

Impact of Cultural Heritage on Tourists. The Heritagization Process

*By Per Åke Nilsson**

Impact of tourism on residents has been the subject of numerous studies over time. The impact on tourists caused by local residents and local cultural heritage has barely been discussed. The presumption is that a tourist needs to be confronted with something unfamiliar, like authenticity, regardless if it is authentic or not. It has been claimed that tourists sometimes do not care about authenticity. If they don't, the greater the likelihood is that they will be influenced by reproduced authenticity. The concept of heritagization is a process to adapt use of culture heritage to promote images favorable for the political management. It is a final stage of a social process, where cultural heritage is used in order to have wished political impact on the visitors. This paper will analyze the role of heritagization from three different aspects by using examples from Transylvania in Romania, Western Pomerania in Poland and the relation between All Saint's Day and Halloween in Sweden.

Introduction

Impact of Tourism on Destinations over Time

The interplay between tourism and cultural heritage is not always regarded by those involved in the preservation of heritage. This neglect stems from historical tensions. For example, excesses during the so called Grand Tour of continental Europe, when young British upper-class youth visited Europe as part of their education (Towner 1985), fueled a negative view of the relationship between tourists and heritage preservationists. A further augmentation of negative impacts occurred after the 1960s when a breakthrough of charter tourism occurred. Tourism was regarded as an endemic disease with roots in a pseudo-world (Boorstin 1961) or as an invasion of grasshoppers (Turner and Ash 1976) creating a beaten and damaged track (Buzard 1993) in the place of interest. Later on, tourism was regarded as part of an international economic development project (de Kadt 1976), more or less commodifying heritage (Cohen 1988, Ritzer and Liska 1997).

Most of these views concern tourism's impact on cultural heritage and also on local residents. As an exogenic phenomenon, it naturally has an impact on endogenic conditions at the destination. Less interest, however, has been focused on how cultural heritage has an impact on inhabitants and tourists, deliberately or unconsciously. This deliberate impact is in focus within the concept heritagization in which authorities, with help from their own tourist industry, decide how cultural heritage should be exposed and interpreted in order to underpin a certain political order.

* Senior Researcher, Holar University College, Iceland.

An example of how this is perceived is found in an interview with the Hungarian prime-minister Viktor Orban in a Swedish daily paper, where he answers the question how cultural heritage can be kidnapped by right wing movements in order to strengthen political interests:

“This is the first time I have been confronted with the phenomenon. I have never thought that culture heritage can be used as fuel for chauvinistic or nationalistic apprehensions.”

(Dagens Nyheter 2018-02-09).

The aim of this article is to show how heritagization has worked as such a political instrument in three different countries. Two of the countries are former communist states, Romania and Poland, where heritagization was part of the official policy, and one, Sweden, where political influence for a long time has been officially banned. The three countries give different examples of how heritagization is used today.

Background

Impact of Culture Heritage on Tourism over Time

Cultural heritage has been of fundamental importance for tourism for many reasons, including as a personal experience for the tourist (Timothy and Boyd 2003, Poria et al. 2003, Weaver 2011), a basis for commercial activity (Robinson and Smith 2006), a carrier and exponent of collective memory (Walsh 1992, Innocenti 2015), a strengthening mechanism for the identity of local residents (Selwyn 1996, Yang and Wall 2009), and for the exposure of minority groups (Roosens 1989, Ryan and Huyton 2002). Museum keepers have used this as the backbone for economic survival of both museums themselves and the bases they stand on (Chabra 2008, Whitehead et al. 2015, Zan et al. 2015). Even if the general tourist seldom visits museums at home, a visit during vacations is often formulated as achieving “culture points” (Boniface 1995, Boissevain 1996, McIntosh and Prentice 1999).

A lot of academic interest has shifted focus from tourists as a group to their individual perceptions of destinations. This can be manifested in a tourist “gaze” (Urry 1990), but also as increased interest in the tourists’ psyche and its impact on different behavior when choosing destinations (Plog 1991). The interplay has been studied between different stakeholders at a destination and between local residents and tourists (Russo 2002, Nilsson 2012, Connolly 2015), sometimes resulting in a cost-benefit analysis of the financial outcomes for residents and stakeholders (Lindberg and Johnson 1997). There is also a focus on relations between tourists and indigenous people (Butler and Hinch 1996), or even crisis resolving (Jóhannesson and Huijbens 2013). Steps have also been taken to discuss cross-border destinations (Eskilsson and Nilsson 2010).

Impact of Cultural Heritage on Tourists over Time: Authenticity and Tourists

If cultural heritage influences not only tourism but also the tourists, this aspect has been less studied. The focus has mostly been on how heritage gives individual tourists an existential authenticity to consider (Cohen 1988, Atkinson 1991). Authenticity represents the past but is perceived and consumed in the present. This creates some problems, since it is impossible to achieve a “true” perception of the past by looking at cultural heritage (Weaver 2011). Ignorance, together with incomplete and selective knowledge of the past, may result in an incomplete and selective experience (Wang 1999, Cole 2007). This can be deliberately used to present for the tourist a wanted picture, often described as a unique, special, even a-typical, character of a destination (Walsh 1992, Majkut 2008).

Thus, the concept of authenticity is a contradiction, showing only what exists for the current moment. The term migrating heritage (Innocenti 2015) would be more accurate to describe the concept, since actual heritage cannot give the whole story, but just a fleeting presentation. The tourist interest in authenticity has made it possible for stakeholders at a destination to present it as a commodity (Cohen 1988, Taylor 2001). For many tourists, an incomplete and selective character of authenticity seems to be irrelevant as long as it gives impressions of authenticity (Greenwood 1989, Hollinshead 1997, Hall et al. 2004, Dodds et al. 2010). However, the less tourists care about authenticity, the greater the likelihood is that the interpretation of heritage instead will be influenced by fabricated textual presentations of reproduced authenticity (McGregor 2000). However, it also opens opportunities for local tourism stakeholders and administrators to abuse cultural heritage for political purposes or for promoting special interests (Goulding and Domic 2009).

Impact of Heritagization Processes

A heritagization process aims at making inhabitants in a region feel that certain cultural heritage is more relevant to them than to foreigners (Walsh 1992). By recycling old ideas and making them relevant again, they can be used to start a process for repossessing the past in a way that supports the legacy of a present political system. Exposing selected cultural heritage to tourists gives an opportunity to revive and contrast obsolete phenomena with everyday habituations or performances (Backhaus 2008). For example, authorities and museum keepers by highlighting these ideas can offer possibilities for locals to create a feeling of solidarity (Poria et al. 2003, Geyzen 2014). This can be deliberately confirmed by highlighting differences between them and the “others” so that this differentiation will legitimize a specifically desired social order (Poria and Ashworth 2009).

By imposing a certain view of the past to visitors, local history is glorified and made congruent with existing nationalist ideas. Examples of this kind of branding are evident around the world. Viking heritage museums in Scotland show that battles between Scots and Vikings normally were won by the Scots,

while deliberately arranged tourist attractions in Scandinavia show how those battles normally were won by the Vikings (Halewood and Hannam 2001, Lyngnes and Sletvold 2007). Oii (2007) shows how the image of Denmark intentionally is arranged to select attractions that fulfill the branding of Copenhagen, and thus the country as a whole, like the Little Mermaid, Zoo and Tivoli. Museums and heritage sites in Croatia are used as a reification of Croatia's glorious history when it departed from Turkey (Massey et al. 2003). In South Korea, festivals and museums act as symbolic mechanisms through which national belonging can be reconstructed and communicated (Park 2010).

Accordingly, heritagization as a cultural paradigm can use cultural heritage both as a frame of mind and abuse it as an idea to promote a political interpretation of heritage (Chabra et al. 2003, Connerton 2009, Borevi 2011). The reference to culture heritage can sometimes be very sweeping or radical, hidden or purposely chosen. The focus is often on ideas instead of objects with the intention to interpret history for one's own advantage (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996, Wight and Lennon 2007, Nilsson 2017). The object is to define the "other" as a threat to the existing order. Instead of talking about "we" as something common for the group, they talk about what distinguishes the group from others. This makes it about fear instead of fellowship (Cole 2007, Connolly 2015, Innocenti 2015).

Theory

The idea of this paper is to exemplify how the impact of a heritagization process transforms both the cultural heritage and the local residents at a given destination. The impact of tourism on cultural heritage is fundamental, either through forms of living, artifacts or references to a collective memory. The impact of cultural heritage on tourists has been less studied and has mostly been on how individuals try to find existential authenticity by seeking their own selves, giving them a conscious and active role.

However, an incomplete and selective knowledge of the past makes the authenticity of cultural heritage influenced by a conscious intention to present a favourable view of the object. As a post-modern reaction to that, it is increasingly stated that the concept is a non-problem, since it is irrelevant whether something is real or false, original or copy, reality or symbol.

Explicitly, the heritagization process is a process from a function of a place, developed by ethnic, religious or social conditions, towards a situation characterized by more or less obsolete traditions, in order to promote certain, often nationalistic, ideas. The goal in these situations is to establish political control over the acculturation process. The less tourists care about authenticity, the greater the likelihood is that they instead will be influenced by fabricated textual representations of reproduced authenticity. This critic of the concept of authenticity, saying that it lies in the viewer's eye, gives opportunities for local tourism stakeholders and administrators to use cultural heritage for political purposes or for promoting special interests.

Method

Material for elucidating the concept of heritagization is taken from literature studies. This has been compared with interviews and material gathered by personal visits to Western Pomerania (former Hinterpomern) in Poland and to Transylvania in Romania, in 2008 and 2016, respectively. For the case of All Saints' Day and Halloween, material has been taken from the author's own experiences and from Swedish newspapers.

Cases

1. Transylvania

Background

Transylvania, located in the Carpathian mountain range, has a diversified history. Dacia was the original name of Transylvania, and it was incorporated by Rome in 101 AD and was used for deported Romans (Wheeler 1955, Korneman 1963). The name Transylvania, *transsilva*, through the forest, originates from the Roman time. The Huns invaded the area in 376, and after they disappeared, the region was dominated by Austrians and Hungarians (Thompson 1948). During the 13th century, Saxonians, who were German-speaking immigrants, founded towns in Transylvania and gave it the German name, *Siebenbürgen*, meaning the seven cities (Lazar 1996). Hungarians took control of Transylvania in the 11th century and in 1526, Turkish Ottomans took over.

From 1686, Transylvania became part of the Habsburg Monarchy under Hungary with the name *Erdély*, meaning the same as *Siebenbürgen*. At the Versailles Conference in 1919, the Habsburg monarchy, as a loser in the war, was split and Hungary became a separate state, but without Transylvania (Taylor 1961; Paşcu & Ladd 1990). Transylvania was instead merged with the newly founded state Romania (Rockberger 2006; Palme 2017). Together with the Romanian-speaking regions, Moldau and Valakiet, it has been part of Romania since then with a mixed population. This explains why Transylvania is split between interests from both Romania and Hungary, and why Hungarian cultural heritage is despised by the Romanian speaking majority. The most flagrant example is how the Hungarian hero Matthias Corvinus from Cluj is transformed into a national hero in Romanian Transylvania (Lendvai 2004).

Figure 1. Transylvania during the 17th Century

In 1919, the population of Transylvania was mixed: 40% Hungarian speaking and 60% Romanian speaking. The proportion of Hungarians declined as more of the region's inhabitants moved into urban areas. The expropriation of the estates of Magyar magnates, the distribution of lands to the Romanian peasants, and the policy of cultural “Romanization” were major causes of friction between Hungary and Romania.

Ceaușescu Period

During the communist regime under Ceaușescu, efforts were made to constitute a Romanian state as a national entity. According to the results of the 2011 Population Census, the total population of Transylvania was 6,789,250 and the ethnic groups included Romanians (70%) and Hungarians (18%), (Verdery 1983, Varga 1999). It is also difficult to measure since people do not always openly declare they are Hungarian-speaking (Varga 1999). People were moved from Moldavia to Transylvania, officially because of a labor force shortage during the industrialization period of Transylvania. Another cause was probably an establishment of an identity creation process in Transylvania as part of Romania, as well as an ethnic cleansing begun with efforts to define a Romanian common cultural heritage.

The move of people from Moldavia radically strengthened the Romanian speaking part of Transylvania and diminished the Hungarian influence in the region. It also diminished the Transylvanian culture since Moldavians were foreigners even to the original Romanian inhabitants in Transylvania (Sweeney 1991). The existing cultural heritage had to adopt Romanian culture, but not

religion. Religion had not been of decisive importance for the inhabitants, and churches were easily adapted to the manifold of religions in the region. The public buildings could also go on with their function, according to the idea that the form was kept even if the content was changed¹.

In Hungary, the partition of the country after World War I, according to the Peace of Versailles in 1919 signed by the victorious states in World War I, was hard to accept both for politicians and citizens. Hungary lost the eastern part of the Habsburg monarchy (Kontler 2009, Cartledge 2011). The first prime-minister, József Antall, said after the fall of the wall in 1990 that he wanted to be prime minister not only for 12 million Hungarians who lived in Hungary, but also for 3 million living in the bordering countries (Nagy-Talavera 2001, Byström 2014). This was not a popular sentiment in neighboring countries or in the rest of Europe and could not be realized. Efforts were made, however, to repatriate these Hungarians to Hungary. In 1998, the Hungarian government gave them Hungarian IDs. The reaction in Europe in general and in Romania in particular resulted in worse terms for Hungarian speaking inhabitants in Transylvania (Palme 2017).

Figure 2. Hungarians in- and Outside Hungary



However, the fall of the communist regime in Romania changed the preconditions for the Hungarian heritagization process. Its aim to control both local residents and tourists became less and less viable to maintain (Ghermani 1986). A more multicultural situation occurred and inbound tourists brought ideas and traditions to Transylvania².

¹ Interview by the author with professor in Geography, Vasile Surd, Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj, Romania, May 22, 2014.

² Interview by the author with professor in Geography, Diana-Elena Alexandru, Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj, Romania, October 23 2015.

Heritagization in Transylvania

During the medieval time up to the end of World War I, the Habsburg monarchy, first called Austria and from 1866 the Dual Monarchy of Austria/Hungary, Austrians and Hungarians dominated Transylvania. During the 19th century, nationalism characterized Europe. Romania was one of the results of this trend, and from 1919 Romania took over the rule of Transylvania. In Moldau and Valaky, over 90% of the inhabitants are Romanian-speaking and thus, the cultural heritage is accepted and embraced by the Romanians (Mallows 2008). Transylvania, on the other hand, is because of its history one of the most multi-ethnic regions in Europe. The most visited “heritage” site is the home of Dracula in Sighisoara. The city of Cluj-Napoca (Hungarian *Kolozsvár* and German Klausenburg), the capital of the region, has several elements of heritagization. In the *Mathia House* in central Cluj, the Hungarian hero MathiaCorvinus was born in 1443 according to tradition. He became king of Hungary in 1458 and vied (in vain) for becoming emperor of Austria. In Cluj, there are several churches representing several religions, such as St. Michael’s Church, which is a Gothic style Roman Catholic site, and the Orthodox Cathedral, built in 1933. There are also there are other churches, each representing different branches of religion that have dominated Transylvania: the Protestant Church, the Reformed Church, and the Unitarian Church. They are all situated close to each other in the city center and all were built in the 19th century (Stan and Turcescu 2007, Mallows 2008). The *Banffy Palace* was built between 1774 and 1775. It is considered the most representative for the baroque style of Transylvania. The first owner of the palace was the Hungarian Duke GyörgyBánffy (1746–1822), the governor of Transylvania. It has over time hosted the Transylvanian governor, the National Guard, an open-air-cinema, coffee shops and today the Art Museum (Mallows 2008).

The *Babeş-Bolyai University* is a public university. It is, with more than 40,000 students, a dominant university in the country with roots dating back to the Hungarian period as a Jesuit monastery, and later as a Hungarian speaking university from 1872 to 1959. It then became a joint Hungarian and Romanian-speaking state university, named after the prominent Transylvanian scientists Victor Babeş, a Romanian-speaking bacteriologist, and János Bolyai, a Hungarian-speaking mathematician (Marga et al. 2010).

Final Comments

Political efforts to underpin the Romanian influence in Transylvania are obvious, even if the authorities try to present them as natural and not discriminatory against Hungarians. Interviews with ordinary people in Cluj indicated that the Hungarians are not discriminated against, and rather the influx of Romanians is the reason for a relative decrease in numbers. Hungarian inhabitants, however, are not easy to interview regarding discrimination because they feel afraid or inconvenienced to use their language.

In a post-communist country like Romania, the politicization of culture and cultural heritage has a long tradition. It would be remarkable if that tradition disappeared from one day to another. For Romania, heritagization is obviously seen as a natural method to unite Romania and thereby make Transylvania more “Romanian”. Hungary, also a post-communist country, has similar ambitions to reunite all Hungarian-speaking people in Europe and thereby counteract the effects of the Verdun treaty. They try to use all possible means to start a heritagization process among Hungarian-speaking people in Transylvania, but with meager results (Brubaker et al. 2006). Thus, these two countries have in common that they try through heritagization to change a state of order, inherited from the communist time. Yet both seem to have difficulties achieving what they intend.

2. Western Pomerania

Background

Poland was in 1795 divided between Russia, Austria and Germany, but it arose again after World War I at the expense of the losers in the war, the same powers that once divided the country (Davies 2001, Palmer 2005, Świącicki 2008a). In 1945, Poland changed its place on the map once more, through a geographically westward move to Western Pomerania (Hinterpomern). The German inhabitants there had to flee to the rest of Germany (Beevor 2002, Toland 2003). An agreement between Stalin and Churchill confirmed that river Oder-Neisse should function as a new border between Germany and Poland, the so called Curzon line (see figure 1). Poles from Eastern Poland, now part of Belorussia, were forced to move to the depopulated Western Pomerania (Gerner et al. 2002, Świącicki 2008b, Applebaum 2012).

Figure 3. Poland after World War II



The populations on both sides of the river Oder-Neisse were strangers to each other with nothing in common and with no interests from either side to

communicate over the river. It resulted in a real and rather impenetrable wall with Germany, as well as an identity-problem among the new inhabitants on the east side of the river.

The “New” Poland After 1945

During the period from 1945 to 1989, the communist regime did not try to deprive the Poles of their cultural heritage, but rather tried to adapt it to forms not contradictory to the communist rule; this was probably due to the fact that the population was thoroughly religious (Johnsson 2017). The churches were still allowed to function if they did not violate the spirit and politics of the party. However, the geographical move westwards forced the new communist regime to “remake” the history of the country. They did it by launching a project called “1000 Years of History” where the “new” Poland was presented as an old entity with a common history for the past 1000 years, despite its new localization. To complete this considerable undertaking, it was necessary to delete some parts of history, highlight other parts, and interpret them in a way suitable for creating commonality (Lukowski and Zawadski 2001, Snyder 2004, Zamoyski 2005, Johnsson 2017).

After the fall of the wall in 1990, communist ideology vanished, and two different ideological traditions were revived: one was Europe-oriented, and thus liberal and tolerant (Michnik and Ost 1992, Bartoszewski and Friszke 2010), while the other was Poland-oriented, and thus Catholic and conservative (Drakulić 1992). The former dominated from the start, but during the first decade of the 21st century the value conservative tradition gained ground. A “back to the roots” movement concerning cultural heritage began (Święcicki 2009).

The problems with the new interpretation of German cultural heritage in Western Pomerania were obvious. There were many remnants of historical ties to various times and places, and the Slavic population had to accommodate its own culture within the layers of an 800-year-old German culture. This in turn had to fit within the new, politically inspired, 1000-years-of-history concept. For the newcomers, it was necessary to make a “showroom” of their own in order to give them an identity to live within this space regardless of origin (Bartoszewski 2007). Today, the communist period is over, and there are again new ideas about how to look upon the cultural heritage and recapture the past³.

Recycling Old Cultural Heritage – Churches and Manor Houses in Western Pomerania

The cathedral in Koszalin was built during Roman-Catholic times in the 15th century. The Reformation during the 16th century made Western Pomerania evangelical, and so the cathedral changed rituals and ceremonies in order to function as a Protestant church. After World War II, the in-moving Slavic population was Catholic and cathedrals became Roman-Catholic churches again.

³ Interview 23/10 2008 with Marta Adamczak, Intendent of Koszalin Regional Museum.

The Catholic minority in Koszalin had in 1869 built a church of their own, which now has become a Protestant evangelical church for the new minority. Some of the incomers after the war were Orthodox, and so they built an Orthodox church. Despite Poland in general being deeply Catholic, churches and religion seem not to have created fights and troubles.⁴

The German churches were the only obvious and concrete milestones from the previous history, and which did not change in purpose. The communist regime did not dare to use these churches in Western Pomerania for profane tasks, like in Russia, and decided obviously to turn a blind eye to them. Why not reuse them in accordance with the present ideology? The same idea was used concerning the manor houses. During the communist period, manor houses were taken over by the state and used for practical things, mostly as storage for grain or as tool sheds. This is representative of a claim according to many planners that form can very well be the same even if function changes (Poria and Ashworth 2009). The use of these places had to be assimilated into the life and customs of the new settlers.⁵ Today, many of them are restored to their original shape, but with new functions, such as joint-venture businesses, private homes, centers for cultural activities, or meeting points for artists.⁶

Cultural Heritage without Roots in Existing Culture

The immigrants, normally coming from rural areas, were not familiar with the sea. From the Middle Ages onwards, the coastline had been of high importance for Western Pomerania as a transport route. The development of steamboats established a new type of infrastructure by including tours to seaside resorts dominated by privately-owned, often small-scale, enterprises up to the 1930s. The Nazis changed the scale of the resorts to become exclusive residences for politicians and officers. When the Soviet Union took over, they did not change the style, but replaced the occupants with communist politicians and officers (Gerner et al. 2002, Palmer 2005).

The situation after the fall of the wall has changed most of the large-scale seaside resort culture to a market-oriented development populated by small-scale entrepreneurs mixed with investments by major hotel chains; there are now only a few reminders of the previous eras (Bartoszewski and Friszke 2010).

The launching of “1000 years of history” became an inspiration to search for roots from before the German period and from a Slavic origin. This search received assistance from the labor of industrious 19th century German archaeologists. The Germans mapped their findings with both accuracy and exactitude (Salter 2000). Today, these maps form an important base for investigations for encouraged researchers. The National Museum of Szczecin

⁴ Interviews with ordinary people and administrators in Koszalin October 2008 and 2016.

⁵ Examples of churches, visited by the author, still in use despite their German protestant background: *Unieście* in Gothic style and *Wozewo* in a modest style.

⁶ Manor houses, visited by the author: *Gašk* manor house, used for public activities within associations, private manor house at Radew river, *Cetuń* palace previously owned by family Siemens but today used as an elderly home.

and the Regional Museum of Koszalin have from 1974 to 1989 supported archeological investigations and have presented them in research reports (Wołagiewicz 1977, Breske et al. 2015). The museum in Koszalin has an exhibition of the findings of the area. A showroom for tourists has been established in Grzybnica, a municipality of Mostowo (20 km south of Koszalin), with the most sensational findings: *KamienneKręgi*, The Stone Circles, from the 1st and 2nd centuries AD (Nõtągiewicz andHakuła 2001).

Final Comments

For Western Pomerania, heritagization became a process that the newcomers had to adopt, despite the fact that there was not very much for them to adapt to, not even such a basic thing as food traditions (Geyzen 2014). However, there was a cultural heritage they could identify with: the Slavic pre-historic period. Furthermore, there was actually another piece of cultural heritage present in their lives: the German houses in which they now lived. After a generation, the agony and aversion to the former owners started to fade away and was replaced by a curiosity among the new generation to find out the history of the houses. As a result, some inhabitants have consciously started to seek the former owners in Germany for a mutual, friendly contact in order to gain more knowledge about the cultural heritage of Western Pomerania⁷. This has also resulted in a readiness for the museums in Stettin and Koszalin to open their archives with former German settlers. Today, a new wave of a “back-to-the-roots” movement has appeared in Poland with a conscious effort to use this heritagization as a process to transform the country.

3. Celebration of Halloween, All Saints Day and All Souls Day in Sweden

Background

There is an almost total mix and confusion in Sweden on what concerns All Saints Day, All Souls Day and Halloween. All Saints Day was celebrated in Sweden, according to the Roman Catholic traditions, from medieval times to 1772, despite the fact that Lutherans stopped the idea of saints in Sweden already in 1527. The concept of All Saints Day was, however, re-introduced in 1953 and the Parliament decided that the day should be celebrated on a Saturday between the 31st of October and 6th of November under the name *allhelgonadagen*, which has opened for an abridged or confused mix of All Souls Day and All Saints Day, since the Sunday after All Saints Day became labeled All Souls Day. The whole weekend is called *Allhelgona*, which underlines the confusion regarding what is a celebration of saints and dead relatives, respectively (Lilja 1998, Herlitz 2007, Skog 2008, Bexell 2015).

Halloween is a short form for All Hallows Eve and is nowadays said to trace back to a Celtic tradition, *Samhain*, which was celebrated during the

⁷ Interview with Marta Adamczak, Koszalin Museum 29.10. 2008

medieval period in Ireland on October 31, partly as a symbol for the end of summer and beginning of winter. This gave the celebration a kind of borderline significance, and it became connected to a night when the dead returned to earth. Fires were lit to scare them away. The tradition was brought to the USA by Irish immigrants in the 1840s (Rehnberg 1965, Rogers 2002, Santino 2009).

Integration Forms

Modernism and globalization give opportunities for international imports leading to cultural exchange (Boissevain 1996). Drivers can be characterized by swiftness due to attraction (Herlitz 2007), prediction for multiplicity (Hall et al. 2004), wishes for individual freedom (Ryan & Huyton 2002), an inherent capacity of success in the message (Santino 2009), juvenile vitality (Lilja 1998), or comfort vitality (MacCannell 1973, Urry 2001). Especially young people seem to be susceptible to such an exchange of ideas (Nuryanti 1996, Zan et al. 2015). These drivers may result in a process where individuals or groups adapt to traits from other countries, more or less successfully, by different strategies, like separation, assimilation, and acculturation (Borevi 2011, Nilsson 2015). Separation is a counter strategy that involves efforts to maintain only one's own cultural heritage, because of disdain for the new culture. Assimilation is relinquishing one's own cultural heritage, while adopting a new culture. Acculturation is a situation where you totally accept the new culture and feel part of it. If you don't want to adapt a new culture, it often results in marginalization, a strategy where you distance yourself from both the old and new cultures (Herlitz 2007, Nilsson 2013).

All Saints Day and Halloween, a Culture Heritage Clash

Halloween was established in Europe after World War II but was celebrated only in narrow, and more or less aristocratic, circles and among students, often in the form of a "Halloween ball". In the 1990s, it became more popular and is now as common as the celebration of All Saints Day. Knowledge of the holiday was spread from the USA by TV series, movies, books, and the Internet, but also by personal contacts, especially exchange students (Pells 1997, Rogers 2002, Palmer 2014). The concept is not a strictly defined issue; people of different ages celebrate it differently, as do people in different regions, whether rural, urban, and suburban. The very designation of the day has also varied over time and across space (Santino 2009).

The appearance of Halloween in Sweden evoked a lot of criticism. It was contrasted to the serious and serene celebrations of All Saints Day and All Souls Day. It was described as a superstitious, superficial, and commercial American stunt with its playful view on death (Herlitz 2007, Santino 2009, Fieldhouse 2017). However, the main activity among the youngsters, the "trick or treat", or begging in disguise, is nothing new in Sweden. The annual celebration of Saint Lucia on December 13th was established before the 20th century, and was accompanied by youngsters in disguise, marching around at night, singing

and making noise in order to claim money to avoid mischief (Lilja 1998). The tradition of young girls dressing up as witches at Easter and asking for money has also been common in Sweden for at least the two last centuries (Skott 2002). Moreover, at harvest festivals, burlesque pranks were common (Lilja 1998).

Manipulating the Past for Hegemonic Design

From the Lutheran state church, but also from the Calvin nonconformist church, Halloween was opposed in Sweden. The main criticism was grounded on a fear that Halloween would become a holiday for the children and thereby be out of the control of the church and parents. This criticism was added to an already negative view regarding Americanisation of Swedish cultural life (Lilja 1998). The pagan traits in Halloween harassed many Christian believers (Herlitz 2007), but it has also been regarded as a possibility for the church to put forward the celebration of All Souls Day as a counter-attack. The tradition of lighting candles on the graves has been encouraged and actually increased. On the websites of different churches, there is special information about the concepts of All Saints Day and All Souls Day, including their actual meanings and the different events that take place on these days. The acculturation process has slowly changed from being characterized by separation to being defined by integration and biculturalism.

An expression of that change is the way the press reported on these events after some time. *SydsvenskaDagbladet* (31/10) comments on the 2009 celebration as follows: "The candles on the graves and the tourists' serene, almost whispering, conversations, is warming on one of the special days of the church year." *SkånskaDagbladet* (16/10) states that "All Saints Day is [compared to Halloween] our own tradition when we celebrate the memory of the saints and the dead." The main message of these articles is that both traditions can live together and develop.

Business life in Sweden has regarded Halloween with an integration process characterized by assimilation. The commercialised Halloween celebrations have been of great interest for commercial life, and thus assimilation has become something for which to strive. Even All Saints Day includes commercial benefits and makes integration something desirable. As one of Lilja's (1998) respondents puts it: "All Souls Day is not any longer just a funeral in Sweden. Now it also means party (p. 75).

Final Comments

The outcome of this meeting between a domestic and an adopted tradition would not have become so integrated in Swedish traditional life if it had not been welcomed by the staff of nursery and primary schools. They saw possibilities to engage children in something that really caught their interests and imagination. There was probably not very much discussion within the staff concerning the content and symbolism in Halloween. Halloween has become more or less a part of the curriculum for these schools all over Sweden. The church has thus

taken advantage of this acculturation process and has turned more and more to relinquishing the old traditions, All Saints Day, and promoting the adoption of Halloween (Herlitz 2007).

The process is a typical heritagization process but with broad, though not total, backing by citizens. The success is probably due to a lack of political interference and a blessing from the state church in Sweden. According to the Swedish Church itself around 40% of its members (4 million out of 10 million), which means about 10 to 20% of visitors, are present at sermons on Sundays (SvenskaKyrkansUtredningar 2015:2). The non-state churches are probably more negative to Halloween, but they are probably too split to become a strong factor of opposing opinion.

Conclusion

The impact of cultural tourism is at least two-fold: on the host society and on the tourists themselves. The impact on the host society is, beside the economic and social consequences of tourism, often a matter of strengthened self-esteem and perceptions of one's own identity. The impact on the tourists lies in providing a wide spectrum of experience. It has to do with the fulfillment of expectations, the perception of events, the attractions experienced, and in the end the memories of the experience. Cultural heritage is a necessary base from which the heritagization process must work. The process aims at establishing solidarity among members of a group.

The case of Transylvania shows how the Soviet view of cultural heritage as a political instrument for unifying citizens still is in use in Romania to some degree. The remnants of Hungarian cultural heritage in Transylvania are now labeled as Romanian. In the recently democratized Romania, the aim of the heritagization process is used to unite the country with the Romanian language as the basic tool.

The example from Western Pomerania shows how the democratization process has become more mature. In this example, it is no longer necessary for the inhabitants to see the Germans as enemies. The open border to Germany has influenced new inhabitants to seek roots both in pre-historical findings and in contacts with tourists from West. Accepting this from the democratic regime in Poland has diminished the political steering of cultural heritage.

All Saints Day in Sweden shows that it is possible to mix two origins and perceptions of cultural heritage, and especially how tourism has had a considerable impact on such a mix. The introduction of Halloween to Sweden inspired a lot of objections, but the very stable administrative system managed to make compromises and gave space for both phenomena, sometimes side-by-side.

References

- Applebaum A (2012) *Iron Curtain. The Crushing of Eastern Europe 1944-1956*. London: Penguin Books.
- Atkinson A (1991) *Principles of Political Ecology*. London: Belhaven.
- Backhaus G (2008) Sublimity in otherness. In M Itkonen, P Majkut (eds) *The Illuminating Traveler* 17-54. Jyväskylä University Press.
- Bartoszewski W (2007) *I hjärtat av Polen. Minnen och tankar [In the heart of Poland. Memories and thoughts]*. Stockholm: Atlas.
- Bartoszewski W, Friszke A (2010) *Not Boring Life. Memories of a Pole in the 20th Century*. Kraków 2010.
- Beevor A (2002) *Berlin – The Downfall 1945*. London: Penguin books.
- Bexell O (2015) Det svenska kyrkoåret under de senaste tvåhundra åren. Förändring och revitalisering. [The Swedish ecclesiastical year during the latest two hundred years. Changes and revitalizations] *Kyrkohistorisk Årsskrift [Annual Journal For church History]* (115) 35-57.
- Boissevain J (1996) *Coping with Tourists*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Boniface P (1995) *Managing Quality Cultural Tourism*. London: Routledge.
- Boorstin D (1961) *The Image or what Happened to the American Dream*. New York: Harpers.
- Borevi K (2011) *From multi-culturalism to assimilation. Swedish integration policy from a European perspective*. *Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift* 113(1): 47-56.
- Breske A, Breske Z, Elwart J (2015) *Kamienne Kręgi Gotów Gdynia*. ISBN 9788375914450.
- Brubaker R, Feischmidt M, Fox J, Grancea L (2006) *Nationalist Policy and Everyday Ethnicity in a Transylvanian Town*, Princeton University Press.
- Butler R, Hinch T (1996) *Tourism and Indigenous People*. London: Thomson Press.
- Buzard J (1993) *The Beaten Track*. UK: Clarendon Press.
- Byström G (2014) *Tystnadens Triumf. [The Triumph of Silence]*. Stockholm: Ordfront.
- Cartledge B (2011) *The Will to Survive. A History of Hungary*. London: Hurst & CO.
- Chabra D, Healy R, Sills E (2003) Staged authenticity and heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 30(3) 702-719.
- Chabra D (2008) Positioning museums on an authenticity continuum. *Annals of Tourism Research* 35(2): 427-447.
- Cohen E (1988) Authenticity and commoditization in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 15(3): 371-386.
- Cole S (2007) Beyond authenticity and commodification. *Annals of Tourism Research* 34(4): 943-960.
- Connerton P (2009) *How Modernity Forgets*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Connolly A (2015) *Cultural Heritage Rights* London: Ashgate Publications.
- Davies N (2001) *Heart of Europe. The past in Poland's Present*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- deKadt E (1976) *Tourism - Passport To Development? Perspectives on the Social and Cultural Effects of Tourism in Developing Countries*. UK: Oxford University Press.
- Dodds R, Graci SR, Holmes M (2010) Does the tourist care? A comparison of tourists in Koh Phi Phi, Thailand and Gili Trawangan, Indonesia. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 18(2): 207-222.
- Drakulić S (1992) *How we Survived Communism and Even Laughed*. London: Hutchinson.

- Eskilsson L, Nilsson JH (2010) *Creating cross-border destinations* Scandinavian. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism 10(2):153-172.
- Fieldhouse P (2017) *Food, Feasts, and Faith: An Encyclopedia of Food Culture in World Religions*. ABC-CLIO.
- Gerner K, Karlsson K-G, Hammarlund A (2002) *Nordens Medelhav: Östersjöområdet Som Historia, Myt och Project. [The Nordic Mediterranean Sea: The Baltic Sea Region as History, Myth and Project]*. Stockholm: Natur och kultur.
- Geyzen A (2014) Culinaireverefgoeding in Vlandertussen 1945 en 2000. Eenhistorisch-gastrolinguistischeanalyse [Culinary traditions in Vlandernbetween 1945 to 2000]. *Journal of Belgian History* 44: 241-244.
- Ghermani D (1986) Rumäniens ideologiserde Bevolkerungspolitik [Romania's ideologized population policy]. *Südosteuropa. Zeitschrift für Gegenwartforschung*. No 2/3.
- Goulding C, Domic D (2009) Heritage, Identity and ideological manipulation: The case of Croatia. *Annals of Tourism Research* 36(1): 85-102.
- Greenwood DJ (1989) Culture by the pound: An anthropological perspective on tourism as cultural commoditization. In VJ Smith (ed) *Host and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism* 171–185. Pennsylvania University Press.
- Halewood C, Hannam K (2001) Viking heritage tourism: Authenticity and commodification. *Annals of Tourism Research* 28(3): 565-580.
- Hall CM, Jeong S, Santos CA (2004) Cultural politics and contested place identity. *Annals of Tourism Research* 31(3): 640-656.
- Herlitz G (2007) *Mors DagochEid-il-fitr (Mother's Day and Eid-il-fitr)*. Uppsala: Uppsala Publishing House.
- Innocenti P (2015) *Cultural Network in Migrating Heritage*. London: Ashgate Publishing.
- Jóhannesson G, Huijbens E (2013) Tourism resolving crisis? Exploring Tourism Development in Iceland in the Wake of Economic Recession. In D Müller, L Lundmark, and R Lemelin (eds) *New Issues in Polar Tourism*.
- Johnsson P (2017) *Polen! Quo Vadis? Om Polen i dagens Europa. [Poland! Quo Vadis? On Poland in Contemporary Europe]*. Stockholm: Carlssons.
- Kontler L (2009) *A History of Hungary*. Budapest: Atlantis Publishing House.
- Kornemann E (1963) *Römische Geschichte. [Roman History]*. Stuttgart: Kröner Verlag.
- Lazar I (1996) *Transylvania, a Short History*. Florida: Simon Publications.
- Lendvai P (2014) *Hungarians*. Princeton University Press.
- Lilja A (1998) *Sockrade hjärtan och godissugna spöken. AllaHjärtans Dag och Halloween. [Sweetened hearts and ghosts longing for sweets. All Saints Day and Halloween]*. Uppsala: Språk- ochfolkminnesinstitutet. [Swedish Institute for language and folklore].
- Lindberg K, Johnson R (1997) The economic values of tourism's social impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research* 24(1): 90-116.
- Lukowski J, Zawadski H (2001) *A Concise History of Poland*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Lyngnes S, Sletvold O (2007) *Uses of Viking Heritage in Icelandic and Norwegian Attractions*. Alta: University College of Finnmark.
- MacCannell D (1973) *Staged Authenticity: Arrangements of social space in tourist settings*. *American Journal of Sociology* 79: 589-603.
- Majkut P (2008) The illuminating traveler: Pace, place, maps and territories. In M Itkonen, P Majkut (eds) *The Illuminating Traveller. Expressions of Ineffability of the Sublime*, 55-98.
- Mallows L (2008) *Transylvania*. Bucks: Bradt Travel Guides.

- Marga A, Bocşan N, Păun N (2010) *Universitatea Babeş-Bolyai în imagin. Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană.*
- Massey G, Hodson R, Sekulic D (2003) Nationalism, liberalism and liberal nationalism in post-war Croatia. *Nations and Nationalism* 9(1): 55-82.
- McGregor A (2000) Dynamic texts and tourist gaze: Death, Bones and Buffalo. *Annals of Tourism Research* 27(1): 27-50.
- McIntosh A, Prentice R (1999) Affirming authenticity: Consuming cultural heritage. *Annals of Tourism Research* 26(3): 589-612.
- Michnik A, Ost D (1992) *The Church and the Left*, Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Nagy-Talavera N (2001) *The Green Shirts and the Others: A History of Fascism in Hungary and Romania*. Iasi: Center for Romanian Studies.
- Nilsson PÅ (2012) *Tourist Background and Local Acceptance*. ICTR: University of Akureyri.
- Nilsson PÅ (2013) Centripetal and Centrifugal Forces. A Case Study of Regional Push and Pull Factors for Backmovers. *Journal of Settlements and Spatial Planning* 4(1): 87-94.
- Nilsson PÅ (2015) *Synen på integration i Sverige under 450 år. En berättelse om den konglomerata staten. [The view on integration in Sweden during 450 years. A tale of the conglomerate state]* ISBN 978-91-976574-7-1.
- Nilsson PÅ (2017) The Blind Spot. How three cities in three different countries counteracted the crisis in the 1970s. *Athens Journal of Architecture* 3(2): 151-176.
- Nõtągiewicz R, Hakuła K (2001) *EinGräberfeldmitSteinkreisen der Wielbark-Kultur in Pommern*. [A grave-field with stone rings from Wielbark-Kultur in Pomerania]. Stettin: National museum.
- Nuryanti W (1996) Heritage and postmodern tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 23: 249-260.
- Oii C-S (2007) *Branding Denmark*. Paper presented at the XIth Nordic Symposium for Hospitality and Tourism Research, Copenhagen.
- Palme T (2017) *Historien om Ungern. [History of Hungary]*. Stockholm: Carlssons.
- Palmer A (2005) *Northern Shores: A History of the Baltic Sea and its People*. London: John Murray.
- Palmer AS (2014) *Folk-Etymology*. Denver, Colorado: Haskell House
- Park HY (2010) Heritage Tourism: Emotional journeys into nationhood. *Annals of Tourism Research* 37(1): 116-135.
- Paşcu S, Ladd R (1990) *A History of Transylvania*. New York: Dorset Press.
- Pells R (1997) *Not Like Us. How Europeans Have Loved, Hated and Transformed American Culture Since World War II*. New York: Basic Books.
- Plog SC (1991) *The Psychology of Travel*. New York: Wiley.
- Poria Y, Butler R, Airey D (2003) The core of heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 30(1): 238-254.
- Poria Y, Ashworth G (2009) Heritage Tourism-Current Resource for Conflict. *Annals of Tourism Research* 36(3): 522-525.
- Rehnberg M (1965) *Ljusen På Gravarna och Andra Ljusseder: Nya Traditioner Under 1900-Talet. [Candles on Graves and Other Light Rites: New Traditions During the 20th Century]*. Nordiska Museets handlingar 61. Stockholm: Nordiska Museet.
- Ritzer G, Liska A (1997) McDisneyization and post-tourism. In C Rojek, J Urry (eds) *Touring cultures: Transformations of travel and theory*, 96-109. New York: Routledge.
- Robinson M, Smith M (2006) *Cultural Tourism in a changing World: Politics, Participation and (Re)presentation*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Rockberger N (2006) *The House of Habsburg*. Stockholm: SNS.

- Rogers N (2002) *Halloween: From Pagan Ritual to Party Night*. Oxford University Press.
- Roosen EE (1989) *Creating Ethnicity: The Process of Ethnogenesis*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Russo AP (2002) The “vicious circle” of tourism development in heritage cities. *Annals of Tourism Research* 29(1): 165-182.
- Ryan C, Huyton J (2002) Tourists and aboriginal people. *Annals of Tourism Research* 29(3): 631-64.
- Salter M (2000) *The Rough Guide to Poland*. London: Penguin Books.
- Santino J (2009) Flexible Halloween: Longevity, Appropriation, Multiplicity and Contestation. In M Foley, H O’Donnell (eds) *Treat or Trick? Halloween in a Globalising World*, 10-15. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholar Publishing.
- Selwyn T (1996) *The Tourist Image: Myths and Myth-making in Tourism*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Skog J (2008) *Teens in Finland. All souls day*. USA: Capstone.
- Skott F (2002) *Först ska vi till Blåkulla och sen ska vi till McDonald's. Påsk-käringari Sverige 1850—2000 [First, we are going to Blåkulla [inferno] and then to McDonalds. Easter witches in Sweden 1850-2000]*. Stockholm: Swedish Institute for Dialects and Folklore.
- Skånska Dagbladet (2009). *Lagom läskigt om Alla helgons dag [Moderately frightening about All Saints Day]*. October 16th 2009.
- Snyder T (2004) *The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569-1999*, Yale University Press.
- Stan L, Turcescu L (2007) *Religion and Politics in Post-Communist Romania*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sweeney J (1991) *The Life and Evil Times of Nicolae Ceausescu*. UK: Hutchinson.
- Svenska Kyrkans Utredningar 2015:2.
- Šwięcicki J (2008a) *Polen under nya Stjärnor. [Poland under New Stars]*. International Studies, 1. Swedish Institute of Foreign Affairs, Stockholm.
- Šwięcicki J (2008b) *Katolska Kyrkan och Politiken I Dagens Polen. [The Catholic Church and Politics in Today's Poland]*. International Studies, 4. Swedish Institute of Foreign Affairs, Stockholm.
- Šwięcicki J (2009) *Polen. [Poland]*. SNS, 42, Stockholm.
- Sydsvenska Dagbladet (2009) *Kall Alla helgons dag på Östra Kyrkogården [Chilly All Saint Day at Eastern Cemetery]*. October 31st 2009.
- Taylor AJP (1961) *The Habsburg Monarchy 1809-1918*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Taylor P (2001) Authenticity in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 28(1): 7-26.
- Thompson EA (1948) *A History of Attila and the Huns*. UK: Clarendon Press.
- Timothy D, Boyd S (2003) *Culture Heritage*. London: Longman.
- Toland J (2003) *The Last Hundred Days*. New York: Modern Library.
- Towner J (1985) The Grand Tour: a key phase in the history of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 12(3): 297-333.
- Tunbridge J & Ashworth G (1996) *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. New York: Wiley.
- Turner L, Ash J (1976) *The Golden Hordes: International Tourism and the Pleasure Periphery*. London: **St. Martin's Press**.
- Urry J (1990) *The Tourist Gaze*. London: Sage.
- Urry J (2001) *Sociology beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-first Century*. London, Routledge.
- Walsh K (1992) *The Representation of the Past. Museums and Heritage in the Post-Modern World*. London: Routledge.
- Wang N (1999) Rethinking authenticity in tourism experience. *Annals of Tourism*

- Research* 26(2): 349-370.
- Weaver DB (2011) *Contemporary tourism heritage as heritage tourism*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 38(1): 249–267.
- Varga EA (1999) *Hungarians in Transylvania between 1870 and 1995*. Budapest: Teleki László Foundation.
- Verdery K (1983) *Transylvanian Villagers: Three Centuries of Political, Economic, and Ethnic Change*. University of California Press.
- Wheeler M (1955) *Rome Beyond the Imperial Frontiers*. London: Pelican books.
- Whitehead C, Lloyd K, Eckersley S, Mason R (2015) *Museums, Migration and Identity in Europe* London: Ashgate Publications.
- Wight AC, Lennon JJ (2007) Selective interpretation and eclectic human heritage in Lithuania. *Tourism Management* 28(2): 519-529.
- Wołagiewicz R (1977) *Kręgi kamiennie w Grzybnicy*. [Stone Circles in Grzybnica]. Szczecin: National Museum.
- Yang L, Wall G (2009) Ethnic tourism: A framework and an application. *Tourism Management* 30: 559-570.
- Zan L, Bonini S, Lusiani M, Shoup D, Ferri P, Onofri F (2015) *Managing Cultural Heritage* London: Ashgate Publications.
- Zamoyski A (2005) *The Polish Way: A Thousand-Year History of the Poles and Their Culture*. New York: Hippocrene Books.