Katja Hrobat Virloget
Znanstveno-raziskovalno središče, Univerza na Primorskem

Saša Poljak Istenič
Znanstvenoraziskovalni center SAZU, Inštitut za slovensko narodopisje
sasa.poljak@zrc-sazu.si

Neža Čebron Lipovec
Fakulteta za humanistične študije, Univerza na Primorskem

Mateja Habinc
Oddelek za etnologijo in kulturno antropologijo, Filozofska fakulteta, Univerza v Ljubljani

Abandoned Spaces, Mute Memories: on Marginalized Inhabitants in the Urban Centres of Slovenia

Article focuses on degraded heritage(s) and their meanings for different groups of inhabitants, interpreting it/them through the studies of dominant and silenced memories. Case-studies of chosen Slovenian urban centres illustrate the consequences of drastic population change after the Second World War and of the transformation of power relations after Slovenia's independence which brought changes in the political-ideological and economic system. As the authors observed, memories and heritage of Italian, German and Yugoslav inhabitants are often mute and silenced within the contemporary Slovenian hegemonic/authorised heritage discourse. Consequences of changes in social relations were also recognised at the micro level in the valorisation of the socialist heritage of industrial plants and military barracks. Today, these places are left to decay as the material reminders of the unwanted (pre-WWII or socialist) past or they are transformed into centres of youth culture, creative industries or administrative centres. However, such reinterpretation does not enable their former users to access them and claim them as their own heritage.

Key words: silenced memory, heritagization, minorities, marginal groups, urbanism, Slovenia

Напуштени простори, нема сећања: о маргинализованим становницима урбаних центара у Словенији

Рад се фокусира на деградирано наслеђе/а и њихово значење за различите групе становника, интерпретирајући га/их посредством студија доминантних и утишаних сећања. Студија случаја одабраних словеначких урбаних центара илуструје последице драстичне популационе промене након Другог светског рата, као и трансформације односа моћи после словеначке независности, која је донела промене у политичко-идеолошком и економском систему. Како ауторке примећују, сећања и наслеђе италијанских, немачких и југословенских становника су често утишана и нечујна у оквиру савременог словеначког хегемоног/ауторизованог дискурса наслеђа.

Последице промена у друштвеним односима такође се могу препознати на микро нивоима у валоризацији социјалистичког наслеђа фабрика и војних комплекса. Данас су ова места препуштена пропадању, будући да представљају материјалне подсетнике на нежељену предратну (пре Другог светског рата) или социјалистичку прошлост. Нека од њих претворена су у омладинске, административне центре, или креативне индустрије. Међутим, ова њихова реинтерпретација онемогућава некадашње кориснике да остваре право на њих као на сопствено наслеђе.

Кључне речи: утишана сећања, херитализација, мањине, маргиналне групе, урбанизам, Словенија.

Introduction

In former Yugoslavia, certain urban centres faced total abandonment after the Second World War (WWII) since their population almost entirely changed, while nowadays several formerly important urbanbuildings (such as barracks, industrial sites etc.) from the socialist period bear no or little significance for the same reason – changes in the political-ideological and economic system. These sites are slowly decaying and have become brownfields of the built environment. The paper focuses on such degraded heritage(s) and their meanings for different groups of inhabitants, interpreting them through the studies of dominant and silenced memories. Our point of departure is the relationship between the current dominant and marginalised (but formerly prominent or dominant) groups who identify with these spaces.

The research is inspired by ethnological/anthropological concept of multivocality (Low and Lawrence-Zuniga 2001) or polyvocalism (Llewellyn 2003) but adopts new assessment perspective as it is focusing primarily on the relationship between dwellers/inhabitants and place/space and the meanings that inhabitants attach to place. In fact, an object becomes heritage only when it is "imbued with meaning" (Veschambre 2004, 75), i.e. when space is transformed into "place" while its inhabitants feel "place attachment". Taking into account that places can have a unique reality for each inhabitant while the meanings can be shared with others, the views of place are often likely to be competing and contested. Our aim is therefore to look especially at the voices of the "infrequently heard" (Low and Lawrence-Zuniga 2001, 15). The main questions we have been concerned with are: what are the values and the monuments in a land where society has undergone a drastic, fatal change, a cataclysm? How do people who have no long-term origins in a land "receive its message"? What are the "places" in the space of the town and which places do they value? How are its newer inhabitants attached to them and how the older ones?

Research context

The issue of abandoned towns in Slovenia fits into massive populations' transfers and ethnic homogenisation of Central and Eastern European nation states or their (federal) parts (Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Ukraine, Poland etc.) due to allies' politics and radical changes of national borders in the post-WWII period.

This led to the creation of new "strangers", marginalised due to their different, non-dominant national or political-ideological identity. Furthermore, some of these groups were collectively held responsible for war crimes (Germans and Italians), their memories silenced and heritage left to oblivion (Reinisch and White 2001; Ther and Siljak 2001; Vardy and Tooley 2003; Čapo Žmegač 2007; Corni 2015; Gousseff 2015). In the span of the 20th century, urban communities in former Yugoslavia as well as in all Eastern and Central Europe have almost totally changed from formerly heterogenic, multiethnic into more or less monoethnic, "uniformed" communities (with a few exceptions such as Bosnian towns). New urban population in the communist states was influenced by the hegemonic discourse of new national states which ideologically changed urban histories in line with their own national, uniformed vision of the past (Ruble 2003; Sezneva 2003). With the change of populations, urban centres in Slovenia lost their original economic and cultural function and acquired new contents in tune with the new political/ideological system – communism/socialism.

Half of the century later – after the Slovenian independence – dwellers from other part of Yugoslavia experienced similar marginalization. Some of them who were previously considered as society's elite (e.g. military officials) or the most prominent (productive) class (i.e. workers) turned into second-class citizens with no real voice. Socialist heritage, especially the former barracks and industrial plants, once a symbol of progress, working class and "brotherhood and unity" of Yugoslav nations, has been left to decay. In the rare cases of its reinterpretation, the former users can no longer access it. Heritage of once visible, but today marginalized groups remain mute within the hegemonic heritage discourse (cf. Vodopivec 2007; Petrović 2013).

Apart from inappropriate economic and spatial politics, one of the most frequent reasons for the abandonment of the urban centres' parts lies in the fact that local population which changed after WWII does not identify itself with those spaces since it does not know its original role and meaning and hence cannot value them. Likewise, Slovenian citizens after the independence do not identify anymore with socialist heritage due to an intentional distancing from it. These spaces are perceived as heritage only by those who, after the change of political system, have become part of a minority and as a rule marginalised. Consequently they do not have the possibility to speak about their memories, thus these remain mute.

Urban centres in Slovenia where the population structure and the prevailing activity have been drastically altered therefore represent a particular challenge for ethnological research on identity, place attachment, memory, interethnic relations, relations between local inhabitants and newcomers of the same nationality, attitude towards space, local tradition, heritage as well as on the related adaptations, inventions, muting etc. The paper brings preliminary comparative analysis of three locations facing the problem of abandoned space due to populations' migrations in different periods – after World War II or after the Slovenian independence: in the three

coastal towns of Piran/Pirano, Izola/Isola and Koper/Capodistria[1], in Brežice and in Ljubljana.

Historical and social framework

Second half of the 20th century

Approximately 90 % of the Italian-speaking population migrated from coastal towns Koper, Izola and Piran after WWII due to the change of national borders and introduction of socialist system. Those who stayed became a minority. In the new state (Yugoslavia) the Italian population was collectively held responsible for war crimes as well as for forerunning three decades of violent fascist politics of ethnic cleansing and imposition of superiority of Italian culture, therefore their memories and heritage were silenced and neglected. The emptied "ghost towns" of Istria were then inhabited by people from other parts of Slovenia and Yugoslavia (Ballinger 2003; Gombač 2005; Hrobat Virloget, Gousseff and Corni 2015). New urban population were subject to general Yugoslav tendency to create a shared identity, since many of them derived from different Yugoslav republics and were bound by the shared workers' Yugoslav identity, socialist society's pillar.

In the Yugoslav/Slovenian collective memory there is no awareness that the inhabitants of the "Slovenian Istrian towns" before the creation of Yugoslavia were predominantly Italian-speaking. The collective memory is constructed on a positive image of itself, while censoring inconvenient and unsatisfactory aspects of the past (Candau 2005, 94). Mentioned part of the coastal past was (deliberately) ignored in the Slovenian historiography and ethnology. The reason why the profession never faced this problem lies in the fact that the Slovenian identity is built on anti-fascist and national-liberation struggle, while the unpleasant consequences – like the post-war mass migrations of (predominately) Italian-speaking Istrians – were deliberately overlooked (Hrobat Virloget 2015a).

The first attempt to raise awareness about the problem of post-war mass migrations from Istria was established only recently in the media by the film of Goran Vojnović *Piran-Pirano* (2010). Unfortunately, the movie did not have a wider media response and did not trigger a self-reflection on national level. The author intertwined the stories of two inhabitants of Piran, an Italian-speaking "local inhabitant" that ran away after the war, and a post-war immigrant from the Bosnian countryside, who has never swum in the "home" sea of Piran. The immigrant's story reflects a rather unpleasant position of the current majority in the coastal towns, the working class from Slovenia and from the rest of the former Yugoslavia, who half a century later still have not entirely adapted to the life in the urban and Mediterranean environment. Interrupted continuity and adaptation to local tradition is reflected, for example, in the memories of the Italian-speaking natives, who taught the newly

---

[1] Both bilingual toponyms (in Slovenian and Italian) are used when the place is first mentioned; then we use only the Slovenian name.

arrived immigrants, unfamiliar with the sea life, about the local fishing rules (Menih 2011, 131–137; Hrobat Virloget 2015b, 542).

One of the consequences of the demographic change in the cities is also inhabitants' various, often contradictory understanding of recent history. Although the communities live in the same area, they preserve their own collective memory and in a way live as "strangers either way" (Čapo Žmegač 2007). Since the "Slovenian" appurtenance of Istria is never questioned in the prevalent Slovenian discourse, the majority of the Slovenian citizens are not able to explain the urban legend about the bunch of keys which the immigrants used when choosing their apartment in the emptied Istrian towns. The memory on the bunch of keys reflects the situation of abandonment of these towns after the departure of the Italian-speaking population and the confusion among the immigrants from Slovenia and Yugoslavia who had found new home in the emptied and foreign "ghost towns":

> Then we started to search for flats. There was an enormous number of flats in Piran but all of them unusable /.../. Unfortunately it was also not clean. When we started to look for flat, I did receive a bunch of keys at the municipality so I walked through Piran from A to Z. /.../ But I didn't find anything, not one single flat where a person could move in (Pahor 2007, 2015).

Today, the majority of Istrian urban centres still seem abandoned. While tourists appoint Piran as one of the fifty most romantic cities of Europe because they are only acquainted with its touristic (summer) aspect, the city remains empty throughout winters, with no life, empty apartments (many of them are second-homes) and a high rate of alcoholism and drug-addiction. Buildings in these cities are not being restored, there is no typical urban bustle on the streets, no tradition of a whole-year life cycle with the sea ... These places are perceived as heritage only by people who – despite different dominant national identity – have stayed here and become officially recognized as Italian minority; consequently they have been marginalised and so have been their memories. Halbwachs (2001) already suggested that in the social process of establishing a consensual collective memory, the memory that does not fit the dominant image of the past is rejected, and the same holds for heritage, understood as the "ideological apparatus of memory" (Jeudy after Candau 2004, 119).

> We had the rights, all of them, but my city was changed (Pula, today in the Croatian part of Istria). All the inscriptions were in Croatian, logically nothing in Italian ... I do not know if I felt as a foreigner in my own homeland then, but I certainly did feel like that later.

In their former home environment, which became foreign to them due to the changed social-political circumstances, their "spatialized" memory was and still is wounded with many interventions in the historic built environment – the anchor of their identity (Halbwachs 2001, 152). Because the city remembers through its buildings, the preservation of old buildings is analogous to the preservation of memories in the human mind. But if the development sweeps buildings away, then memory loss and identity crisis threaten the city as it loses its typology (its memory forms) and can no longer work as "a guide or exemplar for the people living in it"

(Crinson 2005, xii). According to Choay, "[the monument is] capable of directly contributing to the maintenance and preservation of the identity of an ethnic, religious, national, tribal or familial community. For those who erect it, as for those who receive its messages, the monument is a defence against traumas of existence, a security measure" (Choay 2001, 6–7).

A cause for "non-heritage" attitudes in the urban space can be ascribed to the fact that the majority of the population does not identify with the places in question. Newcomers who belong to a dominant national community live with a feeling of rootlessness, they have barely any personal link with the place, especially with those that are related to tradition and memory.

> That's what we miss here where we stayed … the connections, the stories, knowing what happened here in this house, for example, who lived here … These ties have been broken when the majority left. That's why we don't have any attitude, let's say, towards certain buildings. If it was about our own ancestors, it'd be different (Hrobat Virloget 2015a, 174).

Postsocialism: Slovenian independence

The fate of Slovenian coastal towns is comparable with the towns which were emptied after the departure of German inhabitants. As indicated by the case of Brežice, the German-speaking population was almost extinguished after 1945 (Ferenc and Zupan 2011) and is today pushed out of the dominant towns' history. Later, the city was repopulated by migrants from surroundings, other Slovenian towns and, due to the nearby military airport, also from other parts of Yugoslavia. Today, the latter are facing the same fate as the former German inhabitants – and Italians in coastal towns.

The former National home (Narodni dom), which before WWII hosted the local gymnastic association Sokol, was nationalised after the war and transformed into the "House of the Yugoslav People's Army" (the so-called "Dom JLA"). It hosted parallel celebrations of national festivities (in the 1950s) due to the politics of separation between the military and the "civilian" population; first for the army, then for the rest, "second-class" inhabitants of the town of Brežice (Habinc 2009, 31–35). Later on, especially following the change in political direction, the Dom JLA had opened for public, so many people remember it as the central urban social space. But after the Slovenia's independence in 1991 – similar to the House of the aviators ("Dom letalcev") which was built after the WWII for the needs of the airmen in the nearby airport in Cerklje ob Krki – it was first transformed into a hotel and a restaurant and later into an administrative building. After years of endeavours by the local inhabitants, a plaque was attached onto it to remind the people about the pre-war history of the building, while its post-war fate as well the fate of the House of the airmen remains known only to older local inhabitants and is in a way pushed to the margins of the local collective memory. A former House of the Germans (Nemški dom) which often appears as a representative building on the postcards of Brežice due to its aesthetic value, suffers the same fate. The link with the social history of the German-speaking population of Brežice, which almost entirely

disappeared after 1945, is invisible as there is no public sign indicating its former function; it can only be deduced by (older) inhabitants of Brežice.

Urban spaces and names in general do not acknowledge the (former) meaning and purpose of these buildings (the former House of the Aviators was renamed into Youth Center Brežice), therefore the references to the past have remained hidden and individual memories mute also in the recent history. In the best case scenario, former spaces of the Yugoslav Army have been transformed into youth centres or spaces for other groups of the civil society who were formerly not their users. Exceptional are the cases – as is the case of the former military prisons on Metelkova street in Ljubljana which were converted into the hostel Celica ("the Cell") – where the references to the past are preserved or have even been used as a source for a new life of these spaces. However, this by rule happens only if new use is planned as economically and commercially exploitable.

After the dismissal of their original function, the majority of such objects were neglected and left to decay until they have become the "brownfields" (cf. Koželj 1998). Some of them got temporary, usually informal new functions as squats (INDE in Koper, Metelkova and Rog in Ljubljana) or have been – although rarely – renovated within comprehensive renewal projects, especially into spaces for cultural and creative industries (i.e. Stara elektrarna ("Old power plant"), a main venue for more alternative concerts in Ljubljana, and Metelkova Mesto, a former barracks and later squat which is now the area with cultural ministry, main national museums, a major tourist attraction Hostel Celica and alternative/anarchist cultural associations and clubs; Rog factory is also the main focus of the City of Ljubljana's creative agenda, as the city plans to rebuild it into the centre for modern art).

The factories of Ljubljana, such as Rog, were the protagonists of Yugoslav socialist economy and were also an eloquent example of disacknowledgment of the voices of people, who actually contributed to their establishment and who still perceive them as their "second home". Industrial plants have mainly decayed after the independence in the 1990s. However, considering that they are, in most of cases, located on the outskirts of the city centre, they are interesting both for the local authorities and for those who seek new (artistic, business, living) opportunities. Today, we find them remodelled into administrative offices (Tobačna Ljubljana), centres of creative industries (Tobačna, Rog), performance areas (Stara Elektrarna), or they have become brownfields (Pletenine in Ljubljana, Mehanotehnika and Delamaris in Izola). Rare are the cases where the authorities considered the factory worthy of restoration (i.e. Stara elektrarna) and where such places are perceived – by the public and authorities – as cultural heritage; most of them are decaying or are planned to be renewed for the development of cultural and creative industries.

Although such attempts are certainly legitimate – and even desirable as the buildings would collapse without renovation and new use – the main questions remains how much are these former factories – renewed as cultural heritage or used for the development of post-socialist economic activities – still accessible to the workers, the social class that worked in them. What meaning does the empty space have for them? Where once stood the factory, today stands a brownfield, where

even the chimney, the symbol of industrial workers, has disappeared. Can anybody hear those workers' memories? As shown in the research of former Litostroj factory (Ifko 2014) as well as the initiative of the daily newspaper Delo, "Adijo, tovarna!" ("Farewell, factory!") people want to tell their own story, but since "their" former place was taken over by the elites – artist, creatives – or by the city politics, they feel unimportant, left out, and this prevents them from taking active part in the public life. Their voices, memories, heritage remain mute. This was also the message of the public events "I'm telling the story of the town" where the inhabitants of Koper could finally share their memories on the TOMOS factory as well as on the former (today abandoned and decaying) maternity hospital (Čebron Lipovec 2015).

> But I'd wished that we opened this space, well, of politisation of industrial heritage, who can tell here his own story and who cannot. It is not only walls... but what we really get to know about the city power plant. It's true, there are some small inscriptions, it's not much, but how does this industrial heritage here actually live? How do the workers, who once worked here, and how do those who deal with it, still work in the power plant today, how do they perceive it as their space? To open this debate. (Poljak Istenič 2015)

Marginalized heritage

Heritage is binding, intended for "self-veneration" and connecting, thus also excluding others. The difference between heritage and other similar phenomena lies in its explicit "politicalness", especially if we consider it in the framework of an organised and institutionalised social (institutions are political). Most worrisome is the affiliation of heritage with nationality (and other groups) which implies cultural homogeneity (Jezernik 2005, 11–24; Smith 2008, 66; Hall 2008). Nation as an imagined community (Anderson 1998) depends on cultural meanings which connect each individual into a wider national narrative; these are condensed in national heritage. Those who cannot identify with these meanings remain outside, do not belong to it. Since nation is a constant reconstruction, heritage is also a discourse practice and – as well as memory, which shortens, conceals, forgets – a "selective tradition". Heritage is influenced by those who colonised the past, yet a change in circumstances, a twist in history is enough for it to become a subject of revision and conflict (Hall 2008, 220–221).

Since the space of creation and expression of different communities is a space of social interaction, which is never homogeneous or harmonious, the valuing and interpretations are, as a rule, competing. Smith (2006) introduced the concepts of hegemonic or authorized heritage discourse and alternative, marginal, silent, silenced – subaltern heritage discourse. The relationship between the two discourses highlights the levers of decision-making and control, appropriation, ownership and use of culture as well as the privileging of selected cultural spheres and practices as showcases etc. The polyphony and frequently the cacophony of heritage definitions, imbued with politics and economy, have been signalized by the concept of "dissonant heritage" which put in the spotlight the contentiousness and competitiveness as

prominent characteristics of contemporary heritage interpretations (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996; Slavec Gradišnik 2014, 10–11).

Every society therefore has a certain attitude towards the past, even if it ignores it. Researcher study heritage to discover the meaning of what people tell and remember from their past but also what they forget and falsify (Harvey 2001, 320). For example, in urban contexts and in strategic and spatial planning certain narratives have precedence over others. Favoured groups decide on what is going to be preserved, so some groups become expropriated even if they have always been a part of the city (Shofield 2008, 26). Abandoned spaces are therefore linked to unfavoured narratives, rejected by the contemporary heritage discourse because they do not comply with the creation of a contemporary dominant identity.

Privileged vs. marginal citizens and memories

In cities that underwent tectonic changes of population, the most interesting is the symbolic border between the "locals" and the newcomers, even if of the same nationality, which is drawn in the dominant and marginal memories. Newcomers can accept the inferior role of outsiders attached to them by the indigenous population, but roles can also switch. Newcomers of the same nationality feel more patriotic compared to indigenous inhabitants (Čapo Žmegač 2007). In the majority of cases when populations transferred there is a resistance towards newcomers, especially because of the competition for goods since the newcomers are supposed to receive housing, employment etc. (Hirschon 1989; Tanc 2001; Čapo Žmegač 2002; Čapo Žmegač 2007). Similarly, after WWII the "locals" in Istria and in Brežice faced supposedly privileged newcomers from inner Slovenia and the military and political elite from Yugoslavia. The situation turned upside down with the Slovenian independence. Yugoslav military elite, once the privileged population, now became the "erased", its memories are mute, its space reinterpreted or left to oblivion. In cities where most of the newcomers from ex-Yugoslavia settled we encounter the most of the literarily "erased" – i.e. people of Yugoslav nationality who were deleted from the national registry of citizens after the Slovenian independence and were (since they were not listed in any other registers of other Yugoslav republics) thus robbed of all basic citizens' rights (Zorn and Lipovec Čebron 2008).

Stepping out of the national(istic) premises, we can draw parallels to the spaces of former socialist factories or military elite: industrial workers, once the milestones of economic development, are nowadays considered as its inhibitors; "their" spaces have been taken by educated, entrepreneurial, creative young people – against the will of local authorities (Rog factory in Ljubljana), or following it (Tobačna factory), or with their support (so-called creative zones). This raises questions on why someone is privileged in a system and what does it mean to be a "second-class citizen". In Ljubljana as well as in other industrial Slovenian towns, workers are more or less pushed aside, excluded from conservation plans of renewal or revitalisation of spaces: "They invested in the factory and so in the state, but today they are forgotten. Since there is no space for memory, all their effort is erased. Actually, they are being erased" (Vodopivec in Zabukovec 2014). In Brežice, the

pre-war past is recently being "rehabilitated", although without the then prevalent German population, so buildings are restored with their meaning from before 1941 (National Home), military objects are reinterpreted, but the stories on the Germans from Brežice are concealed. And in Istrian towns, the meanings of urban architecture from Austrian and Venetian period are being restored, however, the Slovenian public discourse (intentionally) conceals the link between the Venetian heritage and the Italian culture. Such denial of the connection is painful for the Italian-speaking inhabitants of Istria who – in accordance with the Italian identity construction – identify themselves with Venetian heritage. Ethnic Italians from Istria feel especially bitter that the celebration of the return of Primorska region to Slovenia takes place right in Koper, a town with formerly a majority of Italian-speaking population where /.../ *every wall tells that it is Venetian, it is Italian* (Hrobat Virloget 2014, 233).

Conclusion

Comprehensive analyses of the *lieux d'oubli* (Candau 2005, 162) as the opposite of the *lieux de mémoire* (Nora 1986) or of the relationship between the places and mute memories provided some key insights to our starting points. The process of "(non)heritagisation" (Harvey 2001) reflects the complex relations of power in the background. Demolition or devalorisation implies a denial of the memory of those who identify with certain places and spaces and can be interpreted as symbolic violence, dispossession, denial of identification marks of the part of the population and an expression of power (Veschambre 2008, 7–15, 115–117).

The periods of the presence of the Italian, German and Yugoslav populations on the studied areas cannot be directly perceived. Their heritage remains mute, silenced within the hegemonic or authorised heritage discourse (Smith 2006). Consequences of changes in social relations can also be recognised at the micro level in the valorisation of the socialist heritage of industrial plants and military barracks. Today, these are left to decay as the material reminders of the unwanted socialist past or they are transformed into centres of youth culture, creative industries or administrative centres. Such reinterpretation does not enable their former users to access them again/still.

Spaces of large demographic and political-ideological changes by the rule face a weak local identity and poor interactions of their inhabitants, what negatively affects their initiative and participation in the strategic development of towns, the attractiveness of the town centres for residing and the social life in public spaces. One of the reasons is the ignorance of historical specificities, as memories of them are absent or silent, and the feeling of "rootlessness" of the majority – i.e. immigrants. People in the coastal towns, mostly working class from former Yugoslavia, have hardly adapted to the Mediterranean environment and are not familiar with the Venetian heritage. And newcomers to the socialist buildings use it only as a shell/roof for their activities with no regards to its specific function or heritage. Demographic changes in the towns or its parts also result in inhabitants' dissent on the recent history.

In such contested spaces where several groups are present a plurality of perceptions can be detected – in our case: (heterogenic) Italian minority in Istria, newcomers from different parts of Slovenian and Yugoslav republics from former social political and military elite to workers, employees of former factories, and generally the (non)users of space of diverse social status and origins in general. In the wish to safeguard the heritage of socialism and industrial development as well as their heritage values it is essential to look for the diverse meanings of these places but also for the "shared elements" and the collective memory that facilitates a sense of security and well-being, defines a group boundaries, and stabilizes memories against the passage of times (Halbwachs 2001).

This short analysis has shown the necessity to tackle the problem of abandoned spaces within the wider frame of the studies of silenced memories, placing the problem outside the nationally limited topic in a broader socio-political frame, deriving from the post-war reorganisation of Europe and the establishment of new political-ideological systems. On the given case-studies the further research has the chance to contribute to a comprehensive understanding of processes that induced the denial of heritage of (newly) marginalized groups, which may be identified in several urban centres of Central and Eastern Europe (Gdansk, Kaliningrad, Rijeka, Teplice etc.) as well as on broader territory (Greece, Turkey, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland) while in some areas they represent a still topical problem (ex-Yugoslavia, Ukraine).

References

Anderson, Benedict. 1998 (1983). *Zamišljene skupnosti. O izvoru in širjenju nacionalizma*. Ljubljana: SH – Zavod za založniško dejavnost.

Ballinger, Pamela. 2003. *History in exile. Memory and identity at the borders of the Balkans*. Princeton, Oxford: Princeton university press.

− − − . 2015. "Remapping the Istrian exodus. New interpretive frameworks." In *At home but foreigners. Populations' transfers in 20th century Istria*, ed. Katja Hrobat Virloget, Catherine Gousseff and Gustavo Corni, 69–89. Koper: Univerzitetna založba Annales.

Candau, Joël. 2005. *Anthropologie de le mémoire*. Paris: Armand Colin.

Choay, Françoise. 2001 (1992). *The invention of the historic monument*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Corni, Gustavo. 2015. "Commentary." In *At home but foreigners. Populations' transfers in 20th century Istria*, ed. Katja Hrobat Virloget, Catherine Gousseff and Gustavo Corni, 15–22. Koper: Univerzitetna založba Annales.

Crinson, Mark, ed. 2005. Urban Memory. History and amnesia in the modern city. New York: Routledge.

Čapo Žmegač, Jasna. 2002. *Srijemski Hrvati. Etnološka studija migracije, identifikacije i interakcije*. Zagreb: Duriex.

‒ ‒ ‒ . 2007. *Strangers either way. The lives of Croatian refugees in their new home*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn books.

Čebron Lipovec, Neža. 2015. "'I'm telling the story of the town': Places in a contested space." In *At home but foreigners. Populations' transfers in 20th century Istria*, ed. Katja Hrobat Virloget, Catherine Gousseff and Gustavo Corni, 185–203. Koper: Univerzitetna založba Annales.

Ferenc, Mitja and Gojko Zupan. 2011. *Izgubljene kočevske vasi. Nekoč so z nami živeli Kočevski Nemci*. Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete.

Gombač, Jure. 2005. *Ezuli ali optanti? Zgodovinski primer v luči sodobne teorije*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC.

Gousseff, Catherine. 2015. "Presentation." In *At home but foreigners. Populations' transfers in 20th century Istria*, ed. Katja Hrobat Virloget, Catherine Gousseff and Gustavo Corni, 11–13. Koper: Univerzitetna založba Annales.

Habinc, Mateja. 2009. "Prazniki in tvorjenje skupnosti." *Glasnik Slovenskega etnološkega društva* 49: 30–37.

Halbwachs, Maurice. 2001. *Kolektivni spomin*. Ljubljana: Studia Humanitatis.

Hall, Stuart. 2008. "Whose Heritage? Un-settling 'The Heritage', reimagining the post-nation." In *The Heritage Reader*, ed. Rodney Harrison, Graham Fairclough, John H. Jameson Jnr and John Shofield, 219–228. London and New York: Routledge.

Harvey, David, C. 2001. "Heritage pasts and heritage presents. Temporality, meaning and the scope of heritage studies." *International journal of heritage studies* 7 (4): 319–338.

Hirschon, Renée. 1989. *Heirs of the Greek catastrophe. The social life of Asia Minor refugees in Pireus*. Oxford: Clarendon press.

Hrobat Virloget, Katja. 2014. "Nesnovna dediščina Istre: avtentičnosti, razmerja moči in ustvarjanje vezi." In *Interpretacije dediščine*, ed. Tatjana Dolžan Eržen, Ingrid Slavec Gradišnik and Nadja Valentinčič Furlan, 226‒224. Ljubljana: Slovensko etnološko društvo.

‒ ‒ ‒ . 2015a. "The burden of the past. Silenced and divided memories of the post-Istrian society." In *At home but foreigners. Populations' transfers in 20th century Istria*, ed. Katja Hrobat Virloget, Catherine Gousseff and Gustavo Corni, 155–183. Koper: Univerzitetna založba Annales.

‒ ‒ ‒ . 2015b. "Breme preteklosti. Spomini na sobivanje in migracije v slovenski Istri po drugi svetovni vojni." *Acta Histriae* 23 (3): 531–554.

Hrobat Virloget, Katja, Catherine Gousseff and Gustavo Corni, ed. 2015. *At home but foreigners. Populations' transfers in 20th century Istria,* Koper: Univerzitetna založba Annales.

Ifko, Sonja. 2014. "Industrial architectural heritage − re-evaluating research parameters for more authentic preservation approaches." *Architektúra & urbanizmus* 48 (3/4): 136–155.

Jezernik, Božidar. 2005. "Preteklost in dediščina." In *Dediščina v očeh znanosti,* ed. Jože Hudales and Nataša Visočnik, 11–24. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za etnologijo in kulturno antropologijo.

Koželj, Janez. 1998. *Degradirana urbana območja.* Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za okolje in prostor, Urad RS za prostorsko planiranje.

Llewellyn, Mark. 2003. "Polyvocalism and the public. 'Doing' a critical historical geography of architecture." *Area* 35 (3): 264–270.

Low, Setha and Denise Lawrence-Zuniga, ed. 2001. *The anthropology of space and place. Locating culture.* Oxford: Blackwell publishing.

Menih, Kristina. 2011. *Koprčani.* Piran: Mediteranum.

Nora, Pierre. 1986. *Les Lieux de Mémoire. II – La Nation.* Paris: Gallimard.

Pahor, Špela. 2007. *Srečanja v Piranu. Življenjske pripovedi prebivalcev Pirana.* Piran: Mediteranum.

Petrović, Tanja. 2013. Museums and workers: negotiating industrial heritage in the former Yugoslavia. *Narodna umjetnost* 50 (1): 96–119.

Poljak Istenič, Saša. 2015. Interview with Nina Vodopivec. Audio recording, private arhive.

Reinisch, Jessica and Elisabeth White, ed. 2001. *The disentanglement of populations. Migration, expulsion and displacement in post-war Europe, 1944−9.* New York: Pallgrave Macmillian.

Ruble, Blaire A. 2003. "Living together the city, contested identity, and democratic transitions." In *Composing urban history and the constitution of civic identities,* ed. John J. Czaplicka, Blaire A. Ruble and Lauren Crabtree, 1–21. Washington: Woodrow Willson center press.

Sezneva, Olga. 2003. "Dual history. The politics of the past in Kaliningrad, former Königsberg." In *Composing urban history and the constitution of civic identities,* ed. John J. Czaplicka, Blaire A. Ruble and Lauren Crabtree, 58–85. Washington: Woodrow Willson center press.

Shofield, John. 2008. "Heritage management, theory and practice." In *The heritage reader,* ed. Rodney Harrison, Graham Fairclough, John H. Jameson Jnr and John Shofield, 16–30. London and New York: Routledge.

Slavec Gradišnik, Ingrid. 2014. "V objemih dediščin." In *Interpretacije dediščine*, ed. Tatjana Dolžan Eržen, Ingrid Slavec Gradišnik and Nadja Valentinčič Furlan, 8–24. Ljubljana: Slovensko etnološko društvo.

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

– – – . 2008. "Towards a theoretical framework for archaeology heritage management." In *The heritage reader*, ed. Rodney Harrison, Graham Fairclough, John H. Jameson Jnr and John Shofield, 62–74. London and New York: Routledge.

Tanc, Barbaros. 2001. "Where local trumps national: Christian orthodox and Muslim refugees since Lausanne." *Balcanologie* 5 (1/2): no pagination; http://balkanologie.revues.org/index732.html.

Ther, Philipp and Ana Siljak, ed. 2001. *Redrawing nations: Ethnic cleansing in East-Central Europe, 1944–1948*. Harvard cold war studies book series. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Tunbridge, J. E. and Gregory John Ashworth. 1996. *Dissonant heritage. The management of the past as a resource in conflict*. Chichester and New York: J. Willey.

Vardy, Steven Bela and T. Hunz Tooley. 2003. "Introduction." In *Ethnic cleansing in twentieth-century Europe*, ed. Steven Bela Vardy and T. Hunz Tooley, 9–14. Boulder: Columbia university press.

Veschambre, Vincent. 2004. "Appropriation et marquage symbolique de l'espace."*ESO* 21: 73–77.

– – – . 2008. *Traces et mémoires urbaines, enjeux sociaux de la patrimonilasation et de la démolition*. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes.

Vodopivec, Nina. 2007. *Labirinti postsocializma. Socialni spomin tekstilnih delavk in delavcev*. Ljubljana: Institutum Studiorum Humanitatis, Fakulteta za podiplomski humanistični študij.

– – – . 2015.

Zabukovec, Mojca. 2014. "Industrije v klasičnem pomenu ni več niti na simbolni ravni." *Delo*, February 11th. Accessed February 20, 2014. http://www.delo.si/adijo-tovarna/industrije-v-klasicnem-pomenu-ni-vec-niti-na-simbolni-ravni.html

Zorn, Jelka and Uršula Lipovec Čebron, ed. 2008. *Once upon an erasure: from citizens to illegal residents in Republic of Slovenia*. Ljubljana: Študentska založba.