
BOŽIDAR JEZERNIK AND JURIJ FIKEFK

The First World War—also known as the Great War, which lasted from 1914 to 1918—left a significant mark on the twentieth century. It radically changed the demographic composition of Europe (about seventeen million people were killed), resulted in the dissolution of four empires (Austria-Hungary, Russia, Germany, and the Ottoman Empire), had a crucial impact on European values, inspired the search for the new man during the interwar period, and ultimately significantly influenced the shaping, perception, and reception of cultural heritage. Upon the hundredth anniversary of the war's end, it is worth revisiting certain fundamental starting points and objectivizations—that is, chronotopes—of the First World War from the perspective of ethnology and cultural anthropology. This study thus focuses on three segments or perspectives: 1) the recording of memories or symbolization on monuments and graves; 2) the representation, understanding, and use of heroes, or the main social actors, as well as past and contemporary commemorations; and 3) the interpretations and reinterpretations of cultural and natural environments.

Keywords: First World War, monument, commemoration, heroes,

Prva svetovna vojna ali Velika vojna od 1914 do 1918 je bistveno zaznamovala 20. stoletje. Usodno je vplivala na demografsko podobo Evrope, saj je umrlo okrog 17 milijonov ljudi, na konec štirih imperijev (Avstro-Ogrske, Rusije, Nemčije in Osmanskega cesarstva), usodno je vplivala na njene vrednote in na iskanje po novem človeku med obema vojnama, napisled na oblikovanje, percepциjo in recepcijo kulturne dediščine. Ob stoletnici zato velja z etnološkega in kulturnoantropološkega vidika na novo premisliti nekatera temeljna izhodišča in objektivacije, drugače povedano, označevanja kronotopov prve svetovne vojne. V raziskavi je zato poudarek na treh segmentih oz. pogledih: prvi (1) je zapisovanje spomina oz. simbolizacija, ki jo razbiramo na spomenikih, grobovih in drugo; pomembno (2) je odiskovanje, razumevanje in raba junakov, glavnih socialnih akterjev; izhodišče so tudi nekdanje in sodobne komemoracije, predmet spora ali sprave in soglasja, da je bila nesmiselna; končno (3) gre za interpretacije in reinterpretacije kulturnih in naravnih prostorov, zaznamovanih s prvo svetovno vojno.

Ključne besede: Prva svetovna vojna, spomenik, komemoracija, junaki

The First World War, also known as the Great War, which lasted from 1914 to 1918, left a significant mark on the twentieth century. It was the first military conflict in which industry demonstrated its frightening capabilities and efficiency in the production of means of destruction. It radically changed the demographic composition of Europe. The consequences were terrifying: about seventeen million casualties, some ten million of which were soldiers and some seven million civilians. This death toll also impacted numerous Slovenian families, with more than thirty-five thousand fallen on the fields of battle and an additional eleven thousand left disabled. Reality in the wake of the millions of dead and maimed across the continent brought radical changes to all aspects of life, a restructuring of the old values that also resulted in changes in the manners and content of remembrance, and collective and communal memory.

The Great War also had a direct impact on the fabric of society. Members of different social classes, which had until then been separated by insurmountable barriers of class,

birth, and vocation, were brought closely together by mass military mobilization. In the battle trenches, the democratization of social life became a sudden reality, eventually growing into a social fact throughout the participating nations. Furthermore, the absence of millions of men that departed for war gave women access to social roles and positions that had previously been reserved exclusively for men. The bloodiest war in human history also caused the disintegration of four empires: the Austrian, German, Ottoman, and Russian. In their place rose new nation-states, which also included the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, the first national entity to unite the majority of the South Slavs under one common banner.

George Mosse (1990), Jay Winter (1995, 2006), and other researchers of the memory of the Great War have established that the colossal number of casualties caused a radical shift in the formation of public wartime memory. In preceding times, the heroes whose outstanding deeds had been lauded and preserved for future generations were almost invariably military leaders and generals, whereas regular soldiers were abandoned to oblivion. In contrast, the post-1918 memory landscape gradually replaced traditional protagonists of the collective memory with the symbolism of the “unknown soldier,” a representation of the masses of rank-and-file troops, the ordinary privates and common men that bore the greatest brunt of the dangers and massacres of the world’s “most dreadful war.” The horrendous tally, without comparison in the experience of contemporaries or even the chronicles of history, in many ways opened new contemplative horizons and paved the way for democratic thought. This change in collective memory is, for example, well illustrated by the Metz monument, originally dedicated to Emperor Wilhelm II, which was taken down after the war to make way for the memorial to the *poilu*, a representation of the regular French infantryman.

The Great War, as the most devastating period of twentieth-century European history, left behind an indelible mark in social memory that has been manifesting itself in a rich variety of ways from the time of the war up until the present day: in the personal memoirs of direct participants and remote observers, in public monuments and museums, in historical chronicles and narrations of other recorders of the past, in the reconfigured landscape, and, not least of all, in music and the arts.

The subject of research and analysis within the framework of the project J6-7173¹ is the specifics of the production and preservation of memory of the Great War in the Slovenian part of what was once the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, and in the regions of the former Kingdom of Italy and the First Austrian Republic with a Slovenian ethnic population. In this, interest is focused on the differences in the memory of the Great War as influenced by the various positions of individual countries (the victorious and the defeated), the partiality and politics of memory, and the processes and strategies of

¹ The texts and articles from Slovenian researchers in this issue of *Traditiones* were produced as part of the project J6-7173 Cultural Heritage of the First World War—Interpretations and Reinterpretations (2016–2018), led by Božidar Jezernik and financed by the Slovenian Research Agency.



AVANT

1914 METZ — Statue de Frédéric-Guillaume

Emperor Wilhelm II. Metz before 1914.



The memorial to the *poilu*, a representation of the regular French infantryman. Metz after 1918.

preserving memory in relation to the differences, contradictions, and controversies appearing within, in particular when it comes to the memory of the Great War as a political arena and the domain in which group identities were forged, a social process of the time that was created by social groups with converging or diverging interests—one that also receives a visible place in the social landscape due to its physical monuments, and whose content is constantly replenished through official commemorations.

The project was structured into modules, with each one dedicated to different forms of social memory's creation and manifestation: 1) Military graves and monuments, and historical and recent inscriptions in the landscape; 2) Commemorative practices, memorial events, and the production of memory in contemporary times, often connected with important "heroes" on one side or the other; and 3) Contemporary (re)interpretations of the First World War, especially dealing with the most important and tragic area in Slovenia; namely, the Isonzo Front (see Fikfak & Jezernik 2018).²

Several panels at SIEF and other research conferences (Fikfak, Kovačević, & Jezernik 2018) were held as part of this project; the first and most important one was held in Sarajevo in October 2016 (Bartulović & Strmčnik 2016). Some contributions for this issue of *Traditiones* were created based on presentations in Sarajevo, providing insight into strategies and practices in Poland, Slovakia, the former Kingdom SCS, and Montenegro.

1. MILITARY GRAVES AND MONUMENTS, AND HISTORICAL AND RECENT INSCRIPTIONS IN THE LANDSCAPE

When the Great War finally came to an end, most of Europe found itself questioning its sense and meaning. These contemplations were also explored by the numerous commemorative events dedicated to the memory of fallen soldiers, which took place almost daily in various parts of the continent during the initial postwar years. The issue of the war's purpose and justification was distinctly relevant to the citizens of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, whose (self)questioning and search for historical statements were additionally burdened by the fact that citizens of the new "nation of three names" had been enemies on the frontlines, fighting on opposite sides of the war. This uncomfortable truth was a tremendous obstacle for the formation of a unified "common" wartime memory. An even greater problem lay in the fact that this fundamental issue was never actually discussed with deliberation, but was instead left to an unbridled mixture of victorious (self)satisfaction on one side, and the stumbling search for an embellished historical image on the other. When, after a couple of quiet years, the construction of monuments to the military casualties began in Serbia and Slovenia—few were erected in other parts of the Kingdom—remembrance of the dead soon became intensely intertwined with nationalist ideologies.

² Volume 73 of the Estonian journal *Folklore* is dedicated to issues of the Isonzo front (1915–1917).

Public monuments institutionalize and legitimize memories, and festivities during their unveiling or anniversary commemorations further underscore a particular interpretation of history. Because society's memory is primarily a reflection of synchronous political and social relationships, one that changes together with the alteration of current ideological circumstances, it is tightly connected to issues of control and social power. Individuals and groups often clash when it comes to the meaning of the past because official memory is enforced by the ruling structures, whereas various marginalized social groups attempt to maintain a positive self-image by cultivating their own memory.

In a single country, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes united the "winners" of the Great War (former citizens of the Kingdom of Serbia) and the "losers" (former citizens of Austria-Hungary, ethnically mostly Croatians, Slovenes, Serbs, and Bosniaks). The Austro-Hungarian invasion of Serbia, in which the side of the aggressor mobilized a sizeable number of Croats and also scores of Bosniaks and Slovenes, including many Serbs, resulted in massive casualties and vast economic damage. Thus, the Serbian collective memory of the bloody fratricidal and religious war remained a constant source of distrust, which in a major way also affected the postwar politics of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes.

As argued by Melissa Bokovoy (2001), memorial events marking significant historical anniversaries that were held in locations of the Serbian army and its volunteers' victorious battles acquired a nation-building character in the new nation-state of the South Slavs. In the new common "nation of three names," the prevalent nation-building memory was centered on the victorious Serbian and volunteer military tradition, whereas the defeated Austro-Hungarian tradition was abandoned to decay and scorn once the South Slavs were liberated and united. This tarnished the significance of the Austro-Hungarian victims of war and presented them as casualties belonging to a foreign, invading, and ultimately defeated army. Even though the numbers killed were greater on the Serbian side, its veterans were able to foster the satisfaction that their suffering and sacrifice were not in vain, that they had fought for the freedom and unification of all the Southern Slavs—a great and noble historical cause. Commemorations and festivities marking important battles were tasked with the role of assuaging national traumas left behind by the war, and thus the Austro-Hungarian aggression, the Serbian retreat, the shameful foreign occupation, and finally heroic victory against an overwhelming foe became elements of the Serbian postwar narrative that attributed sense to the wartime experience.

According to information gathered by Petra Svoljšak (2006) and John Paul Newmann (2015), the Austro-Hungarian veterans were treated like "red-headed stepchildren" by the new state, which up until 1925 paid their widows, combatants, and disabled support and pensions that were up to 75% lower than the pensions and support for Serbian war veterans, widows, disabled, and volunteers. Eventually, this situation further contributed to (repressed) national discord.

MONUMENTS BETWEEN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC / OFFICIAL AND SUBVERSIVE

In the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, imposing public monuments were constructed using public funds to celebrate the Serbian military victory, and the bravery and heroism of Serbian soldiers and volunteers glorified by numerous state commemorations. The monuments were mostly built in Serbian towns and villages, whereas other parts of the country—with the exception of the Slovenian part—received almost none. When several years had passed with such neglect of the casualties of other ethnicities, the relatives of the dead and their communities that were denied a place of remembrance and mourning began voicing complaints, saying it was disgraceful that those that had given their lives did not receive even a modest plaque on some church wall or cemetery, not even a minor public monument, and not a single commemoration. Ultimately, the local communities decided to erect such monuments by themselves.

The majority of resources for “alternative” monuments, memorials, and commemorative plaques were collected by churchgoers and the local population in the form of personal contributions or special donations during mass. Consequently, people treated such signifiers of the Great War memory as part of their personal and intimate memory; that is, familial remembrance of lost and missing relatives and civilian suffering. They thus became part of the materialized wartime memory of the local community, which often differed considerably from the official state interpretations. Such a bipolar understanding of wartime events was further exacerbated by events following the Second World War, when politics allowed an exclusively system-approved “textbook” interpretation while “the people” fostered their own verbal historical narrative.

In this way, in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, the building of monuments to fallen soldiers of different ethnicities became a secular ritual that supported either “official” or “subversive” political values. By 1940, the memory of the war became one of the central political friction points, which, in what is now Slovenia, fundamentally influenced the formation of Slovenian national identity as separate from the Yugoslav one. Speakers at local memorial events and commemorations would regularly point out the injustices caused by the unequal treatment of Austro-Hungarian war veterans from the Drava Banate, stress the importance of preserving the Slovenian language, and preach the value of Slovenian national character and the Catholic faith.

The building of monuments to casualties suffered by the Austro-Hungarian side depended on individuals and small groups that were able to mobilize the local population into contributing because the state apparatus did not support them. The most frequent form was a memorial plaque, most often built into the wall of a local church or cemetery, or sometimes appearing engraved in artistic representations (Čopič 1987). Names, usually in alphabetical order, maintained the form of equality that had emerged in the trenches of war, and all the fallen were thus given equal credit as heroes. Names inscribed on memorials honored simple people, granting their memory a respect that had once been reserved for

local elites. These names, which invoked profound sorrow in the people's private reality, were thus transformed into a source of national pride, as stated by Catherine Moriarty. At the same time, direct participation of local parishioners and/or villagers in public commemorative events reinforced the role of the peasantry as vital constituents of the nation.

Gatherings at the unveiling of memorials or during commemorative events frequently included the expression of political views, particularly solemn ones, which did not as much address the past so much as they focused on the current situation. In the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, the memory of the war became one of the central political arenas, and monuments to fallen soldiers in uniforms belonging to opposing sides of the war continued the old conflict with ideological means. As the years passed, this conflict became increasingly heated and political.

The depiction of soldiers in wartime uniforms was a highly problematic topic in the "nation of three names" because Austro-Hungarian forces had invaded the Kingdom of Serbia and left it thoroughly devastated. Thus, uniformed monuments were relatively rare in the Drava Banate, although a few did appear nonetheless. The memory of Slovenian soldiers that perished as combatants in the Austrian army was preserved in an organized manner by the "non-partisan and apolitical" Association of Combatants, which held its first public assembly gathered around "the throne of the Heavenly Queen" in Brezje in 1924. The association assumed the task of bringing together wartime comrades in order to honor the memory of their fallen friends, work to improve the position of disabled veterans, and revitalize the spirit of companionship and closeness that bonded them together in the trenches of war. At its initiative, memorial plaques were unveiled Sunday after Sunday across the parishes of the Drava Province, succeeding in establishing nearly 150 monuments to fallen "Slovenian heroes" by 1926. Each year on November 1st, the association oversaw commemorative events held at cemeteries, monuments, and memorial plaques in honor of their fallen colleagues, which continued up until 1940.

The Association of Combatants helped establish a lively movement for the creation of physical tokens of remembrance across Slovenian parishes. To the families of the deceased, these memorials represented a kind of close, intimate representation of their loved ones' distant graves where they could pray and honor their memory, and the parishes received silent but lasting reminders of the atrocities of war. The number of commemorative items engraved with the names of the fallen that emerged by the local churches and cemeteries grew rapidly, along with the number of monuments; in a matter of a decade, nearly every parish in the Drava Banate had one of its own. Although these developments transpired far from the centers of power and under the guise of a language officials mostly did not understand, they soon came to the attention of Belgrade, the Kingdom's capital, as well. In 1925, the Belgrade newspaper *Politika* published a scathing summary of the movement, saying it was attempting to aggrandize those that had fought for the Habsburgs against the great Yugoslav idea.

MONUMENTS TO THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

The memory of the terrors of the Great War received its most characteristic expression in the tomb of the unknown soldier. This commemorative phenomenon aimed to pay respect, in a physical and individualized form, to the enormous numbers of fallen soldiers whose bodies were left unrecognizable or that had disappeared without a trace. The tomb of the unknown soldier symbolized all the war casualties of a given nation and expressed recognition of their valorous deeds while also enabling survivors to mourn individual anonymous soldiers in a physical location. Their central place in social memory was accentuated by the notable locations they were given in the capitals of countries that had participated in the war. The first two such tombs were constructed in Paris and London in 1920, the next year in Rome and Washington, a year later in Brussels, Prague, and Belgrade, and in 1923 in Bucharest and Vienna. The corresponding commemorative events were very similar to one another, and they included the participation of the top civilian and military leaders as well as masses of veterans and citizens.

In 1927, the resounding establishment of monuments and memorials across Europe encouraged former Slovenian combatants into resolving that they should not lag behind the memorial practices of the great nations. Due to the delicate political nature of a common tomb or the idea of a “pan-Slovenian military Pantheon” (Bonač 1932), its realization was slow. When it came to the location, the site that ultimately prevailed was Brezje as opposed to Ljubljana. Political issues were decisive in this selection because commemorative events in Brezje were more easily disguised as apolitical religious reverence. Brezje was a pilgrimage site that did not divide Slovenes according to natural and state borders. If well-attended commemorations were to be held in the capital Ljubljana, they might acquire the external image of a political manifestation that would likely attract the attention of the state authorities, which might ban or prevent it by force.

In August 1937, in the presence of the highest church and secular authorities and a record visit of “pilgrims,” the foundation stone for the monument to the Unknown Slovenian Soldier was blessed and equipped with a document read by the president of the Association of Combatants, Mirko Ratej. The foundation was blessed by Prince-Bishop Gregorij Rožman, with accompaniment by an army choir. The festive speaker was Governor Marko Natlačen, the patron of the event. The Monument to the Unknown Slovenian Soldier in Brezje was to play an important role in shaping Slovenian national identity, as a proud witness attesting to future generations that the Slovenian nation was aware of its distinctions, appreciated the sacrifices made for its freedom, and showed great respect to the fathers and brothers that suffered the terrible dreads of the Great War. The Association of Combatants then conducted several events and donation campaigns in 1938, 1939, and 1940 that managed to gather sufficient means for a proper monument to be constructed next to the chapel of the Mother of God in Brezje (Anon. 1937).

Work on the monument was still underway in 1940, when the site was also paid an official visit by Slovenia's "national leader," Minister of Education and Culture and Senate Speaker Anton Korošec. The eruption of the Second World War ultimately interrupted all the memorial and commemorative efforts, including the completion of the monument, which was consigned to oblivion.

Monuments are signs that, when needed, are charged with various content. They function as elements of identification or bones of contention. The identification strategies of affiliation or exclusion connected with monuments are especially prominent in Montenegro. Thus, three authors—František Šistek (2018) and Nenad Čagorović & Knežević (2018) at a documentary level—thematize Montenegro's special status during the First World War and especially the two competitive nationalization narratives: the Montenegrin and the Serbian. This competition was halted or suppressed under prewar (royal) and postwar (communist) Yugoslavia, when Montenegro lost its independence. The covert ambivalence was later again brought to life by the independent state of Montenegro. This is also connected with the story about the autocephaly of the Church of Montenegro, which was abolished with the annexation of the Kingdom of Montenegro to the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and incorporated into Serbian Orthodox Church in 1920. It was reestablished in 1993, but was not canonically recognized by other Eastern Orthodox churches. The article by Čagorović and Knežević provides an overview of a relatively small number of the First World War monuments in Montenegro.

The cemeteries and monuments in Poland play a different role, which is discussed by Ewa Karpinska (2018). Among over two hundred First World War cemeteries near Łódź, she selected the ones that were established after the 1914 Battle of Łódź. These objects of memory are places that not only testify to the respect and remembrance of the fallen soldiers, but also make it possible to sacralize the past. They are documents that facilitate narrations, through which it is possible to decipher not only the memory of the dead, but also the manners and patterns of behavior and thought within a culture.

Similar to Čagorović, Katarina Zimová (2018) also provides a fundamental sample overview of the First World War monuments in Slovakia, which she conceives as elements of cultural heritage and social memory. The published photos show the diligence and local character of efforts to preserve the memory of the fallen. The majority of online photos were provided through campaigns, in which many people allowed their personal or family photos to be posted on the internet. Thus, family photos became part of local identifications, which are intensified even further by the diction about the purpose and conditions of using these photos.

Not only monuments and cemeteries, but also landscapes with remnants of the First World War can serve as subjects of research. Thus, Czarnecka maps the landscape of forgetting in the context of the First World War in the town of Legnica (Liegnitz) in southwestern Poland. This town, which still had a population of nearly 80,000 in 1939, over 90% of whom were German, was annexed by Poland after the Second World War. The

author describes the process of (re)constructing and (re)negotiating the cultural landscape of the town by using the metaphors of conversation and conflict, and wonders how the First World War should be commemorated in a town where there are no more Germans nor their memory of the First World War.

Memories of the First World War are also kept and maintained by numerous institutions. The main question addressed by Demski (2018) is how cultural objectivizations related to the First World War are selected and presented in various institutions, such as the Polish Army Museum, selected local regional museums, and the National Digital Archives (NAC). The author analyzes and establishes how the selection and presentation of events related to the First World War are connected with the institution's location (central or regional) and the use of particular media (a digital photo archive).

2. COMMEMORATIVE PRACTICES, MEMORIAL EVENTS, AND THE PRODUCTION OF MEMORY IN CONTEMPORARY TIMES

Monuments preserve the memory of important historical personalities or events, first by being positioned in visible and significant locations, and second by providing a physical place for ritual practices of remembrance. The exploration of commemorative practices, memorial events, and the contemporary production of memory they facilitate are the subject of the second module of the research project, where most attention is directed at the two centers of gravity of memory production: one anchored in certain historical personalities that played vital roles in the occurrence and course of the war, and the other being the Great War itself, its shattering consequences, and finally peace.

In the cities of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the declaration of war on the Kingdom of Serbia was received with major public rallies organized by the civilian and military authorities, and the national newspapers lauded it extensively with sensationalist editorials. In this fashion, the mayor of Ljubljana and head of the Liberal Party, Ivan Tavčar, and Ljubljana Prince-Bishop Anton Jeglič, who had often held conflicting views prior to the war, were suddenly engaged in common belligerent anti-Serbian rhetoric as well.

The end of the Great War inevitably brought new realities to the nations exhausted from its atrocities, and with them new heroes and new forgotten. Postwar rebuilding demanded a vast amount of construction, with foundations even having to be laid anew in many places. In this context, the period fundamentally changed the collective memory of not only the causes and consequences of the war, but also its goals and intentions. In fact, the narrative image of the war from the time it was already over differs to such an outstanding extent from the one perpetuated during the war that the two might as well be completely different wars with completely different motives, intentions, and consequences. In the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, following the establishment of the “nation of three names,” the new entity required its own heroes and symbols to act as a social adhesive.

On the centenary of the Sarajevo assassination, the city's town hall that had been constructed by the Austro-Hungarian authorities and was later razed by the Serbian army in the early 1990s was the site of a commemorative event marking the hundredth anniversary of the Great War's beginning. The solemn event, which featured the Vienna Philharmonic as well as Sarajevo soloists, triggered considerable discontent on the part of certain political authorities, especially in Republika Srpska, where the political brass decided not to attend the event and to instead mark the anniversary of the Sarajevo assassination in their own way. A parallel ceremony was held in Višegrad, where film director Emir (Nemanja) Kusturica opened a project that was supposed to double as a tourist destination and the center of Serbian culture in Bosnia-Herzegovina—Andrićgrad (literally, 'Andrić town'). In it, a highly distinctive place was given to the Young Bosnia organization, with one of the streets bearing its name and a large mosaic depicting all its members. At the same time, the renovated birthplace of Gavrilo Princip was festively opened in the village of Obljaj near the town of Bosansko Grahovo.

HISTORICAL PERSONALITIES AND AMBIVALENCES

At the forefront of commemorative practices and memorial events in contemporary Bosnia and Herzegovina, which is divided between two entities (the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Republika Srpska) lies a conflict between different interpretations of the past, reflected illustratively in the attitude toward Gavrilo Princip and his actions, and the spatial inscriptions of memory (names of streets, bridges, squares, monuments, etc.). The image of Gavrilo Princip underwent numerous changes in the political and media discourse: in Bosnia and Herzegovina he has been made into a terrorist by some following the Yugoslav wars of the 1990s, whereas his status as a national hero was preserved and even further magnified in Republika Srpska. These mutually exclusive binary views pose a sizeable obstacle for the construction of a balanced and representative understanding of the period in question and its key actors.

The comparative study, based on ethnographic fieldwork, discourse analysis, and examination of archival content, makes possible the discovery of heterogeneous interpretations of the Sarajevo assassination's central protagonist, his victims, and the political implications of military conflict, also taking into account distinctive political manipulations and their effects (or countereffects) on contemporary society in Bosnian and Herzegovina. Institutional preservation of memory always attempts to silence alternative memory records and, in this way, to consolidate homogenous, often nationalized narrations of the past (Jezernik 2014). The research sheds light on the changes to local collective memory and historical narration, which were adapted to the social circumstances and ideological twists of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. In communist Yugoslavia, Gavrilo Princip occupied a vital position among Yugoslav heroes and unification fighters, a fact also reflected in the civic tissue of Sarajevo. At the site of the assassination—at what was renamed the Princip

Bridge (*Principov most*) during the Yugoslav era and is today known again as the Latin Bridge (*Latinska čuprija*)—the initial monument to Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife Sofia stood for but a single year. When the First World War was over, the authorities relocated the monument to a museum to make room for the celebration of a new hero, Gavrilo Princip. His memorial plaque was ultimately unveiled in communist Yugoslavia, with a cast of Princip's feet crafted below it, positioned where he stood while firing on the archduke. This famous cast had a tangible connection to the experience of many Sarajevo children up until 1995 because they would “step into the shoes” of the national hero along with curious tourists, a playful habit that developed into a popular local custom. These kinds of real-life stories that can be revealed by ethnographic work often remain ignored by the analyses of memory and commemoration practice that focus on institutionalized and official aspects of commemoration. In this context, Paul Connerton (1989) notes that physical experience is, in fact, a key factor in remembrance because habitual ritualized actions inscribe memory into the physical body. Thus, it is essential to discover and analyze any widespread intimate personal practices of “communication” with monuments.

The political exploitation of Gavrilo Princip has been a mainstay of public life in Bosnia-Herzegovina, especially during elections and political struggles. However, the status of Gavrilo Princip cannot be understood separate from the status of his victim—Franz Ferdinand. In the attitude toward the two key actors in the Sarajevo assassination, one can recognize the different perceptions of two transnational entities; namely, Austria-Hungary and the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, later renamed Yugoslavia. As part of the contemporary initiative to reestablish the monument to Franz Ferdinand and his wife Sofia, for example, Emin Švrakić, the former vice-president of the Sarajevo city council, stated that Austro-Hungarian rule played a highly important role in the development of Bosnia-Herzegovina, and that the country always had good relations with Austria, which certainly attests to the (collective) forgetting or ignorance of the blunders and vices of Austro-Hungarian colonial rule. Through the dynamics of the initiatives for the establishment or removal of monuments, one can observe the prevalent attitude toward imperial and transnational legacies in modern Bosnia-Herzegovina. The country’s tendency to move closer to the European Union, along with the still-living memory of the Balkan Wars of the 1990s, have invariably affected the reconstruction of memory and shaped commemorative practices, in which Bosnia-Herzegovina today exhibits both Eurocentric discourses as well as nostalgic narrations.

In this context, the article by Alenka Bartulović (2018) addresses the transformation of memories of the Sarajevo assassination and tourism representations of Gavrilo Princip. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, there is an increasing presence of new discourses that challenge the simplified understanding of memorialization practices in post-conflict societies as simple battles between antagonistic nationalized versions of the past.

The second local historical personality of the Great War, significant particularly in Slovenian territory, where he had an ambivalent reception, was Field Marshal Svetozar



Svetozar Boroević von Bojna standing alongside his bust. (From the photoarchive of Janez Bogataj).

Boroević von Bojna, who fought for the Austro-Hungarian army. At the proposal of Mayor Tavčar, on August 6th, 1916, the field marshal was designated an honorary citizen of Ljubljana “with great enthusiasm” at a session of the city council. When the war was over, however, the attitude toward the commanding officer known as the “Knight of the Isonzo” changed altogether. On June 24th, 1919, another session of the city council—again led by Mayor Tavčar—removed the Austro-Hungarian officer from the list of honorary citizens.

Opposed to both of these personalities that create or facilitate conflicting viewpoints and ambivalent reception stands a third one, highly significant to the modern Slovenian nation—namely, that of General Rudolf Maister, who succeeded in moving the state border further northward using military force. The intervention of his soldiers in the closing stages of the Great War also brought about the conclusive dominance of Slovenes in the city of Maribor and realized the nation-building idea that had been conceived half a century earlier by Bishop Slomšek. The city now dedicates regular annual events to both men, General Maister and Bishop Slomšek, along with frequent reproductions in various editorials, mass media, and schoolbooks. Their impressive monuments stand in two of Maribor’s major squares, and a distinctive set of commemoration practices is connected to each. Peter Simonič (2018) outlines the historical circumstances of the life and work of General Maister, paying special attention to the changes in the perception and reception of this fighter for Slovenia’s northern border, whose monument stands in front of the most important Slovenian institutions (e.g., the Ministry of Defense) and who turned from a controversial and peripheral figure into a central political and military hero of the Slovenian state.

Mitja Velikonja (2018) presents various art depictions and inscriptions (graffiti, stencils, stickers, murals, etc.) that are based on two heroes: the assassin Gavrilo Princip and General Rudolf Maister. The author combines graffiti and street art studies with a critical analysis of the cult of personality of political leaders.

RITUALIZED PRODUCTIONS OF REMEMBRANCE OF THE GREAT WAR (AND PEACE)

The countless casualties on all sides that were involved in the Great War, the defeats and victories, the changes to national borders, and the creation of ethnically “clean” regions resulted in numerous commemorative events immediately after the war. In the first few following years and decades in particular, the characteristic traits of these efforts were extractive or exclusive strategies and a distinctively nation-building aspect. The nationalization of the space and its people thus occurred in all four countries where Slovenians lived.

Italy, a winner of the Great War, received a sizeable portion of territory populated by Slovenes and Croats through the Treaty of Rapallo and immediately began conducting a consistent process of homogenization—Italianization of the non-Italian population (Lyttelton 2001)—in which it also leaned on ideological continuity with the Roman Empire. With the establishment of ossuaries (e.g., in Kobarid/Caporetto and in Redipuglia/Sredipolje)

and other monuments and inscriptions as well as ritual festivities, it constructed the image of the Italian, and it constantly renewed the concept of sacrifice and victory over the “uncivilized”—as characterized by the non-Italian. Among other moves, the newly formed Austrian state used instruments of free choice to delineate the border with the newly formed Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes; namely, the plebiscite in Carinthia in 1920, which was parlayed into means of intensive Germanization in following decades. Ritual festivities in both these cases emphasized and provided the nationalistic aspect, be it Italian or German, also defining and shaping it by excluding other ethnicities (Slovenes, Friulians, the Roma, etc.). With the Treaty of Trianon, Prekmurje became part of Yugoslavia, and only a small section of it, the Rába Valley, remained in Hungary, which conducted intensive Hungarization within it.

Ritual festivities, their content, and their program consciously fashion the image of a monolithic state and its model citizen, which is constituted precisely through the rejection of the different, or the Other, usually represented by another language or culture. The research thus aims to explore the ritual practices and remembrance of the Great War (and in part also the Second World War) in all three countries stated above by taking a look at the strategies of the majority population, the official, media, and common-sense discourses, and any potential counter-strategies of the minority Slovenes.

In the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes (from 1929 onward the Kingdom of Yugoslavia), ritual remembrance carried ambivalent characteristics. In Slovenian territory, it was distinctively marked by the position of the defeated enemy, stigmatized doubly, which is also the reason it focused heavily on themes of personal tragedy at the level of the family and village community. In the context of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, the ethnocentric, nationalistic aspect of the events is also a worthy research topic due to the radical break from the Austrian state and its heritage, which manifested itself after 1918 in collective forgetting and the intentional erasure of events and personalities of German descent, and in the construction of a continuity of pro-Yugoslav spirit and the Sokol youth movement. In this way, it was not until 2012 that the former local German population was again recognized as an important carrier of Maribor’s economic and political life in the past, which finally occurred within the framework of the exhibit Germans in Maribor held as part of the European Capital of Culture. The city is now once again remembering its multilingual, multicultural, and trans-European heritage as part of efforts to revive northern European identities, a process that corresponds to Slovenia joining the European community and economically and ideologically orienting itself toward the German and other European markets.

3. CONTEMPORARY (RE)INTERPRETATIONS OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

In the Austro-Hungarian Empire, one of the pinnacles of the public glorification of heroic deeds was the great Military Exhibition. In the imperial capital, it opened on July 1st, 1916, in order to showcase to visitors the means and capabilities of the imperial army on the field of battle. The exhibition was based on a traditional understanding of heroism, and it primarily presented a rich array of trophies in the form of confiscated weaponry and other spoils of war. The war trophies glorified the success of the imperial army and tried to persuade onlookers into believing that all enemies clashing with the empire were doomed to fail against the valor and courage of the emperor's soldiers. A special section of the exhibition was dedicated to military graves and monuments.

Contemporaries believed that each and every day of the bloody European massacre was historically relevant. Because experiences could not be captured merely with paper and ink, items and memorabilia from the war had to be collected to appropriately preserve the true image of war for posterity. During the very first year of the war, all the warring countries began considering the establishment of war museums, extensive sources of information for future historians and belletrists. In Austria, such museums were being planned for all major cities of the empire. The principal function of war museums was propaganda, and their establishment was to involve the provincial homeland security centrals from all across the Empire. The first one was conceived in the imperial capital, and others were soon to follow in its remaining major cities. In mid-January 1915 a proposal arose to establish a special military section in the Rudolfinum building in Ljubljana, home of the Provincial Museum of Carniola, and in the same year the Carniolan governor, Ivan Šuštersič, started a preparatory committee to establish a provincial war museum. The committee drew up the work plan and proposed the systematic collection of items that would then be sent to smaller war museums in Ljubljana, Bled, and Bohinjska Bistrica.

The end of the war and the emergence of the new state of the “nation of three names” spelled doom for the former plans to establish museums celebrating the glory of the imperial armada. In the early 1930s, the Association of Combatants then once again began to contemplate a war museum and began collecting various battlefield curiosities for this purpose, especially photographs, diaries, books, and so on. However, the first museum exhibition dealing with the Great War was not opened for another half century, when it finally occurred at the local Tomaž Godec Museum in Bohinjska Bistrica.

In this context, heritage is understood as a metacultural process (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2004) that hinges on a continual negotiation of the past for the constitution of a community and a collective identity in the present. The heritagization of the war provides the foundation for revisiting, reframing, and reconfiguring wartime social memory.

Research in this module focuses on three major themes. The first one concerns the numerous sites at which the continual heritagization of the war has been underway from the end of the war onward, sites that are landmarks in the landscape of social memory linked

to the war—including museums, collections, or monuments, with a focus on contemporary memorial sites and practices. The second theme is the region of the former Isonzo Front as a memorial landscape and the site of new forms of wartime (re)memorialization and (re)heritagization. Finally, the third focus centers on framing these practices and formations against the backdrop of contemporary European heritage discourses and practices as well as processes of European integration by introducing a comparative dimension.

HERITAGE PRODUCTION SITES

In Slovenian museum space, war-themed exhibits between the two world wars were exceedingly rare, and even after 1945 subjects related to the Great War were not often encountered, whereas the Second World War, with the period leading up to it and the ensuing communist revolution, were depicted in a variety of ways in nearly every local, regional, and national museum.

After 1991, namely, various actors began restoring forgotten monuments and establishing new ones. The Second World War, which in communist Yugoslavia effectively pushed the Great War out of public memory, became a problematic historical period following Slovenia's independence, in 1991, because it is considered to have "painfully divided Slovenes," whereas the Great War is interpreted as a time of brutal conflict between nations that teaches contemporary man a lesson of the "universal value of international peace." A shifting attitude toward monuments was also shaped by the new integration processes taking place in Europe in the 1990s, which stressed the importance of common European history and international harmony (in which memory of the war served as a cautionary tale), and the related local initiatives for the resurrection of the memory of the Isonzo Front that culminated in 1993 with the awarding of the Council of Europe Museum Prize to the Kobarid Museum. With its presentations and reinterpretations of the Great War, this museum brought it to the forefront of public awareness. The development of First World War heritage in the context of pan-European commemorations advanced considerably in 2014, with the marking of its hundredth anniversary, and is set to continue until 2018.

Other Slovenian museums—for example, the Museum of Contemporary History—only took on the renewed focus on the Great War heritage in the past couple of years, after 2012, in the summer of which Slovenia also became actively involved in the pan-European marking of the Great War centenaries with the establishment of the National Committee for the Hundredth Anniversary of the Great War (2014–2018) that "in accordance with the Slovenian experience of the war and its collective memory decided to act in the spirit of overcoming the divisions that pushed Europe into war in 1914, strengthen the ideas of coexistence and tolerance, and promote intercultural and intergenerational dialogue." An analysis of these contemporary productions of the Great War's heritage represents a significant research subject in the proposed project.

In the efforts to preserve the memory and heritage of the Great War, an important role is played by the public Monument Protection Service, which has been successfully

developing the doctrine of the Great War heritage protection for over thirty years and is overseeing its forms and presentations in an expert manner. In Slovenia there are 303 listed units of such cultural heritage. Today's lists classify them as "memorials" (statues, markers, plaques, cemeteries, avenues, etc.), whereas past practices classified them as historical heritage or as monuments falling under various respective valuation categories. Most of these units are registered in western and northwestern Slovenia, with as many as 146 in the area managed by the Institute for the Cultural Heritage Protection of Nova Gorica and the remaining 157 spread across other areas.

THE LANDSCAPE OF THE ISONZO FRONT

The Upper Soča Valley with its well-preserved remnants of the Isonzo Front's battlefields is especially suitable for providing a landscape experience because the many monuments, signs, and inscriptions across the territory (Ingold 2000; cf. Tilley 1994) produce a wartime memory through contemporary "authentic" forms of landscape experience (Selwyn 1995, 2004); for example, walking the military routes of the First World War, and visiting monuments, commemorations, or still-preserved trenches of the great battlefields. The routes, locations, and objects that emerged during the war were attributed different meanings by the local communities, the governing and national institutions, and diverse international programs and projects throughout changing periods, which in turn altered the interpretation of their history and collective memory. The social construction of the wartime and peacetime memory of the landscape reflects the political process of reinterpretation and the production of local, national, and European history and memory, while also encompassing physical and symbolic reconfigurations of places, routes, and memorial sites.

Between the two world wars, today's Slovenian Littoral was not part of the Drava Banate but instead belonged to the Kingdom of Italy. The first monuments in this area were already created during the war; for example, Holy Spirit Church on the Javorca Plateau in honor of Austro-Hungarian casualties. After 1918, when the area was awarded to Italy, numerous monuments arose in memory of Italian sacrifices. Due to the experience of Fascism, many Italian monuments fell into ruin after the Second World War, in the new state of Yugoslavia. Even the neutral monuments of the Great War were not taken care of because primacy among historical events in Yugoslavia was accorded to the Second World War for ideological reasons.

In the region of the Isonzo Front, production of the Great War heritage is especially active today and comprises private and national institutions, various organizations, and initiatives by various individuals. Similar to Saunders' conclusions about the Western Front, the Isonzo Front has likewise become a symbolic memory landscape, in which visiting routes, monuments, and museums shapes personal and local identities and the national memory of the Great War (Saunders 2001; cf. Winter 1994 ali 95??). The efforts of various actors are reflected in care for mass graves, restoration of monuments that deteriorated during

the Yugoslav era, furnishing of private and public museum collections, configuring the wartime memory landscape through the restoration of military infrastructure and logistics, research and preparing military casualty records for public use, and inclusion in international associations, programs, and initiatives. The chief functions of all these efforts are the tourism economy, development at the local level, and state protocol at the national level.

One of the internationally most successful projects of this kind is the trail known as the Walk of Peace, established in 2000, which is a scholarly extension of previous heritage initiatives. One of its main contributions is reshaping the mountain landscape, which, through the restoration of bunkers and military routes, is acquiring the character of an outdoor museum with an authentic historical landscape. Routes that once had military significance are today reinterpreted as memorial routes that also offer recreational and sightseeing notes. At the same time, the landscaping project is acquiring an increasingly protocol function. Thus, in 2012, the presidents of Slovenia and Italy—Danilo Türk and Giorgio Napolitano—became honorary patrons of the Walk of Peace’s expansion from the Julian Alps to the Adriatic Sea, which is also Slovenia’s flagship contribution to the pan-European organized remembrance of the centenary of the Great War’s beginning. Although the Great War heritage carries numerous particular meanings, it can also act as a vessel for the active cooperation of new EU peripheries in contemporary European ideological landscapes. In the national sense, it thus represents a new Europeanization of Slovenian history.

The complex and interdisciplinary understanding of First World War heritage has helped develop relevant valuations of the image of the memorial cultural landscape and its monuments. In some areas of Slovenia, the picturesque Alpine and Mediterranean cultural and natural space was adapted to acquire the shape of a memorial wartime landscape. Restored cemeteries and defensive fortifications, bunkers, caverns, churches, chapels, markers, and numerous constructed public monuments are key parts of this “adaptation.” In some places, the memory of the war is preserved by monuments in the shape of sculptures (in Šmartno ob Paki), memorial plaques and various architectural compositions (in Vintarovci, Ormož, and Ptuj), thematic parks (in Dornava, 1924, 2013), or in recent times the reshaping of some markers into composition markers representing the memory of all wars and postwar violence (in Desrnik).

THE LOCALIZATION AND EUROPEANIZATION OF FIRST WORLD WAR HERITAGE

In this section, researchers examine the diverse discourses and practices that define contemporary outdoor First World War memorial projects and memorial landscape construction in Slovenia against the backdrop of similar memorial projects across Europe. In particular, the research in this module focuses on the varied discourses distinctive to recent memorials in terms of which the legacy of the war is defined in both local and global contexts. In addition, the research on the utilization of the discourse also focuses on the different sorts

of relationships that such a discourse allows various social actors to formulate in relation to the memorials and to the war itself.

On the other hand, these memorials are analyzed within a broader comparative framework of (re)memorialization practices across chosen sites to examine the “Europeanization” of the war’s legacy. The research thus also focuses on the development of broader processes of heritagization on the European scale and the interactions among processes taking place at the local, national, and European levels. What memories of the war are chosen and being mediated in the discourse of wartime social memory at the European level? One of the questions to be explored in this context concerns the framing of outdoor museums’ portrayal of the reality of war and of trench warfare within a context of peace. Battlefield artifacts are restored and reconstructed, not only for the descendants of those whose forefathers fought and even died in the war, but also for those that wish to understand what the war was like and why such wars should no longer occur. How are these different messages structured and maintained through the general discourse of “heritage”? Whose heritage do these heritage structures claim to be? What are the messages that the memorial seeks to express to different audiences—local residents, members of particular nations and states, global tourists, schoolchildren, university students, and other war heritage specialists?

In his article, Ivan Kovačević (2018) analyzed the 2005 film *Joyeux Noël*, which describes events on the Western Front on Christmas Day in 1914. After several months of trench warfare under difficult weather conditions, singing carols on Christmas Eve began a spontaneous truce known as the Christmas Truce, which included Christmas Day itself. The analysis of the film traces the French–German conflicts, the possibility of joint action by Christian churches, and elements of interaction. The analysis shows that the very bases of the film (e.g., international production and actors from many different countries) were conceived within the framework of the European Union, which a year earlier (in 2004) accepted ten new members (both former winners and losers of the First World War) into its ranks.

Today, the strategies of re-memorialization of the Great War are numerous, but the most prominent among them are played out at the level of the physical and symbolic landscape (e.g., preservation of battlefields and re-inscription of physical traces of the war into the landscape). Memories of the war are no longer passed on directly from one generation to the next, but are instead mediated through creating new memorials, museums, thematic parks, and trails. The research focuses on a selection of such memorials across Europe, including the recent Slovenian project The Walk of Peace from the Alps to the Adriatic. This is a national and cross-border project with Italy that aims to create a network of various wartime memorials (including outdoor museums, memorials, and public and private museum collections) along the Isonzo Front.

The inscription of such memorials into a social landscape is a challenging endeavor that requires the efforts of many different actors and groups; this also implies that these memorials are often multiply, diversely defined. The project identifies and examines the various views, agendas, and roles that actors and groups have in the shifting construction of social memory through the creation of such outdoor heritage infrastructures. How do their activities and interactions inform the choice of experiences and memories that these contemporary memorials encompass, and the discourses that inform their polyphonic (or even contested) construction? Research in this vein thus explores the particular significance of (re)memorialization practices inscribed into memorials as the product of efforts of local and national actors.

REFERENCES

- Anon. 1937. Slovenski bojevni pri Mariji Pomagaj. *Slovenec*, August 30, 1.
- Bartulović, Alenka and Marjana Strmčnik (eds.). 2016. *International Symposium Heritage of the First World War: Representations and Reinterpretations*, Sarajevo, 5 - 8 October 2016. Ljubljana: Faculty of Arts, Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology.
- Bartulović, Alenka. 2018. Representing Gavrilo Princip: Tourism, Politics and Alternative Engagements With the Memory of the Sarajevo Assassination in Post-War Bosnia-Herzegovina. *Traditiones* 47 (1): 169–191. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2018470109>
- Bokovoy, Melissa. 2001. Scattered Graves, Ordered Cemeteries. Commemorating Serbia's Wars of National Liberation, 1912–1918. In: Maria Bucur and Nancy M. Wingfield (eds.), *The Politics of Commemoration in Habsburg Central Europe, 1848 to the Present*. West Lafayette: Ondine University Press, 236-254.
- Bonač, Fran. 1932. Mir in ljubezen na dan. *Bojevnik*, December 23, 2.
- Connerton, Paul. 1989. *How societies remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Czarnecka, Dominika. 2018. World War I “Cartographies”: Mapping the Polish Landscape of Forgetting in Legnica. *Traditiones* 47 (1): 135–152. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2018470107>
- Čagorović, Nebojša and Saša Knežević. 2018. Monuments and Their Narratives: First World War Monuments in Montenegro. *Traditiones* 47 (1): 87–99. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2018470104>
- Čopič, Špelca. 1987. Slovenski spomeniki padlim v prvi svetovni vojni. *Kronika* 35 (3): 168-177.
- Demski, Dagnosław. 2018. “Dispersed World, Dispersed Legacy.” Photographic Narratives of the First World War on the Basis of Polish “Archives”. *Traditiones* 47 (1): 153–165. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2018470108>
- Fikfak, Jurij. 2015. Political rituals and discourses. The case of Carinthia. *Folklore* 60: 51–72. DOI: 10.7592/FEJF2015.60.fikfak
- Fikfak, Jurij, Ivan Kovačević and Božidar Jezernik (eds.). 2018. *Cultural heritage and the great war: perceptions and receptions*. International conference. Beograd: Filozofski fakultet.
- Fikfak, Jurij and Božidar Jezernik. 2018. Introduction: The Cultural Heritage of the Isonzo Front. *Folklore* 73: 7-18. doi:10.7592/FEJF2018.73.introduction
- Ingold, Tim. 2000. *The Perception of the Environment: Essays on Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Jezernik, Božidar. 2014. *Mesto brez spomina. Javni spomeniki v Ljubljani*. Ljubljana: Modrijan.
- Jezernik, Božidar. 2018. Every War Invents Its Heroes. *Traditiones* 47 (1): 35–60. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2018470102>
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. 2004. Intangible Heritage as Metacultural Production. *Museum International* 221-222 (1-2): 52–56.
- Kovačević, Ivan. 2018. The Christmas Truce of 1914 in the Film *Joyeux Noël* (2005). *Traditiones* 47 (1): 233–247. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2018470113>
- Lyttelton, Adrian (ed.). 2001. *Liberal and Fascist Italy, 1900–1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moriarty, Catherine. 1997. Private Grief and Public Remembrance: British First World War Memorials. In: Martin Evans in Kenneth Lunn (eds.), *War and Memory in the Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Berg, 125–142.
- Mosse, George L. 1975. *The Nationalization of the Masses. Political Symbolism and the Mass Movements in Germany from the Napoleonic Wars Through the Third Reich*. New York: Howard Fertig.
- Mosse, George L. 1990. *Fallen Soldiers. Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nećak, Dušan and Božo Repe. 2010. *O Feldmaršalu Svetozarju Boroeviću de Bojni*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta Univerze v Ljubljani.
- Newman, John Paul. 2015. *Yugoslavia in the Shadow of War. Veterans and the Limits of State Building, 1903–1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saunders, Nicolas. 2001. Matter and Memory in the Landscapes of Conflict: The Western Front 1914–1999. In: Barbara Bender and Margot Winer (eds.), *Contested Landscapes: Movement, Exile and Place*. Oxford and New York: Berg, 37–53.
- Selwyn, Tom. 1995. Landscapes of Liberation and Imprisonment: Towards an Anthropology of the Israeli Landscape. Eric Hirsch in Michael O'Hanlon (eds.), *The Anthropology of Landscape: Perspectives on Place and Space*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 114–134.
- Selwyn, Tom. 2004. Zapiski o vzdušju s terena: Razmišljanja o potek mitoiskateljstva. *Monitor ZSA* 6 (3-4): 50–63.
- Simonič, Peter. 2009. *Kaj si bo narod misli? Ritual slovenske državnosti*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- Simonič, Peter. 2018. Social and Cultural Relocations of Rudolf Maister: About the Political Mythology of Lower Styria. *Traditiones* 47 (1): 193–212. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2018470110>
- Svoljšak, Petra. 2006. Nekaj utrinkov iz delovanja veteranske organizacije Zveza bojevnikov: »Organizacija Bojevnikov je trdna in močna, je zveza src in duš. Je temelj prijateljstva in ljubezni med narodi«. *Prispevki za novejšo zgodovino* 46 (1): 277–288.
- Svoljšak, Petra. 2010. Spomin na svetovno vojno. In: Marko Štepec (ed.), *Slovenci + prva svetovna vojna 1914–1918*. Ljubljana: Muzej novejše zgodovine Slovenije, 94–95.
- Svoljšak, Petra. 2011. Slovenski spomin na prvo svetovno vojno in mesto feldmaršala Svetozarja Borojevića pl. Bojne v njem. In: Marino Manin (ed.), *Feldmaršal Svetozar barun Borojević od Bojne (1856.–1920.)*. *Zbornik radova*. Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 31–42.
- Šísteck, František. 2018. The Contested Memory of the First World War in Montenegro. *Traditiones* 47 (1): 63–86. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2018470103>
- Štepec, Marko et al. 2010. *Slovenci + prva svetovna vojna 1914–1918*. Ljubljana: Muzej novejše zgodovine Slovenije.
- Tilley, Christopher. 1994. *A phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths and Monuments*. Oxford and Providence: Berg.

- Vance, Jonathan F. 1997. *Death so Noble: Memory, Meaning and the First War*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Velikonja, Mitja. 2018. Contested Heroes – Gavrilo Princip and Rudolf Maister as Subcultural Icons. *Traditiones* 47 (1): 213–229. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2018470112>
- Winter, Caroline. 2009. Tourism, Social Memory and the Great War. *Annals of Tourism Research* 36 (4): 607–626.
- Winter, Jay. 1995. *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Winter, Jay. 2006. *Remembering War: The Great War Between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Zimová, Katarína. 2018. First World War Memorials in Slovakia. *Traditiones* 47 (1): 101–114. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2018470105>

KULTURNA DEDIŠČINA PRVE SVETOVNE VOJNE

Vprašanja kulturne dediščine prve svetovne vojne so osrednji fokus raziskave in znanstvene analize v okviru projekta J6-7173; gre za specifičnosti ohranjanja in produkcije spomina na Veliko vojno, zlasti v slovenskem delu Kraljevine SHS ter v italijanskih in avstrijskih deželah s slovenskim prebivalstvom. Razlike v spominu na vojno so pogojene z različnimi pozicijami posameznih držav (zmagovalke in poraženke); gre za parcialnost in politiko spomina, procese in strategije ohranjanja spomina. Spomin na vojno pa je lahko politično bojišče in toriše različnih skupinskih identifikacijskih strategij. Raziskava je strukturirana v tri sklope, od katerih sta v tem zvezku Traditiones obravnavana predvsem prva dva:

1. VOJAŠKI GROBOVI IN SPOMENIKI

Po koncu vojne si je velik del Evrope zastavljal vprašanje o njenem smislu. Odpirale so ga tudi številne žalne slovesnosti in spomeniki, posvečeni spominu padlih vojakov. S tem vprašanjem so bili soočeni tudi prebivalci Kraljevine SHS, tj. države, ki je združila »zmagovalce« (nekdanje državljanje Srbije) in »poražence« (nekdanje državljanje Avstro-Ogrske, Hrvate, Slovence, Srbe in Bošnjake).

Spomeniki med zasebnim in javnim / uradnim in subverzivnim: V Kraljevini SHS so z javnimi spomeniki, postavljenimi z državnimi podporami, slavili srbske vojaške zmage, povzdigovali junaštva srbskih vojakov in dobrovoljcev; hkrati je bil spomin na avstro-ogarsko vojaško tradicijo in na avstro-ogarske vojne žrtve potisnjen v pozaboto. Postavljanje spomenikov padlim vojakom različnih etničnosti je v Kraljevini SHS postalо ritual, ki je podpiral bodisi »uradne«, bodisi »subverzivne« politične vrednote. To je najbolj očitno prišlo do izraza pri upodabljanju vojakov v uniformah na spomenikih. Po srbskih mestih in vseh postavljeni spomeniki namreč praviloma vključujejo figure v srbskih vojaških uniformah, manjše število slovenskih spomeniških figur je v uniformah nekdanje avstrijske vojske.

Spomeniki neznanemu junaku / vojaku: *Spominjanje na vojne strahote je po vojni dobilo svoj najbolj značilen izraz v grobnici neznanega vojaka, ki je simbolizirala vse vojne žrtve določenega naroda, hkrati pa je preživelim omogočala žalovati za vsakim posameznim padlim vojakom. Njihovo središčno mesto v socialnem spominu je poudarjala lokacija v glavnih mestih držav, udeleženek vojne. Uspeh v postavljanju spominskih obeležij in spomenikov je leta 1927 spodbudil tudi nekdanje slovenske bojevниke, da so začeli razmišljati, da tudi Slovenci ne morejo zaostajati za velikimi narodi. Pri izbiri lokacije za skupno grobničo so dali prednost Brezjam pred Ljubljano; spominske svečanosti na Brezjah je bilo lažje predstavljati kot apolitičen, zgolj versko-pietetni dogodek. Zaradi politične delikatnosti zamisli o skupni grobniči tj. »slovenskem bojeviškem panteonu« je njeni uresničevanje potekalo počasi. Izbruh druge svetovne vojne je prekinil prizadevanja tako za postavljanje spominskih znamenj, kot žalnih svečanosti.*

2. KOMEMORATIVNE PRAKSE, SPOMINSKE SLOVESNOSTI IN PRODUKCIJE SPOMINA V SODOBNOSTI

Konec vojne je prinesel nove realnosti z novimi junaki in novimi pozabami. V tem kontekstu se je temeljito spremenil tudi kolektivni spomin ne le na vzroke in posledice vojne, temveč tudi na njene cilje in smotre.

Zgodovinske osebnosti in ambivalence: *V ospredju zanimanja je sarajevski atentat, ki je navadno razumljen kot osrednji povod za krvavo vojno, in njegova recepcija po letu 1918 do danes. Politična izraba Gavrila Princa je zlasti v bosansko-hercegovski družbi stalnica, posebej v času, ko se odvijajo volitve in politične bitke. Komparativna študija na podlagi etnografskega terenskega dela, diskurzivnih analiz in pregleda arhivskega gradiva omogoča heterogene interpretacije osrednjega lika sarajevskega atentata, njegovih žrtev in političnih implikacij; hkrati zajema tudi politične manipulacije in njihove kontra-učinke v sodobni bosansko-hercegovski družbi. Za Slovence je pomembna zgodovinska osebnost general Rudolf Maister, ki je z vojaško silo dosegel premik meje na sever. Z intervencijo svojih borcev je omogočil dokončno prevlado Slovencev v Mariboru in izpeljal zamisel škofa Antona Slomška. Obema, Maistru in Slomšku, so danes v mestu posvečene redne letne prireditve, njuna markantna spomenika danes stojita na dveh osrednjih mariborskih trgih. Na vsakega od njiju je vezan poseben sklop komemoracij.*

3. SODOBNE (RE)INTERPRETACIJE PRVE SVETOVNE VOJNE

V tem sklopu projekta je raziskava osredinjena na vprašanje, kako so po letu 1918 (re)interpretacije Velike vojne na različne načine in različno intenzivno vplivale na ohranjanje dediščine vojne. K drugačnemu odnosu do spomenikov so prispevali tudi novi integracijski procesi v Evropi v devetdesetih letih, ki so poudarjali evropsko zgodovino in mednarodno sožitje (pri čemer je spomin na vojno služil kot opomin). Spomini na Veliko vojno se ne prenašajo več z generacije na generacijo, ampak jih posredujejo s gradnjo novih spominskih obeležij, muzejev, tematskih parkov in poti. Raziskava se ukvarja s spomeniki, postavljenimi širom Evrope, vključno s sodobnim slovenskim projektom »Pot miru od Alp do Jadran«. V okviru re-interpretacij je v

tem zvezku obravnavana posebna tema, namreč, kako so dogodek, skupno igranje nogometa, prenesli na filmsko platno, in kako so oblikovali sporočila o ritualih, ki zmorejo transcendirati nesoglasja in sovražnosti.

Prof. Dr. Božidar Jezernik, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts,
Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, Zavetiška
9, SI-1000 Ljubljana, bozidar.jezernik@ff.uni-lj.si

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Jurij Fikfak, ZRC SAZU, Institute of Slovenian
Ethnology, Novi trg 2, SI-1000 Ljubljana, fikfak@zrc-sazu.si