As many anthropologists that study socialist and post-socialist societies have already determined, communist ideology was not something that people merely uncritically reproduced. On the contrary, they were well aware of the benefits and weaknesses caused by interacting with ideology: they tried to adapt ideology to their own aims and to gain access to the sources and privileges of the state. Communist paternalism was therefore not limited to dependency on the state; it also included familiarity and personal contacts, which the periphery tried to establish with centers of political power (e.g., see Kanef 2004). Because control over time was never absolute under communism (e.g., see Verdery 2002), Kanef claims that various interpretations of the past coexisted, which either helped or hindered people from the periphery establishing relationships with the state and nurturing their political careers. These various interpretations of the past were history, tradition, and folklore. Whereas history was a personification of concurrent politics and economics, tradition was its opposite—it was a potentially alternative way of conceptualizing the past and its social order. History, or linear time, was usually expressed through media and state holidays, whereas tradition, perceived as cyclic time, resisted the state (e.g., in religious or “folk” celebrations). Yet, tradition could also be re-contextualized into folklore and in such a folklorized version it could be presented in public as a state-supported view of a national identity (Kanef 2004: 10).

In her research on these various interpretations of the past, Kanef concentrated on more recent decades in socialist Bulgaria. In contrast, I studied transformations of calendar festivities in the town of Brežice, located in southeastern Slovenia, focusing on the first two decades after the Second World War.¹ I agree with Pittaway and Swain (2003: 12)

¹ The article is based on material that was primarily gathered for my dissertation during my fieldwork between 2003 and 2006 (see Habinc 2006).
that research on earlier periods of socialism could methodologically be more challenging because its remembrance could be subjected to either more general memories about socialism, to remembering its more recent decades, or even to post-socialist nostalgia. However, the material I gathered about conceptualizing the past during socialism shows a remarkable resemblance to Kanef’s triad, which was perhaps even easier to recognize in the first decades of socialism because that was the time of establishing a new state with its new festive calendar. This article thus presents how, in my opinion, the carnival in Brežice became folklore and how the other “typical holiday of Brežice,” St. Roch’s Day, turned into a tradition. However, first I take a brief look at Slovenian holiday legislation and offer a brief overview of holiday practice observed at the local scale in the last decade before and first two decades after the Second World War.

In 1929 a special law was introduced in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, which fixed two state holidays: the birthday of His Majesty the King and the day of the state’s unification. Roman Catholic state employees, who statistically also prevailed in Brežice at that time, were also free from work at Christmas, New Year’s Day, Epiphany, St. Joseph’s Day, Easter Monday, Ascension Day, Corpus Christi, Sts. Peter and Paul’s Day, Sts. Cyril and Methodius’ Day, the Assumption, All Saints’ Day, and the Immaculate Conception (Zakon o praznikih 1929: 767). Shortly after the war, the break with this old holiday arrangement was not immediate and final. According to church chronicle reports, “people were not totally satisfied with the changes that the new system was introducing” (Kronika 1945–1989, 1945: 5) and therefore many religious rituals as well as religious education were not only allowed, but also quite broadly attended and appreciated. In some people’s opinions, the public function of the Church even increased during this period in comparison to prewar times. However, after Tito’s break with Stalin in 1948 (i.e., when Yugoslavia started to prove to the rest of the world that Stalin’s accusations concerning Yugoslav communism were false), the constitutional division between church and state from 1946 became more visible and strictly practiced. Public religious celebrations became exceptional and mostly moved to either the Church’s domain or private spheres. Religious processions at Easter and Corpus Christi, for example, were first moved to land owned by the Church, but by the beginning of the 1950s they had vanished from the streets of Brežice and took place only inside the church. At the same time, one could no longer see St. Nicholas and his costumed escort, and sources no longer reported about Easter bell chiming, processions during the Minor Rogation Days, or public singing at name-days (especially for St. Joseph’s Day). It was not before 1955, ten years after the Second World War, that a special law regulating state holidays was introduced in Yugoslavia. This law defined New Year’s, May Day,

---

2 For example, there were some festive practices not noted or even continued from the years before the Second World War: a mass in 1946 celebrating a federal state holiday, Victory Day; a midnight mass on New Year’s Eve in 1946; a procession at Corpus Christi through the streets of the town, in which the participants carried Eucharist symbols woven out of greenery; and a procession on Palm Sunday in 1949.
and Republic Day as the three federal holidays for which two days off work were allotted (Zakon o državnih praznikih 1955), and other federal or republic holidays were present as well, for longer or shorter periods of time (see Habinc 2006). After the mid-1950s, when this division between history and tradition was already well established with the new holiday legislation, it is interesting that some traditional practices did not lose importance, but gained it. This mostly happened to non-religious parts of tradition, such as carnival, whereas religious festivities were turning into an archaic tradition; in Brežice, this was the case for St. Roch’s Day.

CELEBRATING ST. ROCH’S DAY DURING THE FIRST DECADES OF SOCIALISM
THE TRADITION OF BREŽICE

According to sources, pilgrims started visiting the Church of St. Roch in Brežice on 15 and 16 August (the Assumption and St. Roch’s Day) by the beginning of the eighteenth century (Kemperl 2003: 168). Written and oral sources describe these days as a local, “typical” holiday of the town, but also as the only occasion in the time before the Second World War when Brežice was crowded with people (Počkar 1999: 110, 135). In addition to the fact that St. Roch’s Day was both a religious and social event, it was also important because a fair took place in the town. The main street, running from the Church of St. Roch in the north of the town to the south, was reserved for merchants, craftsmen, and women from the town or its vicinity. On the other hand, the marketplace, located east of the main street, held stands for merchants from other areas. The seven days of the fair distinguished St. Roch’s Day from other festive events, of which some were also characterized as “typical” for the town. For example, this feast, the Corpus Christi procession, and the Easter procession were the kind of events for which the people wore their best clothes, cleaned and decorated their dwellings, and displayed their social status by performing certain customs, such as holding Easter egg hunts. Such display of one’s social status through material symbols also established a distinction between the town and its rural surroundings. However, St. Roch’s Day in particular—with its religious, social, and emphasized economic importance—was much more a holiday that intentionally aimed at connecting people, rather than creating differences between the town and the rural inhabitants.

During the Second World War, the Church of St. Roch was damaged. The parish church’s chronicle reports that in 1945 old construction wood was stored in it and the building was no longer used for religious purposes (Kronika 1945–1989, 1945: 5). However, this only seems to be the case for this particular year because many informants claim that religious rites (at least around St. Roch’s Day) were performed there until the beginning of the church’s extensive renovation in 1951. Allegedly, there was even at least one religious rite added in those first postwar years; namely, some people remember processions with candles.
going around the church on the evening of 15 August. However, when the renovation of the Church of St. Roch began, lasting until 1959 (Kemperl 2003: 173), all religious activities were transferred to the parish Church of St. Lawrence, located in the middle of the town. St. Roch’s Day was still religiously celebrated, but the celebrations were more intermixed with other religious occasions. One of those was, for example, St. Lawrence’s Day, the parish patron saint’s day, celebrated on 10 August, only six days before St. Roch’s Day. During the 1950s St. Roch’s Day was still accompanied by a fair, but with the argument that the stands were disturbing traffic these were prohibited outside the area legally owned by the Church by early 1950s. They were thus limited to small parcels around the (parish) church, although for a few years they were also transferred to the town’s marketplace, which was quite distant from both the Church of St. Roch and the parish church. This reduced the economic importance of the event for both the residents and the visiting merchants. After these reactionary times, St. Roch’s Day acquired the status of a relic and lost its association with economic progress and the idea of modernization. Nevertheless, its religious and (at least for some groups) social function persisted, and pilgrims from the mostly rural surroundings of the town remained very regular visitors to it. However, the persistence of a ritual practice was publicly often disqualified and labeled as “a reactionary tradition.” The “worshipers of the saint”—as, for example, the following media excerpt defined a special “we-group” of not only Brežice’s residents (Elwert 1996, cf. Habine 2011)—were similarly exposed to public criticism and ridicule:3

The traditional church blessing at St. Roch’s in Brežice is accompanied by similar traditional drinking and fights by the fervent worshipers of this saint. The authorities from the Brežice Police deal with pilgrims from the town’s vicinity on a regular basis. Namely, these boys are so “devoted” to St. Roch that they can’t even say goodbye to him without everybody else knowing about it. In this manner they again ended this year’s blessing with carousing and fighting in a pub in [the nearby village of] Čatež. (DŠ 1956)

As I was told, the “members” of this religious “we-group” often perceived themselves as second-class citizens that were publicly criticized for being, for example, “traditionally drunk” on St. Roch’s Day. However, similar activity, such as excessive drinking on the municipal holiday—a historical occasion, according to Kaneff—was presented as cohesive and fun. Or, as the media excerpt humorously presented wine tastings at one such celebration of Brežice’s municipal holiday:

My friends and I considered a wine exhibition with wine tasting “the heart” of the festive events. Malicious tongues say that all seventeen parts of this “program” were a bit too much for the otherwise solid residents, but I think that the locals and their guests processed them well. (Pepče priпoveduje 1954)

3 Cf. examples of their public ridicule at carnivals, described later in the article.
Whereas celebrations of St. Roch’s Day were perceived as a reactionary tradition of Brežice mostly because they were religious acts, carnival—labeled a “pagan, dishonored and shameful” event by a parish priest already in the prewar years (e.g., see Oznanila 1927–1934, 11 February 1934)—had a different starting point for its postwar perception. Written and oral sources characterize it as the “typical” event of the town, although there were no “typical” carnival costumes or characters in the town (Kuret 1984: 236). For a few decades, up until the 1940s, the town’s fire brigade, the local hunters’ association, and the local representatives of the Sokol society—a sports, cultural, and (after 1929) also a regime institution (see Dolenc, Pahor and Majaron 1998: 146)—organized carnival parties and balls. Most of my informants considered the Sokol carnival ball, held on Saturday evening in a small room of the Slovenian Cultural Center, the most important carnival event of them all. It was not only designed as an internal event for members of the association; rather, it was an occasion where not only the local elite gathered, but where carnival models from larger Slovenian towns were followed and where Brežice proved to at least be in touch with wider social trends. At the event people could easily display their social statuses. Similar to the processions already mentioned at the Feast of Corpus Christi or Easter, the Sokol carnival ball also created a distinction between the town and its rural surroundings, where costumed figures still mostly freely wandered through the countryside, and only a few carnival parties in the inns were organized there. The residents of the town, on the other hand, tried to cultivate spontaneous carnival activities: a children’s carnival was held in the Slovenian Cultural Center, a minor carnival parade went through the streets of the town on Shrove Tuesday, and a funeral of a straw figure known as kurent was also staged on the following Thursday. Most of the costumes in both of the parades were individual, and a few group costumes were also presented on floats; the informants I talked to, for example, mostly remembered a “public toilet.” This particular group costume referred to the state of affairs in the town and it was at the same time the community’s self-criticism and a proposal to the local authorities. It ridiculed the hygienic situation on a secluded side street in the town, which was also used as a toilet and therefore often referred to as ‘shit street’. As the excerpt from the following interview illustrates, an improvised public toilet was constructed on a float, driven at the carnival to the municipal headquarters, where a short speech was held about the necessity of a public toilet in the town:

It was on a float—there was a hut set up and on the top there was a sign, “public toilet.” This float was then driven in front of the municipal

---

4 In the 1920s, when a ball (reduta) in only black and/or white costumes was organized (Počkar 1999: 112), informants explained that the Ljubljana’s carnival model was being followed.

5 In German Scheißgasse, and colloquially in Slovenian Šajzgasa.
headquarters and when the hut was opened people could see there was a public toilet inside. (Transcript 2003/04: 177)

All of these carnival activities were interrupted by the Second World War. The first time that both old and new residents started thinking about reviving it was almost a decade after the war. It was in the beginning of the 1950s that history and tradition, in Kaneff’s terms, gained in distinction and also that folklore—as a state-approved version of tradition—was constructed. Folklore’s public existence was made possible in various ways; however, it first had to be discursively argued. This was also the case in Brežice, where the fact that the Church never strongly supported carnival was also stressed in discursive argumentations produced by appropriate Brežice “old-timers.” For example, there was a certain individual that was the only one competent enough to explain why insisting on tradition was “the right thing to do” because he was from the town and played a prominent political role. At the time the following article was published, he was a local political authority, and later he also became a member of the political elite at the republic level in Slovenia as well as at the Yugoslav federal level:

The opinion of certain individuals, that carnival with its masquerades is a remnant of mystical customs and is therefore not modern, will not hold water. The tradition of kurentovanje is an ancient custom in Slovenia. It is significant that the religious circles were never wild about carnival masqueraders. Everyone that knows their history knows that carnival practices in Slovenia are a component of folklore, and it is the right thing to do to support these practices and to preserve them for posterity as national values. (Pust, oj pust ti čas presneti …)

Seen from this excerpt, such argumentation transformed tradition into folklore or into “national values worth preserving for posterity” by referring to counter-religiosity, modernization, and nationalization and by describing continuity as no threat to the new social system (cf. Kaneff 2004: 12). However, not only was the discursive appropriateness of the event constructed, but its non-threatening continuity was also guaranteed by inventing a “typical” Brežice costume. In Kaneff’s words, what seemed to be a topical costume (i.e., a public toilet) in the prewar years became instead a visual element of carnival in the early 1950s—selected, emphasized, and presented as “typical” costume of Brežice and as its “authentic” folklore (cf. Kaneff 2004: 147). It was detached from its actuality, meaning, and social criticism, and as such the costume of the public toilet became presented as a publicly acceptable town tradition. Considering that the immanent characteristic of any carnival is its inversion of the social system and of the prevailing power relations—for example, by ridiculing them (e.g., see Kuret 1984)—it seems that a group costume of a public toilet also had a similar relaxing function. However, its criticism was only directed towards the past; specifically, it constituted one of those costumes that referred to the reactionary past. Namely, most of the

---

6 At the time when this article was published, in my opinion kurentovanje was a synonym for carnival (cf. Habinc forthcoming).
individual or group costumes that appeared at carnivals in Brežice until the mid-1960s reflected contemporaneous popular culture (e.g., Indians, cowboys, the Count of Monte Cristo, a girl with violets, clowns, etc.); some individuals also wore tuxedos, top hats, and other bourgeois outfits, and others dressed up as the last Egyptian king, Farouk I, and his escorts (Transcript 2003/04: 232). As the informants explained, “this was popular at the time,” but historical records add that Farouk was the last Egyptian king, who ended his rule after the upheaval in 1952, when he was replaced by Gamal Abdel Nasser. Alongside Yugoslav President Tito and the Indian political leader Nehru, Nasser was one of the founders of the Non-Aligned Movement in 1961 (Krušič 1976: 646).

Ridiculing everything that preceded the Non-Aligned Movement could thus be interpreted as ridiculing the pre-modern past or the pre-modern Other, while at the same time also emphasizing Yugoslavia’s role in the world’s political movements in general.

However, it was not only the (pre-socialist) past in general that was criticized at the Brežice carnivals; aspects of contemporaneity that conflicted with socialist modernization were publicly exposed as well. For example, informants remember ridiculing individuals that still openly expressed their religiosity: in one of the carnival speeches a local doctor from a religious family was accused of “breaking his patients’ bones,” for example, while at another carnival a love affair between a local vicar and a nurse was also publicly discussed (Transcript 2003/04: 232). In those first postwar decades carnival can thus be considered society’s “safety valve,” but only in a limited, state-approved manner.

In addition to the shifts in the context of an occasion, other changes can also be observed in post–Second World War carnival celebrations in Brežice: for example, ritual practice at that time more or less depended on newcomers to Brežice, especially the group of merchants that mostly migrated to the town from its rural surroundings. Sometimes they knew each other from before, at least by surname, but in many cases they created their first personal bonds when they gathered to sew carnival costumes, prepare group costumes, props, and texts, and when they organized public meetings of the carnival committee, staged in the Sokol’s Slovenian Cultural Center—renamed and owned by the Yugoslav People’s Army after the war. As the other specific “we-group” of the town (Elwert 1996; cf. Habinc 2011), which among other things formed itself around carnival activities, they also organized large-scale parades on Shrove Tuesday, as well as large-scale funeral processions on Ash Wednesday or the following Thursday. In the late 1950s some large-scale
organizations—for example, the Association of Friends of Youth and the National Youth Organization—joined this spontaneous organization, which soon caused carnival to become a large-scale event. More or less it was staged in open, public spaces or to a lesser extent in halls with open access for everybody. The carnivals in the town were thus still distinguished from those in the countryside, but it had changed in comparison to before the Second World War. An urban model of the Sokol ball held in a hall, for example, was replaced with large-scale parades and festive events performed in public spaces. On the one hand, the town’s carnival became ruralized by mostly being performed as a tour, yet it also became cultivated and festivalized for the masses. In Kockel’s words: folklorization during socialism not only showed enthusiasm for colorful, staged, and large-scale presentations of (past and present) cultural or social diversity, but it also tried to suppress other, non-cultivated and non-organized expressions of this diversity in everyday lived reality (Kockel 2002: 168).

FOLKLORIZATION AS DIVERSIFICATION OR MOLDING?

The case studies presented here compared two different calendar holidays. Once again—only now in the context of the conference of the SIEF Working Group on the Ritual Year, dedicated to the relationship between researchers and performers—they highlighted how significant the contextual role a wider socio-political framework has in any concurrent research or/and performed holiday situation. As yet another local example of an “old story” that follows transformations and connects them with the power-plays involved, this drew my attention to different interpretations of one of Kaneff’s key terms used in this article, and to various possible perceptions of what folklorization is. Can the postwar carnival in Brežice as an example of a folklorized occasion really be considered an event that flourished, whereas St. Roch’s Day, on the other hand, became more limited? If one only observes the public appearance of both events, then in my opinion it is possible to agree with this. However, according to Kaneff, folklorization is not a term containing any valuation. It only signifies adaptations of the tradition during socialism, which enabled its transformed version, folklore, to remain public. Similarly, some other authors perceive folklorization not as a process of de-contextualization, but rather as a process of re-contextualizing and creating something new. In this process the past is not merely transmitted into contemporaneity; rather, it is adapted to it and used in a new way (e.g., see Kirshenblatt Gimblett 1995; Kockel 2007; Carter 2007; on heritagization, cf. Baskar 2005). Folklorization thus implies changing both a “text” and/or its “context” of use. As Kockel put it, tradition is vital as long as people use it and find it legitimate, no matter how and in what way it changes (Kockel 2007: 25, 30). Such perceptions of folklorization are in a way close to those known among at least some Slovenian and Croatian scholars. For example, Stanonik sees folklorization as a process of (literary) desubjectivization, as a sign of the vitality of a work or a phenomena (2001: 104; cf. Lozica 1990: 209; Povrzanović 1989: 167). As long as variants live, it could be argued that
the phenomena or a “text” is alive and well. However, if I now turn to the folklorization I had in mind when describing postwar changes in the Brežice carnival, what does folklorization refer to in this case? First of all, it relates to the change of the socio-political context because of which “proper” explanations of carnival and its adaptations were needed. The context of a phenomenon changed and consequently this phenomenon as a “text” changed as well: not only the organizers and performers of carnival were different, but also emphases in the scenario shifted, for example. Without this shift in carnival as a “text,” becoming mostly a large-scale event with new socially relevant costumes for individuals or groups, it probably would not be promoted as much or even encouraged, as it was in those first two decades after the Second World War. However, in my opinion, it is not necessary to see all the changes that carnival as a “text” was subjected to in those first postwar years and that I characterized as folklorization as though they are leading towards the diversification and variedness of the occasion. Framing or freezing a public toilet costume into a “typical” town costume can be better perceived as a limitation than diversification, as molding that does not allow variants. In addition, carnival as a mostly large-scale event and no longer an elite one, or costumes that functioned as society’s “safety valve” only to a limited extent, can be seen more as limitations than as proliferation of variants. Could it therefore be doubted that folklorization (as, for example, in Stanonik’s understanding) is really a signifier of enriching, broadening, and the liveliness of phenomena? Klekot wrote that folklorization was and still is politically an extensively used tool for dealing with potentially dangerous differences in the modern state: “Folklorize and rule’ seems to have been a tacit motto of both the British Empire and the Soviet Union” (Klekot 2010: 80). Based on the case study presented here, and if one observes carnival in the more limited time span of a few decades, questioning Stanonik’s definition thus seems reasonable. Folklorizing tradition did also mean limiting and restricting at least some elements of carnival, which I believe is also a point that Kaneff emphasized. However, on the other hand—perceived over a longer period and comparing carnival in various social contexts—restrictions can perhaps only be seen as the flipside of enriching, with mutual exchange and influence. The molding of the Brežice carnival and its later institutionalization did lead to its (temporary?) disappearance. However, there is no assurance that, for example, the Sokol balls, a group public toilet costume, or perhaps even any less representative elements of any carnival performed in Brežice at any time will not be reused again as an inspiration for “local identity,” sociability, fun, a “safety valve,” or any function a carnival can have. As Kaneff wrote, folklorization is not a specific characteristic of socialist times; it is part of the more general project of modernization (Kaneff 2004: 12, 139-140) and that is why I believe shrinking, molding, and lessening are only an itinerary that can be enriched and broadened again, when perhaps a new reason for legitimizing Brežice’s carnival will be sought.

---

7 The carnival in Brežice died out in the early 1970s, when it became an “institution” with a carnival section as part of the Tourist Board of Brežice overseeing it.
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Folklorizacija kot raznolikost ali omejevanje. Primerjava dveh “tradicionalnih” praznikov

Študija primera obravnava spremembe v praznovanjih sv. Roka in pusta v manjšem slovenskem mestu Brežice, do katerih je prišlo v prvih dveh desetletjih po drugi svetovni vojni. Tako ustni kot drugi viri, večinoma pisni so priložnosti namreč označili kot za mesto »značilna praznika«, oziroma »mestni tradiciji«. Autorica pa sledi Deemi Kanneff, po kateri so zgodovina, tradicija in
folklor med socializmom pomenile tri različne načine konceptualiziranja preteklosti, analizira, kako je ena od omenjenih priložnosti v obravnavanem obdobju postala razumljena kot (nazadnjaška) tradicija, druga pa kot državno odobrena folklora. Rokovega se je po letu 1945 vsaj v javnem diskurzu oprijel status tradicionalističnega in nazadnjaškega verskega praznika, s čimer se ga je tudi vse manj javno praznovalo, močno okrnjena pa je postala tudi njegova gospodarska vloga. Pust kot priložnost, nad katero Cerkev ni bila navdušena že pred drugo svetovno vojno, pa je po drugi strani postal sinonim za mestno tradicijo, ki naj je ne bi le obranjali, ampak kot »narodno bogasto« tudi spodbujali. Iz raznolikih, tudi elitnih načinov pustovanj, znanih v mestu v prvi polovici 20. stoletja, se je po drugi svetovni vojni pust spremenil v javni in množični dogodek. Mnogi, predvsem priseljenci so bili za sodelovanje motivirani, saj jim je udeležba lahko zagotovila specifično vlogo in pozicijo moči. V obravnavanem obdobju je pust postal folklora, k čemu je pripomogel tudi izum »tipične« maske, ki jo avtorica sledeč Kaneffovi razume kot jasen primer folklorizacije: specifični vizualni element je bil izbran in nato preoblikovan tako, da je zadovoljeval sočasne družbene potrebe. Kot »stara zgodba«, predstavljena v kontekstu konference delovne skupine Ritual Year, posvečene razmerju med izvajalci in raziskovalci, članek tako izpostavlja širjo družbeno-politično situacijo vsakokratne raziskave in tudi vsakokratne izvedbe praznika. Z rabo koncepta folklorizacija pa se obenem sprašuje, na kaj se koncept dejansko nanaša in kaj pomeni. Ob tem primerja nekatera široko in splošno nabljena razumevanja pojma kot procesa sprememb z nekaj redkimi opredelitvami, znanimi v slovenski in hrvaški folkloristiki, po katerih folklorizacija pomeni raznolikost in variantnost obravnavanega fenomena. Avtorica se ob tem sprašuje, če sta izum »tipične« maske in omejitve pusta na množične in javne dogodke zares pomenila raznolikost in obogatitev pustovanj ali pa je takšno razumevanje lahko le delno, saj folklorizacija bolj kot karkoli drugega pomeni uokvirjanje in omejevanje.
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