DOI: 10.11649/sm.3102

Slavia Meridionalis 24, 2024
Article No.: 3102

Citation:
Łopuszyńska, H. (2024). *The Klaić Effect*: Dragan Klaić's expert cooperation with Lublin in the European Capital of Culture competition and the city's peripherality. *Slavia Meridionalis*, *24*, Article 3102. https://doi.org/10.11649/sm.3102

Hanna Łopuszyńska
University of Warsaw
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8807-3962

The Klaic Effect: Dragan Klaić's Expert Cooperation with Lublin in the European Capital of Culture Competition and the City's Peripherality[1]

Introduction

Lublin, alongside several other Polish cities, was a candidate for the European Capital of Culture title in 2016. It did not win the title, but participation in the competition resulted in significant and lasting cultural and social revival for this city. This would not have happened without the development strategy that was conceptualised within the ECC task force. Three European scholars played an expert role in the team's work: British theatre scholar Rose Fenton,

[1] The title refers to a book by P. Kubicki, B. Gierat-Bieroń and B. Orzechowska-Wacławska: *Efekt ESK. Jak konkurs na Europejską Stolicę Kultury 2016 zmienił polskie miasta* (Kubicki et al., 2017).

This work was supported by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, Republic of Poland.

Competing interests: no competing interests have been declared.

Publisher: Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, provided that the article is properly cited. © The Author(s) 2024.

Polish poet and cultural animator Krzysztof Czyżewski, and Sarajevo-born theatre theorist Dragan Klaić. In the context of Lublin, the category of peripherality is important, as Dragan Klaić also had in mind.

Dragan Klaić was born in Sarajevo in 1950 and spent his youth in Novi Sad. After graduating in drama at the University of Belgrade, he went to the United States on a scholarship. He later completed his PhD in theatre history and drama criticism at Yale University. Upon his return to Yugoslavia, he began teaching at the University of Belgrade. He then worked as a theatre critic and playwright. He also became a contributor to the theatre quarterly European Theatre Quarterly Euromaske. In 1991, he decided to emigrate from Yugoslavia, which was then in a state of civil war and disintegration. He settled permanently in Amsterdam. He soon became a permanent member of the Felix Meritis Foundation. He also taught at the University of Leiden and has guest-lectured at many other European universities (Klaić, 2006b). The idea of selecting Klaić – as an active and respected academic and cultural critic in Western Europe – to be an expert was Krzysztof Czyżewski's initiative, which came about after Lublin's Vice-President for Culture, Włodzimierz Wysocki, suggested that the ECC task force should engage with researchers as well as cultural activists so as to strengthen Lublin's candidature, especially in terms of its content.

In this dissertation, which reconstructs the thought of Dragan Klaic and his contribution to the ECC Task Force, I argue that Klaić's ideas have the potential to redefine Lublin's peripherality. To this end, I analyse the *Facing the East* part from Lublin's Competition *Application* (Skrzypek, 2010, pp. 110–119), a document that every city participating in the competition was obliged to draft. I confront this text, co-written by Klaić, with the concepts of interculturalism, intercultural competence, and border, as understood by the researcher. I draw here on Klaić's autobiographical essay *Home Is Where Your Friends Are. Exile Between Internet and Ikea Table* (Klaić, 2006b).[2] In the context of the concept of the knowledge society, I discuss the expert documents that he directed to the ECC task force, namely *Model of Cultural Management in Lublin (governance)* and the *Lublin Cultural Observatory*. I also draw on a non-directive interview I conducted on 10 February 2021 with a member of the ECC task team and director of the Department of Culture of the City of Lublin, Michał Karapuda.

[2] The work was translated into Croatian, and it is this version (bearing the title *Vježbanje egzila*) that I use in this work.

Klaić towards the East – an appreciation of Lublin's peripherality?

Peripherality is a matter of optics. The centre-periphery relationship can only be described by a specific category or a carefully selected set of categories. However, this does not change the fact that certain values and narratives predominate in social circulation over others, which means that terms such as peripherality or centrality are the result of more or less intense generalisation. Lublin's peripherality is certainly a peripherality on a national and European Union scale, which explains why the main theme around which the conceptualisations of candidature were focused was called *City in Dialogue*. In this paper, I will look at the *Application*'s thematic axis *Towards the East*, as the analyst's influence seems to be greatest in its creation. However, before doing so, I will look at the key concepts of interculturalism and intercultural competence as this will help me to sketch the broader interpretative context of the aforementioned pillar of the *Application*.

Dragan Klaić, when undertaking sentimental 'experimental' trips in the 1990s to the countries that emerged after the break-up of Yugoslavia (Klaić, 2006b, p. 94), wrote about the "Balkan swamp of similarities cum enmities" (Klaić, 2006b, p. 111)[3] being a negation of the ideas of interculturality and intercultural competence that were very important to him.

This critic defined interculturalism simply as "the interaction of cultural groups despite and in spite of the differences that divide them" (Klaić, 2011b, p. 231). As he explained, it connotes more "engagement" and "dynamism" and is a more "active" concept than multiculturalism. Multiculturalism, however, was not negated here; indeed, it provided a starting point and a basis for interculturalism. At the same time, Klaić marked his commitment to multiculturalism by saying in an interview from 2006 that it may be a failed policy (cf. Modood, 2014, pp. 22–26), but "as a situation, it is still with us" (Sarajevo-x.com, 2006). He grounded this last statement in light of the migratory provenance of communities in today's European cities (Djapo, 2007). Such an understanding of multiculturalism is reminiscent of, for example, Tariq Modood's conception of multiculturalism, who describes it as "the political accommodation of minorities that have emerged through migration to Western

[3] All excerpts translated by the author.

countries from outside the area of the rich West" (Modood, 2014, p. 17). He also points out the rooting of his thinking about the concept in current events of political and social life. Indeed, this British-Pakistani sociologist writes: "multiculturalism […] has its roots in recent, still-embodied policy and political developments and other unfolding events in the real world" (Modood, 2014, p. 30). What is less important is that such a juxtaposition makes it possible to locate Klaić on the map of European thinkers positioning themselves in precisely this particular way towards multiculturalism. What seems important from the point of view of this work, however, is the light shed by these statements on the peripherality of Lublin. This is because it calls into question the strength and unambiguity of the use of this term in relation to this city.

Intercultural competence, on the other hand, was understood by Klaić as "an ability, a will, a mentality, a skill, but also a policy and a strategy for relating to another". In his view, it implied: "respect, curiosity and willingness to enter into sustained relationships and interactions with the other with the conviction that this will bring a kind of cultural enrichment and richness and result productively in the sense of creating new cultural diversity". The "capacity" mentioned here was also "the capacity for authentic and intercultural engagement" (Djapo, 2007).

Klaić criticised certain proposals for intercultural dialogue (which can be found, among others, in *Seeking to Make Sense of Intercultural Dialogue Year 2008* (Klaic, 2006a) for their superficiality. More interesting here, however, seems to be his instructions on how to bring about sustained intercultural or intercultural engagement. These instructions postulate an interest in the traditions and experiences of multicultural cities. In the aforementioned document, Klaić proposes:

> […] a turn towards forgotten cities of past intercultural glories [here, he mentions centres such as Bratislava, Wroclaw or Trieste – author] and the work to rehabilitate their memories and experiences. (Klaic, 2006a)

Given the ethnic conflicts present in the history of the listed centres, one might consider the quoted statement naive. However, it seems to say that familiarisation with tradition can avoid past mistakes, according to the principle that only those who do not know history repeat it.

Let us turn back to the analysis of *Facing the East*. Michal Karapuda recalls:

> […] Dragan has always pointed out that cooperation directly between neighbours – in this case, Lublin and Ukrainian cities or Brest and Belarusian cities – should be a basic activity

> for us. He also reiterat "You have already looked to the West, but you are in the European Union, so now your role is to turn to the East" (Łopuszyńska & Karapuda, 2021).

The Director of the Department of Culture points out that Klaić was clearly critical of the lack of free movement eastward of Poland at the time, and in particular of the lack of this movement eastward of the Lublin Voivodeship, which we can also read in the *Application* section of the document under discussion. Such an approach fails to realise the potential of contacts with, for example, Belarus, which should be equally appreciated here due to its close and real neighbourhood.

This is how the authors of the *Application* justify the importance of the project *Facing the East*:

> [the topic *Facing the East* – author] opens up a long-awaited opportunity for the local, national and international community to overcome entrenched prejudices that have divided the space of European culture for centuries. (Skrzypek, 2010, p. 110)

The city has the potential to be an advocate and promoter of European models and values. This role is to be realised in the regions beyond the eastern border, not only of the voivodeship or the country but of the European Union itself. This is undoubtedly a very ambitious project, especially in view of the fact that the aforementioned prejudices or patterns of thinking are firmly rooted outside the target area. To achieve this goal, the mentality of Poles themselves must, of course, also change. The authors mention the firmly entrenched Polish thinking – the so-called "borderland myth". The narrative locates its pattern-making and culture-creating potential in the eastern borderlands of the former Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth. But, unfortunately, it also includes domination or even colonisation of other ethnic and national groups inhabiting these territories (see also Skolik, 2017, pp. 242–247)[4]. The *Application* thus includes a proposal to replace this pernicious narrative with a narrative of the "myth of the borderland" (Bracha, 2006), which is here understood as "partnering and embodying in our shared centuries-old tradition what is today in Europe referred to as the intercultural dialogue [subc. – author]" (Skrzypek, 2010, p. 110). Let us recall that the above-mentioned idea is very important in Klaic's thought as a whole.

[4] As Mirosław Ustrzycki writes about the attitude to the described lands displayed by the nobility of the late nineteenth century, i.e., the group in the Polish discourse that was most culture-creative at the time: "[they] believed that the Kresy was not a borderland, but the centre of Polishness" (Ustrzycki, 2006, p. 181, as cited in Skolik, 2017, p. 246).

Let us now return for a moment to Klaić's thought itself. In describing his Yugoslav identity, the researcher goes back in time, deep into the history of his family. He points out:

> […] being a Yugoslav, I found a convenient framework for integrating the various roots of my Jewish ancestors, who came from many parts of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, belonging today to Poland, Ukraine, Romania and Hungary, and for combining them [roots – author] with the traditions and temperaments of the Balkan peoples. (Klaić, 2006b, p. 9)

Klaić thus describes Yugoslavia as an administrative creation that allows a unique cultural melting pot to function. In his reflections, however, he does not go so far as to declare the total elimination of administrative borders. Without considering the reasons for this situation, it is worth emphasizing that the border, as he understands it, contains precisely a positive, integrating potential. Perhaps this potential also lies in the very act of crossing borders. After all, without it, the integration of diversity would not carry its qualitative change.

Personal experiences, from which we can, however, read criticism of the functioning of borders and praise of mobility, would also later find resonance in Klaić's scholarly work. Michal Karapuda even got the impression that Klaić wanted to "work through the trauma of emigration and the dangers encountered along the way in the context of cultural activities" (Łopuszyńska & Karapuda, 2021), which means that the idea of a border criticised by the researcher can also be understood metaphorically as an obstacle to building lasting, strong and positive intercultural contacts. Borders for Klaić – being at the same time both real and metaphorical ones – are at the same time symbols of dynamism and stasis, constraints and freedom.

The authors of the *Application* point out that:

> […] there were also times when Lublin forgot or denied its Easternness. At that time, the East became the city's complex, a testimony to its provinciality and civilisational backwardness. (Skrzypek, 2010, p. 110)

The authors of the *Application* point out the presence of negative and traumatic historical backgrounds in the region. At the same time, they do not forget that the Polish side was often largely responsible for the conflicts that occurred. They write:

> […] also on the Polish side, its presence in the East draws a shadow trail – the memory of ethnic, confessional and class conflicts, deportations to the farther East and "repatriations" to the West, loss of property and uprooting (Skrzypek, 2010, p. 110; cf. Pisuliński, n.d.).

They emphasise that the memory of this, including the dark side of history associated with the Polish presence "in the East", should not be forgotten or repressed (Skrzypek, 2010, p. 110).

On the other hand, the *Application* cites several cultural initiatives aimed at developing relations with countries across the eastern border. These initiatives simultaneously contributed to the cultural development of Lublin. We can read there, for example, the activities of Jerzy Giedroyc along with his *Kultura paryska* (Skrzypek, 2010, p. 117; cf. Marszał & Srokosz, 2012). However, the vast majority of the mentioned activities revolve around Polish–Ukrainian contacts, including the activities of *Akcent* magazine, or the idea of establishing a Polish–Ukrainian university in Lublin (Skrzypek, 2010, p. 117).

In my opinion, a clear desire to problematise the Eastern heritage of Lublin is evident in certain statements in the document. On the one hand, it is based on historically grounded diagnoses, but it provides yet another stimulus to consider the peripherality of Lublin or the way the authors themselves perceive it. The text begins with the following sentences:

> Lublin never belonged exclusively to the East […] in all these contexts it was a borderland between East and West, a connector between civilisations. The fact that Lublin is located in the borderland means that its Easternness has never been obvious. (Skrzypek, 2010, p. 110)

A kind of avoidance of the East is present here. Symptomatically, the authors do not mark a certain degree of cultural distinctiveness from the West. Given the requirement of Europeanness or Europeanisation present in the *Application* process of the competition, this would be detrimental to the candidature process itself. In my opinion, precisely that unfortunate distribution of accents implies that despite the declarative desire for interaction, dialogue and cooperation, the East has not only "troubled" Lublin, and – as we read in the document (Skrzypek, 2010, p. 112) – the Lublin of the past, but even the authors of the *Application* themselves have not been able to rid themselves of the residues of the thinking in which peripheral and non-European East connotes negativity. Hence, there is a desire to balance these two cultural dimensions, or rather – to put it colloquially – a desire to incorporate the positive aspects of Easternness or peripherality into the city's development. It can be said that this balancing act manifests itself by marking the dark and light sides – if we want to concretise these Eastern connections – of the history of Lublin–Ukrainian or Lublin–Belarus relations.

The ambitious *Application* is also backed by long experience of positive relations, which increases the chances of its implementation. The role of Lublin as an "active ambassador" of the Eastern Partnership (cf. Mizerska-Wrotkowska, 2011) should be to develop contacts and cooperation through culture. The role of the city is to implement a project of sustainable development within the country, i.e., to level the differences between the east and west of Poland (Skrzypek, 2010, p. 113; cf. Poczta-Wajda & Sapa, 2017).

The authors of the *Application* point to accusations already made against the Eastern Partnership regarding Poland's alleged or anticipated role in the project as a dominant state and again "colonising" the lands beyond its eastern border. However, they distance themselves from these allegations, calling them largely "irrational", although they also point out that they understand the socio-historical basis of Poland's domination with "little knowledge of the languages and cultures of the eastern neighbours" on the part of Poles (Skrzypek, 2010, p. 113).

Looking ahead, it is worth noting, for example, the teaching of the languages of the eastern neighbours in municipal schools, which is practically non-existent.[5] However, there are other initiatives, such as Ukrainian language courses for the employees of Lublin City Hall (InYa, 2023). According to Krzysztof Czyżewski (another expert during the described candidature and co-author of the *Application*), it is language that determines the quality of dialogue – as is especially important in the environment of multi-ethnic, multi-cultural cities – which is why the linguistic competence of the borderland inhabitants is so important (Czyżewski et al., 2006). This poet also points out that "it is impossible to build a lasting bridge without establishing a language

[5] I found no information about the teaching of Belarusian or Ukrainian in these institutions, which is very worrying in the context of the presence of Ukrainian refugees in the city. After all, there is a Ukrainian Sunday School that offers inter-school and inter-primary courses to teach this language (*Ukraińska Szkoła Niedzielna w Lublinie*, n.d.). On the other hand, Ukrainian children can learn polish in Lublin (*Ukraińskie Centrum Edukacji – Lublin*, n.d.). The situation with Russian is not much better. In the educational offer of the three highest-rated public secondary schools in the city according to the *Perspektywy* ranking (*Ranking wojewódzki liceów 2021 – Lubelskie*, n.d.), namely in I Liceum Ogólnokształcące im. Stanisława Staszica (*Oferta edukacyjna*, n.d.), II Liceum Ogólnokształcące im. Hetmana Jana Zamoyskiego (*Rekrutacja do Zamoya*, n.d.) and at III Liceum Ogólnokształcące im. Unii Lubelskiej (*Oferta edukacyjna 2021/22*, n.d.), there is no teaching of Russian. Instead, Russian can be learnt by pupils of, among others, Prywatne Szkoły im. Królowej Jadwigi w Lublinie. As can be seen, the data on Russian language teaching in the city's schools do not illustrate the situation of a possible real subjective dialogue between the described national groups in the city.

that expresses it" (Czyżewski et al., 2006, p. 15), so it is also impossible to create a good neighbourhood.

The content of the *Application* fits in with the general characterisation of the activities of the newly acceded countries, with their discord between the desire to belong to a Western, European community in the political and administrative sense and the aspiration to carry these values to the East. The development of cooperation with eastern states outside the European Union is also important here (Krok, 2006). The turn towards the East has the dimension of a mission of European values:

> […] the border regime called the external border (*limes*) marks a kind of zone of stability and security around the EU – a circle of friends. It is formed by countries remaining outside the European Union, with no integration prospects for the time being. (Krok, 2006, p. 49)

The authors of the *Application* also point out:

> […] the eastern neighbourhood, separated from Europe by the Schengen line, is in fact a truly European test for the people of Lublin and the Lublin region. They understand more and more that in the current situation it is the East that makes them contemporary Europeans to a significant degree, because it is their identity, their licentia poetica in the European Union, their transnational horizon and battlefield against their own historical resentment, their complex turned into competence, their individual development strategy and their own voice heard in the metropolises of Europe. (Skrzypek, 2010, p. 116)

At the same time, the city's role here is defined as being a "dynamic growth centre" (Skrzypek, 2010, p. 113). What makes these assumptions less plausible is the text's lack of emphasis on Polish–Belarusian relations, although one must also bear in mind here the limitedness of actions concerning the city in principle in the face of supra-local political entanglements. Instead, we can also interpret the turn towards locality as a desire to move towards the centre, as "locality is an essential aspect of the ontology of cultures that may identify with the centre but can never coincide with it outright" (Kobylińska et al., 2016, p. 224). For obvious reasons, this connotes the dynamic nature of the centre–periphery relationship. In the very construction of this pillar of the *Application*, what is perhaps also puzzling is the overly bold stewardship of the expression 'East' itself. It may, after all, also be understood very broadly, including in the oriental sense, but such an understanding of the term was hardly intended by the authors of the document, especially since, as I have already mentioned, the proposals and opportunities for cooperation are mainly seen in Polish–Ukrainian relations.

Dragan Klaić and the development of Lublin's cultural infrastructure

At this point, I would like to present Dragan Klaić's contribution to the aforementioned transformation of the cultural and social scene in Central and Eastern Europe after the fall of communism. I restrict my reflections to the expansion and strengthening of cultural infrastructure. As in the previous chapter, I am not building my findings directly on an analysis of the *Application's* thematic axis, which should be *Culture of Knowledge* (Skrzypek, 2010, pp. 120–127) here, but on a discussion of two documents submitted by the researcher to the ECC Task Force. These are *Model of Cultural Management in Lublin (governance)* and the *Lublin Cultural Observatory*. I interpret the sources through the category of the knowledge society.

This choice of research strategy, in my opinion, better illustrates the contribution of Klaić himself to redefining or breaking down the peripherality of the city. Following Jacek Kochanowski, I assume that Polish society at the beginning of the 21st century can be described as a knowledge society. This characterisation means that, for this group, knowledge becomes the main tool for the emancipation and modernisation that goes with it. It determines the success of the transformation process, the associated democratisation, and the shape of economic development (Kochanowski, 2006).

Dragan Klaić, in the documents cited above, proposes a model for the institutional development of the idea of a cultural partnership between the city and its universities. Proposed in the *Model of cultural management in Lublin (governance)* document, Lublin Parliament of Culture was to be an "open forum convened once a year by the mayor and deputy mayor" with the intention of analysing Lublin's achievements to date in the field of cultural management or working out new strategies and setting the budget for the following year. Klaić proposes that the forum should include, in addition to cultural activists or local business representatives, university academics. A person holding the title of professor was even proposed here to chair the session (Klaić, 2011c).

In the second document cited (see also Inkei, 2013, pp. 53–58), the author clearly expresses that "the observatory should be based on a partnership between the city and the universities. He points out that it is important for the observatories' activities to be directed towards cooperation with external actors such as students or interns, including those from abroad. He also writes:

> […] the more public institutions seek to implement evidence-based cultural strategies, the more they feel the need to draw on the work of observatories and similar research and evidence-gathering bodies and be capable of generating and interpreting such evidence (Klaić, 2011a).

The observatory planned by Klaić can be a reservoir of data for entities wishing to carry out cultural research tasks (e.g., universities). The focus area of the observatory was designed by Dragan Klaić in Lublin. The researcher points out that such an institution would also be a good starting point for developing the city's contacts with the East. It would therefore also realise – alongside the Culture of Knowledge theme – the *Facing the East* pillar. By supporting cultural infrastructure, it would offer places of employment for students of Lublin's universities or secondary school graduates, thus protecting the city from their exodus, which is a serious problem for Lublin even today (Pakuła, 2020).[6]

Dragan Klaić thus assumes the role of advocate, initiator and educator in the field of the development and functioning of cultural infrastructure. It is worth noting the important dimension of the texts today from a historical perspective as they contain very basic indications of the hygiene and organisation of the work of such an institution. In the text on the cultural observatory, Klaić writes, among other things, that it is up to the Municipality to have the relevant units check the legal feasibility of the project. The researcher also points out that these institutions usually employ few staff, i.e., few people (Klaić, 2011a). It is worth adding that these recognitions are formulated on the basis of models of the functioning of these institutions in Europe and elsewhere in the world. This is undoubtedly an attempt to Europeanise Lublin's culture. Klaić is thus a practitioner who deftly instrumentalises the competition for the expansion of the city's cultural infrastructure, using his personal so-called cultural knowledge in the process.[7] It should also be mentioned that the observatory project resonated. Lublin's higher education institutions were identified as a possible partner for the to-be-established Cultural Observatory in Lublin according to the 2013–2020 city development strategy (Graban et al., 2013, p. 71), and among the expected results of the strategy "the development of cooperation between universities and the city" was indicated (Graban et al., 2013, p. 72).

[6] The number of people studying in Lublin who are graduates of the region's secondary schools decreased from 84,221 to 60,315 between 2010 and 2020 (*Dane i statystyki*, 2015).

[7] A term proposed by Grzegorz Kondrasiuk (2012).

Conclusion

As I have tried to show, the issues central to Dragan Klaić's thought are reflected in Lublin's application for the title of European Capital of Culture. In the document discussed in this work, *Model of Cultural Management in Lublin (governance)*, the researcher mentions that Lublin, by implementing development programmes, has a chance to become an "inspiration" for other Polish cities. Such cooperation is also intended to be a method of overcoming Lublin's provinciality (Klaić, 2011c). At the same time, it is the peripherality that is associated with it that is also the path to success here, according to the researcher's statement:

> […] the renewal and consolidation of cultural centres cannot be a routine operation, carried out by multiplying some standard model […] the context, location and cultural constellation should determine the function and profile of such a centre. (Klaić, 2009, p. 98)

Proposals formulated by Klaić for the expansion or redevelopment of cultural infrastructure, intended to be a driving force for development and overcoming the city's negative peripherality, are still waiting to be realised. One may wonder why the projects of the Cultural Observatory or Lublin's Cultural Parliament were not realised in later years and why the idea of peripherality as a city's advantage was not developed. What immediately comes to mind here is that Lublin did not ultimately win the competition and so did not get the funds needed to realise these intentions. It is not true, however, that these projects were not realised to any extent. Klaić drew attention to the large number of volunteers in the city (Klaić, 2011c) and this potential of Lublin was developed in the Volunteer Culture programme (Czapka, 2011).

A chance to reconsider Dragan Klaić's idea could undoubtedly be the city's candidacy in another competition, this time for the title of European Capital of Culture 2029. This proposal was put forward in April 2021 by city activists (Domagała, 2021). However, right from the outset, it is striking that the *Open Letter to the City Authorities* regarding the city's candidature for the European Capital of Culture 2029 competition has only been translated into English and Ukrainian, so there is no Belarusian language version, whose presence here would be a manifestation of the desire to build ties with countries from beyond the eastern border, other than Ukraine. Eastern accents are not present in the document at all, which contrasts with the programme of Lublin as European Youth Capital

2023. In the latter, we can, for example, find cyclical integrations of Polish and Ukrainian students (*Wolna WySPA Ukraina: Lubelski Integrator Akademicko-Medialny*, n.d.). In the open letter to the city authorities regarding the application for European Capital of Culture 2029, the emphasis is on cooperation with neighbouring municipalities – which is largely a continuation of the *City and Region* pillar from the application in question – and the issue of inhabitants' participation in the cultural life of the city. The use of Lublin's academic resources in the cultural development of the city is also an important topic addressed in the text, so here Klaić's project seems to have its extension. However, it is important to bear in mind the possible changes in strategy resulting from the presence of Ukrainian refugees in the city, which still undertakes many activities related to their support (*Miasto Lublin pomaga obywatelom Ukrainy*, 2023). However, it can be argued that the researcher's recognition of the positive sides of peripherality was too avant-garde for the city and the urban activists who represent Lublin's citizens. The city's activists seem not to see the potential for the city's Europeanisation in emphasising Eastern accents in the broadest sense. However, in my opinion, a continuation of Klaić's ideas should take place if Lublin wants to develop its European potential and become a truly open city.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akcent. (n.d.). Akcent. Retrieved February 27, 2023, from http://akcentpismo.pl/

Bracha, B. (2006). Pogranicza – kulturowy tygiel czy mit? *Pismo Folkowe*, *2006*(65). https://pismofolkowe.pl/artykul/pogranicza-kulturowy-tygiel-czy-mit-3016

Czapka, M. (2011). Po drugiej stronie lustra, czyli bibliotekarz wolontariuszem. *Biuletyn EBIB*, *2011*(9(127)). http://www.ebib.pl/images/stories/numery/127/127_czapka.pdf

Czyżewski, K., Mutevelić, R., Miletić Oručević, T., Jackson, B., & Szumiński, W. (2006). *Księga mostu* (Z. Dudek, T. Miletić Oručević, M. Duškov, & K. Konopek, Trans.; K. Czyżewski, Ed.). Fundacja Pogranicze.

Dane i statystyki. (2015). lublin.eu – oficjalny portal miasta Lublin. Retrieved February 25, 2023, from https://lublin.eu/mieszkancy/partycypacja/lublin-dla-wszystkich/lublin-miedzykulturowy/dane-i-statystyki/

Djapo, A. (2007, May 25). *KUHINJA: Dragan Klaic interview* [Video]. YouTube. https://youtu.be/50sESV9iSf8

Domagała, M. (2021, April 28). *Lublin Europejską Stolicą Kultury 2029? "Tym razem wygramy"*. wyborcza.pl. Retrieved February 28, 2023, from https://lublin.wyborcza.pl/lublin/7,48724,27026883,lublin-europejska-stolica-kultury-2029.html

Graban, E., Jaborkhel, R., Kamola, M., Karapuda, M., Kipta, E., Pajdosz, A., Pasternak, A., Skrzypek, M., Szlęzak, R., & Wawruch, M. (2013). *Strategia Rozwoju Kultury Lublina na lata 2013–2020. Urząd Miasta Lublin. Załącznik do uchwały nr 895/XXXV/2013 Rady Miasta Lublin z dnia 18 listopada 2013 r.* https://lublin.eu/gfx/lublin/userfiles/_public/kultura/do_pobrania/strategia_rozwoju_kultury_lublina_na_lata_2013-2020.pdf

Inkei, P. (2013). Rola obserwatoriów kultury w kontekście aktywności kulturalnej osób starszych. *Studia Kulturoznawcze*, *2013*(2(4)), 53–58. https://bazhum.muzhp.pl/media/files/Studia_Kulturoznawcze/Studia_Kulturoznawcze-r2013-t-n2_(4)/Studia_Kulturoznawcze-r2013-t-n2_(4)-s53-58/Studia_Kulturoznawcze-r2013-t-n2_(4)-s53-58.pdf

InYa. (2023, February 17). *Urzędnicy uczą się języka ukraińskiego: Bezpłatne zajęcia w Lublinie*. radio.lublin.pl. Retrieved March 28, 2023, from https://radio.lublin.pl/2023/02/urzednicy-ucza-sie-jezyka-ukrainskiego-bezplatne-zajecia-w-lublinie/

Klaic, D. (2006a, October 6). *Dragan Klaic: Seeking to make sense of Intercultural Dialogue year 2008*. The Budapest Observatory. http://budobs.org/component/content/article/86-uncategorised/252-dragan-klaic-seeking-to-make-sense-of-intercultural-dialogue-year-2008.html

Klaić, D. (2006b). *Vježbanje egzila* (Z. Židovec, Trans.). Izdanja Antibarbarus.

Klaić, D. (2009). Ośrodki kultury w Europie: Historia rozwoju i główne czynniki sprzyjające wzrostowi (Z. Nowak-Soliński, Trans.). In J. Sójka, M. Poprawski, & P. Kieliszewski (Eds.), *Instytucje upowszechniania kultury w XXI wieku: Przeżytek czy nowa jakość?* (pp. 88–98). Bogucki Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Klaić, D. (2011a, January 29). *Lublin Cultural Observatory* (K. Szulga, Trans.). Document from the author's private archive.

Klaić, D. (2011b). *Mobilność wyobraźni. Międzynarodowa współpraca kulturalna: Przewodnik* (M. Turski, Trans.). Fundacja Nowej Kultury Bęc Zmiana; Narodowy Instytut Audiowizualny.

Klaić, D. (2011c, February 6). *Model of cultural management in Lublin (governance)* (K. Szulga, Trans.). Document from the author's private archive.

Kobylińska, A., Falski, M., & Filipowicz, M. (2016). *Peryferyjność: Habsbursko-słowiańska historia nieoczywista*. Libron.

Kochanowski, J. (2006). Ponowoczesne społeczeństwo wiedzy – kilka uwag porządkujących. *Nauka i Szkolnictwo Wyższe*, *2006*(1(27)), 83–94. https://pressto.amu.edu.pl/index.php/nsw/article/view/4773

Kondrasiuk, G. (2012). ESK, wiedza kultury, instrumentalizacja. In P. Celiński & J. P. Hudzik (Eds.), *Kultura wiedzy* (pp. 97–110). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Krok, K. (2006). Współczesne spojrzenie na obszary przygraniczne w Europie. In G. Gorzelak & K. Krok (Eds.), *Nowe granice Unii Europejskiej – współpraca czy wykluczenie?* (pp. 47–65). Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.

Kubicki, P., Gierat-Bieroń, B., & Orzechowska-Wacławska, J. (2017). *Efekt ESK: Jak konkurs na Europejską Stolicę Kultury 2016 zmienił polskie miasta*. Zakład Wydawniczy Nomos.

Łopuszyńska, H. , & Karapuda, M. (2021, February 10). [An interwiev with Michał Karapuda conducted by Hanna Łopuszyńska]. Document from the author's private archive.

Marszał, M., & Srokosz, J. (2012). Ukraina w myśli politycznej Jerzego Giedroycia. *Wrocławsko-Lwowskie Zeszyty Prawnicze*, *3*, 55–79. https://www.repozytorium.uni.wroc.pl/Content/122673/PDF/04_Marszal_M_Srokosz_J_Ukraina_w_mysli_politycznej_Jerzego_Giedroycia.pdf

Miasto Lublin pomaga obywatelom Ukrainy. (2023, April 26). lublin.eu – oficjalny portal miasta Lublin. Retrieved April 26, 2023, from https://lublin.eu/lublin/aktualnosci/miasto-lublin-pomaga-obywatelom-ukrainy,9392,66,1.html

Mizerska-Wrotkowska, M. (2011). Geneza i instytucjonalizacja Partnerstwa Wschodniego. In A. Szeptycki (Ed.), *Między sąsiedztwem i integracją: Założenia, funkcjonowanie i perspektywy Partnerstwa Wschodniego Unii Europejskiej* (pp. 43–63). Dom Wydawniczy Elipsa. Retrieved February 27, 2023, from https://open.icm.edu.pl/handle/123456789/5613

Modood, T. (2014). *Multikulturalizm* (I. Kołbon, Trans.). Wydawnictwo Nauka i Innowacje.

Oferta edukacyjna. (n.d.). I Liceum Ogólnokształcące im. Stanisława Staszica w Lublinie. Retrieved February 27, 2023, from https://lo1.lublin.eu/staszic/?subpage=page&id=4

Oferta edukacyjna 2021/22. (n.d.). III Liceum Ogólnokształcące im. Unii Lubelskiej w Lublinie. Retrieved February 27, 2023, from http://www.3lo.lublin.pl/Oferta_edukacyjna_202122,pl,site,136,0,147.html

Pakuła, P. (2020, February 13). Tracimy najzdolniejszych: Co piąty absolwent lubelskich szkół średnich wyjeżdża. *Kurier Lubelski +*. Retrieved February 25, 2023, from https://plus.kurierlubelski.pl/tracimy-najzdolniejszych-co-piaty-absolwent-lubelskich-szkol-srednich-wyjezdza/ar/c5-14783616

Pisuliński, J. (n.d.). *Stosunki polsko-ukraińskie 1939–1947 w polskiej historiografii – przegląd badań*. Retrieved March 25, 2023, from https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:npF91xQxO2sJ:https://ipn.gov.pl/download/1/50103/J-Pisulinski.pdf+&cd=1&hl=pl&ct=clnk&gl=pl

Poczta-Wajda, A., & Sapa, A. (2017). Paradymat rozwoju zrównoważonego – ujęcie krytyczne. *Progress in Economic Sciences*, *2017*(4), 131–141. Retrieved February 25, 2023, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318817500_Paradygmat_rozwoju_zrownowazonego_-_ujecie_krytyczne

Ranking wojewódzki liceów 2021 – Lubelskie. (n.d.). Perspektywy. Retrieved February 27, 2023, from https://licea.perspektywy.pl/2021/rankings/ranking-lubelski

Rekrutacja do Zamoya. (n.d.). II Liceum Ogólnokształcące im. Hetmana Jana Zamoyskiego w Lublinie. Retrieved February 25, 2023, from https://lo2.lublin.eu/rekrutacja/

Sarajevo-x.com. (2006, May 19). *Predavanje Violete Smijanovske u Mediacentru*. klix. https://www.klix.ba/magazin/kultura/predavanje-violete-smijanovske-u-mediacentru/060519022

Skolik, J. (2017). Mit kresowy i rzeczywistość zmitologizowana w życiu i twórczości Josepha Conrada-Korzeniowskiego. *Kultura Współczesna*, *2017*(3), 242–247. https://doi.org/10.26112/KW.2017.96.23

Skrzypek, M. (Ed.). (2010). *Lublin. Europejska Stolica Kultury 2016: Aplikacja*. Urząd Miasta Lublin.

Ukraińska Szkoła Niedzielna w Lublinie. (n.d.). Towarzystwo Ukraińskie. Retrieved February 25, 2023, from http://www.ukr-tov.pl/pl/?page_id=27

Ukraińskie Centrum Edukacji – Lublin. (n.d.). Galileo. Publiczna Szkoła Podstawowa. Retrieved June 17, 2024, from https://spgalileo-lublin.operator.edu.pl/uce/

Wolna WySPA Ukraina: Lubelski Integrator Akademicko-Medialny. (n.d.). lublin.eu – oficjalny portal miasta Lublin. Retrieved April 26, 2023, from https://lublin.eu/lublin/esm2023/kalendarz-wydarzen/wolna-wyspa-ukraina-lubelski-integrator-akademicko-medialny,135,0,w.html

Efekt Klaicia. Współpraca ekspercka Dragana Klaicia z Lublinem w konkursie na Europejską Stolicę Kultury a peryferyjność miasta

Krytyk kultury oraz teatru Dragan Klaić został zaproszony do współpracy eksperckiej z Lublinem podczas udziału miasta w konkursie o tytuł Europejskiej Stolicy Kultury 2016. W tej pracy analizuję wkład badacza w przygotowanie kandydatury Lublina. Skupiam się na kategorii peryferyjności, która jest bardzo ważna zarówno w myśli Dragana Klaicia, jak i w kontekście samego miasta. W zakończeniu stwierdzam, że projekty Klaicia, w których proponował on zarówno sposoby przezwyciężenia negatywnej peryferyjności miasta, jak i wykorzystania jej pozytywnych stron, wciąż czekają na swoją realizację.

Słowa kluczowe: Dragan Klaić; Lublin; Europejska Stolica Kultury; peryferyjność

The Klaić Effect: Dragan Klaić's expert cooperation with Lublin in the European Capital of Culture competition and the city's peripherality

Culture and theatre critic Dragan Klaić was invited to be an expert collaborator with Lublin during the city's participation in the 2016 European Capital of Culture competition. In this work, I analyse the researcher's contribution to the preparation of Lublin's candidature. I focus on the category of peripherality, which is very important both in Dragan Klaić's thought and in the context of the city itself. I conclude by stating that Klaić's projects, through which he proposed ways to both overcome the city's negative peripherality and to exploit the presence of its positive sides, are still waiting to be realised.

Keywords: Dragan Klaić; Lublin; European Capital of Culture; peripherality

Hanna Łopuszyńska (hanialopuszynska@gmail.com) – uzyskała tytuły licencjata ze slawistyki oraz kulturoznawstwa na Uniwersytecie Warszawskim. Interesuje się psychologią historyczną oraz międzykulturową. Dotychczas opublikowała artykuł "Lamentacja dla przyrody – (bez)nadzieja *Ziemskiego lamentu*?" w czasopiśmie „Adeptus" (nr 17/2021).

Hanna Łopuszyńska (hanialopuszynska@gmail.com) – she earned her BA in Slavic Studies and Cultural Studies at the University of Warsaw. She is interested in both historical and cross-cultural psychology. So far, she has published an article "Lamentacja dla przyrody – (bez)nadzieja *Ziemskiego lamentu*?" [A Lamentation for Nature – the (Dis)consolation of *Ziemski Lament*?] in the journal *Adeptus* (no. 17/2021).

Publication History: Received: 2023-05-26; Accepted: 2023-09-07; Published: 2024-07-29