DISCUSSION

LIDIJA NIKOČEVIĆ

Ethnographic Museum of Istria, Pazin

Culture or Heritage?

The Problem of Intangibility

The author advocates the use of the phrase "intangible culture" instead of "intangible cultural heritage". The word "heritage" implies a certain fixity and immutability, and assumes that authorities have identified and proclaimed heritage. Dealing with intangible culture would provide the opportunity for the deflection of the UNESCO model of preserving intangible cultural phenomena, whose application has brought some problems. The author illustrates this in practice with the example of bell-ringers, who are included on the UNESCO Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.

[*intangible heritage, UNESCO, bellmen, Intellectual Property*]

When about fifteen years ago the syntagm "intangible cultural heritage" began replacing the word "folklore", many ethnologists saw this as a positive development. Especially those working in museums have probably related this to a significant contextualization when it comes to museum ethnography. Objects used in past and present everyday life frequently do not tell much if exhibited without an insight into their intangible meanings. How they were made, who made them, what was their role in society, what were they used to do – these are only some of the intangible meanings every object carries.

However, the word "heritage" in this syntagm is not unproblematic: there is a saying among anthropologists, which has an almost anecdotal undertone – "Heritage begins where culture ends". Indeed, its antiquity notwithstanding, heritage is something completely new. It is a new manner of cultural creation in the present which has its roots in the past (Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 1998:7). It is a meta-product based on his-

torical fragments. In other words, there is no heritage as such – it is constructed, thus building a symbolic capital of sorts. Thereby cultural heritage becomes a value, relating to the past and the future (Bendix 2007:8-9). American folklorist Dorothy Noyes notices that cultural practices become fixed, whereby the variety of potential messages reduces. Each locality is presented as unique (on a decorative rather than on a structural level), thus promoting rivalry rather than solidarity among what are frequently marginal communities. Local cultures seemingly belong to the past, and cultural practices which are perceived as heritage become emblematic, posing as identity symbols. The primary audience to which heritage is presented is frequently made of members of an out-group, or "outsiders" (Noyes 2007:50). Furthermore, it needs to be pointed out that heritage is usually identified and defined by persons in positions of power, whether employees of ministries, museum employees, or scientists, so the often criticized "top-down" relationship is in a way inherent to the concept of heritage.

Fig. 1. The carriers of the cultural good, the researcher and state authority – a triangle of the key positions and roles in UNESCO's approach to intangible cultural heritage Photo taken by Rajna Miloš on January 27, 2010, during the visit of the President Stipe Mesić to Ronjgi (Viškovo) when the bell-ringers were presented to him as the cultural good from the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.

Many of these dangers and traps can be escaped if we talk simply of "intangible culture". This would also imply transformations and reduce the possibility of the petrification of the phenomena it pertains to. Unlike the heritage framework, which is mostly focused on reproduction, more attention would be given to processes, including those presently underway. Therefore, the newly founded Centre for Intangible Heritage of Istria in Pićan (established at the Ethnographic museum of Istria in Pazin) does not contain the word *heritage* in its name, also because its founders, learning from the experience of involvement with intangible culture within the UNESCO paradigm, encountered problems which result from such an approach. The following text is an illustration of these problems on the example of bell-ringers (*zvončari*) and to a lesser degree the two-part singing and playing, perceived as cultural goods.

Fig. 2. Performance for the President of the Republic of Croatia: the representatives of bell-ringers groups with Stipe Mesić Photo by: Lidija Nikočević, Ronjigi (Viškovo), Janauary 27, 2010.

In 2003 in Paris UNESCO adopted the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage, completing the already existing conventions. The director-general of UNESCO had introduced the Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity in 2001, which inscribed new cultural goods bi-annually. It was replaced by the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity in 2008. This list encompassed all the cultural goods already included in the

Proclamation and was regularly updated every year. Several people at the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Croatia started working on the issue professionally: the Department for Intangible Cultural Goods and Committee for Intangible Cultural Heritage, of which I am a member since its establishment, were founded in 2004. I have continually pointed out that the term "intangible culture" is better than "intangible cultural heritage". However, since UNESCO's idea and approach were consistently followed, the terminology was adjusted to UNESCO's terminology. Still, what was confusing was the fact that, regardless of the usage of the term "heritage", it was repeatedly emphasized these are "living traditions" instead of dying ones, which are not the subject matter of this kind of approach. This is one of the paradoxes of this paradigm because if a phenomenon is living, it doesn't require preservation; if it vanished, preservation will not help, and is not of interest to the approach (Nikočević 2003:62). I was even more bothered by the term "protection" which was repeatedly used in our discussions in the Committee, even though UNESCO's terminology uses the term "safeguarding".[1] It was the Committee for Intangible Cultural Heritage that tried to settle the mode of evaluation and the criteria. There were unsettled disputes even after the registration of several phenomena in the national Register of Cultural Goods. However, the Minister of Culture was rather impatient and wanted our work to result in specific suggestions for UNESCO's representative list as soon as possible. The bell-ringers, as one of the proposals, were the part of the first draft containing sixteen cultural goods which were accompanied by visual and textual material.

Personally, I felt rather ambivalent about the whole situation. My position as an ethnologist in the context of longtime work with bell-ringers became more complex because I was no longer only a researcher, but also the person assessing and evaluating a tradition according to externally imposed criteria. On one hand it was difficult to refuse to prepare nomination materials for the bell-ringers, not solely because this would entail refusing to do what the Minister expected me to do as the member of the Committee, but also because I was wondering what would the bell-ringers say if I had tried to avoid it, after the leaders of the bell ringer groups signed their consent to the nomination. How was I to justify my reservations considering the advantages of their inscription on the list (considering the fact that at that time I had been familiar with the circumstances that surrounded Lent-related practices in the areas of the bell-ringers, and considering the fact that I had become very critical towards UNESCO's concept of intangible culture)? Moreover, I knew that if I didn't do it,

---

[1] The word "protection" will later have lead to many misunderstanding among the bell-ringers (after the inscription on the Representative list).

someone else, much less familiar with the phenomenom, would do it instead. At the same time, I resented the "top-down" approach and the fact that the local communities were hardly involved in the process.

One could also ask, of course, what I wanted to achieve with my work on the Committee. As a researcher dealing with intangible cultural phenomena, I was interested in whether this initiative lead to petrification and alienation from living social and cultural origins, or whether this type of approach to specific goods would also initiate invention of traditions. I was also interested in what happens to phenomena of intangible culture once they become politicized through international and national governmental "protection" programs. It was a challenge to be able to test the Dutch anthropologist Peter J.M Nas's thesis. He wonders whether tradition should finally become the subject of change both in the sense of invention and development, and decline and vanishing (Nas 2002:140). I realized it was not easy for someone educated as an ethnologist to judge the value of an isolated cultural good, since ethnologists and anthropologists insist on contextual cultural analysis. Furthermore, while ethnologists try to avoid giving value judgments about a culture, the mechanism constructing world heritage devises universal standards for determining which goods make it to the representative list (Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 2006:185).

Finally, it seems that not only in Croatia but elsewhere as well it is mainly the question of pride of national governments,[2] as the number of cultural phenomena on UNESCO's list witnesses the wealth of cultural heritage, while, at the same time, the bearers of those cultural traditions are of less importance. In a wider political sense, the variety of cultural (intangible) forms does not necessarily imply tolerance and universalism, but can result in separatist, complacent judgments of groups that base their particularism in the specificity of their cultural heritage (Eriksen 2001:136). Over time it has become clear that the globalization of intangible cultural phenomena is the means of challenging this globalization. In other words, while emphasizing the struggle against the homogenizing effects of economic globalization, the very concept of world heritage becomes possible thanks to globalization in the political and economic sense. A very important role here is awarded to cultural tourism (Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 2006:165).

---

[2] In 2010 I received a phone call from one of the most prominent bell-ringers from Rukavac, who wanted to talk about the relationship of government institutions toward carnival traditions. He complained that, despite all my efforts, the government still didn't respect the carnival traditions. His daughter, who had been looking forward all year to spend the day in Rukavac, had to attend a geography competition on the day of the carnival. "Now she has to choose between education and pleasure", said her father.

Fig. 3. Intangible cultural heritage as national pride: the representatives of bell-ringers with the President of Croatia, Stipe Mesić. Photo by: Lidija Nikočević

At the UNESCO conference in Abu Dhabi in late September the bell ringers from Kastavština region were inscribed on the Representative list of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, along with six other intangible cultural goods from Croatia. Along with the custom of Buše from Hungary, carnival masked characters with bells inscribed in the same year, and the carnival of Binche (Belgium) inscribed the year earlier, this was the third carnival custom in the list. As with the inscription on the national Register of Cultural Goods in 2007, this pertained to all traditional bell-ringer groups (from Bregi, Brgud, Frlanija, Halubaj, Mučići, Mune, Rukavac, Zvoneće, Žejane, Vlahov Breg and Korensko). I learned of this a day before going away for a trip abroad and shared the information with several people from Matulji and some of the bell-ringer group leaders (*vođe*). While abroad, I monitored national and local press on the internet because I was interested in the reactions to the news. I incredulously read the articles on the website of the Novi list national daily, reporting that only Halubaj bell-ringers had been inscribed on the list, and that that was the result of their project:

> The Halubaj bell-ringers have once again been rewarded for their work and efforts on the preservation of cultural heritage – their project "The annual carnival procession of bell-ringers of the Kastav area" was inscribed

> on UNESCO's Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity established by the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage from 2003. (Danilović Prijić 2009b)

I was also surprised by the fact that this cultural good was located in the "Kastav area", although I remembered using the term *Kastavština.* Subsequently I remembered that the nomination was sent to Paris in English translation, which translated *Kastavština* as the "Kastav area", and that someone, not being familiar with the term *Kastavština*, probably translated it literally back to Croatian. Did this happen at the Ministry at the time of informing the media or somewhere else, remained unknown. While thinking about how to react and to whom to address my reaction, the next day I read a text titled "Who are the real Kastav area bell-ringers?" on the website of the same national daily:

> The Halubaj bell-ringers claim they are surely the "Croatian intangible cultural good", although they haven't received an official confirmation from the Ministry of Culture. However, the document they have mentions "some" bell-ringers from Rukavac and Mučići. Franko Tancabel, the representative of the Rukavac bell-ringers, claims that in yesterday's conversation with the ethnologist Lidija Nikočević, whom he contacted regarding this proposition, he found out that all bell-ringer groups from the Matulji and Halubaj area were a "protected Croatian intangible cultural good". Dragan Jelša of the Mune bell-ringers does not know neither who nor what, but thinks all bell-ringer groups should be protected, and Silvano Luksetic, the representative of the Bregi bell-ringers, says: "Wait, we are all under UNESCO protection, not only the Halubaj bell-ringers. Otherwise, it is a shame". Edvard Radan from Brgud also says he understood all the bell-ringer groups from the Matulji area, as well as the Halubaj bell-ringers, are in the category of protected phenomena, why would they otherwise be invited to the press conference of the Ministry of Culture yesterday, called to announce the UNESCO's decision. Slavko Slavić, a longtime bell-ringer from Mučići says he could talk about this on and on, but will say only two things. Firstly, "you have what you fight for", and secondly: "all of us bell-ringers get the bell-ringer's sting when we are little, and take it to our graves". Of course, all groups should be treated equally, concluded Slavić. (Mrkić Modrić 2009a)

On the one hand I regretted being away, having seen that misunderstandings kept piling up, leading to a culmination of discontent and conflict. At the same time, my mobile phone wasn't recording calls from journalists, bell-ringers or local government officials. I was faced with a dilemma: in what seemed as an imminent address to the media, should I focus on the fact that all groups with a continuity of several years in the area familiar with bell-ringer traditions are indeed included in the list, or should

I clarify the usage of the term *Kastavština* which got "lost in translation" and assumed the form of "Kastav area". At the same time I felt the need to speak for the usage of the term *Kastavština,* signifying a cultural instead of an administrative area (signifying all the municipalities in the area which were, in fact, indicated in the nomination's subtitle). Thirdly, I wanted to stress that this was not a matter of protection, but of inscription on a list, which implies safeguarding, care and a certain acknowledgment. However, the same day saw the publication of an article titled "We are the exclusive bearers of the project" (statement of the president of the organization of Halubaj bell-ringers) in the same daily newspaper:

> (…) the project is titled as it is, even though we, the Halubaj bell-ringers, are its exclusive bearers, and the bell-ringers from Rukavac and Mučići are also mentioned, Marčelja said. He added that it was a fact that people from Halubaj gravitated towards Kastavština, but also that Kastav, rather than Viškovo – a municipality lacking Kastav's tradition and significance – was mainly referred to through history. (…) The fact that we are inscribed on the UNESCO list and declared an intangible cultural good by the Ministry of Culture in late 2007 proves, I think, that we have the prerequisites to embark on the process of the protection of intellectual property, which will give us control over the usage of the Halubaj bell-ringer mask in commercial or other purposes, said Marčelja. (Mrkić Modrić 2009b)

It was difficult to believe that no one from the Ministry was able to explain to the media what had actually been happening (as stated in one of about a dozen article on this "case") by simply reading the Decision. Therefore, it remains unclear whether it was (more) a matter of poor communication, of media's tendency to construct an intrigue and/or of the insistence of the Halubaj bell-ringers that they were the only ones to be included in the list. At the same time, many of my older reservations and criticisms concerning this type of relationship towards living traditions, or "intangible cultural heritage", were intensified and materialized rather clearly. On the other hand, I was surprised at the antagonism between different bell-ringer groups – in this case they were divided into two blocks, those from the western and those from the eastern part of the Kastavština region – manifested at the occasion of an external evaluation of their carnival practices. However, the culmination of tensions was yet to come. Before I sent an explanation to the editors of Novi list, which, as the journalist wrote, "solved all the dilemmas relating to which bell-ringer group is inscribed on the UNESCO list of protected intangible cultural goods of humanity" (Mrkić Modrić 2009c) (although still, to may dismay, using the term protection), the *Bela nedeja,* a three-day long traditional fair, had started in Kastav. On this occasion the "Kastavea" tourist agency printed

t-shirts with the following print: "*I am also the bell-ringer from UNESCO list*", with UNESCO's symbol in the middle. The function, they thought, was twofold: providing an additional affirmation to the Halubaj bell-ringers that they were indeed in the list, and others could get there wearing the t-shirt. Even though those who designed the t-shirt claimed it was the source of amusement, the Matulji bell-ringers, who also frequent the *Bela nedeja* fair, saw this as ultimate provocation and attributed it to the Halubaj bell-ringers. "*I wanted to tear it to pieces!*", says an angry bell-ringer from Mučići, who remembers the situation was just short of a physical confrontation between different groups from western Kastavština and the Halubaj bell-ringers who were holding a beverage booth at the *Bela nedeja* fair. They were very angry and offended. Another bell-ringer said to me angrily several months after the event:

> Who did you ask!? I am against us being under UNESCO. Who signed it in our name, anyway? Now they expect money from it… It is dividing people, it's what brought us against one another. How can you explain UNESCO to a half-literate man? They don't know what to expect now, they think a bunch of people will come here, they are afraid of that… We have no use for it, it is destroying the old bell-ringers, who are disappearing as it is. There will be war with Halubaji, too… They should all just leave us alone, we don't need that. We would gladly un-inscribe ourselves. It's not ours anymore… Now that it is protected, it is everyone's. Globalized.

Fig. 4. A shirt made by the tourist agency 'Kastavea' in 2009 for the annual fair of *Bela Nedeja* in Kastav. Photo by D. D. 2012.

I didn't have many arguments to dispute these doubts and statements, because I shared his opinion to a degree. Moreover, this quotation partly reflects the views of anthropologists and ethnologists dealing with negative effects and aspects of UNESCO's cultural policy relating to intangible cultural heritage (Kirchenblatt-Gimblett 2006, Ericssen 2001, Hafstein 2007, Bendix 2007 i 2009). It also corresponds to the opinion of Jean-Aimé Rakotoarisoa, the director of the Antananarivo university museum in Madagascar, who says:

> The question is, therefore, whether we have the right to expose private knowledge handed down from generation to generation, and to determine criteria for organizing this information. Do our titles, qualifications and functions give us this right? (…) Intangible heritage is one of the last ramparts that shield our communities against all forms of agression to which their leaders have exposed them, sometimes with the passive collusion of the international agencies which are supposed to be helping them in their everyday lives. Do we have the right to deprive them of this last protective barrier? (Rakotoarisoa 2004:11)

After my explanation had been printed in the newspaper, the tensions among the Matulji bell-ringers subdued but the topic was reintroduced several months later, in a meeting initiated by the Halubaj bell-ringers in Marčelji. I was invited to explain what had been happening to the representatives of the majority of bell-ringer groups inscribed on the UNESCO Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. To the repeatedly asked question "*Why does anyone have to protect us? Who, those people from Paris?*", I answered that it is not a matter of protection but rather of safeguarding, that no one will protect them against their will and that probably nothing overly dramatic would happen. I pointed out that this status enabled them to apply for financial support with national and international bodies for organizing exhibitions, printing materials and books, making films or designing programs they find necessary, and which would not necessarily disturb their usual carnival practices.

Some of the bell-ringers were positive about it from the beginning (for example the Halubaj bell-ringers, the Frlanija bell-ringers and individuals from other groups), and it seemed their number increased over time:

> It's an honor. We should know how to make use of it. People see you differently – they see that you are worth something. It is not like – you've come up with something and now you go around doing shenanigans. You don't gain anything by doing it, but you love doing it all the same. It's not right to gain something from it. (a Halubaj bell-ringer).

Indeed, until this day (2011) there have been no hoards of curious tourists or specific demands from centers of power that would imply new processes or representations pertaining to the bell-ringers.

The Halubaj bell-ringers were involved in few such events. On the one hand they were frequently the epitome of bell-ringers, but on the other, such events were consistent with their usual practices of appearing and performing outside of the traditional context. Actually, the "Ivan Matetić Ronjgov" memorial home in Ronjgi near Viškovo was the venue of two official events: a reception for the then-President, Stjepan Mesić, at the end of his term, on January 27 2010, and the reception for the Minister Božo Biškupić, who presented the bell-ringers with framed copies of the UNESCO Representative List inscription charter. The Memorial home in Ronjgi was chosen as a venue probably because it is a memorial home of Ivan Matetić Ronjgov. This meant the joint celebration of the bell-ringers' inscription on the UNESCO list and the inscription of two-part singing and playing of Istria and Hrvatsko Primorje in the same list. In the first case Stjepan Mesić came accompanied by the head of Primorsko-goranska County and a number of esteemed guests. Since this is an area from which Halubaj bell-ringers are recruited, they were hosting the event; they gathered and demonstrated the typical strut and dance of the bell-ringers. The other groups were represented by a single bell-ringer, dressed in bell-ringers' outfit and carrying the bell-ringers' equipment. The event was not without mutual provocations, even though most of the participants were happy to be present and meet the mostly popular president. Everyone brought a present, a large framed picture of bell-ringers, an engraving representing a bell, ceramic plates and jugs with illustrations representing different bell-ringer groups, wine – which were mostly gifts presented to each other by bell-ringers themselves. The Minister of Culture Božo Biškupić, who visited the place several months later, was also presented with many gifts. He left them all in Ronjgi, much to the surprise of some of the bell-ringers, who expected someone from the Ministry to collect them afterwards.

After the Minister and his entourage had left, the head of county and some county officials stayed for the party, as well as some bell-ringers. While I chose food from a rich buffet adorned with pieces of the bell-ringers' equipment, next to me an important official of the County Department for Education and Social Issues was talking to the president of the Halubaj Bell-ringers Association. Talking about the possibility of Halubaj bell-ringers visiting New York, this official said that, if the bell-ringers really wanted to be an attraction, they would dress girls in mini-skirts and put bells on them. Americans would have done so a long time ago, she said.

On the other hand, the carnival practices of groups inscribed on the UNESCO list gain a new, serious significance in their respective local communities. This is no joking matter any more. In the words of a member of the women's group of the "Kumpanija s Halubja":

> We didn't mask as bell-ringers; we thought about it but not everyone was in favor, so we didn't. We can't joke about it; we don't want to and we can't, especially now they are in the UNESCO list, the criteria are different now; they are protected.

This surely reduces the potential number of different creative interpretations; you don't joke about heritage. Something similar happened in Binche, Belgium, whose carnival practice was also inscribed on the UNESCO representative list: while in Binche itself the form of the practice was "petrified", similar practices in the surrounding villages show a higher degree of creativity in interpreting standard patterns (Tauschek 2009:73).

The form and content of carnival practices of bell-ringers' has for a number of years shown the tendencies of codification, standardization and retraditionalization. Obviously, this is not the result solely of the new situation, but of other processes as well – primarily the adoption of recognizable characteristics of individual groups, used for identification among them. A bell-ringer from Rukavac reflects on this fact:

> First they had four pieces of "žukva",[3] and now they should have only three. If some of them used four now, it would be a mess, since the decision was made to use only three. Someone has an idea – We shouldn't have this type of roses – and look what we had thirty years ago! We used to wear jeans on carnival day.

Along with these rules, the ones regulating who wears the bells in the group are also becoming more rigid; there are fewer occasions on which individual bell-ringers wear bells for multiple groups on the basis of friendly or familiar relations. Of course, associations' statutes and regulations as results of their formal organizational rules also contribute to this course of events.

The issue of intellectual property did not begin unfolding with the inscription of bell-ringers on the UNESCO Representative List, but it gained new momentum. Several years ago the Žejane bell-ringers voiced their concern as to the scope of imitation allowed on the part of the bell-ringers from Mune, and this type of debate is largely present among other bell-

---

[3] Spanish broom (*Spartium junceum*); in this context it is a twig in the bell-ringers' head piece.

ringer groups as well. Generally speaking, the inscription of bell-ringers on the UNESCO list has affected the attitude of Halubaj bell-ringers the most. Some ethnologists and film professionals were surprised at the fact that certain bell-ringers from the Halubaj group denied answers to questions on carnival practices, with the explanation that only the association's leader was in charge of giving information since their inscription on the UNESCO list. It appears they are becoming increasingly aware of their "brand", considering the ways of protecting it and making those who use it and make profit of it give a part of the profit to the bell-ringers group. Ethnologists and folklorists are confused and astonished by this attitude, which has turned yesterday's informants into today's guardians of communication about "protected" heritage.

Similar situations happen(ed) in Vodnjan and Galižana, where local Italian communities jealously guard their traditions. For years they have not been included in folklore festivals in Istria, which did not recognize them as representative, probably because theirs was the folklore of a national minority (regardless of the fact that different forms of Italian language and preceding, related languages have been spoken in Vodnjan and Galižana "forever", and the fact that Italians in Istria became a minority only after the Second World War and the Exodus). Thus their traditional dances and songs became symbols of something private and personal, almost of an internalized identity, easily expressed in front of an Italian audience (in Italy) than in the confined and competitive local context. What contributed to this was the fact that Italian population of Vodnjan and Galižana is decreasing, these villages being populated by newcomers. The traditionally competitive relationship between Vodnjan and the nearby Galižana resulted in mutual accusations of "theft" of certain folklore elements and parts of traditional costumes and jewlery. Also, if a young man from central Istria interested in folklore and not a member of the (local) Italian community wanted to learn the Galižana dance, the local dancer would refuse to teach him. This challenges UNESCO's premise that intangible cultural heritage is exchanged, used for communication, contributing to better understanding between communities in contact.

These examples show that this understanding of intellectual property does not acknowledge the fact (clear to ethnologists) that imitation is the state of culture and that neighboring communities spontaneously adopt cultural elements from each other. Moreover, becoming part of a culture (including one's own) means reproducing it. However, in the regime ruled by private ownership, culture is defined as a good, in a similar way as a country is treated as real estate, entering the system of ownership which implies the exchange of value. In this perception culture can become the object of theft, and "imitation" should be regulated and limited. In this

context "authorship" appears as the result of possessive Western individ-
ualism, complementary to the individual who realizes himself or herself
through ownership and creation (Hafstein 2007:84).

Staged presentations of intangible heritage – specifically the "Twelve
Croatian intangible goods" – where they act as isolated, decontextual-
ized phenomena, also raise doubts with ethnologists and folklorists. An-
nouncing the program to present the twelve phenomena of Croatian in-
tangible heritage from the UNESCO list at the 2012 Zagreb Fair, as part
of the project "A Mother's Story – All Together, All for One – The Best of
Croatia", a web-site wrote:

> Reviving tradition: Is there end to Antea Kodžoman's long legs?
> Miss Croatia, Miss Universe, Miss Tourism, Miss Sport, the Queen of
> Croatia and Best Model Croatia – 15 Misses presented the twelve Croatian
> intangible goods from UNESCO list. (http://www.tportal.hr/lifestyle/
> moda/193025/Ima-li-kraja-dugim-nogama-Antee-Kodzoman.html)

The commodification and globalization of intangible culture is evident
within tourism, since the organizers of this event claimed that "Croatia
has over a thousand of cultural and tourist events, but most citizens and
tourists don't have an opportunity to see and experience all of them.
Therefore, this project was designed in order to gather all Croatian cultur-
al products in one place, promoting cultural tourism in Croatia" (http://
www.sisak.hr/clanak_/14383/lipe-na-hrvatskom-naj). This clearly shows
to what extent local traditions become utilized in modern tourism.

After listing several side effects and giving a critical insight into
UNESCO's concept of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, a ques-
tion arises: to what extent is it beneficial to neglect the context of heritage
or the construct it in terms of signification. This seems useful, eventhough
the evaluation through UNESCO's framework is already imposed on in-
tangible cultural heritage, to the extent it is impossible to "rule out" and
ignore it.

COMMENTS

LJILJANA GAVRILOVIĆ
Institute of Ethnography of the Serbian Academy
of Sciences and Arts, Belgrade

In my view, Lidija Nikoćević's rethinking of the issue of (primarily) intangible cultural heritage[1] demonstrates that in practice all of us involved in both research and the implementation of the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*[2] face the same dilemmas: should one take part or withdraw, be critical (of the concept, its implementation, readings, etc.) or work as best as one can without publicly challenging both theory and practice? If we choose not to get involved, the propositions will be more than problematic. But if we do get involved, how disqualifying is this with regards to the results of our research, which are bound to be different from beaurocratically fashioned proposals for different heritage lists? It appears that in this case the proverbially schizophrenic position of an anthropologist (involvement in and understanding of a researched community but also distance and "objectivity") is even more pronounced: not only do we have to put ourselves at the disposition of those we study and be in the service of their own perspective of what they see as their (most often exclusively their) tradition, but we should also – during the process of shaping the proposal – give up the notion (and acceptance) of culture as a constantly fluctuating process of change and take part in the "preservation" of its elements which frequently have no place in the bigger picture of contemporary reality, unless they are fossilized in the function of reasserting group identity practices.[3]

---

[1] … which is in Serbia still coloquially called *baština,* but in official documents this term has been replaced by a less problematic one – *nasleđe* (Gavrilović 2010).

[2] I am the member of the National Committee for Intangible Cultural Heritage, which is one of the task forces of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Sebia.

[3] The trouble is that in the Balkans, or at least in Serbia, these practices are still read in an ethnic code, so nominations for the list of intangible cultural heritage (still only governmental – Serbia has so far not prepared a a nomination for any of UNESCO lists, which comes as no surprise considering the relatively late ratification of the Convention in 2010) are requested either within the framework of rights of minority communities, or as parts of strategies within their political positioning. Namely, these are the only examples when the initiative comes from tradition bearers themselves, while in all other cases, as for example in Croatia, nominations come "from above".

However, alongside all these dilemmas[4] it seems necessary to point to another set of issues.[5] Namely, five recurring categories of intangible cultural heritage which, according to the Convention, encompass the widest possible spectrum of human creativity and form the basis for identification within smaller and/or larger groups (oral legends and expression, including language as the means of transfer/shaping of intangible heritage; traditional performance arts; social practices, customs, rituals and festivities; knowledge and skills relating to nature and the universe; traditional crafts), are in practice (evident both in the UNESCO list and in the lists of individual countries) not treated as general, but exclusively as premodern categories. It is as if modern age, now underway for over two centuries, hasn't brought its own world view, knowledge and skills,[6] and social practices which have their own expiration date, which appear and disappear, change, and most importantly *are* the basis of identity of a large number of people.

However, if we look at them carefully, the basic categories of intangible cultural heritage as defined by the Convention doubtlessly encompass wide segments of the modern world view (for example, scientific methods, basic human rights, including the equality of all people before the law, or the right to culture, and finally the idea of safeguarding cultural goods). These are, in the Western world at least, perceived as given facts and not as cultural constructs of the modern age and the European civilization. If we deconstruct the implicit ideology which shapes these given facts, it becomes evident that they are parts of intangible cultural heritage of a particular culture in a clearly defined period of time, which are then transferred across generations and have a decisive significance for autoidentification and/or group identification of millions of people in the contemporary world. Thus, they can be defined as intangible cultural heritage. Since it has not occurred to anyone to include any of the above in the Convention, the acknowledgment of the widest spectrum of these phenomena, necessary in order to avoid the traps of folklorization of in-

---

[4] Apart from the dilemmas listed by the author of the introductory text, with which I completely agree, for problems of preservation-as-ideology, exotisation, the impossibility of protection of a large number of practices due to clashes with positive regulations, etc. see Gavrilović (2011).

[5] Leaving aside the problems of the "safeguarding" of language (which language? whose? from what time?), one of the many questions is what is being "safeguarded": the essence or the form. There are many others resulting from the text of the Conventions, but even more so from its implementation in different communities. However, I can't address them because opening any of them would go far beyond the limits of this contribution.

[6] For example, no one mentions our/contemporary notions of the knowledge and skills relating to nature/the universe as intangible cultural heritage, even though they are a very important part of our world view and exist for several generations.

tangible cultural heritage and/or application of eurocentric standards in the safeguarding process, but also to open a whole new set of questions directly resulting from fluctuating relations between global and glocal cultures and to confront the beaurocratic measures of safeguarding with everyday life – remains the job of anthropologists. This job is all the more challenging since it is completely unexpected and probably unwelcome on the part of the beaurocracy (the UNESCO and individual countries).

In addition, the Convention overlooks the diverse, primarily individual interpretations of cultural patterns, forms and prescribed/desirable behaviors, as well as different forms of global cultural patterns, which is one of the most interesting and diversified processes taking place before our eyes. All those individual and/or local interpretations of culture remain unsafeguarded (which is not problematic), frequently unrecorded (which is), although they are the key to the understanding of cultural processes on the one hand, and the only way to implement traditions into everyday life on the other. When a famous singer of African "ethno" music says "I love the African hut, but with air conditioning" (Čolović 2006: 191-192), he is in fact talking about the need to merge the tangible (hut, air conditioning) and intangible (African traditional aesthetics, the comfort of modern western civilization) culture, about belonging to different cultures in different times, and about the necessity to connect the traditional and the contemporary, which is the characteristic of every local space. Glocalization is the only possible manner to safeguard tradition (whether tangible or intangible), in relation to the ways of life in contemporary times, which is not evident at all in the implementation of the Convention so far.

Moreover, safeguarding intangible heritage is also part of a globalized culture and its implementation is attempted in as many countries as possible[7]; it is in fact highly ambivalent – it is a global strategy to preserve cultural diversity. The effort to implement the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Heritage means standing at the door which separate the past, the idea of discrete cultures and group (ethnic/religious-ascultural, essentialist) identities, from the globalized world, the fluctuating multilayer and individual identities and the endless variety of glocalized cultural forms. To insist on the safeguarding of only one of these sides of the door might mean to miss the opportunity to know and understand the other one, the one we all live in the present. I think that the place of the anthropologist, as the one able to cross this boundary and move on both sides, is indisputable.

---

[7] Maybe some of them do not want to safeguard their heritage, because they have different perspective on it.

MIRELA HROVATIN
Service for Movable and Intangible Cultural Heritage,
Republic of Croatia, Ministry of Culture, Zagreb

There are several different interpretations of the terms used by author Lidija Nikočević in the introduction – *culture, heritage, tangible and intangible cultural heritage, cultural good* – in professional and everyday contexts. The term *heritage* has been used by professionals more commonly since the late 20th century for everything that we as humans have inherited from the past generations, including cultural, as well as natural heritage (cf. Jezernik 2005:11), which needs to be preserved for certain reasons (historical, social significance etc). The difference between the terms *heritage* and *good* (or *property*, while *element* or *item* is used for intangible heritage, depending on the context) lies in the fact that good is used for a specific segment of cultural or natural heritage that is kept, restored, added to different lists, so it has to be defined, or reduced to one of the possible categories according to regulations. The English word *intangible* (incorporeal, impalpable), which is sometimes replaced by *immaterial*, is related to the notion of tangible (material) cultural heritage, which needed a different, new category. According to Buchli, a relatively vague term *tangible heritage* appears in the English language for the first time in the 19th century, in the context of studying the artefacts[1] of different cultures as evidence for different development stages of humanity. This was later replaced by the *participant observer* method, which aimed at bringing those cultures even closer to the European subject or to justify the authority of the researcher-scientist, that is, to identify the social processes that shaped tangible culture (cf. Buchli 2002).

The term and definition of *intangible cultural heritage* was designed by the organizers of the UNESCO Convention.[2] According to Nikočević, this term was simply translated into Croatian as such, even though the terms *traditional, spiritual, national*, or even *folk culture/heritage* were used in the world, as well as Croatia. Later on, the term *living cultural heritage*, which also refers to intangible cultural heritage,[3] was translated along a

---

[1] These artefacts were often not related to the *living* culture (Buchli 2002:5), the characteristic that largely defines today's intangible cultural heritage.

[2] *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* in 2003. Along with the Convention, the inscription on the Registry in Croatia is also based on the *Law on Protection and Conservation of Cultural Goods* from 1999, which mentions the category of intangible heritage suggested by our experts/ethnologists (cf. Marković 2001).

[3] UNESCO has also designed the *Living Human Treasures* program, which every country can implement separately in order to award and motivate the best bearers of specific intangible cultural heritage.

similar pattern. The intangible cultural heritage, although conceptually representing only one of the aspects of culture,[4] can include several aspects of cultural heritage (such as performing arts) that encompass the category of tradition, or a continuous transfer of knowledge and skills to new generations, but also enhancements,[5] and ever new creation, and in certain cases it cannot be separated from natural heritage.[6] *The intangible culture* can refer to the same thing, but it still implies a wider scope of human creation (including the brand new, not relating to the past, which is not being transferred directly inside a community). According to the UNESCO Convention, the categories of intangible cultural heritage are not intangible heritage as such, but indicate provisional areas in which this heritage is manifested, such as oral legends, customs, skills and crafts etc.,[7] while the *bearers* are the persons who posses that intangible knowledge and skills.

Based on the available information, I assume that the category of intangible cultural heritage occurs for the first time in Japan (in the *Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties*), as the result of assigning greater importance to this issue (when in 1949 it became necessary to restore the murals of a temple destroyed in the war), as well as to the increased public awareness of the importance of preserving Japanese traditional culture, jeopardized by the fast transition to the modern lifestyle.[8] Formally, the term in its present meaning was first mentioned at UNESCO's convention in 1982 in Mexico.[9] Our field in general has problems with terminology, especially when it wants to – as Nikočević points out – distinguish one practice from another one which is similar or identical. This is then reflected in the local terminology. Regardless of the terms and categories used, the inscriptions of goods will continue to refer to culture in general, because it is impossible to detach the intangible heritage from its material quality, from the product that is created and the space where it is taking place. Of course, *safeguarding* is more acceptable than *protection* as proposed by Nikočević, the latter being adopted from professional conservationists in the sense of

---

[4] The definitions most commonly used in theory are similar to this one, which defined culture as: "a set (synthesis) of all human material and spiritual creations" (Skledar 1991:13).

[5] The term *enhance* appears in UNESCO's Convention as part of the measures for the safeguarding of intangible heritage or tradition in a way that it needs to adapt to new times and current needs, so that it does not lose the value it has been gaining over time (Article 2, Paragraph 3 of the Convention).

[6] According to Article 2, Paragraph 1 of the Convention from 2003.

[7] According to Article 2, Paragraph 2 of the Convention from 2003.

[8] http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?cp=JP&topic=lht.

[9] http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?pg=00007.

the need for protection and inscription on the Registry,[10] which implies a series of restrictions for a cultural good.

Through conversations with tradition bearers I have realized that they do not separate tangible from intangible, so they perceive lace as a product and the process of lace making as a single category. Only lately have the people become more aware of this distinction, partly thanks to the process of inscribing the goods on the Registry and the UNESCO lists.[11] This is particularly apparent in the cases of artifacts that no one knows how to make anymore – in almost all cases someone in a community invests effort to preserve that knowledge. Croatia is rather active in this regard and that is the reason why so much has been preserved. The inscription was an additional impulse to the already initiated processes of restoring some knowledges and revitalizing the almost lost practices, even though the revitalization of certain traditions has been known to happen in the past. Of course, these revitalized practices are different from those which have a continutity in their existence, but it is worth to revive and protect the knowledge from disappearing. Naturally, blacksmithing today has quite different goals than it used to, but the very skill of making blacksmith artefacts stays more-or-less the same. There are a few innovations in the technique, but they are not so major as to completely lose the sensitive skill of shaping metal. In this sense, a video recording will not accomplish much if there is no direct transfer of knowledge, observation and imitation, trials and practice. Here lies a great challenge, because it is becoming increasingly difficult to get young people interested in such training. It is not always possible to master such a skill at a later age. For traditions with continuity, such as the bell-ringers, the acknowledgment through lists raise awareness among the young population and the community in general, helping them realize that it all depends on them. It is the future existence of a tradition that is at stake, not the present one: who is it that in fact can and should provide for its transfer?[12] Evidently, the inscription cannot guarantee that a tradition will be preserved, but can be of great help.

The first inscriptions on the Register in 2004 were supported by UNESCO's declaration of Master Pieces of the Oral and Intangible Herit-

---

[10] The Registry of Cultural Goods of the Republic of Croatia, the official record kept by the Ministry of Culture.

[11] Along with the *Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity* based on the Convention, the UNESCO also formed the *List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding*, as well as the system of proclaiming the best safeguarding practices.

[12] The general attitude of UNESCO is that it is a duty of all of us to provide for the keeping of these traditions, or at least to document them, because we have no right to let them be lost forever (cf. Museum International 2004).

age of Humanity,[13] while the text was written following the pattern of movable heritage – what was described was the significance a cultural good has for the community and for Croatia and its appearance, rather than the manufacturing process. The latter became the basis of the text only in the second phase of inscription, in 2007. It is very difficult to define specific elements of intangible cultural heritage, because the definition is limited by language, by text, the way of describing knowledge and skills, historical development, changes in meaning and new values. In general, it is impossible to cover a phenomenon in its entirety, and especially at the level of individual experience, while it often happens that one form of intangible cultural heritage also encompasses another one or many other forms. Looking back on the first days at the Department for Intangible Cultural Goods, I remember spending many hours discussing with my colleagues about the way of writing a short, yet comprehensive piece of text about a cultural good.[14] Everyone agreed that the singling out of specific practices results in the constrution of an ideal. However, culture as a whole is an ever-changing construct, a constructed ideal, and in most cases the goods proposed to be inscribed are to a large extent "symbols of identity", as Nikočević states.

Today even the bearers take part in writing the text, in identification, description or even evaluation,[15] due, for instance, to the lack of new field research or in cases of details that they want noted. This was also influenced by UNESCO's approach, because the nominations had to be pre-

---

[13] *Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity* started as an introduction to the list, which could be formed only after the 2003 Convention was implemented. Croatia too sent nominations for the Masterpieces list, but at that time the focus was more on the uniqueness of a specific custom at the global level. Now, for the new lists, the most important thing is that the custom is still alive. However, it seems that even today all the challenges that UNESCO faces when processing the applications have not been resolved yet, especially in the sense of joint nominations. In general, the form used to describe an element is still limiting; the bearers should be writing and talking about their traditions regardless of the form.

[14] This is how I came to the idea for the form for listing goods in the Registry that is still used today. I made the draft based on UNESCO's Masterpiece form and a general ethnographic description of a phenomenon (name, area, who still practices it, what are the issues), while the final version was designed by the Commission for Intangible Heritage composed of scientists and experts from different institutions in charge of studying the intangible heritage.

[15] Even before that there were similar attempts in Croatia, when "those gathered around *Seljačka sloga* spearheaded a campaign for safeguarding cultural heritage", and "the movement allowed, for the first time in history, to make 'peasants the subjects of culture'" (Leček 1995:108, 107).

pared with the widest possible participation of communities and bearers,[16] which was also applied in creating the Registry. As far as the Registry is concerned, there were no problems with the entries, because there was enough time to contact the bearers and ask them whether they want to enlist. Ethnologists played an important role here, making suggestions as to what to enlist and under which category, and deciding what will be excluded (events). Since the recording of intangible heritage is a relatively new practice, it caused different reactions, but case studies, such as the one done by Nikočević about the bell-ringers, can shed some light on many dilemmas. The awareness or unawareness regarding who is protected and how is the result of poor communication between professionals, government bodies and bearers, especially in the case of inscriptions on the UNESCO Representative List, in the case of which the deadline for preparing sixteen nominations was only three months, so there were some reservations due to the lack of information and fear of change, as Nikočević writes. It cannot be said that this is a top-down approach, because both the Ministry and UNESCO communicate with the bearers and communities, while the latter declare orally or in writing whether they accept the inscription. The nominations are sent through relevant government bodies (ministries), because in this way the UNESCO wants to encourage the government to take part in the care for cultural goods. Naturally, there are also some negative reactions to inscriptions, which is a good thing, as it shows that people are aware of their duty to transfer their tradition, as well as the way in which they will utilize all the available resources tha will help them in the transfer. However, if there are more negative than positive effects of inscription, it is also possible to remove a cultural good from the list. In case of the bell-ringers that Nikočević mentions, it seems that the inscription was just another *trigger* for the already existing competition between bearers and communities.

Until this day controversies remain relating to whether the people of Dubrovnik and Konavle should take a couple of days off to go to the Fiest of Saint Blaise, or to who can make a certain cake, and who should be allowed to come to the market with such a product as a brand. Here lies the real challenge for government bodies and the profession. The development of the cooperation with the neighbouring countries that ratified the Convention after Croatia, some even lacking their own intangible her-

---

[16] This also implies a controlled approach to a cultural good, meaning that it is up to the bearers to decide what will be presented to the public and what will stay in the community and the family. Still, in my opinion, the enlisting itself is a kind of overexposure of a good to the public, so it is better to enlist more jeopardized goods. Were cultural anthropologists/ethnologists not the among the first ones to use informants in their work (cf. Čiča 2010:19)?

itage lists (which is one of the criteria for the inscription on the UNESCO lists), has also been slow. Along with the incentives for conservation, international collaboration is one of the objectives of the Convention and the lists.[17] Perhaps we are able to understand distant cultures and preserve our own traditions, but how do we admit that we share the same/similar traditions with our neighbors and how to put it together on one global list,[18] especially if they were basis for the construction of ethnicity. Hence, a comment from a citizen of Serbia on the inscription of a Croatian intangible cultural good on the UNESCO list: "Why do they need something that is ours",[19] or ask about who a certain intangible cultural heritage belongs to. The problem of common intellectual ownership used to be one of the main barriers for evaluating intangible heritage in the 1970s, but today these issues are somewhat regulated by national or international laws, which provides a way for settling disputes.

For today's bearers – as the inevitable consequence of globalization – the community is entire Croatia and the world, even though they perform their practice in the area they are living in, so the enlisting as an acknowledgment of the value of that tradition, is in a way an incentive to the younger generations to maintain those practices, because of the values that they represent, not only to them and their inner community, but to the entire world.[20] Based on personal communication with the bearers of the goods that were registered, most developments are positive (particularly in the sense of designing new programs and financial incentives), but it is necessary to talk even more, with them, the local community and authorities, because they decide how their knowledge will be used and for what

---

[17] In an informal conversation, one of the experts working on the Convention admitted that he found the competition involved in the process of inscription somewhat entertaining, but that the hardest part – cooperation – was yet to follow.

[18] http://www.glassrpske.com/kultura/knjizevnost/Nenad-Grujicic-Becarac-je-srpska-bastina/lat/70023.html – it is not only unclear whether the same element shared by different countries will be jointly inscribed, as is the case with *ojkanje;* there is also the issue of tracing the origins of a tradition, which is an almost impossible taks. The lack of dialogue not only between communities, but also between experts, is also a major obstacle that should be eliminated. Thus, a "better understanding" through intangible culture is not UNESCO's "premise", as Nikočević claims, but an objective as well. I would also like to add that the media in general are the platform for debate, but also the means of disseminating incomplete or distorted, even if all relevant information is available to them.

[19] http://www.politika.rs/index.php?lid=lt&show=rubrike&part=list_reviews&int_itemID=204788.

[20] We cannot and should not try to eliminate the sense of belonging to the world as our new community, because it is simply the way it is. In part, this sense of belonging results in the raised awareness among the youth that maintaining traditions depends on them. Of course, if all these motivations are missing, a tradition is bound to disappear, so its recording is the last possible safeguarding measure.

purpose (in tourism, for instance), rather than agreeing to everything out of fear,[21] which results with the visit to the Fair that Nikočević mentions. For a better work on registering goods on various lists and evaluating intangible cultural heritage, it is necessary to have ethnologists on the field and to work closely with the bearers, but it also requires systematic and continuous research, to help establish a better relation towards a good and tradition in general. The individuals who are bearers of tradition have been aware of their role in the entire process for a long time and have been actively changing and enhancing their practices as they see fit. The profession does not have to, but it can, and sometime indeed should, take part in that.

---

[21] In a conversation with one of the participants in this event, who is the bearer of a tradition inscribed on the UNESCO list, I found out they were not sure why they had to participate, because they hadn't dare to ask. This is another negative effect of inscriptions, because the bearers think they have to do everything that is requested of them, regardless of where the request comes from. Of course, it seems that the organizer of the event is not even aware of the damage done to the bearers of this heritage; therefore, government institutions and professionals should take a firm stand in situations like this.

DANIELA ANGELINA JELINČIĆ
Institute for International Relations, Zagreb

UNESCO, as one of the most important international organizations dealing with cultural heritage, adopted the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and National Heritage in 1972, but it soon became evident that it lacks the dimension of intangible culture. Many member countries experienced problems resulting from the lack of an official international document which would regulate this aspect of heritage, and pointed out the need to rectify this problem. Therefore, the aspect of spiritual culture was added to regulate the area of intangible heritage, but not before the 32nd session of the General Conference, held October 17 2003, when the Convention on the Preservation of Intangible Heritage was adopted.

Thus, the awareness of the need to preserve intangible heritage assumed an international framework with this Convention, eventhough UNESCO had been dealing with this topic for a number of years. The recommendations for the preservation of traditional culture and folklore were adopted on the 25th session of the General Conference, held in Paris November 15, 1989. With these recommendations UNESCO wanted to direct the attention of member countries to the importance of folklore, and the countries were expected to raise awareness with their respective governments and with the relevant instituitions about the importance study and continuity in the preservation of traditional culutre. The recommendations were not binding, but they were the witness of the need to preserve intangible forms of culture (Jelinčić 2008:93).

Therefore, the new syntagm "intangible cultural heritage" has almost replaced the word "folklore". However, as Nikočević correctly concludes in her text "Culture or heritage? The problem of intangibility", a new problem arises: the problem of the "expiry date" of heritage. The issue of the moment in which a cultural expression, or a cultural good, becomes heritage is not widely discussed. It is often assumed that heritage is inherited from past traditions, that it has nothing to do with the present. The question is, then: when does something become heritage? How old should a cultural expression/good be? Ten, twenty, fifty years? Or does it have to be abandoned alltogether? If it is abandoned, can it be truly preserved? Some authors (Kirschenblatt-Gimblet, Metelka, Jelinčić, ICOMOS) acknowledge the processual and dynamic character of heritage, denying its necessary end of existence and pointing to the creation of heritage across generations, even today, in the contemporary world.

The problem of the "expiry date" or the "antiquity" of heritage seems to be in the center of the problem Nikočević analyzes in her text. Although its title focuses around the problem of intangibility, the real focus is the problem of continuity. The author herself highlights the problem of top-down definitions of heritage, that is, definitions from the position of politics, which leads to additional petrification of heritage, leaving little room for its development. If we start with the premise that heritage is a process, we can hardly discover the original character of a cultural good, especially if it is part of intangible heritage. In this sense, further conclusions can be made about adding certain elements over time, but in the present we recognize an intangible cultural good as authentic (eventhough we are aware of changes or additions). From this perspective the top-down approach in safeguarding and protection of intangible cultural goods seems completely wrong, as do UNESCO's efforts to standardize heritage through its heritage conventions. This standardization is implicit in the above mentioned Convention, according to which the preservation pertains to the measures securing the sustainability of cultural heritage, including identification, documentation, research, preservation, safeguarding, promotion, advancement, transfer, especially through formal and informal education, as well as the revitalization of different aspects of heritage (*Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* 2003:3). On the other hand, cultural politics has the role to preserve national identity, which to a certain extent justifies the need to regulate or standardize heritage. Namely, the preservation of the diversity of heritage is the priority of the globalized world today: almost all relevant documents of international organizations (e.g. UNESCO, the European Union, the Council of Europe) emphasize the wealth the preservation of cultural diversity generates in an international surrounding. Apart from that, withouth a policy of preservation and safeguarding, heritage could vanish under the pressures of globalization. Top-down and bottom-up approaches clash here as well: cultural politics looks for mechanisms of identity preservation, and local communities inheriting an intangible cultural good often have a need for development.

Apart from the legal aspects of the preservation of heritage which can be described as *hard power*, cultural politics uses somewhat "softer" mechanisms. One of them is the fostering of the development of cultural tourism. The benefits cultural tourism can have for heritage are multiple: from overcoming the problem of insufficient public funding for the safeguarding of heritage, higher visibility of heritage in a wider international environment, the possiblity of gaining profit in other sectors, to the local/national pride stemming from displaying heritage to tourists. In this sense the approaches of the public policy and the local community converge.

However, every top-down attempt at protection and safeguarding needs to be complemented by the inclusion of inheritors into the system of protection. Otherwise, misunderstandings illustrated by Nikočević's example of the inscription of bell-ringers in UNESCO's list of intantible heritage are inevitable: from ambiguities related to the question of which bell-ringer groups are inscribed on the list, the resulting animosity among the tradition's inheritors, the misunderstading of UNESCO's concept of safeguarding, to the possibility of excessive commercialization of the custom and the resulting loss of any authenticity.

The next point in the discussion is the participation of the local community in the nomination process and in the possible development of cultural tourism. The main precondition of a successful tourism policy includes the desire of the inhabitants for the development of tourism. Many examples (e.g. Malta, Sardinia, Dubrovnik) have shown that top-down introduction of tourism industry results in animosity, even aggression towards tourism and its participants. In the area of intangible heritage the closest example is perhaps the Fiest of Saint Blaise, another intangible cultural good inscribed on UNESCO's list of world heritage. Guided by the wish to prolong the tourist season in Dubrovnik, a group of citizens proposed an idea for the development of tourist arrangements focused on the Fiest of Saint Blaise, which had been taking place on February 3, the patron saint's day, since 972. On the other hand, another group of citizens, especially those who participated in the celebrations, voiced their opposition to the fiest becoming the focus of tourism development, since it had a symbolic significance for them. Namely, individuals play certain assigned roles in the event and the presence of tourists, they thought, would intrude on the hundreds year-old custom. There are similar analogies with the local Italian traditions in Vodnjan and Galežana mentioned by Nikočević, in which dances and songs became "symbols of something private and personal". This opens up new points in the discussion.

Firstly, article 8 of the Global Code of Ethics for Tourism clearly states that tourists "should have access to (…) tourism and cultural sites without being subject to excessive formalities or discrimination" (*Global Code of Ethics for Tourism* 1999). The denial of access to the Fiest of Saint Blaise, therefore, would represent the breach of article 8. On the other hand, article 4 of the same Code, emphasizing the principle of tourism as the user of cultural heritage and the promoter of its advancement, says that "encouragement should be given to public access to privately-owned cultural property and monuments, with respect for the rights of their owners" (*Global Code of Ethics for Tourism* 1999). The success of a tourism or cultural policy can therefore be measured only in cooperation with the local community which is the inheritor of a custom. This is also acknowledged by

UNESCO's Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, which emphasizes that the safeguarding of cultural heritage is a complex process involving many parties, starting with the communities and groups that inherit the tradition" (*Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* 2003).

Secondly, the commercialization of culture, or heritage, is often perceived as negative. Therefore, the preservation of "authentic" elements implies standardization and unification. Duggan points out that "[a]n authentic culture is not one that remains unchanged, which seems impossible under any condition, but one that retains the ability to determine the appropirateness of its adaptations" (Duggan 1997:31). Maybe it would be overly bold to state that allowing the commercialization of heritage is in fact desirable, since it is known, especially in tourism, that local cultural products are often adapted to the taste of tourists, leading to the loss of connection with the local geographical area and the authentic temporal framework of a custom. In this sense cultural diversity, which represents both an "ethical imperative" and the "common heritage of mankind", is endangered (*UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity* 2001). On the other hand, the petrification of heritage deemed "authentic" robs the inheritors of creativity, so we can no longer speak of living traditions but, in the words of Lidija Nikočević, of "immitating the state of culture". Therefore, it is absurd to speak about the "development of heritage" (*Global Code of Ethics for Tourism* 1999), of "cultural heritage as a source of creativity" (*UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity* 2001), or the need to plan tourism activities "in such a way as to allow traditional cultural products, crafts and folklore to survive and flourish, rather than causing them to degenerate and become standardized" (*Global Code of Ethics for Tourism* 1999).

Therefore, evident antagonisms in the treatment of heritage within international and national policies result in antagonisms within local communities that inherit an intangible cultural good. There are no clear and ultimate answers or directives. Apart from the inclusion of all the interested parties in the process of heritage preservation and potential commmercialization, one should also approach each cultural good or local community individually, and complement this with a continual rethinking of heritage as the bearer of identity of a community, but also as a source of its creativity.

JADRAN KALE
Museum of the Town of Šibenik, Ethnography Department

The article commissioned for this year's theme issue of Etnološka tribina draws the reader into a realistic environment of practicing the Croatian custom that was the first mentioned national cultural good of the new conservation kind, a decade and a half before it was formally registered. From the lecture by Rijeka curator Beata Gotthardi-Pavlovsky in the HED Club on May 23, 1988, I remember the story of how she was telling the Kastav bell-ringers – much to their surprise – that they were a cultural good that needed to be formally registered, along with cathedrals, palaces or royal brocades (a group of us students from the Ethnology Club were passing around the photocopied fanzine *Kulturno dobro* [Cultural Good] at the lecture, with the hypnotizing photo portrait of my little niece on the front page – she went to become a corporate spokesperson – enjoying the well-timed joke before our cultural monuments conservation processor Ivo Maroevic and older students). Reading this article 24 years later, while we follow the author among catering tables in front of county officials, beverage stands, photocopied charters, custom-made t-shirts and newspapers frantically passed around from hand to hand, with such an article about traditions in a globalized market, it could almost be said that every serious piece of work has to be commissioned…

All jokes aside, the article addresses the right issues. Perhaps their outcomes could be divided in two parts. What does the new dialogical concept mean to creators of cultural goods and what does it mean to their researchers? If we take a look at us researchers, I agree that the "heritagization" (Hewison 1987) of cultural practices – as opposed to the concept of intangible cultural heritage – confines ethnology in a narrow reserve of technicians of traditional analyses. Such experience is already known from the years before Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin's work. In this period, ethnologists were being educated to meet the demands of museums for curators of new types of collections. From the era of acquiring skills for handling museumified heritage in budgetary temples of the national identification of the urban proletariat, to which the creators and owners of traditions had no access, we have gradually, over half a century of maturing of a new conservation concept, found ourselves in a world in which most graduated experts no longer work in museums or universities. Our museum colleagues, archeologists, following the example of their international peers, are already founding companies. Granted, they are not hired by local communities or developers, but it is not uncommon today to see an ethnologist filling out applications for trust fund or corporate tenders.

In the prior interdisciplinary evaluation we did not fare well, because even the conclusions of major research projects were not cited by anyone outside one's own hallway. The useful findings that could be applied methodologically or theoretically, for instance from everyday culture research, were not being cited from the local scientific production, but rather directly from international sources. Compared to that, the perspective of the demand for and appreciation of ethnologists from local communities seems to me to be more rewarding. Because of the local dynamics, the prospects of even the ahistoricized heritage from instant menus of the cultural industries' consumers are reduced.

The door which opened ajar towards the dynamics and the living processes of the first Croatian intangible cultural good to be studied are made of pure gold, methodologically speaking. Through them we can see the local communities that, after a full century of nurturing the opinion that folk traditions were original, impressive in their aesthetic or eventful authenticity, legitimizingly non-conflict existence of their homogenous folk expressions, now hit with the same boomerang the experts facing new terminology, as well as the whole society that – in the world spaces of culture and politics – starts praising them in a new way. Because, if the tradition according to the phantasm of the original legitimization of ethnological canton does not reflect harmonious and spiritually more beautiful times of the ancestors that had created it, then there must be something wrong with this tradition?

Confronting this ideological appearance of harmony of our ancestral traditions, each ethnographic museum depot is soaked in blood. From Cvelferija to Boka, the selected male apparel were tailored, weaved or appliquéd as an emulation of the elaborate presents from authorities to bold warrior sung in folk songs, for which the archives keep records of wounding and deaths, while after precarious skirmishes in governors' palaces the new scarlet jackets and jewllery were always already waiting for them. Such male fashions can also be seen in the female clothing culture. For the authorities, it was not difficult to give away presents, because the mobilization of population saved them from hiring costly mercenaries from the international labor market. The hinterland of the Croatian territorial croissant is but a mere border cordon of the first half of the New Age; the drills of territorial fighters live on, important and picturesque, with the *alka* under the mountains, and *moreška* by the sea, while our folk traditions, in their "authenticity", are imbued with the inter-social dynamics, stratifications, tensions and conflicts. The cost of the ethnological original sin of romantic traditions, along with the authoritative interpreters of their authenticity, is in the perpetuating phantasms reflected in the words and motivations of local communities, which are granted

emancipation and respect through the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage, alongside other, more contemporary international treaties.

The folklore of the romantic ideologists of the industrial era comprises today the intangible cultural heritage of the globalized postindustrial age. The difference in concepts lies in the fact that in the process of forging this folk treasury no one had asked the people anything. Ethnologists got another chance when the bearers of the traditional heritage were, on their own initiative, nominally promoted into the creators and owners of cultural practices. It is particularly interesting that in the global trend of antropologization of heritage this moment of cultural intangibility is in fact ethnological; in the final stage of the formation of the concept it sprouted from the Japanese crucible which had its foundations in the German romantic cult of the early 20th century (Nishimura 1995:177-179).

Therefore, I see the "intangible problem" from the title as a chance to rehabilitate national ethnology. In our academic tradition, this would be happening to the benefit of the local creators of culture. Vernacular unrest and dissonance aside, the heritage as a concept and inventory is increasingly becoming a thing of auto-selection by the local community. After all, didn't many vibrant creators have a restless spirit? Let us hope that in these new culture's forgeries of concepts, with these new value categories, the new customer from the intellectual labor market will be conscientiously meeting the emerging demand for focused pundits and trained researchers of the folklore of the new age. This will most of all depend on the relevance of their work, as this article shows.

AMY MOUNTCASTLE
State University of New York

The experiences of Istrian bell-ringers of being placed on UNESCO's representative list of intangible cultural heritage are very instructive. From the rise of jealousies, possessiveness, and claims to intellectual property among the bell ringing communities, to the hyper-control and management of bell ringing, these illustrate that making the UNESCO representative list is, at best, a mixed blessing. Lidija Nikočević questions the semantic wisdom of coupling the term "heritage" with "intangible culture" and suggests that the removal of "heritage" would shift the focus from cultural fixity and petrification toward processes. She is somewhat unconvinced about how effective this might be however, given

the tenacity of the UNESCO heritage framework, so that the question she leaves us with is whether or not the heritage framework can be ignored or "switched off." I imagine that she might say "no" in response to the question.

The criticisms and concerns about the UNESCO program by anthropologists, folklorists, museum directors and curators and others concerned with "the cultural" have been widespread (Brown 2005; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2004, 1995; Silverman and Ruggles 2007). But the sentiment that the initiative is better than nothing, that perhaps the UNESCO program will result in more positives than negatives also seems quite common (e.g. Nas 2002). I too offered such an opinion (Mountcastle 2010), noting that the UNESCO initiative should be commended as an important step in recognizing diversity and as an important aspect of the patrimony of our species. But as I reflect on the experiences that Nikočević reports, I find myself wondering if we are being too generous in our evaluation of the program "Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage." Perhaps the consequences of this initiative weigh more heavily toward the negative.

My concerns about the intangible cultural heritage framework lie in the fact that it is closely, and maybe inextricably, linked to state power. While attempts have been made to build into the system the consultation of culture bearers in the nominating process, ultimately, as the case described by Nikočević exemplifies, the state remains heavily invested, working closely with the Committee for the Intangible Cultural Heritage, in the Croatian case, and even becoming impatient with the committee to generate its recommendations. Therefore, from a practical point of view, recognizing intangible cultural heritage is deeply flawed and remains "top-down," as Nikočević describes. And although the initiative is intended to identify, support and celebrate local cultural forms and traditions, it seems that national pride and competitiveness weigh heavily in the process. These on-the-ground experiences described by Nikočević bear out one of my biggest concerns about the initiative Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage: that it becomes an instrument of the State.

At risk in these initiatives very often are indigenous groups and minority populations. For example, elsewhere I have discussed the case of China and the designation to the Representative List of cultural traditions of ethnic minority populations such as the Uygher and Tibetan and the blatant cynicism and hypocrisy of "safeguarding" bits and pieces of culture while fervently and knowingly pursuing policies that result in cultural death (Mountcastle 2010). I argue that it is structurally problematic to put states in charge of safeguarding threatened cultures because, by definition, a state's basic mission, multiculturalism notwithstanding, is a

homogenizing one (Scott 1999), while the fostering of cultural diversity may be viewed as its antithesis.

While the political contexts of Croatia and China are quite disparate, one point of intersection is that both are engaged in the cultural identity politics of nation building. All states engage in nation-building process, but new states, such as Croatia, and states whose political legitimacy is, at best, tenuous, such as China, have especially compelling needs. There are many strategies for state interventions in culture, from the most heinous of forms such as cultural genocide, to the innocuous – and even optimistic-sounding "economic development", to the form under current discussion – cultural heritage preservation or safeguarding. Heritage, as Nikočević notes, is a meaning laden term, not a neutral one. Kirschenblatt-Gimblett views it as "the transvaluation of the obsolete, the mistaken, the outmoded, the dead, and the defunct (1995:369)." In China, the minority cultures of, say Tibetans, are viewed as backward by the majority Han. At the same time, parts of it are suitable for commodification for tourism. What better mechanism to underscore both, obsolescence and commodification, than the UNESCO heritage framework? After all, the concept of "heritage" "produces something new in the present that has recourse to the past" (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1995:370): the "new" here is a modern state free of inconvenient, recalcitrant indigenous and minority groups that keep making pesky political demands.

From a theoretical standpoint, then, the focus on heritage promotes the antithesis of the stated goals of the Safeguarding initiative of supporting living cultures. When an extant cultural practice, as the case of bell ringing, gains rank on the list of intangible cultural heritage, it transforms or morphs into its mimesis. The practice, and the practitioners, lose their taken-for-grantedness and begin to produce culture in a self-conscious and other-conscious manner.

Nikočević's account describes an ensuing fiasco, as first the news media misunderstood and misconstrued who was being named and misstated that it was about "the protected Croatian intangible cultural heritage". For people on the ground, the bell ringers included, the UNESCO initiative got "lost in translation." No one at the Croatian Ministry of Culture seemed to be able to offer clarification or explanation to the media of what the designation was or what it meant. The level of interest and commitment of the upper echelons of government was questionable, as the story describes how the head of the Ministry of Culture at the time (2010) visited the region to bestow upon the bell-ringers framed copies of their formal enlistment on the Representative list, but then left the hosts puzzled and wondering when he departed the event without taking the gifts

that the bell-ringers had given him. Other parts of the story tell of how the context of bell ringing, Carnival, seemed to be discounted.

This seeming disinterest and lack of commitment of the State in the particular practice, though, should not be misinterpreted. The work of the State is not to recognize and support local practices and culture for their own sake (the purported goal of the UNESCO initiative), but to replicate and sustain itself, which had already been accomplished through the heritage recognition process. What local people who have achieved this "distinction" do with it after the fact is less important than "making the list" and thereby demonstrating that the State is an international player, a State among States.

DRAGANA LUCIJA RATKOVIĆ

Muses Ltd. consulting and managing projects in culture and tourism;
Batana Ecomuseum, Rovinj

In the paper "Culture or Heritage? The Problem of Intangibility", the author Lidija Nikočević presents interesting ideas about intangible heritage, based on her own experiences and challenges she faced in the process of implementing the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Croatia. As an outstanding museologist and scientist dealing with ethnology and cultural anthropology, she has been an active participant in this process, through her work in managing the Istria Ethnographic Museum in Pazin, as a co-founder of the Center for Intangible Culture of Istria in Pićan, and as a member of the Commission for Intangible Cultural Heritage of the Ministry of Culture, the Republic of Croatia.

The implementation of the above mentioned Convention in Croatia culminated with the sensational addition of eleven intangible heritage phenomena to the UNESCO Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, including the intangible heritage of the Kastavština bell-ringers. Through this phenomenon, the author dived deeper into highly complex issues of sustainability of safeguarding intangible heritage. Using a very interesting approach she compared them against different connotations of using the terms intangible heritage and intangible culture. The former was set by the Convention, but is also well-established in Croatia's existing heritage theory and practice. It originated from the traditional concept of protecting primarily tangible cultural heritage. Protection implies an entire mechanism of top-down management,

which – as the author clearly states – relies on the position of power of those who decide what constitutes heritage. On the other hand, using the term intangible culture she raises awareness of the processual nature and re-creation that culture implies. The processual nature and re-creation are the key features of safeguarding intangible cultural phenomena according to the bottom-up or grassroots principle, because the bearers of this type of management are also the bearers and transmitters of intangible culture.

Motivated by the elaboration of this key distinction that is reflected through the usage of the term intangible heritage, or culture, in this review I will focus on presenting the model of ecomuseums as a bottom-up management model *par excellence*, using the example of the first such museum in Croatia – Batana Ecomuseum in Rovinj. The tool for evaluating ecomuseum projects, known as the 21 Principles, is presented at the end of the review, as an incentive for the development of ecomuseums based on a bottom-up model of managing tangible and intangible culture and heritage in local communities across Croatia.

Top-down and bottom-up management

On the example of the intangible heritage of the Kastav bell-ringers, in a direct and convincing "first-hand" manner, Nikočević showed what happens when intangible heritage is managed only using the top-down method. Even the author admits that the bell-ringers

…were the part of [the Minister's] first draft containing sixteen cultural goods which were accompanied by visual and textual material.

The inscription of intangible heritage phenomena from Croatia on the UNESCO Representative List is the result of the government's cultural and heritage policy at the time, in which the decisions, and even the selection of the phenomena from the national list to be proposed for the global list, were up to the Minister. Experts were involved in preparation and development of the documentation, through the Commission for Intangible Cultural Heritage of the Croatian Ministry of Culture. While it cannot be denied that minister Biškupić responded promptly to UNESCO's incentives concerning intangible heritage, it also has to be noted that such a hierarchical approach to valorization and valuation of intangible culture phenomena produced incomplete results and caused many misunderstandings among the bearers and transmitters of the intangible culture phenomena, as the example of the Kastavština bell-ringers showed. Judg-

ing by the described course of events, there is clearly a lack of general understanding that the inscription on the UNESCO Representative List is by no means the final objective, but that it should act as an incentive for laying grounds for a long-term and sustainable safeguarding of intangible culture phenomena in their local communities, with participation of all the key stakeholders of this subtle process. This example busted the myth that intangible culture can be handled in a "bureaucratic manner" of protection, without advocating participative, inclusive and democratic process of safeguarding, carried out in a close and harmonious cooperation between all the stakeholders, with local communities and the individuals who are its bearers and transmitters playing the key role.

Unlike the traditional approach to protecting cultural heritage, the safeguarding approach requires that conditions are created, in a focused and visionary manner, for a holistic management of complex tangible and intangible cultural heritage, with a consideration of its constitutive role in the process of sustainable development of the communities they exist in. Only in this way it is possible to develop the key potentials that cultural and heritage phenomena has for the development of societies and communities today. Because of the connection of intangible culture with the people as their bearers and transmitters, the heritage sector – willingly or not – broke out of the strictly set boundaries of professions, experts and professionals, into the field of "common people", its primary stakeholders. This led to a major shift in the heritage safeguarding paradigm, as understood previously in the institutional frameworks of the western world. The "first voice" of intangible culture bearers becomes the guiding light in the process of increasing democratization of the heritage sector.

> Intangible heritage is by definition people-oriented rather that object-centered. (ICOM Curricula Guidelines)

This means that bearers and transmitters – real living people, "here and now" – are placed in the center of the process of safeguarding intangible culture. They are the key stakeholders of safeguarding intangible culture and the Convention identifies them as individuals, groups and communities. The secondary stakeholders in the process include science institutes, experts and a whole range of people in the role of mediators and facilitators, who assist in the safeguarding process. Finally, we have tertiary stakeholders – government and international bodies – which have the task of securing favorable mechanisms for endorsing and facilitating the safeguarding process (Galla 2010:8). Safeguarding intangible culture can thus be described as a continuous organic and collaborative process of all three groups of stakeholders, which above all respects the leading

role of the bearers and transmitters of intangible culture (Galla 2010:8). It is important to avoid the pitfall of segmenting culture and heritage, and instead develop the awareness of the need for an integral approach to safeguarding cultural and heritage resources, whether they are tangible (fixed or movable) or intangible (Galla 2010:9). The increasing need for safeguarding local cultural identities in the modern world, which implies cultural globalization and unification, inspires expansion of holistic, integrative, bottom-up manner of handling heritage and culture. This process has been embodied in the development of ecomuseums and ecomuseology, or the new museology since the late 1960s.

Ecomuseums – models for managing heritage and culture for sustainable development

Ecomuseums present a visionary development concept of safeguarding, interpreting and presenting culture and heritage that does not succumb to dogma, but is, in its essence, committed to diversity. This is supported by the fact that there is no single generally accepted model, or a common definition of ecomuseum. In any case, the credit for the legacy of ecomuseums goes to the founders and pioneers of this visionary concept, G. H. Rivière and H. de Varine, but also to many great museologists and local communities around the world over the past forty years. Set against the challenges of modern life, the vision of ecomuseum was highlighted every time when the consequences of globalization, environmental pollution and destruction of natural resources, climate change, economic crisis, migrations, ethnic tensions and armed conflicts arose. At the same time it has been gaining ground with the rising awareness of the importance of culture and heritage in sustainable development (Galla 2009) and increasing understanding of the importance of the unbreakable link between man and environment.

The answer to the question of why this model of managing culture and heritage appeared in Croatia only recently perhaps lies in the words of Tomislav Šola: "… since museums often only reflect the situation in the society, the time for their direct action (outside the traditional model) is yet to come (in Croatia)…" (Šola 1989). At that time, it probably never occurred to this top Croatian museologist, the champion of theoretical ecomuseology in Croatia and student of G. H. Rivière, that it would take more than a decade to establish the first ecomuseum in Croatia, the Batana Ecomuseum in Rovinj.

Batana Ecomuseum, Rovinj-Ruveigno-Rovigno

Brought together in an interdisciplinary team of more than eighty experts and stakeholders: ship carpenters, ship builders and fishermen with their families, local explorers and historians, musicians and singers, cooks, model makers, *batana* owners, donators, designers, photographs, museologists, linguists, volunteers and enthusiasts, with my expert contribution in the field of cultural management and interpretation, and coordinated by the *spiritus movens* of the entire project, Rovinj historian Marin Budicin, we created a "critical mass" to set up the nucleus of the future ecomuseum. After almost two years of intensive work, the interpretation and documentation center was simply called the House of Batana/Casa della batana", and opened in the autumn of 2004, with the strong support of local authorities. In his inauguration speech, Rovinj Mayor Giovanni Sponza shared with his fellow citizens the feeling that the permanent exhibition was only the first step in a process that was to have exceptional importance for Rovinj and its residents in the future. For me personally this was the sign that the job I had committed to both professionally and emotionally, was indeed successful, and that for the first time in my career, the co-ownership of a heritage project was truly shared among all its key stakeholders. This marked the birth of the first ecomuseum in Croatia.

The concept of the permanent exhibition of the interpretation center "The House of Batana/Casa della batana" completely relied on the testimonies of the living transmitters of traditions and their personal emotions concerning the *batana*, with the ship as the main link and the guiding principle of interpretation and presentation of Rovinj's identity. The ecomuseum soon branched out around its *oikos* in the wider town area, it revitalized the heritage points and encouraged activities that were primarily based on recreating intangible culture. In each museum project that accepts the model and vision of ecomuseum as its direction, the intangible culture of its people becomes an important part of its overall mission (Boylan 2006). While in our permanent exhibition we were creatively designing the presentation of intangible aspects of the culture developed around the *batana*, their real recreation had to occur "here and now", in the real context of the town's life and its residents. This way, "Spacio Matika", "Small shipyard" locally called Peîcio squèro and the Rovinj regatta of traditional ships with lug and lateen sails became integral parts of the Batana Ecomuseum. Through them we achieved the safeguarding of the local Istrian speech, "bitinada", and skills and crafts of making the *batana*, the three phenomena included in the List of Intangible Heritage of the Republic of Croatia.

In this way, already in the first two years since the opening of the interpretation center, the Batana Ecomuseum, built on the enthusiasm and motivation of more than thirty of its active members, impressively branched out its operation. Since 2006 it has been registered as an NGO, with more than one hundred members.

Finally, as an incentive to the development of locally managed projects that involve safeguarding of intangible culture, such as the case of the Kastavština bell-ringers, I present the recommendation by Peter Davis, renowned British expert in ecomuseums (Davis 2011:285). This is a sort of a tool that can be useful for all types of heritage and culture management at the local level committed to applying the bottom-up principle, as a guideline and indicator. This is called the "21 Principles" (Corsane 2007) or the MACDAB method (Borelli 2008), after the initials of its authors. The following apply to ecomuseums, as well as any other bottom-up heritage and culture management project:

1. Originated and steered by local communities;
2. Allow for public participation in a democratic manner;
3. Joint ownership and management – double input system;
4. Emphasis on process rather than on product;
5. Encourages collaboration with network of partners;
6. Dependant on substantial active voluntary efforts;
7. Focus on local identities and sense of place;
8. Encompasses a "geographical" territory, which can be determined by different shared characteristics;
9. Covers both spatial and temporal aspects – diachronic rather than simply synchronic;
10. Fragmented "museum" with network of hub and antennae of buildings and sites;
11. Promotes preservation, conservation and safeguarding of heritage resources *in situ*;
12. Equal attention given to immovable and movable tangible and intangible heritage resources;
13. Stimulates sustainable development and responsible use of resources;
14. Allows for change and development for a better future;
15. Encourages an ongoing program of documentation of past and present life and interactions with environmental factors;
16. Promotes research with different inputs – from local "specialists" to academics;
17. Promotes multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary approaches to research;

18. Promotes a holistic approach to interpretation of culture/nature relationships;
19. Illustrates interconnectedness between: nature/culture; past/present; technology/individual;
20. Provides for an intersection between heritage and responsible tourism;
21. Brings benefits to local communities e.g. sense of pride, regeneration, and economic, social and cultural capital.

PETER SIMONIČ
Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology,
Faculty of Philosophy, Ljubljana

The article titled *Culture or Heritage? The Problem of Intangibility* is a comprehensive case study of ethnological dilemmas which accompanied the implementation of UNESCO's Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003). The author has vividly described motivations and responses of different actors in the process of safeguarding the masked processions of *Zvončari* (bell-ringers) in the Kastav region (Croatia).

It was a wish of Croatian Government to put Croatian intangible heritage on the world map. This was especially important to the new state, striving to integrate into the European and world community. *Zvončari* were selected by the Minister of Culture, who was probably following the advice of his experts. The author of the article was rather critical towards the political decisions which were made in the national capital. The marked political and national enthusiasm has caused Croatia to be the state with the biggest number of protected intangible heritage sites in Europe and has even reached the third place in the world. Cultural diversity is, of course, an important basis for such an achievement, but, on the other hand, the question arises whether there were other motivations for this abundance (comp. Fikfak 2003).

Some pre-existing regional differences in the carnival practices were straightened after *Zvončari* (bell-ringers) were confirmed to be one of the twelve most important elements in the Croatian Registry of Intangible Heritage. The author describes the newly arisen conflicts over the outfits, protocol and the ownership of bell-ringers masks and processions. Performers or participants (local male groups) felt they now had a bigger

responsibility towards the international community to continue with the custom. In a way, they stepped outside themselves and wished to repeatedly perform a social practice that has now been codified. This process of creation of a frozen culture has been described as "folklorisation" (see Stanonik 1990). It was therefore logical to exclude women and to homogenise organisation under a strict leadership and marketing (branding), and to pose other restrictions on tradition, which has always before been a matter of creativity — and change. Mardi Grass has shifted from marginality of "communitas" (Turner 1967) to the very core of national culture. Creativity and even spontaneous humour have been taken away from local communities; instead they gained an (inter)national recognition and funds. Local culture has been transferred into economic capital, useful for regional and national self-representation and tourism industry. Custom became a sign in postmodern political economy (comp. Baudrillard 1981).

This is actually true for tangible and intangible heritage in general, and has been going on since the very beginning of the romantic descriptions of folk or primitive culture and, later on, has continued with the nationalisation of culture (Löfgren 1989). UNESCO declaration is just a "logical step" forward, biased in socio-economic conditions and values (commodification, globalisation etc.). In my opinion, the author has made a wise decision not to overemphasize the impact of UNESCO declaration in general, but she rather precisely described confusing power relations and negotiations in the specific setting of her work. Being a balanced intellectual is not easy (comp. Schumpeter 1994), especially when you have to deal with real people, as ethnographers do. Nikočević wrote a historical note on the whole process and contextualisation is the most she could do.

Comparison with the "jealous protection" of local intangible heritage in Vodnjan (Istra) is, in my opinion, not appropriate, since there were also ethnical/national differences at play. The issue of hiding local heritage could probably be understood better, if we include political history of this peninsula, the contemporary Italian foreign policy and the local attachment to it. It was not just a matter of cultural ownership, but also of ethnic/minority survival.

I would like to add some other aspects of the problematic nature of (intangible) heritage, based on my own fieldwork. Hopefully it will be of use to the respected author. Nikočević writes that the intangible cultural heritage has started to replace "folklore" as a scientific concept and a social fact, in the course of the last fifteen years. In my opinion, there was also a shift from "tradition" to "heritage", marking a transfer from local and national cultural process and belonging to the ownership of artefacts and

practices. This change was symptomatic of the increased commodification of culture, especially under the framework of neoliberal paradigm (comp. Lowenthal 1998; Jezernik 2010).

Secondly, the Convention for Safeguarding of Intangible Heritage (2003) brought nothing new to (Slovenian) ethnology, as far as research was concerned. In my opinion, this could be related to the "epistemological turn" defined by a Slovenian ethnologist Slavko Kremenšek (1985), who preferred studying people instead of artefacts. Social relations, transmissions of skills and knowledge, social organisations and contexts, and the "way of life", were much more interesting to him (and to Slovenian ethnology afterwards). Novelty of UNESCO convention is in its international political relevance and its obligatory status for all the signatory countries. Convention has straightened the position of ethnology, which deals with the subjects of the Convention. But Nikočević shows how instrumental and servile ethnology becomes when politics embraces and reduces the new paradigm of intangible heritage.

An additional explanation, that intangible heritage deals with the "living traditions" (CSICH 2003) proved to be problematic when applied by the national commissions. Namely, they were exclusively interested in the performativity and the public aspects of culture, leaving the familiar or household levels of society aside. As we know, households/families are basic or, at least, the primary units of social continuity and transmission. I cannot decide, whether this approach to registry of (intangible) heritage is good or bad. Anyway, intangible heritage is related to the public sphere (community) and could or should therefore be replaced by culture, as Nikočević rightly noticed.

Finally, local knowledge, cosmology and skills are not isolated, primitive or exotic, even though Convention tries to present them in this way. People are in a permanent contact and exchange with other people and communities, they read books, watch television. Local traditions are, on many instances, not so unique at all, because they interact under the framework of much broader cultural and political entities (Baskar 2005). Assumption that the Bellmen represent long-lasting and unchanged tradition is then a very naïve one. Even their uniqueness is questionable, since one can find variations of similar furry masks ranging from Bulgaria to Switzerland. Ethnologists surely know that, practitioners of culture probably know that. Political economy makes us forget (comp. Gross 2000).

TVRTKO ZEBEC
Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research in Zagreb

Since the very birth of their disciplines, ethnologists and folklorists have been dealing with the issues of the intangibility of culture, folklore, traditional music, dance, customs, games, beliefs, different types of oral literature, artifacts, traditional knowledge and the way of embodiment and materialization, as well as the problems in writing down, interpretation and reception of the studied cultural phenomena. The initial collecting activities and comparative research soon resulted in theoretical analyses, while the development of specific professions ensued thanks to the progress in methodological procedures and critical discussions that laid ground – in line with global trends – for a gradual change in terminology as well.

The issues of terminology are in fact the problems inside a profession that even the involved parties are often not ready to follow or adapt to. This is exactly the point of critical analyses, so I believe this discussion is also welcome in this sense. Of course, we must bear in mind that many terms that we are using in our profession also have a much wider meaning in everyday life, so it is difficult to expect that the general public will always understand them in the meaning that we assign to them in the professional, metatheoretical sense. This gets even more complex if different disciplines interpret the same terms differently.

In her introduction, Nikočević pointed to the problems with understanding *heritage* in Croatia's ethnology and folklore research. She refers to the leading cultural anthropologists dealing with these topics, analyzing the "construction of heritage" and the attribution of new values and meanings based on older ones, thus shaping the symbolic capital. Regina Bendix (2009:255) uses the English term *heritagization*. It is true that the emphasis on "intangible cultural heritage" over the past few years, as a result from the implementation of the UNESCO *Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage,* has brought a number of problems and different interpretations. However, the "construction of heritage" is not exclusively "reserved" for the people at certain positions of power. What largely contributed to this impression was the "top-down" approach, inevitable in the process of implementation of an international legal convention. Nevertheless, just as we create our own identities and attribute certain meanings to them according to our desires or needs, the same holds true for the implementation and emphasis of certain aspects of heritage. That is why smaller or larger "local communities", as UNESCO calls the bearers of traditions, however heterogeneous they might be, par-

ticipate in the construction of heritage as much as "powerful individuals" do. These processes are not new. The processes of the "invention of tradition" and fostering one and/or repudiating another tradition have existed since the period of nation-building, and they depend on the political and social context at a certain time in the life of a community, country or nation. At first it might seem that these processes are triggered from the top down, from the positions of power. However, prior to the selection or to the fostering of a certain tradition, someone has to create and transfer it systematically; it has to be to a certain extent established, noticeable, and publicly acknowledged in order to be selected at all at a higher level. Hence, those are two-way and mutual processes. There are many levels, sometimes undiscernible and inseparable, and it is sometimes difficult to assess the different roles or contributions by the participants in those processes.

Art historians have been using the term *heritage* for more than 50 years without any reservations, so the text about the history of the Institute of Art History in Zagreb underlines its great share in the "research and presentation of the national art heritage" (Pelc 2011:9). The classical tradition of conservation was based on the "legacy of urban culture" and the experience of art historians. This tradition was considering "intangible heritage" as early as the late 1960s, emphasizing also the need to put this type of heritage in a position equal to that of tangible heritage, on the occasion of the inclusion of "ethnographic monuments in the Law" (Gotthardi Pavlovsky 1969:399-400). By avoiding the terms such as *tradition* and *folklore* (which have different meanings in disciplinary interpretations in different parts of the world), and the attempts to determine the "indigenousness" and "top value" of specific cultural elements and phenomena through the emphasis on intangible culture (because all of them should be equally important), they have been gradually developed and changed in UNESCO's headquarters as well, thanks to the contribution of the experts who participated in drafting the *Convention* and in the shaping and development of its basic starting points and terminology. It is therefore clear that we as experts have the duty to analyze the settings and consequences of the implementation of cultural policies that follow the global model of UNESCO. While doing so, it is difficult to escape terminological pitfalls. Even if we agree that it is better, professionally speaking, to avoid the term heritage in intangible culture, this does not solve the problem of the relations towards branding or fostering a specific instance of intangible culture at the expense of another. Also, the problem of unequal relationship towards that culture would still remain, again at different levels. There should be no dispute that heritage is something we have inherited from past generations, as this is a "living tradition", a tradition that is not

vanishing. On the other hand, it is true that this does not eliminate the paradox of the paradigm, because, as Nikočević says, if something is a living tradition, why there exists the need for safeguarding? However, in a wider context of the policy of the UNESCO conventions, in which the fostering of the master pieces of natural, as well as tangible and artistic heritage and architecture was for many years primarily reserved for the "northern hemisphere" and the Western world, the *Convention* that deals with the fostering of intangible culture should be perceived in the light of the criteria set by the UNESCO in its evaluation. These criteria serve to provide the "others", less represented cultures in the field of global monument heritage, a higher degree of visibility and representation. Unfortunately, the implementation of the *Convention* is increasingly showing that even with the best efforts and a number of UNESCO campaigns aimed at "training" the less developed countries, these processes take a lot of time, but give minimum results. This mostly refers to the poor representation of African countries, although it is often said at UNESCO conferences that this *Convention* is a perfect opportunity for them.

There are five basic criteria that define elements of the living intangible culture (UNESCO 2012). According to the first one, it is necessary to show who are the bearers of a certain tradition and where they are located, what domains of intangible culture this tradition encompasses; in other words, is it a part of practices, representation, expression, knowledge and skills, or instruments, items and cultural spaces connected with them; do communities, groups or individuals recognize it as part of their own cultural heritage and what functions and meanings it has for them today; is it transmitted from generation to generation and do communities create it in harmony with the environment and in interaction with nature and history; does it fulfill the communities with feelings of identity and continuity and is it in line with existing international regulations on human rights, taking into account mutual respect between communities and sustainable development. The second criterion should provide for the visibility and care for transmitting, and it should also be obvious that the inscription on the UNESCO lists would encourage dialogue among communities at local, national and international levels, respecting cultural diversity and human creativity. The third criterion seeks well established and designed measures for protecting the past, existing and future heritage, which the local community has been involved in from the very start, as the bearers of the heritage that is fostered from local to the national, and eventually international level. Another requirement is to have an obvious contribution and support by the country that has signed the *Convention*. The fourth criterion is aimed at seeking confirmation of participation of the bearers and local communities, NGOs, local governments and experts, all in line

with the established practices of the community and bearers. The fifth criterion is the confirmation of inscription of the element in official registries at national level, along with the evidence that these registries are being regularly updated with the approval and participation of local communities, groups and NGOs. The criteria defined this way should ideally allow for visibility and recognizability of the fostered and selected heritage at all levels. Yet, we are aware that there are many ways and sideways on the path from the idea to the realization and that what seems realistic on paper can be utopian in reality. It is all up to the people who are acting on the ideas and we are aware that the universally set standards are rarely enforceable in real life. It is also a fact that according to the experiences of the implementation of the *Convention*, evaluations of the set criteria are modified over time, they are updated, adapted and are becoming stricter in a way, so the application forms are constantly changing, seeking better documentation and more detailed data. It is therefore necessary to constantly keep an eye on the development of the *Convention*, while using our own experience at national and local levels to contribute to a better understanding of the problem at all levels.

The problems that we encounter after the selection and inscription of specific cultural elements that are in this way inevitably torn out and isolated from their real-life context and environment are well described on the example of the bell-ringers from the Kastavština area. Every example of the "inscribed" intangible culture will disclose new problems and issues, specific and unique, depending on a multitude of impacts, local power relations and relations in smaller or bigger groups, communities or among individuals, transmitted through the media and administrative restrictions and frameworks. Yet, it is clear already from the introduction that the intentions to standardize and re-traditionalize are not only the consequence of the UNESCO's policy in selecting the culture that is fostered, but it also stems from the very communities, through better organization, drafting statutes and setting the rules that implicitly result from shaping organizations. Thus, the process is not entirely top-down, but adopts the opposite direction simultaneously. Administratively set criteria should always be viewed critically, but sometimes – without justification – the responsibility is turned over to the implementation of ideas "as set by UNESCO". One should always bear in mind that the UNESCO conventions are signed by member states and that through their national and local policies they are creating their own policies and realize their own national, regional and local interests, in different ways. The responsibility is thus transferred from higher to lower levels, and vice versa. Since the implementation of this *Convention* has much more pronounced political issues than is the case with conservation of tangible monuments

– as the living intangible culture is part of the social and cultural life of a community (Blake 2009:46) – experts involved in the implementation or even creation of such policies have an additional responsibility towards the profession, society and their own conscience. It seems that the *heritage* context and construction in the sense of meaning – as set forth by Nikočević – is impossible to leave aside, as it represents not only the terminological, but also the essential problem that will always be raising questions and doubts, regardless of how professionals or the public call it.

REPLY

LIDIJA NIKOČEVIĆ

Regardless of the evident local lack of ethnological texts dealing with the results of the implementation of UNESCO's mechanism of safeguarding intangible cultural goods, there are evidently some elaborate thoughts on these and similar interventions in "living traditions". Jadran Kale, and especially Ljiljana Gavrilović deal with the position of ethnologists in the practice of evaluation and safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, rightly labeling it as schizophrenic (Gavrilović) considering the variety of frequently opposed or at least uncoordinated positions.

In my case, one of these positions is implied in the area of cultural tourism, emphasized by Daniela Angelina Jelinčić. It is cultural tourism that frequently underlines the problems I dealt with in the introductory text. Cultural practices staged for tourists are often overamphasized in some of its segments, in an attempt to make them more attractive or comprehensible. What is more, in some communities certain "heritage" phenomena are staged for tourists, while some other forms are practiced within the community.

However, when dealing with the topic of the community and the ideal of its inclusion in the acknowledgment and safeguarding of intangible cultural goods, it should be pointed out that problems become more complex if we bear in mind that the community's attitudes are often not uniform, but polyphonous. The one speaking in the name of the whole community is frequently speaking in their own name or in the name of a smaller group within the community, making its voice louder (Nikočević 2007).

Even though Daniela Angelina Jelinčić holds an opinion that local communities often have the need to develop intangible cultural goods (which can contribute, in her view, to the confluence of objectives between cultural tourism and public policies), sometimes the opposite is the case: in the time of rapid and radical change, certain segments of heritage become havens, unchangeable and static. For example, in certain villages in Istria those active in folklore associations or less formal groups dedicated to fostering songs and dances in some cases do not want any changes in those practices. By dressing in folk costumes and singing songs, just like their parents and grandparents did, they feel safe, accepted and temporarily protected from challenges and changes. In this context (but in other contexts as well) the bearers of intangible cultural goods are not always happy with their transference from the margins of the "communitas" (as

noted by Peter Simonič, drawing from Turner) to the center and the core of national culture, perceiving their cultural practice as something intimate. As Simonič writes, local culture is frequently converted into economic capital, useful for the regional and national representation and tourism industry. When it comes to "living traditions", these spheres emphasize the performative, public aspects of these cultural goods, instead of their private and intimate meanings. The bell-ringers' saying – *"Carnival is for poor men and drunks"* – suggests an attitude that the practice should stay on the margins, which is obviously (no longer) the case.

Expectedly, as noted by Tvrtko Zebec, each example of a cultural good from the domain of intangible culture inscribed on the UNESCO list reflects different and specific relations within a community towards the respective cultural element, and wider social facts. Surely, every cultural good requires an individual approach, as pointed out by D. A. Jelinčić. What is more, a nuanced approach should be one of the crucial characteristics of work with intangible culture, whether it is done in the Ministry of Culture, a museum, or a university department.

The Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage underlines the importance of communities, stating the following in Article 15:

> Within the framework of its safeguarding activities of the intangible cultural heritage, each State Party shall endeavor to ensure the widest possible participation of communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals that create, maintain and transmit such heritage, and to involve them actively in its management.[1]

In his interpretation of the Convention, Richard Kurin sees the community as an alternative power center in relation to the state, especially in the postmodern era of weakening national principles and the strengthening of transnational relations and links (Kurin 2007:15). However, Doroty Noyes thinks that this enthusiasm directed at the local community does not necessarily imply the understanding of its internal dynamics. As with the bell-ringers, the realization of tradition as heritage controlled by the community represented a challenge for one of the most important local traditional practices – collective negotiation and conflict resolution within the community (Noyes 2006:28). Outsider perspective on the community, she thinks, is often idealized, containing elements of urban romanticism,

---

[1] A more detailed analysis of the Convention can be found in the text "*Nematerijalni aspekti kulturne baštine i njihovo mjesto u muzejima : pogled etnologa*" [Intangible aspects of cultural heritage and their place in museums: An ethnologist's perspective]. *Informatica museologica* 34 (2003), 3-4; 61-69.

whereby communities are often perceived as solidary and economically disinterested, and internal relationships and power balances are overlooked. The small, dense communities (especially the poor ones) are often the scenes of unsparing struggle for resources, one of which is certainly folklore, or intangible culture/heritage, and its performance is a manner of fostering and maintaining social power (Noyes 2006:32). Noyes also holds that the "narcissism of minor differences", no matter how minor, among groups/folklore practices plays an important role in maintaining internal boundaries. She provides an example: *le Patum* from the Catalonian town of Berga was inscribed on the list of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of the Humanity in 2005. Observing the work of the local cultural bureaucracy in the inscription process, she noticed that the protagonists most skilled in global issues, but that are the least "authentic", impose themselves in the process of identification of the bearers (owners) of tradition and appointment of representative bodies. Outside global observers know little of local realities, and the bearers of tradition who are in good positions are those that will claim the right to the tradition, which leads to intervention, commercialization, corruption and control; intervention because something must be done with the tradition in order to demonstrate activity and safeguarding – tradition can't continue without "management" (which is also the condition for inscription on the UNESCO list). What ensues is the establishment of a bureaucratic mechanism which perpetuates itself through the commercialization of the cultural good, and the process easily leads to the development of individual interest and concentration of power (Noyes 2006:35-6).

As is the case with bell-ringers, the collective performance of *Patum* in Berga is the attempt of a communal realization. This realization is the more valuable the harder it is to accomplish. During *Patum* the multivocality of the community and internal tensions give way to a fragile equilibrium which, however temporary it may be, is remembered long enough to be maintained until the following year. Since the tradition starts to provide an opportunity for individual promotion and progress, segregation occurs, whereby certain groups separate and withdraw from the community. Thus, *Patum*'s local loss will exceed its global gain, intensifying social conflict – which is all a realistic threat the bell-ringers face. Moreover, those who took control over *Patum* resist any changes, as they would imply the change in their positions. Therefore, the present performance of the custom is mostly fixed and unchanging, creative innovations are not welcome. Towards the end of her text Noyes addresses the rigidity and unsuitability of the concept and law of intellectual property which can not, in its present form, be adjusted in such a way as to include the

cumulative and cooperative character of these cultural practices (Noyes 2006:44).

Tvrtko Zebec points out that the concept of cultural heritage should not be contested in the nomination of intangible heritage, since it is a "living tradition". Indeed, the UNESCO Convention underlines that the nominated practices ought to be living cultural practices. However, once they are acknowledged and inscribed on heritage lists, they start manifesting the characteristic of standardization and unchangeability, as illustrated by the examples from Kastavština and Catalonia.

T. Zebec is right, along with Mirela Hrovatin, in his opinion that the tendencies of standardization and retraditionalization, and subsequent conflicts in the community are not solely the result of UNESCO's policy, but also of a number of contemporary factors and organizational forms affecting the quality of living cultural practices. So, they can perhaps, along with Richard Kurin, conclude that UNESCO's approach embodied in the Convention is not without problems, but at the moment it is the best we have (Kurin 2007:18).

In the same text Kurin points to institutions most suitable for the implementation of the Convention. Analyzing governmental bodies and institutions, as well as university departments, he lists the positive and negative sides to their involvement in the process. The third type of organization he finds suitable are museums. Despite their limitations, museums are in themselves cultural institutions that frequently cover the areas listed in the Convention. They have official power, but not of the kind governmental institutions possess. Like universities, they possess professional competence in research and documenting. They cooperate with students, and frequently with highly motivated volunteers that can take over some of the activities. Museums can be exceptionally skilled in the promotion of interests and appreciation of a cultural tradition. Dragana Lucija Ratković illustrates this well in her account of the activities of the ecomuseum in Rovinj. This prompted the Ethnographic Museum of Istria in Pazin to design a more integral engagement with intangible culture, which led to the establishment of the Center for Intangible Culture of Istria in Pićan.[2] The word "heritage" was not included in its name because

---

[2] The Center includes the following departments: research, archive and documentation, consultative and educational department, and production. Taking into consideration the cultural context, these areas of work safeguard and accomplish the following:
- the consistency of living traditions and development of creativity
- documenting, storing and analyzing existing material whose content relates primarily to Istria, and which is stored in Croatia or abroad
- the establishment and development of new collections of documents on the intangible heritage of Istria

of its undertones (which was explained in this as well as in the introductory text), which can suggest a culture that existed primarily in the past, which is unchangeable and fixed, and recognized by an authority as valuable and representative. In a multicultural region such as Istria, a county with two official languages, a region which was a part of five different states over the course of the twentieth century, the issue of recognition and nomination of heritage by state authorities can cause disputes and doubts, especially when it comes to a "top-down" approach. However, it is crucial that the Center wants to deal with other forms of culture, those that are as yet not deemed as heritage, such as new musical traditions, intangible culture of workers in shipyards, or the craft of filigrees in tourist centers. Since the younger population is one of the target groups, it was considered opportune to underline that culture is here understood as a process in which they can take part with their creative contribution. This makes the Center a platform for a new communication with the members of local communities, whereby they can participate in the acknowledgment, safeguarding and interpretation of their cultural identities.

In addition to UNESCO's dominant paradigm of the approach to intangible cultural heritage or intangible culture, one should seek for new ways and methods, especially considering the specific social situation in specific communities and the society as a whole.

- educational programs and counseling for those who deal with Istria's intangible culture in their work
- scientific congresses, programs and events
- production and publishing
- local, regional, national and international cooperation with institutions and individuals:

http://www.emi.hr/index.php?grupa=1&stranica=27&jezik=hr (20/10/2012).

Literatura / References

Baskar, Bojan. 2005. "Avstro-ogrska zapuščina. Ali je možna dediščina multinacionalnega imperija". U/In *Dediščina v očeh znanosti*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za etnologijo in kulturno antropologijo, 41-52.

Baudrillard, Jean. 1981. *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*. St. Luis: Telos Press.

Bendix, Regina. 2009. "Heritage Between Economy and Politics. An Assesment from the Perspective of Cultural Anthrolpology". U/In *Intangible Heritage*. Laurajane Smith i/ and Natsuko Akagawa, ur/eds. London, New York: Routledge, 253-269.

Blake, Janet. 2009. "UNESCO's 2003 Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage. The Implications of Community Involvement in 'Safeguarding'". U/In *Intangible Heritage.* Laurajane Smith i/and Natsuko Akagawa, ur/eds. London, New York: Routledge, 45-73.

Bouchenaki, Mounir, ur/ed. 2004. *Museum International* 56/1-2. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Borelli, N., G. Corsane, P. Davis i/and S. Maggi. 2008. "Valutare un ecomuseo. Come e perche. Il metodo MACDAB". Istituto di Ricerche Economico Sociali vdel Piemonte, Torino, Italy.

Boylan, J. Patrick. 2006. "The Intangible Heritage. A Challenge and an Opportunity for Museums and Museum Professional Training". *International Journal of Intangible Heritage* 1:53-65.

Brown, Michael F. 2005. "Heritage Trouble. Recent Work on the Protection of Intangible Cultural Property". *International Journal of Cultural Property* 12:40-61. http://www.indiana.edu/~mlcp/working_groups/Brown,%20Heritage%20Trouble,%20IJCP,%202005. pdf.

Buchli, Victor. 2002. "Introduction". U/In *The Material Culture Reader*. Victor Buchli, ur/ed. Oxford, New York: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Dana, 1-22.

Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. 2003. Paris: UNESCO.

Corsane, G., P. Davis, S. Elliot, M. Maggi, D. Murtas i/and S. Rogers. 2007. "Ecomuseum Evaluation. Experiences in Piemonte and Liguria, Italy". *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 13/2:101-116.

CSICH. 2003. Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage. UNESCO http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/01852-EN.pdf (20.4.2010).

Čiča, Zoran. 2010. Komentar na tekst Marijane Belaj: "Antropolog na hodočašću. O problemu razumijevanja i tumačenja iskustava". *Etnološka tribina* 33:7-44.

Čolović, Ivan. 2006. *Etno*. Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek.

Davis, Peter. 2011. *Ecomuseums. A sense of Place.* 2nd revised edition. London, New York: Continuum International Publishing Group Ltd., 93.

de Varine, Hugues. 1978. "L'Ecomusée". *La Gazette* (Association des Musées Canadiens) 11:28-40.

Duggan, Betty J. 1997. "Tourism, Cultural Authenticity, and the Native Crafts Cooperative. The Eastern Cherokee Experience". U/In *Tourism and Culture. An Applied Perspective.* E. Champers, ur/ed. New York: State University of New York Press, 31-57.

Fikfak, Jurij. 2003. "Od tradicije do produkcije lokalnosti – nekatera izhodišča in pogledi". U/In *O pustu, maskah in maskiranju*. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU, 9-20.

Galla, Amareswar. 2009. "Locating Culture in Sustainable Development". U/In *Culture, Local Governments and Millennium Development Goals. Agenda 21 for Culture*. Barcelona.

Galla, Amareswar. 2010. "Editorial". *International Journal of Intangible Heritage* 5:8-9.

Garces Cang, Voltaire. 2007. "Defining Intangible Cultural Heritage and Its Stakeholders. The Case of Japan". *International Journal of Intangible Heritage* 2:46-55.

Gavrilović, Ljiljana. 2010. "Nomen est omen: baština ili nasleđe – (ne samo) terminološka dilema". *Etnoantropološki problemi* n.s. 5/2:41-53.

Gavrilović, Ljiljana. 2011. "Potraga za osobenošću. Izazovi i dileme unutar koncepta očuvanja i reprezentovanja nematerijalnog kulturnog nasleđa". *Etnoantropološki problemi* n.s. 6/1:221-234.

Global Code of Ethics for Tourism. 1999. http://www.unwto.org/ethics/full_text/en/pdf/Codigo_Etico_Ing.pdf (1.8.2012.).

Gotthardi Pavlovsky, Beata. 1969. "Folklorna građa i pitanje njezine zaštite". *Makedonski folkor, Prvi međunarodni simpozij balkanskog folklora*, Ohrid, 7.–8. 7. 1969. Skopje: Institut za folklor, 397- 406.

Gross, David. 2000. *Lost Time. On Remembering and Forgetting in Late Modern Culture*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Hewinson, Robert. 1987. *The Heritage Industry*. London: Methuen.

http://www.glassrpske.com/kultura/knjizevnost/Nenad-Grujicic-Becarac-je-srpska-bastina/lat/70023.html.

http://www.politika.rs/index.php?lid=lt&show=rubrike&part=list_reviews&int_itemID=204788.

http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/00009-HR-PDF.pdf.

http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?cp=JP&topic=lht.

http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?pg=00007.

http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/.

ICOM Curricula Guidelines for Museum Professional Development: the text is hosted and maintained online by the Smithsonian Institution at: http://museumstudies.si.edu/ICOM-ICTOP/index.htm.

Jelinčić, Daniela Angelina. 2008. *Abeceda kulturnog turizma*. Zagreb: Meandarmedia.

Jezernik, Božidar. 2005. "Preteklost in dediščina". U/In *Dediščina v očeh znanosti*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za etnologijo in kulturno antropologijo, 11-24.

Jezernik, Božidar. 2010."Slovenska kulturna dediščina in politika". U/In *Kulturna dediščina in identiteta*. Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete, 7-29.

Kremenšek, Slavko. 1985. "Način življenja 1". U/In *Etnološki razgledi in dileme 2*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, Univerze Edvarda Kardelja v Ljubljani, Oddelek za etnologijo (Knjižnica Glasnika Slovenskega etnološkega društva), 102-167.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. 1995. "Theorizing Heritage". *Ethnomusicology* 39/3:367-380. http://www.nyu.edu/classes/bkg/web/semheritage.pdf.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. 2004. "Intangible Heritage as Metacultural Production". *Museum International* 56/1-2:52-65. http://www.nyu.edu/classes/bkg/web/heritage_MI.pdf.

Konvencija o zaštiti nematerijalne kulturne baštine. 2003. http://www.nn.hr/sluzbeni-list/mugovori/index.asp (9.6.2006).

Kurin, Richard. 2007 "Safeguarding Imtangible Cultural Heritage. Key Factors in Implementing the 2003 Convention". *International Journal of Intangible Heritage* 2:9-20.

Leček, Suzana. 1995. "Između izvornog i novog – 'Seljačka sloga' do 1929. godine". *Etnološka tribina* 18:103-123.

Löfgren, Orvar. 1989. "The Nationalization of Culture". *Ethnologia Europea* 19/1:5-24.

Lowenthal, David. 1998. *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marković, K. 2001. "Kultura je važno sredstvo ruralnog razvoja". *Informatica museologica* 32/1-2:139-144.

Mountcastle, Amy. 2010. "Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Inevitability of Loss. A Tibetan Example". *Studia ethnologica Croatica* 22:339-359. http://hrcak.srce.hr/index.php?show=clanak&id_clanak_jezik=93296.

Nas, Peter J. M. 2002. "Masterpieces of Oral and Intangible Culture. Reflections on the UNESCO World Heritage List with CA Comment". *Current Anthropology* 43/1:139-148.

Nikočević, Lidija. 2007. "Konstrukcije identiteta i muzeološka interpretacija kulture zajednica u Istri". *Etnološka tribina* 30:21-28.

Nishimura, Yukio. 1995. "Changing Concept of Authenticity in the Context of Japanese Conservation History". U/In *Nara conference on authenticity in relation to the World Heritage Convention*. K. E. Larsen, ur/ed. Pariz, Tokio, Rim i/and Trondheim: UNESCO, Agency for Cultural Affairs, ICCROM, ICOMOS i/and Tapir Publishers.

Noyes, Dorothy. 2006. "The Judgment of Solomon. Global Protections for Tradition and the Problem of Community Ownership". *Cultural Analysis* 5:27-56.

Pelc, Milan. 2011. "Skica za povijesni portret". U/In *Baština u fokusu/Heritage in Focus. 50 godina Instituta za povijest umjetnosti 1961.-2011./50 years of the Institute of Art History 1961-2011*. Studije i monografije Instituta za povijest umjetnosti, vol. 41. Zagreb: Institut za povijest umjetnosti, 9-23.

Ratković, Dragana Lucija. 2012. "Batana Ecomuseum, Rovinj-Rovigno. Croatian Ecomuseology "at the Backdoor". U/In *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Ecomuseums, Community Museums and Living Communities*. Seixal: Green Lines Institute for Sustainable Development, 305-315.

Rivière, Georges-Henri. 1992. "L'Ecomusée, un modèle évolutif (1971 – 1980)". U/In *Vagues. Une anthologie de la nouvelle muséologie I*. A. Desvallées, ur/ed. Mâcon: editions W, 440-445.

Schumpeter, Joseph Alois. 1994. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. London, New York: Routledge.

Silverman, Helaine i/and D. Fairchild Ruggles, ur/eds. 2007. *Cultural Heritage and Human Rights*. New York: Springer.

Skledar, Nikola. 1999. "Etničnost i kultura". U/In *Kultura, etničnost, identitet*. J. Čačić-Kumpes, ur/ed. Zagreb: Institut za migracije i narodnosti, Naklada Jesenski i Turk, Hrvatsko sociološko društvo, 41-50.

Stanonik, Marija. 1990. "O folklorizmu na splošno". *Glasnik SED* 1-4:20-42.

Šola, Tomislav. 2003. *Eseji o muzejima i njihovoj teoriji. Prema kibernetičkom muzeju*. Zagreb: Hrvatski nacionalni komitet ICOM.

Turner, Victor. 1967. *Forest of Symbols. Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*. Cornell University Press.

UNESCO 2012. Forms for nominations, proposals, assistance requests and periodic reporting: ICH-02 Representative List <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=372.

UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity. 2001. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001271/127160m.pdf (1.8.2012.).

Zakon o zaštiti i očuvanju kulturnih dobara. 1999. http://www.nn.hr/sluzbeni-list/sluzbeni/index.asp (7.4.2004).

Kultura ili baština?
Problem nematerijalnosti

Sažetak

Autorica se zalaže za uporabu sintagme "nematerijalna kultura" umjesto "nematerijalna kulturna baština". Riječ "baština" podrazumijeva određenu fiksnost i nepromjenljivost te pretpostavlja da su određeni autoriteti prepoznali i imenovali baštinu. Fokus na nematerijalnu kulturu pružilo bi i šansu za otklon od UNESCO-ovog modela očuvanja nematerijalnih kulturnih fenomena, čija primjena donosi i određene probleme. Kako se oni iskazuju u praksi, autorica je ilustrirala primjerom zvončara koji su uvršteni na UNESCO-ovu Reprezentativnu listu nematerijalne kulturne baštine čovječanstva.

[*nematerijalna kultura, baština, UNESCO, zvončari, intelektualno vlasništvo*]