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Introduction

I am grateful to have been invited to this conference and workshop. Let me state my case right from the start: the little I know about Asian traditional musics stems from reading and listening to records – I have little or no first-hand knowledge neither of Asian traditional music nor of the politics of traditional music in this part of the world. Nevertheless, I hope that the insights I have gathered through over 30 years of performing traditional music and studying traditional music-making in the Scandinavian countries and East-Europe, may be of some interest in this context.

The theme of this conference is preservation of traditional music. Although often projected as objective, neutral, preservation is a process that creates, constructs the very objects that is to be preserved. The old and valuable objects, instruments, tunes, or whatever, is a result of this process, not the other way around. Thus archivists, collectors, museum curators, not so much preserve, but produce “history”, “tradition”, “heritage”, using memories, historical remnants, historical leftovers, as their raw material. This is a reason why control over the usages of preserved artefacts is such a major issue in the history of collection and preservation, archives and museums.

In many parts of the world today a new mode of heritage production is gaining importance. This heritage production departs from a reformulation of the relation between local, national and global and also between “preservation” and “use”. The idea is that the preserved artefacts no longer should be displayed in museum monitors, or in printed collections, but instead be used, in one way or the other, to produce experiences. One of the ways to use the remnants of the past is as raw material for the experience and tourist industries’ expansion into our pasts, creating new memorable sites and destinations, projected as local and unique, but in fact cast in a globalized mould. If before preservation could often be presented as an end in itself, and the experiences derived from the preserved objects thus secondary, today, more often than
not, it is the other way around. This implies a major shift in the control of what is to be preserved, and of course, for what reasons and purposes.

In my presentation here I will look at how “preservation” and “use” has been understood as sometimes cooperating, sometimes opposing, strategies. As I see it however, both words indicate usages. And, which is important in this context, whatever can be used can also be abused. I will draw most of my examples from “folk” and “traditional music” in Sweden, but I will also use some examples from Eastern Europe and former USSR. I will argue that the question of control over usages is a key to the understanding the history of preservation of traditional music, as it is a key to the understanding of recent trends in global heritage production, and the important but notoriously difficult difference between “use” and “abuse”. I will also argue that when traditional music is to be preserved, it is not so much the traditional musics that need careful examination, as the preservation itself: its objects, methods, techniques, goals and ideologies.

A brief look at the history of preservation of traditional music in Sweden

The history of folk music, traditional music, or music as heritage, in any one country, is one of struggle for power and control over immaterial and intangible but powerful resources central to kings, nations, regions as well as to ordinary people. You could even say that the very idea of a folk or traditional music is a result of taking control over such resources, and of moving music from its original context, into a new and foreign context. A means to do this is collection, preservation, and exhibition.

Looking at the history of folk and traditional music in Sweden from this viewpoint you may discern a number of fairly distinct phases.

Phase one

The history of collection of old songs in Sweden starts already in the mid 17th century. The Swedish king decided to send out a royal antiquarian to collect old heroic songs, which at that time meant texts, mainly ballads, about knights and other heroes fighting against dragons and villains. The primary reason was not to preserve the songs, but to use them to legitimate and to glorify the kings’ geopolitical aspirations. At that time Sweden had become the great power of Northern Europe and the idea was that the songs would support the further expansion into
Russia, by casting the king as an descendant of Saint George and other legendary heroes of the great past.

**Phase two**
The next phase begins in the late 18th century, when the shockwave following the French revolution reached Sweden. The rulers of the old world now step by step was forced to leave over to a growing bourgeoisie. By the early 19th century new ideas reached Sweden also from Germany, from the Grimm brothers, von Herder, Goethe and others, about “the folk”, bearer of a national culture, more true and just than the foreign manners of the rulers. From France the Swedish imported ideas about ‘the people’, phrases such as “All power belongs to the people”, and from Germany ideas about ‘the folk’, as in “folk song”, “folk music”, “folk tale” and “folk tradition”. During this phase a rather small number of young urban intellectuals on their own initiative started to collect folk songs and instrumental tunes. As in the first phase, preservation was not the primary goal. The aim was to use the collected items as weapons against the kings and the nobles. The old rulers were foreign, as were their noble manners and their whole culture. The culture of the new rulers, the new era should be national. Here is when nation building in Sweden goes into its most important period, and when folk songs, dances, tales and what not, becomes seen as and used as authentic representations of the spirit of the people.¹

This development marks an important shift in the history of music in Europe, later on affecting the musics of the entire world. A basic prerequisite for any collection is ideas about certain valuable and collectable objects, in this case coined as ‘folk music’. These objects are taken out of their original contexts, and given radically new meaning as they are moved into new and foreign contexts and given new roles as national. The best example is maybe the old ballad collected by the young student Richard Dybeck in his home region, then set to new nationalistic words and sung by himself in his many “folk concerts” in Stockholm, which in the late 19th century was accepted as the Swedish national anthem.

**Phase three**
As I have already mentioned, during the two first phases the collectors’ primary intention is not preservation, but rather intervention, into very concrete cultural and political courses of
events. By the late 19th century a new wave of collecting folk items swept over Sweden. This time, the collecting was set up against an understanding of ‘the old peasant culture’ as rapidly disappearing. This devolutionary premise (Dundes 1965) turned collecting into a means for preserving. In turn this led to the building of special institutions, in which the collections could be adequately taken care of, preserved, and of course, exhibited. Now is when the great ethnographic archives and museums are founded, as for example the Nordic Museum in Stockholm and Skansen, the world’s first open door ethnographic museum.

When put into business these new institutions soon set up their own agendas about what to collect and preserve, how and why. Here is when the transformation of folk music is brought to a new level. A whole set of new arenas, not only for storing and showing, but also for performing the stored items are created, and on these arenas new performing practices are being developed, of which a large part are borrowed from “classical music”.

During this phase the control over folk music, as collected, as preserved, as exhibited, as performed, was in the hands of the urban bourgeoisie. As a hundred years earlier, folk music is raised by urban intellectuals as a weapon a banner and a shield in a struggle of power. But this time it is not the kings and nobles and their foreign, indeed cosmopolitan, culture that is targeted, but the growing working class. ‘Folk’ is now recharged from ‘people’, in the broadest sense, to the more limited ‘peasantry’. The farmers in the dying peasant society, were attributed all the old, true and authentic that the workers lacked. In Sweden the struggle over power was symbolically expressed by the leading urban elite as a struggle between the peasants fiddle, - old, hand made, unique, difficult to master – and the workers accordion – new, factory made in thousands of identical copies and learnt to play within ten minutes (Ronström 1990).

The devolutionary premise and ‘the folk’ as a weapon against the working class aspirations for power turned the archives and museums into real cultural fortifications, bastions for defence of the old, and central attack arms for the creation of the new. If earlier the collectors were devoted individuals, working on their own, following their own ideas about how, and what to collect, now the institutions took control, by developing their own professionalized
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1 Incidentally, in Swedish the word for people and folk is the same. Borrowed from German ‘folk’, the Swedish ‘folk’ married the socialistic ideas about the people to the romantic ideas about the ‘folk’, which gave the
standards and ideologies. If earlier the collected folk music could be rather heterogeneous in content, now the collections, by applying these standards became more and more standardised, homogenous.

Phase four
In the 1920s and 30s a whole set of new practices developed around the museums and archives. ‘Folk music’ is exhibited, published, researched, performed, recorded, broadcasted. In this process of mediaization, folk music is adapted in form, content and meaning to these cultural forms, previously unknown to it. New types of ensembles are born, new ways of arranging and interpreting, new roles, functions and meanings are attributed to the music. ‘Folk music’ is understood as remnants of a lost past. What could and should be done is to preserve these remnants, and to control the preservation is a duty of professionals in the preserving institutions.

The driving force behind all this is institutionalisation. Any institution can be described as a solution that looks for its problems, in competition with other institutions. During the 1920’s and 30’s the museums and archives had fostered a professional staff with professional methods and professional, scientific results. If folk music was widely recognised as important, it was still not seen as scientific enough. In this respect ethnographic museums and archives could have hard times competing with natural, historical or geographical museums and archives. The vogue for counting, measuring, quantifying that swept through ethnology and folklore in Europe, and certainly in Sweden, during the 30’s can be seen as an answer. By emphasising quantitative “hard data” the study of the “old peasant society” should be able to take place among the recognised scientific subjects in Academia, and in society at large.

This had interesting consequences. The counting and measuring of the tunes already collected, showed that the tonality of a large part of Sweden’s folk music is minor (Moberg 1950). This, of course, can be explained by the earlier collectors presumption s that minor music is somehow older than major, or more pleasing, or both, and therefore more authentic. The research about tonality also showed that most “minoric” part of Sweden was Dalecarlia in mid-Sweden, already staged by the urban bourgeoisie as the most authentic part of the nation, the cradle of the Swedish folk and nation. This strengthened the national hierarchy of concept an especially strong and powerful foundation.
landsplaces and regions, placing Dalecarlia and minor modes at the top, and marginalizing other regions and major modes.

Also in this phase ‘folk music’ is raised as a weapon. But now, more often than not, the enemy comes from abroad, disguised as jazz, “negroe music”, “schlager” or other foreign demoralising influences. Thereby, ‘the folk’ to a higher degree than before is understood as the entire population, the Swedes at large. ‘Folk music’ now becomes not only the music of the peasantry, but of the Swedish nation, step by step including the music of the working class, but of course not of the minorities, Saamis, Finns, Germans, Jews, Gipsies and others.

Phase five
In the fifth phase, beginning in the 50’s, the horizon of folk music definitely shifts from national to international. By the mid 60’s we can already see the first traces of a new movement, which in a few year would radically change the use and function of folk music in Sweden. As in so many other countries in Europe during the period immediately after WW2, industrialisation and urbanisation reached a new peak, as well as nativity rates. Equipped with resources no generation before them could dream of, the many youngsters that reached their adolescence in the late 60’s, looked for something new, that could represent them, as opposed to their parents. They found music, which led to a boom for the music industry, and a chance for many not only to buy and listened to new musics, but also to start to play themselves. Many teenagers took up pop and rock music. Surprisingly many took up folk music, starting an impressive revival of folk music, dance, costumes and more. While it may seem as though the pop and rock music fans are the more modern and internationally oriented, in fact also the new folk music devotees belong to a fundamentally modern and international movement.

The revival changes the contexts of folk music entirely. If in the early sixties a folk music event, in Sweden called “fiddlers gathering”, would attract some fifty fiddlers and a couple of hundred of listeners, in the mid 70’s an audience of around 50.000 gathered in a small village in Dalecarlia to listen to thousands of fiddlers, most of them in their twenties and thirties.²

Within this movement the whole idea of folk music is reformulated and redefined. From being centred around tunes, dances etc as objects, the interest now is geared at performances, events. Authenticity is still a key concept, but its locus shifts from texts to contexts, from

² Among them myself, a twenty year old fiddler.
products to processes. What the youngsters had in mind was not so much to preserve as to use the music. “Living folk music” became the cry of the day. The idea was to stop acting as parrots, simply repeating over and over again the same old phrases, as the previous generations had done. Instead the aim was to set up anew the whole “tradition”, understood not as objects, results, but as a whole cultural system, an infrastructure, and then to so to speak climb into it and use it, not for reasons located in the past, but located in contemporary society.

A dream maybe, but a dream very different from the ones that reigned in earlier phases. In the revival movement informality was praised. There should be improvisation, no printed music, small groups, no large stages, no distinct borders between performers and audiences. This led to an impressive growth of the number of folk musicians, and to a shift from folk music as national representation to a means for sociability, having fun. Value judgements changed from being based on abstract qualities, such as age and provenience, to the more concrete “Does it swing?” and “Can we dance to it?” Looking back to this period you could say that the result of all this, whether intended or not, was a rediscovery of some of the mechanisms underlying the making of folk music in Sweden.

Although focusing upon a national repertoire of music, the revival movement should be understood as a truly international phenomenon. You can find the same development in many other countries, such as Norway, Denmark, England, West and East Germany, and Hungary. On the cover of the LP Tanchaz 1, “Living Hungarian folk music” from 1978, the Hungarian poet Sándor Csoóri writes: “Let the experts or happy know-it-alls pass scrupulous judgement and say what they want. I can only say what my conviction and disposition prompt me to say: There were two important historic moments in the history of folk dance: one when it went up onto the stage, and the other, when it left the stage to return to the soil. Not as an art, but that it may remain dance—in the same way as the wind is wind, and the rain is rain.” His words expresses well the ambitions of revivalists, not only in Hungary, but in Sweden and many other countries as well.

3 Cf Ferenc Sebő in Bodor 1981.
4 Tanchaz 1. Elő népzene IV. Hungaroton SLPX 18041.
In this period the concept folk music becomes too dubious and problematic. Instead “traditional music” is launched as the new politically right phrase. With this change it now becomes possible to include also music of the “non-folk” into the revival movement: music of the workers, of the minorities, as well as blues, early jazz standards and old schlagers could now be heard among the old fiddle tunes.

**Phase six.**

In the 1980’s the sixth and latest phase starts. This is a period when the revival movement is organised and institutionalised. Much of the control of the meaning and use of folk music is taken over by the new organisations and institutions. Since devolution is no longer the dominant way to understand change, the focus shifts from collection and preservation, to creation, use and re-use. New tunes are composed in traditional or semitraditional styles, and many of them become very popular around the country. Folk musicians are now educated as music teachers, and employed by the growing communal music schools. There they start to teach their music to the very young, fostering new generations of folk musicians. In the 90’s there were more folk musicians than ever in Sweden, probably more than during the whole history of folk music all together, and better equipped and educated than any other generation before them.

In this phase the horizon again shifts, now from international to global. As I understand it, music becomes heritage, is heritage-isised if such a word is conceivable. Heritage is a new globalized mode of cultural production, where a major value is pastness - the older, the better. All music with a history can be heritage-isised, from classical, to jazz, pop, and rock, and certainly traditional musics of all kinds. The rapid heritage-isation of music is again shifting the control over folk and traditional music, in ways not yet easily understandable or describable.

To sum up the previous sections you could say that folk and traditional music in Sweden today exists in several different constellations. There still is some music with basically the same use and function as in the “old peasant society”. There is also some folk music that reproduces practices of the late 1890s and early twentieth century. There are the forms of the 30’s and 40’s, as there are still many revivalists that continue to perform in the styles of the 60’s and 70’s. And of course, there are today’s more market oriented “world music” styles. All these constellations make use of basically the same repertoire, collected and preserved.
mainly in the late 19th century, and of the same type of discourse, centering around words that continue to be important in the 21st century: ‘folk’, ‘traditional’, ‘authentic’ ‘old’. Also, to all of them preservation is important, but for different reasons. All of these constellations have been born by moving a music from one context to another, for reasons of preservation or use.

**Doers, knowers and makers**

Some of the changes outlined above can be analysed by use of a simple model. Any field or arena of music consists of at least three typical positions in relation to the actors’ motives or goals. Many actors’ prime motive is simply to make music. These we can call “doers”. To make music, doers have to obtain extensive knowledge and resources, and these are primarily understood as means to reach the goal. Abstract, theoretical knowledge that does not relate directly to the music-making often play a subordinate role. For the typical doer, quality and authenticity are anchored in the music-making itself and the experiences that evolve from it: “As long as it feels all right, it is all right”.

For another type of actor it is precisely the abstract knowledge about music that is the goal. We can call these “knowers”. Their goal is the knowledge itself and the research involved to find answers for questions about when, where, how and who. The typical case is of course the academic researcher, but in reality most knowers are amateur-researchers who do not belong to Academia. The result of focusing upon knowledge is that most activities consist of, and circle around, words. Typical knowers perform most of their activities at desks, in archives, libraries, classrooms and at conferences. Quality and authenticity are anchored in scientific procedures. This makes exegesis an important activity, that is, discussions about how sources and materials can be interpreted. From the perspective of the doer, the results of such discussions, often presented as central products of many years of research, can seem of remote interest because of the lack of obvious relationship to music-making. In Sweden, as in many other countries, the differences in perspectives of “doers” and “knowers” have become institutionalized in conservatories and departments of musicology respectively.

A third type of actors are those whose prime motive is to distribute and sell the results of the activities of doers and knowers. Producers, managers, salesmen, entrepreneurs of different kinds: we can call them “makers”. The goals of doers and knowers are for makers more often than not means to reach other goals, for example to raise attention, spread messages, attract
audiences, or to make money. Typically, quality is related to how successfully these goals are reached, and therefore quality is readily translated to quantity.

Doers, knowers and makers are three positions that actors can take in relation to a musical field. One and the same individual can easily move between all three positions. They make up a system, a model that can be used for description and analysis of processes of change in the control of, and power over, the expressive forms that make up the centre of a musical field.

**Shifting power over the Middle Ages**

An example is the displacement of the power over the “Middle Ages” that has taken place since the 1980’s. Earlier the Middle Ages belonged almost entirely to knowers because of their control over the access to the firsthand-sources, for example the unique and precious medieval books (incunabular), preserved in special research libraries. Knowledge about the Middle Ages thus became profoundly marked by their special interests and filtered through their perspectives. The type of knowledge needed by potential doers to enact other versions of the Middle Ages was not produced at all by the knowers. Instead they produced many – to the doers mostly uninteresting - debates about interpretation and origins. But during the 1990s the monopoly of the knowers was broken due to the publishing of source material on the Internet. Thereby the sources became directly accessible, in transcription or facsimile, to a growing number of young people interested not in knowing, but in doing. In their hands, these sources were quickly transferred to handbooks for performers by adding simple, concrete “do-it-yourself” instructions to the original texts.

A specific example of this proces is Thoinot Arbeau’s “Orcheseographie” first published in 1589, one of few sources on dance modes of the late Middle Ages and Renaissance. For centuries it was available only to a small number of dance professionals and researchers. Between the 1880s and 1970s the book was published in several limited editions. In the 1990’s the entire work was scanned and made available on the Internet by several persons independently from each other, all of whom had links to then fast growing Middle Age movement around the world. 5 Most of these “doers” seem to have little or no interest in source interpretation and criticism, but all the more for how they themselves could learn to perform the dances. To meet these needs, to the new Internet editions have been added simple

5 With one of its centres in the world-wide organization Society for Creative Anachronism, SCA.
“do-it-yourself” instructions that seem be modelled upon the “getting started” sections of software manuals. On the Internet you can also find appropriate music, advice on style, clothing, shoes and much more. As a result of this rapid development, during the medieval week in Visby, Gotland, young enthusiasts dressed up in medieval-style clothes dance their home-made versions of dances, most of which have not been danced at all for centuries. These are performed to their own homemade songs or to any music that happens to be available to them. Their interest is not to create authentic replicas of the original dances, but rather to experience the dancing itself. There are many similar examples whereby Internet provides not only an easily accessible channel to original sources, but also to “cookbook” recipes for how to make the best use of them, that is how to achieve the strongest possible experience.

The knowers’ loss of the monopoly over the sources has meant that they can no longer control definitions of content, meaning, right or wrong. This has given the doers new possibilities. This is but a small part of a massive trend in many parts of society that may be summarised “from informative to performative”. Many observers have pointed out that in recent years museums, schools, TV, and radio, have come to centre around the sensual, emotional and experiential, rather than the earlier so central intellectual capacities. When emotions and experiences are foregrounded, objects are transformed into instruments for the experiencing subjects. The objects are interesting as long as they produce emotional experiences. This creates a drive for raised levels of esthetical expression. Then esthetics, not ethics, moral or knowledge, become leading principles of how to evaluate life (cf Bauman 1994). These two shifts - from knowers to doers and makers, and from knowing, doing and making, to the results and effects (emotional experiences, performances, profits, raised attention etc) - represent a new order in the power structures around the production and managing of knowledge that without doubt will have many consequences in the future (Lundberg, Malm & Ronström 2000).

Shifting control over folk music in Sweden
The development of folk music in Sweden can also be described and analyzed as shifts from knowers to doers and makers, and from knowing to doing and making. As we have seen, the concept of folk music was coined in the late 18th century on the initiative of knowers. The content grew out of long-standing negotiations between knowers and doers. By the late 1900s folk music had became petrified into a national symbol, and as such it survived well into the
1970s. Then a new generation of young doers simply took over the power over the definitions and moved folk music from the urban salons and the national manifestations, to large popular outdoor celebrations. With the popularisation of folk music during the 1970’s and 80’s the emergence followed of a new and earlier almost insignificant type of actors in the field of folk music: record producers, managers, festival organisers, and so on. With them followed stickers, flyers, riders, posters, demos, important features of a pop/rock musical format that during the following decades became standard also in the field of folk music. In the course of only a few years, makers took control over arenas and media central to the field. Their perspective soon came into conflict with those already established, and the result was the birth of a new type of folk music, in Sweden first coined “FUP” (folkmusik utan polis, or “folk music without police”), then “new folk music” and världsmusik (“world music”).

Starting in the 80’s the, gradually changing its focus, “where the action is”, from informal live performances to big festivals and CD- recordings.

A result of these shifts is a new wave of medialisation of the folk music scene. The ideas about the locus of music, or as Erwin Goffman puts it “where the action is”, changes. Earlier in Sweden folk musicians tended to hold that the music was located in the interaction between musicians, and between musicians and audience. This was institutionalized in fiddlers gatherings, spelmansstämmor, and expressed through its focus on informal playing together. Recordings were seen as secondary representations of music. Today, often the opposite is true, as already has been the case for a long time among rock and pop musicians. The prime locus of modern folk, traditional or world music is formally controlled situations, such as big festivals, studios or rehearsal rooms. Live performances are increasingly seen as secondary representations of recordings, or recordings still to be made. This has led to a new level of objectification of the music, not so much as ‘folk’ of the old days, but as artistic creations of especially gifted individuals, that is a return of the old romantic notion of the artist.

As in the field of the Middle Ages more and more of what is considered to be the “original” sources of folk music have become available on the Internet, as transcriptions, midifiles, recordings, texts etc. Thereby the doers are equipped with new tools, while at the same time knowers rapidly loose control to makers over such important parts of the field as aesthetical evaluations and definitions of central concepts. This shift is partly a result of the impressive
general growth of both doers and makers in most fields of music in the last decades. Earlier, when music was an activity of the few, makers were neither many nor significant. In the 20th century the music market has exploded. The more doers the bigger market, and the bigger market the more makers. Today, the number of makers in the field of folk music is larger than ever before. It is among the makers that we find many of folk musics’ most “burning souls”. What they are burning for is not necessarily more or better music, but raised visibility, attention and status for “their” kind of music, for their country or ethnic group, if not for their record company, artist agency or festival. Through this development folk music has become a part of a growing world-wide “attention economy” (Goldhaber 1997a, b), which in turn is closely related to the new global mode of heritage production.

Concluding remarks

What generalisations can be made from the Swedish case? The first point I want to stress is that collection and preservation is never neutral, objective. Rather, the objects to be collected and preserved are created by and through these activities. Secondly, every system, every institutionalised practice, produces its objects, and its users, by taking control over definitions and practices. Folk and traditional music is the result of collecting and preserving. The shifts in the meanings, uses and functions of folk and traditional music are results of changes in institutional practices, or by changes of control from one institution to the other. If we are to understand folk music and traditional music, we have to start by investigating into the definitions and practices of the institutions in control of collecting and preserving, as of exhibiting and distributing.

There also other points that comes up when reflecting over the Swedish case. One is that there are a number of possible ways to understand both “preservation” and “use”. For example, when preservation is translated to the national level it could mean anything from exclusion, as when certain musical forms are forbidden, as when certain musical forms regarded as especially valuable are claimed to be essentially “ours”, although admittedly also used by

---

6 As when the popular folk dance ”Eleno mome” in the early 1980’s was excluded from the official repertoire of Yugoslav folk dance groups on the grounds that it was originally Bulgarian.
others, and by elimination, as when musicians are simply killed, their instruments and other remnants of their activities is destroyed.

Another point is that if the idea is to preserve, in the sense of ensuring the survival of traditional music, it might paradoxically be necessary to abandon the idea that the music in question is dying or disappearing. Such a devolutionary premise leads us far too easily to rescue operations, which in fact may be the most serious threat of all to a “living tradition”. Rescue operations demand action, “before it is too late”, which leaves little time for reflexion. They also require clear-cut definitions of what should be collected and preserved, which, as I have tried to show, depends less upon the music itself, than upon the ideologies, resources and practices of the institutions involved. In short, what is preserved is what could and should be preserved, not what there is to preserve. And, as we have seen, in the process of adapting collected musics to preserving institutions, the musics undergo such fundamental changes that it is questionable if it is at all the “same” music in any meaningful sense.

The most important lesson from the Swedish case is perhaps that it is possible to change focus from music as objects and products to interaction and processes. When the static view is replaced by a more dynamic, it is possible to see change not as a threat to tradition, but as the constituent factor of tradition, which many revivalists in Sweden and elsewhere gradually discovered. What I have tried to show here is that an emphasis on preservation of music as static objects both presupposes and produces changes in the uses, functions and meanings of the same music. An emphasis on the uses, functions and meanings on the other hand, both presupposes and produces changes in the performed music. It might turn out that changes of the latter type are less important then of the former.

The results of the changes instigated by the many folk revivalists in Sweden are indeed impressive: more folk music and more and better educated folk musicians than ever; a whole new musical infrastructure, from teaching institutions to festivals and clubs; museums and

---

7 As when all sides in the Yugoslav conflict in late 80s and early 90’s started to change the names of persons in the much praised old heroic epic songs to make them more in tune with their own naming practices, with the obvious aim to strengthen the claims to their rights to these songs.

8 The most famous example is perhaps an incident reported of in the memoirs of Dimitrij Shostaković. In the Ukraine in the 1930’s the Soviet authorities rounded up a large number of singers of old heroic epic songs, to have them to perform at a large festival. According to Shostakovic, after the festival every one of them was brought out through the backdoor and shot.
archives transformed from controllers to suppliers of material, no need for immediate rescue operations. If it is at all possible to generalise from this it would be that it seems more meaningful to use available resources to strengthen the infrastructure of a certain music culture than to collect and preserve music as such. Instrument making, teaching, performing, composing, socialising through and around music - all these activities that make up the core of any music culture, can be if not preserved, in any case supported. Any such support has to consider not so much the needs of the preserving institutions as the needs of the performers and their audiences.

This seems all the more important in the light of where the new mode of globalised heritage production seems to lead us. Even when traditional music is understood as “folk”, national, it is today often used on a global arena.9

Heritage is rapidly moving us into new mindscapes, by introducing new discourses, redefining concepts, taking control over memory and history. By being heritage-isised, traditional music now is moving into a new domain, where it is understood as belonging not only to a folk, or a nation, but also to mankind. This makes any music possible to explore by anybody, for whatever reason. This has implications for individuals and groups, as they may get access to more musical forms to express their emotions, affections and identities. It has implications also for transnational organisations, such as Unesco with its World Heritage Lists, and of course the global music and tourist industries. These global structures seem to have much to gain in terms of control over resources by promoting music as heritage. So, when Japanese Gagaku, or the carnival in Trinidad is transformed to World Heritage, what does this mean in terms of control over musical behaviour? Embraced by such structures what risk is there of suffolking?

References and suggested reading:

9 As for example when the Tuvan government in 1994 organized the first world championship in chöömej, with the intention to persuade Unesco to recognize this vocal technique as belonging to the Tuvan people, of course in hard competition with the Mongols, and some other peoples of central Asia.
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