

MANAGEMENT AND PRODUCTION OF INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE

EXAMPLES IN SERBIA

MIROSLAVA LUKIĆ-KRSTANOVIĆ

The UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) has established new administrative rules and strategies of preservation, protection and implementation. The policy of intangible cultural heritage entails the conceptualization and configuration of the elements of intangible cultural heritage in the national framework as a model and as special perceptive strategies. Administrative stereotypes and pragmatism are confronted with scientific contextualization and with issues that determine various kinds of representation policies. In Serbia, intangible cultural heritage has been adopted as a strategy of state policy, accumulated scientific knowledge and various perceptions. Bearing in mind the specific social and political circumstances of the country in the periods of crisis and transition, the construct and status of intangible cultural heritage are manifested through ambivalent processes of worldwide networking and positioning through a symbolic fight of meanings as a "national issue".

Key words: *intangible cultural heritage, managing, production, Serbia.*

Unescova Konvencija o varovanju nesovne kulturne dediščine je postavila nova administrativna pravila in strategije njenega ohranjanja, zaščite in rabe. Politika nesovne kulturne dediščine vsebuje nacionalno zasnovno in konfiguracijo elementov nesovne kulturne dediščine kot model ter posebne strategije. Administrativni stereotipi in pragmatičnost se spoprijemajo s strokovno kontekstualizacijo in vprašanji, ki določajo raznovrstne politike reprezentacije. V Srbiji je nesovna kulturna dediščina sprejeta kot strategija državne politike, nakopičenih znanstvenih spoznanj in raznovrstnih razumevanj. Upošteva je posebne družbene in politične okoliščine v državi v času krize in tranzicije, se konstrukt in položaj nesovne kulturne dediščine izražata v ambivalentnih procesih svetovnega mreženja in postavitve s simbolično bitko pomenov kot »nacionalne zadeve«.

Ključne besede: *nesovna kulturna dediščina, upravljanje, produkcija, Srbija.*

INTRODUCTION

Programming intangible cultural heritage (ICH) is based on a bureaucratic taxonomy, monitoring systems, the established order, production and the consumer market. It is an operation too large for the dispersion and regulation of cultural phenomena to be brought into order through systems of informing and social usefulness. Public debates, which began in the 1990s, have opened up many questions focusing on social networks, human rights, as well as corporate and global trends (Castells 2000; Eriksen 2001; Graham 2002; Brown 2005). Definitions and construction of intangible cultural heritage are established by policies of heritage organization and implementation in a form that entails complex networks of relations, hierarchies, areas of interest and a range of interactions. From social perspectives, heritage ensures the status of occurrences and constructs in the shaping of cultural and economic capital within the political scenes. In this sense, heritage may also be determined as a retrospective expression of culture, which is transformed into a highly

politicized commodity (Brown 2005: 43). From the position of scholarly interpretation, this phenomenon implies a discursive and contextual comprehension to arrange various levels of meanings and power structures. The “trouble of heritage” permanently confronts the contextual and pragmatic view on the *society* of heritage, starting with definitions, conceptions, instrumentalizations, goals, etc.¹ Firstly, the following issue is often imposed – for whom and with what purpose is all this being done as part of overall and comprehensive evoking and instalment of cultural heritage? This question will most certainly be hard to answer, because the production of heritage elements increases daily and the number of insiders and members of the programme of intangible cultural heritage is getting higher and higher, with far-reaching goals of its omnipresence. The *Convention’s*² narrative and strategic programme, which entails forms and methodologies of operation and managing heritage, includes communities and authorities.³ Intangible cultural heritage as a culturally marked and marking product has a public and representative character within power/knowledge, which can be related to the symbolic and constructive discourses of interpretation (Foucault 1972; Hall 1997; Geertz 1998). This is why I shall question some of the guidelines and policies of intangible cultural heritage, especially in the area of representing power structuring.⁴

INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN FORMAT: NORM AND INSTITUTION

The turning point in the process of promoting intangible cultural heritage (ICH) was the adoption of the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* at the 32nd Conference of UNESCO 2003 (Paris), when ICH was defined and constructed within an autonomous frame of reference.⁵ The *Convention* is based on the existing universal declarations with the mission to: guarantee human rights, copyright, and individual property, protect cultural heritage, promote and preserve cultural differences and establish

¹ In 2011, an international conference titled *Tradicija in kulturna dediščina izzivi za ustvarjalnost in poustvarjalnost/Tradition and Cultural Heritage: Challenges for Creativity and Performance* was held in Ljubljana, organized by the ZRC SAZU Institute of Slovenian Ethnology. The focus of discussion entailed various discourses on the interpretation of tradition and cultural heritage, practices of researching intangible cultural heritage, contemporary applications of cultural heritage, but also problems and dilemmas within policies and strategies concerning intangible cultural heritage.

² UNESCO *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* (2003).

³ The number of countries that signed the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* is getting higher. By 2011, 142 countries in the world ratified the UNESCO *Convention*.

⁴ This paper is based on the research project *Kulturno nasleđe i identitet* (Cultural heritage and identity, N. 177026), co-funded by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Serbia.

⁵ See: http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=17716&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html; Aikawa 2004: 137–149.

cultural dialogue. In order for a phenomenon to gain the status of ICH, it necessary has to be placed within an identifiable and limited frame of reference marked by practices, representations, expressions, skills and knowledge, which are transferred through generations of a community or a group, providing them with a sense of identity and continuity (Article 2 of the definition). This may be called the phase of standardization, or establishing the criteria for ICH due to the needs of international administration. The next step was the institutionalization of ICH with the aim of managing, operationalizing, cooperating and monitoring how the distribution of cultural phenomena was being mapped. The hierarchy in the management of ICH entails that the bureaucratic cooperation should be reflected in the procedures and activities of international committees, state/national commissions and committees, NGO's sector and funds (fiduciary status). It is a strategic programme, which involves operative forms and methodologies, strict and extensive liaison and coordination of experts. Each of the member states founded their own bodies – commissions, centres, coordination teams, which are responsible for the administrative aspects of heritage, i.e. the groundwork for further treatment, preservation and presentation of ICH. Also, regional networks and sub-regional networks have been established, which are again based on international contacts and cooperation of expert teams. This didactic and educational arrangement encompasses a series of measures and training programmes on the national level monitored by the UNESCO office in Venice; annual seminars are given by experts, and conferences are being held in the region of South-East Europe (Bulgaria 2007, Turkey 2008, Croatia 2008, Serbia 2010). The international incorporation into UNESCO bodies, as well as state and national institutionalization⁶ made ICH state-related and nationalized, which means that states became the primary holders of property over culture (Gavrilović 2010: 48).

The last two decades in Serbia were marked by economic transition as well as political antagonisms, the economic crisis and a complete disavowal of universal cultural values. Hence, the policies pertaining to the management of cultural heritage were focusing mainly on national glorification. Culture and cultural heritage were used as instruments in political clashes and narrow national interests embedded in hermeticism and self-sufficiency. It was only after the political changes in 2000 that Serbia gradually started to take part in European processes, mainly by adopting the regulations and standards of European institutions. Expert engagement and action towards the consolidation of administrative and academic knowledge in Serbia started straight after the implementation of the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the ICH* in European countries. Although Serbia was not amongst the first signatories of the *Convention*, expert presentations and proposals started appearing in meetings and consultations after 2004.

The first of such meetings, which was interdisciplinary in character and organized by the Museum Society of Serbia, was held at the Ethnographic Museum in Belgrade

⁶ Of 218 nationally categorized elements on the UNESCO list, only 14 are multinational.

in 2004.⁷ In the following years there was further cooperation and activation of individuals, especially connections of museum experts with international institutions, as well as recognition of the field in the identification of ICH. In Serbia, the *Convention* was ratified in 2010: realizing the programme for the implementation of identification and of applying ICH. In 2011 two bodies were formed within the Ministry of Culture and Information of the Republic of Serbia: the National Committee for the Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Commission for Entries into the Registry of Intangible Cultural Heritage. The assignment of the Committee and the Commission is to revise the applications submitted and, based on the criteria from the *Convention*, determine the cogency of applications in relation to the national registry, the *Representative list of the intangible cultural heritage of humanity* and the *List of intangible cultural heritage in need of urgent safeguarding* within UNESCO programmes. One of the important priorities is the formation of the Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in Belgrade. During 2010 and 2011 important events were held, such as: the Ministry Conference and the Summit of Chiefs of States on Cultural Heritage in Belgrade, where nine regional countries and observers participated; the International Seminar on the Preservation of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Ethnographic Museum. The launch of the project “Fortresses on Danube” and the Danube strategy under the sponsorship of UNESCO (office in Venice) includes both tangible and intangible heritage.

It can be said that a stable bureaucratic apparatus of competencies and responsibilities was established on an international, as well as national level by means of norming (adoption of the *Convention*) and institutionalization (founding the administrative bodies that implement the *Convention*).

DIFFERENT WAYS OF INTERPRETATION: PARADIGMS AND DILEMMAS

Some disciplines such as ethnography, ethnomusicology and folklore studies had been involved in the safeguarding of intangible heritage long before the bureaucratic concept established by UNESCO's 2003 *Convention* (Gavrilović 2011b: 51). While ICH is firmly institutionally established as a functional interest for the needs of the state, the nation and international institutions, conceptual frames and applicability of the *Convention* remain arbitrary and questionable in the academic discourse.⁸ Thus, science has found itself in the ambivalent

⁷ The results and presentations from the gathering were presented in *Zbornik radova* under the title *Negovanje i zaštita nematerijalne baštine u Srbiji. Stručni skup o nematerijalnoj baštini* (Fostering and Protection of Intangible Heritage in Serbia: Expert Gathering on Intangible Heritage), ed. by Ž. Gvozdenović. Beograd: Muzejsko društvo Srbije, 2006.

⁸ Alongside administrative verifications, academic research and publication flourished, which significantly contributed to a greater exposure of ICH. It is worth noting two studies with relevant interpretations and comments on ICH (Rusalić 2009; Gavrilović 2011b).

position of the arbiter, promoter and critic of heritage. In this part I will present the problems/dilemmas concerning the fields of interpretation and contextualization of phenomena in the process of identifying the bureaucratic metalanguage, specific initiatives and national politics.

ORDER

In order for a phenomenon to gain the status of ICH, it has to be artificially planted into the identifying and definitional frame of reference: oral traditions and expressions, including language, performing arts, social practices, rituals, festive events; knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe; traditional craftsmanship. This wide spectrum of cultural phenomena fitting into the field of ICH shows a certain fluidity of definition or a *tour d'horizon definition*. This definition has left aside the sphere of cultural universalism as a general form of how human communities and groups function based on the principles of collectivity, rather directing towards and favouring predominantly ethnic, national and religious attributes of communities and groups. For the needs of such mapping, new paradigms have been established, but at the same time certain dilemmas have appeared in the reading of heritage. It was clear that a frame had to be found, i.e. an identification strategy that was applicable and mostly focusing on standards and representative forms of folklore often recognized in traditional and village culture. The triad folklore – tradition – village in this way became a significant paradigm adequate for further processing and national mapping (with romantic triggers), secured by territorial and time coordinates. The largest number of registered intangible heritage elements refers to the so-called folk elements originating from rural areas with indications of long duration. Ideal-type models thus emerged from ethnographic stereotyping, and suitable systems for national appropriation were established based on UNESCO's definition.

A dilemma appears when one wishes to introduce ICH into a discourse of urban culture, popular culture or industrial heritage. Do city cultures satisfy the specifications and parameters of heritage? Does a metropolis have its heritage? Do global cultural trends and cultural hybridization have their heritage? Popular culture as an industrial product is an unstable and passing category, creating within itself fractions in the form of sub-cultural movements. However, when we look closer, popular culture also creates recognizable histories reflecting specific social and cultural circumstances (e.g. the construction of popular culture under the name “ex-Yugoslavian”, which is verified by generations covering the period from the 1950s to the 1990s).⁹ Who finds this either interesting or necessary? Firstly, generations past and future, who by the projection of intragenerational and inter-

⁹ It is documented in the publication *Leksikon Yu mitologije* (Lexicon of Yu Mythology), which contains references related to the popular culture heritage from the period of socialist Yugoslavia (e.g. manifestations of the Day of Youth, children's game “rotten mare“, work actions, *Hajdučka česma* (concert in Belgrade), Kulišić (a club in Zagreb, cult spot for concerts of all famous bands), Cokta (cola drink, a Slovenian brand), turbo-folk music, etc. After the breakup of Yugoslavia, a great deal of this heritage has been revitalized into national/state heritage in the function of enforcing respective national identities.

generational sharing of memories and knowledge create certain circles of heritage through the instrument of nostalgia.¹⁰ Not that each generation rectifies heritage, but it leaves its mark in the creation and amending of heritage, which is a product of a certain “generation’s plebiscite” (Naumović 2009: 13).¹¹ Heritage can be collectively imported and recognized also when it goes through the processes of metamorphosis and changes in urban, industrial or cyber societies. The basic dilemma is whether to consider heritage as having a static and unchangeable past or as a dynamic process of changes with old/new elements and mutating forms of recycling, which shape the recognized whole.

STEREOTYPE

At the next level of definition there are measures by which the status of ICH is determined. The measures have the aim of setting the generational transmission, awareness of communities’ and groups’ autonomy, interaction with history, perception of continuity and representation of cultural entities and differences. The definition of the *Convention* in the domain of these measures allows for much manoeuvre. However, when these measures become part of national policies regarding the registration, identification and representation of ICH, specific paradigm/criteria requests are set. The conceptualization of ICH is usually based on the inherited values of sources, authenticity, continuity and affiliation. Basically, heritage refers to property that serves as a guarantee for the entity and identity code of a “We”-group. National policies focus on the property of heritage as an ethnic emblem, national wealth, the national and state metaspign. In Serbian terminology, the word heritage is often used interchangeably with the old word *baština*¹² in order to highlight its property roots (much like the terms *očevina* = patrimony and *dedovina* = patrimony, which basically mean the patrilineal inheritance of property), which figuratively means the inheritance of cultural wealth via state and “national tutors”.¹³ This entire corpus establishes certain power structures and authority over heritage. The main rivalry is between practices and events that turn into heritage after a long period of time and practices and events of “made-up traditions” with pretences to be turned into heritage as a brand. The former are manufactured national models and the latter are being manufactured into national models. For example, folk trumpet playing, although familiar since the beginning of the 20th century, only became a representative event and came to be conceptualized as folk musical tradition with the first festival event in 1961, which was started by communist activists in the city of

¹⁰ As Grahm concludes: “Heritage is elusive, ambiguous and hybrid knowledge that roots the elements of the knowledge economy in place” (Grahm 2002: 1016).

¹¹ In his analysis, Naumović paraphrases Renan’s syntagm; Renan declared that the existence of a nation was based on a “daily plebiscite”.

¹² The use of the Serbian term *kulturna baština* and *kulturno nasleđe*, both of which are translated as “cultural heritage”, present the old/new concept and context as the form of essentialism and the form of epochalism.

¹³ Gavrilović analysis old term “baština” as symbol of patriarchy and essentialism (Gavrilović 2010: 46–47).

Guča. In the last 55 years, trumpet playing became a globalized phenomenon with the label “Serbian brand”. On the other hand, the struggle for positioning takes place in the context of the ownership of such music – is trumpet playing Serbian or Romani, and how it can be packaged as a national product. Trumpet playing thus enters the bureaucratic zone of the conflict of opinions and the positioning of power structures regarding its preservation as a paradigm or a brand, i.e. national or market ownership (Lukić Krstanović 2011: 266–267). It is not hard to conclude that the structuring of paradigms suits the ideology of peculiarity/entity, which largely encourages the mentioned expression of *other*, and excludes the expression of *otherness*. When the term “Serbian heritage” is used, it simplifies the meaning linking together either what does not belong to the same category or excluding everything that has no connotations of “Serbian heritage”.

PARADIGM

The bureaucratic concept and scientific discourse of ICH constantly balances two principles: essentialism and constructivism. Both approaches purify heritage from the excess of possibility, focusing on one model only. The Patron Saint Day (*krsna slava*), for example, is one of the crucial and most vital customs, which largely satisfy the criteria for ICH registration. What creates confusion in the process of bureaucratization is its deconstruction with pretentious essentialist and purified approaches, with the goal of a better positioning on the lists. There are claims that the descent of Saint’s Days reaches back to the Middle Ages and further; ritual props are in the focus of materializing the custom although they are not primary. Currently they are being linked to village customs, although they are also widely recognized in cities, but sometimes with different contents, etc. The persistence of patron saint days is not questionable, nor is their vitality, only their construction in “the frozen form” is. The application for the ICH status, i.e. its artificial appearance, is also in an opposition with its real format. Customs, rituals, musical performances, oral traditions are prepared for administrative processing, but the same elements are *living practices* that change, mix, and are ephemerally upgraded, which is why it is quite difficult to leave them within static frames. If they have to go through application processes, such elements should be left with the possibility of their constant development, at least for it to be known how each era or generation shaped them, if for no other reason.

RIGHTS

The scientific and research discourse particularly takes into consideration the problems that give advantage to the critical approach, with the goal of bringing the social platform to the highest level of cultural valorisation and human rights.¹⁴ In this sense, it is sometimes difficult to satisfy and implement all the procedures. To name some further dilemmas: by sticking to the *Convention*, in which a broad definition of ICH is given, the question appears

¹⁴ The initial formulation of the link between the rights and culture as opposition (versus), or the position “rights above culture” and “rights as culture” (Cowan, Dembour and Wilson 2001: 1; Eriksen 2001: 134).

whether each community as a social entity can be the submitter of each social practice that it deems valid? In principle, yes – but this provokes the question of tolerance limits and human rights if it is known to which extent human rights might be misused and violated (especially by communities that prefer customs with elements of discrimination). The dilemma also pertains to cases of inconsistency between what members of the community think, and this can be in opposition with the political correctness of the current state and international policies (for example, the question of ethnicity or language). Safeguarding or preservation of certain practices, especially in the area of magic, beliefs, or social rituals, often infringes on the concept of human rights, copyright or private property. This poses the question whether everything which is labelled as ritual – ritual practices – should get a positive treatment and who is it that makes the decisions whether certain customs should be safeguarded based solely on their supposed antiquity and long tradition, regardless of their destructive or aggressive elements.¹⁵ The Convention in large part also relies on the protection of copyright, i.e. individual rights, which again in the research sense, poses the question of anonymity or official identification of the work's author, who would be often marginalized by the authority of the collective/community (if the author is anonymous how can they be legally or administratively protected?).¹⁶ There is a large body of people interested in gathering information on rituals, dances and music in the territory of Serbia (experts and other authorities).

CREATION

“The fossilization of ICH” especially pertains to museums in order to protect and preserve artefacts or cultural monuments, but what about ambient spaces that offer different visions of ICH? We are talking about the protection of intangible heritage taken out of its protection zone, becoming a representative embodiment of the needs of cultural life and consumption. At the moment when ICH steps on stage, it becomes the property of producers, managers, sponsors, audience, and performers. The production of ICH as a representation creates new rules of handling, as well as new visual orders in the direction of various aesthetics and, above everything, perception. For the needs of cultural representation and tourism, ICH is willing to join forces with material heritage, from which it has never really been separated, creating a certain holistic system of meanings. Aesthetization and the market allow the fusion of past and current culture, e.g. in various ethno festivals combined with old fairs. Since 1960s, with the establishment of the Trumpet festival and similar manifestations, a new era of reanimation of the *homeland* culture has begun. It became bureaucratized in its domain of amateurism. The folklore creativity became distinguished from the general sum of ritual practice by acquiring the priority of the public stage. Since the 1970s, folklore manifestations increasingly began to be called archaically *Sabor* or The Assembly, a term,

¹⁵ For example the polemic and discussion about Vlach magic.

¹⁶ According to WIPO – World Intellectual Property Organization, the property protected is 20–30 years old.

which etymologically points to the genesis of people's celebrations from fairs and religious rites (Lukić Krstanović 2011: 268).

The project entitled "Fortresses on the Danube" funded by the UNESCO office in Venice is a step toward not only the conservation of significant historical monuments, but also their affiliation with different events and performances. For example, the Petrovaradin fortress is represented and marketed to tourists as the site of the EXIT festival and wine festival *Smederevska jesen* (Smederevo Autumn).

AMBIVALENCE

In general, interpretations of ICH imply cultural dynamism and a connection between European cultures, which is recognized through dualism, i.e. mutual action of authenticity, originality and characteristics, as well as in integrating global trends (Golež Kaučić 2009: 94). On the other hand, in Serbia, as well as in many states in transition, this dualism is often perceived and expressed through confrontations or the opposites of the global and local, the national and European, which are generally recognized in ambivalence. To negotiate between the symbolic status of "our" culture on the one hand and European culture on the other (or regional common denominators), refers more to a monism of heritage which, in this way, is easier to recognize in the public discourse.

Heritage in denominators of states (see: UNESCO lists) refers to distances more than approximations. However, the policies of ICH give chance to future regional networking in which cultural crossovers are preferred, and are as inevitable as cross-cultural elements. If we just look at the entire Balkans region and South-East Europe, we will inevitably encounter numerous common elements.¹⁷ There are no homogeneous national cultures in the Balkans (the film directed by Bulgarian Adela Peeva "Čija je to pesma/Who's song is it?" speaks of this diversity-similarity).¹⁸

REPRESENTATIVE POSITIONING: IN-OUT

The system of the representation of ICH is expressed in two ways – as a presentation within an exchange of experience among participants of a cultural community as the process, and *self-representation* and *heritage as presentation*, as the products. Self-representing the local community heritage through a preservation and maintenance process as confronted with the legacy of the institutional representing code for state/national use which fabricates heritage. Although these two models of representation are compatible, I will point out their confronting status that creates certain dilemmas and problems in their further action and production. Whether it is the elements/constructs such as ritual practices, oral

¹⁷ A good example is the element on the UNESCO list *Mediterranska dijeta / Mediterranean diet* (Greece, Spain, Italy, Morocco); see: <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/RL/00394>.

¹⁸ See also (Rusalić 2009: 137).

traditions or languages, skills – traditional crafts, performing arts or events, instruments as artefacts and similar – it is clear that their transparency and manifestations are mainly reflected in visual and representative form, i.e. *regime*,¹⁹ in order to achieve a strong effect of action in the form of protection, sustainability and preservation with the pretensions of national exposure.

In Serbia, as in most countries, there is a public campaign for the promotion of ICH, which becomes a *matter* of state and national importance. If I remind the reader about the political triggers of the crisis of society – the transition,²⁰ it becomes clear that the efforts towards implementation of heritage have become, on the one hand, a step towards approaching European integrations, but on the other a step towards the nationalization of heritage hermetized “each-to-their-own”. The affirmation of heritage is especially highlighted in the countries where the national identity is brought to the highest level of the state. Public promotions, discussions, information, and conferences establish a special representative discourse, in which this attitude towards heritage is reflected. At the same time, seminars have started, commissions have been formed, research projects funded, numerous interviews and information have appeared in the media, which brought ICH to the level of competency and significance. ICH has been adopted by state institutions, which clearly indicates that it is in their possession. Such representation gives heritage the holistic appearance of the contributing whole of the state instruments. The elements are represented in two ways: 1. emphasis on the elements that should direct attention to certain customs and practices, with the goal of being registered bureaucratically, and as such, protected or to continue *to live*; 2. emphasis on the customs, rituals, oral traditions, performing practices and alike that are labelled as future candidates for the UNESCO lists. The registered heritage and the elements worthy of UNESCO lists establish a relationship of the power of legitimacy and authority, subordination and domination verified by those who show, promote and choose such elements. For example, one of the first elements of ICH with the label of representation is Patron Saint’s days, which are highlighted as one of the most important holidays in the cycle of family customs.²¹ Alongside Patron Saint’s days, other elements have been gaining priority in nominations by being highlighted in the

¹⁹ The “regime of representation” includes the exercise of symbolic power through representational practices (Hall 1997: 259).

²⁰ Serbia got the status of the EU membership candidate in 2012. The pressing issues like the status of Kosovo, high unemployment, low living standard, corruption, crime, as well as current political disturbances and major turns in the positioning of power, show that the relation towards European integrations is constantly changing.

²¹ Numerous titles in the press: *Patron saint day candidate for UNESCO*. The following appeared on an online forum: “If patron saint’s days would fulfill all harsh UNESCO conditions, which are extreme value, rooted cultural tradition, affirmation of cultural identities, and with a greater engagement of the officials, patron saint’s days could carry the name of a masterpiece of intangible cultural heritage of the humanity.” These and similar statements aim for the high positioning of element with the goal of its established affirmation without competition. See: <http://forum.badnjak.com/viewtopic.php?f=4&t=519&start=0>.

public discourse: ceramics in the village of Zlakusa, folksong singing *guslarstvo*, playing the instrument of *frula*, *kolo* dances, Piroć's carpet manufacture, folk music from Vranje and others. Dominating in the mapping of ICH is a growing number of elements which represent an open approach of choice.²² Selective knowledge and perceptions have become the main initiators of registering ICH and its further networking. In this developments, ethnologists, ethnomusicologists, folklorists appear as arbiters, attorneys, finders, forming a special social space of finding and monitoring the circulation of elements.

The next step of representation is the promotion of elements in the function of the media and tourist market. Various strategies of representing ICH are nothing but results of different policies of perception, which have their instructors and arbiters in the adaptation of ICH for the field of spectacle. Customs, rituals, crafts, and performing practices that serve in various manifestations thus become marked elements suitable for presentation with the label "nominations for the UNESCO lists". The suggested nomination in a symbolic way marks their leading position, which suits various forms of the stereotypical service of national, ethnic, and ethnocentric strategies. Marked by media and prejudiced elements, such suggestions often represent a suitable trigger for much political speculation and contradictory attitudes. The related discussions and dilemmas refer to the questions: does a custom or a ritual need purifying from the "media contamination" when the same phenomenon is being promoted in the media? Does a ritual or custom need to be left in its "original" form when it becomes part of tourist and market offers?²³ Relations between elements establish certain hegemonies of sustainability and protection. The media are mostly attracted by the elements that have the sustainability potential and are as such recognizable vital representations in the function of national matters, whereas the elements that are endangered and seek urgent protection are less attractive to the media and require a special form of promotion.²⁴ Exclusivity in the media is given only to the elements that express representativeness through the word "ancient" in the sense of exotic. Finally, the representative regime also entails a series of activities with a tendency to bring heritage policies to the highest level of institutionalization and interaction. For, example, the International Mother Tongue Day is organized in cooperation with the representation of naive painters of Slovaks in Serbia with its base the in museum and gallery centre in Kovačica. Taking

²² In some papers suggestions are being explained, amongst which are the ritual processions *lazarice*, the tales of hidden treasures, *kolo baba*, the role of *čauša* at wedding, customs related to godfathers, vampire stories, production of *gajda* and *frula* and similar (Srećković 2011: 72–74; Marjanović 2011: 108–112). Regardless of the multitude of ideas advertised in the media, the elements have entered a public procedure and replaced expert valorization.

²³ Comments in the media mostly revolve around Patron Saint's days: the customary Patron Saint's day cake is being made less and less, it is being bought instead; the day is celebrated not at home but in a restaurant, turning into a real party. The positive and negative image of Patron Saint's day becomes a media detector in the evaluation and modeling of customs in the area of not only bureaucracy but also ethics. See: <http://www.novosti.rs/vesti/kultura.71.html:320619-Krsna-slava-kandidat-za-Uneska>.

²⁴ This fact was pointed out by Kraus (2011: 11).

place under the scientific seminar title: *Oral Tradition of the National Minorities as Part of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of the Republic Serbia*, it includes workshop training for representatives of minorities for the implementation of ICH. This event involves education, knowledge, heritage promotion – naive paintings, interethnic cooperation and state interests; or, in short, aesthetics, ethics, and politics. The collective treatment of heritage is in this way projected through a vision of the community, a user group of these types of various representations that again construct this type of heritage. This is how the society of ICH circulates through communications, but also in the construction of *heterostereotypes and autostereotypes* for representation (Bokova and Ganeva-Raicheva 2012: 31).

CONCLUSION: TOWARDS THE FUTURE HERITAGES

Unlike stereotypical administrative accounts, scientific research and interpretations indicate a changeable dynamics and often an ambivalent process of *living heritage*, which entails a permanent questioning of methods and strategies of their preservation and sustainability. In Serbia, various viewpoints, perceptions, comments and discussions in the process of the implementation of ICH show that the institutionalization of ICH is sometimes a rigid effort that closes itself in its traditionalist frames identified in ideal models of romanticism. At the same time, ICH is a matter of contemporary processes and as such being protected and evaluated due to becoming a source of wealth of various cultures. Depending on state, expert and bureaucratic policies and markets (including those within Serbia), heritage will in the future construct and implement – or comfortably locate itself within – bureaucratic protocols without the fear of endangering its status or becoming a only a matter of prestige and tension in competitive fields. Future heritage will multiply, but the question will remain – will it be satisfied with its position of a “constant“ or will it confront the contemporary – multiplying, trans-cultural processes – and thus accumulate. In this sense, there is an encouraging example of the famous jazz musician Herbie Hancock as a goodwill ambassador promoting the Inter-cultural Jazz Day and establishing jazz as an ICH under the UNESCO sponsorship.²⁵ Perhaps this example will encourage others to pull heritage out of its stereotyped position, no matter how bureaucratically formalized, giving a chance to many cultural phenomena to represent themselves not as finished centuries-old constructs, but as *open works* in their timeline. Whether traditionalist and essentialist strategies of puritanization and conservative cultural heritage as a national issue or the transformative ratio of incomplete living cultures will prevail in the end – only time will tell.

²⁵ See: www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco/about-us/who-we-are/goodwill-ambassadors/herbie-hancock/.

REFERENCES

- Aikawa, Noriko
2004 An Historical Overview of the Preparation of the UNESCO International Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. *Museum International* 56 (1–2): 137–149.
- Bokova, Irena and Ganeva-Raicheva, Valentina
2012 *The Cultural Diversity of Bulgaria*. Plovdiv: Lettera Ltd.
- Brown, Michael, F.
2005 Heritage Trouble: Recent Work on the Protection of Intangible Cultural Property. *International Journal of Cultural Property* 12: 41–61.
- Castells, Manuel
2000 Materials for an Exploratory Theory of the Network Society. *British Journal of Sociology* 51 (1): 5–24.
- Cowan, K. Jane, Marie-Bénédicte Dembour and Richard Wilson (eds.)
2001 *Culture and Rights: Anthropological Perspectives*. Cambridge University Press.
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland
2001 Between Universalism and Relativism: A Critique of the UNESCO Concept of Culture. In: Cowan, Dembour and Wilson (eds.) 2001, 127–148.
- Fisk, Džon (Fiske, John)
2001 (1989) *Popularna kultura* (trans. *Understanding Popular Culture*). Beograd: CLIO.
- Foucault, Michael
1972 *The Archeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock.
- Gavrilović, Ljiljana
2010 Nomen est omen. Baština ili nasleđe (ne samo) terminološka dilema. *Etnoantropološki problemi* 5 (2): 41–53.
2011a *Muzeji i granice moći*. Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek.
2011b Potraga za osobenošću. Izazovi i dileme unutar koncepta očuvanja i reprezentovanja nematerijalnog kulturnog nasleđa. In: Živković, Dušica (ed.), *Nematerijalno kulturno nasleđe / Intangible cultural heritage of Serbia*. Beograd: Ministarstvo kulture, informisanja i informacionog društva, Centar za zaštitu nematerijalnog kulturnog nasleđa pri Etnografskom muzeju u Beogradu, 50–57.
- Gerc, Kliford (Geertz, Clifford)
1998 (1973) *Tumačenje kulture I* (trans. *The Interpretation of Cultures*). Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek.
- Golež Kaučić, Marjetka
2009 Evropska kulturna identiteta. Realnost ali fikcija? (European Cultural Identity: Fact or Fiction?). *Traditiones* 38 (1): 91–98.
- Graham, Brian
2001 Heritage as Knowledge: Capital or Culture. *Urban Studies* 39 (5–6): 1003–1017.
- Hall, Stuart
1997 Introduction. In: Hall, Stuart (ed.), *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage, 1–11.
- Handelman, Don
1998 *Models and Mirrors: Towards an Anthropology of Public Events*. Oxford: Bergahn Books.
- Kraus, Entoni
2011 Konvencija o zaštiti nematerijalnog kulturnog nasleđa iz 2003. godine. Izazovi i perspektive. In: Živković, Dušica (ed.), *Nematerijalno kulturno nasleđe / Intangible cultural heritage of Serbia*. Beograd: Ministarstvo kulture, informisanja i informacionog društva, Centar za zaštitu nematerijalnog kulturnog nasleđa pri Etnografskom muzeju u Beogradu, 10–20.

Leksikon Yu Mitologije

2005 *Leksikon Yu Mitologije*. Beograd and Zagreb: Rende, Postscriptum.

Lukić Krstanović, Miroslava

2011 Political Folklor on Festival Market: Power of Paradigm and Power of Stage. *Český lid* 98 (3): 261–280.

Marjanović, Vesna

2011 Običaji rituali i svetkovine (i složena struktura simbola otvorenog značenja). In: Živković, Dušica (ed.), *Nematerijalno kulturno nasleđe / Intangible cultural heritage of Serbia*. Beograd: Ministarstvo kulture, informisanja i informacionog društva, Centar za zaštitu nematerijalnog kulturnog nasleđa pri Etnografskom muzeju u Beogradu, 108–115.

Naumović, Slobodan

2009 *Upotreba tradicije u političkom i javnom životu Srbije na kraju dvadesetog i početkom dvadeset prvog veka*. Beograd: Institut za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju, IP "Filip Fišnjić".

Rusalić, Dragana,

2009 *Making the Intangible Tangible: The New Interface of Cultural Heritage*. Beograd: Institute of Ethnography SASA (Special editions; 63).

Srećković Saša

2011 Zaključci radionice na Regionalnom seminaru o nematerijalnom kulturnom nasleđu u Sirogojnu. In: Živković, Dušica (ed.), *Nematerijalno kulturno nasleđe / Intangible cultural heritage of Serbia*. Beograd: Ministarstvo kulture, informisanja i informacionog društva, Centar za zaštitu nematerijalnog kulturnog nasleđa pri Etnografskom muzeju u Beogradu, 72–76.

Internet links

www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco/about-us/who-we-are/goodwill-ambassadors/herbie-hancock/

<http://www.novosti.rs/vesti/kultura.71.html:320619-Krsna-slava-kandidat-za-Uneska>

<http://forum.badnjak.com/viewtopic.php?f=4&t=519&start=0>

www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=00011&RL=00435

http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=17716&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

www.unesco.org/new/en/general-conference/single-view/news/intangible_heritage_committee

UPRAVLJANJE IN USTVARJANJE NESNOVNE KULTURE DEDIŠČINE. ZGLEDI IZ SRBIJE

Politike nesnovne kulturne dediščine (NKD) kažejo na močno birokratsko podlago in hierarhije, strateški nadzorni sistem, ustvarjen z mrežo razmerij med ekspertnimi področji in redom za ustvarjanje in porabo kulture. Medtem ko je NKD pridobila trdno institucionalno podlago za potrebe države in naroda, ostajata vsebinski okvir in implementacija Konvencije o varovanju nesnovne kulturne dediščine (2003) razmeroma poljubna in celo sporna. Eksplicitna opredelitev NKD izhaja iz kulturne univerzalnosti, utemeljene na človeških skupnostih, skupinah in posameznikih, vendar je bila uporabljena in preusmerjena k strategijam, ki dajejo prednost etničnosti in narodnosti. Da bi bile te strategije uspešne, so bile postavljene paradigme, ki pa razpirajo dileme in razprave o razumevanju in ustvarjanju NKD. Politika NKD obsega nacionalno konceptualizacijo in konfiguracijo elementov NKD kot model in posebno strategijo recepcije. Administrativni stere-

otipi in pragmatizem se spoprijemajo z znanstveno kontekstualizacijo in vprašanji o raznovrstnih politikah reprezentacije.

V Srbiji in številnih drugih tranzicijskih državah je dualistično načelo pogosto razumljeno in izraženo v ambivalentnih nasprotjih med globalnim in lokalnim, nacionalnim in evropskim. Na eni strani je kulturna dediščina še vedno dojeta matrica nacionalne identitete, na drugi pa govori o decentraliziranih in lokaliziranih identitetah z elementi hibridnosti. Osrednja razprava torej poteka med tistimi eksperti, ki vidijo starost in kontinuiteto kot imperativ NKD, in tistimi, ki vidijo gibkost NKD kot ustvarjalni potencial kolektivnih spominov skupnosti in skupin in ne kot nacionalno reprezentacijo. Različne strategije reprezentacije NKD niso nič drugega kakor rezultat različnih politik dojetanja, ki imajo svoje učitelje in rabsodnike pri prilagajanju NKD polju spektakla. Razločki med strokovnimi mnenji o tem, kaj je dediščina in kako naj bo opredeljena, so včasih koristni, saj problematizirajo NKD in odpirajo pomembna vprašanja za razpravo. Le čas bo prinesel odgovor, ali NKD bolj ustrezajo tradicionalistične in esencialistične strategije ohranjanja kulturne dediščine kot nacionalne dobrine ali pa transformativna paradigma živih kultur.

Dr. Miroslava Lukić Krstanović, senior research associate,
Ethnographic Institute, Serbian Academy of Sciences
and Arts, Knez Mihajlova 36, 11000 Beograd, Serbia,
Miroslava.lukic@ei.sanu.ac.rs