HERITAGE, DEVELOPMENT AND NATURE:
THE PURPOSE OF ANTHROPOLOGY OF PROTECTED AREAS

PETER SIMONIČ
University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts
Department of Ethnology and Cultural
Anthropology
1000 Ljubljana, Zavetiška 5, Slovenia

The conceptual field of cultural heritage and of development anthropology is defined by three fundamental elements: invention and admiration (mythology, ethnonationalism, regionalization, sacralisation), capitalization (fetishism, marketing, competitiveness), and protection of political and economic sources of a society. Anthropology has always been involved in the study of the dichotomy nature/society but the primary role of biology and economics in establishing and management of protected areas indicates that the ethno- and anthropocentric perspectives have been neglected or narrowed. The text offers some theoretical considerations on current economic and ecological conditions of anthropological engagement with reference to the situation in protected areas in Slovenia.

Key words: *cultural anthropology, heritage, globalization, ecology, applied anthropology, management, epistemology*

SPHERES OF APPLICATION

When pondering upon the development potential of cultural heritage one's point of view depends primarily on the social position from which he or she observes a particular activity and forms an opinion of what is development and what is cultural heritage.

Primarily, it is imperative to distinguish between *academic* work and research and between *practical* application. While researchers employed at universities or institutes are usually bound to scholarly and theoretical work, practicing anthropologists and ethnologists are more subject to the rules of the game outside the research sphere (Ervin 2000:2–3). Let us check the conditions of contemporary academic anthropologists first.

Social sciences and humanities are encouraged to become applicative in character. The Bologna study reform has introduced the principle of

competence, that is of social relevance and the applicability of students; this is especially true of students opting for a three-year degree. The principal aim is to produce experts capable of "surviving" in the course of interaction with different subjects of the civil society in the current conditions of neo-liberal capitalism, the economic and ideological imperative of the present. Courses on ethnology and cultural anthropology should also establish contacts with potential employers, in return offering its students different kinds of applicative knowledge and skills. They should respond to public debates focusing on identity, heritage, and cultural, economic, and ecological systems, producing survival strategies and increasing accumulation of economic, social, and cultural *capital*. The criteria for the success of science are therefore the number of students and graduates on the one hand and the possibility of their obtaining employment on the other.

In accordance with that, domestic and international scientific calls for projects prefer research teams that are able to prove the applicative focus of their project while basic research projects remain in the background. In this case, applied anthropology provides outsourcing services to the state administration and to the civil society/economy.

The second important trend in universities and institutes is an increasing dependence of their members on the points received for the publication of texts in international scholarly journals. The impact of British and American hegemonies of the 19th and the 20th centuries on science policies is only logical. Although the system of points increases scholars' enthusiasm for writing it is to the detriment of their indirect (unscientific) applicative work in society. Scientific papers published in recognised journals are mostly detached from ordinary struggles and worries. Academic carriers are often a result of appropriate manipulation with established references and discourses (deduction) and not an award for contribution to the quality of life itself.

Practicing anthropologists working outside the sphere of academia and other state institutions as well as numerous graduates, all of whom have placed their knowledge and skills on the market, perceive and employ cultural heritage in different manners. Their knowledge may be better or worse than the academic knowledge. But since their economic existence depends on the civil society and the market, most of them are unable to fully

or publicly *deconstruct* the process of inventarisation and capitalization of development and cultural heritage. They represent their means of livelihood. Their analysis is mostly oriented toward market rules and niches. The social system as such is outside their range. The same is true of practicing experts from other disciplines that are *active* in this area, particularly of economists and sociologists.

As we can see, applicability may be perceived on at least two levels: on the theoretical level and on the existential level. Many examples have already been stored within the archives of ethnologists and cultural anthropologists.

CULTURAL HERITAGE

Two significant shifts in the scholarly focus of ethnologists and anthropologists have occurred in recent decades. The first concerns an intensified interest in (cultural) heritage. The concept of *traditional culture* that used to define the focus of (historic) anthropology has been transformed into the concept of *heritage* – a functional *survival*. It has done so by employing such concepts as *invented* traditions and social memory, and by criticizing the concept of modernization. The notion of functional survival is understandably perceived differently in the past (see Habsbawn and Ranger 1983; Baskar 1993; Lowenthal 1998; Jezernik 2010), depending upon one's perception of time and place and upon ties created in different social and cultural circumstances.

On the theoretical level the concept of heritage is considerably more diverse and functionalistic as tradition used to be. It represents a shift from political aspirations (nationalization, emancipation) to social ones (marketing, social policy). Since heritage shapes people's shared social foundations by way of education, culture, and science, it plays a significant role in defining the so-called we-groups. It is due to our shared (mythological) past that we are unified in the present. Essential in the definition of the domain of (cultural) heritage are rights, competences, and the positions of power that define it according to their own needs. What used to be reified tradition has increasingly become a dynamic and active heritage that is constantly reinvented and constructed.

Rather than with opposite identities such as the Roman and the Germanic versus the Slavic, or the differences between national mythologies, economic activities of the modern person are imbued with the global/local dichotomy. Economic changes that have occurred during the last two centuries have been oscillating between tendencies of the economic individual and the solidarity of the cultural human being. This represents the continuum between liberalism and protectionism, between neoliberalism and the social/walfare state, and so on. More than merely a shared foundation (in the process of nationalization of culture; see Löfgren 1989), heritage is available for the purposes of the civil society in the sense of marketing (see Luhmann 1990) and informalisation (Frykman 1995). Cultural and symbolic capital can be translated to its social and economic form (comp. Bourdieu 1977). Depending upon the place and time, the state may encourage or hinder these processes. But it never assumes a neutral position within the process of strengthening its power and centralization.

Another significant shift in the field of cultural heritage is an increased interest in living (intangible) heritage. Clearly not new in ethnology and anthropology, this concept is of considerable importance for the exposure of the formerly pronounced material side of heritage application (food culture, crafts products, architecture, destinations and landscapes, etc.). Intangible heritage includes knowledge, practices, skills, beliefs, social organization, rituals, dances, and so on, that have been transmitted from generation to generation (UNESCO 2003).

While this approach opens the door to a number of tourism opportunities it also encourages folklorisation (comp. Stanonik 1990), all in an effort to preserve cultural diversity in today's global, neocolonial, and uniformising world (see UNESCO 2001).[1]

Social and scholarly problems concerning cultural heritage can be condensed in the following conclusions:

- Cultural heritage is a dynamic process subject to the needs and endeavors of a particular society.

---

[1] In Stanonik's view folklorisation is mechanism of frozen past and therefore ahistorical. Ivan Čolović has noticed (2000) that it is a scientific or political selection and classification of referential (premodern) practices, which are of aesthetical value and essential to ethno-nationalism (comp. Čolović 2000).

- Cultural heritage is created at the intersection of the local, the regional, the national, and the transnational (Europeanization, globalization).

- Although the heritage of a particular region or nation often seems specific a more detailed examination shows that it is shared by a much larger area or by former economic and political imperia (Todorova 1996; Baskar 2005).

- Nationalization of cultural heritage is connected with patriotic historiography that, having succumbed to mythological dimensions of the national, largely disregards the comparative aspect (Lowenthal 1998).

- The established cultural heritage is most frequently the heritage of the prevailing nation/religion (evoking minority and intercultural communication issues) (Jezernik 2010).

- As a discourse, cultural heritage has been embedded into a locality by way of mythologies and sacred spaces (Kravanja 2007), and as a cultural landscape (Kučan 1998).

- Elements of cultural heritage are increasingly turned into economic capital with which localities, regions, and nations enter the global economic exchange (barter, tourist exchange) (Lowenthal 1998; Papatheodorou 2006).

- Increased importance of cultural heritage stimulates a local production of culture and encourages copying, imitation, discovery, and the remaking of artefacts and locations for their entry onto the map of world (destinations) and for the creation of local identities (Fikfak 2003).

- Cultural heritage is embedded in modern means of communication and channels (i.e. the internet).

SPATIAL ASPECTS OF HERITAGE – SLOVENIAN CASE

The increased importance of ecology represents a shift from the means of social and material reproduction as were known in the period of industrialization and modernization; the same can be said for the science of human beings. Ethnology and anthropology have accumulated a wealth of data on the tangible and the intangible heritage that could be very beneficial for the planning of the so-called green politics and economy. That which is

old has suddenly becomes modern again. This is due not only to nationalistic (romantic) nostalgia but also to its "preindustrial sustainability".

Global economy presumes a global market in which sources and products are traded across large distances (Plattner 1991; Giraud 2006). The much-desired end of our dependency upon external and polluting energy sources, primarily oil, shall change the situation on a local level. This process has already begun. People are looking for ways of attaining food self-sufficiency and of preserving cultural landscape and renewable energy sources. Since nature protection areas are generally situated in rural parts (agricultural and forestry areas) the changing social values are reflected in the strategies and in the social network of these two sectors. We do not refer only to the introduction of new technologies and work methods but also to broad social and cultural changes – when disintegration denotes adaptation to the new. Even if ethnology might not be present everywhere in practice it will have to monitor the many changes of the broader social paradigm. While it is true that protected areas are still far from being the paragon of planning and management it may be expected that their model shall gradually spread beyond their actual areas.

In addition to economic and political factors, epistemological and professional limitations need to be taken into consideration. What is meant by this is the difference between biological and anthropological approaches to the concept of heritage and its spatial range. The initiators of protected areas have presumably proceeded from an ecocentric point of view; in accordance with the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, they focus on the protection of *natural diversity in situ*. Anthropologists, on the other hand, emphasize anthropocentricity and have been since 2001 focusing on *cultural diversity* and intangible heritage.

A synergy between the two is almost impossible in Slovenia since in accordance with a shift in aims in the protection of natural and cultural heritage in 2001 a formerly single institute in has been divided in two administrative units, the Institute of the Republic of Slovenia for Nature Conservation and the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage of Slovenia. Both operate from the premise that the central point of their interest is endangered and therefore needs to be protected and preserved.

According to biologists, Slovenia is one of the countries with the richest biological diversity (Mršič 1997), not only in Europe but also in the world. A similar claim, based on an imbuement of cultural strata and defined by Vilko Novak already in 1960, has been made by ethnologists. A holistic (ecological and anthropological) perception of heritage is therefore rather difficult to realize in practice even though it is clear that natural and cultural heritage are closely intertwined and historically mutually conditioned.

Creators of protected areas employ an ecosystemic perspective that is basically regional. However, in the present world of global interaction the boundaries of each ecosystem have become blurred. During the process of Slovenia's accession to the European Union the State had to adopt the legislation of the European Union as well as of current European programs. The *Natura 2000* program, a European network of nature protection areas, is the central and most significant project in the field of nature conservation (in situ). Over thirty percent of Slovenia's territory has been included in the program.

In addition to the text by V. Novak, Slovene ethnologists have defined several ethnic/cultural regions with shared geographical (environmental), economic, and social characteristics: the Mediterranean, the Alpine, the Pannonian, and the Central Slovene regions (Baš 1980). Other ethnologists adopted the administrative organization of Slovenia of their time; the project entitled Ethnological Topography of Slovene Ethnic Territory depicted villages, towns, and districts as micro regions (Kremenšek 1974). The most recent attempt was made in 1996 by Janez Bogataj and Vito Hazler who identified 96 territorial units that may be either broken down into yet smaller units or united into larger regions of "the way of life". What may be problematic with these approaches is that today we tend to speak of life styles and diffusion, which may challenge the existing taxonomies of ethnic/cultural areas.[2] The "cultural core", which is of vital importance for the classical ethnological and anthropological regionalization, is namely not defined solely by traditional economic activities and social and cultural organizations that follow "regional characteristics in nature" (comp.

---

[2] The concept of cultural areas, geographical units with homogenous environmental and cultural traits, was introduced in American cultural anthropology by Clark Wissler and Alfred Kroeber (see Kroeber 1931).

Steward 1955). Today, it is also defined by national and global movements of goods, capital, and people as well as by individual choices and actions. Rather than on seemingly defined regional structures, our attention is focused on the fluid and active cultural production and on power relations (comp. Roscoe 1993; Kurtz 2001).

Despite attempts to define ethnic/cultural areas, the most common approach on the level of practicing ethnology (conservation, museology) is the thematic or localised approach in which heritage elements, the artefacts (in situ), are preserved separately from the broad social (end ecological) networks. Within the context of nature protection areas cultural heritage is only partial, and also in an explicitly inferior position, particularly when reduced to its material aspect – the aspect advocated by the state administration. Yet it is only through the inclusion of *social* networks – the intangible heritage – that an ethnological (applied) approach can include a broader area. This area may either correspond to, or is different from, the principle of regionalization of protected areas in the field of nature conservation.

The second significant aspect of cultural heritage of protected areas is the inability of ethnologists and anthropologists to define long-term management guidelines. While conservationists determine a protected area and conceive its management program, social scientists and scholars working in the humanities are easily satisfied with identification and restoration of cultural heritage. And then they step back. This is why numerous projects have no realistic/actual possibility to survive/of surviving and shall become a burden for the local or the national community in the long run.

The third methodological limitation of park management concerns exactly this participation of the local population. Contrary to the past, when the prevailing maxim was "protection from the people", administrators of protected areas have now adopted the concept of "protection for the people." At least in principle, and frequently after a protected area has already been determined; their goal is sustainable development with the cooperation of the local population (Barclay 1998). Since they tend to neglect cultural factors in such protected areas (Colchester 2003; Simonič 2006) they are generally unsuccessful. Although ethnologists and anthropologists need to consult the local population in the course of their fieldwork and research,

in the phase of application, the locals are no longer a mandatory factor in the decision-making and management of (material) cultural heritage. Local resistance is evident in almost every landscape, regional or national park in Slovenia, especially after socialism and the introduction of civil/human rights.

TEMPORAL ASPECT – CULTURAL HERITAGE AS A FACTOR OF DEVELOPMENT

Ethnological identifications and analyses of (cultural) heritage may be applied in diverse areas. Specialized branches of anthropology actually represent partial applications, for example psychological, medical, and economic anthropologies, anthropology of tourism, of Slovenes, of popular culture, and so on. All of them follow changes in social dynamics and strive to be useful, relevant, and applicable.

Giving the term its strictest meaning, applied anthropology is associated with planning, and also indirectly with management. In their capacity of advisors, anthropologists and ethnologists can, and do, participate in different bodies and teams, for example in government and nongovernmental organizations and their cultural, social, and sports programs and projects. The number of graduates in the last decade is namely much higher than the number of available usual posts in museums, archives, institutes, institutions, and in the academia. These graduates have to obtain employment elsewhere, be it in their fathers' workshops or in international humanitarian programs in the developing countries, to name but a few. Applied anthropology and applied ethnology are spontaneous and logical consequences of societal needs and of educational policy (comp. Bogataj 2000).

Speaking about development anthropology in periphery, we generally refer to local, regional or national adaptations to broader (global) economic, technological and social conditions. In this case, applied anthropology is closely historically intertwined with colonialism (Metraux 1972; Ervin 2000; Nolan 2002), mainly because it blindly follows the so-called modernist paradigm (comp. Wallerstein 2006). Hardly any space has been left for the consideration of local factors in the existing (global) network

of power, world market, and fierce economic competition. "Development has turned into a deliberate, industrialized, and extremely complex industry with significant political and economic functions for prosperous donors who are not necessarily in tune with the needs of the poor." (Bodley 1994:339). Rather than toward the people, the prevailing orientation is toward capital.

It is a paradox that contemporary anthropology is largely ethnocentric, that it is adapted in accordance with the theories of "reality" of the "developed world." "Development represents growth; technology the motor; and quantification the criterion." (Nolan 2002: 268). It is in this sense that the state administration perceives development policy. The local population and other factors involved with protected areas (tourist industry, agriculture, forestry, etc.) are offered financial help and technological modernization. Yet the locals will not necessarily increase their ability to improve their survival skills and become "competitive". Development aid leads to dependence, and dependence diminishes the possibility, and the desire, to seek solutions and to form spontaneous actions and networks. This is as true of Slovene "undeveloped" protected areas as of the "developing countries": similar principles of capital centralization and homogenization operate on national and on global levels (comp. Marx 1986; Anderson 1998; Wallerstein 2006; Graeber 2011).

While it is true that ethnology has a lot to offer to various "development programs" it is uncertain to what degree the existing ideological matrix of social Darwinism is prepared to listen to it. Let us name a few suggestions, for example an emphasis on qualitative rather than the merely quantitative aspects of analysis and evaluation; long-term (basic) research that should be the basis of applied projects instead of random (guerrilla) projects (see Noland 2002; Mariampolski 2006) designed to fit immediate political and economic aims (immediate reward results); an understanding of cultural diversity and local characteristics rather than an automatic unification of factors on the level of "regional culture"; emphasis on the strengthening not only of economic capital but also of social and cultural capital; and the respect of local (family) traditions and heritage; self-government of communities versus the State and it's regional economic alliances.

The new development anthropology should include the local population as well as other participants without adopting the rule of those

whose capital is the strongest and the loudest. Deprivileged local populations do not strive only for economic growth; disguised in the statistical mask of progress, economic growth frequently conceals social stratification within such populations as many ethnographies have revealed (comp. Dragoš and Leskošek 2003). A logical question that needs to be raised now is whether people will be given the right to voice their opinion but once, shall they receive the right to vote, or will they be assigned a permanent representative who will participate in the management of development projects in/and protected areas.

THE ROLE OF ANTHROPOLOGISTS

Ethnologists and anthropologists may participate in regional development on the level of analysis, planning, implementation, supervision, and evaluation of tangible and intangible heritage (in connection with ecosystemic questions). Since there is not enough space here to discuss and define characteristics of every phase of a project or a program we will only suggest that analysis can be implemented by way of different theories and methodologies. As far as heritage of protected areas is concerned, the knowledge about ecological, i.e. environmental, anthropology (i.g. Townsend 2000; Moran 2000; Dove and Carpenter 2008) is particularly useful. Within the framework of development anthropology, planning is the first phase of application during which policies are formed concerning various participants in the project. Implementation and supervision are management categories in which various segments of the project and interest groups are implemented and utilized. Evaluation is an anthropological-management category. During this phase, scholars evaluate the starting point of the original project; the impact of the project on the society (target group); and simultaneously also the mentioned three phases of management. Ethnologists or anthropologists may participate either in the entire process or only in certain phases.

Participation of ethnologists in development programs raises ethical questions already put forward in the early 1950s at the world anthropological conference in New York (see Kroeber 1972). Should the same person be entrusted both with project *management* and ethnographic

research? Should the anthropologist assign work, hire and fire staff, make decisions on construction and introduction of new methods while at the same time "walk from hut to hut, collecting data on popular customs and belief" (Metraux 1972:742)? Should the anthropologist also assume the role of administrator and manager? According to Keesing (1998:472), an administrator with some anthropological knowledge may be more useful than an anthropologist loyal to "development." And just what exactly do we want to develop?

The most important element in development anthropology (of nature protection areas) is working with (and for) people. It denotes the difference between the types of projects and management that focus on technicism, means of production, and industry (the so-called Fordism) and between research work and management in culture where an individual (or a group) creates a product or a destination for another group of people – positioned customers and stratified locals. *Human resource management* is of key importance here. In addition, we should be aware of the fetishism of goods, i.e. the personification of things and simultaneously the instrumentalisation of people (Marx 1986). In a project that glorifies heritage and capitalizes on it, people (the local population) become human resources whose desired and undesired characteristics are deliberately selected or rejected; by doing this, we perform a (developmental, marketing) reduction of personality and culture.

Working with people with different interests and knowledge denotes that development anthropologists act as "cultural translators" among them (Nolan 2002:270), looking for differences and similarities. They always remember the existing power relations and never forget to whom they have to answer and defend the results of their research and implementation. Who is paying for their work? Who are they working for? And why exactly do they wish, and have to, do this?

CONCLUSION

It does not suffice for the anthropology in academic circles and in various institutes to suggest different manners in which cultural heritage may be used for the purpose of development; more urgently, it has to be established why the demand for such applicability seems to be so pressing

and even self-evident. What are the current social conditions, and which heritage segments seem best-suited and the most popular for this purpose?

In the course of the 20th century, applied anthropology (applied ethnology) spread to a number of fields. Trends of their recognition may be linked to changes in social and economic circumstances, ideologies, and educational politics. Civilizational contrasts between the capital and labour, between accumulation and social redistribution, have led anthropology to the sphere of development programs which on the one hand strengthen competitive capabilities and cultural diversity of a community or a region and on the other focus on social issues that endeavour to humanize the human existence.

It is not unimportant from the viewpoint of academic development anthropology if our point of departure is neoclassical (competitive struggle, technology, invisible hand of the market; Smith 1991); social (dialectics of the class struggle, modes of production, power, social welfare; Marx 1986); or ecological (relations between individuals, sociocultural systems, and ecosystems; comp. Schneider 1991; Dobson 2000). Increasingly gaining in importance in the last three decades, the last one is particularly current in relation to the management of (cultural) heritage of a nation's protection areas. Each of these approaches defines in its own way the spatial/temporal categories in which people should act; simultaneously they also define applied and development anthropologies.

REFERENCES

ANDERSON, Benedict. 1998. *Zamišljene skupnosti*. Ljubljana: Studia Humanitatis.

BARCLAY, Mairin. 1998. *IUCN's Fifty Years Evolution from "Protection" to "Sustainable Use"*. Kingston: Queen's University. http//:www.iucn.org (accessed 15. 9. 2003).

BASKAR, Bojan. 1993. "Od funkcije k evoluciji". In *Med ustnim in pisnim. Študije o pisnosti, družini, kulturi in državi*, author Jack Goody. Ljubljana: Studia Humanitatis, 329–349.

BASKAR, Bojan. 2005. "Avstro-ogrska zapuščina: ali je možna dediščina multinacionalnega imperija". In *Dediščina v očeh znanosti*, eds. Jože Hudales and Nataša Visočnik. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za etnologijo in kulturno antropologijo, 41–52.

BAŠ, Angelos, ed. 1980. *Slovensko ljudsko izročilo*. *Pregled etnologije Slovencev*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.

BODLEY, John H. 1994. *Cultural Anthropology: Tribes, States, and the Global System*. Mountain View: Mayfield.

BOGATAJ, Janez. 2000. "Aplikativna etnologija v Sloveniji". In *Kolesar s Filozofske,* ed. Janez Bogataj et al. Ljubljana: Oddelek za etnologijo in kulturno antropologijo, Filozofska fakulteta, 203–215.

BOGATAJ, Janez and Vito HAZLER. 1996. "Regionalizacija". In *Enciklopedija Slovenije*, vol. 10. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 147–149.

BOURDIEU, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

COLCHESTER, Marcus. 2003. *Salvaging Nature. Indigenous Peoples, Protected Areas and Biodiversity Conservation*. Montevideo: World Rainforest Movement.

ČOLOVIĆ, Ivan. 2000. *Bordel ratnika − Folklor, politika i rat*. Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek.

DOBSON, Andrew. 2000. *Green Political Thought*. London: Routledge.

DOVE, Michael R. and Carol CARPENTER, eds. 2008. *Environmental Anthropology: A Historical Reader*. Malden [etc]: Blackwell Publishing.

DRAGOŠ, Srečo and Vesna LESKOŠEK. 2003. *Družbena neenakost in socialni kapital*. Ljubljana: Mirovni inštitut.

ERVIN, Alexander M. 2000. *Applied Anthropology: Tools and Perspectives for Contemporary Practice*. Boston [etc.]: Allyn and Bacon.

FIKFAK, Jurij. 2003. "Od tradicije do produkcije lokalnosti − nekatera izhodišča in pogledi". In *O pustu, maskah in maskiranju*, ed. Jurij Fikfak et al. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU, 9–20.

FRYKMAN, Jonas. 1995. "The Informalization of National Identity". *Ethnologia Europaea*, vol. 25 (1):5–16.

GIRAUD, Pierre-Noël. 2006. *Neenakost v svetu. Ekonomija sodobnega sveta*. Ljubljana: Založba /*cf.

GRAEBER, David. 2011. *Debt: the first 5,000 years*. Brooklyn (N.Y.): Melville House.

HOBSBAWM, Eric and Terence RANGER, eds. 1983. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge [etc.]: Cambridge University Press.

JEZERNIK, Božidar. 2010. "Slovenska kulturna dediščina in politika". In *Kulturna dediščina in identiteta*, ed. Božidar Jezernik. Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete.

KREMENŠEK, Slavko. 1974. "Etnološka topografija slovenskega etničnega prostora". *Traditiones*, vol 3:189–191.

KRAVANJA, Boštjan. 2007. *Sveti svet. Topografija religioznega prostora na primeru Breginjskega kota*. Ljubljana: Oddelek za etnologijo in kulturno antropologijo, Filozofska fakulteta Univerze v Ljubljani.

KROEBER, Alfred L. 1931. "The Cultural Area and Age Area Concepts of Clark Wissler". In *Methods in Social Science*, ed. Stuart A. Rice. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 248–265.

KROEBER, Alfred L., ed. 1972. *Antropologija danas*. Beograd: Vuk Karadžić.

KUČAN, Ana. 1998. *Krajina kot nacionalni simbol*. Ljubljana: Znanstveno inpublicistično središče.

KURTZ, Donald V. 2001. *Political Anthropology: Paradigms and Power*. Colorado: Westview Press.

LOWENTHAL, David. 1998. *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

LÖFGREN, Orvar. 1989. "The nationalization of culture". *Ethnologia Europea*, vol. 19 (1):5–24.

MARIAMPOLSKI, Hy. 2006. *Ethnography for Marketers*. *A Guide to Consumer Immersion*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

MARX, Karl. 1986 [1867]. *Kapital. Kritika politične ekonomije*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.

METRAUX, Alfred. 1972. "Primenjena antropologija u državnoj upravi ― Ujedinjene nacije". In *Antropologija danas*, ed. Alfred L. Kroeber. Beograd: Vuk Karadžić, 736–744.

MORAN, Emilio. 2000. *Human Adaptability: An Introduction to Ecological Anthropology*. Colorado, Oxford: Westview Press.

MRŠIČ, Narcis. 1997. *Biotska raznovrstnost Slovenije. Slovenija ― "vroča točka" Evrope*. Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za okolje in prostor, Uprava Republike Slovenije za varstvo narave.

NOLAN, Riall. 2002. *Development Anthropology. Encounters in the Real World*. Colorado, Oxford: Westview Press.

NOVAK, Vilko. 1960. *Slovenska ljudska kultura: Oris*. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.

PAPATHEODOROU, Andreas, ed. 2006. *Corporate Rivalry and Market Power. Competiton Issues in the Tourism Industry*. London, New York: I. B. Tauris.

PLATTNER, Stuart. "Markets and Marketplaces". In *Economic Anthropology*, ed. Stuart Plattner. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 171–208.

ROSCOE, Paul B. 1993. "Politics and Political Centralization: A New Aproach to Political Evolution". *Current Anthropology*, vol. 34:111–140.

SCHNEIDER, Jane. 1991. "Spirits and the Spirit of Capitalism". In *Religious Regimes and State-Formation. Perpectives from European Ethnology*, ed. Eric R. Wolf. New York: New York State University, 181–220.

SIMONIČ, Peter, ed. 2006. *Ethnography of Protected Areas: Endangered Habitats – Endangered Cultures*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za etnologijo in

kulturno antropologijo, Društvo za raziskovanje, trženje in promocijo varovanih območij Slovenije.

SMITH, Adam. 2010 [1776]. *Bogastvo narodov: raziskava o naravi in vzrokih bogastva narodov.* Ljubljana: Studia humanitatis.

STANONIK, Marija. 1990. "O folklorizmu na splošno". *Glasnik SED*, vol. 16 (1–4):20–42.

STEWARD, Julian Haynes. 1955. *Theory of Culture Change: The Methodology Multilinear Evolution*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

TODOROVA, Maria. 1996. "The Ottoman Legacy in the Balkans". In *Imperial Legacy: The Ottoman Imprint on the Balkans and the Middle East*, ed. Carl L. Brown. New York: Columbia University Press, 45–77.

TOWNSEND, Patricia K. 2000. *Environmental Anthropology: From Pigs to Policies*. Pospect Heights: Waveland Press.

UNESCO. 2001. *Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*. Paris: General Conference of UNESCO.

UNESCO. 2003. *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Paris: General Conference of UNESCO.

WALLERSTEIN, Immanuel. 2006. *Uvod v analizo svetovnih sistemov*. Ljubljana: Založba /*cf.

Peter Simonič

BAŠTINA, RAZVOJ I PRIRODA: SVRHA ANTROPOLOGIJE ZAŠTIĆENIH PODRUČJA

U svojoj koncepciji, područje kulture baštine i razvoja u antropologiji definirano je trima ključnim elementima: izumom i divljenjem (mitologija, etno-nacionalizam, regionalizacija, sakralizacija), kapitalizacijom (fetišizam, marketing, kompetitivnost), te zaštitom političkih i ekonomskih zasada društva. Antropologija je uvijek bila uključena u raspravu o dihotomiji priroda/društvo; ali primarna uloga biologije i ekonomije u uspostavi i upravljanju zaštićenim područjima ukazuje na činjenicu da su etno and antropocentrične perspektive bile zanemarene ili vrlo ograničene. Članak donosi neke teoretske rasprave o sadašnjim ekonomskim i ekološkim uvjetima antropološke uključenosti, sa osvrtom na situaciju u zaštićenim područjima u Sloveniji.

Ključne riječi: kulturna antropologija, baština, globalizacija, ekologija, primijenjena antropologija, management, epistemologija