

## Festival through the Optics of Folklorism and Heritage Tourism Case-study of the *Country Wedding in Ljubljana*

Saša Poljak Istenič

### 1. Introduction

Since the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the heritage has been the basis of tourist movement, although the comprehension of heritage changed in time, along with its use and misuse.<sup>1</sup> Following the industrial revolution, this period can be portrayed as „the destruction of the past”<sup>2</sup>. The industrialization drastically changed lifestyles and caused a gradual disappearance of traditional cultural elements. Technological innovations, radical modernization, mass migrations, and the extension of life contributed to the feelings of uncertainty people have been experiencing.<sup>3</sup> These processes strongly influenced the relationship towards heritage. They provoked romantic, sentimental and nostalgic feeling about heritage and „a new awareness that seeks to find novel ways to communicate with the past”<sup>4</sup>.

In the middle of the 1960's, almost three decades before heritage became – as Palmer puts it – a „buzz” word<sup>5</sup>, the biggest annual festival in Slovenia, the *Country Wedding in Ljubljana*, used traditional heritage elements to promote Slovenia as an attractive tourist destination. Although the so-called „country weddings” were already performed at folklore festivals between the two world wars, none of them reached the popularity of the festival in Ljubljana. The festival – which was initially called *Kmečka ohcet* (*Peasant Wedding*), later renamed *Ohcet v Ljubljani* (*Wedding in Ljubljana*, but publicized as *The Country Wedding in Ljubljana*) – was organized in the capital of Slovenia, in Ljubljana, between 1965 and 1990. In the course of twenty-five years, more than 300 wedding couples from most of the European countries, America, Africa and Asia exchanged their vows according to „old manners and customs”. The festival received a wide popularity among Slovenes as well as tourists; in 1980's, there was approximately 2.000–3.000 participants and members of folklore groups dressed in national costumes and more than 100.000 spectators each year.

On the basis of a case-study of this festival, the article examines how the festival was used to promote tourism and what was the image of Slovenia presented at the festival; it focuses on the interpretation of cultural heritage and analyses what kind of heritage was appropriated and adapted for creating a distinctive sense of Slovene nationhood; it illustrates how tourist materials and some activities reflected socialist ideology; and examines the influence of the festival among Slovenes living abroad and on tourist development of the country.

## 2. Theoretical and Methodological Framework

The analysis of the *Country Wedding in Ljubljana* is made through the optics of two strongly related phenomena: folklorism and heritage tourism.

### 2.1 Folklorism

According to Bendix's research<sup>6</sup>, the word *folklorism* was for the first time used in 1930's and 1940's by French ethnologist A. Marinus when he described „neo-folklorisme” as a new theoretical orientation toward expressive culture.<sup>7</sup> German folklorists quote Heintz to be the first to use the term in 1958.<sup>8</sup> The term is frequently used in German-speaking and Slavic countries since Hans Moser launched the concept in 1962 suggesting that it should mark the evidence of the use of folklore.<sup>9</sup> As „second-hand folklore”<sup>10</sup>, the phenomenon indicates a growing interest in things „folk” and all its derivations in life, especially when these derivations disappear. At the same time, people are not willing to preserve the disappearing derivations or, when they are revived, accept them in authentic form, but only adapted to their own interests.<sup>11</sup> These interests are influenced either by the nostalgia for abandoned environment or by profit. A decade before Moser, Richard Dorson in the USA introduced a similar concept named *fakelore* denoting spurious folk material.<sup>12</sup>

Polish ethnologist Józef Burszta points out the following characteristics of folklorism:

1. Only several elements – becoming attractive because of their artistic form or emotional content – are chosen from traditional culture.
2. These elements are rarely presented in their authentic form; they are rather recast to meet the aesthetic, practical or other needs, especially in tourism.
3. They are transferred from their authentic environment, often separated from their holders and presented only in chosen situations.<sup>13</sup>

In the article, I attempt to evaluate the festival through the concept of folklorism, especially according to the characteristics listed by Burszta. A present romantic and nostalgic notion of heritage, which has been labelled folklorism, certainly prevails in Slovene tourism, but is not new. Its roots are in the concept of tourism before the Second World War that corresponds to the first presentations of „country weddings” at different folklore festivals. Such „weddings” in Laško, Bohinj, Semič, and in some other towns, are still very popular, but none of them are as well-known as the *Country Wedding in Ljubljana* – even fifteen years after its discontinuation.

## 2.2 Heritage Tourism

In recent years, heritage tourism has gained increasing attention and a number of researchers developed different definitions of this phenomenon. If we sum them up, we can define it as a subgroup of tourism, based either on the historic attributes of a site or an attraction, or on tourists’ motivations and perceptions.<sup>14</sup> We can certainly conclude that the relationship between heritage and tourism is very complex and can be seen as a dichotomy between tradition and modernity: while heritage is, owing to its role as a carrier of historical values from the past, viewed as part of society’s cultural tradition, the concept of tourism is a form of modern consciousness, its fundamental nature is dynamic and its interaction with heritage often results in a reinterpretation of the latter. In addition, tradition implies stability and continuity whereas tourism involves change.<sup>15</sup>

In the article, special attention is given to the analysis of the use of heritage for tourist purposes, which is, at least in Slovenia, one of the most often discussed phenomena of folklorism. Equally thoroughly examined is the role that heritage tourism has in the construction and maintenance of national identity since it used some of the historic symbols of the nation as a means of attracting tourists.

## 2.3 Construction of the Article and Principal Hypotheses

The analysis of the *Country Wedding in Ljubljana* is based on archival sources, newspaper articles, photographs, video films, and interviews with its organizers as well as its participants. The festival is first analysed as a means of tourist promotion of Slovenia. After discussing the idea for and the development of the festival I examine the image of Slovenia as presented to the tourists. I use Goffman’s dichotomy of „front” and „back”

regions, which was brought into tourist studies by MacCannell when discussing the impact of the foreign couples' experience of both regions on their opinion about the image of Slovenia created by the festival's organizers. I also present the relationship towards the presentation of the country expressed in the interviews with the organizers and Slovene participants of the festival. Based on some of the ideas in Palmer's article „Tourism and the Symbols of Identity” I try to evaluate why the images of Slovenia and of its „way of life” were so successfully used in the promotion of Slovenia as a tourist destination.

Next, I analyse the interpretation and the use of cultural heritage at the festival. Besides applying the concept of folklorism to the analysis of heritage interpretation, I also borrowed the ideas from the article „Staged Authenticity and Heritage Tourism” written by Chhabra, Healy, and Sills when focusing on the displacement and modification of cultural heritage. The analysis tries to evaluate to what extent the heritage was displaced and modified to meet what were supposed to be tourists' needs and desires. Special attention is also given to the rearrangement of cultural heritage, e.g. customs and national costumes, to present Slovene national identity.

Inspired by Palmer's findings of heritage tourism as a force in the construction and maintenance of a national identity, I borrow Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett's idea of a festival as the alternative of museum exhibitions, in which presented/performed material had been „severed from their local and ceremonial settings and reclassified as art”, and at the same time „the proprietary rights to the material have been transferred from local areas to the 'nation', where regional forms are declared national heritage”<sup>16</sup>. By analysing the available data an attempt is made to illustrate how by translating local/regional into national characteristics the *Wedding's* organizers postulated a national (Slovene) identity; I also tried to discover what role heritage tourism played in the presentation of Slovene national identity.

The analysis of the tourist flyers on the *Country Wedding in Ljubljana*, written in the manner of socialist rhetoric, indicates the promotion of Slovene economy, science and culture. The paper discusses how the organizers unintentionally promoted the socialist system in Yugoslavia while presenting the economic achievements. They brought together different couples from different countries in the spirit of brotherhood and unity. I especially focus on the promotion of economic efficiency of the Yugoslav socialist system and analyse how the idea of brotherhood and unity was put into practice.

Finally, I look at the echoes of the festival among Slovenes living abroad. With the example of the case-study of the *Slovenian Country Style Wedding*, organized by Slovene immigrants in Australia, I examine the influence that the idea of the festival had on expressing national/ethnic identity outside the country. At the end of the article, an attempt is made to evaluate the influence of the festival on different aspects of Slovene tourist development, and to point out positive and negative aspects of the festival.

### *3. Festival as a Means of Tourist Promotion*

#### *3.1 The Idea for and the Development of the Festival*

The idea for these „folklore/tourist” events, as they had been named, arose during the preparation for an international hockey championship in Ljubljana whose organizers felt that such a sporting event should be accompanied by a large folklore festival for tourist purposes. The first, still experimental, *Wedding* was organized in October 1965. The groom and the bride were both tourist workers.

A year later, the organizational committee swelled considerably. It included representatives of the founding organizations, who contacted Yugoslav tourist representatives in Stockholm. The wedding couple that represented Slovenia was chosen with the help of 'Dnevnik', one of the main Slovene daily newspapers. It published the pictures and the most interesting data of each couple who applied for the *Wedding*. The readers voted for their favourites; in later years, a public event was organized where the couples had to compete and demonstrate different skills and activities (i.e. preparing food, singing, etc.). The 'Ekspressen', a Stockholm newspaper, publicized a similar competition for wedding candidates, and a bride and a groom-to-be who would represent their country were chosen by readers' votes out of two hundred candidates. The event thus acquired an international character. It was estimated that the second *Wedding* drew approximately 50.000 spectators.

The Yugoslav Radio-Television Network first transmitted the festival in 1967. Aside from a couple from Slovenia, there were five wedding couples from abroad, all of whom had been selected by their local papers: from Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Italy and Sweden. The 'Ekspressen' called the *Wedding* a „tourist folklore event of European standing”<sup>17</sup>. It drew a crowd of approximately 70.000. The following year the number increased to 80.000 spectators, all of whom had come to watch twelve prospective newlyweds (coming also from Denmark, the Netherlands and Tunisia) take their

vows. For the first time, there were also couples from other Yugoslav republics, this time from Croatia and Serbia. The event was widely covered by the media: the Yugoslav Radio-Television Network broadcasted an hour-long documentary programme to sixteen countries. Aside from numerous photographers and journalists, television and radio commentators and camera crews (even a film crew from Buenos Aires) there were as many as 141 accredited journalists.



Wedding procession through the centre of Ljubljana at the 1969 Peasant Wedding (photo: Institute of Slovene Ethnology archives).

Each year, the *Wedding* included more wedding couples (especially those from other Yugoslav republics), became longer and featured more activities, and therefore attracted an even larger crowd. But when in 1975 the *Wedding* coincided with the Yugoslav national holiday, also called the Youth Day, Ljubljana civic authorities wished to ban it even though the wedding couples had already been selected.<sup>18</sup> Considering the importance of this national holiday, it was clear that the state and local authorities did not wish to allow the *Wedding* to turn the public's attention from the activities honouring Tito's birthday. Anyhow, by stressing the fact that the event celebrated youth the organizers somehow managed to persuade the authorities to allow the festival to take place, but without any activities that would happen in the open-air.

Due to increasing critical observations about its concept and financial requirements, as well as an unfavourable attitude of certain politicians, the event was discontinued after 1975, only to be resurrected four years later. Though under a different name, it still focused on the predominantly „farming” aspects of the custom.<sup>19</sup> The new name, *Ohcet v Ljubljani* (*Wedding in Ljubljana*, in English publicized as *Country Wedding*

in *Ljubljana*), was justified by the organizers by its different concept: „It was felt that the entire event should focus on old manners and customs as well as modern cultural concepts. A number of cultural and entertaining events were to take place in the week before the final wedding procession and the *Wedding's* conclusion. The *Wedding's* organizational committee agreed that every year the entire event would depict the manners and customs from a different Slovene region. The new name was therefore better suited for this purpose”<sup>20</sup>.

The new, „modernized” version of the *Wedding* can be divided into two parts. One represented events that had been based on folk traditions and were to take place in their original setting, for instance the transportation of the dowry; these events were performed by local inhabitants while the wedding couples and journalists were there only as spectators. The second part consisted of different „folklore, especially music events of tourist nature”<sup>21</sup> such as exhibits, promenade concerts, concerts of folk music, performances of folk dance groups, or sale of souvenirs and crafts products. Each year's wedding couples actively participated in some of these events, for instance in the bachelor's party, the wedding procession through the centre of *Ljubljana* and at the wedding party.



The presentation of traditions from Prekmurje region at the 1979 Country Wedding (photo: Institute of Slovene Ethnology archives).

Due to its new concept the 1979 *Wedding* was organized according to traditions from the Prekmurje region (in northeast Slovenia) and „with the participation of local culture associations, folklore groups, souvenir makers and the like”<sup>22</sup>. One part of the event, the so-called wedding journey, took place in Gornja Radgona, a town in Prekmurje, whereas in *Ljubljana* there was an exhibit of artists from this

region. In 1980, when the Lipica Stud Farm from the Primorje region celebrated its 400<sup>th</sup> anniversary, the *Wedding* was organized in the spirit of traditions from Primorje. There was an evening of folk singers and folk musicians – members of Slovene minority living in Primorje region in Italy, and certain events in towns along the littoral part of

Slovenia; among them were a special event in Lipica, a bachelor's party in Portorož, and a meeting of the wedding couples with Slovenes living in Rupingrande – Veliki Repen in Italy.

Despite the interruption the *Wedding* continued to receive a wide popularity among Slovenes as well as tourists. It was estimated that in 1979 the „wedding and folklore procession around Ljubljana” with over 2.000 participants dressed in national costumes and accompanied by local and foreign folk dance groups was seen by more than 100.000 spectators, many of whom had come from abroad (Germany, Italy, France, Spain, the Netherlands, Denmark). Yet the organizers felt that the *Wedding* was poorly covered by the media and too often criticized for excessive expenses instead of being given recognition for its „popularisation of Slovene national customs, Slovenia and Yugoslavia.”<sup>23</sup>

The *Wedding*'s popularity reached its peak in mid-1980's. There were as many as twenty-four wedding couples with 2,500 to 3.000 people in national costumes participating in the wedding procession, and a crowd of over 100.000. More than a hundred journalists, mostly foreign, covered the whole event. But despite the new concept the festival „slowly became less attractive and, during its final years, attracted fewer and fewer spectators”<sup>24</sup>. The last *Wedding* was organized in 1990. In 1991, Slovenia seceded from Yugoslavia and became an independent country. Because of the following war and a lack of funds, the *Wedding* was discontinued. This decision had also been influenced by the opinion of ethnological experts who – in accordance with the recommendation of UNESCO – pointed out that heritage should be recreated and presented in its original environment.

### *3.2 Image of Slovenia as Presented to Tourists*

Since the tourist materials described the festival as „folklore/tourist” event and the organizers claimed that the main purpose of the festival was tourist promotion of Slovenia, it is important to analyse how the country was presented to the tourists.

In the context of ethnic tourism, when dealing with arrangements of tourist settings and adjustment of heritage in order to suit the tourists, MacCannell implanted Erving Goffman's concept of „front” and „back” regions into tourist studies. MacCannell describes tourist settings as six stages spreading from „front” region to „back” region, where stages 1-3 refer to „front” regions and present different arrangements of social

space in order to deceive the tourists who are looking for authentic experience, and stages 4-6 referring to „back” regions and presenting the social space usually closed for tourists and inspiring their curiosity.<sup>25</sup>

The selected wedding couples had a double role: they were simultaneously festival performers, and also tourists. Performing at the „front” regions, they were also living in the „back” regions of the festival; but as tourists, they were again mostly sightseeing the „front” regions. Talking about the image of Slovenia they had obtained at the *Wedding*, two grooms from Austria (who participated at 1983 and 1990 *Weddings*) made a comment that the *Wedding* was based only on folklore and depicted Slovenia in an extremely biased manner.

One groom, married in 1983, stated, „Yugoslavia promoted itself as if the *Wedding* had been a kind of special event in Slovenia ... I am aware that this was a tourist promotion ... They showed attractive places to journalists and for a whole week we had been driven through a variety of interesting landscapes. Now, I know that this was a way for Slovenia to become recognized and popular abroad, that it was important. However, I was a little annoyed – as if this was an extremely interesting event for the whole of Europe as well as elsewhere ... I think the promotion was too narrow. If Slovenia had used the *Wedding* in order to show something different, and not just its folklore, I would have been more satisfied. For example, we went for Kamniška planina where some farming women made butter and cheese for us while two accordion players provided the musical background. Everything was happening on this level. For the whole week, wherever we went, to Kranjska Gora or to Bled, we had to wear our national costumes; there was only folklore and nothing else.. In addition to this, he stressed that they had observed a large folklore event at the Ljubljana principal outdoor market, a similar event at the Cankarjev dom congress centre, and another folklore show at the Tivoli Hall where they had the wedding dinner. He pointed out that the only thing he remembers are folklore events and numerous stands with food, drinks, and arts and crafts. „This is not enough [for tourist promotion]. If you limit yourself only to that, you give the impression of a ‘folklorized’ country, even to the tourists from abroad, and the creation of such image is really not necessary for Slovenia and the image that it wants to promote abroad.”

The other groom from Austria (married in 1990) also felt that the village lifestyle and the customs connected with it were unduly glorified. Similar was the opinion of Slovene ethnologist Naško Križnar, who in the 1980's wrote that „from the beginning

of the 20<sup>th</sup> century Ljubljana, the capital of Slovenia, has been trying to win European acclaim by organizing a *Peasant Wedding*(!)<sup>26</sup>.

But on the other hand, neither the organizers nor the Slovene participants I had interviewed were critical about the image of the country presented through the *Wedding*. They all felt that there was nothing wrong with the fact that the festival depicted Slovenia as an agricultural country filled with folklore customs. As stated by a spokesman for the Ljubljana Tourist Association and the main organizer at the time: „Thank god that the tourists did not receive an impression of Slovenia as an industrial country ... instead, they beheld its still unspoiled countryside and people willing to depict its customs.” According to the bride at the 1968 *Peasant Wedding*, people raved about the „homeliness” of the *Wedding* in the period of developing industry and were glad that the *Wedding* made it possible for Ljubljana to open up to contacts with the countryside.



The brides competing in raking hay at the bachelorette's party, 1974 (photo: Institute of Slovene Ethnology archives).

the country revealed a past that people could have recognized as theirs. That is the reason why heritage tourism can be seen as timeless and as a potential to unite people. Representing a lifestyle „perceived to have been better, more fulfilling and community-driven”<sup>28</sup> is one of the reasons why the festival was so successful among Slovenes, while nationality had been used as „one of the principle colourings” of the foreign tourists visions.<sup>29</sup>

The situation was similar to what Samuel found out about England: tourism industry marketed a particular version of Slovenia – as the country was „... caught in a time-warp and people comport themselves as a folk”<sup>27</sup>. In the case of the *Country Wedding in Ljubljana*, segments of heritage, especially folklore elements, became the means of attracting visitors.

The presented images of

#### 4. *The Interpretation and Use of Cultural Heritage*

##### 4.1 *The Interpretation of Cultural Heritage*

Slovene ethnologist Janez Bogataj points out that the festival created the opportunity „to isolate many cultural elements from its natural milieu, only to be artificially reconstructed, either by representation or else by theatrical re-enactment, in the street, on wagons and stages ... [But] these elements were not part of cultural continuity, or a revived historical segment of urban life-style”<sup>30</sup>.

There was no authentic „Slovenian peasant/country wedding” in the past, and there had been no country wedding taking place in the Slovene capital in the past. Only several elements – which were perceived as attractive because of their artistic form or emotional content – were chosen from traditional culture. It is the process József Burszta defines as a characteristic of folklorism.<sup>31</sup> The Ljubljana *Country Wedding* festival was a construct of different segments of social, spiritual and material heritage from different rural parts of Slovenia. Rural manners and customs were namely transplanted to an urban milieu that had no direct connection to them. According to Burszta, this is the second characteristic of folklorism: the elements from traditional culture are transferred from their authentic environment, often separated from their holders, and presented only in chosen situations.<sup>32</sup> The event, however attractive for non-discriminating spectators, was namely based on folklore and disputable interpretation of cultural heritage.

For instance, one of the unusual interpretations of cultural heritage, where heritage was transplanted from rural to urban surroundings, was the traditional village custom of the so-called ‘vasovanje’ (village courting), when young single men climbed a ladder under their sweetheart’s window. In urban Ljubljana, where the brides stayed in a hotel, this manner was reconstructed with a hook ladder leaning against brides’ windows. (In 1968, one uninitiated bride ran from her hotel room screaming because she had mistaken her courting visitor for a burglar.) And this corresponds to the third characteristic of the folklorism: traditional elements are rarely presented in their authentic form; they are rather modified to meet the aesthetic, practical, or other needs, especially in tourism.<sup>33</sup>

This is also the crucial finding of Chhabra et al. (2003)<sup>34</sup>. They pointed out that nowadays folklore events and cultural products are displaced and modified to fit new conditions of time and space. In the case of the *Country Wedding in Ljubljana*, cultural products and social spaces were rearranged to correspond to the farming concept of



Rearrangement of the location for demonstrations of skills – a competition in sawing at the bachelor's party in Preddvor, 1972 (photo: Institute of Slovene Ethnology archives)

the festival, and to what were presumably tourists' needs and desires. For example, the wedding couple and the people participating in the parade wore national costumes (or their equivalents), the craftsmen were selling hand-made traditional products transformed mainly into souvenirs, and some urban locations were rearranged to become suitable for presentations of farming chores (e.g. threshing, etc.).

Despite the recommendation of UNESCO and the advice of professionals that heritage should be recreated and presented in its original environment, traditional cultural elements presented at the festival had been transported from their original environment to the place of greater tourist attraction and capacity. In the first period (from 1965-1975), when the event was still called the *Peasant Wedding*, certain cultural elements had been transported from their original environment to the wholly urban Slovene capital. In the second period (from 1979-1990), the elements were transported within the same geographical and cultural region, and presented at the wedding procession in Ljubljana.

Different, more or less organized groups of people interested in the preservation of Slovene cultural heritage – folklore dance groups, groups displaying Slovene national costumes, craftsmen producing traditional Slovene crafts or souvenirs, tourist associations, village communities, and farming women's associations – were invited to organize different events during the festival. Although all of them depicted or re-enacted segments of traditional rural culture, they focused on those that were artistically or emotionally more attractive for tourists, for instance folk dances and music, national costumes, wedding customs and traditional food. Although the *Wedding's* organizers tried to depict regional customs by employing local participants, due to the tourist nature of the event did not succeed to create an authentic impression. For example, when a wedding reception according to local customs was organized on one farm, the BBC television crew believed that the customs were performed by professional actors.

#### 4.2 Presentation of Slovene Identity through „National” Heritage

According to Palmer, heritage tourism „is a powerful force in the construction and maintenance of a national identity because it relies upon the historic symbols of the nation as the means of attracting tourists. Thus, the tourism industry, through its use of »our heritage«, becomes yet another means by which contemporary concepts of nation-ness are defined. Such a position has implications for the way in which sites are managed and promoted”<sup>35</sup>.

Despite the fact that national identity is not formed only through history and heritage, the tourism industry has been the most often criticized for selecting and promoting certain aspects of the past or heritage<sup>36</sup> as if they were „a unified phenomenon representative of *the nation*”<sup>37</sup>. Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett also points out that it is often the case of different festivals that „the proprietary rights to the [performed] material have been transferred from local areas to the ‘nation’, where regional forms are declared national heritage”<sup>38</sup>. This process can be marked as folklorism; according to Stanonik (referring to Bausinger, Burszta, Kumer and Moser), folklorism against a large geographical unit is the means of differentiation, while against a small unit it is the means of integration. If standardization and universalization are on the one hand typical of folklorism, it, on the other hand, revived regionalism. But exactly with stressing these characteristics it becomes folklorism, because it uproots distinctive elements of a country from their regional dependence and offers them to consumers as picturesque scenery.<sup>39</sup>

In order to make the event more attractive for tourists in the first period of the festival (1965–1975) the organizers included the most interesting and colourful Slovene customs regardless of their origin. Even though the ‘Dnevnik’ newspaper, which was and still is one of the most prominent dailies in Ljubljana, printed a special issue with explanations of the original elements of the customs depicted at the *Wedding*, as well as of their variants, the fact remains that they had been selected according to their attractiveness and spectacular elements and presented as „Slovene” national customs. In the second period (1979–1990), the organizers transformed the selection of certain local customs and habits into the presentation of „regional” customs and habits, while at the same time maintaining that the *Wedding* in Ljubljana was „the final manifestation, a parade of different Slovene characteristics in general,” which, according to them, were „the heritage of marriage customs and manners in different forms, and from different parts of Slovenia”<sup>40</sup>.

Only in rare instances were the events incorporated into the *Wedding* the result of a professional reconstruction of actual customs in a given location; one of them was dowry transportation in Mekinje by Kamnik, reconstructed on the basis of a study by ethnologist Marjanca Klobčar. Local customs were most often explained as variants of some general Slovene culture, thereby reinforcing a stereotype of „truly Slovene”. A booklet printed for one of the *Weddings* explains that „the Wedding in Ljubljana is inspired by an invaluable source of customs and manners of Slovene folk heritage and should therefore be viewed as one of the most prominent events organized in Ljubljana. For older generations, this preservation of the way of life in the past is an opportunity that reawakens pleasant memories while the young learn about their folk heritage and original folklore that represent the basis of Slovene cultural heritage; this, on the other hand, is also a good opportunity for numerous foreign guests and tourists to learn about our cultural wealth and diversity”<sup>41</sup>.

A similar process of translating local/regional into Slovene national characteristics took place in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The nationally conscious Slovene middle class

had chosen a Sunday dress of farmers living in the vicinity of Bled, a famous tourist resort in the Gorenjska region, had embellished it a bit, and started wearing it on special occasions. The dress, called the „national costume”, was supposed to express an appurtenance to the Slovene national cultural tradition and to the Slovene „nation”. A national costume was the most visible sign of Slovene national identity at the *Country Wedding* festival in Ljubljana. In 1980's, 2,500 to 3,000 people in national costumes participated in the wedding procession. According to organizers of the *Wedding* the festival reawakened an interest in national costumes. Many people in Slovenia brought out in the open their old costumes, or bought new ones, in order to participate in the wedding procession through Ljubljana. The festival also initiated the origin of new folk dance groups from local inhabitants who provided themselves national costumes.<sup>42</sup>



The couple in „Slovene national costume” at the 1971 Peasant Wedding (photo: Institute of Slovene Ethnology archives).

It is interesting that the festival also served as a presentation of Slovene national identity in view of the idea of brotherhood and unity of all the people and nations in Yugoslavia. As we have seen, heritage (e.g. national costumes, dances, customs) provided an almost „inexhaustible supply of material”<sup>43</sup> which was appropriated and adapted to express Slovene national identity. Tourism served to define Slovene cultural identity, and made it visible to themselves and foreigners (Yugoslavs and tourists or participants from foreign countries). As Palmer points out, „cultural identity underpins national identity as it communicates the past and present traditions and mores of a people, thus enabling them to be identified as a distinctive group.” In her point of view, despite the fact that the images of tourism may have very little to do with the „real” lives of the people, or with how the people themselves understand their national identity, they may be selected just to enable tourists to recognize a nation and may not have been meant to represent how the local people actually see themselves in the present century. Actually, „heritage tourism is ... more representative of who we were than it is of who we are”<sup>44</sup>.

### 5. Reflections of Socialist Ideology

Despite the organizers' claims that they had no intention to promote the Yugoslav socialist system, the analysis of the tourist flyers on the *Country Wedding in Ljubljana* shows that they were not entirely able to avoid the promotion of ideology. Promotional materials were written in a manner of socialist rhetoric and exposed the idea of brotherhood and unity, economic achievements and prosperity of science and culture. A good example is the flyer on the 1985 *Wedding*: „Ljubljana – the capital of the Socialist Republic Slovenia – continues to strengthen and expand its ties with different parts of the world. An increasingly larger proportion of its production is gaining affirmation in the world market. Achievements of our scientific institutions are also respected beyond our borders, and many international companies have chosen Ljubljana for their activities. The voice about numerous events organized in Ljubljana has spread abroad; let us just mention the International Graphic Biennial, an international fair of electronics, wine and timber industry, cultural events of the Ljubljana Summer Festival and, aside from many others, the Wedding in Ljubljana. The Cankarjev dom and its congress tourism have become a part of the Ljubljana life-style, and the door of this cultural and congress centre always stands widely open to cultural achievements of our nations and nationalities as well as to cultural events from abroad. Ljubljana is also a city in which members of not only Slovene, but also of all other Yugoslav nations and nationalities work and create in unity and equality. This is a town of brotherhood and

unity in which each and every friend of ours feels, and shall continue to do so, very much at home – free, in a democratic and humanistic atmosphere that has been created by its working people and citizens in the spirit of socialist self-management”<sup>45</sup>.

According to the main organizer of the festival, foreign tourists actually admired the spirit of the „free”, „domestic” and „humanistic” atmosphere as promoted in the 1985 flyer. While visiting Slovenia/Yugoslavia, they had been expecting to find a firm socialist regime, but were instead able „to see that Slovenes could also rejoice and party. They could see that Yugoslavia was an open country.” As stated by participants of the festival, the wedding couples coming from the countries of the Eastern Bloc were extremely surprised to find that the Yugoslav form of socialism was so very different from the Russian model.

### *5.1 Presentation of Economic Efficiency of Yugoslav Socialist System*

The festival was financed mostly by sponsors, the biggest of which was Pivovarna Union (Union Brewery). Hotels in Ljubljana offered accommodation for wedding couples and (except for the last few years) journalists free of charge and some seaside tourist companies provided facilities for wedding couples’ honeymoon. Other sponsors were usually other successful Slovene companies. Many of them donated their products to wedding couples, for instance bedroom furniture and household appliances to Slovene, and some smaller gifts and also the wedding rings to all the couples. For many years the Dom Company presented each wedding couple with a cradle. In 1968 the Maribor Textile factory donated a set of clothes identical to those that it had been exporting to Sweden for some time, to the Swedish bride. Such gifts enabled foreign visitors to form a favourable impression of the development of Slovene economy; in this manner, the *Wedding* also represented a promotion of socialism as a progressive, successful political system.

During some of the years in which the Union Brewery was the main sponsor the wedding couples were taken for a tour through its highly modernized plant. According to the employee at the Ljubljana Tourist Association at the time, „our economy was very well represented by the Brewery. The Brewery also has its own museum, which indicates a certain degree of cultural sophistication.” By that time, the Union Brewery had also received several prominent commendations for its work that could be displayed and were a source of considerable pride. On top of that – according to the opinion of a spokesman for the Ljubljana Tourist Association and the main organizer at the time

– the wedding couples, journalists and other invited guests were also tourists, and as such were able to sample its beer and pass along the word about its quality. Visits to the Slovenijavino winemaking company, or to a wine cellar, served the same objective.

One of the events at the *Wedding* was also the crafts fair, which was initially organized in Ljubljana as part of the *Wedding* festivities. In postwar years department stores could not buy products directly from their makers, and private enterprise was relatively undeveloped. The *Wedding* presented a unique opportunity for the craftsmen to publicly display their ware on the streets of Ljubljana. On the other hand, the crafts fair was another opportunity to illustrate the Yugoslav political system that, when compared to the one in Russia and in Russian satellites, was quite liberal. And since the craftsmen were selling products not available in stores this attracted customers. Some of the craftsmen, for instance a glassblower and a candle maker, later opened their own stores in downtown Ljubljana.



Makers of wooden ware from Ribnica participating in the wedding procession at the 1979 Country Wedding (photo: Institute of Slovene Ethnology archives).

## 5.2 Putting the Idea of Brotherhood and Unity into Practice

From its very beginning, the *Wedding* also aspired to political objectives: it was a vehicle for preserving the contacts with befriended cities and in this way embodied the idea of brotherhood among the states and nations. Wedding couples from befriended cities were invited to the *Wedding*, often accompanied by the mayor or by other prominent civic officials who were then scheduled to meet with the mayor of Ljubljana. According to an employee of the Ljubljana Tourist Association and chairman of the *Wedding's* organizational committee for many years, the *Wedding* also initiated economic cooperation between Ljubljana and for example Chengdu in China. Then there were

some visitors from Parma, Italy, who were companions to the Italian wedding couple. They were so thrilled at seeing Slovene butchers roast an ox in the middle of a street that the whole party of butchers was invited to roast an ox at one of their public events. Contacts were also forged between different folk dance groups who visited each other afterwards or gave performances in each other's towns.



Image of brotherhood and unity – grooms at the bachelor's party in Medno, 1969 (photo: Institute of Slovene Ethnology archives).

*Wedding* organized a special club for those who had gotten married at the Ljubljana event. One of such clubs was in Bratislava in Slovakia. The *Wedding* couples often visited each other, especially those who acted as best man and bridesmaid to one another. Organizers often tried to combine couples from the countries that were not in good relations, for instance the couple from the U.S.A and the one from Russian Georgia. These efforts can also be seen as putting the idea of brotherhood and unity into practice.

Since one of the most important Yugoslav national holidays was the celebration of President Tito's birthday on the 25<sup>th</sup> of May, the so-called Youth day, the festival was also consistent with the Yugoslav socialist ideology. The *Wedding* was a good opportunity for the young to meet and socialize with peers. According to the main organizer, some towns whose wedding couples regularly participated in the

## 6. Echoes and Impact of the Festival

### 6.1 Slovenian Country Style Wedding in Australia

The reason why people are differentiated on the basis of the most attractive and effective phenomena in nation's history and tradition is, in Burszta's opinion, the contradiction to the process of cosmopolitanisation of world culture. To avoid uniformity of cultures, folklore elements in this process are attributed a great applied value<sup>46</sup>. The use of folklore elements to express national/ethnic identity is probably even more frequent

among national minorities and emigrant groups than in the homeland. The case-study of *Slovenian Country Style Wedding* in Australia, based on the notes in the Anthology of Australian Slovenes, shows which segments of heritage were chosen to present „Slovene” culture and gives the impression of the influence the idea of the *Country Wedding in Ljubljana* had on expressing national/ethnic identity outside the homeland.

Wollongong is an industrial town on Australian Pacific coast with a number of immigrants from former Yugoslavia (although the least from Slovenia). They settled there mostly in the 1950's and the 1960's. The first Slovene society, Danica, was founded in 1953 when approximately 500 Slovenes were living in the area; 200 of them became members of the society. But the membership shortly decreased and in 1969 the society was terminated. A year later, a new society called Planica was founded which, among other activities, organized two country weddings; they were the adaptations of the famous *Country Wedding in Ljubljana*. The *Weddings*, of course more modest than in Ljubljana, were a great – organizational and financial – achievement for such a small society, and an „extraordinarily interesting novelty for Wollongong, a nice, but culturally a rather boring town”<sup>47</sup>.

Two couples got married at the first country wedding in Australia, which was named the *Slovenian Country Style Wedding*, and which took place on the 4<sup>th</sup> of April 1975. One couple belonged to the Slovene community in Wollongong; the other one was Australian – the bride came from the surroundings of Wollongong and the groom from Tasmania (but with a Slovene surname). The Slovene couple went on their honeymoon to Yugoslavia as the guests of the JAT (Yugoslav Airline Company), which just then established a regular airline between Belgrade and Sydney.<sup>48</sup>

The wedding ceremony was divided into two parts: a parade on the main street of Wollongong with the *šranga* – a custom when the groom, if he is not from the same village as the bride, has to pay a compensation to the unmarried local boys so they allow him to take the bride to his home and out of her village – and the wedding ceremony with the reception and banquet in the town hall. Among other things, the parade included an ironworks brass orchestra, the Australian-Slovene Alpine orchestra Šernek, horsemen, some of which were dressed in Slovene national costumes, a crowd of people in national costumes and with the accordion-player, the Triglav folklore group from Sydney, members of the Nova Avstralija (New Australia) Club, a maker of wooden ware from Ribnica (a town famous for such products) and, of course, grooms harnessed in a team, and brides seated in a carriage. The negotiations at the *šranga* were in English so more spectators could understand the custom. After the

wedding ceremony and lunch, the wedding guests watched the „solemn and colourful” performance of the Triglav folklore group and of a Macedonian folklore group from Sydney. The most interesting custom presented at the *Wedding* – at least according to the reporter who witnessed the event firsthand – was the „traditional Slovene custom of proposal of the bride”, performed on the stage, in which the actors spoke Slovene but the dialog was simultaneously translated to English for those who did not speak Slovene.<sup>49</sup>

The Planica Society published a 28 pages-long brochure in English, in which they introduced the event and – in words and photographs – presented the *Country Wedding in Ljubljana*.<sup>50</sup>

The second country wedding in Wollongong was organized on the 16<sup>th</sup> of April 1977. It was longer and „even more colourful than the first one”. The parade included policemen on horseback, a group of Scots in traditional costumes and playing traditional instruments, members of Hungarian and Italian clubs and of the Macedonian Society, all wearing their national costumes, the Triglav Slovene chorus and the Triglav folklore group from Sydney, Macedonian folklore group Ilinden from Sydney, an ironworks brass band, and others who had already participated in the first *Wedding*.<sup>51</sup>

Three couples married on the second country wedding. The bride in the first couple, which was described as the Yugoslav couple, was born in Wollongong, but of Slovene origin; her groom was from Croatia. She wore the so-called „Slovene national costume”, and he was dressed in the Dalmatian costume. Like the Slovene/Yugoslav couple of two years ago, they spent their honeymoon in Yugoslavia as guests of the JAT airline. The second couple was described as German; while the groom had immigrated to Australia from Germany, his bride was Australian-born and was half-German and half-Italian. They spent their honeymoon at the Australian Gold Coast as guests of the local airline. The newlyweds of the third couple were Yugoslav emigrants to Australia.<sup>52</sup>

This time, the event was divided into three parts: a bachelor's and a bachelorette's party, the parade with the *šranga*, and the wedding ceremony with the reception in the Town Hall. Even the wedding program was „more lively and extensive” than in 1975. Among invited guests were also some prominent officials, for instance the mayor of Wollongong, the Labour Party leader, a senator, and the Yugoslav ambassador in Australia. The cultural program was similar to the one performed in 1975, including the „traditional Slovene” proposal of the bride and performances of folklore groups and a chorus.<sup>53</sup>

All the wedding couples, the course of events, and several photographs from the previous *Wedding* were presented in the 24 pages-long brochure titled the „Slovenian Country Style Wedding”<sup>54</sup>.

As in Slovenia, the Australian *Weddings* introduced new folk dance groups consisting of local inhabitants who wore their own national costumes. An Australian Slovene, who was a member of the Yugoslav-Australian voluntary society in Sydney and an honorary member of the Planica Society in Wollongong in the middle of 1980's, formed four Slovene folklore groups, two of which specifically for the *Slovenian Country Style Wedding* in Wollongong. As she told in the interview with Pavla Gruden: „The Weddings were organized by the Planica Slovene Society that did not have a folklore group. Can you imagine our Country Wedding without our national dances?”<sup>55</sup> Both Wollongong groups were later discontinued „due to unfavourable conditions and circumstances”<sup>56</sup>. The above-mentioned organizer attended the parade wearing a costume described as „the costume from Ljubljana”, and, like some other Slovene immigrant women, sewed a number of the so-called „Slovene national costumes”.

The description of the event and an interview with a participant of the festival shows that only spectacular elements, such as the colourful national costumes, lively „national” dances, songs and attractive customs (e.g. the proposal of the bride or the *šranga*), were presented to the public. Like in Slovenia, the customs were not presented in their original environment, and social spaces were rearranged in order to correspond to the general presumption of tourists' needs and desires. Most of the chosen, presumably traditional, elements were adapted for stage performance; the altered dance styles, the change of the original Slovene text into English or simultaneous translations, were all introduced in order to attract more visitors.

The husband of the interviewed woman, who acted several times as president of the Slovene Society in Sydney and was also a founding member of the Triglav Society, described the *Slovenian County Style Weddings* in Wollongong as „the biggest cultural event” among Australian Slovenes<sup>57</sup>. But despite the popularity of the event – among Australian spectators as well as Slovene Australians – neither the town authorities nor the local businesses were interested enough to invest in the festival or to at least show moral support; as a result, the event was discontinued after 1977.<sup>58</sup>

## 6.2 Influence of the Festival on Tourist Development in Slovenia

The festival certainly achieved the organizers' goal: it was reported in all prominent European and in some non-European newspapers, on television and on the radio. Slovenia and Yugoslavia became well-known countries. Many Slovene tourists travelling abroad reported that when mentioning where they were coming from, this immediately brought forth the associations of the *Country Wedding in Ljubljana*. Unfortunately, there is no study of the correlation between the increased number of tourists in Slovenia in the following years and the festival.

The *Country Wedding in Ljubljana* had some more positive consequences. The festival presented at least a spatial scheme for other performances in Ljubljana. This was the first postwar public event to be held in the streets and on the squares of the capital. During the *Wedding's* initial years Ljubljana store windows competed for the best-designed wedding theme window award. According to the organizers, this was the motive that from then on, the store windows of Ljubljana started to pay more attention to their design and presentation to the public. The festival also served to incite the „culinary fantasy” of different caterers. They participated in the preparation of individual entrees for the wedding feast, organized public competitions and tried to introduce as many innovative touches as possible.

In the opinion of the main organizer of the *Wedding*, one of the consequences of the reconstruction of dowry transportation through the town of Ribnica was the beginning of the reconstruction of the Škrabec homestead at Hrovača; the homestead had been one of the candidates for the 2004 European Museum of the Year Award. The *Wedding* also stimulated other Slovene localities, for instance Kandrše and Semič, to organize similar events and attract tourists to less-known parts of the country. Such country weddings, but with only one wedding couple and with fewer participants, are still popular in some smaller Slovene towns (e.g. Laško, Bohinj and Semič).

## 7. Conclusion

When elements are severed from their primary environment and they take over new functions in the new environment we speak about the phenomenon of folklorism. These new functions serve propagandistic, political, commercial and tourist purposes. Folklorism can satisfy the needs for the exotic or for simplicity; satisfy curiosity and meet the needs for discovering the strange and the unfamiliar; stimulate the nostalgia

for the lost domestic tradition or try to preserve this tradition, at least in some other form; satisfy the needs for a certain kind of pastime activities; and last, but not least, it can stimulate national and patriotic pride.<sup>59</sup> On the one hand, we can understand folklorism as tourist, propagandist, and commercial (mis)use of heritage, which leads to its deformation, trivialization, banality and, at the end, to kitsch; but on the other hand, folklorism can be seen as a positive phenomenon – it preserves many a value which could have been forgotten or unknown, and stimulates creativity.<sup>60</sup>

The case of the *Country Wedding in Ljubljana* is a complicated one, even from the current point of view. As it is a clear example of folklorism, researchers, especially ethnologists, evaluate it as mostly negative, as a medium that evoked romantic and nostalgic feelings toward heritage. In 1991, because of the ensuing war for independent Slovenia, and also due to insufficient funding, the *Wedding* in Ljubljana was discontinued. Among other things, this decision had presumably been influenced by ethnological expertise. In spite of different attempts of organizers to give consideration to professional advice of ethnologists and other experts they failed to construct a less objectionable design of the event. Much more successful are those who organize the so-called *Kraška ohcet* (*Karst Wedding*) in Veliki Repen – Rupingrande in Italy, who, according to ethnologists „follow the model of historical theatre, or a living museum”.<sup>61</sup>

On the other hand, however, we cannot deny the importance of the festival for the expression of Slovene identity in „brotherly” and „unified” Yugoslavia and, however briefly, the significance of similar events organized by Slovene immigrants in Australia. Nor can we overlook its influence on the development of other tourist events in Ljubljana and on local festivals in other Slovene towns. It certainly stimulated the creativity of numerous folklore groups, craftsmen, and artists. It evoked appreciation and respect for the heritage. And last, but not least, in opinion of many tourist workers and marketing experts the festival was the freshest and most successful advertising undertaking that promoted Slovenia as a tourist destination. Even in the beginning of 2005, a student of tourism asked me about my opinion about the possibility to once again organize such an event in Ljubljana. I answered that almost certainly there would never be another such *Country Wedding in Ljubljana*; but since several ethnologists have been participating with the Ljubljana Township in creating a concept of international wedding according to customs that had taken place in urban environments, there may in the future be a similar, yet different festival.

- <sup>1</sup> *Janez Bogataj*: Dediščina in turizem/Heritage Tourism. In: Angelos Baš (ed.): Slovenski etnološki leksikon/Slovene Ethnological Lexicon. Ljubljana 2004, 76-77.
- <sup>2</sup> *Wiendu Nuryanti*: Heritage and postmodern tourism. In: Annals of tourism research, 23 (1996), 2, 249-260, here 250.
- <sup>3</sup> *David Lowenthal*: The Past is a Foreign Country. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne 1995 (original work published in 1985), 396.
- <sup>4</sup> *Nuryanti* (see note 2), 250.
- <sup>5</sup> *Catherine Palmer*: Tourism and the symbols of identity. In: Tourism management, 20 (1999), 313-321, here 315.
- <sup>6</sup> *Regina Bendix*: In search of authenticity: the formation of folklore studies. Madison, Wisconsin and London 1997, 253 sq.
- <sup>7</sup> *Åke Hultkrantz*: General ethnological concepts. Copenhagen 1960, 188 sq.
- <sup>8</sup> *Bendix* (see note 6), 253 sq.
- <sup>9</sup> *Hans Moser*: Vom Folklorismus in unserer Zeit/On folklorism in our time. In: Zeitschrift für Volkskunde/Review for Ethnography, 58 (1962), 2, 177-209, here 179.
- <sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 180.
- <sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 179 sq.
- <sup>12</sup> *Bendix* 1997 (see note 6), 190 sq.
- <sup>13</sup> *József Burszta*: Kultura ludowa – kultura narodowa. Warszawa 1974, 311 sq.
- <sup>14</sup> *Yaniv Poria, Richard Butler and David Airey*: Clarifying heritage tourism. Annals of tourism research 28 (2001), 4, 1047-1049; *Yaniv Poria, Richard Butler and David Airey*: The core of heritage tourism. Annals of tourism research, 30 (2003), 1, 238-254.
- <sup>15</sup> *Nuryanti* (see note 2), 249.
- <sup>16</sup> *Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett*: Destination culture: tourism, museums and heritage. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London 1998, 65.
- <sup>17</sup> Obrazložitev k imenovanju odbora na Mestnem svetu/Explanation of the town council committee nomination. Typescript (dated 26<sup>th</sup> February 1969). Slovene Tourist Association archives, 2.
- <sup>18</sup> The Youth Day (25<sup>th</sup> May) was a Yugoslav national holiday celebrating the birthday of President Tito. This date was his public birthday (his actual birthday was the 7<sup>th</sup> of May). It was considered a holiday of all Yugoslav youth. Numerous sports, cultural and other activities took place in addition to the principal, public celebration of Tito's birthday. The most popular was the „youth relay race“ where young people of all Yugoslav nationalities ran all over the state and passed a baton to each other. The race ended on a stadium in Belgrade where usually the most successful Yugoslav sportsman handed the baton over to President Tito.
- <sup>19</sup> *Janez Bogataj*: Sto srečanj z dediščino na Slovenskem/One hundred encounters with Slovene heritage. Ljubljana 1992, 338.
- <sup>20</sup> Poročilo/Report. Typescript (dated 29<sup>th</sup> October 1979). Slovene Tourist Association archives, 1.
- <sup>21</sup> Ohcet v Ljubljani '84/Country Wedding in Ljubljana '84. Typescript (undated). Slovene Tourist Association archives, 1.
- <sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 1.
- <sup>23</sup> Poročilo o mednarodni kulturno turistični prireditvi Ohcet v Ljubljani '80/Report on the International Tourist Event the Country Wedding in Ljubljana '80. Typescript (dated November 1980). Slovene Tourist Association archives, 1 sq.
- <sup>24</sup> *Bogataj* (see note 19), 338.
- <sup>25</sup> *Dean MacCannell*: Staged authenticity: arrangements of social space in tourist settings. In:

American Journal of Sociology, 79 (1973), 3, 589–603.

<sup>26</sup> *Naško Križnar*: Kmečkost v sodobni kulturi/The rural in modern culture. In: Glasnik Slovenskega etnološkega društva/Bulletin of Slovene ethnological society 23 (1983), 3, 64–67, here 65.

<sup>27</sup> Qtd. in *Palmer* (see note 5), 315.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., 315.

<sup>29</sup> Horne, qtd. in *Palmer* (see note 5), 315.

<sup>30</sup> *Bogataj* (see note 19), 338.

<sup>31</sup> *Burszta* (see note 13), 311.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 311.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 311 sq.

<sup>34</sup> *Deepak Chhabra, Robert Healy and Erin Sills*: Staged authenticity and heritage tourism. In: Annals of tourism research 30 (2003), 3, 702–719.

<sup>35</sup> *Palmer* (see note 5), 313.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 315.

<sup>37</sup> *Kevin Walsh*: The representation of the past: museums and heritage in the postmodern world. London and New York 2001 (original work published in 1992), 178.

<sup>38</sup> *Kirshenblatt-Gimblett* 1998 (see note 16), 65.

<sup>39</sup> *Marija Stanonik*: O folklorizmu na splošno/On folklorism in General. In: Glasnik Slovenskega etnološkega društva/Bulletin of Slovene Ethnological Society, 30 (1990), 1–4, 20–42, here 25.

<sup>40</sup> *Janez Bogataj*: Ohcet u Ljubljani 1987/Country Wedding in Ljubljana 1987. Typescript (undated). Slovene Tourist Association archives, 1.

<sup>41</sup> Ohcet v Ljubljani 1985/Country Wedding in Ljubljana 1985. Program booklet. Slovene Tourist Association archives, 2.

<sup>42</sup> In opposition to Slovene participants, some participants from abroad had real problems when trying to find a national costume, or even inventing one; for example, a wedding couple from the Italian town of Parma borrowed the costumes in a theatre, and a Canadian couple came dressed as North American Indians.

<sup>43</sup> *Palmer* (see note 5), 316.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., 316–320.

<sup>45</sup> Ohcet/Country Wedding 1985 (see note 41), 2.

<sup>46</sup> *Burszta* (see note 13), 314.

<sup>47</sup> *Jože Žohar*: Slovensko-avstralski klub Planica Wollongong, NSW/Slovene-Australian Club Planica Wollongong, NSW. In: Zbornik avstralskih Slovencev 1985/Anthology of Australian Slovenes 1985. Ljubljana: Slovensko-avstralski literarno-umetniški krožek (SALUK)/Slovenian-Australian Literary & Art Circle (SALAC) 1985, 94.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., 94.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 94 sq.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., 95.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., 96.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid.

<sup>55</sup> *Pavla Gruden*: Slovenska pionirja/Slovene Pioneers. In: Zbornik avstralskih Slovencev 1985/Anthology of Australian Slovenes 1985. Ljubljana: Slovensko-avstralski literarno-umetniški krožek (SALUK)/Slovenian-Australian Literary & Art Circle (SALAC) 1985, 64.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., 64.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., 66.

<sup>58</sup> *Žohar* (see note 47), 96.

<sup>59</sup> *Maja Bošković-Stulli*: O folklorizmu/On folklorism. In: L. Babić and F. Čulinović (eds.): Zbornik za narodni život i običaje/Miscellany for national life and customs 45 (1971), 165-186, here 175.

<sup>60</sup> *M. Ramovš*: Pojavi folklorizma v Beli krajini/The Phenomena of Folklorism in Bela krajina. In: I. Slavec Gradišnik and T. Dolžan Eržen (eds.): Zgodovinske vzporednice slovenske in hrvaške etnologije – 5: Dolenjske Toplice, 3.-5.11.1987/Historical Parallels of Slovene and Croatian Ethnology – 5: Dolenjske Toplice, 3.-5.11.1987. Ljubljana 1988, 215-220, here 220.

<sup>61</sup> *Bogataj* (see note 19), 338.