

EDITORIAL

The current volume starts a new journal. The *Journal of Ethnology and Folkloristics* (JEF) is a multidisciplinary forum for scholars. In the first place we aim to combine the efforts of Estonian anthropologists, ethnologists and folklorists. JEF will be published twice a year jointly by the Estonian Folklore Archives at the Estonian Literary Museum (EFA), the Estonian National Museum (ENM), the Department of Estonian and Comparative Folklore and the Department of Ethnology at the University of Tartu (UT). JEF is a successor to the journals *Pro Ethnologia* (19 volumes, published by the Estonian National Museum between 1993 and 2005) and *Studies in Folk Culture* (5 volumes, published by the Department of Estonian and Comparative Folklore and the Department of Ethnology at UT between 2003 and 2005).

In a broad sense anthropology, ethnology and folkloristics deal with quite similar issues concerning human existence in changing natural and cultural environments. The common ground of different fields we represent is obvious, as we share research traditions, conceptual frameworks and methodologies. Our previous co-operation has been considerable, also. So it seems that the time has come to make a new step in our partnership, and to start jointly publishing an interdisciplinary and interinstitutional journal. This effort encourages all of us to meet new challenges. JEF is our shared intellectual adventure.

Our aim is to offer publication opportunities to authors with rather broad areas of interest. Editors neither restrict the potential topics of contributions geographically, nor by determining prospective articles by a certain range of issues these papers must concern. We expect to publish articles that are based on empirical analysis of particular cultural phenomena, as well as papers that are more theoretically oriented. We do not restrict the list of disciplines our contributors may represent. In principle, we are ready to publish articles that follow the traditions of anthropology's neighbouring disciplines, ethnology and folkloristics. Our most certain co-interest can be found in museology. This area is attached to our provisional plan of development because ENM is the leading institution of museology in Estonia. Besides, there is no special scholarly periodical of museology published in Estonia. Our journal will attempt to fill this gap to some extent.

By publishing a joint peer reviewed journal we attempt to concentrate our intellectual, administrative and financial resources. In this way we intend to develop JEF as a high-level international journal that contributes effectively to the development of research in the fields of humanitarian and social sciences. We also hope that through JEF's broad scope we will succeed in integrating research in several closely related disciplines, and to promote scholarly cooperation at both Estonian and international level. Our aim is not only to disseminate our own research results to an international scholarly audience – JEF is open to contributions from our colleagues in all parts of the world.

The current volume presents research from two annual conferences at the Estonian National Museum, dealing with issues relating to the development of museums and issues of the relationship between culture and power. The experience a museum can offer to its audiences depends upon what kind of collections the museum has, how these collections have been formed and how it is possible to introduce them. Contemporary

museums have moved much closer to their audiences and are now more aware of what they are presenting, why and to whom.

In the opening article of the volume, *The Abode of the Other (Museums in German Concentration Camps 1933–1945)*, Božidar Jezernik focuses on a dark episode in the development of museums and museological thought. These museums, established in German concentration camps during World War II, symbolise precisely those attributes to which the museum was conceived as an antidote. SS museums exhibited and displayed material within a *Rassenkunde* (race science) framework. According to Jezernik, these museums became instrumental in the process of defining the Aryan *Übermensch* (Superhuman), born to conquer and rule the world as a member of the *Herrenvolk* (master race), and the non-Aryan; and in validating the difference between the ‘pure races’ and people with ‘inferior hereditary quality’. SS museums put on display ‘pieces of evidence’ with a view to rendering present and visible that which was absent and invisible: the hierarchical order of different races. After the fall of the Nazi regime, the future of those collections, containing the remains of human bodies, had to be decided. The author claims that although none of these collections is now on display, including at the museums opened at the sites of the former concentration camps, some of them should be preserved as a powerful reminder that anthropology without humanity just could not aspire to be a science.

The second article by Karin Konksi, *Sovietisation and the Estonian National Museum during the 1940s–1950s*, discusses a different ideological regime: the impact of Sovietisation on museums. The second part of the article gives an overview of the Estonian National Museum (ENM) during 1940s–1950s. At that time, one of the significant parts of Sovietisation policy was the absorption of local cultural and research institutions into the new system, and bringing them to the forefront to promote Soviet ideology. The Sovietisation of the Estonian National Museum actually began twice – before and after World War II. In 1940, The ENM was split into several parts, including the Ethnographical Museum and the Literary Museum. In 1946, the Estonian National Museum was merged with the newly established Academy of Sciences of the Estonian SSR, thus ensuring its status as a scientific institution, except that scientific research continued only in co-operation with Moscow. In the 1950s the former comparative-historical approach was replaced by new trends. These propagandistically inclined directions forced research into ethno-genesis and the socialist reorganisation of workers’ and kolkhoz peasant culture and everyday life, and attempted to prove the positive role of the Soviet system. The propagandistic tendency of cultural-educational activities, aimed at “educating the people”, became an indispensable part of the everyday work at the museum. The article evaluates to what extent these changes replaced the former system, and how much the museum managed to maintain continuity.

In the article *On the Survival of Rare Plants – Hungarian Museums in the Decade of Changeover*, Hanneleena Hieta approaches museum institutions as particular responses to the social environment, through a case study of Hungarian museums. She employs a metaphor of natural evolution and follows the processes that began in the 1960s, experiencing drastic changes only in the 1990s; while changes in the amount and principles of public funding affected the status and functioning of museums. Hieta demonstrates how museums as social institutions depend on surrounding society, trends of culture, politics and economics. In the case of Hungary it is possible to observe how the trends

of decentralisation and the growth of the public sector directly impacted on museums; but also how trends of diminished state involvement and privatisation were also mirrored in museums. Although environmental factors play a decisive role in the evolution of the museum, this metaphor is blind to some of the critical factors in development, including the decision makers and power issues around decision making, and individual and institutional concepts of power.

In the article *The Contemporary Museum as a Site for Displaying Values*, Mare Kõiva discusses the issues of contemporary museums in the late twentieth and early twenty first centuries. She asks what explanations there might be for the boom, when museums are being reformed and applying different means of expression and representations of culture; when they are no longer architectural monuments filled with cultural and artistic objects; and when globalisation has rendered the keyword 'exotic' extinct, to be replaced by a closer interest in us – in the 'I', or personality, of the museum goer. She brings out the main keywords in contemporary museum discourse, namely the multi-functional museum, the museum as an open classroom, the issues of tangible and intangible history, and also the relationship between permanent and temporary exhibitions and their merging.

The second part of the volume brings together texts touching on the relationship between culture and power at a more general level. Alexey Zagrebin's article *The Scientist and Authority in the History of Finno-Ugric Research in Russia*, outlines different periods in Finno-Ugric ethnology since the era of the Enlightenment by studying the relationship between the researcher and authority. He calls attention to the ideological and theoretical side of researchers' activities, which are inevitably connected with their methods of obtaining knowledge from informants representing various ethnic traditions.

In the article *When Ethnic Identity is a Private Matter* Kjell Olsen aims to discuss the issues of Sámi identity through his own fieldwork experience, comparing it to Harald Eidheim's studies in the same area about 40 years ago. Previously people lived in small local communities along the coastline. Today the majority of the population lives in larger local and regional centres. Here ethnicity is no longer a private matter in the sense that it is supposed to be kept out of multi-ethnic social contexts because of the stigma attaching to individuals recognised as Sámi. Kjell Olsen suggests that, even if dramatic changes have occurred in the socio-economic, as well as discursive, relations between Sámi and Norwegians in the last forty years, there is continuity in the way the conceptual difference is upheld.

In the article, *Challenges Faced by the Lithuanian State from Regional Identities*, Petras Kalnius examines how the search for identity attempted by the Žemaitians, a Lithuanian local cultural group, eventually evolved into the demand that the Žemaitian community should be recognised as an autochthonous nation, and the Žemaitian dialect as a separate language, with all implicit rights. The ideas about protective areas became especially vivid at the time when Lithuania was about to enter the EU. Attempts to implement the idea of self-governed cultural regions had to do both with assumed threats from the changing political framework, and also the political ambitions of their authors. At the same time these ideas find no support either in the central, or in local government bodies, or even in local communities.

The last article again touches upon the issue of Sovietisation. In the article *Ritual, Power and Historical Perspective: Baptism and Name-Giving in Lithuania and Latvia* Rasa

Paukštytė-Šaknienė follows the relationship between Sovietisation and traditional culture in two Baltic countries, Lithuania and Latvia, using as her example attempts to replace the old, Christian-based, name giving rituals with new ones, as well as discussing the question of power transmission through life cycle rituals. Soviet rule denied “religious traditions” and tried to form a new atheist communist culture including new traditions. These new rituals were expected to replace older religious rites because communist morality and socialist internationalism was expected to overpower bourgeois nationalism. As indicated by scholars investigating Soviet rituals, and by the author’s fieldwork data collected in 1999 in northeast Lithuania and in 1998 in southeast Latvia, the mission of creating communist traditions was not always successful.

Kristel Rattus writes in her article *Which heritage? Which landscape? Defining the Authenticity of Cultural Heritage in Karula National Park*, about a conflict between a national park and a local tourist entrepreneur over heritage protection issues in the national park.

In this conflict, different ways of interpreting cultural heritage are involved. Her article describes how the parties use the notion of authenticity as an ideological argument in order to legitimise specific heritage representations, or to prevent them.