# Heritage and Scale – Challenges to Wellbeing

## *and Place Management in Dubrovnik's World Heritage Site*

Celine Motzfeldt Loades+ (Norway)

## Abstract

This article is an ethnographic contribution to ongoing debates on the consequences of heritagisation and touristification in the lived realities of World Heritage sites. Based on my doctoral research in Dubrovnik, Croatia, the article provides an ethnographic case-study that explores the consequences of global tourism and relationships of scale on Dubrovnik's urban development, local tourism management and the citizens' experienced wellbeing. The article calls for a broader conceptualization and treatment of heritage that encompasses the multiple values attached to the World Heritage and the wider geographical scale and socio-cultural relations that the World Heritage is situated in. To the inhabitants living in or near the enlisted site, Dubrovnik's World Heritage is made meaningful to its citizens within the horizon of the city's wider cultural heritage, historical relations and embedded cultural historical structures. At the same time, global tourism and relationships of scale asserts ever stronger impacts on how World Heritage sites are managed, understood and used, for instance as selling-points in tourism and place production. A 'scaling up' in the tourist industry's power and ownership structures in the new Millennium have affected World Heritage sites' possibilities to influence destination management and to bring forth a sustainable and responsible tourism.

## Introduction

The incentives for obtaining status as a World Heritage site are connected to a whole host of socio-cultural and political factors, where the desire to bolster tourism and attract international investment to stimulate economic and infrastructural development occupies a central position (Russo, 2002; Drost, 1996). While some instances of the attainment of World Heritage status produce few evident benefits on the ground, in other cases, the World Heritage status has become intertwined with local socio-cultural relations and power dynamics. It can be is actively drawn on in the consolidation of cultural identities and nationhood, in mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion and in discourses on development.

A locally integrated and culturally sensitive approach to heritage and tourism management has the potential to safeguard cultural values and local identity (Nasser, 2003; Auclair and Fairclough, 2015). By fostering culturally sensitive heritage and tourism management, the necessary protection of the cultural heritage and local environment can be provided, and at the same time local economic development and regeneration will be encouraged (Salazar, 2013). Without accommodating for long-term, sustainable heritage and site management, World Heritage enlistment can become a "double-edged sword" to the communities living in or near the site (Xiaoya, 2013; Salazar, 2013). This can present substantial challenges to the intended long-term benefits of heritage and negatively affect both the communities' wellbeing and the environment in the wider World Heritage area. Ethnographic knowledge of how heritage is produced and interpreted within particular cultural contexts, and of how heritage production intersects with – and influences – cultural practices, perceptions and social change, is needed in order to better understand the *"global-local dynamics of heritage interpretation"* and production as well as its diverse uses and effects (Salazar, 2015).

In the last couple of decades, many World Heritage sites have experienced considerable growth in tourism numbers. With an infrastructure unprepared to cater for the rapidly growing numbers, many urban World Heritage sites struggle to deal with the environmental and social pressures of mass-tourism. Although Dubrovnik's World Heritage status and the large tourism potential that it brings have aided towards the city's urban restoration and economic recovery after the Croatian war of independence (1991-1995), the focus onto economic growth and increased tourism numbers have overshadowed communal concerns. 'Over-tourism' and an urban management that fails to involve the local population in decision-making processes are negatively affecting the local population's wellbeing and the citizens' connections to the urban heritage.

This article is an ethnographic case-study that explores the consequences of globalization processes and relationships of scale on Dubrovnik's urban development and local tourism management. Based on my doctoral research in Dubrovnik, Croatia, the article discusses how global processes of change, especially connected to global tourism, affect the wellbeing of the local residents and stimulate local responses including political activism.

## Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework informing this article, and the doctoral research that it is based upon, is inspired by the interdisciplinary field which is loosely labelled critical heritage studies. The 'critical' element in critical heritage studies centers particularly on a rejection of the 'authorized heritage discourse' (Smith, 2006). According to Smith, the 'authorized heritage discourse' which is the dominant perspective in heritage management practices with roots back to the 19th Century, perceives heritage as related to material and monumental structures that are seen to have innate, unchanging qualities and values. In this view, heritage's meanings are seen as a natural consequence of its physicality rather than as part of a culture's attempts to create meaning, identity and to make cultural boundaries and position themselves within their surroundings. Critical heritage studies, on the contrary, approaches heritage as relational and as a process, which is socially constituted, produced and continually negotiated in the interfaces of shifting spatial and temporal relations.

The research informing this article explores the interpretations and uses of Dubrovnik's cultural heritage and its relationship to place as processual and relational. The values and meaning attached to the city's heritage and to place are shaped by, and tied to, present-day purposes, ideologies, cultural symbolism, power relationships, and hopes and desires for the near future. The particular meanings of heritage, and how they intersect with the production of locality, need to be understood as a hybridization of a range of inter-connected processes occurring simultaneously at different scales. The particular forms and meanings which 'the local' and 'the national' have for Dubrovnikans are not reliant on discernible processes happening either 'here' or 'there', but are continuously co-produced and altered by varying spatial and temporal scopes. This article addresses the following main research question: *How does global tourism influence the production of locality and the management of Dubrovnik's World Heritage site?*

## Research Methodology

The article's discussions and findings are founded on ethnographic research for the degree of Ph.D. at the Department of Social Anthropology, University of Oslo (2008-2018). The ethnographic research is based on twelve months of fieldwork in Dubrovnik, Croatia which took place in 2009, 2012 and 2015. It also includes data from a fieldtrip to Zagreb. I have also had evolving contact with researchers, institutions, political and cultural activists, students and citizens in other parts of the country throughout, between and after my fieldwork periods, most notably in Dubrovnik, Zagreb and Split.

I carried out the research primarily by using anthropological methods; in particular participant observation and semi-structured interviews. The contexts and locations for utilizing participant observation varied. I conducted participant observation in a structured manner at a variety of public events including on particular days of commemoration, public meetings, debates organized by NGOs and grassroots activists, seminars, conferences, religious sermons and events, openings of art exhibitions at a local cultural center and in a variety of cultural performances

and events. However, the main context for conducting participant observation was in everyday conversations with local residents in which I was an 'observant participator' (Moeran 2009).

Most of my informants are citizens living in the Dubrovnik-Neretva County *(Dubrovacko-neretvanska županija)* and are between 17 and 83 years of age. The criteria for selecting my informants were informed by a combination of 'snowball sampling' (Coleman, 1958; Noy, 2008) and carefully targeted sampling of informants from different educational, ethnic-religious and socio-economic backgrounds.

In addition to participant observation, I carried out 92 qualitative, semi-structured interviews, as well as three follow-up e-mail interviews in 2018. As a complimentary methodological approach to semi-structured seated interviews, I also carried out several mobile conversational interviews in locations which my informants chose. This type of ethnographic inquiry uses locomotion within a 'field site' as a method to facilitate new insights (Sheller and Urry, 2014; Büscher and Urry, 2009). Mobile ethnography can enable a more 'grounded' ethnographic sensitivity to how ones' informants relate to their environment. I experienced mobile ethnography as a particularly productive method in gaining insights into how informants perceive and experience Dubrovnik's World Heritage site as part of a much wider social-cultural and historically embedded milieu.

### From a 'Living Heritage' to a Museum City

> Dubrovnik was once our living heritage, you know …but we cannot live here now…I do not think it is possible to live a normal life in Dubrovnik, especially during the summer season! Because of tourism, everything else is subordinated…tourism dominates everything and locals cannot live normally. It is simply too crowded!

These reflections from Ivana, a Dubrovnikan woman in her forties, reflect a growing sentiment of many Dubrovnikan residents in recent years. Ivana's ponderings of why the citizens' daily life in Dubrovnik has become close to intolerable is not related tourism per se. Rather, her discontent, echoed in conversations with numerous other residents of Dubrovnik, relates to the overall number of tourists visiting the city in certain periods of the day, thus causing congestion. The majority of local residents I encountered put this change down to the exponential growth of cruise-ship tourism in the last ten to fifteen years. In combination with what many locals perceive as a money-grabbing and insensitive local urban management, which fails to include the well-being of the city's residents, many Dubrovnikans are experiencing a diminishing sense of connection with the historic city center and its urban heritage.

In Dubrovnik and a large number of other European urban World Heritage sites, tourism has been an active element in the urban management of the sites for a long time. In many urban World Heritage sites, including Dubrovnik, tourism precedes World Heritage enlistment.[1] Tourism has thus a long history of intersecting with heritage management and has influenced "how World Heritage Sites are perceived, encountered and experienced in the wider social and political realm"

(Bourdeau and Gravari-Barbas 2016:1). Yet, tourism development and cultural heritage management have often existed in an unwieldy relationship with each other. Their separate interests and approaches towards conservation and development have frequently come into conflict (McKercher, Ho, and Du Cros, 2005). This discord is particularly pronounced in urban contexts, and perhaps even more so in the so-called 'tourist-historic cities' (Ashworth and Tunbridge, 2000; Orbasli, 2002), where the often large number of interest groups compete over limited space and finite 'heritage assets' (Orbasli, 2002). In such contexts, public and political discourses on heritage and urban development often become more intensified and competitive (ibid.). Moreover, the different interests and intentions of the heritage management and tourism industries do not always align with the local population's daily needs and concerns. Given the huge economic potential which cultural heritage and tourism development offers, there is a risk that the well-being of the inhabitants in World Heritage sites becomes neglected (ibid.).

Historical processes and events of the recent past have influenced how Dubrovnik's World Heritage site is perceived and used by its current inhabitants. In particular, the city's condition as a post-war society influences communal interactions, cultural perceptions and practices. The post-war condition has refocused the meanings attached to the city's World Heritage site and the way it is used in identity discourse and geo-political, spatial orientations (Loades, 2018). The shelling of Dubrovnik during the Croatian war of independence caused major material damage to Dubrovnik's World Heritage site. This had long-lasting consequences for heritage restoration and has influenced interpretations and uses of Dubrovnik's World Heritage in identity consolidation. The fact that the war occurred concurrently with the economic transition from Titoist communism to a global, capitalist market economy, further intensified the use of heritage as an economic resource in post-war restoration and tourism development.

In post-war Dubrovnik, the city's urban heritage is used to consolidate geopolitical orientation and ideological discourse by bolstering Dubrovnik's (and Croatia's) desired cultural and political belonging to Western-Europe, and subsequent detachment from the Balkan region. The perceived cultural and political heritage of the Dubrovnik Republic (1358-1808), is used in local political discourse to re-negotiate Dubrovnik's politically peripheral position within the Croatian nation-state and re-construct centrality and within the parameters of the new nation-state. The locally perceived political heritage of Dubrovnik Republic (embedded in a discourse of having long-standing international diplomatic skills and an ability to sustain its freedom), is also central to the symbolism of political stability and amenability within the context of Croatia's post-war identity within the EU.

Dubrovnik's status as a World Heritage site has helped to unify and anchor identities within the new geopolitical context following the turbulent 1990s war and other political upheavals. Yet the use of the city's World Heritage in post-war political discourse and economic development has equally produced new power dynamics, lines of social differentiation and exclusion mechanisms. Consequently, the interpretations and uses of Dubrovnik's World Heritage, under the contempo-

rary conditions of market-liberalism and global tourism, have led, in certain areas, to dissonance and outright conflict (ibid.).

Many World Heritage sites are today experiencing challenges of 'over-tourism' and several World Heritage sites, such as the two Adriatic cities, Dubrovnik (Loades, 2018) and Venice (Casagrande, 2016), are facing a rapid depopulation. Their historic centers are becoming increasingly 'museumified' (Di Giovine, 2008) 'playgrounds' for tourists and less 'living' cities for the local populations.[2]

The population of Dubrovnik's walled center decreased from approximately 5,000 in 1990 to roughly 1,200 inhabitants in 2016.[3] Many apartments in the center have been sold to international investors and are now rented out as holiday homes and only used during the tourist season. Work sites and central amenities designed for the local population's daily needs have been moved out of the center to be replaced with large numbers of souvenir shops, up-market boutiques, restaurants, cafes and bars aimed at attracting and catering for a growing number of tourists.

In order to understand Dubrovnikans' growing discontentment with current tourism, we need to take a closer look at substantial changes that have taken place in global tourism in the new millennium. Changes in global tourism have had significant impacts on local destination management and the living conditions for the host populations affected by mass tourism.

Many local residents are today under the impression that tourism in Dubrovnik has reached a 'tipping-point' and they see little or no possibility of changing the impacts of tourism towards more sustainable outcomes. One of these, a young archaeologist called Luka, thinks that Dubrovnikans are in the process of "breaking the branch on which we sit."[4] Speaking from an archaeological point of view, Luka thinks there is reason to be concerned about the long-time de-generation of the material urban heritage due to the large tourist crowds. He is also concerned with long-term economic sustainability and potential vulnerability of the city due to its over-reliance on tourism and the city's urban heritage in economic development. However, more than anything, his use of the metaphor of 'breaking the branch' emerges from his deep concern about the challenges to the longevity of Dubrovnikans' cultural traditions and their urban, civic identity. With growing conviction, he believes that with the current conditions of tourism developments, the residents' identification with the city center is steadily diminishing and many experience that the quality of life for the population is getting worse. Luka thinks that the local authorities fail to sufficiently deal with these challenges due to the lure of short-term economic gains which tourism promises. By giving in to the desire for ever-increasing tourism growth in a limited space, he thinks that tourism inevitably infringes on local life. At the current rate of development, Luka thinks the long-term effects of tourism in Dubrovnik will come with a crippling price. 'Where will Dubrovnik be in 20 years?' he asks. What will be left for the local population and whether anyone will live within the walled center in future? Luka contemplates.[5] What will be the value of the city's heritage if the center becomes a 'dead museum'?

A Different Type of Tourism

Tourism is one of the fastest growing sectors in the world economy, which also contributes significantly towards the global GDP.[6] The direct economic contribution of travel and tourism amounted to approximately 2.31 trillion U.S. dollars in 2016, thus making tourism, as stated by the UNWTO, into a "key driver for socio-economic progress.[7]

On the Dalmatian coast, tourism is a well-established industry, which has propelled local and regional economic development since the dawn of modern tourism, especially since the 1950s. Post-war economic and infrastructural recovery has been heavily dependent on the return and expansion of tourism. Dalmatia, of which Dubrovnik is a part of, thus plays a central role in post-war national economic development. Following the decline in agricultural production, the destruction of heavy industry and political and social restructuring in the post-war era, tourism has expanded into one of Dubrovnik's main sources of income and economic growth.

If managed sustainably, tourism at World Heritage sites has the potential to make significant contributions to the local economy. This can ensure funding for heritage restoration and urban regeneration. Tourism to World Heritage sites may also offer employment opportunities for the local population inhabiting the sites. Dubrovnik's World Heritage status and its large tourism potential are important keys to explaining the city's comparably high economic performance and low unemployment figures on a national basis. Many Dubrovnikans appreciate the contribution of tourism to the economic and infrastructural recovery and development in the post-war period. However, the character of tourism has changed significantly after the turn of the new millennium and it has fomented growing dissatisfaction among the local population.

Under Titoist communism, there was no room for developing private, family-run hotels as everything was controlled by the state. Due to the urgent need for foreign investment in rebuilding the tourism industry after the war, Croatia sold off many tourism facilities cheaply. International investments have helped to recover much of the tourism infrastructure but without these investments, there would be insufficient capital to renovate the large hotel chains from the former Yugoslavia. However, this process has also created a long-term dependency on international investments.

Although Dubrovnik's post-war restoration of its urban heritage and its recovery of the tourist industry tends to be portrayed as a success story,[8] the economic benefits reaped from the city's World Heritage status and its tourism appeal has not benefitted all citizens equitably. In a cultural climate struggling with corruption and nepotism, social differentiation between those who benefit from tourism and those who do not, have in many cases induced growing discontentment and envy. The economic transition from Yugoslavian Titoism to global capitalism has been accompanied by uncertainties and lack of transparency relating to property and land ownership transference. With the nation's highest real estate prices, the

high monetary value of property and land areas, have in a large number of cases induced on-going ownership conflicts. An example of this was found with a family who had an on-going ownership conflict that they had 'inherited' from the husband's father and was still unresolved over twenty years later.

Another area of concern to the local population is how a large proportion of the money generated from tourism benefits external investors such as multinational companies and not the local economy. By steadily selling off the city's tourism facilities, land areas and urban property to international investors (both Croat expatriates and foreigners), many Dubrovnikans experience that their heritage and local civic identity are simultaneously being sold off. Although Dubrovnik's residents and the local economy largely are performing economically better than many other post-war communities in the region, the experienced level of satisfaction with life circumstances locally is not necessarily optimal.

Although tourism also constituted a large chunk of national revenue in the former Yugoslavia, the tourism industry in that period was much more self-contained. In addition to educated and relatively affluent cultural tourists from Europe, tourism in Dubrovnik under Yugoslavia mainly consisted of domestic tourists, who came on pre-booked package tours for between one and three weeks. There was also more tourism during the winter. Under Titoist communism, the citizens' experienced a greater degree of stability relating to income and employment. Moreover, Dubrovnik's tourism industry existed alongside other industries, such as its centuries' old maritime industry.

Due to global interconnections, fluctuations and the vulnerability of global tourism, local populations living in World Heritage sites today often experience a great degree of economic insecurity. The subjects many Dubrovnik residents often honed in on to explain their dissatisfaction were the increased lack of economic security and intensified seasonality in work and income. Although the employment figures in Dubrovnik are higher than the national average, strong seasonal fluctuations in the availability of work mixed with long periods of unemployment affect the well-being of many Dubrovnikans.

Certain measures have been taken in order to tackle the challenges of seasonality and pedestrian congestion in the walled city center. The local authorities, in co-operation with the tourism industry, have begun to focus on developing strategies to spread out the tourism impacts beyond the UNESCO World Heritage site. There has also been a growing focus onto how to prolong the duration of tourism visits and to expand the tourism season beyond the main tourist season. The launch of a 'Dubrovnik – a City of all Seasons' campaign, coupled with the introduction of more international flights in winter, is starting to have an effect on growing tourism numbers in winter. In 2012, the Ministry of Tourism published the 'Strategy of Croatian Tourism Development by 2020' report. The report identified seasonality as one of the main challenges to Croatia's further tourism development and to the employment situation in tourism- and service sector. The majority of tourism visits to Croatia take place over four months of the year - in 2012, 89.8% of the

overnight tourism visits occurred between June and September.[9] A major reason for seasonality in Croatia's tourism market relates to the high concentration of tourism visits in the coastal region. This tendency is particularly pronounced in Dubrovnik and the entire Dalmatian coast. This supports the assertion that although the city's cultural heritage constitutes a central part of its tourism appeal; 'sea and sun' tourism is also a major source of its popularity as a tourism destination. In order to encourage increased tourism in the remainder of the year, the 'Strategy of Croatian Tourism Development by 2020' report recognized the importance of diversifying the range of tourism offerings and promoting tourism in connection with cultural events and public celebrations that occur outside of the main tourist season.

Winter tourism is prioritized as a major area of tourism promotional activities. Cultural events, which formerly did not attract many tourists, such as the St. Blaise festival (3rd February) and the Dubrovnik Carnival (9th – 13th February) now receive widespread promotion and are used to promote Dubrovnik as a "city for all seasons" to tourists. Other cultural activities, such as the Dubrovnik Winter Festival (December 6th – January 2nd) have been invented in order to encourage winter tourism. The number of winter tourists has grown significantly in recent years. The heavy promotion of Dubrovnik as a "city for all seasons" has also had an overall effect on increased overnight visits in periods with no particular cultural events. In November 2017, for example, 26,947 tourists visited Dubrovnik, which constituted a 23% increase from the previous year.[10]

Niche tourism types, such as heritage trails, rural heritage tourism, wine, gastro, and agro- tourism have received strong promotion and several related cultural events and activities such as, the 'Spring Gourmet Week' (1st – 8th April), Dubrovnik 'FestiWine' (16th – 22nd April) and 'Good Food Festival' (18th – 21st October) have been invented to encourage this.

Dubrovnik also increasingly promotes itself as an international arena for business and conference tourism. This has been a gradual process, but in recent years active targeting and promotional activities at international conference fairs has become more widespread. In 2010, a specialised unit the Dubrovnik Tourism Board, named The Conference Bureau, was established to facilitate and provide assistance to conference organizers, and to promote Dubrovnik in international convention and conference fairs.[11] The crossovers between conference tourism with gourmet and cultural tourism have also become more intertwined in the promotional portfolio of the marketed tourism offers.

Partly due to the eagerness to present Dubrovnik as an elite tourist destination and as fully restored to its 'former glory' as a peaceful and stable 'cultured' city, the personal and cultural traumas and humiliation caused by the Croatian war of independence tend to be glossed over in tourism promotion.[12] There has been little focus on the populations' need for reconciliation. Moreover, the potential for fostering participatory, community-based tourism projects in helping post-war communities re-find dignity and meaning is almost entirely absent in local and

regional tourism developments. The focus onto short-term economic gains over-shadows the other potential roles which tourism can fulfil.

## An 'Overheated' World Heritage City

Fluctuations in global tourism and the 'scaling up' in power and ownership struc-tures in the new Millennium, have affected the ability of many World Heritage sites' to influence destination management and to bring forth a sustainable and responsible tourism. Increased interconnections across spatial scales and an ac-celeration of tourism numbers and journeys made to World Heritage sites, con-tribute towards 'overheated' (Eriksen, 2016) conditions in many localities using their heritage as a selling point in tourism.

Used both in a concrete sense – as in the challenges that we face by climate change, and in metaphorically, Eriksen (2016) sees *overheating* as having become endemic in the globalized world. Populations in disparate geographical areas of the world increasingly experience interrelated crises. He identifies three areas, in particular, as being affected by *overheating:*

- *Environment* (challenges relating to climate change, pollution, diminishing bio-diversity etc.), which tends to be downplayed under the neoliberal economy and the pursuit of economic growth. Therefore, accelerated growth and con-sumption produces a 'overheating' in the environment.
- *Economy*, which due to its increasingly global interconnectedness, lack of diver-sification and 'scaling up' is particularly vulnerable to global events, processes and potential economic recessions.
- *Identity*, which relates to an experienced crisis in the reproduction of iden-tity, locality, place and cultural diversity. This is connected with processes of 'disembedding' (Eriksen, 2007) and relates to globalization, increased mobility, technological innovation, flows of products and ideas, cultural commercializa-tion and commodification.

These 'three crises', Eriksen (ibid.) asserts, tend to involve crisis in reproduction and clashing scales, where, for example, the double-bind of accelerated economic growth and cultural and environmental *sustainability* is becoming ever more pal-pable, and seemingly irreconcilable, in the context of global climate change. Eriksen (ibid.) describes global tourism as exhibiting all the central features of 'overheating.' In Dubrovnik and Croatia, all three crises are apparent. They relate closely to the effects of globalization processes and global tourism on the city, but also to local and regional historical events and processes, which condition the responses to these 'crises' and help to give form to their particular expressions (Loades, 2018).

The strong reliance on tourism as a near mono-economy makes Dubrovnik vulnerable to fluctuations in global tourism and to transformative global and regional processes and events, such as regional political instability, war, global economic recession and environmental catastrophes. Dubrovnik's tourism in-dustry has experienced clear, periodic setbacks, which reveal the vulnerability of the current tourism-dependent local economy and its integration into global

processes and events. The management of Dubrovnik's World Heritage and its use in tourism destination management are increasingly integrated into higher-level scales. The globalization of the tourism industry, combined with technological innovations, have made it easier for small-scale tourism sites to market themselves internationally, to attract larger tourist crowds and new tourism groups. At the same time, international tourism corporations hold more power to influence local tourism management through monopolization of companies' ownership and an integration of local sites into international itineraries. This is particularly the case in tourism sites that are dependent on cruise-ship tourism. Although many Dubrovnikan citizens benefit economically from tourism. Tourism has become a "double-edged sword of integration into higher levels of scale … where localities increasingly depend on the higher systemic levels for their survival" (Eriksen, 2016:69).

### Cruise-ship Tourism – Global Connections and Local Impacts

Recent developments in the global cruise-ship industry have had significant consequences for the character, impacts and challenges of tourism in large numbers of cruise destinations worldwide (Krželj-Colovic and Brautovic, 2007; Klein, 2011). With the globalization of the cruise-ship industry, the power of multinational corporations to influence local place management has increased. Cruise tourism constitutes a major element in enhancing Dubrovnik's state of 'overheating' and exemplifies how touristic cities increasingly depend on "higher systemic levels for their survival" (Eriksen, 2016). This limits the local municipalities' possibilities to manage tourism sustainably by controlling the numbers of cruise tourists visiting Dubrovnik and spreading the arrivals across the year.

Cruise tourism has undergone an exponential growth since the late 1990s. The number of cruise routes and ports of call worldwide have increased considerably and the sizes of the cruise-ships have grown.[13] In the period 2002-2012, cruise-ship calls to Dubrovnik tripled (Caric and Mackelworth, 2014). Dubrovnik has become a transit port in an increasing number of international itineraries. Today 80% of cruise-ships visiting Croatia moor in Dubrovnik (ibid.). The global cruise-ship industry is growing so fast that it is creating challenges for the management and preparedness of ports worldwide. The exponential growth of cruise tourism to Dubrovnik has many visible impacts on the walled city center and causes new challenges to urban- and tourism management. With its medieval urban layout and an infrastructure not suited to the arrival of high volumes of tourist at once, Dubrovnik faces large challenges relating to, traffic and pedestrian congestion, waste management, water provision and pollution. Cruise tourism has changed the character of tourism in Dubrovnik, but has also affected locals' attitudes towards tourism and their wellbeing.

Cruise tourism has been strongly encouraged in Croatia's regional and national post-war economic development. As many of Dubrovnik's tourism facilities were heavily damaged from the war, the renovation of the formerly state-owned hotels delayed the revival of land-based tourism. This process was further delayed by frequent property transference disputes and depended upon securing interna-

tional funding and investments. The provision of accommodation and catering facilities on board the cruise-ships, on the other hand, enabled a swifter return of Dubrovnik's cruise tourism after the war. Many Dubrovnikans I encountered during my period of doctoral research emphasized that they were initially positive towards cruise tourism when after the war. To many locals, the return of cruise tourism became synonymous with the return of normality and stability and symbolized Dubrovnik's international character and connectedness with the wider world. Many citizens thought that cruise tourism would make a significant financial contribution towards the city budget. In the late 1990s, the average cruise passenger tended to be affluent. However, with the growth of cruise tourism in the new millennium, the prices of cruise tours have been reduced, and thus the average age and purchasing ability of the cruise passengers has fallen (Perucic and Puh, 2012).

Structural changes in the cruise-ship industry have affected local destination management and the local municipalities' possibilities in managing its tourism sustainably. In recent years, there has been a shift of focus in the international cruise-ship industry away from the previously important land-based destinations and onto the boat journey itself with a variety of facilities offered on board. Cruise tourists are encouraged to spend more money on the ship itself instead of in the different port destinations (Perucic, 2007; Perucic and Puh, 2012). This has contributed towards a new geography of cruise tourism, where "the cruise industry sells itineraries, not destinations, implying a level of flexibility in the selection of ports of call" (Rodrigue and Notteboom, 2013:1). The consequences of these shifts for the host communities are many, especially in terms of shrinking economic benefits to the local economy.

Another evident change in cruise tourism is a monopolization process of the cruise-lines' ownership composition. A small number of increasingly powerful multi-national consortiums control and shape the global cruise-market. Just three companies own 75 per cent of the international cruise market and 96 per cent of the cruise market is controlled by only four companies (Perucic, 2007, Rodrigue and Notteboom, 2013). With increased capital and power to pursue new cruise markets, this monopolization process leads to greater fluctuations in the cruise market, which can affect the services provided, the range of destinations offered and the demands placed on the host communities and ports. Consequently, it has become increasingly difficult for municipalities and port authorities in cruise destinations, to influence the traffic flow, routes, ship sizes and numbers of embarking passengers.

Another structural change in global cruise tourism is that, increasingly, large multi-national corporations secure a stake in the cruise ports' ownership or lease sections of the ports on a long-term basis. This can make it more difficult for the host communities to determine terms and conditions for steering cruise management locally. It can diminish the local port authorities' and the municipalities' power to institute constraints on the number of cruise arrivals, as well as affecting their power to encourage a seasonal spread of cruise arrivals and thus miti-

gate overcrowding at the height of the cruise season. In Venice, the world's largest cruise port operator, the French-Turkish consortium, Global Ports Holding (GPH), have steadily bought up shares in the cruise port, *Venezia Terminal Passaggeri*. Global Ports Holding has similarly tried to assert influence in Dubrovnik's cruise port. In 2016, Dubrovnik International Cruise Port Investment, owned by GPH, signed a 40-year contract with Dubrovnik municipality to lease a land area next to the existing cruise port in the western-lying part of the city part, Gruž. The port investment involve the construction of a new 25,000 square meter port next to the existing one (continuing along the river, *Rijeci dubrovackoj),* a new passenger terminal and a bus station. The value of the project is estimated to €94 million. However, due to suspicion of corruption, lack of transparency concerning the conditions of the contract, and local civic opposition, the contract has been halted.

As we can see, with the globalization of tourism, global multinationals are gaining more power to influence local tourism destinations. However, local municipalities are also central drivers in outsourcing the control of the ports to multi-national consortiums. Mirroring processes occurring nationally, Venice has undergone a process of rampant privatization of cultural heritage assets (Benedikter, 2004, Ponzini, 2010) and an out-sourcing of tourism facilities since the early 1990s. Although Croatia's economic transition to the market economy occurred following national independence in 1991, the challenges of post-war economic, infrastructural recovery and large-scale restoration work, has delayed this process somewhat. However, in the course of the last decade, Dubrovnik's privatization process has escalated considerably. The majority of politicians in the municipal government, of all political leanings, tend to uncritically embrace a further growth of tourism numbers to Dubrovnik (Loades, 2018). Public property and land areas previously used by the local population have been sold off or leased to private investors in tourism. An example of this tendency is seen by how a small public park has been turned into the luxurious gardens of a private hotel. The combined privatization and commercialization processes of cultural heritage assets also affect cultural institutions' potential longevity. An example of this is found in how a cluster of cultural and humanitarian NGOs, housed in the World Heritage enlisted 16th Century quarantines, Lazareti, have been under the threat of losing the premises they have inhabited for up to 25 years to the establishment of a multimedia center for cruise tourists.

### Local Resistance and Civic Action in the Adriatic
In recent years, cruise-ship tourism has stirred great deal of discontent and outright resistance in many host communities (Colomb and Novy, 2016; Vianello, 2016a). The attitudes towards cruise tourism in Dubrovnik are undoubtedly mixed and many locals express a great deal of ambivalence towards this emergent tourism-form, perceiving it to bring both benefits and detriments to the city. However, over the course of my doctoral research, I have noticed a turn towards apprehensiveness and critique about the overwhelming impacts that the large crowds have on everyday life.

Many host communities in the Mediterranean have increasingly met the enormous growth of cruise tourism with resistance. In Venice, local resistance has grown hugely (Vianello, 2016a) and has led to the establishment of the civil action group, *No Grandi Navi* (No large ships). Civic resistance towards cruise tourism in both Dubrovnik and Venice stem from concern over the lack of measures taken to limit and spread the number of cruise ships and passengers visiting per day and in certain periods of the year. However, the critiques also surpass the issue of tourism management. The very essence of the capitalist, free market logic of global tourism, monopolization processes, outsourcing of cruise destinations' cultural and natural assets, including heritage, landscapes and ways of life, become targets of critique. *No Grandi Navi* has held a range of demonstrations in the Giudecca canal of the Venetian lagoon. The activists make use of banners, boats, torches and use their own bodies to block the cruise-ships from entering canal by spreading out and swimming in the lagoon. Every day around 20 large cruise-ships enter the narrow canal, dock in the Marittima port and then disembark some hours later (ibid.). The large scale of the ships places an enormous pressure on the fragile foundations of Venice's buildings, which are built on poles. When the cruise-ships pass through the lagoon, an estimated volume of between 30,000 and 35,000 cubic meters of water (depending on the ship's size) is shifted, first by being pressed against the foundations, then pulled back again as the cruise-ship leaves. Venice's cruise tourism thus constitutes a direct threat to the city's cultural heritage.[14] However, the social consequences of over-tourism, and how tourism increasingly is experienced as negatively influencing the citizens' wellbeing, are equally a cause of concern.

The relatively small spatial confinements of both Venice and Dubrovnik; Venice by its lagoon and Dubrovnik by its city wall, mean they experience many of the same tourism related pressures. As in Venice, local resistance against cruise tourism in Dubrovnik has grown, especially over the course of the last decade. Many Dubrovnikans repeatedly complain of how, despite strong local discontent with the congestion and pollution caused by cruise tourism, the municipal authorities and port authorities do little to manage it. Unlike Venice, however, there has been little visible resistance in front of tourists. Although the Venetian demonstrations against large cruise-ships entering the lagoon clearly have inspired and encouraged many Dubrovnikan political activists I have encountered, there is no parallel in Dubrovnik to the types of demonstrations or the blockage of cruise-ships from docking.

Critiques of cruise tourism have however been voiced by the civil initiative, *Srd je naš*,[15] but largely through political lobbying and by calling on the aid of UNESCO and ICOMOS. In 2012, *Srd je naš* called on UNESCO's aid to pressure the local authorities to action to limit tourism numbers and sustainably manage its cruise tourism.

Dealing with Over-tourism

*Srd je naš'* appeal for international intervention by UNESCO and ICOMOS led to
a joint UNESCO and ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to Dubrovnik in 2015.
Based on the report of the joint UNESCO/ ICOMOS monitoring mission in 2015,
the World Heritage Committee later discussed Dubrovnik's status as a place of
'Outstanding Universal Value' at its World Summit in Istanbul in July 2016. The
question of placing Dubrovnik on the 'World Heritage List in Danger'[16] arose for
the second time, revealing the fragility of the World Heritage status to the city's
population. The verdict made during the 2016 World Summit was that Dubrovnik
is allowed to keep its status as a site of 'Outstanding Universal Value (OUV).' How-
ever, the World Heritage Committee demanded that the Dubrovnik municipality
need to provide UNESCO with a new, sustainable tourism management plan –
which introduces sustainability measures taking into account the 'carrying capac-
ity' of the walled city center. The evaluation highlighted the management of cruise
tourism as a major area in need of improvement. In the World Heritage Commit-
tee's report, the carrying capacity for the number of people entering the walled
center of Dubrovnik was set at 8,000. This number constitutes a significant reduc-
tion of the numbers visiting the walled center in this period, which often reached
to 12,000 and at its highest close to 15,000 people in one day.

In the second decade of this millennium, a critical discourse on 'over-tourism' has
received some attention in academia and has become a widely reported 'phenom-
enon' in the international press. The concept does not present a fundamentally
new phenomenon, but can rather be understood as an intensification of an on-go-
ing process of tourism growth with accompanying wide-reaching negative rami-
fications for the host communities and the environment. The term crystallizes a
tendency in global tourism's overwhelming, and sometimes detrimental impacts
on localities, and brings attention to the pressing need to deal with the negative
consequences.

Definitions of 'over-tourism' often combine quantitative and qualitative assess-
ments of the impacts of tourism on places (Goodwin, 2017; Milano et. al., 2018;
Seraphin et. al., 2018; Weber, 2017). Over-tourism can relate to a situation when
the 'carrying-capacity' of a place is exceeded (Weber, 2017). It can also relate to
a tendency where the numbers of tourists have escalated rapidly in a short pe-
riod of time and therefore do not harmonize with the existing infrastructure and
amenities of the place. However, most definitions of the term incorporate qualita-
tive assessments to how the local population *experience* the impacts of tourism.
Accumulative factors in deciding whether a place is suffering from 'over-tourism'
can involve assessments of the negative impacts on the experienced quality of life
of the residents receiving high tourism numbers, where "the quality of the experi-
ence" [of a place to tourists and locals] has deteriorated unacceptably" (Goodwin,
2017:1), situations where mass-tourism has "enforced permanent changes to…
lifestyles, access to amenities and general well-being" (Milano, 2018) and where
tourist gentrification causes a process of depopulation and flight of local residents
in the city cores. All of these accumulative factors are descriptive of the current
situation in Dubrovnik. In 2019, Dubrovnik was placed as number three on Vivid

Maps' Over-tourism map as cities with the most tourists per capita (1000 tourists per resident).[17]

The international focus on over-tourism has asserted some effects on local tourism management practices in the Adriatic. In the last years, Venice and Dubrovnik have implemented a range of measures to manage the undesired impacts of tourism in the city cores. Measures of managing and restricting cruise-ship traffic and tackling traffic and pedestrian congestion and flow have asserted some effects on the character of tourism in each of the cities. In 2018, Venice launched the awareness raising campaign, 'Enjoy Respect Venezia.' Dubrovnik similarly launched the project, 'Respect the City' (Poštujmo Grad) in 2019.[18] Venice municipality has implemented measures to move the tourist crowds more swiftly out of certain city parts which are suffering from over-crowding and a penalization system for certain kinds of behavior, such as picnicking in public urban spaces, littering, sitting down in front of shops, swimming in the canals, bike riding in the city center and being dressed 'improperly' according to local cultural perceptions. These measures are part of the wider awareness raising campaign intending to shift the character of tourism towards a more responsible and locally sensitive tourism that recognizes the importance of safeguarding local values and customs.

The World Heritage Committee's report in 2016, and the threat of Dubrovnik being placed on the World Heritage List in Danger, have led to the introduction of measures to monitor and control tourist numbers. In January 2017, towards the end of Andro Vlahušic' term of office as the Mayor of Dubrovnik, 116 live surveillance cameras, monitoring the numbers entering and leaving through the city wall entrances, updated every 15 minutes and publicly accessible on the internet, were installed at the five city gates. This represents a growing area of urban tourism management that utilizes new technological solutions to measure and control tourism flows. Other UNESCO World Heritage sites that struggle with overcrowding at certain times of the year or certain points of the day have introduced similar technological solutions. In the five UNESCO enlisted fishing villages, Cinque Terre in Italy's north-western province, Liguria, the local authorities have introduced a ticketing system and a mobile phone application.[19] Through these measures, tourists can obtain figures on the tourist numbers at any given time. At certain times of the year tourists must pre-book their visit to the town, and when numbers exceed 1.5 million people annually, new visitors are rejected. Dubrovnik is similarly planning to launch a smart phone application, which provides information to tourists on the number of visitors to the center at a given moment. The smart phone application will also provide information on alternative sites to visit outside the walled center. In combination with plans to provide a car sharing system for visitors, the municipality attempts to use 'smart technology' in order to disperse the large crowds out of the city center.

After Mato Frankovic was elected the new Mayor of Dubrovnik in May 2017, the issue of instituting measures to deal with overcrowding and to limit cruise tourism have been given much more attention in politics and the local media. Early in his term of office, Frankovic announced that he intended to drastically reduce the

numbers of people entering the walled center at any given time by restricting the maximum number of visitors to 4,000 people (in other words, half of the recommended 'carrying capacity' numbers set by UNESCO). One way to achieve this, he argued, is to reduce the number of cruise-ships calling on Dubrovnik in the tourist 'high season' (between April and October).

Despite the stated aims of the current municipality to reduce the daily number of visitors to the walled center, it remains uncertain whether Dubrovnik's authorities actually will intervene and control access to the city center if the numbers surpass the 'carrying capacity'. According to the local municipality, there will be attempts to divert the flow of pedestrians if the numbers go above 6,000 people. When the numbers inside the walled center reach 8,000 people, the police will start to prevent further crowds from accessing the walled center. Exactly how the authorities plan to divert the crowds, and what criteria will be used for allowing or denying people to access the city center, is not clear.

The local municipality has also stated that there are plans to launch priority tickets which can be bought before arrival by tourists who may be concerned that they will be able unable to enter the walled center. However, unless properly regulated, tour operators could easily exploit such measures. Cruise tourists' guarantee that they are provided with access to Dubrovnik's World Heritage site is essential if cruise-lines are to market the site as one of the attractions in their itineraries. Will priority access, therefore be given long in advance to tour operators and cruise-lines, which rely on pre-scheduled travel itineraries? Such a system may, in fact, further reduce the numbers of land-based tourists to the city and therefore diminish the number of overnight stays. This could have a negative knock-on effect on small-scale tourism initiatives and reduce the annual income to local families who rely on letting a room or an apartment to tourists.

### Global Tourism - Vulnerability and Change

Although instituting measures to control the flows and numbers of tourists that enter World Heritage sites offer a potential to improve the living conditions for residents in places suffering from over-tourism, there are still considerable risks involved in heavy reliance on tourism. The strong reliance on global tourism for national and local economic growth, as well as for individual livelihoods, makes Dubrovnik particularly vulnerable to global processes and events. Environmental catastrophes, economic fluctuations and recession, international political conflicts, refugee crisis, acts of terrorism and warfare have negatively affected the tourism industry in many places (Henderson, 2007a; Beck, 2005; Henderson 2007b). The longevity of tourism as a major source of economic revenue to Dubrovnik therefore depends on continued regional stability. This sense of vulnerability to changing regional circumstances and the potentiality of a future war in the Balkans are things that many Dubrovnikan residents I have encountered have in the back of their minds. In national and municipal tourism development strategies, on the contrary, the potential detrimental effects on the tourism industry if a regional conflict was to ignite, is largely absent.

Dubrovnik is, due to the recovery of the tourist industry, a high performer in its own domestic national context and the unemployment rate is amongst the lowest nationwide. In the regional context, Croatia is, also largely due to tourism, performing comparatively well economically. However, if regional political conflict reappears and if war breaks out a nearby country in the future, Croatia's tourism industry will almost certainly suffer. Despite the large geographical distance between Kosovo and Croatia, the knock-on effect of regional conflict was evident in 1999, during the war in Kosovo. After the end of the Croatian war of independence, the renewed unstable political conditions in the Balkan region precipitated a sudden drop in cruise-ship arrivals to Dubrovnik. This was witnessed during the 1999 war in Kosovo where Dubrovnik's tourist industry, which was on the rebound, temporarily collapsed. Although the political situation in Croatia had stabilized, in the 'mental geographies' of many tourists and cruise companies Kosovo was seen as near. Due to the Kosovo war, many tourists considered it unsafe to travel to the entire Balkan region. Cruise companies changed their itineraries accordingly.[20]

The flightiness of the global tourism market has a strong impact on the local population of Dubrovnik. Whereas tourism in Yugoslavia was pre-booked by tour agencies many months in advance, the influence of internet booking today makes locals more vulnerable to changes in the tourism market and the global economic situation. This vulnerability is furthermore heightened by transformative global events and catastrophes.

In the last few years, several European tourism destinations have experienced a significant drop in tourism numbers due to increased political instability, terrorist attacks and the Syrian refugee crisis. Political instability and an escalation in terrorist attacks in Turkey since 2015 have had negative consequences on the national tourism industry. Many formerly popular tourist resorts have had to close down due to the absence of tourists. Numerous Turks earning a living from tourism have temporarily lost their source of livelihood. Likewise, tourism numbers dropped on the Eastern Aegean islands in Greece, which were part of the route of Syrian refugees to enter Western Europe. However, although the international tourism industry is particularly vulnerable to political instability, armed conflict and environmental disasters, tourism usually returns when the regional or local conditions in or near the tourism destinations are considered stable. Einar Steensnæs, former vice president of the Executive Board of UNESCO Paris (2005-2009), reflects on how tourism, despite its vulnerability to global events, usually recuperates when stability returns:

> Turkey and Greece experienced great difficulties in maintaining their tourism industry in the aftermath of the political unstable conditions when the safety situation was not considered stable. However, since then, things have changed in Turkey and Greece and today tourism has in many ways normalized again. This shows that people follow world events closely and choose their holiday destinations accordingly. Experience shows that when the security level is considered as safe again, tourism returns relatively soon afterwards.[21]

However, Steensnæs emphasizes that in the case of long-term conflicts or warfare, and if tourists do not consider the level of security as satisfactory, long-term detrimental effects on tourism could occur. He thinks that the vulnerability of tourism has furthermore increased due to changes in international tourism in the last couple of decades. In the early days of tourism, he asserts, a limited number of places featured as 'natural' holiday destinations to the tourist. Today, on the contrary, tourists of a certain economic standing see 'the whole world' as constituting potential destinations for vacations. The flightiness of tourism has been stimulated by lower costs, heightened connectivity of travel modes, easily accessible information and heavy tourism promotion of a growing number of tourism sites. This has increased the competition for tourists' attention. If political conflicts or warfare ignites in areas near popular tourist destinations, tourists will choose to travel to other places, which may appear as equally appealing destinations. Steensnæs reflects:

> People are ready to find alternative places for travel. This is quite worrying for tourism. If a new war broke out in the Balkans, the situation could become dramatic. The regional situation is very delicate. If the world powers became involved in the case of a new war in the Balkans, and the level of security is not considered satisfactory, tourism will disappear. People will find other places to travel. I do, however, think that tourism can be restored again even after war – as long as people feel confident that the level of security is satisfactory. ibid

As Dubrovnik's recovery of tourism illustrates, the 1990s Balkan wars had crippling long-term effects, but the consequences on the tourism industry and local economy have not been re-erectable. However, the successful return of tourism to Dubrovnik has depended on strategic, large-scale national promotional efforts internationally. Strategies of re-focusing itself as a city for heritage-and cultural tourism and of representing itself as being a part of Western Europe and the Mediterranean (as opposed to being a part of the Balkan region), are parts of deliberate attempts to convince tourists that Dubrovnik is a safe and politically stable place to visit. If a new conflict or war is to erupt in near future, the trust and conviction that Dubrovnik is a safe and stable place, removed from the conditions of the Balkans at large, may prove to be fragile.

In the case of a new war in the Balkan region, Dubrovnik's increased dependency on cruise tourism may furthermore heighten the city's vulnerability as a tourist destination. With a steadily growing number of cruise destinations globally, cruise-ship companies are more likely to change their itineraries if conflict or warfare erupts. This aspect was reflected in my interview with Steensnæs:

> From the point of view of the [cruise-ship] companies, places that today are identified as attractive destinations will seize to be so if the security situation is not considered as satisfactory. Despite their former appeal, the companies will find new destinations and cruise-ship tourism may not be re-erected to the same degree afterwards. In Africa, several countries have obtained a satisfactory level of stability. In for example, Kenya, Tanzania, Senegal and Ghana, new cruise-ship destinations are likely to appear and the companies may view these as positive alternatives. In cruise tourism, the companies decide the destinations. Ibid

The focus onto the impacts of cruise tourism in World Heritage sites was, according to Steensnæs, completely absent during his period in UNESCO Paris. "All together the focus onto the dilemmas emerging from tourism itself, received very little focus," he reflects. Steensnæs thinks that today UNESCO cannot ignore the negative consequences of over-tourism in World Heritage sites.

There is a dawning awareness in many World Heritage sites struggling to cope with large tourism numbers that the site's continued attractiveness to tourists as places of Outstanding Universal Value will in the long run depend on managing tourism flows. UNESCO's advisory bodies, such as ICOMOS, have played a central role in bringing matters of sustainability to the fore. Today, an assessment of the potential negative impacts of tourism on the sites' Outstanding Universal Value has become part of the monitoring procedure of the World Heritage sites. However, UNESCO has limited capacity and funds to follow up issues emerging. UNESCO therefore relies on honest reporting by the State Parties, an aspect that may be affected by the sites' levels of corruption and political transparency, as well as by issues relating to the economic incentives behind the use of sites' World Heritage status.

### From a Material Based to a 'Living' and Values Based Heritage Management
The 'place branding' potential of obtaining World Heritage status and the lure of the economic benefits that tourism may offer to World Heritage sites have led to a 'rush to inscribe' (Meskell, 2012). The exponential growth of World Heritage nominations in the new millennium has brought attention to the fact that the behind-lying motivations to be taken up on UNESCO's prestigious list are often connected as much to commercial and monetary interests as it is to a desire to protect the cultural and natural heritage of a place.

This brings attention to the strong need to look beyond heritage as merely being related to their material representations, a 'natural' or 'objective' selection of cultural representations or natural environments. Heritage should instead be seen as a multi-faceted process and a social practice, which for various political, ideological, economic, cultural and historic reasons are selected and reified as a culture's valuable heritage at a certain point in time. The meanings of heritage are malleable and change in relationship with local, regional and global processes. To foster a sustainable management of World Heritage sites it is therefore essential to incorporate a values-based heritage management both into the enlistment process of sites and in the continued monitoring of the sites.

Although the material-based approach to heritage management continues to dominate management practices, the ways in which heritage is understood and the potential roles it can fulfil have significantly broadened since the 1980s and 90s (Ekern et. al., 2012; Harrison, 2013). This reconceptualization of heritage, advocated particularly by UNESCO and its Advisory Bodies, ICOMOS and IUCN,[22] sees a culture's heritage, sense of identity and cultural continuity as encompassing an intimate connection between its 'tangible' and 'intangible' expressions, including facets such as the built environment, traditions, knowledge, skills, landscapes and cultural spaces, and 'living' expressions of a culture.

Since the 1990s, the dominant material-based approach has been supplemented with two emerging approaches to heritage management (Poulios, 2014). These can broadly be defined as, the 'living heritage' approach and the values based approach to heritage management. The material-based approach to heritage management offers little possibility for community involvement as it is driven by scientific 'expert groups' (ibid.). The 'living heritage' approach, on the contrary, focuses on fostering a heritage management, which aims at sustaining continuity and correspondence between the care of heritage (both 'intangible' and 'tangible') and communities' relationships experienced 'bond' to heritage and place (ibid.).

The values based approach to heritage management, an approach that was forwarded by the 1999 Burra Charter, attempts to incorporate the multiple values attached to heritage by different stakeholders into decisions made in heritage management practices (Poulios, 2014). Since then, aspects such as communities' cultural values, dignity and spiritual values have gained a wider recognition as important elements to strategically map and incorporate into management practices. However, although the international discourse on heritage management practices and the multiple roles that heritage can fulfil to communities have broadened, the material-based approach often continues to dominate urban management 'on the ground'. In Dubrovnik, this approach has, if anything, been strengthened due to the commercialization of the city's cultural heritage through the tourism industry, Croatia's entry into the global market economy and due to the pressing need for urban restoration following the 1990s war.

The extensive material damage to the urban fabric of Dubrovnik during the war placed the city on UNESCO's 'List of World Heritage in Danger' between 1991 and 1998. Local, national and international technical and scientific 'expert groups' assisted in restoring the World Heritage site. This has strengthened heritage management practices' focus onto prioritizing buildings of 'monumental value' and the historic, walled center. The post-war restoration of Dubrovnik is internationally recognized as a successful and a praiseworthy example of international public-private collaboration. As one of four examples globally, the restoration of the Old City of Dubrovnik is included as an example of UNESCO's "successful restorations," under the headline "Success stories,"[24] The enormous and continued efforts to restore 'the Pearl of the Adriatic' in the aftermath of the 1979 earthquake and the war damage from the 1990s war, may, indeed, be deemed as successful according to architectural, structural and aesthetic requirements. However, measures of success are perhaps less discernible when it comes to political prioritizations and socio-economic processes guiding the post-restoration use of 'tangible' urban heritage.

The pressing need for restoration following the two consecutive crises has led to a very practical, technocratic type of heritage management. According to many local residents, heritage management frequently overlooks the integration of the buildings' uses, once restored, into the projects. The yardstick of success revolves around aesthetic and 'authentic' facades and structures. Consequently, the perception of Dubrovnik's cultural heritage as being inherently 'a part of' the urban

fabric of the walled center, its 'tangible' monuments and structures dating back to particular epochs, continues to dominate local heritage perceptions.

Many citizens have started to question what the purpose of restoring the walled center is if its residents will not use the center and its restored buildings. Andro, a music teacher in his 40s, touched on this concern. He questions what purpose the post-war restoration of the walled center really has if the buildings are not inhabited by local residents who live there all year around. He is concerned with how the local inhabitants' quality of life and the infrastructural needs of daily life have largely been ignored in Dubrovnik's post-war restoration and tourism management. While he used to feel a strong connection to the city's urban, architectural heritage, today he looks upon Dubrovnik as a 'lifeless museum:'

> What does it mean to protect our heritage? I think that if you convert something into a museum, even if it is perfectly restored … it is gone from life. Before I thought we should restore buildings to their 'original forms.' Now I value primarily living things. Even if satellites and air conditioning spoil the aesthetics of the buildings, I would prefer that as long as it is a living city … for the local population … but not if restoration is aimed at apartments for tourists (Interview with informant Dubrovnik, 2102).

Many Dubrovnikans I have encountered express similar attitudes to Andro. Several local citizens reflect that year by year, they feel that their city is being transformed into an 'exhibit' in an open-air museum. Less and less is the city looked upon as being for their own enjoyment and use. Some residents even experience that their own homes are becoming 'museumified' and that their private lives are turned into exhibits for public scrutiny. This is especially the case for locals who live in apartments overlooking the city wall, where continuous crowds of tourists walking on the wall constitute one of the main sights from their lounge, kitchen or bedroom windows. By focusing on restoring 'facades', but largely overlooking how the structures, buildings, monuments and landscapes' feature in the inhabitants' lives and meaning-making, or what they will mean to future generations, Dubrovnik's cultural heritage is at risk of becoming 'fossilized' and 'museumified.'

## Conclusion

To the communities living in or near World Heritage sites, the World Heritage List represents much more than a legal instrument for heritage protection. The officially sanctioned UNESCO concept, 'World Heritage', is produced within the contemporary cultural contexts of the World Heritage sites, often relating to specific cultural symbols, economic processes, ideological uses and political intentionalities for the near future (Chalcraft, 2016; Liao and Qin, 2013; Zhu, 2016; Berliner, 2012; Wang; 2012; Casagrande; 2016). This sheds light on the fact that World Heritage, and the site's more broadly defined cultural heritage, cannot be perceived as having fixed meanings that remain the same after the site's World Heritage inscription. Nor can the particular meanings attached to UNESCO's ascription of the sites' 'Outstanding Universal Value' be seen as synonymous with how the local populations inhabiting the sites come to understand and use their World Heritage and cultural heritage more generally.

The pressures of tourism, and the often associated demands of development and construction, are challenges shared by a large number of World Heritage sites. However, these issues are often most acutely felt in urban World Heritage sites, and particularly, the 'tourist-historic cities' which tend to have many infrastructural and architectural limits to the number of tourists they can absorb (Orbasli, 2002; Ashworth and Tunbridge, 2000). Even though the lure of economic gains from tourism strongly influences the discourse of unhampered tourism growth in Dubrovnik, local politicians, the tourism industry and urban managers have begun to recognize the need to encourage a sustainable tourism and overcome infrastructural challenges faced by the historic urban fabric of the city center. Over the last decade, the discourse of sustainable tourism has become increasingly prominent in Dubrovnik's tourism and heritage management. However, although some concrete actions have been implemented to control the flows and numbers of tourists arriving at certain times, the lack of long-term strategies to lay down a new course for sustainable tourism is evident.

In order to stimulate a sustainable management of World Heritage sites, heritage needs to be understood and managed in connection with the wider spatial and cultural environments in which they are embedded. By awarding protection to certain spatially defined areas of a culture, other areas, which may also be central to cultural heritage and identities, may be overlooked. In the wake of obtaining World Heritage nomination, pressures to construct tourism facilities near the sites, often emerge. As such, these areas close to World Heritage sites are particularly vulnerable to exploitation from market interests.

In order to foster a sustainable heritage management and tourism development in Dubrovnik and other World Heritage sites struggling with over-tourism, it is important to safeguard the lived cultural expressions and traditions of the local populations, and protecting the multiple uses and meanings of the landscapes adjacent to the World Heritage sites. The coastal and mountainous area near Dubrovnik's are exterior to the spatially demarcated World Heritage site, but are closely interrelated with local identity, cultural symbolism and public memory. These areas are under huge pressures from tourism developments. It is therefore of extra significance that these areas become integrated in Dubrovnik's long-term sustainable management of the wider urban milieu.

I see a strong need for urban managers and tourist operators in World Heritage sites, as well as UNESCO, to shift their deep-seated focus on material-based heritage towards a value-based heritage approach.

Identifying the welter of values attached to World Heritage sites and their wider cultural and physical environments at an early stage can help unearth potential areas of dissonance and conflict. The identification of the multiple values ascribed not only to the UNESCO protected site, but also to the wider heritage area, should specifically be incorporated into the nomination processes of new World Heritage sites and in the continued monitoring of existing sites. Otherwise, World Heritage is at risk of becoming 'fossilized' and removed from the inhabitants and the wider

environment it is situated within. If World Heritage becomes devoid of meaning and value to the populations living in or near the sites, it ceases to be 'living heritage.'

## Endnotes

1   As one of the world's earliest UNESCO World Heritage sites, the Old City of Dubrovnik was inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage list in 1979.

2   Di Giovine (ibid.) defines 'museumification' as "the transition from a living city to that of an idealized re-presentation of itself, wherein everything is considered not for its use but for its value as a potential museum artifact (2009:261)". Di Giovine specifies that these 'museum artifacts' do not only comprise material representations, but can also relate to 'intangible' aspects of a culture, such as ethnicity, nationhood, human beings themselves and their activities (2009:261).

3   Source: Dubrovnik Municipality.

4   "Piliti granu na kojoj sjediš. The verb, piliti, translates as 'to saw'. The accurate translation is therefore, "To saw the branch on which you sit".

5   In the period of 1950-2016, the numbers of international arrivals have increased tremendously, from 25 million in 1950, 435 million in 1990, 674 million in 2000 to 1235 million international arrivals in 2016 (https://www.statista.com/statistics/262750/number-of-international-tourist-arrivals-world wide/. )

6   http://media.unwto.org/press-release/2018-01-15/2017-international-tourism-results-highest-seven-years.

7   Numerous local, national and international newspaper articles reports on the economic benefits that Croatia reaps from its tourism industry. Also, the restoration of the Old City of Dubrovnik features in UNESCO's presentation of 'success stories' http://whc.unesco.org/en/107/.

8   Source: Croatian National Tourist Board (Hrvatska turisticka zajednica).

9   Source: Dubrovnik Tourism Board.

10  It is important to note that through the international research institution, the Inter-University Centre (established in 1972) conference tourism is a well-established tourism form in Dubrovnik. However, since 2010, conference tourism has been targeted more specifically as a part of Dubrovnik's 'elite tourism' strategy.

11  See further discussion of Dubrovnik's 'elite tourism strategy' in Loades, 2016. JUCR, ISSN 2228-8279. Volume 12, s 20-37. doi: 10.14456.

12  See further discussion of Dubrovnik's 'elite tourism strategy' in Loades, 2016. JUCR, ISSN 2228-8279. Volume 12, s 20-37. doi: 10.14456.

13  Venice has experienced an exponential growth rate in tourism since the 1950s. The city received

an average of around 2 million tourists during the 1950s. By 1995, the tourist numbers had grown to 12 million and reached 16 million in 2011. Between 1997 and 2009, cruise-ship tourism to Venice increased by 374.5 per cent, and the city has become the fourth most popular destination in Europe.

14 Srd je naš' comprises six NGOs. Two major areas of focus for Srd je naš' is to bring attention to and reduce the negative impacts of cruise tourism and lobbying to prevent the realization of the planned large scale golf and tourist resort on Mount Srd, the hill overlooking Dubrovnik's walled centre. See further discussion of Srd je naš' activities relating to the golf project in Loades, 2016. JUCR, ISSN 2228-8279. Volume 12, s 20-37. doi: 10.14456.

17 https://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/3546.

18 https://www.vividmaps.com/2019/03/the-over-tourism-map.html.

19 https://www.dubrovnik.hr/vijesti/projekt-potujmo-grad-11950 and https://www.comune.venezia.it/en/content/enjoyrespectvenezia.

20 https://www.thelocal.it/20160817/italys-tourist-jewel-feels-the-strain-of-fame.

21 While 187 cruise ships moored in Dubrovnik in 1998 (with a total of 108,595 passengers), the number dropped to 36 (13,425 passengers) in 1999. Source: Dubrovnik Port Authority.

22 My interview with Steensnæs took place at the Oslo Center for Peace and Human Rights, April 18th 2018. In his period in UNESCO's Executive Board, Steensnæs was also the leader of the delegation for negotiations. He is currently the Executive Director at the Oslo Center for Peace and Human Rights.

23 International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN).

24 https://whc.unesco.org/en/107.

## References

Ashworth, Gregory John. Heritage, Tourism and Places: A Review. *Tourism Recreation Research* 25, no. 1 (2000):19-29.

Ashworth, Gregory John, and John E Tunbridge. *The Tourist-historic City.* London: Routledge, 2000.

Auclair, Elizabeth, and Graham Fairclough. *Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustainability: Between Past and Future.* London: Routledge, 2015.

Beck, Ulrich. *Power in the Global Age: A New Global Political Economy.* Cambridge: Polity, 2005.

Benedikter, Roland. "Privatisation of Italian Cultural Heritage." *International Journal of Heritage Studies,* 10, no. 4 (2004): 369-389.

Berliner, David. "Multiple Nostalgias: the Fabric of Heritage in Luang Prabang (Lao PDR)." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 18, no 4 (2012): 769-786.

Bourdeau, Laurent, and Maria Gravari-Barbas. *World Heritage, Tourism and Identity: Inscription and Co-production.* London: Routledge, 2016.

Büscher, Monika, and John Urry. "Mobile Methods and the Empirical." *European Journal of Social Theory* 12, no. 1 (2009): 99-116.

Caric, Hrvoje, and Peter Mackelworth. "Cruise Tourism Environmental Impacts –The Perspective from the Adriatic Sea." *Ocean & Coastal Management* 102 (2014): 350-363.

Casagrande, Marco. "Heritage, Tourism, and Demography in the Island City of Venice: Depopulation and Heritagisation." *Urban Island Studies* 2 (2016): 121-141.

Chalcraft, Jasper. "Decolonizing the Site." In *World Heritage on the Ground: Ethnographic Perspectives.* Edited by Christoph Brumann and David Berliner. New York: Berhghan, 2016. 219-247.

Colomb, Claire, and Johannes Novy. *Protest and Resistance in the Tourist City.* London: Routledge, 2016.

Di Giovine, Michael A. *The Heritage-scape: UNESCO, World Heritage, and Tourism*. Lexington Books, 2008.

Drost, Anne. "Developing Sustainable Tourism for World Heritage Sites." *Annals of Tourism Research* 23, no. 2 (1996): 479-484.

Ekern, Stener, William Logan, Birgitte Sauge, and Amund Sinding-Larsen. *Human Rights and World Heritage: Preserving our Common Dignity Through Rights-based Approaches to Site Management.* Milton Park: Taylor & Francis, 2012.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. *Overheating. An Anthropology of Accelerated Change.* London: Pluto Press, 2016.

Goodwin, Harold. *The Challenge of Overtourism.* Responsible Tourism Partnership Working Paper 4. October 2017.

Harrison, Rodney. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. London: Routledge, 2013.

Henderson, Joan C. *Managing Tourism Crises*. London: Routledge, 2007a.

Henderson, Joan C. *Tourism Crises: Causes, Consequences and Management*. London: Routledge, 2007b.

Klein, Ross A. "Responsible Cruise Tourism: Issues of Cruise Tourism and Sustainability." *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 18, no. 1 (2011): 107-116.

Krželj-Colovic, Zorica, and Helena Brautovic. "The Development of Dubrovnik as a Cruise Destination." In *Proceedings of The 18th International DAAAM Symposium" Intelligent Manufacturing & Automation: Focus on Creativity, Responsibility and Ethics of Engineers,"* Zadar, Croatia, 24-27.10. 2007.

Liao, Jiang, and Su Qin. "Creative Destruction and Transformation of Place-based Identity in Ancient Town of Zhouzhuang." *Acta Geographica Sinica* 8 (2013): 012.

Loades, Celine Motzfeldt. "The Wall in Our Minds: Negotiating Heritage and Identity in Post-war Dubrovnik." Ph.D. thesis, The University of Oslo, 2018.

McKercher, Bob, and Hilary Du Cros. *Cultural Tourism: The Partnership Between Tourism and Cultural Heritage Management*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Meskell, Lynn. "The rush to inscribe: Reflections on the 35th Session of the World Heritage Committee, UNESCO Paris, 2011." *Journal of Field Archaeology*. 37, no. 2 (2012):145-151.

Milano, Claudio, Joseph M. Cheer, and Marina Novelli (eds). *Overtourism: Excesses, Discontents and Measures in Travel and Tourism*. CABI, 2019.

Moeran, Brian. "From Participant Observation to Observant Participation." In *Organizational Ethnography: Studying the Complexity of Everyday Life*. Edited by Sierk Ybema, Dvora Yanow, Harry Wels, Frans H Kamsteeg. London: Sage, 2009. 139-155.

Nasser, Noha. "Planning for Urban Heritage Places: Reconciling Conservation, Tourism, and Sustainable Development." *Journal of Planning Literature* 17, no. 4 (2003):467-479.

Noy, Chaim. "Sampling Knowledge: The Hermeneutics of Snowball Sampling in Qualitative Research." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 11, no. 4 (2008): 327-344.

Orbasli, Aylin. *Tourists in Historic Towns: Urban Conservation and Heritage Management*. Milton Park: Taylor & Francis, 2002.

Perucic, Doris. "The Impact of Globalization on Supply and Demand in the Cruise Industry." *Tourism and Hospitality Management* 13, no. 3 (2007): 665-680.

Perucic, Doris, and Barbara Puh. "Attitudes of Citizen of Dubrovnik Towards the Impact of Cruise Tourism on Dubrovnik." *Tourism and Hospitality Management* 18, no. 2 (2012): 213-228.

Ponzini, Davide. "The Process of Privatisation of Cultural Heritage and the Arts in Italy: Analysis and Perspectives." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16, no. 6 (2010): 508-521.

Poulios, Ioannis. "Discussing Strategy in Heritage Conservation: Living Heritage Approach as an Example of Strategic Innovation." *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development* 4, no. 1 (2014): 16-34.

Russo, Antonio Paolo. "The "Vicious Circle" of Tourism Development in Heritage Cities." *Annals of Tourism Research* 29, no. 1 (2002):165-182.

Rodrigue, Jean-Paul, and Theo Notteboom. "The Geography of Cruises: Itineraries, not Destinations." *Applied Geography* 38, (2013): 31-42.

Salazar, Noel B. "The Double Bind of World Heritage Tourism." *The Significance of World Heritage: Origins, Management, Consequences*: Edited by Bo G Jansson. 2013. 274-291.

Salazar, Noel B. "The Local-to-global Dynamics of World Heritage Interpretation." In *World Heritage, Tourism and Identity*. Edited by Laurent Bourdeau and Maria Gravari-Barbas, New York: Routledge, 2015. 121-130.

Seraphin, Hugues, Paul Sheeran and Manuela Pilato. "Over-tourism and the Fall of Venice as a Destination." *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management* 9, (2018): 374-376.

Sheller, Mimi. "The New Mobilities Paradigm for a Live Sociology." *Current Sociology* 62, no. 6 (2014): 789-811.

Smith, Laurajane. *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Orbasli, Aylin. *Tourists in Historic Towns: Urban Conservation and Heritage Management*. Milton Park: Taylor & Francis, 2002.

Vianello, Michele. "The No Grandi Navi Campaign: Protests Against Cruise Tourism in Venice." In *Protest and Resistance in the Tourist City*. Edited by Claire Colomb and Johannes Novy. London: Routledge, 2016. 185-204.

Wang, Shu-Yi. "From a Living City to a World Heritage City: Authorised Heritage Conservation and Development and its Impact on the Local Community." *International Development Planning Review* 34, no. 1 (2012):1-17.

Weber, F. *Overtourism. An Analysis of Contextual Factors Contributing to Negative Developments in Overcrowded Tourism Destinations*. BEST EN Think Tank XVII Innovation and Progress in Sustainable Tourism, 2017. https://researchonline.jcu.edu.au/50855/1/TTXVII%20Proceedings% 202017%20FINAL.pdf.

Xiaoya, Sun. "China's Heritage Tourism: a Double–edged Sword." *International Journal of Leisure and Tourism Marketing* 3, no. 3(2013): 252-266.

Zhu, Y. "Heritage Making in Lijiang." In *World Heritage on the Ground: Ethnographic Perspectives*. Edited by Christoph Brumann and David Berliner. New York: Berghahn, 2016. 78-96, 2016.