

dr. sc.
Fedja Vukić
Ivana Podnar

**IDENTITETSKA MAPA
SUVREMENOG ZAGREBA**

**AN IDENTITY MAP OF
MODERN ZAGREB**

SAŽETAK: Istraživanje identitetske razmjene između pojedinca i ideje o gradu (zajednici) teorijski je uspostavljeno na ideji o identitetskom sustavu koji projektno može pomoći podizanju razine identifikacije. Istraživanje je provedeno na terenu, dokumentiranjem komunikacije u javnom i privatnom prostoru te istraživanjem stavova građana o vrijednostima koje identificiraju grad Zagreb. Analiza rezultata upućuje na sklonost građana da prepoznaju grad u kojem žive kao vrijedno i dobro mjesto ali istovremeno je situacija u prostoru bitno drukčija i upućuje na nižu razinu identitetske razmjene.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: identitet, mapa, grad, stavovi građana, identitetski sustav

ABSTRACT: Research into the identity exchange between individuals and the idea of a city (community) is theoretically established on the idea of an identity system which when projected can assist in raising the level of identification. Research was carried out on the ground by documenting communication in public and private space and by surveying the attitudes of citizens about the values that they identify with the city of Zagreb. Analysis of the results indicates the tendency of inhabitants to view the city in which they live as a valuable and good place. However, at the same time, the situation on the ground is significantly different and suggests a lower level of identity exchange.

KEY WORDS: identity, map, city, attitudes of citizens, identity system

UVOD

Ova studija ima za cilj pokazati razine komunikacije u javnom prostoru i kroz to pokazati kvantitetu i kvalitetu identitetske razmjene između pojedinca (skupina pojedinaca) i ideje o zajednici/gradu. Primarni je smisao studije povezati podatke i spoznaje o suvremenom identitetu grada s onim koji se kritički valorizira kao povijesni slojevi identiteta, u svrhu stjecanja potpunije, realističnije slike o identitetskim potencijalima grada Zagreba, koji se izražavaju upravo u susretu tradicije/povijesti i suvremene kulture življenja u gradu koja, između ostalog, nudi i interpretacijsku perspektivu u tradiciju.

Radna hipoteza za mapiranje identiteta uspostavljena je na administrativnoj podjeli grada na 17 zona/četvrti. Kolikogod ta podjela u stvarnosti urbanog života mjestimično bila samo formalna ili čak nelogična, shvaćena je kao dostatno dobar okvir za uspostavljanje mapirane strukture, a tamo gdje se takva podjela pokazala kao neodgovarajuća onom što situacija u gradu doista jest, studija na to ukazuje.

Kako bi se postigla jasnoća identitetskog profila suvremenog Zagreba, obavljeno je istraživanje u kombinaciji *desk research* metoda i terenskog istraživanja. *Desk research* metodama istraživani su statistički podaci i pokazatelji za grad Zagreb po pojedinim administrativnim četvrtima, te komparativni podaci za grad Zagreb i provjerljivi podaci do kojih se službeno moglo doći za gradove u SEE regiji. Uz to istražene su razine vizualizacije imena grada, na svim razinama, od službenih do posve neslužbenih i privatnih, a kriterij je bio da su te vizualizacije javno prezentirane, u fizičkom ili virtualnom prostoru.

Terensko istraživanje obuhvatilo je obilazak svih 17 gradskih četvrti i dokumentiranje komunikacije u javnom prostoru na sljedećim razinama: komuniciranje uprave grada i srodnih organizacija, komuniciranje osobnih i skupnih individualnih identiteta, stanje komunalne

INTRODUCTION

This study aims to show the levels of communication in public spaces and through this illustrate the quantity and quality of identity exchange between the individual (groups of individuals) and ideas about the community/city. The primary purpose of this study is to connect data and knowledge on the modern identity of a city with what are critically considered to be the historical layers of identity. This is to acquire a more complete and realistic picture of the identity potentials of the city of Zagreb. These potentials are expressed in the contact between tradition/history and the modern culture of living in a city which, among other things, also offers an interpretative perspective on tradition.

The working hypothesis for the identity-mapping is based on the administrative division of the city into 17 districts. No matter how formal or even illogical this division might seem in the reality of urban life, it is a reasonably good framework for establishing mapped structures. Where these divisions prove to not correspond with the real situation in the city, it is shown by the study.

In order to achieve clarity in the identity profile of modern Zagreb, research was carried out by combining desk research methods and field research. The desk research methods examined statistical data and indicators for the city of Zagreb for individual administrative districts, comparative data for the city of Zagreb and verifiable data that can be officially obtained for cities in the region of South-East Europe. In addition, the layers of visualisation of the name of the city were researched at all levels, from the official to the completely unofficial and private. The relevant criterion was that these visualisations were presented publicly in either a physical or virtual space.

The field research encompassed all 17 city districts and the documenting of communication in public spaces at the following levels: communication of the city authorities and similar institutions,

opreme, arhitektonski i prostorni zahvati. Uz to u ukupno 17 gradskih četvrti obavilo se anketno istraživanje na uzorku n=850, a na temu identiteta grada.

ZAGREB DANAS – DEMOGRAFIJA, EKONOMIJA, GOSPODARSTVO I KULTURA¹

Šire područje Zagreba danas broji više od milijun stanovnika, a službene statistike govore da je 2001. godine zabilježeno 779 145 žitelja, na površini od 641,36 km², što je 18% ukupnog stanovništva države. Taj broj nije se bitno mijenjao od 80-ih godina 20. st., a tako stabilna struktura trebala bi olakšavati dugotrajno planiranje života u gradu. I dobna je struktura relativno pozitivna uzme li se u obzir progresivan trend starenja stanovništva u zapadnoj Europi; prema podacima iz 2001. više od 55% stanovništva spada u radno aktivno, tj. 25–64 godina starosti. Oko 23% stanovništva ima više ili visoko obrazovanje, što je u usporedbi s ostatkom Hrvatske vrlo visok postotak, koji prati trendove zemalja Europske Unije. Osim toga, Zagreb je i grad koji predstavlja centar atrakcije, ne samo na nacionalnoj već i na regionalnoj razini, što pokazuju i podaci prema kojima je 2001. zabilježeno oko 4 500 stanovnika drugih naselja i država prisutnih duže od 1 godine u Zagrebu, najviše zbog rada i školovanja, ali na žalost, još uvijek i kao posljedica nedavnih ratova (izbjeglice). Istovremeno, Zagreb ne može izbjeći sudbinu čitave zemlje u kojoj velik broj radno sposobne i često visoko kvalificirane radne snage odlazi na duži period u inozemstvo – 2001. čak oko 25 000. Od oko 45% aktivnog stanovništva, 83,2% 2001. godine bilo je zaposleno, a u isto vrijeme stopa nezaposlenosti u zemljama Europske Unije bila je 8%. Iz navedenog proizlazi da se Zagreb kao glavni grad Hrvatske po mnogim pokazateljima približava standardima EU-a, no još uvijek postoje važni kriteriji na kojima je potrebno raditi.

Postotak ukupno zaposlenog stanovništva prema oblicima vlasništva pokazuje da je, očekivano,

communication of personal and collective individual identities, the state of communal facilities, and architectural and spatial interventions. In addition to the 17 city districts, surveys were conducted on the city's identity using a sample of n=850.

ZAGREB TODAY – DEMOGRAPHICS, ECONOMY, BUSINESS AND CULTURE¹

More than a million people live in the area of greater Zagreb. According to official statistics, in 2001 a total of 779,145 inhabitants were recorded in an area of 641.36 km², which represented 18% of the total population of the country. This number has not changed significantly since the 1980s. Such a stable structure should make the long-term planning of life in the city easier. The demographic structure is relatively positive, given the progressive ageing of the population in western Europe. According to figures from 2001, more than 55% of the population belong to the working population, i.e. 25–64 years old. Approximately 23% of the population have completed further or higher education, which when compared to the rest of Croatia is a very high percentage and follows the trends in the countries of the European Union. In addition, Zagreb acts as a magnet, not only at the national level but also regionally. This is shown by the fact that in 2001 4,500 inhabitants from other towns and states had been in Zagreb longer than one year. This was mainly for work and education, but also, unfortunately, as a consequence of the war (refugees). However, at the same time, Zagreb is unable to avoid the destiny of the whole country in which a large number of the working population, often highly qualified workers, go abroad for long periods. In 2001, this was as many as 25,000 people. Of an active population of about 45%, in 2001 83.2% were in employment. At that time, the unemployment rate in the countries of the European Union was 8%. From the above, it can be seen that Zagreb, as the capital of Croatia, according to many indicators, is approaching the

najveći broj aktivan kod privatnih poduzeća, 54%, a 37% u državnim poduzećima različitog tipa. Zagreb ostvaruje 36% ukupnog izvoza RH, a sukladno tome udio Zagreba u ukupnom BDP-u RH iznosi oko 31%. Poseban status metropole pokazuje i iznosom prosječne plaće, koja je 2008. iznosila 6 145 kn, dok je taj prosjek na razini čitave zemlje bio 5 000 kn. Prihod gospodarstva grada ostvarile su sljedeće djelatnosti: trgovina 40%, prerađivačka industrija 14,8%, poslovne usluge 11,3% te građevinarstvo 7,1%.² Stoga je i najveći broj zaposlenih u trgovini i prerađivačkoj industriji. Međutim, Zagreb nastoji održati i svoju obrtničku tradiciju, pa tako zagrebački obrtnici obuhvaćaju 17,4% te djelatnosti na nacionalnoj razini.

Kultura je još od vremena Ise Kršnjavija bila iznimno značajan aspekt društvenog života, koji je često puta bio pokretač razvoja i drugih, gospodarskih, područja. Sve do 1950. godine u Zagrebu je djelovalo jedno kazalište, centralna kazališna kuća na Trgu maršala Tita, a potom su sagrađena još 4. Godine 1975. djeluje 10 kazališta, a 2008. – 25. Broj određenih kulturnih ustanova svjedoči i o promjenama trendova navika, pa je tako u Zagrebu 1965. zabilježeno 35 kinematografa, dok ih se danas broji 7. Posljednjih godina pokreću se akcije za spas gradskih kina (kino Europa), a ponekad i njihovu prenamjenu (Zagrebački plesni centar u nekadašnjem kinu Lika). Godine 1990. u Hrvatskoj se počinju osnivati pučka otvorena učilišta i domovi kulture, kako bi se decentralizirala i difuzionirala kulturna i edukacijska aktivnost. Godine 2006. takvih je ustanova u glavnom gradu djelovalo čak 25, raspoređenih po različitim gradskim četvrtima. Iako pučka učilišta, sa svojim kulturno obrazovnim programom, nisu nositelji velikih manifestacija i događanja, oni preuzimaju važnu ulogu u identitetskom formiranju ne-centralnih dijelova grada.

U tom je kontekstu svakako iznimno značajna i izgradnja novog Muzeja suvremene umjetnosti,

standards of the EU. However, there still remain important criteria that need to be worked upon.

The percentage of the employed population in terms of form of ownership shows that, as expected, the greatest number of the active population (45%) are employed in private firms, compared with 37% in state companies of various types. Zagreb accounts for 36% of the total exports of the Republic of Croatia. As a result, Zagreb's share in the total GDP of the Republic of Croatia amounts to approximately 31%. Its unique status as the capital is also shown by the average salary, which in 2008 came to HRK 6,145, while the average for the rest of the country amounted to only HRK 5,000. The city's economic revenues come from the following activities: retail 40%, manufacturing 14.8%, services 11.3%, and construction 7.1%.² Consequently, the largest number of those employed are in the retail and manufacturing industries. However, Zagreb has also attempted to maintain its artisan tradition, which is reflected in the fact that Zagreb craftsmen represent 17.4% of such activities at the national level.

Ever since the time of Iso Kršnjavi, culture has been a particularly important aspect of social life, which has often been the driving force of development and other economic areas. Until 1950, there was only one theatre working in Zagreb. This was the central theatre on Marshal Tito Square. After this, another four were built. By 1975, there were 10 theatres, and by 2008, 25. The number of cultural establishments bears witness to changes in habits. In 1965, there were 35 cinemas registered in Zagreb, while today there are only 7. Recent years have seen campaigns launched to save the city's cinemas (the Europa cinema) and sometimes their conversion (the former Lika cinema is now the Zagreb Dance Centre). In 1990, further education colleges and arts centres started to appear in Croatia as part of the process of decentralising and diffusing cultural and educational activities. By 2006, there were 25 such institutions present in various districts of the

locirana upravo u Novom Zagrebu. Ta gesta kulturne politike grada i države pokazuje tendenciju formiranja simboličkih mjesta izvan tradicionalnog baštinskog, a time i simboličkog resursa – Donjeg i Gornjeg grada. Također, sve je više galerija koje se otvaraju izvan centra, u stambenim dijelovima grada, obogaćenima za sadržaje koji su izvorno trebali biti planirani kao neizostavna ljudska potreba. 27 muzeja, koliko ih danas djeluje u Zagrebu, još uvijek ne uspijevaju biti mjesta javnog života, osim ako se radi o manifestacijama poput Noći muzeja ili velikim gostujućim izložbama slavni umjetnika poput Marca Chagalla. Većinom, muzeji su i dalje zatvorene institucije koje komuniciraju s malim brojem posjetitelja, ne koristeći golemi potencijal formiranja, redefiniranja i subvertiranja identiteta.

Identitetski potencijal kulture djelomično se prepoznaje u turizmu, koji unatrag posljednjih 8 godina pokazuje značajan rast: 2001. godine u Zagrebu je zabilježeno oko 370 000 dolazaka, od čega je oko 200 000 bilo domaćih, dok je 2008. ukupno došlo oko 700 000 turista, od čega oko 500 000 domaćih. Taj se rast ostvarivao postupno, kako u kontekstu domaćih, tako i u kontekstu inozemnih turista. Očekivano, najčešći strani gosti u Zagrebu dolaze iz Njemačke (46 000), zatim SAD-a (32 000), Austrije (31 000), Italije (29 000), Francuske (26 500).³ Značajan je porast broja gostiju iz Japana, kojih je 2005. Zagreb posjetilo 8 145, a 2008. gotovo 30 000.

USPOREDBA S GRADOVIMA U REGIJI – LJUBLJANA, GRAZ, BEČ, BUDIMPEŠTA, PRAG, SARAJEVO, BEOGRAD

Iako termin Jugoistočna Europa (SEE Europe) krije problematično jedinstvo zemalja koje okuplja pod tim najmanje geografskim, a najviše političko-društveno-kulturnim pojmom, kvantitativni pokazatelji mogu biti korisni za analizu različitosti, a u nekom budućem istraživanju i njihovih uzroka.

capital. Although further education colleges, with their cultural educational programmes, do not hold major events, they play an important role in the identity formation of non-central parts of the city.

In this context, the building of the Museum of Modern Art was very significant, located as it is in New Zagreb. This gesture of the cultural policy of the city and state demonstrates a tendency to create symbolic places outside the traditional cultural and symbolic resource of the Lower and Upper Towns. Similarly, more and more galleries are being opened outside the centre in residential areas of the city, which are being enriched with facilities which should have originally been planned as a basic human requirement. There are 27 museums in Zagreb today, but they still do not thrive as places of public life unless we are talking about events such as Museum Night or significant guest exhibitions of the work of celebrated artists like Marc Chagall. On the whole, museums continue to be closed institutions that communicate with small numbers of visitors and do not use their enormous potential to form, redefine and subvert identity.

The identity potential of culture has been partly recognised in tourism, which during the last 8 years has experienced a significant growth. In 2001, approximately 370,000 arrivals were recorded in Zagreb, of which about 200,000 were domestic. In 2008, on the other hand, approximately 700,000 tourists came, of whom about 500,000 were domestic tourists. This growth, in the context of both domestic and foreign tourists, was achieved gradually. As expected, the most frequent foreign visitors to Zagreb came from Germany (46,000), followed by the USA (32,000), Austria (31,000), Italy, (29,000), and France (26,500).³ There was a marked increase in the number of guests from Japan. In 2005, 8,145 Japanese guests visited Zagreb, while in 2008 the number had reached nearly 30,000.

Ljubljana, glavni grad Slovenije, koja je zajedno sa Zagrebom dijelila nedavnu političku povijest unutar SFRJ, danas broji 267 386 stanovnika, na površini od 114,90 km². Usprkos manjoj veličini u smislu stanovništva i površine, Ljubljana umnogome predstavlja veći centar atrakcije: stopa nezaposlenosti iznosi 6,4%, a prosječna bruto plaća 1 745 eura. Ljubljana predstavlja i regionalni sveučilišni centar s oko 50 000 studenata, 21 fakultetom i 3 akademije. S 15 muzeja, više od 40 galerija, 14 kina i 11 kazališta, Ljubljana se predstavlja kao grad kulture i umjetnosti, u kojem se održava čak 10 međunarodnih festivala. Godine 2010. Ljubljana je proglašena i svjetskom prijestolnicom knjige⁴.

Graz ima populaciju od 257 898 stanovnika na 127,58 km², što ga čini sličnim slovenskoj metropoli. Međutim, sličnosti tu ne prestaju: prosječna neto plaća u Grazu iznosi 1 948 eura, stopa nezaposlenosti 6,9%, a jedan od ključnih razvojnih sektora su obrazovanje i kultura. Najbrže rastuća privredna grana Graza su kreativne industrije. Na 6 sveučilišta u Grazu studira 44 000 studenata. Stara gradska jezgra uvrštena je na UNESCO-vu listu svjetske kulturne baštine, a 2003. godine bio je Europska prijestolnica kulture. Iako Graz nije ni glavni ni najveći austrijski grad, uspio se etablirati kao vibrantna turistička atrakcija, koja uspješno povezuje kulturnu baštinu i kreativne industrije, staru gradsku jezgru i najnovija arhitektonska dostignuća. U Grazu je smješteno više od 30 muzejskih i više od 25 galerijskih institucija, a njegov je potencijal Europska Unija prepoznala još 1979. godine, kad mu je dodijelila priznanje za promociju europskih ideala.⁵

Kao glavni grad Austrije, Beč broji 1 664 146 stanovnika, a raspoređeni su na površini od 414,90 km². Beč predstavlja gospodarski centar Austrije, atraktivan stranim ulagačima, pa je 2008. zabilježeno 119 međunarodnih tvrtki koje su odabrale Beč te 29 poduzeća iz središnje i istočne Europe. Stopa nezaposlenosti u jeku ekonomske krize 2009. bila je 8,4%, dok je 2004. iznosila

A COMPARISON WITH OTHER CITIES IN THE REGION: LJUBLJANA, GRAZ, VIENNA, BUDAPEST, PRAGUE, SARAJEVO AND BELGRADE

Although the term South-East Europe conceals the problematic unity of the countries that occupy what is less a geographical than a socio-political and cultural idea, quantitative indicators can be useful in analysing differences and, in future research, their sources.

Ljubljana, the capital city of Slovenia, which shares with Zagreb a recent common political history as part of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, today has a population of 267,386 in an area of 114.9 km². Despite its smaller size in terms of both population and area, in many ways Ljubljana represents a greater centre of attraction: the unemployment rate is 6.4% and the average gross monthly salary is EUR 1,745. Ljubljana is also a regional university centre with approximately 50,000 students, 21 faculties and 3 academies. With 15 museums, over 40 galleries, 14 cinemas and 11 theatres, Ljubljana presents itself as a city of culture and the arts in which as many as 10 international festivals are held. Ljubljana was proclaimed World Book Capital 2010.⁴

Graz has a population of 257,898 covering 127.58 km², which is similar to the Slovenian capital. The similarities do not stop there: the average net salary in Graz is EUR 1,948, the unemployment rate is 6.9%, and one of the key developmental sectors is education and the arts. The fastest growing branch of the economy in Graz is creative industries. There are also 44,000 students studying at the 6 universities in Graz. The historic centre of the city has been placed on the UNESCO World Heritage List and in 2003 Graz was the European Capital of Culture. Although Graz is neither the capital nor the largest city of Austria, it has succeeded in establishing itself as a vibrant tourist attraction that successfully combines its cultural heritage and creative industries, and also its historic centre and newest architectural achievements. Graz houses

svoga 6%. U Beču živi oko 20% svih Austrijanaca, dok je bečki udio u ukupnoj državnoj ekonomiji oko 27%.⁶ Regija Beča peta je najbogatija regija Europske Unije. Prosječna je satnica 2009. godine u Beču iznosila 10,7 eura, dok je iste godine u Ljubljani bila 5,1 eura, u Pragu 4 eura, a u Budimpešti svega oko 2,5 eura. Osim privrede, Beč je i sveučilišni regionalni centar s 15 sveučilišta, te kulturna meka u kojoj je smješteno 100 muzeja, 70-ak kazališta, 4 operne kuće i brojni međunarodni festivali. Jezgra grada uvrštena je na UNESCO-vu listu svjetske kulturne baštine.⁷

U Budimpešti je 2001. službeno zabilježeno 1 778 000 stanovnika, što je otprilike petina ukupnog stanovništva, na površini od 525 km². Glavni je grad nacionalno gospodarsko središte, čije šire područje proizvodi 42% nacionalnog BDP-a i privlači 60% stranih ulaganja. U njegovoj se kulturnoj baštini prepoznaje bogata povijest, nekoliko je gradskih lokacija uvršteno na UNESCO-vu listu svjetske baštine, a mađarski Parlament treća je najveća zgrada parlamenta na svijetu.⁸ U Budimpešti je smješteno gotovo 100 muzeja, a njegova kazališna, festivalska i galerijska djelatnost spadaju u sektor brzorastućih kreativnih industrija. Međutim, kulturnom bogatstvu ne odgovara adekvatna privredna situacija; 2009. godine prosječna neto satnica u Budimpešti bila je dvostruko manja od one u Ljubljani, a gotovo pet puta manja od satnice u Beču. Godine 2004. stopa nezaposlenosti u Budimpešti iznosila je 6,3%, no 2009. situacija se drastično pogoršala, te je nezaposlenost na razini države dosegla čak 10,5%. S 10 sveučilišta Budimpešta predstavlja i studentsku metropolu.

Češka je prijestolnica po broju stanovnika od 1,21 milijuna manja od Beča i Budimpešte, a proteže se na površini od 496 km². U Pragu se odvija oko petina svih investicija u Češkoj, a BDP glavnog grada više je nego dvostruko veći od ostatka zemlje. Regija Praga spada među 12 najbogatijih regija Europske Unije.⁹ Godine 2002. stopa nezaposlenosti u Pragu iznosila je 3,2%¹⁰, a nakon

more than 30 museums and 25 galleries. Its potential was recognised by the European Union as far back as 1979 when it received recognition for its promotion of European ideals.⁵

As the capital of Austria, Vienna has 1,664,146 inhabitants and an area of 414.90 km². Vienna is the economic centre of Austria and attractive to foreign investors. In 2008, 119 international companies chose Vienna, as did 29 businesses from Central and Eastern Europe. The unemployment rate during the economic crisis of 2009 was 8.4%, though in 2004 it had been only 6%. Approximately 20% of all Austrians live in Vienna, while Vienna's share in the total national economy is around 27%.⁶ The Vienna region is the fifth richest region in the European union. The average hourly wage in Vienna in 2009 was EUR 10.7. In the same year, this figure was EUR 5.1 in Ljubljana, EUR 4 in Prague and just EUR 2.5 in Budapest. Besides being an economic centre, Vienna is also a regional university centre with 15 universities. It is also a cultural mecca that has 100 museums, around 70 theatres, 4 opera houses and which hosts numerous international festivals. The centre of the city has been placed on the UNESCO List of World Heritage.⁷

In 2001, Budapest officially had 1,778,000 inhabitants, which is about a fifth of the total population of the country, in an area of 525 km². The capital is the centre of the national economy, and its wider area produces 42% of the nation's GDP and attracts 60% of foreign investment. Its cultural heritage is the result of a rich history and several locations in the city have been placed on the UNESCO List of World Heritage. The Hungarian Parliament is the third largest parliament building in the world.⁸ Budapest contains nearly 100 museums, and its theatres, festivals and galleries fall into the fast-growing creative industry sector. However, its cultural riches are not matched by the economic situation. In 2009, the average hourly wage was twice as low as that in Ljubljana, and nearly five times less than the hourly wage in Vienna. In 2004, the

krize 2009. 5,2%¹¹. U Pragu djeluje 5 državnih sveučilišta i sve više privatnih, od kojih čak dva spadaju među top 500 iz cijelog svijeta. Jednako je rangiran i Beč, dok Budimpešta i Ljubljana imaju po jedno. Međutim, Prag je i velika kulturna metropola, uvrštena u UNESCO-vu listu zaštićene baštine, u kojoj se nalazi 130 kazališta i gotovo 500 galerijskih i muzejskih institucija različitih profila.¹²

Kratki komparativni pregled susjednih metropola završavamo gradovima s kojima je Hrvatska donedavna formirala jednu državnu cjelinu.

Sarajevo je po površini i broju stanovnika značajno manje od Zagreba: u njemu živi 297 416 žitelja na površini od 141,5 km²; ove su brojke nešto veće nego u Ljubljani. Ekonomska situacija Sarajeva znatno je lošija od svih dosada navedenih metropola: prosječna plaća iznosi oko 500 eura, a broj zaposlenog stanovništva je 94 165¹³. Iako je ekonomska snaga glavnog grada Bosne i Hercegovine veća od ostatka zemlje, stopa nezaposlenosti još je uvijek iznimno velika. Kultura i umjetnost, kako tradicionalne tako i suvremene, veliki su identitetski resurs Sarajeva, koji nosi važnu ulogu u kreiranju i čuvanju memorije na nedavnu prošlost. Zbog iznimnih ratnih posljedica u gradu se svi sektori teško vraćaju u predratno stanje, no kultura pokazuje najveći zamah. U Sarajevu djeluje 35 institucija kulture, od Nacionalnog teatra s Operom i Baletom do ostalih kazališta, galerija, muzeja. Edukacija u Sarajevu također predstavlja snažnije uporište, sa Sveučilištem na kojem djeluje preko 20 fakulteta i akademija.

Beograd je površinom i populacijom najveći grad s prostora bivše SFRJ: 1 576 124 stanovnika na 3 222,68 km². Beograd predstavlja nacionalni i regionalni centar s velikom atraktivnom moći, međutim zbog nedavne prošlosti njegovo je gospodarstvo, u usporedbi s Europskom Unijom, i dalje u lošijoj situaciji. Stopa nezaposlenosti 2008. godine iznosila je 15,2%, dok je u ostatku Srbije bila čak preko 25%. Osim što je glavni grad snažni

unemployment rate in Budapest came to 6.3%. However, in 2009 the situation dramatically worsened to the extent that unemployment at the national level reached as high as 10.5%. With 10 universities, Budapest is a significant student city.

The Czech capital, with a population of 1.21 million, is smaller than Vienna and Budapest and covers an area of 496 km². About a fifth of all investments in the Czech Republic are made in Prague, and the GDP of the capital is more than twice that of the rest of the country. The Prague region is among the 12 richest regions in the European Union.⁹ In 2002, the unemployment rate in Prague came to 3.2%,¹⁰ and after the crisis of 2009, 5.2%.¹¹ Prague has 5 state universities and an increasing number of private ones. It has 2 universities among the top 500 in the whole world. Vienna has a similar ranking, while Budapest and Ljubljana have one each. However, Prague is also a cultural centre, placed on the UNESCO List of Protected Heritage, and has 130 theatres and nearly 500 galleries and museums of various kinds.¹²

This short comparative overview of neighbouring large cities is concluded with a survey of cities together with which Croatia until recently formed a single state.

In terms of area and number of inhabitants, Sarajevo is significantly smaller than Zagreb. It has 297,416 inhabitants and covers an area of 141.5 km². These figures are somewhat larger than those for Ljubljana. However, the economic situation in Sarajevo is markedly worse than that in all of the cities mentioned above. The average salary is about EUR 500 and the number of those unemployed stands at 94,165.¹³ Although the economic strength of the capital of Bosnia and Herzegovina is greater than that of the rest of the country, the unemployment rate is still extremely high. Culture and the arts, both traditional and modern, are a significant identity resource for Sarajevo, and play an important role in creating and preserving the memory of the recent past. As a result of the serious consequences of the war, all

privredni centar zemlje, on je i sveučilišno središte, u kojem djeluju dva državna sveučilišta te sve veći broj privatnih visokoškolskih institucija. Jednako tako, kultura i umjetnost veliki su kreativni potencijal, koji se prepoznaje u više od 10 međunarodnih festivala, brojnim muzejima, galerijama i kazalištima.

Roland Berger je 2009. godine proveo istraživanje centralne i istočne Europe,¹⁴ u koje su uvršteni i neki od ovdje analiziranih gradova: Zagreb, Ljubljana, Beč, Budimpešta i Prag. Kriteriji prema kojima je izvršeno rangiranje bili su infrastruktura, edukacija, inovacija, internacionalnost, životni standard te kultura. Najviše je bodova po svim kriterijima osvojio Beč, a odmah iza njega našao se Prag, čiji su najveći resurs kultura i obrazovanje. Treće mjesto, od 10 glavnih gradova spomenute regije, zauzela je Budimpešta, i to prvenstveno zahvaljujući brzorastućim kreativnim industrijama i bogatoj kulturnoj ponudi. Ljubljana se nalazi na četvrtom mjestu, a najviše su rangirani inovacija i internacionalnost. Zagreb nije pokazao vodeću poziciju ni po jednom navedenom kriteriju, a najveći deficit vidljiv je u vrlo malom broju zaposlenih u kreativnim industrijama, slaboj prisutnosti sjedišta međunarodnih kompanija, malom broju javnih prostora u odnosu na veličinu grada te malom broju muzeja i galerija.

Istovremeno, *desk research* komparativnih podataka i pokazatelja gradova u SEE regiji, koji je proveden za potrebe ove studije, pokazuje dodatne značajke suvremenog grada Zagreba u odnosu na gradove u regiji. Iako se do kompletnih podataka nije moglo doći radi nepostojanja ili javne nedostupnosti statistika, usporedba pokazuje da Zagreb ima priličan kvantitativni potencijal, da ima prilično značajne formalne pokazatelje (broj obrazovanih, broj obrazovnih i kulturnih institucija), ali te prednosti ne kapitalizira, odnosno ne koristi ih ili ih koristi slabo kao činitelje turističke atrakcije. To uglavnom može uputiti na činjenicu da grad Zagreb kao turistička destinacija nije prepoznat

sectors are finding it hard to return to the pre-war situation. Culture, on the other hand, is showing the greatest signs of revival. In Sarajevo, there are 35 cultural institutions, from the National Theatre with its opera and ballet to other theatres, galleries and museums. Education in Sarajevo similarly has a strong basis, and there is a university that has over 20 faculties and academies.

In terms of area and population, Belgrade is the largest city in the area of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia with 1,576,124 inhabitants and an area of 3,222.68 km². Belgrade is a national and regional centre with great drawing power. However, because of its recent past, its economy, when compared with the European Union, continues to be in a bad state. In 2008, the unemployment rate was 15.2%, while in the rest of Serbia it was over 25%. Besides being the economic powerhouse of the country, the capital is also a university centre with two universities and an increasing number of private higher education institutions. Culture and the arts have equally great creative potential, which can be seen in more than 10 international festivals and the numerous museums, galleries and theatres.

In 2009, Roland Berger¹⁴ carried out research in Central and Eastern Europe which included some of the cities analysed above: Zagreb, Ljubljana, Vienna, Budapest and Prague. The criteria used in carrying out the rankings were infrastructure, education, innovation, internationalism, living standards and culture. Vienna achieved the most points for all the criteria, immediately followed by Prague, whose biggest resources are culture and education. Third place out of the 10 capital cities of the above-mentioned region was taken by Budapest. This was chiefly due to its fast-growing creative industries and rich cultural offer. Ljubljana was in fourth place and was ranked highest for innovation and internationalism. Zagreb did not achieve the leading position in any of the criteria, and its biggest deficit is visible in the very small number of people employed in the creative industries, the weak presence of the offices

od javnosti u emitivnim tržištima, odnosno da ne postoji posebno razaznatljiv njegov identitet u inozemstvu. Iako je broj turističkih dolazaka u porastu, čini se da je potencijal daleko veći. K tome, ionako slaba razina inozemnih ulaganja u Zagreb smanjena je tijekom 2009., uslijed globalne recesije i krize finansijskih tržišta. S jedne strane, dakle, Zagreb još uvijek ima velik potencijal za razvoj kreativnih industrija i tercijarnog sektora, no s druge, međutim, ostali regionalni centri imaju više inicijative, koja se prepoznaje kako u broju turističkih dolazaka tako i u aktivnostima (poslovne operacije, politika, sport), koje ujeću ne samo na broj posjeta nego i na profiliranje identiteta grada.

PROSTORNA STRUKTURA GRADA

Od siječnja 1997. godine Grad Zagreb je samostalna, jedinstvena, teritorijalna i upravna jedinica koja ima položaj županije. U sastavu grada je 70 naselja, a od 1999. osnovane su gradske četvrti, njih 17, te mjesni odbori kao oblici mjesne samouprave.¹⁵ Gradske četvrti Zagreba su sljedeće: Donji grad, Gornji grad – Medveščak, Trnje, Maksimir, Peščenica – Žitnjak, Novi Zagreb – istok, Novi Zagreb – zapad, Trešnjevka – sjever, Trešnjevka – jug, Črnomerec, Gornja Dubrava, Donja Dubrava, Stenjevec, Podsused – Vrapče, Podsljeme, Sesvete, Brezovica. Te su četvrti međusobno vrlo različite, ne samo po geografskom položaju u odnosu na centar i po broju stanovnika, već i po svojim vrlo specifičnim i međusobno teško usporedivim fizičkim karakteristikama, a time svakako i simboličkim potencijalom.

Specifičnost urbanih, povijesnih i kulturnih obilježja gradskih četvrti prepoznatljiva je uglavnom njenim stanovnicima, a širi konsenzus o identitetskoj važnosti za čitav grad postignut je na prostoru centra grada, u kojeg ubrajamo Donji grad, Gornji grad – Medveščak te dio Trnja i Maksimira. Te četvrti po broju stanovnika i

of international companies, the small amount of public spaces in relation to the size of the city, and the small number of museums and galleries.

However, desk research of comparative data and indicators for cities in the South-East European region which was carried out for the purpose of this study shows that the modern city of Zagreb has other attributes in relation to the other cities in the region. Although it was not possible to obtain complete data due to their non-existence or inaccessibility to the public, a comparison reveals that Zagreb has considerable quantitative potential and that it has significant formal indicators (the number of educated people and educational and cultural institutions), but that it does not capitalise on these advantages and does not exploit them or insufficiently exploits them as a tourist attraction. This might on the whole point to the fact that Zagreb is not recognised as a tourist destination by the market and that it does not have a particularly discernable identity abroad. Although the number of tourist arrivals is growing, it would seem that the potential is much greater. The already poor level of foreign investment in Zagreb during 2009 was reduced further as a consequence of the global recession and the crisis on the financial markets. Zagreb still has great potential to develop creative industries and a tertiary sector. However, other regional centres have more initiatives, which can be seen both in the number of tourist arrivals and activities (business, political, sporting) that have an impact not only on the number of visits but also on profiling the identity of the city.

THE SPATIAL STRUCTURE OF THE CITY

Since January 1997, the City of Zagreb has been an independent, unitary, territorial and administrative unit which has the status of a county. The city comprises 70 boroughs but since 1999 has been organised into 17 city districts with local councils as forms of local self-government.¹⁵ The city districts of Zagreb are as follows: Donji

površini spadaju u manje četvrti: 3-15 000 km², s 37-50 000 stanovnika. Suprotno tome, najveće četvrti, kao što su Novi Zagreb – istok sa 65 000 stanovnika, Gornja Dubrava sa 61 300, Sesvete s gotovo 60 000, čine cjeline koje populacijom odgovaraju veličini srednjih hrvatskih gradova, no vrlo rijetko predstavljaju prostore kulturne memorije zajedničke svim stanovnicima čitavog Zagreba. Specifičnost četvrti očigledna je i gustoćom naseljenosti, pa se tako prije spomenuti Novi Zagreb – istok prostire na svega 16,5434 km², a Sesvete na 165,2547 km², dakle na 10 puta većoj površini. Neminovno je da iz takvih omjera površine i broja stanovnika proizlaze i velike morfološke i urbanističke različitosti, kao i razlike u očekivanjima i navikama urbanog života.

Grad Zagreb kao jedinstveno administrativno područje osnovan je 1850. godine, spajanjem Gradeca i Kaptola. Uskoro su pod Zagreb ušla i prva podgrađa koja su se radijalno širila do podizanja pruge na južnom rubu grada, koja je odredila daljnje pružanje u smjeru istok-zapad. Intenzivna urbanizacija prema jugu dogodila se nakon Drugog svjetskog rata, najprije na potezu današnje Ulice grada Vukovara, a zatim i na desnoj obali Save, a intenzivna rezidencijalna izgradnja na Podsljemenu novijeg je karaktera i još uvijek je prostor elitne, no često bespravne, izgradnje individualnih objekata. Nekadašnja istočna industrijska gradska zona postala je poslovna zona, jednako kao i zapadni dijelovi grada. Upravo takva urbanizacija, koja je poslovne funkcije izmjestila iz užeg gradskog središta, zahtjeva identitetsko strukturiranje koje neće biti monofunkcionalno, već će omogućavati smislenu i inspirativnu identitetsku razmjenu. U trenutnoj situaciji u identitetskom formiranju grada koriste se identitetski potencijali samo vrlo ograničenog, središnjeg dijela grada, dok većina dijelova, dominantna i po broju stanovnika i po površini, niti koristi postojeći potencijal niti strukturira nove identitetske sustave.

Pokazatelji iz socijalnog izvješća grada Zagreba za 2008. godinu po pojedinim administrativnim

Grad, Gornji Grad-Medveščak, Trnje, Maksimir, Peščenica-Žitnjak, Novi Zagreb-Istok, Novi Zagreb-Zapad, Trešnjevka-Sjever, Trešnjevka-Jug, Črnomerec, Gornja Dubrava, Donja Dubrava, Stenjevec, Podsused-Vrapče, Podsljeme, Sesvete, and Brezovica. These districts differ greatly from each other, not only in terms of their geographical position in relation to the centre and their number of inhabitants, but also in terms of their very specific features and physical characteristics, which are hard to compare with each other. Consequently, this is true when speaking of their symbolic potential as well.

The specific nature of the urban, historical and cultural features of the city's districts is generally recognisable to its inhabitants. There is a broad consensus that what is important for the identity of the whole city is to be found in the centre. This area includes: Donji Grad, Gornji Grad-Medveščak, and parts of Trnje and Maksimir. In terms of population and size, these districts are among the smallest: 3-15,000 km², with 37-50,000 inhabitants. In contrast, the largest districts, such as Novi Zagreb-Istok (65,000 inhabitants), Gornja Dubrava (61,300) and Sesvete (nearly 60,000) constitute units whose populations correspond to the size of medium-sized Croatian towns, but which very rarely represent areas of common cultural memory for all the inhabitants of Zagreb. The individuality of districts is evident in their population density. Novi Zagreb-Istok covers 16.5434 km², while Sesvete is 165.2547 km², i.e. it covers an area that is 10 times larger. It is inevitable that significant morphological and urbanistic differences should arise from such disproportions in population and area, as well as differences in the expectations and habits of urban life.

The City of Zagreb was established as a single administrative area in 1850 with the joining of Gradec and Kaptol. Zagreb's first suburbs soon appeared, spreading out radially until railway tracks were laid down on the southern outskirts of the city, which meant that further growth occurred to the east and west. Intensive urbanisation

četvrtima upućuju na svojevrsnu urbanu i socijalnu harmonizaciju grada. Nedvojbeno je da povijesna jezgra, najstariji dio grada iz predmodernizacijskih vremena, stagnira po svim pokazateljima, dok rubni dijelovi grada doživljavaju demografsku i graditeljsku ekspanziju. K tome, postoji i razlika u obrazovnoj strukturi, odnosno razini obrazovanja, ali prema svim ostalim pokazateljima socijalna slika gradskih četvrti prilično je ujednačena, pa su tako središnje zone i rubovi grada vrlo ujednačeni prema broju članova u obiteljima, kvadratnim metrima stambenog prostora, pa čak i po broju nezaposlenih. Ni u jednom od tih pokazatelja, naime, nema znatnijih odstupanja prema kojima bi se neka gradska četvrt bitno odvojila od prosječnih pokazatelja, a na što, vjerojatno, utječe i recesijska situacija u cijeloj Hrvatskoj.

Takva situacija donekle je evidentna u rezultatima istraživanja komunikacijske vizualizacije imena “Zagreb” koja je provedena za potrebe ove studije, i to u fizičkom te u virtualnom javnom prostoru. Pronađeni primjeri upućuju na raznolikost u pristupu komunikacije ideje o gradu Zagrebu, u cijelom rasponu: od službenih razina gradske uprave do posve neformalnih oblika komunikacije osobnih identiteta ili projekata. U cijeloj vertikali odnosa prema kolektivnom identitetu, komunikacija ne pokazuje postojanje hijerarhije odnosno vrijednosnog suda prema kojem bi se moglo razlikovati kvalitetu posredovanja ideje o Zagrebu. Ime Zagreb kao pojam posreduje se ili različitim oblicima predefinirane vizualne forme ili prilično jednostavnim razinama tipografskog uobličavanja, što upućuje na nedostatak kulture komunikacije, odnosno na nepostojanje svijesti o “alatima” za komuniciranje ideje o gradu. Uz to, grafičke forme koje prate takvu slovnu vizualizaciju imena nerijetko su semantička zbrka tradicijskih i suvremenih motiva i oblika u spoju koji gotovo nigdje ne upućuje na postojanje standarda u shvaćanju ideje o gradu. Najprisutniji je motiv u vizualizaciji imena grada interpretacija tradicionalnog motiva gradskih kula, preuzeta s povijesnog pečata.

towards the south took place after World War II. This was initially on the site of modern-day Vukovar Street and then on the right bank of the Sava. Intensive residential building of a newer character occurred on Podsljeme, which is still an area of elite, though often illegally constructed, individual buildings. What was once the eastern industrial zone of the city has become a business zone, as have the western parts of the city. Such urbanisation, which has transferred business functions from the city centre, requires an identity structure which is not monofunctional but which will allow meaningful and inspirational identity exchange. At present, in the formation of the city’s identity, the use of identity potentials is restricted to the centre of the city, while the majority of areas, which are dominant in terms of population numbers and area, do not exploit existing potentials or structure new identity systems.

Indicators from the Social Report of the City of Zagreb for 2008 for individual administrative districts point to the urban and social harmonisation of the city. Without doubt, according to all the indicators, the historic centre, the oldest part of the city, dating back to the pre-modern era, is stagnating, while the outskirts of the city are enjoying both a demographic and building expansion. There are also differences in educational structure, i.e. levels of education. However, according to all other indicators, the social picture of city districts is fairly uniform. For example, central districts and those on the outskirts are very uniform in terms of the number of family members, the size in square metres of living space, and even in terms of unemployment figures. There is no indicator where there is a significant divergence according to which any city district markedly differs from the average. This is probably influenced by the recession affecting the whole of Croatia.

This situation is evident from the results of research on communication of the visualisation of the name “Zagreb”, which was conducted for the purpose of this study in both physical and virtual locations. The examples found indicate the variety of approaches

MAPIRANJE IDENTITETSKE RAZMJENE PO 17 DIJELOVA GRADA

Za potrebe ove studije porovedeno je istraživanje identitetske razmjene između pojedinca/pojedinaca i skupina pojedinaca u relaciji prema ideji o gradu Zagrebu i to na dvije razine: dokumentiranjem komunikacije u javnom prostoru i provedenom anketom o stavovima građana tijekom veljače i ožujka 2010. na uzorku n=850. Po 50 osoba je anketirano u svakoj gradskoj četvrti.

Rezultati istraživanja komunikacije strukturirani su u 17 administrativnih gradskih četvrti i zajedno tvore elemente za identitetsku mapu suvremenog Zagreba. Određenu vrijednosnu dimenziju mapi daju i rezultati provedene ankete o stavovima građana po gradskim četvrtima u navedenom uzorku. Anketa je provedena metodom upitnika koji su ispitanici popunjavali.

Sumarni rezultati ankete su sljedeći za grad Zagreb ukupno:

1. Što je glavni simbol Zagreba?

☞ katedrala i stari grad	311 (36,59%)
☞ poslovni tornjevi	78 (9,17%)
☞ rijeka Sava i Medvednica	226 (26,59%)
☞ Majka božja od Kamenitih vrata	141 (16,59%)
☞ Dinamo	94 (11,06%)

2. Kako biste opisali Zagreb kao osobu?

☞ mlad i lijep	297 (34,94%)
☞ star i ružan	234 (27,53%)
☞ zreo i pametan	221 (26,00%)
☞ nezreo i naivan	98 (11,53%)

3. Što je najveća vrijednost Zagreba?

☞ neovisni hrvatski grad	273 (32,12%)
☞ kulturne vrijednosti	278 (32,71%)

to communicating ideas about the city of Zagreb. These span the whole range from the official levels of the city administration to completely informal means of communicating personal identities or projects. In the whole vertical structure of relationships towards a collective identity, the communication does not show the existence of a hierarchy or value judgements according to which it would be possible to differentiate the quality of mediating an idea about Zagreb. The name Zagreb as an idea communicates either a variety of predefined visual forms or somewhat simple levels of typographical shaping, which suggests the lack of a culture of communication or the non-existence of an awareness of the tools for communicating ideas about the city. In addition, the graphic forms associated with such literal visualisation of the name are often a semantically confused joining of traditional and contemporary motifs and forms that practically nowhere indicate the existence of a standard in comprehending an idea of the city. The most frequent motif in visualising the name of the city is the traditional one of the city castle taken from the historical seal.

MAPPING IDENTITY EXCHANGE FOR 17 CITY DISTRICTS

For the purpose of the study, research into identity exchange was carried out among individuals and groups of individuals in relation to ideas of the city of Zagreb. This took place at two levels: documentary communication in public locations and by conducting a survey of the attitudes of citizens during February and March 2010 using a sample of n=850. 50 people were surveyed in each city district.

The results of the research are structured in 17 administrative districts and together form the elements of an identity map of modern Zagreb. A particular valuable dimension is also given to the map by the results of the research conducted on the attitudes of citizens by administrative district in this

- ☞ sport 145 (17,06%)
- ☞ prirodne ljepote 154 (18,11%)

4. Jeste li zadovoljni životom u gradu?

- ☞ da, potpuno 394 (46,53%)
- ☞ uglavnom 274 (32,24%)
- ☞ ne 182 (21,41%)

5. Što biste promijenili u Zagrebu?

- ☞ promet i parking 258 (30,35%)
- ☞ odnos prema prirodi 257 (30,24%)
- ☞ vrijednost rada 210 (24,71%)
- ☞ zdravstvenu zaštitu 125 (14,70%)

ANALIZA

Istraživanje je imalo za cilj dokumentirati i analizirati stanje posredovanja identiteta u cijeloj zoni grada, u domeni javnog prostora, na razinama posredovanja službenog, neslužbenog, osobnog i skupnog identiteta i posebno relaciju identitetske razmjene između identiteta pojedinca i ideje o gradu.

Studija ima za cilj evidentirati semiotičke vrijednosti komuniciranja identiteta u prostoru grada, kako bi se ukazalo na neke konstante vizualnih formacija kojima se ti identiteti posreduju. Istraživanje je pošlo od podjele grada na zone u kojima se istraživalo, a kako bi se naposljetku došlo do mapiranja identitetske situacije u prostoru suvremenog grada Zagreba i kako bi se na taj način uspostavila njegova identitetska mapa. Dodatno je provedeno i anketno istraživanje, kako bi se utvrdili neki općeniti stavovi građana koji se mogu vezati uz identitet i njegovo poimanje, a u svrhu usporedbe sa stanjem komunikacije na terenu.

Time se stvaraju osnove za semantičku analizu situacije u stvarnosti života suvremenog grada.

sample. The survey was carried out by means of a questionnaire which the respondents completed.

The following is a summary of the results for the city of Zagreb as a whole:

1. What is the main symbol of the city of Zagreb?

- ☞ the cathedral and Old Town 311 (36.59%)
- ☞ business towers 78 (9.17%)
- ☞ the River Sava and Mount Medvednica 226 (26.59%)
- ☞ Mary, Mother of God of the Stone Gates 141 (16.59%)
- ☞ Dinamo 94 (11.06%)

2. If Zagreb were a person, how would you describe it?

- ☞ young and beautiful 297 (34.94%)
- ☞ old and ugly 234 (27.53%)
- ☞ mature and intelligent 221 (26.00%)
- ☞ immature and naive 98 (11.53%)

3. What is Zagreb's greatest value?

- ☞ its status as an independent Croatian city 273 (32.12%)
- ☞ its cultural worth 278 (32.71%)
- ☞ its sport 145 (17.06%)
- ☞ its natural beauty 154 (18.11%)

4. Are you satisfied with life in the city?

- ☞ yes, completely 394 (46.53%)
- ☞ on the whole 274 (32.24%)
- ☞ no 182 (21.41%)

5. What would you change in Zagreb?

- ☞ transport and parking 258 (30.35%)
- ☞ the relationship towards the environment 257 (30.24%)

Istraživanje je provedeno u nekoliko navrata na terenu neposrednim uvidom u pojedine zone i sondažnim uvidima u pojedine razine komunikacije. Tijekom nekoliko kampanja obilaska terena, odnosno prostora grada koji i jest žarište istraživačkog interesa, posebna je pozornost poklonjena posredovanju individualnih identiteta, odnosno vizualnim i verbalnim formacijama komunikacije koje nisu vezane uz službene razine uprave ili vlasti. Uz to, pozornost je poklonjena odnosu pojedinca prema zajednici i na razini komunalnog stanja.

Istraživanje prema prikupljenoj dokumentaciji na terenu upućuje na sljedeće zaključke:

1. Ne postoji ni jedna izdvojena cjelina u gradu koja bi se razinom komuniciranja odnosno posredovanja identiteta izdvojila od ostalih. Čak i u historijskom središtu grada, koje zauzima posebno topografsko i simboličko mjesto u životu grada, danas je posredovanje identiteta posve identično onome kakvo se zbiva u drugim zonama, pa i na periferiji grada. Je li riječ o trendu “periferijskog pulsa u srcu grada” ili pak o homogenizaciji gradskog identiteta širenjem utjecaja središnje pozicije gradske jezgre, može se tek pretpostavljati, ali dokumentirana situacija govori u prilog prvog trenda.

2. Posredovanje identiteta u svim dijelovima grada zasnovano je na sljedećim motivacijskim konstantama: isticanje pojedinca u svrhe poduzetničkih poduhvata različitih dimenzija (proizvodne, uslužne i turističke djelatnosti), posredovanje ideje nacionalnog identiteta, posredovanje pripadnosti gradskoj četvrti, komunalno uređenje planiranih i neplaniranih prostora za sportsku uporabu (dominantno – nogomet), komuniciranje pripadnosti gradu (vezano uglavnom uz sport, odnosno nogomet) i komuniciranje privatnih poruka. Korištenje urbane infrastrukture u procesu posredovanja identiteta uglavnom svjedoči o više ili manje nasilnom ulasku pojedinačnih identiteta u skupni identitet, koji je prethodno projiciran, odlukom grada u neki njegov dio.

☞ the value attached to work	210 (24.71%)
☞ health care	125 (14.70%)

ANALYSIS

The research aimed to document and analyse the mediation of identity in the whole area of the city, in the domain of public space, at the level of mediation of official, unofficial, personal and group identity and particularly the identity exchange relationship between the identity of the individual and ideas about the city.

The study aims to record semiotic values of communicating identity in the area of the city to show certain constants in visual formations by means of which this identity is mediated. The research started by dividing the city into zones in which the research was carried out in order to finally arrive at a mapping of the identity situation in the area of the modern city of Zagreb and in this way establish its identity map. In addition, a survey was conducted to identify certain general attitudes of citizens concerning identity and its conceptualisation for the purpose of comparison with the communication situation on the ground.

Therefore the foundations were established for a semantic analysis of the situation based on the reality of life in the modern city.

The research was conducted directly on several occasions in the field in different areas and also thorough examining different levels of communication. During several field campaigns in the area of the city, which was the focal area of research interest, particular attention was paid to the mediation of individual identities, i.e. visual and verbal formations of communication which were not connected with official levels of authority. In addition, attention was paid to the relationship between the individual and the community, and also at the level of the communal situation.

3. Komunikacijske konstante koje se koriste na svim razinama mogu se klasificirati kao semiotički hibridi, odnosno uglavnom se koriste semiotički amalgami lokalnih i općih (preuzetih) idioma, odnosno koristi se mješavina tradicionalno ukorijenjenih predodžbi i masovne kulture medijskog tipa. Jedini izuzetak od tog dominirajućeg modela komunikacije jest posredovanje ideje nacionalnog identiteta u kojem se variraju vizualni elementi nacionalnog grba ili pak ističu slike pojedinaca vezane uz problematiku percepcije ratnih zbivanja. Takve komunikacijske konstante upućuju na posebnosti rituala identifikacije pojedinca i zajednice, koje se mogu klasificirati kao dva tipa. Za razmjenu pojedinačnog za kolektivni identitet koriste se simbolička sredstva koja: a) ispunjavaju značenjem grafičku formu kao simbol za sve ili b) šire značenjsko polje lika pojedinca kao simbola svih.

4. Takva semiotička situacija, odnosno identitetska mapa grada Zagreba, upućuje na intenzivne modernizacijske (ekonomske, ideologijske i demografske) procese, odnosno upućuje na činjenicu da se Zagreb još uvijek dinamično ali i kaotično te prilično neplanski urbanizira, što je evidentno kroz terenski obilazak grada. Taj proces pouzdano se može povezati s tranzicijom društvenog konteksta, koja je potakla velike funkcionalne i fizičke promjene u strukturi i sadržaju grada. Te promjene mogu se registrirati i na simboličkoj razini, jer danas u samom gradu vide tek rijetki ostaci kulture kakva je u Zagrebu postojala do 1990.

5. Istovremeno, posljedice gospodarske “pretvorbe” vidljive su u identitetu velikih dijelova prostora grada koji su: a) ispražnjeni od funkcije, b) promijenili su funkciju ili c) tek čekaju prenamjenu. Ta posebna dinamika stanja “ne više ali i ne još” na neposrednoj razini djeluje na život ljudi, pa tako i na razini na kojoj posreduju vlastiti identitet u prostoru grada. Stoga su semiotički hibridi u komunikaciji uronjeni u fluidno stanje urbane promjene,

Research based on the documentation gathered in the field leads to the following conclusions:

1. There is no part of the city which in terms of communicating or mediating identity can be isolated from the others. Even in the historic centre of the city, which occupies a special topographical and symbolic place in the life of the city today, the mediation of identity is completely identical to that which occurs in other areas, including on the outskirts of the city. Is the trend that of the pulse of the outskirts being felt in the heart of the city or is it a question of the homogenisation of city identity through the spreading influence of the centre of the city? The documentary evidence suggests that it is the result of the first trend.

2. The mediation of identity in all parts of the city is based on the following motivational constants: the emphasis on the individual for the purpose of business enterprises of various types (manufacturing, services and tourism activities); mediation of the idea of national identity; mediation of belonging to a city district; the communal organisation of space planned and unplanned for the use of sport (predominantly football); communication of belonging to the city (generally concerned with sport, especially football); the communication of private messages. The use of urban infrastructure in the process of mediating identity generally testifies to the more or less violent entrance of different identities into the group identity that had previously been projected by a decision of the city regarding its particular parts.

3. The communication constants that are used at all levels can be classified as semiotic hybrids. They generally use semiotic amalgams of local and general (assumed) idioms or a mixture of traditionally rooted imagery and mass culture of the media kind. The only exception to this dominant model of communication is the mediation of the idea of national identity in which there is the visual element of the national coat of arms or the image of the individual connected with the problem of perception of events in the

odnosno u kontekst koji se može nazvati “tranzicija kao stanje”.

6. Posredovanje individualnih identiteta u prostoru grada zbiva se i na podlozi komunikacije komercijalnog tipa, kojom korporacije na službenim mjestima oglašavaju svoje proizvode, a posebno na prometnim pravicima i u blizini novih trgovačkih centara kao novih žarišta urbane dinamike. Kontekstualiziranje semiotičkih vrijednosti individualnih identiteta u takvom okviru poprima posebnu vrijednost, jer se jasnije očitava posebnost lokalnog idioma kulture komuniciranja u odnosu na opći standard komunikacije komercijalnog tipa.

Semiotički hibridi posredovanja individualnih identiteta u prostoru grada karakteristični su za cijeli grad, koji prolazi kroz dinamičnu fazu tranzicije. Utoliko se treba upitati bi li i kako jedan sustavno promišljen i kvalitetno implementiran sustav komunikacije – program stvaranja identitetskog sustava (*brenda*) grada Zagreba – mogao biti jednako prihvaćen u svim dijelovima grada kao alat identifikacije pojedinca i skupina pojedinaca s idejom o zajednici/gradu.

ANALIZA POVIJESNIH SLOJEVA IDENTITETA

Povijesni slojevi identiteta grada Zagreba mogu se pojednostavnjeno podijeliti na dvije razine, povijesno naslijeđe i naslijeđe modernosti. Te su dvije komponente važne jer jedna utječe na razumijevanje i interpretaciju druge, odnosno u rezultanti tih dvaju razina stvaraju se identifikatori zajednice zvane Zagreb danas.

Općenito se može reći da se stanovnici Zagreba rado i u velikom postotku identificiraju s predodžbom o gradu kao povijesnom središtu, čak i ako ne znaju dostatno informacija o pravom povijesno dokumentiranom karakteru te središnjosti. Bez obzira na utemeljenost takve identifikacije, koja je emocionalna prije nego objektivna, to je realan resurs s kojim valja računati

war. Such communication constants indicate the importance of rituals identifying the individual and community. These can be classified into two types. To exchange the individual for collective identity, symbolic means are used which: a) charge with meaning a graphic form that acts as a symbol for all or b) spread the field of significance of an individual character as a symbol for all.

4. Such a semiotic situation and identity map of Zagreb indicates intensive modernisation processes (economic, ideological and demographic) and the fact that Zagreb is still dynamically, but also chaotically, urbanising in a somewhat unplanned manner, which is evident from a field trip in the city. This process can be reliably connected with the transition of the social context which brought about great functional and physical changes in the structure and facilities of the city. These changes can be registered at the symbolic level, because the remains of the culture that existed in Zagreb before 1990 can rarely be seen in the city itself today.

5. At the same time, the consequences of the economic transformation are visible in the identity of large parts of areas of the city which are: a) devoid of function; b) have changed their function; c) still awaiting development. This particular dynamic of the state of “no more but not yet” directly operates at the level of people’s lives and also at the level which mediates identity in the area of the city. Consequently, the semiotic hybrids in communication are immersed in a fluid state of urban change in a context that can be called “transition as a state”.

6. The mediation of individual identities in the area of the city also takes place on the basis of communication of the commercial type by which companies advertise their products in official places, especially on transport routes and in the vicinity of new shopping centres, which serve as the new focal points of the urban dynamic. The contextualisation of semiotic values of individual identities in such a framework assumes particular value because it more clearly outlines the

u svakom ozbiljnijem pokušaju promišljanja projektiranja identiteta grada Zagreba.

K tome, te se povijesne vrijednosti vrlo često koriste u turističkoj promociji, pa se pojam “Zagreb” svodi samo na predmodernu središte i moderni grad, dok se o ostalim dijelovima grada nerado govori, a još ih se rjeđe pokazuje. Mora li biti tako? Valja imati na umu da i neki još donedavno rubni dijelovi grada već imaju svoju povijesnu dimenziju (primjerice, nekad novi dijelovi grada nastali pedesetih i šezdesetih godina), dok su neki drugi dijelovi (Trešnjevka, sjeverna rezidencijalna zona) vjerojatno izgubljeni za svaki identitetski projektni program uslijed tranzicijske devastacije prostora nekontroliranom izgradnjom.

Povijesni prijelaz od predmodernog u moderno doba grada Zagreba označen je širenjem gradske strukture, koja je uvijek reflektirala određeni identitetski program. Što je taj program danas? Ukoliko postoji, je li jasno prepoznat ili čak formuliran? Kultura je na horizontu moderne epohe prepoznata kao identifikator čak i programa nacionalnog oslobodjenja. Kakvu poziciju ima kultura danas?

Sagledavanje povijesnih elemenata identiteta grada pokazuje da Zagreb teško može izdržati usporedbu na razini pojedinačnih posebnosti (zgrade, proizvodi, ljudi, događaji...) već i s najbližim urbanim okruženjem (Budimpešta, Beč, Prag, Graz...), ali ono što ga čini svakako posebnim, drukčijim, pa time i prepoznatljivim, jesu ambijenti u kojima se pretapa (ne uvijek najsretnije, ali i to je posebnost) tradicijsko i moderno, potom su to različiti oblici društvenih rituala koji se upražnjavaju ili u tim ambijentima ili pak u prirodi, koja je važan identifikator Zagreba. Naposlijetku, kulturne manifestacije tvore suvremeni horizont interpretacije prirodne i kulturne baštine.

Sve to skupa, samo zajedno, može poslužiti kao platforma za projektirano stvaranje i održavanje identitetskog sustava grada Zagreba. Zagreb nema

importance of the local idiom of the culture of communication in relation to the general standard of communication of the commercial kind.

Semiotic hybrids of mediating individual identities in the area of the city are typical of cities that are passing through the dynamic phase of transition. It should be asked whether a systematically well thought out and well implemented system of communication (a programme to create an identity system (brand) for the city of Zagreb) could be uniformly accepted in all parts of the city as a tool of identification of individuals and groups of individuals with ideas about their community/city.

ANALYSIS OF THE HISTORICAL LAYERS OF IDENTITY

The historical layers of the city of Zagreb can be simply divided into two: historical tradition and the tradition of modernity. These two components are important because one influences the understanding and interpretation of the other, as the product of these two layers creates the identifiers of the community known as Zagreb today.

On the whole, it can be said that the inhabitants of Zagreb readily and to a large degree identify with the image of the city as a historical centre, even if they do not have sufficient information on the real historical and documented character of that centre. Regardless of the foundations of such identification, which are emotional rather than objective, it is a real resource which should be taken into account in any serious attempt to consider designing an identity for the city of Zagreb.

As a result, this historical value is frequently used in tourist promotion and the idea of ‘Zagreb’ is reduced to just its pre-modern centre and the modern city, while the other parts of the city are not so readily referred to and far less frequently shown. Does it have to be so? It is worth bearing in mind that certain parts of the city that until recently were on the outskirts already have their own

istaknutih pojedinačnosti, ali u sustavu međuodnosa može se graditi prepoznatljiva razumljivost značenja.

VREDNOVANJE IDENTITETSKE MAPE

Za potrebe studije provedeno je istraživanje komunikacije u prostoru grada te su istraženi stavovi građana o identitetskim vrijednostima. Dokumentiranje komunikacije te analiza stavova građana zajedno tvore virtualnu identitetsku mapu suvremenog grada, odnosno topografski lociraju ideje o zajednici i vrijednost tih ideja.

Iz prikupljenog materijala vrlo je jasno da je grad Zagreb još uvijek prilično neuređen, čak i zapušten grad, kako na razini javnog prostora, tako i privatnog. Ta se činjenica iskazuje kroz stvarno stanje fizičkog prostora, ali i kroz simboličku razinu komunikacije ideje o gradu.

Istovremeno, istraženi stavovi građana o identitetu grada Zagreba pokazuju veliku razinu identifikacije, posebno s povijesnim slojevima identiteta grada i s prirodnom baštinom grada. Ideja o kulturi kao identitetu najprije se manifestira kao predmoderni kulturni sloj, rijetko kao naslijeđe modernosti. Ideja o “starom” koje je dobro i vrijedno ukupno nadilazi ideju o “novom”.

Stoga postoji određeni jaz između očitih pozitivnih izraza ideje o pripadnosti zajednici te identitetu te zajednice prema stvarnom stanju fizičkog prostora i stanju komunikacije u tom prostoru. Taj jaz upućuje na određenu socijalnu problematiku, ali i na prostor za unaprjeđenje kvalitete identitetskih programa za grad Zagreb.

Pritom je ključna činjenica da u osnovi ne postoje razlike između stanja prostora i stavova građana u središtu grada i na periferiji, što je fenomen već uočen i u istraživanju identiteta nekih drugih hrvatskih gradova. Mapiranje tog stanja kroz dokumentiranje komunikacije i analizu stavova građana upućuje na tipično tranzicijsku nivelaciju

historical dimension (for example, the once new parts of the city that came into existence in the 1950s and '60s), while some other areas (Trešnjevka, the northern residential zone) have probably become lost to any identity design programme as a result of the transitional devastation of the area through uncontrolled construction work.

The transformation from the pre-modern to the modern era of the city of Zagreb is signified by the expansion of the structure of the city, which has always reflected a specific identity programme. What is that programme today? If it exists, is it clearly recognisable or even formulated? Culture on the horizon of the modern era is recognised as an identifier even in programmes of national liberation. What kind of position does culture occupy today?

An examination of the historical elements of the identity of the city shows that it is hard for Zagreb to compete at the level of individual attractions (buildings, produce, people, events) with its nearest urban neighbours (Budapest, Vienna, Prague, Graz). However, what it does have that certainly makes it distinctive and so recognisable is its ambiances which blend (not always in the happiest way, but even that is distinctive) the traditional and the modern. Then there are the different forms of social ritual which are practised in these ambiances or even in the natural environment that is such an important identifier of Zagreb. After all, cultural events are the horizon of interpretation of natural and cultural heritage.

All this, but only together, can serve as a platform to design, create and maintain an identity system for the city of Zagreb. Zagreb does not have any outstanding unique feature, but within a system of interrelationships it is possible to engineer a recognisable intelligibility of meaning.

EVALUATING THE IDENTITY MAP

For the purpose of this study, research was carried out on communication in the area of the city and

shvaćanja i prakticanja identiteta zajednice zvane “Zagreb”.

Čak i na razini označavanja različitih vrsta osobnih ili kolektivnih programa koji nose ime grada, postoji vrlo raznolik pristup označitelju, pa dakle i označenom, što upućuje i na razlike u shvaćanju identiteta grada. Te razlike, međutim, nije moguće strukturirano mapirati po pojedinim četvrtima grada jer su svugdje prisutne.

Drugim riječima, centralnost i periferijske pozicije u gradu Zagrebu nije moguće evidentirati na razini istraživanja identiteta, jer je u svim dijelovima grada jednako stanje prostora i komunikacije.

ANALIZA IDENTITETSKE RAZMJENE

Iz ujednačene strukture identitetske mape, u kojoj ne postoji centralnost ni periferijske zone, proizlaze i temeljne vrijednosti identitetske razmjene između pojedinca (pojedina) i ideje o gradu.

Očita je različitost doživljaja identiteta grada, pa time i različitost načina u njegovom označavanju od strane pojedinaca. S druge strane, ni gradska uprava nema jedinstven pristup u oblikovanju programa, kako na razini oblikovanja prostora tako i na razini oblikovanja simboličkih struktura koje bi pomogle identitetsku razmjenu.

Stavovi stanovnika grada, dakako, razlikuju se međusobno, ali takvu danu situaciju upravo bi uprava grada mogla ili morala pomagati ujednačavati.

U Zagrebu se to ne događa, odnosno događa se sporadično, bez strategijskog plana, izvan utvrđenog niza pravila i bez koordinacije pojedinih segmenata uprave. To je očito kako u oblikovanju prostora – u cijelom rasponu od urbane opreme do simboličkog označavanja – tako i u izostanku cjelovitih programa koji bi povezivali pojedine “resore”, primjerice turizam i

the attitudes of citizens towards identity values. Documentation of communication and analysis of citizens’ attitudes jointly create a virtual identity map of the modern city and topographically locate ideas about community and the value of these ideas.

From the material gathered, it is very clear that the city of Zagreb is still a rather disorganised and even run-down city, both in terms of public and private space. This fact can be seen in the real state of physical space in the city but also at the symbolic level of communication of ideas about the city.

At the same time, the research into the attitudes of citizens about the identity of the city of Zagreb shows a high degree of identification, especially with the historical layers of the city’s identity and with its natural heritage. The idea of culture as identity is primarily manifested as the pre-modern cultural layer, and only rarely as the consequence of modernity. The idea of the old as something good and valuable supersedes the idea of the new.

Consequently, there exists a definite gap between the clear positive expressions of the idea of belonging to the community and the identity of that community in terms of the real state of the physical space and state of communication in that space. This gap indicates a definite social problem but also the opportunity to develop a quality identity programme for the city of Zagreb.

The key fact is that there is basically no difference between the state of the location and the attitudes of citizens in the centre of the city and on the outskirts, which is a phenomenon that has already been observed in research on the identities of certain other Croatian towns. Mapping this situation by documenting communication and analysing the attitudes of citizens reveals a characteristic transitional levelling of the understanding and practice of identity of the community called “Zagreb”.

At the level of identifying the different types of personal and collective programmes that carry the

gospodarstvo, kulturu i *business*, obrazovanje i javnost...

Iako se većina ispitanih u istraživanju slaže oko pozitivnog stava o gradu, posebno oko nacionalnog karaktera njegova identiteta, ta se pozitivnost, međutim, rjeđe sreće u odnosu prema javnom (zajedničkom!) prostoru. Očito je to u odnosu prema zajedničkim dobrima u tom prostoru, koji je nerijetko destruktivan.

Na formalnoj razini, dakle, stanovnici Zagreba deklarativno se izražavaju kao poštovatelji i čuvari identiteta, no u stvarnosti svakodnevno odnos prema materijalnim manifestacijama tog identiteta često ih demantira.

ZAKLJUČAK

Suvremeni Zagreb nasljeđuje složenu kulturno-povijesnu situaciju, materijaliziranu u kulturnim spomenicima. Uz to, grad prolazi kroz intenzivnu fazu urbanih i demografskih mijena, koje se zbivaju kao svojevrsna ekstenzija konteksta u kojem grad egzistira: prirodna baština jest fizički i semiotički okvir na koji se stanovnici često pozivaju ali ga često i opovrgavaju njegovim zloupotrebavanjem.

Dinamična tranzicija grada komunicira na razini semiotičkih hibrida kojima se identitetska razmjena pojedinačnih identiteta s idejom o zajednici/gradu. Hibridi su sastavljeni od elemenata različitog porijekla, čija uporaba kroz prenamjenu u novom kontekstu svjedoči o tome kako populacija grada participira u kontekstu globalne tranzicije, ali korištenjem semantičkih elemenata u lokalnom kontekstu. Komunikacijski elementi koji se preuzimaju iz masovnih medija adaptiraju se za lokalne potrebe, pa time svjedoče o informacijskoj uključenosti stanovnika grada u globalne komunikacijske mreže.

S obzirom na to, može se istaknuti činjenica da je na općenitoj razini identitetska razmjena u Zagrebu obilježena relacijom dviju komponenti: a)

name of the city, there is a very varied approach to the signifier and thus also to the signified, which suggests differences in understanding the identity of the city. These differences, however, cannot be structurally mapped according to individual city districts because they are present everywhere.

In other words, centrality and peripheral positions in the city of Zagreb cannot be recorded at the level of researching identity because in all parts of the city there is no difference between the state of the location and the communication.

ANALYSIS OF IDENTITY EXCHANGE

Out of this uniform structure of an identity map in which there is neither centrality nor peripheral zones, fundamental values arise concerning the identity exchange between individuals and ideas of the city.

It is clear that there is diversity as far as the city's identity is concerned and consequently a diversity in the way it is identified on the part of individuals. On the other hand, the city authorities do not have a single approach to the forming of programmes, either at the level of shaping space or at the level of forming symbolic structures that could help in identity exchange.

The attitudes of the city's inhabitants naturally differ. However, the city administration could, or rather should, help to make the situation more uniform.

In Zagreb, this does not happen or it happens only sporadically, without any strategic plan, outside the established series of rules and without the coordination of the individual segments of the city administration. This is particularly the case in the shaping of space (from urban architecture to symbolic identification) and also in the absence of complete programmes that would connect individual resources, such as tourism and the economy, culture and business, education of the public, etc.

lokalnom tradicijski uvjetovanom društvenom sredinom koja ima izraženu potrebu za predmodernim simboličkim vizualnim naslijeđem kao sredstvom za posredovanje identiteta i b) komunikacijskom razinom koja informacijske elemente povlači iz globalne masovne kulture.

BILJEŠKE

¹ Podaci preuzeti iz Statističkog ljetopisa grada Zagreba 2009.

² Izvor: Gradski ured za stratezijsko planiranje i razvoj Grada – Odjel za statistiku, HGK-Komora Zagreb

³ Podaci za 2008. godinu preuzeti iz Statističkog ljetopisa grada Zagreba 2009.

⁴ Izvor: <http://www.ljubljana.si/en/about-ljubljana>

⁵ Izvor: <http://www.graz.at>

⁶ Izvor: <http://www.wien.gv.at/statistik/pdf/wirtschaftsstandort-09.pdf>

⁷ Izvor: <http://www.wien.gv.at>

⁸ Izvor: <http://www.budapest.com>

⁹ Izvor: <http://www.prague.com>

¹⁰ Izvor: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_PUBLIC/1-17112003-AP/EN/1-17112003-AP-EN.HTML

¹¹ Izvor: <http://www.simplyhired.com/a/local-jobs/city/1-Prague,+OK>

¹² Izvor: http://kultura.praha-mesto.cz/files/=65317/statistika_kultury_2007en.pdf

¹³ Izvor: <http://www.sarajevo.ba/ba/stream.php?kat=423>

¹⁴ Izvor: Hot Spots in CEE, The Roland Berger city ranking survey 2009.

¹⁵ Statistički ljetopis Grada Zagreba 2009.

Although the majority of those surveyed for the research agreed on the positive aspects of the city, especially on the national character of its identity, this positive view is encountered less frequently in relation to public (common) space. It is clear that the relationship between this space and the common good is often a destructive one.

At the formal level, the inhabitants of Zagreb declare themselves to be the respecters and guardians of identity. However, in everyday reality, their relationship towards the material manifestations of this identity contradict this.

CONCLUSION

Modern Zagreb has inherited a complex socio-cultural situation materialised in cultural monuments. In addition, the city has passed through an intensive phase of urban and demographic change which has taken place as a kind of extension of the context in which the city exists. Natural heritage is the physical and semiotic framework to which inhabitants often refer, although they often deny that it is abused.

The dynamic transition of the city communicates at the level of semiotic hybrids through which the identity exchange of different identities with the idea of the community/city takes place. Hybrids comprise elements of different origin whose use through conversion into new contexts testifies to how the population of the city participates in the context of global transition, but through the use of semantic elements in a local context. Communication elements which are taken from the mass media are adapted for local needs and so bear witness to the informational inclusion of the inhabitants of the city in the global communication network.

Given this situation, it should be emphasised that, at the general level, identity exchange in Zagreb is characterised by the relationship of two components: a) a local traditional conditioned

social environment that has an expressed need for pre-modern symbolic visual heritage as a means of mediating identity; b) a communication layer that draws on information elements from global mass culture.

REFERENCES

- ¹ Statistics taken from the Statistical Yearbook of the City of Zagreb 2009
- ² Source: City Office for Strategic Planning and the Development of the City – Department for Statistics, Croatian Chamber of Economy, Zagreb
- ³ Statistics for 2008 are taken from the Statistical Yearbook of the City of Zagreb 2009
- ⁴ Source: <http://www.ljubljana.si/en/about-ljubljana>
- ⁵ Source: <http://www.graz.at>
- ⁶ Source: <http://www.wien.gv.at/statistik/pdf/wirtschaftsstandort-09.pdf>
- ⁷ Source: <http://www.wien.gv.at>
- ⁸ Source: <http://www.budapest.com>
- ⁹ Source: <http://www.prague.com>
- ¹⁰ Source: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_PUBLIC/1-17112003-AP/EN/1-17112003-AP-EN.HTML
- ¹¹ Source: <http://www.simplyhired.com/a/local-jobs/city/l-Prague,+OK>
- ¹² Source: http://kultura.praha-mesto.cz/files/=65317/statistika_kultury_2007en.pdf
- ¹³ Source: <http://www.sarajevo.ba/ba/stream.php?kat=423>
- ¹⁴ Source: Hot Spots in CEE, the Roland Berger City Ranking Survey 2009
- ¹⁵ Statistical Yearbook of the City of Zagreb 2009

LITERATURA I IZVORI / LITERATURE AND SOURCES

Zagreb

Statistički ljetopis grada Zagreba 2009,
<http://www1.zagreb.hr/zgstat/documents/Ljetopis%202009/STATISTICKI%20LJETOPIS%202009.pdf>

Državni zavod za statistiku; <http://www.dzs.hr/>

Hrvatska gospodarska komora; BDP/stanovniku; http://www.zg.hgk.hr/zaposlenost_demografski_trendovi_bdp.html

Ministarstvo kulture; Registar kulturnih dobara RH - kulturna dobra na području grada Zagreba – molba za ustupanjem podataka iz Registra (Klasa: 612-08/1 0-12/0554, Ur. broj: 532-04-0 1-1/4-10-2)

Sarajevo

Statistički godišnjak/ljetopis federacije Bosne i Hercegovine 2009, Sarajevo 2009; <http://www.fzs.ba/god.htm>

Bih Agencija za statistiku, Priopćenje; Prosječne neto isplaćene plaće u 2009. godini; http://www.bhas.ba/Arhiva/2009/Sao/NPL_2009Q2_001_01_HR.pdf

Službene stranice grada Sarajeva; Površina; <http://www.sarajevo.ba/ba/stream.php?kat=31>

Beograd

Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia: Census of population, Households and Dwellings 2002, National or Ethnic Affiliation, Belgrade 2003

Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia: Census of population, Households and Dwellings 2002, Educational attainment and literacy, Belgrade 2003

Ljubljana

Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia;
<http://www.stat.si/>,
http://www.stat.si/letopis/2009/31_09/31-07-09.htm

Beč/Graz

Statistisches Jahrbuch Österreichs 2010; http://www.statistik.at/web_de/services/stat_jahrbuch/index.html

Statistics Austria; Gross regional product 1995-2007 by NUTS 3 region: absolute and per capita;
http://www.statistik.at/web_en/statistics/national_accounts/regional_accounts/nuts3-regional_gdp_and_main_aggregates/index.html

Budimpešta

Hungary Statistical Office; Average monthly gross earnings of employees

http://portal.ksh.hu/pls/ksh/docs/eng/xstadat/xstadat_annual/tabl6_02_01_11ie.html

Prag

Statistical yearbook of Prague 2008.;
<http://www.czso.cz/xa/edicniplan.nsf/p/101011-09>

Eurostat

Eurostat; City statistics, Urban audit data collections, key indicators for core cities

(Registration; username:andrea.mrkobrad@gmail.com; password: andrea)

http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/region_cities/city_urban/data_cities/tables_sub1