

# FARMERS' MARKETS AS INTANGIBLE HERITAGE

## An Identity Resource and/or Renewable Economic Resource

Ana-Marija Vukušić

Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research, Zagreb

This article analyses the proposal to include trading at farmers' markets as an element of intangible cultural heritage in the Register of Cultural Goods of the Republic of Croatia. The first part outlines the broader context of how the idea of nomination came about, along with a re-examination of how the public perceives the term *heritage* in Croatia, and the elements by which farmers' markets – the perception of which has an unavoidable material aspect (space, goods, money) – are recognized as intangible heritage. This is followed by a critical look at the central points of *inclusivity* in the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage: the variety of ways in which heritage can exist and the forms through which it can manifest itself, as well as the central role this document assigns to communities as the creators and guardians of heritage. Based on this, the last part consists of an analysis of the application for including trading at farmers' markets in the national list. This analysis is focused on the issue of the community and its representation, i.e. the issue of the repercussions that obtaining heritage status can have on communities and culture, primarily in light of the proposed "safeguarding measures".

Keywords: farmers' markets, intangible heritage, UNESCO, community

In the summer of 2013, one of the issues which managed to divert at least some of the media attention from the celebratory atmosphere surrounding the Republic of Croatia's accession to the European Union, was a protest organized by (some of) the vendors from the farmers' markets regarding the adoption of the Cash Transaction Fiscalization Act (Zakon 2012). This act, according to the minister of economy at the time, was adopted to establish control over the origin of goods, cash transactions, the legality of employment, etc.<sup>1</sup> One of its requirements is for fiscal cash registers to be used by anyone selling agricultural products at farmers' markets that they had not produced themselves.<sup>2</sup> Since the public perception of the fiscalization of farmers' markets was primarily based on a belief that it was meant to "drive smugglers away from farmers' markets [and] collect tax on goods sold" (Šimić 2014), the protesters tried to dispel the notion that they were protesting only to avoid paying taxes. They emphasized that they wanted to "contribute to their country by paying

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.index.hr/vijesti/clanak/strajk-zbog-fiskalizacije-na-trznicama-se-nastavlja/686524.aspx#lightbox\[galerija\]/7/](https://www.index.hr/vijesti/clanak/strajk-zbog-fiskalizacije-na-trznicama-se-nastavlja/686524.aspx#lightbox[galerija]/7/) (accessed 20. 9. 2018).

<sup>2</sup> The exemption from using fiscal cash registers at farmers' markets largely applies to producers with registered family farms (*obiteljsko poljoprivredno gospodarstvo*, OPG), since it is assumed they sell products they have grown themselves.

taxes and to do their part for its well-being”<sup>3</sup>, but that the proposed model of fiscalization was not appropriate for doing business through farmers' markets, and that a more acceptable solution ought to be found.<sup>4</sup> Leaders of the Association of Croatian Farmers' Markets (*Udruga hrvatskih tržnica*) and Zagreb Farmers' Markets (*Tržnice Zagreb*), voiced their support for the protesters.<sup>5</sup>

Among the statements quoted by the media, one of the most striking was by the spokesman for Zagreb Farmers' Markets. He briefly presented the essence of the problems and fears troubling the vendors, which they themselves pointed to in their appearances in the media and in some of the messages written on their placards.<sup>6</sup> Appealing to the authorities to exempt farmers' markets from the fiscalization process, the spokesman pointed out that if carried out, this process “could destroy many things, but would bring few profits”, and that vendors “will end up unemployed and on welfare”. He further argued the need for this exemption by pointing out that “the tradition of shopping” in open spaces had been present in Dalmatia for two thousand years and in Zagreb since 1242 and Béla IV's Golden Bull. Finally, he concluded that, “the instrument of globalization should not be used on the old man because it could kill him” (Polšak Platinuš 2013). The farmers' markets being symbolized as a long-lived old man able to preserve his vitality despite the changing social, economic, and political contexts, and the opinion that the Fiscalization Act as the instrument responsible for his demise would be a by-product of globalization are highly reminiscent of the key elements of the dominant stances on safeguarding heritage, which largely rely on UNESCO's Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (Convention 2003).<sup>7</sup> In this document (parts of which will be discussed later on), globalization is seen as the starting point for a series of processes that can lead “to grave threats of deterioration, disappearance and destruction of the intangible cultural heritage” (Convention 2003, Preamble).

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.tportal.hr/vijesti/clanak/ovo-nije-prosvjed-protiv-poreza-vec-rat-protiv-strojeva-20130702/print> (accessed 18. 1. 2018).

<sup>4</sup> The problems they mentioned included, for example, the lack of (necessary) computer literacy among the majority of the vendors, the added financial burden (obtaining the registers), the issue of whether the registers would be affected by weather conditions (the very high and low temperatures in which vendors have to work) as well as the fear that introducing registers would end the particular kind of communication between vendors and customers (bargaining, price changes during the day, etc.) (<http://www.politikaplus.com/novost/81912/revoltirane-kumice-hrvatske-trznice-opustjele-tijekom-strajka-zbog-fiskalizacije>; <https://www.vecernji.hr/vijesti/fiskalizacija-na-trznici-prodaja-bez-racuna-raskidi-ugovora-strajk-578018>, accessed 18. 1. 2018).

<sup>5</sup> The Association of Croatian Farmers' Markets is an organisation which aims to make farmers' markets the central place for buying fresh, locally-grown food (Statut 2015, Article 8). I will discuss one of the ways in which the association carries out its activities in a later segment. Zagreb Farmers' Markets is a company which focuses on organising the sale of foodstuffs in open spaces within the city of Zagreb (<http://www.trznice-zg.hr/default.aspx?id=7>, accessed 18. 1. 2018).

<sup>6</sup> For example, “Fiscalization – Loss of Jobs – Businesses Closing” (<https://www.vecernji.hr/vijesti/fiskalizacija-na-trznici-prodaja-bez-racuna-raskidi-ugovora-strajk-578018>, accessed 18. 1. 2018), “We work from 3 a.m. to 6 p.m. to feed our families” (<http://www.poslovi.hr/hrvatska/hus-pozvao-splicane-na-prosvjed-protiv-fiskalizacije-246437/multimedia/p0>, accessed 18. 1. 2018), “Considering the opinions of the little guy – that is democracy” (<http://www.soundset.hr/vijesti/zagreb-i-okolica/novi-prosvjed-protiv-fiskalizacije-na-dolcu>, accessed 18. 1. 2018), “We work at +40 and -10 degrees, without air conditioning, and in the wind and rain” (<http://www.novolist.hr/Vijesti/Hrvatska/Prodavaci-na-trznicama-u-Rijeci-Splitu-i-Zagrebu-strajkaju-zbog-fiskalizacije>, accessed 18. 1. 2018), etc.

<sup>7</sup> Croatia ratified the convention in 2005.

No explicit connection between farmers' markets and the concept of intangible cultural heritage can be found in the spokesman's statement or in most of the other statements recorded during the protests. However, according to the convention, intangible cultural heritage is heritage that is "transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity [...]" (Convention 2003, Art. 2.1). Considering this, an implicit connection (*transmitting, response to the environment, continuity*) can be found in the fact that the protesters' messages were riddled with references to the idea that farmers' markets were intertwined with everyday life, that many people depended on them for survival (as both vendors and customers), and that for many, they were both a "need" and a "calling" often taken up as family tradition. It was also emphasized that the continuity of the business model (cash transactions without a receipt) used at farmers' markets was a direct demonstration of its suitability. It is believed that abolishing this business model, as envisaged by the Fiscalization Act, would consequentially lead to the disappearance of farmers' markets as they have *always* been known in Croatia.

There is an explicit relationship between farmers' markets and intangible cultural heritage, which is evident through the questions of whether farmers' markets deserve to be designated as heritage, and whether the system of fiscalization can serve as a mechanism for confirming such a designation or, on the contrary, act as the means of the markets' undoing. This relationship is presented in two articles published during the protests (Vlašić 2013; Pavičić 2013).

Despite the authors being in agreement in their support for the relevant governmental authorities' efforts to bring order in a general sense, including implementing a tax policy that would eventually abolish the "gray economy", their opinions differed when it came to introducing fiscal cash registers at farmers' markets. When arguing their respective stances on fiscalizing farmers' markets, both authors referred to the concept of heritage. Vlašić took a critical look at how the concept was invoked in the context of resisting fiscalization, and presented heritage as something that Croatian citizens are primarily "proud of". He strongly emphasized the need for issuing receipts at farmers' markets for "everything that is financed from the system" and as a form of fighting the "green mafia", and he pointed out that "selling without issuing a receipt [...] has nothing to do with tradition and intangible cultural heritage" (Vlašić 2013).

In contrast, Pavičić considers the broader context of Croatia joining the European Union, claiming this process would bring about "an avalanche of lower prices", which would turn many customers away from farmers' markets. He also argued that, due to stricter control at customs, it would also lead to the disappearance of some familiar products people in Croatia have grown accustomed to seeing at farmers' markets, which mostly come from neighboring countries that are not members of the EU. Because of all this, he believed that if carried out fiscalization would contribute to the "death of the *pazar* [farmers' market]", thereby also resulting in the "end of an important part of national culture". Therefore, farmers' markets ought to be, as the

author points out, “appreciated, safeguarded, and defended” since they are “in a true sense, the reflection of our pluralist identity, meaning an identity without retouching or fabrications”. They show “who we are and what we are, without artificial rigidity”, and are therefore “real, serious intangible cultural heritage, and a strategic, cultural, tourism-related, and anthropological fact” (Pavičić 2013).

Except as examples of opposing ways of thinking about the benefits and drawbacks of introducing fiscal cash registers, these articles can at least partially serve as indicators of how intangible cultural heritage is perceived in the Croatian context: Heritage is what people are proud of, and its compliance with different laws is of the utmost importance; it is an expression of Croatian identity and should therefore be appreciated and safeguarded. In these articles, the concept of intangible cultural heritage is applied to something that people primarily associate with fulfilling an everyday, basic need (obtaining food) rather than with culture. They also associate the term with something that necessarily includes a material aspect (space, goods, money) and which has a primarily economic function. Interestingly, however, the articles do not question the appropriateness of the application.

Such a view of heritage presumes that tangible and intangible cultural heritage overlap, that heritage can be manifested in a variety of forms, and that people have a central role in both creating and safeguarding it. This view appears as a sort of sub-text in Pavičić’s article and is a strong indication that the basic assumptions behind the concept of intangible cultural heritage, as defined by the 2003 convention, have become fairly accepted in Croatian public discourse.

It seems that cultural heritage “is suddenly at every turn”, and it has become something people talk about more frequently, most often as something that must be preserved (Hafstein 2012: 501). Therefore, even though Pavičić strongly emphasizes the need to safeguard farmers’ markets (“appreciated, safeguarded, and defended”), he is not concerned with how this activity would be carried out. However, one can infer from the article that in order to preserve farmer’s markets, spontaneously raising awareness of their importance<sup>8</sup> is not enough. Instead, it requires a more or less formalized set of activities based on officially obtaining the status of heritage. The proposal for including trading at farmers’ markets in the Croatian list of intangible heritage, which is currently being considered by the Ministry of Culture’s Committee for Intangible Cultural Heritage, should also be viewed in this context.<sup>9</sup>

I will analyze this proposal, primarily with regard to the incentives preceding it and the potential consequences of including this “element” in the list, in the final section of this paper.<sup>10</sup> Prior to that, I will focus on the aspects of UNESCO’s initiative

---

<sup>8</sup> The article itself could be seen as a commendable contribution to this end.

<sup>9</sup> This list is an integral part of the Register of Cultural Goods of the Republic of Croatia (<https://www.min-kulture.hr/default.aspx?id=6212>, accessed 10. 5. 2018). On the history of protecting intangible cultural heritage in the Republic of Croatia and the issue of lists, see Hameršak and Pleše 2013.

<sup>10</sup> The aim of this paper is not to determine whether farmers’ markets should or should not be given heritage status. Instead, the paper focuses on just one of a larger set of avenues for potential research on the issue of farmers’ markets as heritage. A more comprehensive ethnographic study would certainly have to include the perspectives of all the actors involved with the nomination (the nominator, vendors, customers, tourists, etc., as well as the experts in charge of implementing the intangible heritage program).

for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, which I believe are relevant to this analysis and which have already been partially highlighted in the text. These aspects, to put it briefly, deal with the inclusivity of the concept of intangible cultural heritage.

## The inclusivity of intangible heritage

The inclusivity of the concept of intangible heritage, which came with the 2003 convention, is one of the most recognizable features of the entire initiative to safeguard intangible heritage. This is directly related to the convention being introduced within the context of the exceptionally successful UNESCO World Heritage program of 1972, which was focused on protecting material and mostly immovable forms of culture: monuments, buildings, archaeological sites, natural landmarks, and so on.<sup>11</sup> By making sure that intangible aspects of culture (e.g. songs, dances, specific knowledge, and skills) were covered by international heritage policies, the new convention constituted an official promotion of the viewpoint that tangible and intangible aspects of culture are intertwined and should be equally considered, while also acting as a mechanism through which “heritage equality” could be achieved at a global level.<sup>12</sup> The Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity and the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, both arising out of the 2003 convention, were supposed to bring heritage status to parts of the world which had been deprived of this possibility by the previous program.

In addition to the 2003 convention’s contributions to the perception and valuation of heritage, the importance of the new convention is also evident in its challenge of *authorized heritage discourse*, which, as Laurajane Smith (2015) points out, the World Heritage project is bound up with. This discourse, Smith states, is based on the power relationships governing the processes of legitimizing heritage, in which a significant role is played by specific professions that were able to assert themselves as arbiters of “authenticity”, or the “innate” and “inheritable” value of a certain segment of the past. The challenge posed to this discourse is primarily evident in the scope of the term *heritage* and the authority of those whose role is to decide what does or does not constitute heritage. The definition of heritage in the new convention – knowledge, representations, expressions, practices, and skills that individuals and communities create and “recognize as part of their cultural heritage”, which “provides them with a sense of identity and continuity” (Convention 2003, Art. 2) – is obviously greater in scope than the one from 1972. However, with regard to challenging authorized discourse, it is important to note that the key actors in the

---

<sup>11</sup> The central document of this program is the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (Convention 1972), on the basis of which the World Heritage List was created.

<sup>12</sup> A look at the World Heritage List suggests that the 1972 program favors elitist architecture and localities situated in the Northern Hemisphere, which is why countries lacking that type of monument, meaning those with stronger intangible traditions (Kurin 2004; Munjeri 2004) were not included.

legitimization of heritage should not be expert authorities, but rather the communities that recognize certain aspects of their activities as culture and identify with it.

Along with heritage, community is one of the central terms in the 2003 convention. Communities are assigned a key role in creating, changing, recognizing, and safeguarding heritage; they are at the heart of the convention and the very existence of heritage depends on them (Labadi 2013: 123; Blake 2009: 45–46). However, despite the all-around emphasis on communities, which gives an impression that communities are precisely what the convention is trying to protect, the term *community* is not defined in this document; instead, as noted by Hafestin (2013: 55–56), it is formulated in a circular fashion. The lack of a definition is undoubtedly related to the assumed self-explanatory nature of the term, which is supposed to function as a “magic word around which consensus can take shape in international tensions over the uses of tradition” (Noyes 2006: 31). This is in line with the romantic approach to culture, prevalent throughout the initiative, in which communities are seen as natural, delineated, and homogenous groups of people that create and possess folklore and speak with “one voice” (Noyes 2011: 40; Tauschek 2015: 301). However, in reality, the boundaries between communities are not clearly determined, and the communities themselves are not objectively definable groups of individuals. They are instead complex, competitive groups riddled with different power relations (Noyes 2006). This discrepancy between the reality of communities and the simplified view resulting from the convention has proven to be the source of a wide array of problems when implementing the UNESCO program. These cover a broad range and include what the state’s role is in defining community and heritage, an individual’s belonging to a community on the basis of their “loyalty” to heritage, the homogenization of the diversity of belonging to a community, the representation of a community (at the local, national and international level), and power games (social, political, and economic) within and between different communities. All of these feed into the issue of ownership over culture, or in other words, managing culture (Vukušić 2017: 188–189).<sup>13</sup>

Another aspect of the inclusivity of the 2003 convention – or, according to Laurajane Smith (2015), a challenge to the discourse embedded within the World Heritage program – pertains to the diversity of forms (*practices, representations,*

---

<sup>13</sup> The elementary problem can already be discerned from the fact that, despite the convention’s all-around focus on the heritage of communities, there is no mechanism through which communities could suggest to UNESCO directly and without mediation by the state that the culture which they believe to be “their heritage” be included in one of the lists. More specifically, according to the convention, states are those that “identify and define the various elements of the intangible cultural heritage present in [their] territory”, “take the necessary measures”, “draw up [...] inventories of the intangible cultural heritage present in [their] territory”, and provide UNESCO with their suggestions of representative heritage (Convention 2003, Art. 11–12). Consequentially, it appears that the convention’s promotion of the importance of the community is, in fact, purely declarative (Zebec 2013: 320). On the broader set of problems related to the role of the state in heritage regimes and the various bureaucratic structures the elements have to pass through during their nomination, see Bendix et al. 2012. The effect of international recognition on people’s everyday lives and their relationship towards cultural practices in terms of identity and economic factors is described in the articles included in the publication *UNESCO on the Ground* (Foster and Gilman 2015), while different levels at which problems arise out of defining the community and its role in current heritage processes can be found in Adell et al. 2015.



*expressions, knowledge, skills*) in which heritage can exist in and the ways (*oral traditions and expressions, performing arts, social practices, rituals and festive events, knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe, and traditional craftsmanship*) in which it can manifest itself (Convention 2003, Art. 1, Art. 2).

The scope of the term *heritage*, as it appears in this convention, should be considered within the context of UNESCO's earlier efforts aimed at protecting intangible heritage, primarily the 1998 Programme of the Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity, which emphasized the "outstanding value" of heritage and "excellence in the application of skills and technical qualities" (Masterpieces 2006: 4).<sup>14</sup> The new convention attempted to avoid the elitist rhetoric evoked by the term *masterpieces* so the adjective *representative* was used in the title of the list to suggest heritage which is common, average, or typical.<sup>15</sup> The avoidance of elitism and the turn toward culture that "people practice as part of their daily lives" – assuming it has symbolic importance and is transmitted within the community – has made the concept of intangible cultural heritage open enough to include a whole series of activities that we can determine are transmitted within the community and constitute an important aspect of its life (Kurin 2004: 67, 69). Such a view of heritage ultimately makes it possible to see the entirety of life as heritage, since "no community is without embodied knowledge transmitted orally, gesturally, or by example" (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2006: 169).

However, despite the broader definition of heritage, even a cursory glance at UNESCO's lists of intangible heritage suggests that the perspective of the experts who participated in creating the document prevailed in the interpretation of the concept (Kurin 2004: 69), since the largest number of elements included in the lists belong to the domain of traditional culture and folklore. A glance at the UNESCO's lists also shows that the number of elements included in them is continuously growing.

Reflecting on this issue as one of the signs indicative of the intangible cultural heritage "epidemic", Valdimar Hafstein (2015), in a piece which begins in the form of a dialog between a doctor and a patient, presents intangible heritage as the diagnosis of a chronic condition affecting culture caused by social, economic, and demographic changes (globalization). The condition cannot be cured; it can only be kept under control through carefully devised treatment: "documentation", "identification", "analysis of the modes of transmittal" and so on. In order to properly contain the condition, Hafstein continues, what is required are actions by the institutions (intangible heritage councils, committees, commissions, foundations, etc.) that manage the genres through which heritage is expressed (lists, festivals, workshops,

<sup>14</sup> The list of masterpieces which resulted from this UNESCO programme (ninety in total) was included in the Representative List in 2008. On the activities of UNESCO pertaining to the promotion of intangible cultural heritage prior to the 2003 convention, see Aikawa-Faure 2009.

<sup>15</sup> However, as noted by Foster, giving something the designation of "representative" suggests that it stands out from the average or typical. While from the perspective of UNESCO, an element that is selected to be included in the Representative List can function as "just one of many on a list". From the perspective of the culture, i.e. states and communities, the element that is included now "occupies a vaunted position", thus setting itself apart from all those that were not selected (Foster 2015a: 148).

competitions, prizes, etc.). Hafstein's humorous critique accurately portrays the critical points of UNESCO's entire program to safeguard intangible heritage: the application of museological values and methods (documentation, safeguarding, evaluation, presentation, interpretation) to living people, their knowledge and practices, and their living spaces and social universes (Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 2006: 161).<sup>16</sup> The application of these procedures – or as Hafstein (2015: 286) ironically states, successful safeguarding – does the following in practice:

reforms the relationship of subjects with their own practices (through sentiments such as “pride”), reforms the practices (orienting them toward display through various conventional heritage genres), and ultimately reforms the relationship of the practicing subjects with themselves (through social institutions of heritage that formalize previously informal relations and centralize previously dispersed powers).

Despite the overall “defamiliarization” (Foster 2015b: 226) that evidently (cf. e.g. Tauschek 2013, 2015; Noyes 2006; Nikočević 2013; Yun 2015) occurs as a consequence of recognition by UNESCO, the interest for inclusion in intangible heritage lists does not seem to be waning. According to current data, 470 elements have been included in the lists so far, while 50 are going through the valorization process required for them to be included in 2018.<sup>17</sup>

One of the interpretations of the steadily increasing interest in UNESCO's lists and the fast pace at which the convention was ratified, has at its core the assumption that heritage plays an important role in constructing a country's image within an international context. Working from this idea, intangible cultural heritage is treated as a significant component of a country's “soft power”. According to Joseph Nye (2016), this power is based on a particular country's culture, political values, and foreign policy.<sup>18</sup> Cooperation with organizations such as UNESCO is seen as an important factor for increasing a country's soft power, particularly in the case of countries that cannot compete internationally in areas pertaining to “hard power” (military, economy).<sup>19</sup>

In other words, the inclusion of cultural heritage in UNESCO's list is seen as one of the ways in which a country can brand itself by highlighting its unique features, thus creating additional value and qualitative differences when compared to

<sup>16</sup> This is what Barbara Kirschenblatt-Gimblett, whom the author also refers to in the text, calls metacultural operations.

<sup>17</sup> When discussing interest in UNESCO's lists, it should be noted that the number of nominations is much larger than the number of elements included in the lists, since a significant portion is rejected and sent back for amendments. It should also be stressed that a special category is reserved for proposals which, in agreement with the applicant countries, have not yet been considered due to the limited capacities of the Committee, its bodies and the Secretariat – the number of such proposals is 111 in total (see <https://ich.unesco.org/en/lists>; <https://ich.unesco.org/en/files-2018-under-process-00913>; <https://ich.unesco.org/en/backlog-files-00554>, accessed 14. 5. 2018).

<sup>18</sup> As opposed to “hard power”, which is based on the military and economic potentials of a country. A more detailed analysis of the applicability of the concept of “soft power”, the changes to its meaning, and the associated criticisms (e.g. Nisbett 2016), is beyond the scope of this paper.

<sup>19</sup> It is believed that potentially ignoring UNESCO can “have a long-term negative effect on the image” of such countries in the international context (Schreiber 2017: 52).



the competition (Skoko and Kovačić 2009: 31), which is primarily expected to be useful in terms of tourism and the economic benefits that can result from it.<sup>20</sup>

The perception of UNESCO as a “powerful brand” (Foster 2015b: 228) is also present at the level of the communities that are listed as the bearers or practitioners in UNESCO’s lists. This is confirmed by their reactions to recognition by UNESCO, which, although recorded in different parts of the world, included similar emotions: pride, an increase in self-confidence, and the feeling that what they are doing is meaningful. This is accompanied by the frequent expectation that recognition by UNESCO will bring certain amounts of financial support for safeguarding (Foster 2015a; Hafstein 2015; Vukušić 2018: 703–704).

In addition to the international level, the epidemic of intangible heritage (Hafstein 2015) can also be observed at the national level. It is also based on lists; however, in this case, this refers to lists intended for elements of intangible culture present within a particular country.<sup>21</sup> These lists were created to serve as mechanisms for identifying heritage (Convention 2003, Art. 12) and their importance lies in the fact that the inclusion of an element in a national list is required for it to be nominated for UNESCO’s international lists.

It can be assumed – although it should in no case be taken as a rule – that the countries more actively engaged in including cultural heritage in UNESCO’s lists also devote significant efforts toward continuously adding new elements to their national lists. This is confirmed by the example of Croatia, which according to estimates based on the number of elements included in UNESCO’s lists (presently fifteen<sup>22</sup>), is “the fastest-developing country in the area of intangible cultural heritage within the EU” (Schreiber 2017: 51). The number of intangible heritage elements on national lists in Croatia is constantly growing and currently stands at 168.<sup>23</sup>

When it comes to the motivations of those who nominate their practices for inclusion in the national list, it is important to highlight that the legal status of cultural heritage, meaning it has been included in the Register of Cultural Goods of the Republic of Croatia, is the key criterion in the process of assessing requests for providing public financing to safeguard intangible culture.<sup>24</sup> It therefore follows from this and other criteria (for example, “professional and quality-based content”, transfer of knowledge and skills through seminars and workshops, documentation, and so on) that even at the national level, the spontaneous performance of a particular practice (song, dance, customs, etc.) is no longer a sufficient means of safeguarding.

---

<sup>20</sup> In the Croatian context, this is illustrated in, for example, the statement made by the minister of culture when the *Šinjska alka* was included in UNESCO’s Representative List, in which he stressed that it was “a huge asset for the country’s economy”, and one which would “surely contribute to the development of tourism” (Milaković 2010).

<sup>21</sup> These lists are closely related to the convention because countries that have signed the document are obliged to compile and regularly update the list(s) of intangible cultural heritage present in their territory (Convention 2003, Art. 12).

<sup>22</sup> See <https://ich.unesco.org/en/state/croatia-hr> (accessed 2. 6. 2018).

<sup>23</sup> See <https://www.min-kulture.hr/default.aspx?id=3650>; <http://www.min-kulture.hr/default.aspx?id=3646> (accessed 2. 6. 2018).

<sup>24</sup> The tender is organised by the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Croatia. The criteria for assessment can be found at <https://www.min-kulture.hr/default.aspx?id=5910> (accessed 11. 5. 2018).

In order to safeguard their heritage in accordance with the stated propositions, it is absolutely essential that communities obtain new knowledge and skills (management, organization, archiving, pedagogy, etc.), which also entails different forms of collaboration (individual and institutional). Of course, all of this is done with the aim of promoting heritage as intensively as possible (workshops, seminars, festivals, etc.), which often implies an audience, a scene, accompanying events, a high level of organization, etc. For a community to be able to successfully safeguard its heritage under these rules, it is necessary that, in accordance with these criteria, additional financial resources be secured for carrying out such activities.<sup>25</sup> Including a particular cultural heritage element in the national list of intangible heritage is also undoubtedly among the decisive criteria on the basis of which the potential sponsors of an event connected to that element would assess whether the investment would pay off, which demonstrates that “sponsoring and protecting are twin engines in generating cultural value” (Bendix 2015: 231).

Consequently, it would be logical that the culture included in the lists becomes recognizable to the general public and is perceived as culture worthy of attention, but also as culture which, by virtue of the symbolic importance provided to it by the context of the list, should be protected (internally) and respected (externally). The symbolic value the lists give to culture is undoubtedly recognized by the bearers and practitioners, and it is certainly one of the main incentives for submitting nominations. The brand presented by the national list, along with previously listed emotions (self-confidence, the confirmation that one is doing the “right thing”, etc.) and expectations (e.g. benefits for tourism) stirred by the designation of heritage, can also serve as means for achieving goals that do not have to necessarily be directly related to safeguarding as promoted by the convention (Convention 2003, Preamble, Art. 1). This question will be discussed in the following section, where I will consider the application for the inclusion of trading at farmer’s markets in the list of intangible heritage of the Republic of Croatia.<sup>26</sup> In doing so, I will focus on the features of intangible heritage which are ascribed to farmers’ markets in the relevant documents (Strategija 2013; Elaborat 2016), on the issue of the community and its representation, and in particular on the issue of the repercussions that potentially obtaining heritage status could have not just for the element itself, but also for the community that *produces, safeguards and preserves* it (Convention 2003, Preamble).

---

<sup>25</sup> As stated in the criteria, “proof of co-financing” should be enclosed with the application (<https://www.min-kulture.hr/default.aspx?id=5910>, accessed 11. 5. 2018).

<sup>26</sup> The full title of the document is *Report on the Proclamation of the Traditional Practices of Trading at Farmers' Markets as Intangible Cultural Heritage* (Elaborat 2016). I would like to use this opportunity to thank the association for providing me the report.

## “The traditional practices of trading at farmers’ markets” – intangible cultural heritage?

“Traditional practices of trading at farmers’ markets” is the name of the element which the Association of Croatian Farmers’ Markets<sup>27</sup> requested be designated as heritage in 2017 by the relevant committee of the Ministry of Culture.<sup>28</sup> It cannot be determined with certainty how the idea behind this proposal developed or whether the thing that triggered it was the concepts of farmers’ markets as heritage which emerged during the 2013 protests (and which, as mentioned previously, were backed by the association). What is certain, however, is that the idea of farmers’ markets as heritage existed in 2013. The *Strategy for the Development of Croatian Farmers’ Markets in the Period from 2014 to 2020* was devised in 2013, with “farmers’ markets – intangible cultural heritage” being one of its five strategic goals for development (Strategija 2013: 40).

This is an extensive document based on the assumption that the survival and development of farmers’ markets as a familiar place for selling locally-grown agricultural products is directly connected to the survival of rural areas. Except in an economic sense, according to this document the significance of farmers’ markets can also be seen within the context of the social (communication between the city and the countryside, social inclusivity, the availability of food for low-income groups), cultural (tourism), and health-related (the availability of quality, seasonal, fresh and locally-grown food) role they play in the everyday lives of people living in Croatian cities.<sup>29</sup> The authors of the strategy identified the following key points which threaten the sustainability of farmers’ markets: the domination of industrial food (at the global level), changes in consumer shopping habits (related to the rise of supermarket chains in Croatia), and the predominance in the local context of food imports in comparison to food exports. Hence, the association highlighted “increasing domestic farmers’ markets’ competitiveness and sustainability” as its basic, strategic goal (Strategija 2013: 35). Five specific steps were planned to achieve this goal (the farmers’ market: “a familiar place for local food”, “a desirable tourist destination”, “a partner in creating and monitoring the implementation of legislation”, “protected in-

<sup>27</sup> The Association of Croatian Farmers’ Markets was founded in 2000. According to its website, it brings together thirty-six companies which operate retail farmers’ markets (<https://www.uht.hr/udruga/o-nama>, accessed 12. 12. 2017). The association’s primary goal is to make farmers’ markets the central place for buying fresh, locally-grown food of known origin grown according to the principles of sustainable agriculture. It, therefore, promotes buying directly from the producers and increasing the share of consumption of domestic agricultural products (Statut 2015, Art. 8).

<sup>28</sup> At the time of writing, the Committee for Intangible Cultural Heritage is, to the best of my knowledge, still considering the proposal.

<sup>29</sup> This is a document comprised of forty-four pages and seven sections, with an introductory part and conclusion. The sections include an analysis of the present state of food production in Croatia and the world, the state of farmers’ markets in Croatia, and what the association does; the results of a SWOT analysis carried out by the association; a review of the potential for the development of farmers’ markets; a presentation of the principle of sustainability for farmers’ markets, and the criteria for realizing it; the vision and general strategic goal; a presentation of the five strategic goals and the measures for realizing them, envisioned as steps towards achieving the general goal; and a presentation of the time frame for realisation (Strategija 2013).

tangible cultural heritage”, “the site for the application of sustainable technologies”), with multiple associated measures for realizing each step.<sup>30</sup>

The fourth strategic goal, “farmers’ markets – intangible cultural heritage”, is based on the belief that farmers’ markets are “city centers in a communicative, cultural, and economic sense”. They represent “the traditional way of supplying food to the urban population”, where the “original” way of trading is still practiced (from stalls, using cash payments), and should therefore be “preserved as a unique Croatian quality” (Strategija 2013: 40). Due to the emphasis placed on the “traditional” and “authentic” nature of trading at farmers’ markets, one cannot escape the impression that this strategic goal was devised as a reaction to the adoption of the Fiscalization Act.

A similar impression is gained from the *Report on the Proclamation of the Traditional Practices of Trading at Farmers’ Markets as Intangible Cultural Heritage*, which is the central mechanism through which this goal is to be achieved (Elaborat 2016). In accordance with the propositions in the application from the Ministry of Culture,<sup>31</sup> this document consists of a description of the element, information about the association that nominated it as well as information about its current state and the proposed safeguarding measures. In terms of content, the report is in many ways consistent with parts of the strategy: the importance of the survival of farmers’ markets for life in rural areas and the economy in general is highlighted, as well as importance for the state of public health (availability of local, fresh food); however, the social and cultural aspects of trading at farmers’ markets are given stronger emphasis, which is logical considering the purpose of the document. For example, it is stressed that the tradition of trading in open spaces spans several centuries, and that the business is often passed down within families from one generation to the next. There is also information about the history of the development of farmers’ markets and their role in certain Croatian cities. Farmers’ markets are also presented as places where the urban and rural populations meet. A specific, contextually determined type of communication is associated with this meeting, which involves, for example, information on how the food is produced, its origin, preparation and serving suggestions, etc. Furthermore, emphasis is placed on the social inclusivity of farmers’ markets (a meeting place and a place for mutual appreciation between members of different social groups), as well as on the forms of behavior inherent to farmers’ markets. These forms of behavior imply many unwritten rules and one way they are manifested is in *properly* abiding by the *principle* of direct marketing (hollering at and inviting customers to try a certain product, offering, bargaining, and so on) so as not to threaten

---

<sup>30</sup> Although the strategy, as a whole, is a rather interesting document in an analytical sense, I will not discuss it in more detail due to the paper’s focus. A partial list from the development plan of what the association is involved in demonstrates the range of its involvement: farmers’ market certification; joining relevant international organizations and organising events to promote farmers’ markets and a diet based on locally-grown seasonal products; increasing the visibility of farmers’ markets as tourist destinations; improving communication at all levels when adopting regulations pertaining to farmers’ markets; efforts to use renewable energy sources; improving information technologies, etc. (Strategija 2013: 36–41).

<sup>31</sup> The application form for the Register of Cultural Goods of the Republic of Croatia is available at <https://www.min-kulture.hr/prijavnice/Prijavnica.aspx> (accessed 13. 5. 2018).

the other vendors. Moreover, successfully maintaining the balance between rivalry and amicability among vendors at farmers' markets is highlighted as an indicator of how well their informal behavior functions.

Thusly portrayed, the liveliness of the farmers' markets is mostly threatened, as can be inferred from this report, by state bureaucracy. It is stated that by insisting on the application of "over-regulated and increasingly stricter legislation", state bureaucracy is "making the survival of this traditional form of trading impossible". By doing so, it is consequentially removing "the last link between the city and the countryside" and is allowing "many dishes, drinks, and customs" to be forgotten (Elaborat 2016: 33–34). In the context of such a vision of (the future of) farmers' markets, protecting them appears to be not just of the utmost necessity, but also a matter of common sense:

If this form of protection could be achieved and if we recognized a tradition that has never and never will jeopardize the health of citizens, then we could create an atmosphere in which rigid bureaucracy would have to reduce its influence to realistic levels, as is the case, after all, in the entirety of the EU. (Elaborat 2016: 34)

\*\*\*

Based on everything that has been said so far, one cannot avoid the impression that the key driving factor behind the nomination of trading at farmers' markets was the assumption that obtaining heritage status could help defend it from effects the association believes to be harmful. Working from this assumption, the heritage status would, first and foremost, provide farmers' markets with long-term immunity that would protect them from the unwanted influences of state bureaucracy, which is currently taking the form of the Fiscalization Act. Such a view of the status given to culture by virtue of its inclusion in the list is not unusual; in fact, it is a component of the process of heritagization which by *definition* involves the use of heritage for achieving certain social goals. In an international context, an example of this can be found in the case of the element called "Traditional knowledge of jaguar shamans of Yurupari", which was inscribed to UNESCO's Representative List in 2011. The example is interesting because of the transparency of the explanation which preceded the inscription: the potential inclusion in UNESCO's list is decidedly presented as a form of protection not just from mining in a sacred area, but also from the arrival of tourists and outsiders in general.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>32</sup> <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/traditional-knowledge-of-the-jaguar-shamans-of-yurupari-00574> (accessed 13. 3. 2018). The term *sacred area* refers to the wider territory surrounding Pirá Paraná River in south-eastern Colombia, where different ethnic groups associated with the culture presented in the nomination live. One of the interpretations of this nomination claims that obtaining representative heritage status from UNESCO is the first step towards recognizing the sacred and ritualistic roles of plants such as coca, tobacco and ayahuasca (a brew made from the decoction of two plants native to the Amazon forest, the Banisteriopsis caapi and the leaves of Psychotria viridis), which are important elements in sustaining the lifestyle of the communities living in the area (Pérez 2015).

In the case of heritage lists at the national level, a partial parallel can be drawn with the Croatian example of designating the game *picigin* as an intangible cultural heritage.<sup>33</sup> The decision issued by the Ministry of Culture, which determined the heritage status of this game,<sup>34</sup> suggests that the initiative for safeguarding was created because of its social value as well as to make it more recognizable. The larger backdrop of the application, along with an answer to what exactly is understood by the terms *social value* and *recognizable*, is explained by ethnologist Vedrana Premuž Đipalo: The main reason for creating the initiative for safeguarding was the “possibility that a concession would be granted over the city beach” where the game is played, that “hotels would be constructed” in its immediate vicinity, as well as “indications that ball games might be banned at the city beach” that residents of Split were strongly attached to. In light of this, the initiative to designate *picigin* as a form of cultural heritage was created with the hope that heritage status could result in “some sort of protection” and a “potential exemption from possibly charging entrance fees for the beach”, along with permanently “providing a space where the game could be played” (Premuž Đipalo 2015: 336).

Terms and phrases such as “public availability”, “raising public awareness”, “popularization”, “recognizing the harmful effects of globalization on the survival of heritage” and so on, which are mentioned in the Ministry of Culture’s decision on the heritage status of *picigin*, can be found in most other decisions by the Ministry confirming heritage status.<sup>35</sup> Their frequent appearance in such decisions is not unusual, seeing that they are directly related to the view of safeguarding espoused by the 2003 convention (Convention 2003, Art. 3), which the national list of intangible heritage relies on. However, keeping in mind the continued interest in the list of intangible heritage in Croatia, one can assume that the communities themselves are well informed about the procedure for obtaining heritage status, and that, in an effort to secure this status as painlessly as possible, they see such terms as key words which ought to be emphasized in the application.<sup>36</sup>

Different variations of these terms, i.e. this particular view of safeguarding as a process that has the visibility and recognition of elements as one of its central goals, can also be found in the report. Other than serving as an indicator of how informed the association is about the current evaluation system in this area of culture, it is also interesting to note the suggested safeguarding measures and activities which, as it is

---

<sup>33</sup> *Picigin* is a ball game which is played in the shallow part of a sandy beach and is primarily associated with Bačvice Beach in the city of Split.

<sup>34</sup> [http://www.picigin-bacvice.com/files/picigin/picigin-vijesti-nematerijalno\\_kulturno\\_dobro\\_rjesenje.html](http://www.picigin-bacvice.com/files/picigin/picigin-vijesti-nematerijalno_kulturno_dobro_rjesenje.html) (accessed 14. 5. 2018).

<sup>35</sup> For example: <https://fdk.hr/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/rje%C5%A1enje-MKRH.pdf>; <https://www.ips-pljockanje.hr/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Rje%C5%A1enje-Ministarstva-kulture-o-pljo%C4%8Dkanju.pdf>; <http://makarska.hr/hr/rjesenje-ministarstva-kulture-umijece-pripreme-torte-makarane-ima-svojestvo-nematerijalnog-kulturnog-dobra/2084> (accessed 14. 5. 2018).

<sup>36</sup> The provocative proposal that the work practices in children’s libraries be registered as intangible heritage can serve as an example (Hameršak 2016).



assumed, are intended to result in greater visibility and recognition of farmers' markets. These include the project "Kindergartens and Schools at Farmers' Markets", which is to be realized in the future, the continuation of the project "Certification of Croatian Farmers' Markets", which has already been initiated, and an event called Days of Croatian Farmers' Markets (Elaborat 2016: 34).<sup>37</sup> One cannot help but wonder, particularly in the case of certifying farmers' markets, whether the stated safeguarding measures are directed more toward increasing farmers' markets' competitive advantage and economic sustainability<sup>38</sup> than toward safeguarding culture in the way that seems to be advocated by the 2003 convention. A somewhat similar impression comes from the part of the report entitled "Why Do We Need Protection?" that precedes the presentation of safeguarding measures:

The survival of vendors working from stalls at farmers' markets (primarily those who sell their own local products) will contribute to increasing the amount on offer and the consumption of fresh, locally-grown food, which will in turn have a positive effect on production growth, and also on citizens' health and overall quality of life. (Elaborat 2016: 34)

It seems that the positive effects of designating farmers' markets as heritage (increased production, the survival of small agricultural producers, a healthy population, and an overall better quality of life for Croatian citizens) are not related to culture in the strict sense of the convention. However, it is precisely these aspects of farmers' markets that can function as decisive arguments in favor of heritage status. This is especially true if they are considered within the context of the association's broader efforts to develop the markets (Strategija 2013), which emphasizes that the survival of rural areas depends on the development and survival of farmers' markets. The atmosphere surrounding the development of farmers' markets, evident to an extent in the perceptions discussed in this paper regarding the positive effects of potential heritage status, is compatible with the basic elements of sustainable development (economic and social development that relies on the sustainable use of natural resources), which is a term that has become increasingly prevalent in recent years in UNESCO's visions for safeguarding intangible heritage. This can be seen in the suggestions and incentives inviting member states "to recognize, promote and enhance the importance of intangible cultural heritage as a strategic resource to enable sustainable development", which are a part of the *Operational Directives* (2018, Art. 173).<sup>39</sup> Special emphasis is placed on the different aspects of inclusive social de-

<sup>37</sup> The purpose of certification is to make it easier for producers to sell their products directly to consumers with a guarantee of the product's origin (Pravilnik 2016). According to the data provided in the report, sixteen cities and more than six hundred family farms (OPGs) are involved in the project. The other aspect of protection, Days of Croatian Farmers' Markets, is an event the association organizes each September in Zagreb's central square to support OPGs and familiarize people "with the values and advantages of locally-grown food" (<https://www.uht.hr/novosti/52-dani-hrvatskih-trznica-26-09-2015>, accessed 21. 9. 2018; Elaborat 2016: 34).

<sup>38</sup> This is the fundamental goal of the development of farmers' markets according to the strategy (Strategija 2013: 38).

<sup>39</sup> Different versions of this document (2008, 2010, 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018) are available on UNESCO's website (<https://ich.unesco.org/en/directives>, accessed 10. 7. 2018). These versions show more significant attention being

velopment, among which one can find aspects closely related to these assumptions about the effect of giving farmers' markets the designation of heritage: "sustainable food security" and "quality health care" (Operational 2018, Art. 177–179). It remains to be seen to what extent these operational directives (although supportive of including heritage in different development programs and plans serve simply as guidelines rather than obligations) will influence the decision of the national committee, and whether the same decision will be affected by the relationship between heritage and the state's broader economic policy (taxes).

While keeping in mind both the proposed "safeguarding measures" and the basic assumption of every heritage development program according to the Operational Directives "to ensure that the rights of the communities, groups and individuals that create, bear and transmit their intangible cultural heritage are duly protected when rising awareness about their heritage or engaging in commercial activities" (Operational 2018, Art. 173b), in the following section, I will focus on what I believe to be a much more interesting issue: the question of the community that shapes the life (and culture?) of farmers' markets.

Who actually creates and safeguards the heritage of farmers' markets and in what way? The question is particularly relevant if one remembers how farmers' markets were presented in the report in which adjectives such as "original", "authentic" and "traditional" (specific communication, trust, informal forms of behavior, social inclusivity, etc.) are used to argue in favor granting heritage status to this form of trading at farmers' markets. The central role in creating and maintaining this character of farmers' markets is, without a doubt, played by vendors and customers; they are, in the words of the convention, the fundamental communities that are constantly recreating heritage "in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history", which in turn "provides them with a sense of identity and continuity" (Convention 2003, Art. 2). Although a similar sentiment is suggested in the various parts of the report which describe the element, it is a fact that farmers, resellers, and citizens-customers are not the bearers of the tradition in a formal sense. Specifically, in the section of the report (Elaborat 2016: 23–39) dealing with the "bearers", what is stated are the members of the Association of Croatian Farmers' Markets, i.e. the public companies that operate retail farmers' markets in different Croatian cities. This leads to one of the central critical points of the initiative for safeguarding and protecting heritage: the issue of the community, its representation, and power relations within/between communities. Put simply, the issue in this specific case comes down to the fact that the communities that nominated the element (the association, i.e. companies which operate retail farmers' markets), pursuant to their legally defined purpose, manage other communities (producers, vendors, customers), without which there would be no heritage in the first place (no matter how we choose to define it). It follows that the crucial question is whether the members of the latter

---

given to the need to combine safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development from 2016 onwards.

category were informed about the transformation that could in the name of “safeguarding heritage” change a significant part of their daily lives.<sup>40</sup>

This question is primarily relevant in the context of farmers’ market certification. Even though this project was not devised to serve a purpose related to the nomination and was only included as an example of an appropriate safeguarding measure on which the association was already working, heritage status would surely give the certification processes additional motivation, which in this case stemmed from the list’s symbolic capital. This is the same added value which the association was counting on, as is evident from the report, as a potential defense from the unwanted effects of “state bureaucracy”. This leads to the problem of hierarchies forming between the communities and the space provided to each one for carrying out their respective actions. The association wanted to use the nomination to secure a space within which farmers’ markets would be protected from the laws of the community superior to it (the state). It designated the certification process as one of the central safeguarding measures, and one of the ways the success of this is measured is by the number of new certificates issued.

One of the problems arising from this is the question of whether or not a mechanism exists that market vendors could potentially use to protect themselves from the certification. This question is particularly interesting because certification is a process advocated by the association, which, considering that it brings together companies in charge of *managing* the markets, is in a way superior to market vendors. Both the report and the strategy see the wishes and needs of all those who meet the basic requirements for receiving a certificate as unquestionable (Pravilnik 2016).<sup>41</sup> However, even if it is assumed that everyone who is able to obtain a certificate (or at least a majority)<sup>42</sup> decides to respond to the siren call of certification, a question still remains concerning those whose livelihood and that of their families depends on working at the farmers’ markets, albeit “only” as vendors or, to use the report’s terminology, as “resellers”.

Data from the available documents from the association suggest this question was not relevant when the measures for ensuring the sustainability of farmers’ markets were devised. However, this is not just important with regard to the survival of resellers’ jobs at farmers’ market; it is also relevant if one takes into account the features of heritage assigned to farmers’ markets. As stated in the report, farmers’ markets are places marked by the “originality”, “authenticity” and “traditionality” of their way of doing business, which is based on specific, informal forms of communication and a multitude of unwritten rules of behavior on which the trust and mutual understanding between different participants of market life are based. This is the

---

<sup>40</sup> Casual conversations with some of the vendors at Zagreb’s main market suggest that the majority of vendors may not be familiar with the initiative to grant farmers’ markets the status of intangible heritage. A more comprehensive ethnographic study would certainly have to include the thoughts of all the participants of market life concerning the idea of farmers’ markets as heritage.

<sup>41</sup> The term *certificate* refers to a document used to confirm that the holder has produced agricultural products or derivative products at their own farm (Pravilnik 2016, Art. 4).

<sup>42</sup> This applies primarily to vendors operating a registered family farm (OPG).

primary reason why farmers' markets are a form of intangible heritage with all the participants of market life contributing to its creation.

How will the most crucial "safeguarding measure" (certification) affect this image of farmers' markets, especially if one takes into account issues like the requirement to display the certificate in one's place of work, the use of "certified" bags, the intention to separate certified vendors (producers) from those who are not (Pravilnik 2016, Art. 19, 21, 24), and even the use of standardized aprons<sup>43</sup>? It is difficult to believe that in a system set up in this way the features of farmers' market that, according to the report, enable us to see them as heritage would be able to survive, especially considering the certificate influences how prices are set. These include fresh, certified food still being available to "everyone, regardless of their purchasing power", that markets continuing to be places where "social inequalities are reduced", where there are no "exclusive offers and prices", and where it would still be possible for vendors to successfully "maintain a balance between competition and rivalry on one hand and friendship and solidarity on the other" (Elaborat 2016: 31, 20).

From all of this, it is evident there are two different concepts of heritage: In one, heritage is an identity resource, and in the other, it is a renewable economic resource (Bendix 2013: 368). In the first case, which in many ways is similar to Pavičić's (2013) view of the features of heritage present in farmers' markets, heritage is based on experience and the emotions an individual associates with some aspect of culture. It relies primarily on the particular *quality* which arises continuously and spontaneously ("the culture [...] the people at the *pazar* [farmers' market] represent, without being aware of it") from the everyday activities of the different actors participating in its creation (in this case, customers, vendors, producers, tourists, etc.). This is in many ways congruent with the definition of heritage as culture that "is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity" (Convention 2003, Art. 2). However, in the process of implementing the convention at the local and national levels, culture is increasingly seen as resource.

This can also be seen in the nomination of trading at farmers' markets for inclusion in the national list of intangible heritage, and especially in the market certification program. The association's decision to pursue the nomination should be considered in the wider context of the initiative for the development of farmers' markets, which, as can be inferred from the strategy, is driven by positive intentions (health, economic development, survival of rural areas, etc.), collaborative efforts between experts from different areas, and an enormous amount of work. In that sense, the nomination can serve as a confirmation of the association's engagement in recognizing and using different niches, which could potentially lead to the fulfillment of their fundamental goal: to increase local farmers' markets' competitive advantage and sustainability (Strategija 2013: 35). In the realization of this strategic goal, ef-

---

<sup>43</sup> For example, see <http://www.varazdinske-vijesti.hr/gospodarstvo/foto-gradska-trznica-proslavila-15-godina-od-obnove-varazdinskog-placa-u-radu-24154/> (accessed 24. 5. 2018).

forts aimed at obtaining heritage status can rely on the assumption that such a status brings along with it the idea of culture as a resource, which is an inseparable part of the existing valorization processes and activities in the area of safeguarding culture. In these processes, as Skonuti (2009: 90) noted, “the illusion of authenticity” provides actors with the belief that they are continuing something which was started a long time ago; however, the challenge to their actions is the future rather than the past or present. Therefore, when devising safeguarding measures suited to this type of challenge, they turn to the trusted and omnipresent “mechanisms in late modern everyday life: competition and quality control” (Bendix 2009: 264).

## REFERENCES

- Adell, Nicolas, Regina F. Bendix, Chiara Bortolotto and Markus Tauschek, eds. 2015. *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice. Participation, Territory and the Making of Heritage*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag. <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.gup.191>
- Aikawa-Faure, Noriko. 2009. “From the Proclamation of Masterpieces to the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage”. In *Intangible Heritage*. Laurajane Smith and Natsuko Akagawa, eds. London, New York: Routledge, 13–44.
- Bendix, Regina. 2009. “Heritage between Economy and Politics. An Assessment from the Perspective of Cultural Anthropology”. In *Intangible Heritage*. Laurajane Smith and Natsuko Akagawa, eds. London, New York: Routledge, 253–269.
- Bendix, Regina F., Aditya Eggert and Arnika Peselmann, eds. 2012. *Heritage Regimes and the State*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag.
- Bendix, Regina. 2013. “Nasljedstva. Posjed, vlasništvo i odgovornost”. In *Proizvodnja baštine. Kritiske studije o nematerijalnoj kulturi*. Marijana Hameršak, Iva Pleše and Ana-Marija Vukušić, eds. Zagreb: Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku, 353–376.
- Bendix, Regina. 2015. “Patronage and Preservation. Heritage Paradigms and Their Impact on Supporting ‘Good Culture’”. In *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice. Participation, Territory and the Making of Heritage*. Nicolas Adell, Regina F. Bendix, Chiara Bortolotto and Markus Tauschek, eds. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag, 219–234. <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.gup.231>
- Blake, Janet. 2009. “UNESCO’s 2003 *Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage*. The Implication of Community Involvement in ‘Safeguarding’”. In *Intangible Heritage*. Laurajane Smith and Natsuko Akagawa, eds. London, New York: Routledge, 45–73.
- Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*. 1972. <https://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext/> (accessed 17. 5. 2018).
- Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. 2003. <https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention> (accessed 22. 3. 2018).
- Elaborat o proglašenju tradicijskog umijeća trgovanja na tržnicama nematerijalnim kulturnim dobrom*. 2016. Zagreb: Udruga hrvatskih tržnica. Manuscript.
- Foster, Michael Dylan. 2015a. “UNESCO on the Ground”. *Journal of Folklore Research* 52/2-3: 143–156. <https://doi.org/10.2979/jfolkrese.52.2-3.143>
- Foster, Michael Dylan. 2015b. “Imagined UNESCOs. Interpreting Intangible Cultural Heritage on a Japanese Island”. *Journal of Folklore Research* 52/2-3: 217–232. <https://doi.org/10.2979/jfolkrese.52.2-3.217>
- Foster, Michael Dylan and Lisa Gilman, eds. 2015. *UNESCO on the Ground. Local Perspectives on Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Hafstein, Valdimar. 2012. “Cultural Heritage”. In *A Companion to Folklore*. Regina F. Bendix and Galit Hasan-Rokem, eds. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 500–519. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118379936.ch26>
- Hafstein, Valdimar. 2013. “Pravo na kulturu. Nematerijalna baština d.o.o., folklor©, tradicijsko znanje”. In *Proizvodnja baštine. Kritiske studije o nematerijalnoj kulturi*. Marijana Hameršak, Iva Pleše and Ana-Marija Vukušić, eds. Zagreb: Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku, 37–63.
- Hafstein, Valdimar. 2015. “Intangible Heritage as Diagnosis, Safeguarding as Treatment”. *Journal of Folklore Research* 52/2-3: 281–298. <https://doi.org/10.2979/jfolkrese.52.2-3.281>

- Hameršak, Marijana and Iva Pleše. 2013. "Uvod u proizvodnju baštine". In *Proizvodnja baštine. Kritičke studije o nematerijalnoj kulturi*. Marijana Hameršak, Iva Pleše and Ana-Marija Vukušić, eds. Zagreb: Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku, 7–28.
- Hameršak, Marijana. 2016. "Nematerijalna kulturna baština. Pregled i provokacija". In *Dječja knjižnica i nematerijalna kulturna baština*. Grozdana Ribičić and Vesna Mihanović, eds. Split: Gradska knjižnica Marka Marulića, 13–27.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. 2006. "World Heritage and Cultural Economics". In *Museum Frictions. Public Cultures/Global Transformation*. Ivan Karp, Corinne A. Kratz, Lynn Szwaya and Tomás Ybarra-Frausto, eds. Durham, London: Duke University Press, 161–202. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822388296-008>
- Kurin, Richard. 2004. "Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in the 2003 UNESCO Convention. A Critical Appraisal". *Museum International* 56/1-2: 66–77. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1350-0775.2004.00459.x>
- Labadi, Sophia. 2013. *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage and Outstanding Universal Value. Value-based Analyses of the World Heritage and Intangible Heritage Conventions*. Lanham: Altamira Press.
- Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity Proclamations 2001, 2003 and 2005*. 2006. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001473/147344e.pdf> (accessed 21. 5. 2018).
- Milaković, Goran. 2010. "Naš delegat pred komisijom UNESCO-a u Nairobiju ustao je i zaokao. Nakon toga su rekli OK". *Jutarnji list*, 18. 11.
- Munjeri, Dawson. 2004. "Tangible and Intangible Heritage. From Difference to Convergence". *Museum International* 56/1-2: 12–20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1350-0775.2004.00453.x>
- Nikočević, Lidija. 2013. "Kultura ili baština? Problem nematerijalnosti". In *Proizvodnja baštine. Kritičke studije o nematerijalnoj kulturi*. Marijana Hameršak, Iva Pleše and Ana-Marija Vukušić, eds. Zagreb: Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku, 335–350.
- Nisbett, Melissa. 2016. "Who holds the Power in Soft Power?". *Arts & International Affairs. The Official Journal of the Institute for International Cultural Relations, University of Edinburgh*. <https://theartsjournal.net/2016/03/13/nisbett/> (accessed 26. 4. 2018).
- Noyes, Dorothy. 2006. "The Judgment of Solomon. Global Protections for Tradition and the Problem of Community Ownership". *Cultural Analysis* 5: 27–56.
- Noyes, Dorothy. 2011. "Traditional Culture. How Does It Work?". *Museum Anthropology Review* 5/1-2: 39–47.
- Nye, Joseph. 2016. "Think Again. Soft Power". <https://foreignpolicy.com/2006/02/23/think-again-soft-power/> (accessed 30. 4. 2018).
- Operational Directives for the Implementation of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. 2018. [https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ICH-Operational\\_Directives-7.GA-PDF-EN.pdf](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ICH-Operational_Directives-7.GA-PDF-EN.pdf) (accessed 11. 7. 2018).
- Pavičić, Jurica. 2013. "Trezorski ministar bič božji mora pokazati više savitljivosti prema pazarima. Oni ne smiju postati Lidl". *Jutarnji list*, 3. 7.
- Pérez, Leonardo Rodríguez. 2015. "Knowledge of the Jaguar Shamans of Yurupari Intangible Heritage of Humanity Knowledge for Sustainable Development?". <https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/IPeoples/EMRIP/CulturalHeritage/MalocaInternationale2.pdf> (accessed 12. 4. 2018).
- Polšak Platinuš, Vlatka. 2013. "Kako šefica Porezne i Linić mjesecima sustavno ignoriraju apele". <https://www.tportal.hr/vijesti/clanak/kako-sefica-porezne-i-linic-mjesecima-sustavno-ignoriraju-apele-20130619/print> (accessed 18. 3. 2018).
- Pravilnik o organizaciji i radu certificirane seljačke tržnice i uporabi oznake "Proizvodi hrvatskog seljaka"*. 2016. Zagreb: Udruga hrvatskih tržnica. <https://www.uht.hr/download/pravilnik.pdf> (accessed 7. 5. 2018).
- Premuž Đipalo, Vedrana. 2015. "Ne vridi mi dan ako ne dođem na Bačvice. O piciginašima s Bačvica i stvaranju mjesta". *Ethnologica Dalmatica* 22/1: 317–341.
- Schreiber, Hanna. 2017. "Intangible Cultural Heritage and Soft Power – Exploring the Relationship". *International Journal of Intangible Heritage* 12: 44–57.
- Skoko, Božo and Vinko Kovačić. 2009. "Koncept meke moći država i njegova primjena na Republiku Hrvatsku". *Polemos* 12/1: 29–49.
- Skounti, Ahmed. 2009. "The Authentic Illusion. Humanity's Intangible Cultural Heritage, the Moroccan Experience". In *Intangible Heritage*. Laurajane Smith and Natsuko Akagawa, eds. London, New York: Routledge, 74–92.
- Smith, Laurajane. 2015. "Intangible Heritage. A Challenge to the Authorised Heritage Discourse?". *Revista d'Etnologia de Catalunya* 40: 133–142.
- Statut Udruge hrvatskih tržnica*. 2015. Zagreb: Udruga hrvatskih tržnica. [https://www.uht.hr/download/STAT-UT\\_Udruge\\_hrvatskih\\_trznica.pdf](https://www.uht.hr/download/STAT-UT_Udruge_hrvatskih_trznica.pdf) (accessed 8. 5. 2018).
- Strategija razvoja hrvatskih tržnica 2014. – 2020*. 2013. Zagreb: Udruga hrvatskih tržnica. [https://www.uht.hr/download/Strategija\\_razvoja\\_hrvatskih\\_trznica\\_2014\\_2020.pdf](https://www.uht.hr/download/Strategija_razvoja_hrvatskih_trznica_2014_2020.pdf) (accessed 8. 5. 2018).
- Šimić, Zlatko. 2014. "Fiskalizacija na tržnici nikad nije ni zaživjela". *Jutarnji list*, 10. 7.



- Tauschek, Markus. 2013. "Vlasništvo nad kulturnim dobrom kao strategija. Karneval u Bincheu, stvaranje kulturne baštine i kulturnog dobra." In *Proizvodnja baštine. Kritičke studije o nematerijalnoj kulturi*. Marijana Hameršak, Iva Pleše and Ana-Marija Vukušić, eds. Zagreb: Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku, 157–177.
- Tauschek, Markus. 2015. "Imaginations, Constructions and Constraints. Some Concluding Remarks on Heritage, Community and Participation." In *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice. Participation, Territory and the Making of Heritage*. Nicolas Adell, Regina F. Bendix, Chiara Bortolotto and Markus Tauschek, eds. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag, 291–306. <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.gup.237>
- Vlašić, Boris. 2013. "A da i čist račun bude kulturna baština?" *Jutarnji list*, 5. 7.
- Vukušić, Ana-Marija. 2017. "Zajedništvo, dijeljenje i uvažavanje? UNESCO-ova multinacionalna nominacije proslave blagdana Sv. Jurja." In *Stranputice humanistike*. Petar Bagarić, Ozren Biti and Tea Škokić, eds. Zagreb: Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku, 187–209.
- Vukušić, Ana-Marija. 2018. "Alka i UNESCO – prepoznatljivost i očuvanje?." In *Zbornik radova s Međunarodnog znanstvenog skupa održanog u Zagrebu 12. svibnja i Sinju od 14. do 17. svibnja 2015. godine*. Josip Dukić and Gossip Grbavac, eds. Sinj: Franjevački samostan Gospe Sinjske, Viteško alcarsko društvo Sinj, Grad Sinj i gradovi i općine Cetinske krajine, 703–716.
- Yun, Kyoim. 2015. "The Economic Imperative of UNESCO Recognition. A South Korean Shamanic Ritual." *Journal of Folklore Research* 52/2-3: 181–198. <https://doi.org/10.2979/jfolkres.52.2-3.181>
- Zakon o fiskalizaciji u prometu gotovinom. 2012. [https://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2012\\_12\\_133\\_2822.html](https://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2012_12_133_2822.html) (accessed 13. 3. 2018).
- Zebeć, Tvrtko. 2013. "Etnolog u svijetu baštine. Hrvatska nematerijalna kultura u dvadeset i prvom stoljeću." In *Proizvodnja baštine. Kritičke studije o nematerijalnoj kulturi*. Marijana Hameršak, Iva Pleše and Ana-Marija Vukušić, eds. Zagreb: Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku, 313–333.

## Tržnice kao nematerijalna baština. Identitetski resurs i/ili obnovljivi ekonomski resurs

U članku se analizira prijedlog da se trgovanje na tržnicama uvrsti u Registar kulturnih dobara Republike Hrvatske kao nematerijalno kulturno dobro. Prvi dio članka ocrtava širi kontekst nastanka ideje o nominaciji te preispituje značajke javne percepcije pojma *baštine* u Hrvatskoj i elemente po kojima se tržnice – u čijem je poimanju aspekt materijalnosti neizbježan (prostor, roba, novac) – prepoznaju kao nematerijalna baština. Slijedi kritički osvrt na središnja mjesta *uključivosti* Konvencije o očuvanju nematerijalne kulturne baštine: raznolikost načina na koje baština može egzistirati i oblika posredstvom kojih se može manifestirati te središnje uloge koju taj dokument daje zajednicama kao kreatoricama i čuvaricama baštine. U osloncu na to, posljednja cjelina donosi analizu prijave trgovanja na tržnicama za uvrštenje na nacionalnu listu, pri čemu se fokus stavlja na problem zajednice i njezina zastupanja, odnosno na problem reperkusija potencijalnog dobivanja baštinskog statusa na zajednice i kulturu, ponajprije u svjetlu predloženih "mjera očuvanja".

**Cljučne riječi:** tržnice, nematerijalna baština, UNESCO, zajednica