Multiple Ways of Belonging in a Multicultural City

Anita Sujoldžić

Institute for Anthropological Research, Zagreb

A B S T R A C T

The focus of the present study is on the interdependence of language and urban identity set within the framework of theory of practice and the concept of the right to the city. It is concerned with the formation of local identities in the context of a multicultural city of Pula, in the Croatian region of Istria, characterized by a substantial presence of immigrant and ethnic minority groups. The paper explores to what extent the image of the city, with its spatial and social structure, as well as socio-economic and historic context determines discourse on multicultural interactions as well as the ways those images shape a sense of identity, and how these identities are affected by interpersonal and inter-group communication. By looking into factors and processes through which different dimensions of identity become salient, specific attention is given to how power relations influence the dynamics of identity negotiation and the re/articulation of potential hierarchy of differences.

Key words: urban identity, belonging, linguistic exclusion, the right to the city

Introduction

The problem of identity, individual as well as collective, has become a focal point in the social sciences and in public debates as a result of globalization processes intensifying interconnectedness, cultural communication and encounters. The importance of the construction and perception of individual and group identities in contact, and critical questions about cultural and linguistic differences as well as issues of belonging have become increasingly salient across a wide range of disciplines from political science, sociology, anthropology and linguistics, to history and cultural and film studies[1–4]. Though no singular theoretical position unifies all these perspectives, they all share a common assumption that identity is seen as fluid, ambiguous and fragmented, a dynamic process, multiply constructed through different discourses. The constitution of a social identity is viewed essentially as an act of power, constructed in or through difference and exclusion[4]. Conceptualized in this way, identity emerges only in relation to the »other«, defined predominantly by what one is not or what one lacks, as a counterpoint to discourses and meanings dominant in society. As defined by that which it excludes, identity is thus mediated individually and collectively by social discourse and socio-historical context.

Multicultural cities are increasingly viewed as dynamically constructed contexts rather than statically given places inhabited by largely un-mixed, co-existing self-contained local and minority or immigrant groups, with stable identities and static language based cultures. Their multilingual and multicultural landscape is shaped in a complex way by globalization, immigration and tourism, resulting in shifting group boundaries, competing discourses of belonging and contingent constructions of new identities. Small-scale cities with a history of migration are particularly important locales to understand and explore urban reality as sites of contestation of these social transformations, and to obtain insights beyond the dominant concept of multiculturalism and multilingualism as ideological and political societal ideal based on bounded and homogenous cultural and ethnic groups, and confront complex and, in many cases, unique challenges that this reality entails and creates[5].

Language use offers a unique access to the cultural complexity of the city, as linguistic practices both represent the urban reality and construct it through the participants everyday practices. Social use of language reflects and articulates a particular social and cultural dynamics[6]. Therefore, it can be argued that urban identity is a discoursal formation, one that is a relational, contextually embedded, and power-laden phenomenon articulated through the interplay of not only oppositions and differences, but also through collective experiences

of shared cultural spaces of belonging. The emergent positions of intercultural identities may open up the possibility of a cultural hybridity, subverting any assumed or imposed hierarchy of cultures and/or languages (dialects).

Habitus and the right to the city

The notion of the right to the city as developed by the seminal work of Lefebvre[7,8] defines belonging to a political community in terms of inhabitance or just living in a city as an urban dweller. It implies the right to appropriate urban space in the sense of the right of inhabitants to use it in their everyday lives fully and completely. It also implies the rights of inhabitants to participate in institutionalized control over urban life including participation in the social, political life, management, and administration of the city. The Lefebvre's emphasis on the right to be different, »the right not to be classified forcibly into categories which have been determined by the necessarily homogenizing powers«[7], however, is challenged by power relations along ethnic, or cultural lines which constrain the possibilities to realize the right to participate in urban life.

As Barth[9] argued, group identities are constructed by self-attribution, as much as by categorization of other bordering groups. In other words, feelings of communality and belonging to a particular place or a given cultural space are defined in opposition to the perceived identity of other ethnic groups. Another scholar who builds his social theory on the relational view of the social practice, Bourdieu[10,11] defines a sense of one's place, an embodied sense of place, as the habitus, a system of dispositions to a certain practice of everyday life. His concepts of habitus, field, and various forms of capital can be useful in trying to deconstruct the urban identity and its articulation. Habitus can be interpreted simply as the basic system of knowledge that people normally use in their daily lives, i.e. the habituated practices of individuals.

While a field may be understood as a structured network of social practices and positions related to a an area of production as well as the positions of agents in the field in terms of power, prestige, and influence, or their capital, a person's trajectory may be understood as the sequence of positions held by that person in one or more fields[1]. The habitus is a set of dispositions internalized during socialization and inscribed by the trajectory which generate practices, perceptions and attitudes which become habituated without being consciously coordinated. As pre-reflective, they are highly durable and persist through life and they are both the product of the history of the habitus, and the resource of its continuous reproduction. Members within different groups are considered to share the same habitus which determines the social identity and behavior of individuals. This approach enables the analysis of the variations in the respective persons' dispositions towards other groups, based on language, gender, education and class. An important output of habitus is the person's taste, or attraction to certain practices and objects, including linguistic practices. Since it is a product of the habitus, it is both immediate and emotional, and structured by power and social positions.

Within a field, due to power relations there are certain dominant practices, as well as practices of marginalized status. The dominance is achieved through the accumulation of various legitimate forms of capital that are currently valued within the field. Besides economic capital, Bourdieu[11] identifies different states of cultural (including linguistic capital) and social capital, either of which can act as a symbolic capital when conceived as a form of power, as legitimate demands for recognition, or deference. In this way, habitus, the durable, transposable, structured (and structuring) dispositions of individuals, works together with the necessary legitimate capital in a given social field.

Habitus expresses a certain shared cultural understanding or local knowledge, and provides the transmission of culture from one generation to another. In everyday life, individuals as agents construct public spaces interacting with others in the social settings. Depending on their possession of scripting and local knowledge, individuals perceive and use urban public space differently and ascribe to it a sense of belonging or strangeness[12].

Research questions

This article aims at uncovering some dimensions of urban identification processes through narrated forms of belonging or dis-belonging as interrelated with cultural, linguistic practices among a sample of inhabitants of Pula. The central questions that guide research are related to the ways in which historical and socio-economic contexts shape dealing with diversity in this city, and how is the dynamics of communication related to the participation of citizens in social and economic practices. Particular attention is given to different articulations of identity and power relations that constrain or facilitate the right to the city of Pula by its various inhabitants.

Methods

This analysis is based on a research project carried out between 2007 and 2009 in which residents of Pula were interviewed regarding their everyday experiences as related to their sense of belonging and their perception of the urban life. The research is based on a qualitative, content analysis methodology. Topics for the *interview* were designed to cover the main questions expected to be answered by inhabitants of the city of Pula including declared members of certain minorities, in order to get a detailed description based on the informants' view of Pula's multicultural and multilingual reality. These questions served as a guideline and could be modified according to special needs and given circumstances, allowing new questions to be brought up during the interview as a result of what the interviewee says. Respondents told their stories about their lives in the city and from their daily experiences as related to their identity, sense of belonging and perceptions of multicultural practices and diversity in the town of Pula.

The unit of analysis was the city of Pula, without starting from preconceived officially categorized ethnic groups or communities living in Pula. A total of 104 inhabitants of Pula were interviewed, out of which 47 were males and 79 were females, with age ranging from 23 to 88. In order to position the interviewees' narratives within their identities, they were asked during the interview to declare themselves in terms of their cultural and ethnic identities. 47 interviewees affiliated with ethnicity or nationality other than Croatian. The persons interviewed represent both the »majority« hegemonic, that is, the Croatian and also the »minority«, the 'other' whether the autochthonous Istrian Italians, old national minorities like Hungarians or »new« minorities or immigrants, like Bosnians, Macedonians or Albanians. This wide range of cultural dimensions and self-perceived ethnicities enabled exploring the various expressions of belonging and identification strategies.

Historic and Socioeconomic Trajectories Shaping Pula's Urban Identity

The multicultural and multilingual city of Pula owes its multiethnic composition to the specific position of Istria (a border region) and the specific historical situation which resulted in numerous migration flows and mixtures of traditions and cultures. The millennium political strivings, tensions and divisions of this area between various states and rulers have significantly influenced the specific heterogeneous situation of the city of Pula. The changes of power relations in the last century affected historical socio-economic contexts through which Pula was first shaped as a military stronghold, then as an industrial city and finally as a city of culture and attractive tourist destination. All these changes affected memories of the current citizens of Pula which shape their sense of belonging to this city.

Pula is maybe the town with the longest history on the eastern Adriatic coast and the remains of its ancient past are still clearly visible in its architectural design. Archeological finds in the vicinity of Pula prove that the area was inhabited already at about 40,000 B.C. and that during the 5th century B.C. the Histrian tribe set up a fortified settlement here. The Histri were conquered by the Romans in 177 B.C. who founded a colony called Colonia Iulia Pollentia Herculanea. Under the rule of Emperor Augustus (30 B.C.–14 A.D.) Pula (Pietas Iulia) was the main administrative centre of Istria and already counted 30,000 inhabitants. The Roman amphitheatre, temples and other remains are even today major landmarks and tourist attractions in the central part of the city which spread around them during the following centuries.

From 1331 on, Pula was for several centuries ruled by the Republic of Venice. This period brought, however, a period of decline for the town, marginalized to a provincial position of the Republic, so that in the 17th century there were only a few hundred inhabitants left. Linguistically, however, during this period the Venetian variety became firmly rooted as Istrian *koine*, substituting the previous autochthonous Romance Istriot varieties that developed from the regional Latin in contact with various substrates.

After the war with Napoleon, Austria obtained most of the Venetian Republic in 1797. From then, Pula remained part of the Austrian Monarchy until 1918 (only interrupted by Napoleonic rule between 1805 and 1814/15) and this period was the most important for its future development. After 1848, the year of the Revolution, Austria moved its military port from Venice to Pula. In addition to its main naval arsenal in Pula, Austria built also a major shipbuilding yard. This marked the beginning of a most prosperous period of the town with intense urban development and demographic increase due to immigrants from various parts of the Empire, as well as Slavic populations from Istrian villages. Under the patronage of Vienna the official language was German, but due to Austrian policy of non-interference with the local government, Italophone varieties remained dominant in everyday use. Although the Croatian element was growing in the city, they also had to learn Italian varieties, since it was a condition for their integration into a new city environment, so that Croatian varieties were rapidly thrown out of use.

After WWI, when Pula and the whole Istria became part of Italy, under the fascist government, non-Italians, especially Slavic residents, faced huge political and cultural repression and a large number of Croatians and Slovenians were forced to exile. During the period of Italianization people were forced to change their names into the Italian ones, while Slavic language varieties were erased from public life. Since considerable number of people who came from rural areas did not speak Italian language but local Chakavian varieties of the area they came from, they had to learn Italian (in school) and thus became bilingual, while the Italian population remained monolingual (and older generations living in Pula today are still monolingual, even if they understand the Croatian variety). Pula remained dominantly Italian town till the end of the WW II.

When Istria became part of the Yugoslav Federation the exodus of the Italian population from Istria again drastically changed the numeric situation of the population in the region. A huge number of Italians left the city to become *esuli* in Italy and those who stayed or *rimasti* were faced with new power relations. Many immigrants from other parts of Croatia and ex-Yugoslavia came and settled in Pula finding employment in the shipyard and military.

In the 1990's, when Croatia gained independence, it replaced the official socialist discourse of the past with nationalist narratives of memory and homogenizing identity. However, as a result of democratization and the anticipation of Croatia's EU accession, alternative voices appeared in Istria, which led to the development of a strong political regionalist movement and the emergence of a widely politicized regional identity as opposed to (several) national identities, with a celebration of multiculturalism.

The official discourse of the city authorities in Pula has been based on an inclusive, open, tolerant and self--governing attitude, attempting to run the city's municipal and financial affairs independent of the central national government, since 1991, within the regional policy of the Istrian County and its position as an Euroregion. Both the Statute of the Istrian County and that of the City of Pula recognize within the legal framework the city's cultural and ethnic diversity. They acknowledge the right of all citizens to receive equal treatment from the authorities while respecting their right to difference based on nationality, ethnicity or gender. All national minorities coexisting in Pula (Italian, Serbian, Slovenian, Macedonian, Albanian, Bosnian, Hungarian, Montenegrin and Roma) accordingly can participate in the urban reality at the institutional level through their Councils, whose goals are to improve the position of the respective minority, to protect their rights and interests, and to protect their national, cultural and linguistic identity, as proved by the Statute.

It is also becoming evident that the tolerant attitude towards non-hegemonic identities, has wider affects on the city and region, other than the relationships between the individual's identity and the community, and that the tendency to tolerate different identities is also linked to the labor market. The city's leadership actively encourages various European projects within the Euroregion policy and foreign investments in land and property. As evidenced by the census in 2001, only 45% of the current citizens in Pula were born in the city. Another 18% were born in the Istrian County, while the same percentage applies to those born in another county of Croatia (18%). A total of 19% were born in other countries, mostly former republics of Federal Yugoslavia, including 10% of persons born in Bosnia and Herzegovina and 5% of those born in Serbia. The data on declared nationality/ethnicity (71.65% Croatian, 5.83 Serbian, 4.82 Italian, 7,54 other ethnicities while 10.16% declined to declare their ethnicity) and religious affiliation (68.34% Catholics, 5.15% Moslems, 5% Orthodox, 2.35 other affiliations and 19.6% atheists and non-affiliated) clearly reflect its cultural heterogeneity as well. The data on declared mother-tongue, however, according to which Croatian is the mother--tongue of 88.38% of the citizens, indicates assimilatory linguistic tendencies as well as an arbitrary connection between language and national/ethnic identity.

Memory and Dynamics of Belonging

The historical situation of ethnic minorities coexisting in Pula demonstrates how they are influenced by the power relations between coexisting communities that dispose of a different status. The once dominating Italians of Pula became a national minority. They gradually became bilingual since they had to learn Serbo-Croatian at school, as the official language during the Yugoslav pe-

riod. An explanation of the phenomenon in Istria which occurred in the 1990s census when people declared Istrian as their national identity is given in an Italian-identifying interviewee's account of belonging which clearly indicates relative and elusive concepts of minority and national identity. She said that she and her friends would be called *fascists* by Croatian children while at school in Pula; later at the university in Trieste, their Italian colleagues called them *Sćavi* (meaning 'slaves', a common derogative 'nickname' for (South-)Slavs in general used by Italians). They were rejected by Croats for being Italian; they were rejected by Italians, who thought of them as different and who they thought were different, as *Croati/Slavi/Sćavi*. They were neither; they were both; they, therefore, were Istrians.

The memory of these traumatic events deeply shapes the sense of belonging to the city of those who were born there before 1950. This sense of belonging is based on collective memories of fascism, communism, violence, intolerance and lack of respect regarding authentic culture, new languages, new customs that are evoked as main *topoi* in both Italian and Istro-Croatian narratives:

»can you imagine the chemistry of the moment in which nobody spoke our language, except to insinuate »you Italian, you fascist«, and we did not speak theirs!«[1] (F, 50 Italian, Pula)

Conversational problems with official authorities in the recent past (Mussolini's Italy, communist Yugoslavia) form older respondents' collective memory and figure as traumatic significant *topoi* in their personal histories. Older respondents who were not fluid speakers of Italian or Croatian language witness fear and shame when confronted with demand of using Italian (during Italian government) or Croatian (in the period of Croatian/Yugoslav government) in formal contexts (in communication with municipal and local authorities, e.g.). Discomfort and embarrassment accompanied these conversational situations, that provoked either anger and harassment of the official authorities, or their mocking and humiliation. Older and *middle* generations felt somehow at a disadvantage, having lived in circumstances in which speaking one's dialect/vernacular was considered to be a sign of an uneducated, primitive person:

»(…) my dad (…) was ashamed terribly [of his dialect] *in the 1960s when he went, especially since he was from Fažana, a small town and when he went to secondary school here (…)«* (30, F, Croatian, Pula)

»In the already »liberated« Pula, I started to go to school in which it was forbidden to speak Istrian dialects. We continued to use them in the street, speaking and mixing bits of Italian with Chakavian. […..]*However, I learnt quickly our standard Croatian language, even my pronunciation was relatively correct. I remember when a teacher scolded a few pupils for talking in Chakavian at school, pointing at me as an exemplary student of the Cro-*

I   A.M. Mori, N. Milani, *Bora*, Frassinelli, Milano, 1998.

atian standard language. I was proud then, I admit, I did not understand that I should have actually been ashamed. True, we were ashamed at that time of our mother tongue. In the same way, my parents, uncles and aunts were forced to speak Italian not only in school, but in their everyday life, as Istrian Chakavian dialect was considered to be inferior.«[II] (M. 55, Croatian, Pula)

At the same time, belonging has its personal aspects, belonging to places, neighbourhoods and people that are connected to personal experiences of the past *convivenza*[III] of Istro-Italians and Istro-Croatians. The long-term childhood memories often reveal nostalgic undertones of that life as revealed by the following narrative:

»In the street, school, and in any other occasion we played together, the Italian and Croatian children… True, sometimes we would fight, and call each other names…« they« would call us »sciavoni«, and we would call them »macaroni«, or something like that…Soon, however, the Italian children started to leave, opting [for Italy]*, and we would always comment painfully, with sincere sadness, the departure of each of our little friends.«* (M. 55, Croatian, Pula)[IV]

For such persons memory becomes part of their own identity but also part of their collective identity and shared symbolism of a community. Its significance in their own life is a result of their own affiliations, beliefs, and ideology. Particularly for Italians in Pula, who currently live in what they experience as an anomalous and not entirely fair situation, memory to places they »territorialized« in their everyday practices in childhood become the essence of belonging and attachment to the city, rather than their current everyday practices. As compared to older generations, younger Italians, however, are not burdened by the past in the same way, as they were born in a different political situation, already as members of a minority. This is how one of our Italian respondents described the situation:

»Let's say children who were born later, as my daughter in 76, or my son in 71… I think they belong to this society much more than we could. They are integrated. I would even say that a large part of them assimilated… assimilated. Let's say, one part have not assimilated, but they have integrated, which is far better.« (Italian, M, 67, Pula)

During the post-war period Pula again became an important military port and a great number of Yugoslav National Army officers of different ethnic origins and their families were coming to Pula from other parts of the Yugoslav federation. They settled in empty apartments of those that emigrated or in newly built apartment buildings in the outskirts of the city. In that period Pula was considered and named »little Yugoslavia«:

»Pula was, not only during the Austro-Hungarian Empire, but during Yugoslavia Pula was a military centre, the largest of Yugoslavia. So, many, many young people who came to perform military service remained in the city. And all the minorities of…. of all peoples, I mean, most of the former Yugoslavia. We used to say that Pula was a little Yugoslavia. This was true because the army made many nationalities coexist in Pula.« (Italian, F, 69, Pula)

Many respondents mentioned the influence of Pula's military history on its multicultural identity. Many migrants from all parts of the former Yugoslavia were continuously settling in Pula when Istria became one of the most developed regions in the whole Federation. The most recent immigration wave occurred after 1991 due to the war in Bosnia and Croatia. Many refugees from Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina who came to Pula decided to stay there permanently. Istria has always been trying to conciliate various cultural influences and this is one of the reasons why it is perceived as multicultural and tolerant:

»They have never hated us, we never felt that in our lives. We have never been rejected… The Croats have always been ok with us, completely, one hundred percent, and it's not important if we are Hungarians. […] That I feel, absolutely nothing, like we were born here. Because they never hated us […] we never felt that.« (Hungarian, M, 65, Doroslov)

During Yugoslavia all these ethnicities were residing in the same country. With the socialist ideology of »brotherhood and unity« it was very easy to migrate and all the ethnicities had equal, full Yugoslav citizenship. In the narratives of our minority respondents this period is usually described positively with respect to the openness and tolerance of Pula toward different nationalities. When Croatia gained its independence, all ethnic communities residing in Pula gained the status of a national minority and today constitute an essential part of the complex multicultural and multilingual reality of the city of Pula. For many of them the process was not, however, easy, as they had to prove the right to gain Croatian citizenship. This quote shows how one of our Albanian respondents described this specific situation:

»Over night they woke up in another country. That is, you know… I have arrived here in my country. And over night, suddenly, you are not a citizen anymore. You're nowhere. Over there Serbs do not want you, here Croats do not want you. I mean, they don't want… you do not know where you are, neither in heaven nor on earth. And that is, that is a problem.« (M, 51, Albanian)

When asked about political and social changes in 1991, the answers of the respondents are not uniform.

[II]   Janko, P. *O Istri i istrijanstvu je riječ.* Pula: C.A.S.H., 1997.

[III]   co-existence

[IV]   ibid.

They experienced those changes differently and were not affected by them in the same way. Although the vast majority said that they did not perceive any changes in terms of ethnic tolerance, some of them mentioned that they felt a difference in the way the nationality suddenly became a factor that was recognized and mattered.

»When this situation began…. a lot of things happened, some people immediately left… you could really feel it, at least I did, because I was already old enough to understand certain things. You could see that for the New Year,s Eve when all the doors were closed, you could go only to one or two doors and that's it. Before, everything was open«. (F, 30, Hungarian, Pula)

Another additional factor that shaped the multicultural reality and diversity is the shipbuilding industry. Since this sector of industry survived till nowadays the urban identity of the city cannot be separated from the local shipyard. Today it is called »Uljanik« and it represents an important landmark for the citizens not only in economic terms as a place of employment for many of them, but at the symbolic level as well.

»Uljanik employed some twelve thousand people, I do not know exactly, I was happy to work there… though I can agree with you that now it looks ugly, but once there were not so many tourists, so they thought ok, the shipyard had to be so big. However, now it should stay where it is«. (F, 69, Macedonian, Tetovo)

For many of the respondents »Uljanik« is still a kind of historic synonym for multiculturalism (nowadays many migrants are still working there).

The Articulations Urban Identity

The official discourse of multiculturalism allows for a sense of belonging expressed through a *multi-layered citizenship* which means that one's citizenship in collectivities can be identified in different layers – local, ethnic, national, or state. One's citizenship is affected and often constructed by positioning of each layer to the others in specific historical contexts.

Many interviewees, particularly those born in Pula, accommodate their multiple identifications – local, regional, national (and sometimes supranational) as a kind of hierarchy where local comes first. They are first and foremost inhabitants of their town (e.g. *Puljan/Puležani* »inhabitants of Pula«), then Istrians, and then Croats. Or as one of them put it: *»Puležan first, everything else afterwards«. For some, regional identity seems to be more important than local: »I would say I'm from Istria first. Then* [I would mention] *Pula.«*

Members of other ethnicities, the first generation of immigrants often associate their sense of belonging with citizenship. Answering the question how do they perceive or identify themselves, their usually responded in the following way:

»I feel Hungarian, but also as an inhabitant of Croatia and the citizen of Pula, who lives here for a long time, 47 years.« (M, 64, Hungarian, Doroslovo)

The *Puležan* identity is articulated in cultural and linguistic interactions within the context of both past and present multicultural reality of the city of Pula. When talking about what it means to be a *Puležan or Polesano*, the responses of our respondents are rather varied. The indigenous strongly identify themselves with their town of birth, while the same is not applicable to all other inhabitants, i.e. newcomers. Most of our respondents (locals as well as migrants) claim that to be a *Puležan*, the most important thing is to be born in Pula:

»Well, now for example, my three grand-children, they are for example now »Puležani«. Because their mother and father were born here, which I cannot say for myself. Not even my children can say that they are »Puležani« because their parents weren't born here. But their children are already …« (a newcomer from Slavonia, F, 56, Croatian, Otok-Vinkovci)

Among the dispositions that define the habitus of a *Puležan*, the understanding of the *convivenza*, the historic co-existence of Slavic and Italian people and their mutual respect and acceptance has a prominent position in a number of social fields:

»Here, we have a nice symbiosis of Italian and Croatian communities. You greet an Italian »Buon giorno«, and he says »Dobar dan«. It's a sign of respect. My mom can't speak Italian, and her first neighbours know only a few words of Croatian. But they get along well, because they are good people.« (M, 40, Istrian, Pula)

»Therefore, if there is anything that is autochthonous here, it is asparagus, truffles and that are Croatian, Slovenian and Italian people living in this region. What should I say, that's it. Those who know, those who live with us in this region for many decades, even centuries, do not ask themselves this question. We are all part of this milieu. Those who come from the outside, without the basic information, they will need a certain amount of time to get used to the idea. Not all.« (M, 45, Italian, Pula)

In the social urban context this habitus is critical since it is constructed through different forms of capital to be facilitated in the field, among which specific linguistic everyday practices act in a form of symbolic domination through legitimate demands for recognition. These everyday language practices are fluid and complex, depending on actors in conversation, topics and contexts where language practices are taking place. They include the plurilingual competence primarily in Istro-Venetian, Chakavian and urban Pula Croatian vernacular. They are opposed to both standard Italian and standard Croatian which are used only in very official and formal contexts (e.g. school):

»Yes, we always speak Istro-Venetian. Never the standard, never… I can count on my fingers, maybe three or four persons who normally use the standard language. Even, the educated ones, like professors, or I don't know,

engineers, normally communicate in Istro-Venetian. Always. That standard escapes…, only at school, like when you are forced, you know. But, with friends, neighbours we always speak in our way. You know, Italian, but our way«. (F, 25, Italian, Pula)

Code-switching, code-mixing and receptive multilingualism are usual everyday phenomena for true Puležans, and these practices too represent a cultural capital:

»I never think about it… It just depends on the person I meet whether I speak Chakavian, Istrovenetian or Croatian..« (F, 34 Croatian, Pula)

Only some older members of Italian minority do not speak Croatian variety (but understand it). A high number of mixed marriages contributed to increase in bilingual competence among younger generations:

»And I think MANY of the majority population have learnt Italian. They married, had children… many families are bilingual, mamma mia! We have a whole generation of young people who are more or less bilingual… all.« (Italian, F, 69, Pula)

Bilingual families cultivate their bilingual peculiarity: spouses use different languages in mutual conversation, and raise their children using both languages, to be bilingual. The dominant behaviour is using two languages mutually in interaction:

»I am Italian, my husband is Croatian, we mix both (languages) all the time… This is the only way we can understand each other.« (F, 37, Italian, Pula)

A variety with strong interferences is often spoken, a variety which allows mixtures inside of a convergence-continuum, with the imaginary extreme poles between »pure« *Istrovenetian* and »pure« *Istrochakavian;* including also interference between Istrochakavian and standard Croatian, or Istrovenetian and standard Croatian, and Istrovenetian and standard Italian. Code-switching and code-mixing symbolise certain acts of identity beyond merely linguistic fact, and play a role in self-construction and self-representation of a typical Puležan/Polesano. These linguistic alternations are linked to the positively valued connotations of tolerance, openness, accommodation, solidarity etc., by the bilingual speakers. They represent diversity and difference in relation to those speakers who are not bilingual, and who perceive these competences as a form of symbolic capital, like an Albanian respondent:

»What can I say, those who live here and were born here, are true Puležan, they all speak Italian. It does not even matter if they are Italians or not. But they had that contact, this opportunity to learn Italian from the beginning, I think, from an early age.« (M, 52, Albanian)

Interestingly, while Puležani themselves consider their own various linguistic practices as markers of their tolerance, openness and solidarity, their habituses exclude all other linguistic practices as distinctive, as belonging to

»other« and thus not acceptable. Historically, the tension between the »civilized« city and »uncivilized« peasants from the surrounding villages, even excluded from the urban habitus typically rural Chakavian varieties. However, under the influence of the current regional policy promoting Istrianity and re-appreciation of all Istrian varieties, rural varieties have been slowly adopted by the urban habitus as well:

»I can tell you that my peers in high school that came from the village, never spoke Chakavian with us. And today, I see high school students who normally speak theirs…. It's a big democratization. [You mentioned earlier that you considered them as peasants?] *Yes, well, we had a name for them. We called them »kurijere*[V]*«. They would always leave earlier…. If school finished at 7.15 or 7.05, they would always leave at 6.55 as they had to catch »kurijera«, a bus.«* (M, 35, Croatian, Pula)

The general opinion of all our respondents born in Pula is that newcomers should adapt to the local culture and life-style and integrate into the community by adopting its basic values instead of trying to maintain close social networks within their communities. Importantly, they should learn the local varieties and use them in everyday communication with the locals, which is a very important condition for integration.

»A woman once said (to us) jokingly, why did you not learn to speak Croatian. Listen I said, without offence, I said, but you came to us, and not the other way round. So, why don't you learn Italian, I said, instead of asking from us to learn Croatian. And then she laughed, as it was just a joke…« (F, 60, Croatian, Pula)

The local habitus clearly distinguishes itself from other ethnic groups, as well as from Croatians in other parts of Croatia. Many local respondents expressed their opinion on immigrant groups as rigidly closed entities (sometimes even irritatingly) who will never be able to become *Puležani*. The locals, true Puležani say for all others that they came *from beyond the mountain Učka*, that they do not understand the customs and values of the local people and that most often they do not even try to accept the typical life-style.

Reshaping habitus: contingent identities caught in hegemonic power relations

Newcomers and members of minorities other than the Italian one, despite the fact that most of them identified with the city and considered themselves as citizens of Pula, especially bearing in mind the fact that many of them lived there for over at least thirty years, seem to be aware that the majority population, do not perceive them as *true locals*. They feel that for the local people they will remain foreigners:

(Would you say that you are a *Puležan*?)

»No, no. Here you have to eat three bags of salt and in one life you cannot eat up three bags.« … *»Yes, yes, yes. It's an unwritten rule and it is such a…someone who hears*

V   a bus in local variety.

this would say 'It's not like that, we accept you', but it's different to accept people...I'll tell you something: how an Albanian accepts a foreigner in Kosovo. In Kosovo a foreigner wouldn't be easily accepted, but once he does, he gets integrated in those most vital things that make up a life of a family, of most families in Kosovo, he would no longer be a foreigner ever. He can come and go, but he remains a Kosovar. But here it is not like that. No, here, the people are different, maybe because Italy is too close.« (M, 57, Albanian)

Habitus is forced to change due to migration, as migrants struggle to adjust to the new setting, where they have to learn not only new skills but also a new life-style, or a new dialect or language[13]. While they learn to adopt new practices in the particular social fields, such as work or school, their traditional habitus can be carried on in the other fields, like family or community. This tension between the new and traditional habituses is enforced for the children of immigrants who are more exposed to social fields, like school, for appropriating a new habitus.

Particularly those young generations, who are of »mixed« ancestry, may feel differently, struggling to articulate their belonging to the urban space of Pula, beyond the given terms and categories of ethnicity or community:

»I don't know how I feel about it at all. Because my parents came from different parts of the then country [Yugoslavia], *….. I really don't know how to feel. Because there are so many »mixed« people in my family I do not have a feeling of belonging here or there. I would rather say: if I'm living here at the moment, this is who I am, if I'm living somewhere else, than I'm that.«* (M, 30)

They may, on the other hand, feel no need of having to belong, to identify themselves with a group, but feel as if they are connected to the whole world:

»I don't have any wish to… declare myself at all. It is somehow funny, this labelling, defining, whether national or geographical.' (M, 25, Pula). Or as yet another summarizes it: 'Why do people have to define themselves? I don't think a person wonders about it if they are ok with themselves. It makes a part of me. I cannot say I'm Croatian, Istrian, Italian… It's simply spontaneous.«* (F, 28, Pula)

Pula is generally recognized as a multicultural city, whether officially or by all people living there. The official discourse of multiculturalism and diversity exposes many similarities with the official EU discourse of unity in diversity. As such, diversity is perceived as a historically embedded long-term strategy and favourable condition of the city of Pula and its future development. However, unofficial dicourses of this diversity are quite varied and depending on particular habituses of social actors can appear quite selective as well. In the narratives of the indigenous citizens, this diversity takes a form of a historically specific Istrian context, which has always been characterized by diversity. It is considered to be a normal aspect of life in Istria, together with a number of mixed marriages, mixed cultures and customs, frequently within the same family.

The local respondents usually evoke Istrian openess, adaptability, communicativity and tolerance toward newcomers: *»Well, we have always accepted everyone that came here, as if they belong here.«* (F, 50–60)

There are, also, some positive views on immigrants, although they are rare; An elderly lady expresses her opinion on newcomers, trying not to judge them by the place of their origin, but finding another criterion which is equally applicable across cultural borders: *»There are Albanians, Serbians, Bosnians, people from everywhere. Everything is alright, if they are good people. Because, there are also some our people, Croats who are not good.«*

The openess of the Pula's society is noticed and positively evaluated also by some newcomers, although most of them, like the following Albanian respondent, are aware of its conditionality and/or selectiveness.

»They will accept you only after it becomes certain that you live whole-heartedly here, which means being integrated in the whole system, and not just formal integration in different institutions and so forth, but also in communication with people and in private communication.« (M, 57, Albanian)

These discourses of diversity are, thus, in conflict with the widespread view of Puležani that immigrants are expected to assimilate into the local culture as well as with their negative views of cultural and linguistic practices of the »other« in the public space mentioned previously. They mostly resent that newcomers (»furešti«) do not accept the Istrian way of life and traditions, including language(s), while trying to impose their own. One of our respondents seems to be aware of this ambivalence when she stated: *»This multiculturalism, it is an outside word which we do not experience in the inside. We don't have a feeling of multiculturalism….that we are this… they are Albanians, or they are multiethnic…«* (F, 30–40, Istrian)

Right to the City and Everyday Practices: Public and Private Spaces

Lefebvre[8] was the first to acknowledge the social construction of space, arguing that no space could claim to be socially neutral. Publicness and privateness form the major boundary definitions of social interactions through which different social actors appropriate and exploit space. Thus, the public sphere represents a field of struggle and contestation in which avoidance and participation are articulated in the continuously constructed and negotiated boundaries of use and appropriation (Bourdieu, 1990).

Public spaces are places that are legally open to everybody and in which a range of people can interact with other people they do not necessarily know. and in which they can engage a range of public and private activities. They include not only not only open-air public spaces, like streets and parks, but also public buildings and public sectors of semi-private and semi-public buildings including, shops, cafes, restaurants, theatres, and cinemas,

as well as the institutional sectors of education, health, administration, care services, such as schools, hospitals, banks, etc.[12].

In Pula, the urban public space is perceived and used differently. The social relations in urban public and everyday life reflect and expose differences, represented not only by ethnicities, or nationalities, but also within the community itself, intersecting with age, gender and socio-economic status. With regard to access to interactional activities, information and resources, the majority of public spaces in Pula are open for the display of the authentic Puležan habitus, except in the most formal places (e.g. school), while, the respective traditional habituses of immigrants are reserved only for the private sphere of home.

When talking about the use of public spaces by such groups as *Puležani* or immigrants we are not only describing these groups' characteristics, but also their specific ways of appropriating the public space as opposed to other groups' ways. The narratives of immigrant respondents illustrate how such public spaces as shops and even streets are appropriated by the dominant linguistic practices of the Puležan habitus, excluding other social actors:

»Working in the hospital I came across the problem of language because people here speak the Istrian (variety) and I simply did not understand it… Sometimes in the street she would say give me that šu, šu, give me that šugaman, and I wouldn't know what that was.« (Macedonian, F, 63, Kočarevo, Vojvodina)

»This was really bothering me at the beginning: I came to the hairdresser, to the butcher and I hear only Italian. […] *And I was so embarrassed then, and now as well.* […] *So that I do not understand, I don't understand a word. I mean, I do not have to understand, but that is not nice when they are speaking and I do not have any idea what are they talking about, I just stand and wait…«* (Macedonian, F, 63, Negotin, Macedonia)

The privilege to use their mother tongue in the workplace have only the members of Italian (but they use Italian only with others who speak it) and the Albanian minority. However, while the practices of the former are acceptable in almost all public spaces of Pula, the practices of the latter are again restricted to a private or at best semi/public space. Since the Albanians mostly own family-based businesses related to their traditional working crafts (goldsmiths, filigrees, patisseries, bakeries) they employ mostly their co-nationals or members of the family and thus use their mother tongue in the workplace as well (when communicating with them).

The lack of competence in indigenous linguistic practices, by various social actors, ironically, sometimes restricts also the sphere of their legitimate public usage for pragmatic reasons. Even if the members of the Italian minority legally have the right to use their language in all situations, in practice they often »adapt« to the Croatian local variety for pragmatic reasons. They claim that it is easier for them to speak the Croatian variety than to not get understood by people who do not speak or understand Italian, mostly newcomers to Pula who are increasingly encountered in various public spaces.

»And I could use it (Italian language) on the market and… I maybe it was more difficult to use it in public services. Because I did not… you know, it is always difficult to prove or explain to someone… I am a member of the (Italian) Community and I have the right to speak in Italian. I mean, you're too much complicating your life. Because… so that in these services I was, and now I use it automatically, I automatically use the Croatian language.« (Italian, F, 69, Pula)

On one hand, both Istrian Croatians and Italians mostly consider the minority status of Italians as anomalous and perceive them *»as indigenous local people«* (F, 45, Croatian, Pula) who are *»automatically counted as Istrians«* (F, 40, Italian, Pula). The Italian respondents in particular, frequently articulate their position as a right to belong to the city:

»We also have certain mechanisms that protect us in advance because we maintained them from the past, for example, obligatory election of an Italian minority representative as vice-mayor like myself and as vice-president of the City Council, that is guaranteed by our Statute and which in a way recognizes the fact that the Italian national community, while being a minority, is nevertheless strongly integrated into the system of local self-government.« (M, 45, Italian, Pula)

However, sometimes ambivalent attitudes can be found by some local Croatians who negatively describe their privileged position, like a middle-aged Croatian woman from Pula who resents their having been privileged in a way at school: *»The Italians always had more; it was always better for them.* […] *they got their textbooks for free, and we from Croatian school bought them regularly.* […] *They were going on trips all the time* […]*«.*

Legitimized forms of exclusion can be viewed as one of the ways to exclude »others« by way of clarifying the boundaries between »us« and »them.« A conflict is inherent here between equality and difference as in a democratic society we should all have equal access to all goods and resources that society offers. This conflict between equality and difference has its expressions in the differential rights in political citizenship of the Italian national minority as compared to all other minorities:

»Now compare these rights. The rights of the Albanians and of the Italians… incomparable. So, if we have ten percent, they [Italians] *have ninety percent.* […] *They have more rights than the Croats, not to mention the Albanians.* […] *But look, go to »Circolo«[VI], and ask them: tell me, do you have more rights than the Albanians? And*

VI   Circolo is the Italian cultural association in Pula.

they will say noooo, no way, we are all equal. How are we all equal?« (M, 49, Albanian)

The Italians in Pula have some specific rights and facilities: the fact that their member is elected either as mayor or vice-mayor, the right of public use of their language and the right of preserving their national and cultural identity, the right of pre-school and elementary, high school and college education in their own language according to special programs which contain their history and culture, institutional socio-cultural support from Italian government, as well as the right to Italian retirement pay and permissions to work in Italy. Such things are clearly perceived by members of other ethnicities as something that puts them in a subordinate position compared to Italians:

(And the Italians?) »The first. The autochthonous, yes.«

(Do you think that they are in some kind of…?) *»Yes, yes they are, definitely. Firstly, there are much more Italians numerically, secondly, Italy helps them, they have their circles and schools and that. Obviously they have the best position.«* (Hungarian, F, 68, Otok, Vinkovci)

Interestingly, although the percentage of those who declared Italian nationality in Pula is only 4.82%, which is lower than the percentage of some other ethnicities, they are perceived as the largest minority there. This is probably the effect of the official status of the Italian language as well as the widespread use of Istro-Venetian dialect in everyday communication of both Istrian Croatians and Italians. Our research demonstrates the significance of language competencies for social and economic integration as well as inequalities in political and socioeconomic life of various minorities and newcomers, compared to the indigenous inhabitants. The latter have the privilege of proficiency in both the local varieties as well as the Italian one (bilingual competence):

»Well, speaking about work…the Italian community perhaps in some cases… in certain situations may benefit by knowing exactly Italian. […] In other situations the knowledge of Italian definitely provides more opportunities.« (Italian, M, 55, Pula)

Traditional habituses and mother tongues of the members of minorities, other then the Italian one, are thus reserved for the private and family sphere, and other co-nationals (language as resource for community solidarity), and the most familiar and spontaneous situations, such as to express anger or swearing (emotionally charged situations), as reported in one interview. This is also confirmed by the indigenous citizens in their claims concerning the integration of immigrants: they are expected to adapt themselves to the dominant life-style and to adopt to the local variety when communicating with locals. Some locals mentioned even as a problem the fact that other minority languages can be sometimes heard in the street and think that immigrants: *»…just stubbornly stick to their ways, they do not learn our dialects and should adapt to our ways...«,* as clearly indicated by a middle-aged man from Pula. They consider that immigrants should practice their customs and use their mo-

ther tongues at home, but that they are not acceptable in the public sphere, as it is vividly pointed out by one of our Puležan respondents:

»Well, no, I don't ask that they [newcomers] reject their own, no… I do not claim that. But, when one of them constantly flourishes in our faces, of all of us, what is only his…, OK, all right, you are what you are, you are black, not white, but for God's sake stop forcing it down my throat every day… This person does not have to become Istrian, to declare himself like that and to renounce everything he cares about…Indeed, if he knows who he is, where he comes from and cherishes his own values, it is to his credit. But, to keep rubbing it in me every day again, again, again, again….it's terrible. And there are people like that in Pula, there are..« (M, 31, Istrian)

»For foreigners like Italians, Germans, or similar, it's O.K. Well, maybe because they bring profit...But for people who come from beyond the Učka mountain, they are closed… They tell them openly, that they will not prosper here.« (F, 56, Croatian from Slavonia, Otok-Vinkovci)

This critical view of the proclaimed but selective multiculturalism particularly comes into expression when our respondents talk about everyday social practices and boundaries between private and public spaces:

»No, they are open, yes open, when you come here, but (...) There is a difference in what I was used to do in the town where I lived before (and here), when you meet someone here, you go out with him, for example, once a week, after some time you invite him to your place. This is normal for us, you invite him to come to your place, your appartment. But here...somehow,... they are OK, but there is no such intimacy, to invite you to their home for lunch, for dinner, or that they come to your place...« (F, 35, Bosnia)

Such accounts demonstrate how symbolic boundaries can retain a constraining character, when they are shared and established, and turn into social boundaries. They influence the pattern of social interaction in important ways and work in categorization of social and collective identifications, underlying the difference between »we« and »they«, between the indigenous and newcomers. Here a sense of belonging and power relations are associated with the »private« – the power to exclude of indigenous Puležani as compared to newcomers.

The narratives of all migrant respondents, when talking about their settlement in Pula suggest that they did not encounter many difficulties in adjusting to the local life-style. However they all mentioned that the lack of language competence made their adaptation difficult at first. Our respondents who are members of Albanian, Bosnian, Macedonian and Hungarian minorities learnt Serbo-Croatian at school in their countries of origin during Yugoslavia. This facilitated their linguistic integration into the host community, but at the same time brought them some problems. One of them is related to perceived differences between Serbo-Croatian and the Croatian standard. Many of them spoke with a strong Serbian accent, which was negatively perceived by the locals:

»Even if I have always had some difficulties because they say straight away you are a Serbian, I am not a Serbian. And sometimes I was offended because I was compared with the Serbians.« [Have you experienced the feeling of discrimination?]. *That's what I felt, even at work sometimes. I did not get a job.«* (M, 50, Hungarian, Vršac)

On the other hand, although they were able to gain competence in Croatian standard rather quickly, the local Istrian varieties, either Chakavian or Istro-Venetian were not easily acquired. The Chakavian variety, though considered officially a Croatian dialect differs greatly from the Croatian standard and includes many romance elements which makes difficult its intelligibility. As these varieties are predominantly used by locals in everyday social public space and function as a symbolic capital in terms of the authentic identity, the lack of competence in them can be an obstacle for newcomers' social integration, as testified below:

»My mother went to the high school in Sombor in Vojvodina and there they learned Serbian, what was Serbo-Croatian then. She came here from there, but it was also difficult for her because what she had learned there really differs from what is spoken here, the dialect is totally different. She always tells stories how when she started working she was sent to bring »šugamane«[VII] *but she didn't have a clue what they asked her to do, she didn't understand.«* (F, 30, Hungarian, Pula)

Sometimes, the first generation of post-war newcomers belonging to other ethnicities were confronted with the view that some social or economic activities require local cultural capital that they lacked and were reserved only for the locals:.

»I don't know, I have not encountered any obstacles no matter what. However, my dad did. He experienced some unpleasant comments, that he is just a »furešt«[VIII]*, a stranger, that wants to go fishing but he doesn't know what the sea is. And like, he would open a store or something.«* (F, 30, Hungarian, Pula)

Our interviewees told us that they do not speak their minority mother tongues at the work place[IX] and that in public communication they exclusively use a variety of majority language, Croatian. They themselves described it as a mixture of Serbian, Istrian[X] and Croatian:

»I speak always like that because all my friends and relatives and everybody speak in the same way. I do not associate with real Istrians like those who speak Chakavian all the time. However my husband, because of his

work he meets with Istrians and I see that he speaks the Istrian dialect even over the phone, if it is about work.« (F, 40, Macedonian, Kumanovo)

The above narrative discloses at the same time, a gendered sense of belonging, outside intimate and semi/private spaces such as home and close circles of friends. A sense of belonging and power relations are associated with the »private« – the power to exclude – and the »public« – the power to gain access. Power relations dictate the boundaries of belonging, and they exclude the »other« those that are not considered by the hegemony to be part of it, such as immigrant women who do not work. The latter feel excluded from the boundaries of Istrianity but they do feel included within the boundaries of multicultural life in Pula.

Social and symbolic boundaries can be cultural and follow the cultural rules or *scripts* of difference and differentiation, that are known by the parties who are involved in the social interaction. This *shared local knowledge* is unequally distributed, and contextual, because it develops in interaction among people with the objects and situations of a social setting that are specific to a local context. It is powerful because it develops out of familiarity, real, everyday experience and acquaintance, and strongly affects a sense of belonging or strangeness[14].

When they define social boundaries the indigenous Puležani rely on such cultural scripts. They consider the unwillingness of newcomers to assimilate and to learn these scripts, particularly those related to language practices, as an irrational choice or a lack of common sense as explained by some of our respondents:

»I have friends among them [newcomers]*… they are normal, they hang around, but they do not want to learn that Italian, I don't know why. They feel a sort of repulsion. I don't understand why. They simply refuse to learn it…. As if they have a sort of mechanism in there heads* [laughs] *that prevents them.«* (F, 21, Istrian Croatian, Pula)

When talking about the way immigrants are perceived, a male interviewee explains that people from Pula and Istria *don't want to have anything to do with them unless they have to* (…) *For example,* [when] *I go to the market, I prefer to buy Istrian honey, not for example honey from Daruvar*[XI]*. Because of its quality.* He then explains the difference between »us« and »them« saying how people from Pula are somehow more naïve, while *these others are either skilful trades people or like to make up stuff. »Making-up stuff«* obviously translates to »lying«

VII   šugaman means towel in the local variety, as compared to »ručnik« (Standard Croatian) or »peškir« (Serbian) Serbian)

VIII a foreigner

IX   It is important to stress that for Albanians the situation is different, because a lot of them work in family bussineses. Since they speak Albanian with the members of their families therefore they speak Albanian at work.

X   It should be mentioned that the Istrian language does not exist, so they refer to local forms of the urban Chakavian dialect (Pulezanski).

because he continues explaining that he does not believe that »lying is taught«, but he does consider it *a matter of home upbringing.* He also does not go to pubs and restaurants where waiters do not know what *biska*[XII] is (which means they do not belong to the in-group, they are not Istrians), since it seems to him that newcomers *exploit this openness and tolerance [of Istrians], and don't accept it as a value«* (M, 45). In this narrative, the mistrust of newcomers is clearly related to their lack of the locally shared knowledge, which defines the codes of appropriate social practice or as in this case, even »civilized« behaviour.

Similarly, three young female students admit they do not like to associate with immigrants from other parts of Croatia and other countries of former Yugoslavia, and they prefer the company of locals to those of immigrants. *»We will now seem as if we are discriminating against them. (…) There is always a kind of mentality inside us, maybe in our families and then they transfer it to us. And when I hear a Slavonian, I will rather* [be in company] *with Istrians than Slavonians. I don't know why, they aren't bad either, I simply don't know why, I can't explain.*' *Their words may not sound so harsh or cruel, but they basically voice the same exclusionary boundary.«*

From such examples, it is obvious that the proclaimed multiculturalism is perceived by the locals only in the context of *convivenza* of Italians and Croats that share not only the environment but also the specific local knowledge and »practical sense«[1]. Belonging and attachment are built on the base of accumulated knowledge, memory and intimate corporal experiences of everyday use and social practices[15].

Conclusions

The historical trajectories that affected migratory processes and together with the socioeconomic effects shaped current urban identifications. Here, the notion of history brings us back to the concept of habitus. Bourdieu[10] sees the habitus as a generative principle of distinct and distinctive practices. It is not something natural or inborn, but the product of history i.e. of social experience and education, and although the dispositions are long-lasting and they tend to reproduce themselves, it may be changed by history, new experiences or education, and accommodates for an ongoing and recursive process of cultural construction and reconstruction.

Similar history produces similar habituses in individuals, who may act similarly and, in turn, reproduce the culture of their shared social fields through practices, or, under historically changed circumstances, they may be guided by improvisations originating from their shared experiences, to act in a way to fit effectively into new and changed social conditions[10].

As described previously, the historical period of fascism with forced Italianization traumatized Croatian and other Slavic inhabitants of Pula, but at the same time it marginalized the authentic identity and specific practices of Istrian Italians who have always perceived themselves as distinct from the »real« Italians in Italy. The period of socialist Yugoslavia provoked the massive traumatic exodus of Italian citizens and the »degradation« of their previously dominant habitus into a minority, and though it significantly improved the social position of Croatians under the ideology of »brotherhood and unity«, the local specific needs and cultural, linguistic practices were again neglected. The most recent changes in the 1990's, brought both nationalist tendencies from the centre, and as a reaction, local political parties which were regionally oriented. They are still in power in Istria and emphasize the cultural specificity of their region in relation to the other parts of Croatia as well as multicultural nature of Istria, based on co-existence of both Croatians and Italians.

In the context of both Pula and Istria, because of their own complex and ethnically mixed origins, the indigenous inhabitants were reluctant to identify themselves in the context of any national group. It seems that the personal accumulated space-time experiences and inheritances have modified Puležan habituses primarily in terms of mutual respect of the two main ethnic groups, of the »civilized« urban Istro-Venetian Italians, and the »uncivilized« rural Istro-Chakavian Croatians, and legitimized their multiple historical »truths« as part of the urban life and identity. They used the knowledge coming from their past experiences to develop social rules and values not just of co-existence of parallel cultures, but of intercultural and interlingual practices that now dominantly shape the urban identity. This process of forgetting results in carefully constructed narratives and memories that ensure similarity and closeness of shared practices and imagined future in the sense of knowledge constitutive of identity[16]. However, due to the inherited parameters of modification, inscribed in the habitus by the continuous need to adapt to the external »others« throughout history, this adjustment positions this identity and intercultural practices as distinctive and exclusionary from all other practices.

The unequal participation in decision making of minorities coexisting in Pula is quite evident with respect to the status of the Italian national minority. The specific historical situation ensured better position of the Italian minority compared to all other ethnic minorities in Pula (a kind of »privileged position« since it is considered autochthonous minority) and consequently facilitated

---

XI   Daruvar is a town in central Croatia.

XII   *Biska* is an Istrian brandy made of mistletoe. It is interesting to note that another interviewee claims that *biska* is a relatively newly-invented tradition and that it did not exist five or ten years ago, whereas there are a lot of sources confirming its traditional status. (http://www.vrh.hr/biska.html).

their integration (both social and economic) as well, which was confirmed by all our respondents regardless of their ethnic affiliation. The local urban *Puležan* identity is thus mobilized in the interest of maintaining a hegemonic self-collective, a kind of homogenized heterogeneity to which the »other« is expected to assimilate. The symbolic prestige of this identity seems to be also internalized by the newcomers, so that many pluralistic voices actually existing in the city are silenced or marginalized in its public life. When newcomers are prepared to learn and then mimic local ways, distinctions are blurred and they gradually become less noticeably »other«.

The dynamic perspective of exploring the urban experiences of the diversity of individuals and groups indicates various forms of everyday attachments and belongings. At the same time this analysis reveals the urban space as a site of social exchanges among diverse groups in society, and as a field of struggle and contestation, where different identities compete for the continuous process of appropriation of the urban public space. Thus, two identities, immigrant identity and indigenous identity, construct two forms of belonging: a dialectic sense of belonging of an immigrant who is also a member of cultural minority, and in contrast a strong sense of belonging of an indigenous person who expresses a strong bonding to his home and city. The citizenship definitions related to the concepts of national minorities (i.e. dichotomy between majority and minority) determine which identities are included within the hegemonic community and which are excluded. Even formally expressed definitions of »full citizenship« often produce negative effects on immigrants and people of ethnic and other minorities, as revealed by analyzed narratives.

The present study also shows the benefits of taking the city as a unit of analysis rather than focusing exclusively on specific ethnic group experience, as the dynamics of boundary making varies considerably within the overall structure of urban space. Individuals pursue a variety of different strategies of ethnic boundary making, e.g. from strong to non-existent ethnic ties and identities.

This variety of meanings reveals the fact that identities are not homogeneous, one-dimensional or static, but rather are unfinished and constantly in flux. Instead of interpreting identities as discrete entities with clear boundaries, we see that in reality they often function analogically. In terms of othering the zone of cultural intimacy of constitutive knowledge clearly shows some essentialist assumptions that contradict the formal official national and regional policies including the view of co-existence, tolerance and openness 'indicating the formal tension between the official self-representation and what goes on in the privacy of collective introspection. This also leads people into their never-ending negotiations on cultural identification and various forms of self-ascription, and confirms fundamentally, that the politicized debate on culture and identity is negotiation for economic resources and power in the modern society.

Acknowledgements

R E F E R E N C E S

1. BOURDIEU P, The logic of practice. (Stanford University Press, California, 1990). — 2. GIDDENS A, Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age. (Polity Press, Cambridge, 1991). — 3. ERIKSON EH, Childhood and Society (Norton, New York, 1963). — 4. HALL S, DU GAY P, Questions of Cultural Identity (Sage, London, 1996). — 5. GLICK SCHILLER N, ÇAGLAR A, GULDBRANDSEN CT, American Ethnologist, 33 (2006) 612. — 6. FAIRCLOUGH N, Discourse and Social Change (Polity Press, 1993). — 7. LEFEBVRE H, Critique of Everyday Life (Verso, London, 1991a). — 8. LEFEBVRE H, The Production of Space (Blackwell, Oxford, 1991b). — 9. BARTH F, Ethnic groups and boundaries: The social organization of culture difference, (Little, Brown, Boston, 1969). — 10. BOURDIEU P, Distinction; a social critique of the judgement of taste, (Routledge&Kegan Paul, London, 1986). — 11. BOURDIEU P, Habitus. In: HILLIER J, ROOKSBY E (Eds) Habitus: A sense of place. (Aldershot, Ashgate, 2005). — 12. LOFLAND LH, The public realm, exploring the city's quintessential social territory. (Aldine De Gruyter, New York, 1998). — 13. FRIEDMANN J, Place-making as project? Habitus and migration in transnational cities. In: HILLIER J, ROOKSBY E (Eds) Habitus: A sense of place. (Aldershot, Ashgate, 2005). — 14. GEERTZ C, Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology. (Basic Books, New York, 1983). — 15. DE CERTEAU M, The practice of everyday life, (University of California Press, Los Angeles, 1984). — 16. STRATHERN M, Property, Substance, and Effect. (Athlone, London, 1999).

A. Sujoldžić

Institute for Anthropological Research, Gajeva 32, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia
e-mail: anita@inantro.hr

VIŠESTRUKI IDENTIFIKACIJSKI PROCESI U MULTIKULTURNOM GRADU

S A Ž E T A K

U radu se razmatra međuovisnost jezika i urbanog identiteta u okviru teorije prakse i pojma prava na grad.Analiza je usmjerena na oblikovanje lokalnih identiteta u kontekstu multikulturnog grada Pule, regionalnog centra u Istri, u kojem živi značajan broj doseljenika iz drugih krajeva Hrvatske i pripadnika etničkih manjina. Središnja pitanja odnose se na stupanj u kojem prostorna i društvena struktura grada te njegov socioekonomski i povijesni kontekst određuju diskurs multikulturnih interakcija i identifikacijske procese, kao i ulogu komunikacije i jezika u tim procesima. Posebna pažnja se pridaje odnosima moći koji utječu na dinamiku identifikacijskih procesa i artikulaciju potencijalne hijerarhizacije razlika.