



Introduction

Heritage at the Margins

In recent years, there has been growing academic interest in studying the multifaceted effects of UNESCO World Heritage sites ‘on the ground’.¹ Ethnographic case studies illuminate that to the communities living in or near the sites, the World Heritage List represents much more than a legal instrument for heritage protection. Such studies show that the officially sanctioned concept ‘World Heritage’ is produced within the contemporary cultural contexts of the World Heritage sites themselves, often relating to specific cultural symbols, economic processes, ideological uses and political intentionalities for the near future. This sheds light on the fact that World Heritage, and the sites’ more broadly defined cultural heritage, cannot be perceived as having fixed meanings that remain the same after a site’s World Heritage inscription. Nor can the particular meanings attached to UNESCO’s ascription of the sites’ ‘Outstanding Universal Value’ be seen as synonymous with how the local populations inhabiting the sites come to understand and use their World Heritage and cultural heritage more generally.

This book approaches heritage as sets of representations and relations (traditions, practices and symbols) that are socially constructed and hierarchically prioritized for particular reasons relating to spatial and temporal conditions. Focusing on the lived realities and self-expressions of Dubrovnikan citizens, contextualized within spatial relations and recent processes of change, the book explores how political, social, economic and cultural processes influence what is privileged and reified as heritage, and for what reasons.

A culture’s heritage can consist of, or be manifested in, both material and immaterial artefacts and practices. But the material and immaterial

aspects of heritage are intertwined and need to be studied in relation to one another. Regardless of the forms of representation, heritage is inevitably interlinked with relations of power and cultural memory, and is encapsulated in spatial and temporal relations (Lowenthal 2003; Ashworth and Tunbridge 1996; Smith 2006).

The incentives for obtaining status as a World Heritage site are connected to a whole host of sociocultural and political factors, where the desire to bolster tourism and attract international investments to stimulate economic and infrastructural development occupies a central position. While some instances of the attainment of World Heritage status produce few evident consequences on the ground, in many others the World Heritage status becomes intertwined with local sociocultural relations and power dynamics, and is actively drawn on in the consolidation of cultural identities and nationhood, in mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion and in discourses on development. The potential of the ‘branding’ effects of obtaining World Heritage enlistment has led to a ‘rush to inscribe’ and since the initial twelve inscriptions on UNESCO’s World Heritage List in 1978, the total number of sites has risen to 1,154 properties in 2021.² Several scholars and heritage managers have voiced concerns about whether the benefits that World Heritage can offer to heritage protection over the long term will be outweighed, or at least hampered, by the lure of short-term commercially motivated prioritizations. To such critics, it is not the encouragement of tourism in World Heritage sites per se that constitutes a challenge to heritage protection. Rather, the critiques tend to centre on the problems of poorly managed tourism development and uncontrolled constructions near World Heritage sites. Such processes can over time have adverse effects on the longevity of heritage and the values and identification attached to it, and can furthermore have negative impacts on the intercommunal relations of the host communities and on the environment. As such, tourism in World Heritage sites can become a ‘menace to the sustainable management of heritage. Therefore, a good understanding of the tourism sector, its markets and trends is instrumental to sustainable heritage management’ (Salazar 2015: 128).

A locally integrated and culturally sensitive heritage and tourism management has the potential to safeguard cultural values and local identity. By fostering a culturally sensitive heritage and tourism management, one can provide the necessary protection of the cultural heritage and local environment, and, at the same time, encourage local economic development and regeneration. Without accommodating for a long-term, sustainable heritage and site management, World Heritage enlistment can become a double-edged sword to the communities living in or near the site, which can present substantial challenges to the long-term impacts of heritage, and

negatively affect the communities' quality of life and the environment in the wider World Heritage area. Ethnographic knowledge of how heritage is produced and interpreted within particular cultural contexts, and of how heritage production intersects with – and influences – cultural practices, perceptions and social change, is needed in order to better understand the 'global-local dynamics of heritage interpretation' and production, its diverse uses and its effects (Salazar 2015: 128).

This book is a contribution to these ongoing debates. The book provides an ethnographic case study that explores how cultural heritage and its World Heritage is produced, negotiated and contested in Dubrovnik's postwar context,³ under the conditions of a global market economy.

As one of the world's earliest UNESCO World Heritage sites, Dubrovnik's inscription on the World Heritage List in 1979 occurred under a very different political, economic and cultural context – that of Josip Broz Tito's communist Yugoslavia (1945–91). In the period following national independence in 1991, Croatia has gone through and is still undergoing dramatic changes, all of which create new conditions for identity constructions and shape the particular meanings and uses of Dubrovnik's World Heritage.



Figure 0.1. Dubrovnik's walled centre and the suburbs Pile, Ploče and Buža from above. © Institute for the Restoration of Dubrovnik.

For much of the twentieth century, the population living in the Croatian territory has been subjected to political upheaval and conflict, wars and economic change. This has particularly been the case in the so-called borderland regions of the country, like Dubrovnik-Neretva County. Historical processes occurring in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries are of great significance in understanding how Dubrovnik's cultural heritage is produced and frequently used for ideological purposes, both in consolidating postwar nationhood and in local attempts to renegotiate Dubrovnik's centrality within the new nation state and in relation to Europe.

A main argument developed in this book is that historical processes and events of the recent past influence how Dubrovnik's World Heritage site is perceived and used by its current inhabitants. In particular, the city's condition as a postwar society influences communal interactions, cultural perceptions and practices. The postwar condition has refocused the meanings attached to the city's World Heritage site and the ways it is used in identity discourse and geopolitical and spatial reorientations.

Dubrovnik's status as a World Heritage site has helped to unify and anchor identities within the new geopolitical context, following the turbulent war in the 1990s and political upheavals. Yet the use of the city's World Heritage in postwar political discourse and economic development has equally produced new power dynamics, lines of social differentiation and exclusion mechanisms. Consequently, the interpretations and uses of Dubrovnik's World Heritage in contemporary society have led, in certain areas, to dissonance and outright conflict. This book's ethnography reveals that the way in which Dubrovnikans understand and use the city's World Heritage status – and the multiple ways in which this status becomes connected to the broader cultural heritage – constitute a source of both unification and dissonance. This is of paramount importance in attempts to foster a sustainable, community-based management of World Heritage.

The strong emphasis globally on the use of World Heritage in tourism development and in presenting new investment opportunities has, to a certain degree, distilled the 'value' of heritage into something quantifiable, which can then be commoditized as a 'product' for sale. Due to the large benefits that cultural heritage potentially brings to economic development, the protection of the former tends to be viewed in terms of 'investment decisions', 'where a "return" is expected from an "investment" in culture or heritage' (Labadi and Gould 2015: 203). This type of thinking is present in Dubrovnik's urban management and political prioritizations. It must be emphasized that to use World Heritage in economic development per se is not necessarily problematic and can potentially constitute a positive force for community development. However, without also recognizing and integrating other aspects and roles that heritage fulfils in relation to the communities

inhabiting the sites, one risks losing the important ‘lifeline’ embedded in heritage to practices, cultural values and place. This can ultimately induce communities’ sense of feeling deprived of their identification with their World Heritage, its perceived roots in the past and its continuity to the present.

The Dubrovnik Republic’s (1358–1808)⁴ cultural history and materiality are recognized in UNESCO’s inscription of the World Heritage site. In local postwar identity discourse, however, Dubrovnik’s World Heritage is often narrowly interpreted as virtually synonymous with the heritage of the Dubrovnik Republic.

The history of the Dubrovnik Republic, and the tangible heritage from this epoch, also constituted valuable resources for identity formation and tourism promotion in the former Yugoslavia.⁵ However, following Croatia’s independence, the longevity of the autonomous Dubrovnik Republic and its cultural, mercantile and political connections internationally are interpreted through the prisms of the recent experiences of war, Yugoslavian rule and the new geopolitical conditions.

UNESCO’s dialectic of World Heritage as being both of universal value and locally unique, as simultaneously expressing the diversity and unity of humanity, is interpreted and reinterpreted within pre-existing and changing local and national contexts. Dubrovnik’s (and Croatia’s) perceived Western European character, and the perception that the city has always been a stable and peaceful cultural oasis at the fringe of the turbulent and politically fragmented Balkans, are historically embedded themes in identity discourse. The continuing importance of Dubrovnik’s (and Croatia’s) position as a borderland between Europe and the Balkans and as a European cultural and religious ‘frontier’ is embedded in heritage discourses and interpretations of the city’s World Heritage. Rather than simply representing *World Heritage* of *universal* value, the cultural and symbolic values that World Heritage nomination epitomizes tend to be incorporated into the pre-existing discourses of Dubrovnik and Croatia’s intrinsic, but ‘long-denied’, Western European cultural identity.

Dubrovnik’s World Heritage is viewed by local residents as a technical, ‘professional’ denomination, which over the last four decades has become integrated into ‘local realities’. To many Dubrovnikans, World Heritage largely relates to the materiality of the UNESCO-protected site, and constitutes something that ‘adds value’ and international acknowledgement to the city’s walled centre. In daily life, however, interpretations of the World Heritage site are melded into discourses of Dubrovnik’s *kulturna baština* (cultural heritage) in a much deeper sense. This understanding of the World Heritage site, in its embedded cultural history and regional ethnography, includes a whole host of cultural values, regional, historical and political relationships, and past events, which are repeatedly drawn on in the present.

Consequently, Dubrovnik's broader cultural heritage cannot be separated from the attempts to make the city's World Heritage meaningful to its inhabitants.

Heritage and Temporality

Selected pasts, conveyed as heritage, have provided a major resource in the production of similarity and alterity throughout history in the territory comprising contemporary Croatia. Heritage production has abetted the creation and maintenance of notions of ethnic and religious distinction and remains central to the establishment and growth of nationalism. Central to such nation-building is the attempt to reify perceived historical 'golden eras' and promote perceptions of cultural purity and superiority of the 'collective self' as opposed to the inferiority of constructed otherness.

When history is turned into heritage, an 'intensification of the experience of synchronicity, and the concomitant destruction of diachrony – the loss of a sense of the past – are promoted' (Walsh 2002: 68). This selection process is entailed in heritage production, where certain selected, national or local, publicly sanctioned historic images, values, events, traditions and relations are prioritized over others. This selection process can result in a simplification and reification of the pluriversity of different pasts into one or a few selected 'master-narratives' (Salazar 2012a).

However, the particular pasts utilized as heritage and the meanings they convey are shaped and changed by the specific circumstances of each historical present. Different uses are made of the same heritage in different historical periods and are connected to the different social and political processes and power dynamics of each time. After the dissolution of the former Yugoslavia, Dubrovnik's cultural heritage has especially been marshalled to align the geopolitical borders of the new nation state to the perceived cultural borders of *Hrvatstvo* (Croatianness or Croatian nationhood). Throughout Dubrovnik's history, the city's religious and cultural borderland condition has asserted strong influences on local identity constructions. Cut off from the Balkan interior by the Dinaric Alps and positioned next to the Adriatic Sea, the narrow strip of land that today makes up Dubrovnik-Neretva County (Dubrovačko-neretvanska županija) has both forced and allowed its citizens to develop a culture both of separation and of long-distance sociopolitical connections with the Mediterranean. The real and imagined threats of invasion from the interior Balkans and Central Asia throughout its history were formative in Dubrovnikans' development of diplomacy, espionage and military strategies, and its perceived frontier position influenced the development of the long-standing *libertas*

(freedom) discourse (see Chapter 2). However, the establishment of the new national borders following the dissolution of the former Yugoslavia has made Dubrovnik's borderland condition even more pronounced in local identities. The air distance from the City of Dubrovnik to the national borders of Bosnia–Herzegovina and Montenegro is respectively around 5 km and 33 km.⁶ This has, metaphorically speaking, exacerbated the contemporary uses of heritage in Dubrovnik to build 'walls' against the interior parts of the Balkans and 'bridges' towards Western Europe, particularly the Mediterranean. The experiences of geographical, sociocultural and political marginality are multilayered. The Croatian nation state exists at the geographical margins of Europe; Dubrovnik exists at the geographical margins of Croatia ('the margin within the margin'); and the rural areas of Dubrovnik-Neretva County, which also inform this book's ethnographic material, are situated at the margins of Dubrovnik ('the margin within the margin').

Contemporary Dubrovnican identity constructions are strongly informed by the city's peripheral territorial position not only within Europe, but also within the Croatian nation state. The establishment of new state borders following Croatia's independence has cut off the county of Dubrovnik-Neretva from the rest of Croatia with the 20 km Bosnian coastal strip by Neum. This has heightened Dubrovnicans' feelings of living in a peripheral part of the nation state. By foregrounding the history of Dubrovnik Republic (1358–1808) as the city's 'golden era' and as a central cultural, political and mercantile seafaring republic in the development of 'European identity', local identity discourses attempt to reverse Dubrovnik's peripheral position and instead claim its centrality in forging a historic continuity of Croatia's European bonds. In upholding a perception of historical and cultural continuity, Dubrovnik's UNESCO World Heritage status becomes a resource in reconstituting a centred sense of self in a population that feels peripheral to both national and European political and cultural affairs. The centrality of Dubrovnik's cultural heritage in stimulating a recovery of tourism and the national economy in the postwar period, alongside feelings of being marginalized and underprioritized in the national context, constitutes a major source of ambivalence and dissatisfaction amongst its citizens.

The cultural, economic and political history of the Dubrovnik Republic has provided a source of local identity constructions, offering a model of cultural cohesion, distinctiveness and historic continuity for centuries. The nineteenth-century Slavic cultural movement of Illyrianism, popular in most parts of Dalmatia, employed the history of the Dubrovnik Republic to explain the combined presence of Slavic and Roman aspects in the region's culture (see Chapter 2). The symbolism attached to the historic city state

in postwar Dubrovnik, on the other hand, attempts to eradicate any traces of Slavic cultural or ethnic elements from its history, while accentuating a Mediterranean cultural and historical origin, particularly by emphasizing the city's connections with ancient Rome and the Venetian Empire.

In the postwar context, the heritage of the Dubrovnik Republic is also central to Dubrovnikans' desires to reconstruct continuities with a past devoid of conflict. It is especially relevant in reshaping the city as a cultured, peaceful economic and political centre rather than a national and European periphery. Forging continuity with this distant historical epoch has furthermore aided in forming the contours of the Croat people as an ethnically homogenous group, and it gave credence to the existence of a Croatian national consciousness throughout history.

Walls and Gateways

As I gazed down upon the narrow belt of coastline and the rugged Dinaric Alps from the aeroplane window on my first research trip to Dubrovnik in 2009, the themes of separation and connectivity that later recurred in numerous conversations with local citizens started to unfold. Dubrovnik's geographical and topographical remoteness from Croatia's seat of power, Zagreb, the city's vulnerability to successive historic attacks from both sea and mountain, and the sea's connotations of international trade and connections are embedded in social memory and identity discourse. In the narrative of how the historic Republic, despite its small size, managed to maintain its autonomy for four hundred years, Dubrovnik's city wall holds a central position.

Historic city walls, and wall constructions in contemporary geopolitical contexts (for instance, in the cases of the USA and Israel), tend to give connotations of fortification – of determining who is kept out and who is allowed in – and therefore stand as potent symbols of exclusion. However, in the context of international tourism and heritage promotion, Dubrovnik's historic city walls are used as sticking plasters of attraction and become symbols of inclusion and openness to the world. In a European heritage perspective, and according to UNESCO's World Heritage concept, Dubrovnik's city wall is part of a wider urban European history that is bound together as humankind's 'shared heritage'. Today everyone is allowed within the city walls, regardless of one's culture, ethnicity or beliefs (and everyone is allowed entry onto the wall, as long as one pays the entry fee). Yet the city wall's symbolism in international and local contexts has not merely shifted from that of exclusion to inclusion. Its meanings are multiple

and overlapping, relational and changing. Inscribing memory in places and materiality inevitably involves certain selections, as all places and material constructions are imbued with countless memories of different past and present events, processes and social relations. Social memories are part of a 'selective canonization process', which:

Foreshortens, silences, disavows, forgets and elides many episodes which – from another perspective – could be the start of a different narrative. This process ... confers authority and a material and institutional facticity on the selective tradition, making it extremely difficult to shift or revise. (Hall 1999: 221)

The memories inscribed into monuments, landscapes and the urban fabric of cities, however, do not merely constitute potent symbols that are drawn on in the cultural imagination in order to confer authority. Memories aid in making and remaking meaningful places where lives and identities are embedded and played out in ever-changing contexts (Tilley 2006).

An inspiration for this book's title comes from a young informant – Maša, a media student at the University of Dubrovnik. She was very frustrated with Croatian society, and how the culture and people's mindsets are always 'stuck in the past'. She compared this mentality to Dubrovnik's city walls and argued that 'Like Dubrovnik's city wall which surrounds the city, it's like we also create these walls in our minds, which stop us from seeing what's on the other side and stop us from being able to change'.

To Maša, cultural heritage mainly represents a burden to the population – a burden from which they cannot escape, which prevents people from moving on, 'reaching out' and being inclusive to that which is different or unfamiliar. She saw 'the walls' of heritage as central in preventing new openings from emerging. Her reflections harmonized closely with my research and fieldwork observations, where I repeatedly observed a community engaged in constructing, metaphorically speaking, 'walls' or 'borders', but also 'gateways'. The fragility of the Croatianness of the young nation state and the heavy weight of emotional trauma caused by the Croatian War of Independence mean that building gateways to other cultures, ethnic-religious groups or structures (for instance the EU) is hampered by the need to forge the 'walls' of nationhood.

While Dubrovnik's cultural heritage is, indeed, cherished by its population and provides an important source of identification, the city's heritage also induces conflict and ambivalences. The 'borders' and 'contents' of Dubrovnik's heritage constitute an ongoing process of negotiation between different population and interest groups. What fits within the imagined borders of a culture's heritage and what doesn't, and how and why gateways towards other cultures, people and practices are made and remade,

are conditioned by socio-cultural and political circumstances, as well as personal experiences and events. This brings attention to how heritage does not exist in isolation in the physical structures that we come to label cultural heritage, but also exist in our minds.

The centrality of the book's metaphors of 'walls and gateways' operates at many different levels in local identity discourse. The significance of the actual Dubrovnik city wall (Dubrovačke gradske zidine), constructed between the twelfth and seventeenth centuries, plays a central role not just as a historical monument, but also in identity discourse, geopolitical orientations, economy and power dynamics.

Central to the heritage discourses discussed in this book is how the selection and combination of pasts and materiality conjure spaces into places, and mould fragmented histories into continuity. Materiality and places also influence practices, perceptions and memory, as well as the other way around. In local discourse and cultural representation, the city wall is one of the most potent symbols representing many different aspects that are seen to epitomize Dubrovnian identity. The city wall becomes a material manifestation demonstrating Dubrovnik's historical and cultural influences, the longevity and autonomy of the historic Republic and the city's self-perceived international (or perhaps rather Mediterranean) character. The wall also stands as a symbol of the citizens' strength and solidity in enduring hardship and wars, and as a marker of their urban, civic culture. It is furthermore used as a material representation demonstrating the city's successful postwar recovery through restoration and the ability to attract tourists back to the city and recover peace after the war. In local discourse, the city wall is used to demonstrate a whole host of historical processes, events and sociocultural characteristics of that which is deemed unique about Dubrovnik and its citizens.

The reflections of Jadranka, a female Dubrovnian in her fifties, reveal much about the intimate relationship between the urban fabric of the city and its citizens: 'Without the city wall Dubrovnik would be nothing special! We would just be like any other old, Mediterranean city. The wall is what makes Dubrovnik into a heritage city!'

By locating the city's 'heritage value' in the particular materiality of the city wall, Jadranka appears to echo what Smith (2006) refers to as the 'authorized heritage discourse'. This predominant discourse, which derives from a nineteenth-century European tradition, naturalizes 'a range of assumptions about the innate and immutable cultural values of heritage that are linked to and defined by the concepts of monumentality and aesthetics' (ibid.: 4). That heritage is largely seen as having innate qualities that make its heritage status a natural consequence of its physicality, rather than being part of a culture's attempts to create meaning and identity, to

draw cultural boundaries and to position itself in its surroundings, reveals that the ‘authorized heritage discourse’ continues to dominate popular perceptions. While the ‘authorized heritage discourse’ generally tends to remain unchallenged, dissonance and contestation over heritage is often limited to ‘case-specific issues’ (ibid.). As I argue in this book, Dubrovnik’s heritage management practices and cultural discourses regarding what constitutes heritage and how to delineate a balance between conservation and development often exist as unquestioned ‘facts’ underlying broader cultural discourses. Such perceptions are strongly influenced by the ‘authorized heritage discourse’.

The ‘authorized heritage discourse’ has strongly influenced Yugoslavian and Croatian heritage management and perceptions up to the present. It constitutes a strong influence on how Dubrovnikans talk about and relate to their cultural heritage. Jadranka’s insistence that Dubrovnik’s uniqueness resides in the city wall can only be deciphered as a sign in relation to a signifier. In the absence of a contextual and historical knowledge of the Dubrovnik Republic, the city wall would not be imbued with the same meaning to its citizens. Through engaging in long-term ethnographic research and gaining the confidence of local residents, it becomes evident that Dubrovnik’s cultural heritage and its World Heritage status contain many, often contradictory, layers of meaning, which constitute a source both for unity and for exclusion. The city wall’s meanings to Dubrovnikans are by no means ‘innate and immutable’, but are shaped within the particular ethnographic cultural context in the present, as well as by different spatial and temporal processes. The cultural meanings of the city wall undergo negotiation in each historical present and can thus be seen as relational and processual cultural heritage.

The city wall’s cultural and political symbolism of defence and its role in ensuring long-lasting freedom, autonomy and longevity are central to Dubrovnik identity discourse. However, my research indicates that while the city wall’s symbolic connotations of freedom persist, the widespread feeling of being both trapped within and excluded from the city’s cultural heritage is imbued in the wall’s meanings to a population that increasingly depends on tourism and the city’s cultural heritage for its sustenance. This sense of alienation is strongest when it comes to the citizens’ most potent cultural and political symbol, the city wall itself. New meanings attached to the wall are emerging, such as confinement, exclusion and commercialization.

Another component to the ‘wall’ metaphor draws on the historically embedded metaphor of the Croat people and Croatian territory as an *antemurale* (*murus* = wall); a kind of ‘wall’ or ‘bulwark’ in defence of Christianity (*antemurale christianitatis*) (Kolstø 2005; Žanić 2005; see

Chapter 3 for further discussion). The myth of being an *antemurale christianitatis* is a particularly potent symbol in Croatian imagery and mythology, and first emerged over five hundred years ago. However, the sources of the perceived threat have changed over the course of history. The concerns and perceived threats are shaped by each historical present, and ‘every time the changeable constellations of power and interest encourage the creation or the redefinition of collective identities’ (Žanić 2005: 76). However, despite the changing points of reference throughout Croatia’s history as to what the *antemurale* stands in defence of, the metaphor of the wall has held and will most likely continue to embody an effective symbol in this borderland region’s self-perceptions:

The murus, or wall, is ... the ultimate boundary metaphor, the last line of defence of cosmos or order, against the forces of chaos or disorder. The antemurale myth, then, stresses not only that the group is an integral part of true civilization, but also that it represents its very outpost’. (Kolstø 2005: 20)

The imagined borders of the *murus*, delineating what fits within and outside the walls, is relational to the power dynamics and geopolitical relations of different historical presents. The religious (Catholic) connotations of the *antemurale* are still important, though the historically embedded connotations of the *antemurale christianitatis* against Islam have shifted more towards a desire to forge walls against the Serbian Orthodox Church in the postwar context. Following the world-changing events of 11 September 2001 and acts of Islamic terrorism in Europe throughout the second decade of the twenty-first century, though, the connotations of Islam in the *antemurale* myth have resurfaced. However, the myth also reaches many other areas beyond that of religion. Sometimes the borders of what fits inside and outside the imagined *murus* are centred on ethnicity, but perceptions of belonging and alterity (the imagined ‘walls’) can also be centred on cultural and social practices that are grounded just as much in socio-economic background, educational levels and geographical area of origin. As I will discuss in more detail in the following chapters, this reification of Dubrovnik’s Western European or Mediterranean cultural belonging, and a subsequent forging of ‘walls’ towards the Balkans, sits centrally in postwar attempts to foster the ‘Dubrovnian spirit’ as gentle, peaceful, sophisticated and cultured, positioned at the border of a turbulent region.

As the ‘hot nationalism’ (Ignatieff 2010) of the 1990s lessened and Croatia’s EU negotiations began in 2005, the symbolism in Croatian nationhood constructions of the country as a bulwark or wall became increasingly synthesized with the idea of Croatia personifying a *bridge* to Europe. Žanić reflects:

On the eve of the collapse of the absolutist regime, Croatia had profiled three basic metaphors for inquiring into its identity: the original crossroads or central place, the bulwark, in both its traditional and modified forms, and the newly formed bridge metaphor. The latter two interrelated in irreconcilable competition and complementarity. (Žanić 2005: 50)

The bridge metaphor actively draws on the importance of Dubrovnik's and Dalmatia's tourism industry and the region's historical embeddedness within Mediterranean cultural history. However, while symbolism of the bridge was particularly prominent throughout the 2000s – especially in the period of Croatia's EU negotiations – the image of Croatia as embodying a bulwark or a wall has grown in prominence in both national and Dubrovnikan identity constructions throughout the second decade of the new century. Although the 'bridge' metaphor is readily drawn on in the public imagination to assert Croatia's connections to Western Europe, I see the 'gateway' metaphor as more fitting. Throughout history, Dubrovnik has represented a geographical and strategic gateway between the sea and the interior, between Western Europe and the Balkan Peninsula. Like the five gateways of Dubrovnik's city wall, the gateways to inclusivity, democracy and 'openings' (for example through EU membership) are narrow, crowded and chaotic. Opening up gateways to the future presents new potentials and opportunities, but also entails sacrifices. Gateways represent small windows in time and space that may remain open, but can potentially be shut again; the solid structure of the walls envelops the gateways.

Heritage Production as Process

With an ethnographic focus on specific transformative sociocultural processes, events, public discourses and individual life stories, this book explores the ways in which Dubrovnik's heritage and cultural identities are constructed, negotiated and produced in the postwar context. The processes of and conditions for heritage production in Dubrovnik can be understood as a hybridization of a range of interconnected processes occurring simultaneously at different scales. The particular forms and meanings that 'the local' and 'the national' take to Dubrovnikans are not reliant on discernible processes happening either 'here' or 'there', but are continuously co-produced and altered by varying spatial and temporal scopes.

Heritage production is inevitably part of cultural discourse, which 'Not only organizes the way concepts like heritage are understood, but the way we act, the social and technical practices we act out, and the way knowledge is constructed and reproduced' (Smith 2006: 4).

The perceptions, representations and applications of heritage in a culture are ingrained and habituated in its inhabitants' bodies and practices, and, among other things, in public discourses, memory, rituals and acts of commemoration. Heritage thus tends to be reified and naturalized as stable and unbroken components of a culture's perceived collective identity. As established previously, selected heritage often provides important means of demarcating a society's cultural and political borders against that which is considered external. However, the particular meanings, representations and uses of heritage are continuously negotiated and contested among individuals and groups, both within and between societies.

A main argument developed throughout this book is that the perceptions, representations and uses of cultural heritage, as well as the local responses and conditions of life in World Heritage sites, are intimately contextual and processual. Heritage is continuously shaped and reshaped in the interfaces of shifting spatial and temporal relations. What cultural heritage and World Heritage status mean to the population of a World Heritage site, and how they are represented and used in different contexts, are intertwined with processes of social, cultural, economic, political and environmental change. By focusing on the interrelationships between local perceptions and practices, this book explores the particular ways in which the perceptions and the management of heritage are historically, politically, economically and culturally embedded.

While the strong sense of marginality has created a relatively stable element in identity constructions throughout much of Dubrovnik's history, cultural identities are also conditioned by the particular sociocultural and political circumstances of each historical present. The turbulent and traumatic period that followed the dissolution of Yugoslavia, as well as regional ethnic-religious homogenization following large-scale forced and voluntary migration, have both created and revived many internal and regional narratives and discourses of the near and distant pasts, and their relationships with and influences on contemporary society. As a young nation, Croatia has undergone considerable and sometimes traumatic transformations, which have had substantial effects on the ways in which heritage, places and identities are perceived, used and represented. The memory of the war and of hard-fought independence is particularly strong in identity production in Dubrovnik and other Croatian cities, such as Vukovar, where the citizens had direct and transformative experiences of shelling and being under siege.

Dubrovnik's cultural heritage in a broad sense, and the interpretations and use of its World Heritage status within a postwar context, are constructed and reconstructed by multiple groups and individuals. The multiple meanings of heritage are mediated through public memory and cultural practices, and become embedded in place. Heritage production entails

processes of selection and therefore inevitably builds on inclusion and exclusion. Dissonance and power relations are therefore inherent elements in heritage production (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996a). Perceptions of the present and hopes and desires for the future are intimately interwoven with and influenced by Dubrovnikans' differing perceptions, experiences and representations of the 'past in the present'. The fact that the transition from Titoist communism to global market liberalism coincided with the context of war has contributed towards intensified ambivalence, vulnerability and contestations of heritage, identities and place.

The sense that the population have shared experiences and traumas of the Croatian War of Independence, combined with the myth of the recovery of a historical Croatian 'homeland', has been utilized in forging nationhood. However, the book demonstrates that different understandings, experiences and memories of this past also constitute major sources of dissonance in contemporary Dubrovnik. Public depictions of a culture's temporal and spatial relations are embodied and naturalized within individuals from childhood. At the same time, individuals tend to integrate their own experiences and memories within the culture's overarching narratives. However, discord between individuals' personal experiences of the war and public discourses of the 'past in the present' can lead to 'dissonant heritage' (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996a). This is particularly manifest in conflicting discourses on the development of Mount Srđ, overlying Dubrovnik's walled centre, due to the mountain plateau's embedded cultural symbolism of war, defence and freedom (see Conclusion).

As already established, local heritage production is particularly influenced by the city's *postwar* context. At the same time, a strong process of 'heritagization'²⁷ of Dubrovnik's World Heritage site has occurred in the postwar period, which bears striking similarities to many urban World Heritage sites globally. Adhering to Harrison's (2013: 69) definition, Dubrovnik has been transformed from a functional 'thing' (a city centre shaped by and for its inhabitants) into a site of 'display and exhibition' aimed particularly for touristic consumption. The city centre has undergone a significant depopulation – work sites and central amenities designed for the local population's daily needs have been moved out of the centre to be replaced with heritagized and touristified products, experiences, sites and places aimed at attracting and catering for a growing number of tourists.

A major objective in this book is to explore the often contradictory uses of Dubrovnik's cultural heritage in contemporary cultural and political identity discourse. On the one hand, cultural heritage continues to create and perpetuate cultural distinctiveness, and therefore exclusion. However, in line with processes paralleled across the West, Dubrovnikan cultural heritage production in the twenty-first century has also played an important

part in processes of modernization, democratization, economic growth and sociopolitical developments. These processes are particularly evident in Dubrovnik's marketing of its World Heritage status, in postwar tourism promotion and in shaping strategies of achieving postwar economic recovery and growth. Dubrovnik's cultural heritage has provided an important resource in Croatia's postwar economic development strategies. The connections between heritage management and tourism have become much more closely aligned.

Moreover, these processes are also found in the uses of Dubrovnik's cultural heritage in nationhood discourse, particularly relating to Croatia's EU membership. In these contexts, Dubrovnik's World Heritage status, and especially the political and cultural heritage of the Dubrovnik Republic, is used in demonstrating Croatia's desire and willingness to achieve European integration. The emphasis on heritage is here on opening up 'gateways'; on fostering inclusivity, cultural diversity and regional reconciliation; and on demonstrating the city's cultural, and therefore also political, stability in a region perceived as turbulent. When cultural heritage is used in the capacity of tourism promotion and in positioning, legitimizing or negotiating the role of Croatia as an EU member state, it often fulfils purposes of being encompassing rather than excluding. For many Dubrovnikans, the traumas of the recent past heighten the desire to 'move on' from associations with the embedded history of conflicts in the Balkans. The use of cultural heritage in representing the city as a peaceful and politically stable place sits centrally in this. Furthermore, the acute need for economic and infrastructural recovery and growth through tourism development has induced a need to suppress the more autochthonous and excluding elements of heritage, as these would be counterproductive to tourism development. The importance placed on the return of tourism and the growth of international investments in Croatia, where Dubrovnik's tourism plays a highly central role, relies on the promotion of its cultural heritage as inviting and inclusive, and furthermore on presenting convincing images of the population as being reconciled with regards to its turbulent past.

The reification of the Dubrovnik Republic in local identity discourse simplifies the complex past and the many historical processes that do not fit with the overarching freedom (*libertas*) discourse (see Chapter 1). For instance, the recent Yugoslavian past and Croatia's allegiances to Nazi Germany, and the acts of ethnic cleansing carried out by the *Ustaša* – the Croatian Revolutionary Movement (Hrvatski Revolucionarni Pokret) – during the Second World War, are actively suppressed in public memory and the representation of Dubrovnik in tourism promotion. While this book's theoretical framework is indebted to social-constructionist approaches, I simultaneously emphasize that in the territory comprising Croatia, there

are certain underlying historic and geopolitical structures that can be seen as having a large degree of continuity and that have conditioned and shaped identity constructions and cultural practices throughout much of the region's history. As the book's ethnography demonstrates, Dubrovnikans' sense of constituting a cultural crossroad and borderland in the context of a wider the West has permeated their cultural identities for many centuries and has contributed towards marginality, fragility and ambivalence as central components in identity perceptions and self-representations.

However, historical processes and events occurring in the period following national independence have produced new conditions for communal interactions, practices, cultural representations and meaning-making. Recent historical processes have configured the conditions for identity production and contributed towards changing the perceptions and uses of the city's World Heritage. Shortly after Croatia declared its national independence, the Croatian War of Independence began. The shelling of Dubrovnik caused huge material damage to the city's World Heritage site. Not only did the war have long-lasting consequences for heritage restoration, it also had an enduring influence on the interpretations and uses of Dubrovnik's World Heritage in identity consolidation. The fact that the war occurred concurrently with the economic transition from Titoist communism to a global, capitalist market economy further intensified the use of heritage as an economic resource in postwar restoration and tourism development. The domestically contentious question of EU membership, which belatedly resulted in Croatia's inclusion in the EU in July 2013, has dominated national and local public identity discourse since the turn of the millennium. Dubrovnik's World Heritage site and the city's historical incarnation as the Dubrovnik Republic have constituted an anchor in aligning Croatia and Dubrovnik within a perceived 'European community', represented in the latest context by the European Union.

Cultural Heritage and Commodification in a Postwar Context

As previously established, cultural heritage and tourism have been central to stimulating infrastructural recovery and economic development in the aftermath of the Croatian War of Independence. The role that cultural heritage plays in post-independence national politics builds on the double purpose of utilizing heritage as a vehicle for forging 'exceptionalism' and for increasing national revenue and tourism development (Jelinčić and Žuvela 2014: 88). Turning heritage into a commodity generally rests on two processes: on the one hand, heritage is made sellable, for example in the form of souvenirs, local crafts and food products. On the other hand,

heritage is commoditized by making it into tailored ‘heritage experiences’, typically through guided tours, museum exhibitions, and visiting buildings, monuments, urban environments and landscapes. The two processes are often interwoven and are shaped by a complex web of producers and distributors that fosters heritage as ‘unique and authentic’ in order to increase product potential. In several of the European urban World Heritage sites – the so-called ‘historic’ towns and cities – the entire centre comes under UNESCO protection and the urban fabric is made up of a relatively ‘unified’ architectural style dating back to one or a few particular historical epochs. In these ‘historic cities’, the whole city centre is often represented and commoditized as a heritage experience, so that by visiting the World Heritage site, one is metaphorically speaking ‘consuming the city’. While in many instances, commercial market interests and the political interests of the state or local community harmonize, some of the roles that heritage plays in nation-building and identity constructions are obscured in certain contexts. For instance, heritage models built upon mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion that are based on religion, ethnicity and decent are actively concealed in tourist promotion and communication with international organizations such as the EU and UNESCO. Herein, heritage used as a vehicle in international ‘bridge-building’ attempts overshadows the domestic or regional dynamics in which heritage sits centrally in forging ‘walls’ between ethnic and religious groups or in separating political convictions.

Heritagization processes are tied to cultural practices, which in themselves have a long history connected to ‘late modern life worlds’ (Bendix 2008). The European classical tradition and Western aesthetic, artistic and architectural criteria and ideas of authenticity in conservation and restoration are evident in Dubrovnik’s heritage production. As such, the city’s heritagization processes can indeed be seen as connected to historic processes and cultural traditions of Europe and the West, which are embedded in particular cultural practices and ideals. However, the heritagization processes that Dubrovnik underwent in the former Yugoslavia and is experiencing today are relatively dissimilar and are strongly marked by the particular political and economic models of each period. Contemporary heritagization processes in Dubrovnik are largely governed by the logic of the neoliberal market economy and the growth and increased competitiveness of global tourism. Although tourism was an important factor in Dubrovnik’s heritage production under Titoist communism, the majority of the city’s work sites and amenities in that period were located in or near the city centre, and tourism, to a much larger degree, complemented other industries and artisanal production (Racusin 2012). Prior to the economic transition following Croatia’s independence in 1991, the UNESCO-protected walled centre had a population around five times higher than

today's figure, and the city centre nowadays mainly functions as a site for tourism consumption. This illustrates the processual and relational nature of heritagization processes and makes the synchronic heritagization processes at work in many World Heritage sites today relatively comparable, at least in the more culturally similar sites, such as Venice and Dubrovnik.

From the very early stages of World Heritage enlistment and often even before its realization, its symbolic and commercial potential is utilized and shaped by a whole range of interest groups. Dubrovnik is representative of how the heritagization of practices and places generates social, cultural and economic stratification. However, local culture and history, as well as the established power relationships in each World Heritage site, steer the ways in which these heritagization processes unfold. While some groups and individuals are, or feel themselves to be, included as the 'owners', 'bearers', producers or distributors of a particular cultural heritage, others feel excluded and disowned.

The twofold process of utilizing heritage as a commodity and a means of cultural identity production long predates the establishment of the post-Yugoslavian era. In the increasingly globally saturated tourism market, the quest for defining and promoting heritage products and experiences in terms of their 'uniqueness' and 'authenticity' is intermixed with the driving forces of neoliberal capitalism. Consequently, heritage tourism often become a means of global or regional competition in order to attract the highest tourist numbers and increase tourist-generated revenue. However, in postwar Croatia, the economic exploitation of cultural heritage has strongly intensified, which in turn intensifies local feelings and reactions to these processes.

Growing out of nineteenth-century national romanticism and attendant ideas of architectural and archaeological conservation, Croatian heritage perceptions and management are embedded in a European tradition of reifying particular buildings, monuments and artefacts as heritage. This tradition is strongly evident in Dubrovnik's heritage management. Since Croatian independence, however, the concept of heritage has undergone a significant expansion to include elements of cultural identity, such as local practices, skills and traditions. Many cultural artefacts and practices formerly regarded as *cultural traditions* are today increasingly managed and disseminated as *cultural heritage*. To a certain degree, UNESCO's 'heritage vocabulary' of *intangible heritage* is appropriated by the 'heritage practitioners' themselves. The reorientation of cultural traditions as intangible heritage is particularly situated within the context of the country's EU membership (Zebec 2014). Since the turn of the new millennium, the question of EU membership has divided Croatia's population, shaping identity politics and the roles that heritage plays in the consolidation of identities.

With the hard-fought national independence in recent memory, EU debates have been marked by a strong sense of vulnerability and ambivalence with regards to whether membership will compromise the newfound national identity, Croatia's perceived cultural borders and its distinctiveness. The question of EU membership has also resuscitated sentiments of vulnerability to foreign rule and fears of exploitation of resources, real estate and land areas by private companies. In the period 2009–12, Croatia gained thirteen UNESCO intangible heritage enlistments.⁸ These enlistments served an important political symbolic function in the nation state's attempt to unite a divided population and legitimize EU membership. The process was twofold: cultural traditions formerly considered peripheral were valorized as central building blocks of contemporary nationhood. Furthermore, UNESCO's heritage enlistments (both World Heritage and intangible heritage) provided a framework for cultural protection so that EU membership would not compromise the locally and nationally unique. The discursive re-orientation of cultural traditions to intangible heritage is also tied to global processes relating to the growth of international tourism, and is embedded within a capitalist market logic. Aspects of both material and immaterial culture are decontextualized and converted into 'heritage attractions': discrete units of touristic consumption. In an increasingly saturated international tourism market, and within the context of the accelerated flow of and access to global commodities, these 'heritage units' become commercial assets in the 'competition' between holiday destinations. At the same time, it would be unjust to merely emphasize economic incentives as being the prime driving forces behind these processes. The heritagization of traditions in Croatia is also deeply rooted in the search for cultural borders, redefining connections with Western Europe and fostering a sense of continuity with epochs perceived as peaceful, such as the Dubrovnik Republic, in a region marked by its borderland status and turbulent past.

Heritage and Postwar Tourism Development

The management and marketing of Dubrovnik as a tourist and cultural heritage destination long precedes its UNESCO inscription. However, the interrelationships between heritage as identity politics and as an economic resource have become even more closely interwoven in the postwar period, and are often imbued with a much stronger emotional intensity and ambivalence than in the former Yugoslavia.

Dubrovnik's walled centre was also a tourist magnet before it achieved status as a World Heritage site, particularly from the dawn of modern tourism in the 1950s. A large part of Dubrovnik's tourism appeal can be

ascribed to its well-preserved historic city centre, with its medieval urban layout, its abundance of well-preserved Renaissance, Gothic and Baroque architecture, and its impressive 1,940-metre-long intact city wall encircling the city centre. However, Dubrovnik's early tourism development also related to the favourable Mediterranean climate and high sea temperatures. Moreover, the low tourist prices and 'under-exploited' coastline compared to other Mediterranean tourist destinations were also part of its success as a tourist destination in the former Yugoslavia. These aspects tend to be under-communicated in contemporary tourism promotion, where the connotations of being a 'beach and sun' destination do not harmonize with the desired self-image of being a luxurious destination for 'heritage tourism'. In cooperation with the tourism industry, the local municipality goes to great lengths to foster an image of Dubrovnik as a 'high culture' destination. Twenty per cent of the annual city budget is spent on the culture sector, most activities of which are aimed at tourists and a relatively small segment of the local population interested in the so-called 'high arts'. On the Dalmatian coast, postwar urban and rural reconstruction have predominantly been connected to tourism developments. In Dubrovnik, tourism has played a central role in stimulating economic recovery in the postwar period. Despite the city's small population of a little over 42,000 inhabitants,⁹ Dubrovnik receives nearly two million tourists annually¹⁰ and has become one of the most popular cruise ship ports in Europe. In 2014, 22 per cent of the national gross domestic product (GDP) derived from tourism, and at the current trend of tourist growth, tourism-derived GDP is expected to increase at a rate of 7.5 per cent annually (Jelinčić and Žuvela 2014). That tourism is a potentially fragile industry is common knowledge to many citizens, whose sources of livelihood were disrupted during the war and in the period of postwar restoration. Recognition of this fragility, however, is largely absent from national and local tourism development strategies, which envision tourism growth as the desired development goal for the Croatian economy. Postwar rebuilding required much external economic assistance, from both international institutions and private bodies. This has created a strong sense of vulnerability and a fear of exploitation, fears which manifest frequently in public discourse on heritage management, conservation and construction schemes. While Dubrovnikans tend to be very appreciative of the international monetary and technical assistance accompanying the World Heritage status, many Dubrovnik citizens likewise express a strong degree of suspicion towards private investors and feel that EU membership makes the young nation more susceptible to economic and resource exploitation.

In the postwar context, the connection between tourism development, heritage management and nation-building has grown even more intimate.

In the period 2003–13, Croatia had the highest level of financing in the cultural heritage sector (especially restoration and conservation projects) in the formerly Yugoslavian area (see Table 1). Although Croatia's cultural heritage financing was reduced significantly over this period – most likely due to the 2008 global financial crisis and time elapsing since national independence (and thus a diminished 'need' to consolidate nationhood through cultural heritage), the nation consistently had the highest level of financing in this sector in the region. Furthermore, cultural heritage restoration and conservation received the largest slice of funding from the Ministry of Culture's total annual budget compared to other cultural sector activities in the same period (Jelinčić and Žuvela 2014: 100).

Heritage and Dissonance

Heritage is intimately connected to identity. Although the connections between heritage and identity are compound, an effect of heritage production is that it 'creates and recreates a sense of inclusion and exclusion' (Smith and Akagawa 2008: 7). All heritage is someone's heritage and therefore logically not someone else's. The original meaning of an inheritance from which 'heritage' derives (etymology: iritage (Old French), hereditare (Late Latin)) implies the existence of disinheritance. By extension any creation of heritage from the past disinherits someone completely or partially, actively or potentially. This disinheritance may be unintentional, temporary, of trivial importance, limited in its effects and concealed; or it may be long-term, widespread, intentional, important and obvious (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996a; Bendix 2008; Peckham 2003). Power is thus embedded in the very term 'heritage' – if someone inherits something, others are inevitably excluded from inheriting it too.

The cultural and political processes that World Heritage sites undergo following heritage enlistment are diverse and dependent on particular circumstances relating to local and regional historic relations, the existing economic situation, the social and political infrastructure of the community, and the degree of transparency, corruption and hegemony of certain groups in relation to others. However, despite the particular cultural and political circumstances of World Heritage sites in different parts of the world, it is possible to identify many similar consequences that large numbers of World Heritage sites experience when the World Heritage status is used as a major resource in attracting tourism and economic development. Some of these consequences are: increased contestation over limited land and real estate; depopulation of city centres, especially in the so-called 'tourist-historic cities' (Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000); and increased commodification

Table 0.1. Cultural heritage financing in the Southeast European Region, 2003–13.

Country	Public expenses for cultural heritage (in millions of Euros)		Expenses for cultural heritage per capita (Euros)		Structure of finance for cultural heritage PIL sites				
	2003	2013	2003	2013	Private	State	EU	Donors	
Albania ^a	2.8	6.8 ^c	0.78	2.26	Low	Low	High	Medium	
Bulgaria ^a	2.38	5.35	0.32	0.77	Low	High	Low	Low	
Romania ^a	6.8 ^b	9.4 ^c	0.31	0.43	Low	High	High	Low	
Croatia ^a	37.1 ^c	27.1	8.39	6.06	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low	
Serbia ^d	12.2	8.4	1.62	1.16	Low	High	Low	Low	
Montenegro ^a	0.6	2.4	0.46	3.85	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium	
Bosnia and Herzegovina ^e	2.6 ^b	0.93	0.65	0.24	Low	Low	High	Medium	
Republic of North Macedonia (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (1991–2019))	2.9	6.2	1.41	2.97	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	

Source: Rikalović (2014).

Notes:

^a only investment from the Ministry of Culture

^b 2007

^c 2012

^d all levels of government

^e only levels of entities and the federation

of ‘tangible’ heritage, cultural artefacts, cultural traditions and experiences as sellable products in tourism promotion. Other processes following the pressures of tourism in World Heritage sites can be the replacement of central facilities and infrastructure for the local population with tourism commodities, differentiation between those who benefit from tourism and those who do not, social exclusion, and sometimes conflict (Porter and Salazar 2005). The impacts of mass tourism in World Heritage sites on the environment and existing infrastructure are also often evident. World Heritage sites in the developing world or in areas recovering from natural catastrophes or armed conflict may experience difficulties in adapting in time to the demands of increased tourism. Although there is not always a correlation between World Heritage enlistment and tourism growth, it is of importance that all sites ‘implement a management plan to mitigate tourism impacts and sustain site significance’ (Landorf 2009: 53). For a sustainable heritage management to exist, a long-term, holistic management that encompasses the multiple interest groups living in or near the site is essential. As we shall see in this book, this is also of importance in order to diminish conflict and dissonance.

A large number of UNESCO World Heritage sites are increasingly forced to come to terms with the multiple, frequently undesired and contradictory consequences of tourism-based development. Although large segments of Dubrovnik’s population are proud of its World Heritage status and many experience an increased material living standard due to the return of tourism after the war, there is a dawning awareness that Dubrovnik’s heritage is not an inexhaustible resource. Many local residents feel offended by commercialization, crowding and privatization of public places. To many, this reduces their identification with the city. Consequently, many Dubrovnikans feel divorced from their cultural heritage. Such paradoxes and the dilemmas they create for populations inhabiting World Heritage sites are not unique to Dubrovnik. However, the process is played out and grounded in each particular local circumstance; for Dubrovnik, this is that of its *postwar* context. This is fundamental for apprehending Dubrovnik’s heritage discourses and the particular mooring of spatial and temporal dimensions in reconstructing locality and self in the aftermath of war and emotional trauma. The emotional and social trauma and material and infrastructural damage wrought by armed conflict tends to permeate community interactions, cultural discourses and responses to change. Although many features of the public discourse on identity and difference were present before the Croatian War of Independence, war-related traumas have undoubtedly intensified and refocused these debates.

The war experiences have polarized identity constructions and contributed to a more antagonistic cultural climate. In the context of the

strong heritagization and commercialization of culture and traditions in Dubrovnik's postwar era, heritage binds the local population into having a sense of shared identity, but it also becomes an area of contestation and dissonance.

Dubrovnik's postwar context does not only influence the present, it also shapes debates about the future. Many Dubrovnikans wish to see the country develop in a more liberalist and democratic direction, identifying Croatia more closely with Western Europe and detaching it from the Balkan region, which is perceived as the source of so much recent pain. At the same time, the war experiences have opened up many emotional wounds, which many Dubrovnikans find it hard to distance themselves from. Therefore, reconciliation with the turbulent past following Croatia's secession from Yugoslavia is far from being achieved, and the legal and political foregrounding of heritage politics sits quite uncomfortably with this situation. Disputes over the turbulent past, the composite present and the uncertain future repeatedly cast shadows over urban and rural development plans in Dubrovnik. This is for instance evident in the negotiations, dissonance and outright resistance that the planned golf and real estate construction on Mount Srđ, positioned on the hill above Dubrovnik's UNESCO-enlisted World Heritage site, has undergone since the first decade of the new millennium (see Conclusion).

The Ethnography of Heritage

Although this book's ethnographic material is in many ways culturally embedded and unique to the local context, the many-sided and often problematic consequences of tourism-based developments in Dubrovnik are of more than merely local relevance. Depopulation, 'museumification',¹¹ and increasing environmental and infrastructural pressures are challenges shared by many UNESCO World Heritage sites, especially 'tourist-historic cities'. Many World Heritage sites worldwide have undergone dramatic transformations, such as the sudden onset of a new political and economic system, environmental catastrophes, civil unrest and war. The often urgent need for economic recovery and infrastructural and urban regeneration in World Heritage sites with a history of war makes these places particularly vulnerable to exploitation and short-sighted development schemes. Postwar Dubrovnik public identity discourses reveal many tensions between perceptions of the past and future, and such ambivalence marks contemporary constructions of cultural heritage. While the past is a major point of reference in local and national identity constructions, many citizens, fuelled by postwar politics and propaganda, place their hopes in imagined futures of economic prosperity, devoid of conflict. Postwar national

identity constructions feed into an amalgam of forces that have intensified cultural commodification. The country's need for postwar economic and infrastructural recovery led to a dependence on tourism and international bodies, at the same time as Croatia made its entrance into the global capitalist economy. As witnessed in a large number of UNESCO's World Heritage sites, commodification of culture is perhaps an inevitable process as soon as heritage becomes part of tourist promotion and economic livelihood. However, the particular effects of commodification processes, the ways they unfold and the extent to which they increase dissonance create novel forms of inclusion and exclusion, hegemony and subjugation in each locality.

The ethnographic approach offers a fruitful lens for understanding the local specifics of the 'global heritage regime' (Bendix 2008) and how this is unfolded in the particular, lived realities of citizens inhabiting World Heritage sites. 'Global heritage' and 'World Heritage' are themselves imagined concepts that only become meaningful when they are realized and interpreted in particular sociocultural and political lived realities (Macdonald 2013). Although the manifestations of World Heritage 'on the ground' are strongly influenced by the particulars of each locality, the large growth of World Heritage enlistments has contributed towards the emergence of a collectively imagined heritage-scape (Di Giovine 2008). As such, studying World Heritage 'on the ground' represents an enlightening means of exploring the global-local dynamics of heritage and identity interpretation and production (Salazar 2015).

With the large increase in UNESCO World Heritage nominations in the twenty-first century, I see a strong need for ethnographically founded research that examines the multifaceted motivations and effects of heritage enlistment. With its capacity to pay close attention to local and personal heritage discourses, ethnographic research can contribute towards a better insight into the ways in which World Heritage enlistment conditions, and is conditioned by, intercommunal relations, cultural practices and perceptions. Ethnographic research can furthermore highlight the roles that heritage plays in power relationships and processes of inclusion and exclusion, and how it may lead to contestation between different groups inhabiting a heritage site. By illuminating disparities and discord between different heritage discourses and local people's experiences and memories, one can gain a fuller insight into how cultural memory and perceptions of the past are inscribed into places, are situated within relations of power and become central in shaping the future uses of and access to places.

In the methodological approaches of research directed at finding sustainable solutions to a range of contemporary urban and rural challenges, localized narratives and oral histories increasingly feature. We can see a certain

turn in attention towards ‘small heritages’ (Harvey 2008) or ‘heritage from below’ (Robertson 2012) in policy and practice. The strong focus on ‘intangible heritage’ in Croatian local and national politics over the last decade is indicative of this process. An exploration of the ‘small heritages’ may potentially offer new lenses for understanding the effects of and responses to the role of heritage in economic growth, sustainability, and shaping and reshaping cultural boundaries. However, the underlying motivations and driving forces steering a reorientation to ‘small heritages’ differ significantly and need to be analysed ethnographically.

World Heritage has provided a new ‘global grammar’ (Turtinen 2000) through which local heritage can be interpreted. Although this ‘global grammar’ may be said to assert a strong degree of influence on heritage management policies in World Heritage sites globally, the interpretations and uses of heritage and of World Heritage status importantly remain embedded in local and national cultures and meaning systems. By gaining insights into the specificities of heritage production in different localities, one can gain a deeper understanding of the concept of World Heritage and the disparities between the ideal intentions and actual applications ‘on the ground’. The accumulation of ethnographic knowledge into World Heritage production in the diverse, concrete realities worldwide presents a productive lens for comparing and contrasting the uses and interpretations of World Heritage in different UNESCO-enlisted sites.

As previously established, it is important to pay attention to how the inhabitants living in or near a UNESCO-enlisted site make World Heritage meaningful within the specific cultural environment and landscape their lives are embedded within. The particular ethnographic realities, embedded cultural patterns and historical processes together inform the meanings and values attached to World Heritage. However, in the contemporary world of accelerated global interconnectedness and change, World Heritage production ‘on the ground’ cannot be seen as isolated from contemporary global processes and spatial relations. The ethnographic approach offers a lens to explore the pluriversality of heritage interpretations (Salazar 2012a) and uses, as well as how they are embedded in their ethnographic realities *and* affected by global processes of change.

Methodological Considerations

My research in Dubrovnik indicates that place and spatial boundedness are very important to the way identity is constructed. Uncertainties relating to global processes and their impacts on locality, as well as recent historical, political and economic change and the traumas of war, have brought

about a renewed focus on locality and place in postwar Croatia. Attempts to create correspondences between geopolitical constructions such as the Croatian nation state, geographical regions and cities, and cultural characteristics, practices and heritage are abundant. At the same time, by living in an international tourist destination and a UNESCO World Heritage site, Dubrovnikans also experience in day-to-day life that the ‘neat’ boundaries of locality are inexorably blurred by global processes and processes occurring in other parts of the world. These processes, in turn, provoke local responses, which interact with wider forces in shaping notions of ‘locality’ in a given time and space. Cultural practices and identity constructions in Dubrovnik and Croatia therefore consist of a ‘dialogue’ with overlapping global, regional and local processes. Although Dubrovnik may be experienced as a relatively ‘bounded’ entity to those who inhabit the *place*, the construction of *locality* cannot be seen as isolated and static.

In the ethnography presented in this book, I assert that the production of meaning and locality is part of active, interconnected, and ongoing sociocultural, symbolic, economic and political processes. The production of meaning, such as what constitutes a culture’s heritage and how it should be used, represented and consumed, does not take place separately at the global and local levels. Nor can heritage be seen as either universal or particular. Rather, it is continuously co-produced and negotiated in complex ways, always imbued with a variety of spatial and temporal reference points, and produced in the interfaces of the ‘universal’ and the ‘locally unique’.

Anthropologists are generally wary of making claims to universality, which are seen as conveying ethnocentric perspectives and reinforcing power relationships between selfhood and otherness. Cultural relativism, a central component of postmodern anthropology, emphasizes that every society has its own ‘cultural logic’ and therefore should be studied in its own terms. Although anthropology recognizes that it can never fully reveal the lifeworlds of informants, and that there are significant limits to the anthropologist’s ability to access informants’ true perceptions and experiences (and not just the representations of those perceptions and experiences), the anthropologist strives, in a sense, to become an advocate for ‘the voices’ of ‘others’ and of the marginalized. These motivations are evident in my research and choice of methodology. I recognize that there are certain limits to fully conveying my informants’ innermost experiences and perceptions, but I maintain that UNESCO’s understanding of World Heritage and the role of heritage in fostering ‘cultural diversity’, ‘local empowerment’ and ‘sustainable development’ are only made meaningful when studied ethnographically.

Contemporary technologies and relatively low travel costs in the contemporary world have opened up new opportunities for anthropologists to

carry out *multi-temporal* and *multi-sited* fieldwork – possibilities that were not readily available in the past. In a world marked by increased global connectivity and accelerated change, anthropologists and other researchers utilizing ethnographic methods need to pay close attention to change and new modes of connectivity. One way of doing this is by carrying out fieldwork over several time periods, by revisiting the same fieldwork site.

In order to overcome some of the temporal limits to identifying processes of social, cultural and political change that are associated with a limited fieldwork period, I chose to divide my fieldwork into several periods, spanning three different years – 2009, 2012 and 2015. One advantage of carrying out fieldwork and research over a longer duration of time was that the ethnographic material and interaction with my informants made it evident that neither the society in question nor the informants' lives are static. Throughout my fieldwork periods, I sometimes observed that my informants' life circumstances had changed from one period to the next. Engaging in multi-temporal fieldwork also helped me to better identify the interconnections between global events and processes – such as the global economic recession, the global migrant crisis, international terrorism and changes in international cruise ship tourism – and the ways in which these processes affected local perceptions and stimulated local responses. In between each fieldwork period, and again in carrying out research 'from afar' in the years following the completion of my fieldwork, many local issues of relevance to my fields of study (for instance, relating to tourism and heritage management, local politics and construction projects) have taken new directions. This draws attention to the fact that the 'field', despite constituting a geographical and geopolitical 'entity', is not an unchanging object of study, but is shaped by different and changing spatial and temporal relations. This means that 'the field' is both a process, affected by various political and cultural circumstances, and a place with specific spatial and historical grounding.

Methods

This book is based on over a decade of anthropological research and draws on one year's worth of ethnographic fieldwork in Dubrovnik. Most of the ethnographic material derives from my fieldwork in the City of Dubrovnik and Dubrovnik-Neretva County. I have also had evolving contact with researchers, institutions, political and cultural activists, students and general citizens in other parts of the country throughout and between my fieldwork periods, most notably in Zagreb and Split. This book's material also comprises continuing research 'from afar' that was carried out until 2020, mostly

through email and telephone correspondence with informants, institutions and organizations central to the research. Textual analysis of media material and public documents also comprises a part of the research material.

In Dubrovnik's postwar context, the perceptions, motivations and driving forces behind the different models of conservation, restoration and development are not only many-sided, but also often marked by aggravation and conflict. It is therefore of extra importance to treat informants' representations of themselves and their culture as subjective and partial truths in a much more complex whole. With issues of representativity in mind, I ensured that my informant group was composed of people of different ages and a diversity of social and educational backgrounds and lines of work, and that it reflected people with different political viewpoints, religious affiliations and ethnicities. Most of my informants are citizens living in the City of Dubrovnik and the adjacent rural areas in Dubrovačko Primorje and Konavle. A few informants are expatriates who have returned to the Dubrovnik region within the last few decades; a few are foreigners who have settled in the region with Dubrovnikan spouses; and a couple are Zagreb-based or international investors working on projects in Dubrovnik. Otherwise, the rest have grown up and lived most of their lives in the Dubrovnik region. My informants range between 17 and 83 years of age. Due to some difficulties relating to access and the demographic composition of Dubrovnik's population at large, the majority of my informants are of Croat Catholic backgrounds. However, some are Serbs, Muslim Dubrovnikans, Bosniaks (i.e. Bosnian Muslims), Jewish Dubrovnikans or of mixed religious-ethnic backgrounds.

The choice of methods informing this book comprises a combination of formal interviews, semi-structured qualitative interviews, participant observation and mobile ethnography (i.e. conversational walking interviews, while focusing on how the informants experience different places). Altogether, over all fieldwork periods, I carried out close to one hundred interviews, the majority of which were qualitative, semi-structured interviews with a duration of approximately 1–2 hours. The criteria for selecting my informants were, in part, informed by 'snowball sampling', where becoming acquainted with one person would often lead to the accumulation of several more contacts. However, I also utilized carefully targeted sampling of informants from different educational, ethnic-religious and socio-economic backgrounds. Such targeted sampling was motivated by the intention of ensuring a higher degree of representativity in my informant groups.

I have largely used participant observation as a method in the context of everyday conversations and through participating in leisure activities with local residents. I also utilized this method more generally in a variety of

public locations where locals interact with one another. Participant observation – or rather, perhaps, practising being an ‘observant participator’ in conversations and social interactions – has particularly helped me to pay attention to discourse, patterns and modes of conversations, thematic repetitions from one conversation to another with the same informant, and the development of certain ‘narratives’ in the way informants talked about certain things or were uncomfortable talking about others.

Outline of the Book

This book consists of an introduction, six chapters and a conclusion. In the introduction, ‘Heritage at the Margins’, I have outlined the research project on which this book is based and its rationale. The chapter has presented an overview of the theoretical underpinnings that provide the framework for understanding the ethnographic material presented in the book.

The use of heritage to consolidate nationhood, as well as in boundary maintenance and exclusion mechanisms based on religious-ethnic and cultural distinction, has been a dominant pattern throughout the history of the Balkans. Chapter 1, ‘Dubrovnik’s World Heritage: Between the Universal and the Particular’, contextualizes contemporary heritage production in Croatia and Dubrovnik within UNESCO’s ‘vocabulary’ of World Heritage as encompassing, accessible and equally shared by all of humanity. Despite the strong influences of heritage as an including force, as advocated through UNESCO’s World Heritage programme, the strongly conditioned regional history continues to impact upon the uses of heritage. Heritage is used to demarcate borders and to produce ethnic and cultural identities that are seen as distinct and separate from those of Dubrovnik’s neighbours.

Dubrovnik’s borderland and crossroads status in a geopolitical and historical context has heightened the importance of heritage in demarcating the city’s boundaries. The use of Dubrovnik’s cultural heritage, and its World Heritage status, to demarcate boundaries and ‘walls’ exists alongside, and sometimes come into conflict with, the discourse on heritage as encompassing and as a potential to create ‘gateways’. Chapter 2, ‘The Past in the Present’, discusses how selective pasts, historical processes and events are drawn on in contemporary identity discourse and in geopolitical and cultural orientations.

Chapter 3, ‘Postwar Identities’, provides a contextualization of aspects of postwar nationhood consolidation that are of particular relevance to Dubrovnik identity discourse. The main part of the chapter explores postwar identity discourses in Dubrovnik and how the city’s inhabitants renegotiate its cultural heritage within the new parameters of the nation

state. The chapter highlights that competing, overlapping and sometimes contradictory uses of heritage in the amalgamation of Dubrovnik's postwar identity, when merged with individuals' memories and experiences of war, frequently produce strong degrees of ambivalence in individuals.

Chapter 4, 'Place for Some or Places for All', analyses the consequences of postwar tourism developments – the market-led reification of cultural heritage in contemporary tourism promotion and economic development. I explore the effects of sociopolitical and economic change on the experiences of locality, daily life, communal interactions and the citizens' relationships to cultural heritage and materiality.

Chapter 5, 'The Overheated City: Tourism and Its Discontents', explores Dubrovnikans' experiences of, and responses to, tourism, postwar tourism-driven economic development and changes in the urban environment in the postwar period. I argue that as the local economy, jobs and daily lives are increasingly attuned to tourism and the commercial promotion of Dubrovnik's cultural heritage, many locals feel 'trapped' in the city. My ethnographic material illustrates that ambivalence, nostalgia and a sense of identity deprivation are prominent features of contemporary local life. Many Dubrovnikans place these sentiments in connection with experienced changes in intercommunity relations in the postwar period.

Chapter 6, 'Contested Places', brings attention to how heritage and the meanings attached to landscapes are produced and used by multiple groups. The chapter demonstrates how the economic uses of heritage and the different symbolic, cultural and memorial values attached to heritage and landscapes produce a strong degree of friction and dissonance. The chapter explores the contestation emerging in the wake of Golf Park Dubrovnik, a planned construction project of golf courses and real estate constructions upon Mount Srđ. Since Mount Srđ constitutes an important local landmark of Dubrovnik's defence and freedom throughout history, as well as an important piece of common land, the contestations and dissonance experienced in the light of the construction plans and their attempts to privatize and commodify the landscape have turned into outright resistance.

In the conclusion, 'From a Material-Based to a Value-Based Heritage', I summarize the main arguments of this book. I advocate a need to steer away from a primarily material-based heritage approach, and I argue the case for incorporating a more thorough value-based understanding of the multiple meanings of and attachments to heritage in specific World Heritage sites. By including the values attached to different heritage resources and to different areas (both urban areas and landscapes), we can better accommodate a community-based, sustainable heritage management.

Notes

Some of the material from this chapter has previously been published in the following publications: Celine Motzfeldt Loades. 2012. 'A Beautiful Burden? Identity Constructions in a Post-War Heritage City', in Kristian Bjørkdahl and Kenneth Bo Nielsen (eds), *Development and Environment: Practices, Theories, Policies*. Oslo: Akademika Forlag; Celine Motzfeldt Loades. 2016. 'Contested Places and Ambivalent Identities – Social Change and Development in UNESCO Enlisted Dubrovnik', *Journal of Urban Culture Research* 12: 20–37; and Celine Motzfeldt Loades. 2019. 'Heritage and Scale – Challenges to Wellbeing and Place Management in Dubrovnik's World Heritage Site', *Journal of Urban Culture Research* 19: 5–32.

1. The terms 'ground' in 'World Heritage on the ground' (Brumann and Berliner 2016) and 'below' in 'heritage from below' (Robertson 2012) refer to the lived realities and social and cultural contexts of communities living in or near World Heritage sites.
2. See <https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/> (accessed 28 June 2021).
3. The term 'postwar' refers to the period after the Croatian War of Independence (1991–95).
4. The Dubrovnik Republic was a maritime and mercantile republic that played a central role in international trade, diplomacy and cultural production. Its historical territory largely conforms to the contemporary territory comprising Dubrovnik-Neretva County. The Republic was first named *Communitas Ragusina* (the Ragusan Community) in Latin, but was renamed *Repubblica Ragusina* (the Republic of Ragusa) in the late fourteenth century. The Slavic name for the Republic was *Dubrovačka Republika* (Dubrovnik Republic) (Harris 2003). I shall henceforth refer to the historic Republic as the Dubrovnik Republic.
5. The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (*Socijalistička Federativna Republika Jugoslavija*, or SFR *Jugoslavija*, 1945–91), was established on 11 November 1945, when the Communist Party came into power with Josip Broz 'Tito' (1892–1980) as its leader. Yugoslavia was modelled on the Stalinist model of the Soviet Union and was formed as a federation consisting of the six republics – Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia–Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro and Macedonia (see Map 2.1). In addition, two autonomous provinces within the Serbian Republic, Vojvodina and Kosovo, were established (Mønnesland 2006).
6. Source: <https://www.distancefromto.net/> (accessed 28 June 2021).
7. Heritagization describes the process by which objects and places are transformed from functional 'things' into 'objects of display and exhibition' (Harrison 2013: 69).
8. Croatia shares two UNESCO intangible heritage enlistment with other European nations; 'the Mediterranean diet' (status obtained in 2013) with six other countries in the Mediterranean region and 'the Art of dry stone walling, knowledge and techniques' (<https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/art-of-dry-stone-walling-knowledge-and-techniques-01393>, accessed 7 September 2021) with seven other Mediterranean and Central European countries. Croatia also gained two more intangible heritage enlistments, 'Community project of safeguarding the living culture of Rovinj/Rovigno: the Batana Ecomuseum' and 'Medimurska popevka, a folksong from Medimurje' (<https://ich.unesco.org/en/>

RL/meimurska-popevka-a-folksong-from-meimurje-01396, accessed 7 September 2021), respectively in 2016 and 2018, giving Croatia with a total of 17 intangible heritage enlistments.

9. According to the 2011 national population census, the population numbers for the City of Dubrovnik were 42,615 inhabitants. The population for Dubrovnik-Neretva County was 122,870 inhabitants. See <https://www.dzs.hr/eng/censuses/census2011/censuslogo.htm> and edubrovnik.org (accessed 29 June 2021).
10. In 2016, Dubrovnik received 1,013,116 tourist arrivals ('land-based' tourism only; cruise ship tourism is not included in this figure). Of these, 958,817 were foreign tourists and 52,200 were domestic tourists. The figures for 2016 were 12 per cent higher than the previous year. Dubrovnik received 3.5 million overnight stays in 2016; this is a 13 per cent increase from 2015. (Source: Dubrovnik Tourism Board). The numbers of cruise ships mooring in Dubrovnik have equally increased in recent years. In 2016, 529 cruise ships called at Dubrovnik, with a total number of 799,916 passengers. In comparison, 475 cruise ships called at Dubrovnik in 2015 and 463 in 2014. (Source: Dubrovnik Port Authority.)
11. 'Museumification' can be seen as 'the transition from a living city to that of an idealized re-presentation of itself, wherein everything is considered not for its use but for its value as a potential museum artifact' (Di Giovine 2009: 261). Di Giovine specifies that these 'museum artifacts' do not only comprise of material representations, but can also relate to aspects of a culture, such as ethnicity, nationhood or human beings themselves and their activities (ibid.).