find out how to deal with a conflict situation; what stance to take when faced with the complexity and diversity of the world. In this regard, heritage becomes a matrix to categorize diversity, holding authority when it comes to both past and present. This is all the more reason not to view heritage as homogeneous and uniform. and it is certainly not indisputable.

The role of the cultural institution is to show various ways of arranging the past, presenting possible readings and perspectives; deconstructing the illusion of a single, centralized narrative of our past and thus about ourselves.

### *Self-Reflexivity—Posing Questions*

It is vital that we have a look at and critically reflect upon our own way of thinking about the past, because, like it or not, we are under its sway. How we explain and understand cause-and-effect relationships in heritage is of major significance for our understanding of the present.

If we imagine that our fate is ruled by a zeitgeist or some other external force that shapes history regardless of what we do as individuals; if we accept that there is a “historical law,” then inevitably this translates into thinking that our individual actions are indeed insignificant. The immediate consequence of this way of thinking will be a lack of a sense of agency and impact on reality.

Thus, we should not affirm the fatalistic nature of our history. Let us seek out flesh-and-blood people in our past; let us delve into their dilemmas and decisions; let us try to think in contexts. Let us try to measure ourselves up to the situations our ancestors faced. Why? above all, so we can see their lives on a human scale. So we can try to understand who could have had an impact on their lives and why, and how we ourselves might have a similar impact. For if we accept that our fates depend exclusively upon external factors of the *deus ex machina* variety, then we will probably conclude that our individual attitudes, choices, and actions have no real effect on anything.

What we need as a society is a tool to deconstruct processes for defining heritage. The very fact of asking “what is heritage?” could be a basic identity-building civic exercise. Getting into the habit of deconstructing and posing these questions on a greater or smaller scale (depending on the type of cultural institution coordinating the process) could become a basic identity exercise.

Meanwhile, the point is not always to change something—and definitely not once and for all! Yet let us question our canons and shared sites of culture (why, for instance, should we read “Katarynka” at school?). Let us feel authorized to ask why an old church or palace is of value to us. What does it mean to us? Though these questions may seem mundane, their rudimentary nature may be why we do not ask them at all... It is self-reflexivity that separates heritage from history. This is where its civic dimension comes into play.

\*\*\*

Here we return to one of the key concepts tied to heritage and identity—significance. Heritage contains self-reflexive debates on ways of producing significance. It is in the domain of heritage that we may note how we think as a collective. These processes are worth studying carefully. I am putting special emphasis on them not only because we can see clearly here how heritage strongly reflects social processes of inclusion and exclusion, but above all because I see them as a chance to better understand ourselves. Carefully listening to voices passed on through heritage carries the promise of learning something valuable about us as a society.

If we believe the past is to be our fortress, one impregnable by outsiders; a site of identity that must be guarded at all costs, we give up on the potential that might come from problematizing it. The multifacetedness and diversity of the past, so often overlooked in official memory politics, whose task is to consolidate the nation by unifying and homogenizing its image, are not necessarily effective. We experience this especially in those cases where the past is still recalled and experienced by those witnesses who remain... and yet their tales are not necessarily compatible.

Does this make them untrue? apart from tending to its multifacetedness and diversity, we should be forever trying to find its cracks; this means not leaving this heteroglossia to itself, but creating the conditions for it to be processed and problematized.

The concept of heritage allows us to take a look at the past which not only incorporates a diversity of voices and experiences but also consents to bringing processes of social memory into the sphere of a discourse on our shared identity. The truth of time, conceived as the proper telling of history, is not, then, an overriding category excluding other voices from the identity discourse, ones that are less audible or altogether missing. The truth of time may be understood as a reflection upon the present—this is a perspective we narrate about the past and thus of a community's continuity.

Perhaps the point here is not the past itself and its commemoration but rather the choices that stand before us as a society.







## NOTES:

- 1 Cf. Krzysztof Kowalski, *O istocie dziedzictwa europejskiego – rozważania* (Krakow: MCK, 2013), 76.
- 2 Cf. *ibid.*, 70–76.
- 3 Gregory J. Ashworth, “Sfragmentaryzowane dziedzictwo: sfragmentaryzowany instrument sfragmentaryzowanej polityki,” trans. Monika Myszkiewicz, in *Dziedzictwo kulturowe w XXI wieku. Szanse i wyzwania*, ed. Monika Murzyn, Jacek Purchla, Krakow 2007, 32–33.
- 4 *Ibid.*
- 5 Leszek Kołakowski, *The Presence of Myth*, trans. Adam Czerniawski (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 4–5.
- 6 See: Kowalski, *O istocie*, 20.
- 7 See: Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006).
- 8 See: “Naród,” in *Encyklopedia PWN*, <https://bit.ly/3jGDMTa> (accessed: 15.04.2022).
- 9 See: Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983).

- 10 Quoted from: *Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*, <https://rm.coe.int/1680083746> (accessed: 15.04.2022).
- 11 Robert Traba, *Przeszłość w terażniejszości. Polskie spory o historię na początku XXI wieku* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2009), 86.
- 12 Ibid., 86.
- 13 Kowalski, *O istocie*, 7–8.
- 14 See: *ibid.*
- 15 See: Arnold van Gennep, *Obrzędy przejścia: systematyczne studium ceremonii: o bramie i progu, o gościnności i adopcji [...]*, Warsaw 2006.
- 16 See: The Grunwald Swords: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grunwald\\_Swords](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grunwald_Swords)



małopolski  
instytut  
kultury **mik**

INSTYTUCJA KULTURY  
WOJEWÓDZTWA  
MAŁOPOLSKIEGO

 MAŁOPOLSKA

Publisher:

The Małopolska Institute of Culture in Krakow

30-233 Krakow, ul. 28 Lipca 1943 17 C

tel. 12 422 18 84, [www.mik.krakow.pl](http://www.mik.krakow.pl)

Director: Joanna Orlik

Editor-in-chief: Elżbieta Kaproń

Translator: Søren Gauger

Proofreader: Steven Hoffman

Series graphic design and typography: Kira Pietrek

Typesetting: Aleksandra Poprawa

ISBN online publication 978-83-61406-70-9

Kraków 2023

This publication is not for sale.

It is available on an international Creative Commons license: acknowledgment of authorship – Non-commercial use – On the same conditions 4.0 (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0).

## **Małopolski Instytut Kultury w Krakowie**

**[Małopolska Institute of Culture in Krakow, abbr.**

**MIK]** is an independent body set up by the Małopolska local government. MIK engages in many activities to study and promote cultural heritage of the Małopolska region. MIK provides workshops and training as well as organizes conferences and seminars for culture sector employees. We also research the evolution of cultural trends and development directions.

Three words describe us in short:

Region, React, Rethink!

MIK is a proud member of three international networks: Culture action Europe, Interpret Europe, and the European Network of Observatories in the Field of arts and Cultural Education (ENO).

[www.mik.krakow.pl](http://www.mik.krakow.pl)



**Łucja Piekarska**, PhD, is a social anthropologist at the Institute of European Studies of the Jagiellonian University. She studies the issues of social memory and identity, with her special area of interest being museums. One of the results of these interests is the monograph *The Invisible Hand of Europe: The Museum as a Civilizing Tool* (Berlin – New York – Oxford – Warszawa 2020). She is involved in research on populism, especially its relationship with religion. She advises museums and cultural institutions on heritage interpretation. She is an expert of the Council of Europe in the field of cultural routes.