

World Heritage Beyond Anthropocentrism: Insights from Bač Cultural Landscape

ABSTRACT

Amid growing ecological crises, global warming, health pandemics, violent migrations and neo-colonial practices, it is necessary to rethink the contours and ideological foundations of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. This paper deals with the reflection of World Heritage from the point of view of post-anthropocentrism – a philosophical, political and activist movement that questions the centrality of man in the world order and advocates the need to consider more-than-human participants in the web of life. Our thesis is that World Heritage can and should be redefined so as to include ideas and practices in which heritage and the living and non-living world is seen not as a resource, but as an active participant in creating a healthier, fairer and more inclusive life on earth. In the first part of the paper we rely on growing literature on new materialism and post-anthropocentrism to set the theoretical framework for reimagining World Heritage. Then, we move to analyse World Heritage Convention from the perspective of post-anthropocentric critique. Finally, we reflect on the case of the Bač Cultural Landscape as the case that offers insights into opportunities and limitations of post-anthropocentric approach to heritage.

KEYWORDS

Cultural landscape, more-than-human world,
relational ontologies, ecological thought, Symbiocene

INTRODUCTION

We live in a very particular moment on the planet Earth. A moment in which we are not only witnessing, but continuously contributing to ecological collapse, climate change, global warming and biodiversity loss. This situation is not reflected only in narrow professional and scientific circles any longer. It is a reality that one can face on an everyday basis, in the media, major political meetings, international reports, and among other, heritage field.

This period has been named the Anthropocene,¹ suggesting that we live in a new geological age in which humans greatly influence climatic, biophysical, and evolutionary processes occurring at a planetary scale. In such narrative, humans are producing piles of waste, burning fossil fuels which lead to climate collapse, and extracting life from the planet, causing immense biodiversity losses. We take the position of others, which claim that this is not the condition that was caused by humanity as a whole, but by the current capitalist world-relations which organise not only human behaviour, but relationships within the web of life. This group names the current period the Capitalocene,² putting capitalist relations on the centre stage. Nevertheless, capitalist world-relations are enabled by humanist, anthropocentric thinking, on the one hand, and colonial relations on the other.

At the moment, in the field of heritage, the dominant ways to deal with climate change and ecological crisis are risk assessments, disaster management plans and green transformation of the sector, with the goal of preserving heritage and institutional structures amidst raging changing climate. This approach to the crisis, however, tries to treat the effects or symptoms rather than the causes of the problem. In its core, current ecological crisis is a crisis of man's relationship with other beings with whom we share the planet. As such, it has its deep foundations in anthropocentric understanding of the world, in culture and history – in the stories, relationships and practices with which parts of humanity have grown up with for centuries.

It is precisely in such crisis that the heritage sector is called upon to contribute to rethinking fundamental concepts and imagining alternatives to the current ways of doing. In it, the heritage sector and profession must extend beyond the preservation of recognized heritage in a world where the diversity and density of life is lost every day, in order to contribute to truly holistic care and safeguarding of the web of life, including human traces in it. In this article, we try to imagine World Heritage in Symbiocene,³ a geological era which might take place, in which symbiotic relationships of mutual aid, care and interdependence of the web of life take central place. For such era to happen, we need ontological, epistemological and methodological shift away

1 W. Steffen et al., Anthropocene: Conceptual and Historical Perspectives, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc.* 2011, 369.

2 J. W. Moore, *The Capitalocene, Part I: On the Nature and Origins of Our Ecological Crisis*, 2017, *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 44 (3) 594–630.

3 G. Albrecht, G. V. Horn, *Exiting the Anthropocene and Entering the Symbiocene*, 2016 Available online: <https://humansandnature.org/exiting-the-anthropocene-and-entering-the-symbiocene/>.



Fig. 1

Bač Cultural Landscape – a territory shaped by many beings

(© N. Marković)

from anthropocentrism, a shift that enables radical re-imaginings of human roles and relations within the web of life, as well as of regenerative and caring practices.

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Explorations of what heritage might be and mean beyond anthropocentrism have been emerging with our growing interests in ecological thought, pre-modern and relational ontologies and new materialism. However, simultaneously, they have been shaped through our experience of working on the Nomination Dossier and Management Plan of Bač Cultural Landscape, a work which illuminated the boundaries and frameworks of our understanding, evaluation and perception of this territory in the context of World Heritage. This engagement has shed light on how deeply professional heritage discourses, policies, practices and arrangement are rooted within anthropocentrism. It also demonstrated how stakeholders' imaginations are rooted in ontologies of separation and anthropocentrism. And finally, it has hinted to the limits, assumptions and frameworks of World Heritage as a mechanism of cultural policies and a mechanism of expert thinking and evaluation of heritage.

Therefore, this paper is organised in three sections. The first section deals with the critique of anthropocentrism and draws from the growing literature on new materialism, posthumanism and post-anthropocentrism to set the theoretical framework for rethinking World Heritage. The second section uses desk research method and discourse analysis to look at the World Heritage Convention (WHC) using post-anthropocentric critique. The third section focuses on the case of the Bač Cultural Landscape (BCL) nomination process for the WHL. In this section, we illustrate five aspects of post-anthropocentric approach to heritage used in defining values and management needs for the Bač Cultural Landscape. In addition to analysis of the key documents such as the Nomination Dossier and the Management Plan for Bač cultural landscape, we use participant observation method, due to our positions of involvement in the process of the nomination. One of us has been engaged in the nomination process from 2017–2023, is one of the authors of the Nomination Dossier and the co-author and coordinator of the Management Plan. Another author is the co-author of the Management Plan, engaged in the nomination process as of 2019. We reflect on the changing understandings of this landscape, drawing from the notes from our diaries and correspondences with colleagues. In conclusion, we summarise how Bač Cultural Landscape nomination process has implications on rethinking World Heritage beyond anthropocentrism.

POST-ANTHROPOCENTRISM – A CRITIQUE OF HUMAN EXCEPTIONALISM

Anthropocentrism is a philosophical view of the world that considers humans to be the centre and measure of the world, reality and the Universe. In such understanding, the human species is perceived as the highest form of life, and as the ultimate purpose of the world's development. Anthropocentrism has its foundations in ancient Greek philosophical traditions, then in Judeo-Christian religions, as well as humanist thinkers and



Fig. 2

View on the Bač Fortress and the Old Town

(© N. Marković)

Cartesian dualism. As a consequence of the European colonization of the rest of the world, this type of understanding of the world and (hu)man became dominant globally.

This position assumes that humans are superior to and independent in relation to all other forms of life, and therefore have the right to exploit and manage others as objects and resources.⁴ In anthropocentric worldview, other forms of life are important as long as they contribute to humans. In its best, but still patronising form, anthropocentrism implies human stewardship of the web of life. In its worst, it allows for ravaging extractivism and destruction of the web of life, to serve the needs of humans. It is important to underline though that 'human' in anthropocentric worldview does not really account for all the humanity, and that this exact worldview implies that some humans are more human than others.⁵ Women, people of colour, children, people with disabilities, indigenous peoples, uneducated and poor, have all been on the lower part of the 'human' ladder, with 'proper' human being reserved for white, educated, cultured, well-off men. This is why post-humanism and post-anthropocentrism have emerged as interrelated streams of thought which challenge both the central role of humans, but always also the exceptionalism of the humanist image of a proper 'Man'.

The alternatives to anthropocentric and humanist worldview can be found in numerous pre-modern cultures, including indigenous knowledge systems,⁶ and traditional folk knowledge,⁷ in what de Sousa Santos terms epistemologies of the South,⁸ Many of those forms of knowledge nurture a deeply non-anthropocentric worldviews, in which Earth, soil, plants, animals, rivers and mountains are understood as sentient and knowing beings, as brothers and sisters or as teachers. The issue is of course, how these knowledges are safeguarded, valued and transmitted so they can be learned from in the future. The question is as well, as Sterling argues, how to 'engage with knowledges of diverse marginalised peoples in a humble, ethical and sustainable manner'.⁹ This is where the concept of pluriverse as opposed to universalist modern cosmology comes into play. Pluriverse recognises that western universalist hegemony works to delegitimise all other ways of being and knowing in this world. Instead of the Western "One-World-World", pluriverse thinkers and activists support the struggle for the "world in which many worlds fit".¹⁰

4 H. Kopnina *et al.* Anthropocentrism: More than Just a Misunderstood Problem., *J Agric Environ Ethics* 31 (2018) 109–127.

5 S. Wynter, Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, After Man, Its Overrepresentation – An Argument, *The New Centennial Review* 3(3) (2003) 257–337.

6 V. Watts, Indigenous Place-Thought and Agency Amongst Humans and Non-humans (First Woman and Sky Woman Go on a European World Tour!), 2013, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society 2 (1) 20–34; R. W. Kimmerer, Braiding Sweetgrass: Indigenous Wisdom, Scientific Knowledge and the Teachings of Plants, Minneapolis 2015.

7 D. P. Agrawal, S. Jamal, M. Shah, Traditional Knowledge Systems and Archaeology: With Special Reference to Uttarakhand New Delhi 2007.

8 B. Sousa Santos, Epistemologies of the South Justice Against Epistemicide, London and New York 2014.

9 C. Sterling, Critical heritage and the posthumanities: problems and prospects, 2020, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 26(11), p.1031. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2020.1715464>.

10 A. Escobar, Designs for the pluriverse: Radical interdependence, autonomy, and the making of worlds, Durham 2018.



Fig. 3

Night sky and stars seen from the Bač Cultural Landscape

(© N. Marković)

Besides these older systems of knowing, there is also a rich and inspiring stream of contemporary philosophical writings, ranging from new materialism,¹¹ posthumanism,¹² and object-oriented ontology.¹³ They all have a common agenda of destabilizing anthropocentrism and overthrowing the hegemony of human as a measure of realities, things, sensibilities, meaning, knowledge, opinions, politics and society. Notwithstanding their important differences, they all try to point out to possible other understandings and relationships in the world. Instead of the humanist, modernist, (neo)liberal centrality of (hu)man as subject the recognition of more-than-human worlds presupposes agency and the communicability of non-humans. It also implies the impossibility of thinking about the world and politics without taking into account the interdependence, needs, rights and lives of non-humans, the whole web of life.

Rosi Braidotti, one of the central thinkers of posthumanism, considers the ground for critical posthumanism by claiming that in posthuman thinking one has to eliminate human exceptionalism, universalist logic and mind-body separation. She embraces a neo-Spinozist ontology in claiming that it is the intelligent and self-organising matter which creates life and life conditions.¹⁴ Unlike separational ontology of Western modernism and Enlightenment, this implies ontology of radical immanence as well as relational ontology, in which everything is not only related to each other, but dwells within one another. It means that not only separation between Nature and Culture is impossible to maintain, but also separation between human and more-than-human world. Consequently, Braidotti argues for 'naturecultural' as inseparable continuum, as well as for 'humanimal' continuum within the web of life.¹⁵ Timothy Morton, similarly, calls for ecological thought¹⁶ that requires practicing and thinking 'Ecology without Nature'¹⁷, positing that the very idea of Nature as separate from human experience is what is allowing for its destruction.

Going back to the heritage field, what would it mean to think of heritage as interspecies concept, without reproducing distinctions between Nature and Culture, or Man and Biosphere, Humans and Environment? This, of course, has immense implications for the current arrangements within contemporary heritage field, as well as its core modern concepts and anthropocentric foundations. As Sterling argues 'ontological and epistemological shift of posthumanism disrupts anthropocentric designs

11 For overview see edited volumes: D. Coole, and S. Frost (eds), *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*, Durham 2010; and T. Bennett and P. Joyce, *Material Powers: Cultural Studies, History and the Material Turn*, New York 2010.

12 See: D. Haraway, *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature*, New York 1991; I. Hassan, *Prometheus as performer: Towards a posthumanist culture?* *Georgia Review* 31 (1977) 830–850; D. Haraway, *When Species Meet*, Minneapolis 2008; and R. Braidotti, *The posthuman*, Cambridge 2013.

13 B. Latour, *We Have Never Been Modern*, Cambridge 1991; T. Morton, *Hyperobjects: Philosophy and Ecology after the End of the World*, Minneapolis & London 2013.

14 R. Braidotti, *A Theoretical Framework for the Critical Posthumanities*, *Theory, Culture & Society* 36/6 (2019) 31–61.

15 *Ibid.*

16 T. Morton, *The ecological thought*. Cambridge 2010.

17 T. Morton, *Ecology without Nature: Rethinking Environmental Aesthetics*, Cambridge 2007.

on care, inheritance, vulnerability and stewardship: all foundational concepts for the heritage field that seem to require a fundamental rethink in the current era of climate breakdown¹⁸. Within heritage studies, there are therefore increasing number of voices who are attempting to rethink heritage ontologies beyond nature-culture divide,¹⁹ conceive posthuman approach to heritage²⁰ or rethink the very practice of human techno-managerial approach to saving heritage.²¹

UNCOVERING ANTHROPOCENTRIC ARRANGEMENTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE

Fifty years ago, international community aimed to provide a framework for safeguarding heritage amidst destruction, caused both by the fast modernist development, as well as other economic and social changes. It did so within a mindset of that era, bound in the faith of human exceptionalism, decolonisation efforts of many nations and the belief in necessity of growth and development. As such, the World Heritage Convention reflects the dominant post-WWII worldview, as well as dominant power relations of such world. The Convention and its List are by far the most prominent and well-known mechanism of international cultural policy, with nation states across the world continuously competing to get new sites on the List.

The WHC and its List has become one of the most influential cultural policy mechanisms, a mechanism that has been praised by many, but also critiqued by many. These critiques include Convention's neo-colonial, Europocentric understanding of heritage; its authorising, institutionalist, technocratic and bureaucratic nature; as well as commodifying influence of heritage sites, which promotes competition, branding and economic benefit of listing. However, very little has been said about the anthropocentric foundations of the WHC, and how these foundations reproduce the myths of human exceptionalism, separation between Nature and Culture, as well as universalist logic, which is exactly what we will focus on.

Firstly, the Convention enforces a clear separation between Nature and Culture, continuously reinstating cultural heritage and natural heritage as distinct categories. Not only does the Convention recognise these two concepts as separate, but provides clear definitions for both. Thus, Article 1 states what is considered under cultural heritage, divided into monuments, groups of buildings and sites (WHC, p. 2). Article 2 states what natural heritage is, ie. physical and biological formations, geological and physiographical formations and precisely delineated areas which constitute the habitat of threatened species of animals and plants, as well as natural sites and precisely delineated natural areas (WHC, p. 2–3). Furthermore, in Article 8.3, the Convention envisages support of professional bodies, namely ICOMOS and IUCN (WHC, p. 5),

18 C. Sterling, *op. cit.* 1031.

19 R. Harrison, *Beyond 'Natural' and 'Cultural' Heritage: Toward an Ontological Politics of Heritage in the Age of the Anthropocene*, *Heritage & Society* 8 (2015).

20 C. Sterling, *op. cit.*

21 C. DeSilvey, *Curated Decay: Heritage Beyond Saving*, Minneapolis and London 2017.

that again clearly divide domains of knowledge and expertise between cultural and natural heritage.

Secondly, the Convention reproduces human exceptionalism, in both treating heritage as “the world heritage of mankind”²² as well as seeing mankind as the only legitimate carer of world heritage. It clearly envisages cultural and natural heritage as *properties* to be safeguarded, researched, documented and managed by humans, whether those within State Parties, or institutions and heritage professionals. Even when natural heritage is discussed, there is no agency given to more-than-human world, which is present in many contemporary concepts such as self-regeneration, rewilding, or resiliency of the web of life. Therefore, human interventionism is taken as a key force of heritage protection.

Thirdly, the Convention insists on ‘modern scientific methods’ as legitimate modes of knowing and practicing heritage, as well as on ‘the outstanding universal value’ in line with what can be proved scientifically.²³ The importance of potential world heritage is defined by scientific point of view or aesthetics and beauty. This delegitimises other non-modern knowledge systems and pluriversal modes of inheriting, many of which are rooted in non-anthropocentric ontologies. Thus, it sets the playground of modern scientific inquiry and universalist logic which excludes numerous non-European naturecultures and heritages. This colonial critique has been voiced by numerous authors and activists already.²⁴

The foundational text of Convention has been supplemented and changed in the last fifty years, both through the Operational Guidelines, the sites that get on the WHL, and complementary conventions. Thus, in 1992, the Convention became the first legal instrument to recognise cultural landscapes, as areas in which humans and more-than-human world interacts to create heritage on a particular territory. Moreover, there are examples of WHS, such as Budj Bim Landscape in Australia or Osun Mangrove in Nigeria, in which indigenous non-anthropocentric knowledges and beliefs form the basis for the outstanding universal value (OUV) and management systems which are in place. Finally, in 2022 Operational Guidelines, local communities and indigenous people have been recognised as stakeholders which need to be consulted and involved in nomination processes.²⁵ However, these are all small steps, which do not necessarily set the ground for treating world heritage as a matter of nature-culture continuum and interspecies relations. Cultural landscape still sets a very clear idea of human adaptations to and of the landscape, often treated as inanimate territory, while incentives for recognition of stakeholders involve only

22 WHC, p. 1.

23 WHC, p. 1.

24 See for example: I. Fogarty, (2022). Coloniality, Natural World Heritage and Indigenous Peoples: A Critical Analysis of World Heritage Cultural Governance. In: M. T. Albert, R. Bernecker, C. Cave, A. C. Prodan, M. Ripp (eds.) 50 Years World Heritage Convention: Shared Responsibility – Conflict & Reconciliation, Heritage Studies, Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-05660-4_4.

25 Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, WHC.21/01 (2021), paras. 12, 14bis, 64, 117, 119, 123.

human subjects. Moreover, the indigenous sites and knowledge on WHL are still subject to modern management and scientific arrangements and are immensely marginal in the whole WHL.

BAČ CULTURAL LANDSCAPE – RETHINKING INTERACTIONS WITHIN THE WEB OF LIFE

With all this in mind, we turn to the process of nominating Bač Cultural Landscape on WHL, a process that lasted from 2017–2023, pointing out to sparks of post-anthropocentric thinking within this process. Professional work and dedication to valuing the territory that is today Bač Cultural Landscape (BCL) had its history in the protection of three monuments of exceptional significance – Bač Fortress, Franciscan Monastery and Bođani Monastery – as well as the protection of natural sites and protected areas within that territory.²⁶ But as soon as the national legislation of urban planning envisaged the concept of cultural landscape, Bač Cultural Landscape became the first one in Serbia to be protected through the mechanism of the Spatial Plan for the Area of Specific Purpose in 2015.²⁷ This demonstrated an intersectoral and inter-institutional effort to not only discursively promote Bač Cultural Landscape, but to use every possible legal mechanism that could help valorise, frame and safeguard this area as cultural landscape.

However, both in that period and in the first years of the nomination process, the group of professionals working on the nomination, two of us included, struggled to go beyond the idea that territory with all its elements is a stage for human interactions and practices. We also struggled to go beyond the approach of seeing the territory as a place where protected cultural and natural sites, as well as intangible practices are located. Our initial drafts for the nomination dossier, conversations with international colleagues, as well as ideas for the management planning reflect these struggles. It was through the nomination process and involvement of ever-increasing number of professionals from different disciplines (geology, urban planning, hydrology, natural protection, history, architecture, heritage studies, anthropology, etc), as well as interactions with locals, that we have started reading the landscape as an intricate, continuous, and contingent engagement between diverse forces within the web of life (fig. 1).

The introduction to the Management Plan illustrates this understanding of territory and heritage as entangled, interspecies, cross-generational and relational:

“The Bač Cultural Landscape has been and remains home to countless generations of humans, animals and plants. They came and went away, and it allowed them to settle, reproduce, discover it and change it according to their needs and possibilities, just as it has changed and shaped them. Every generation lived from

26 For the detailed overview of conservation, research and management efforts in Bač Cultural Landscape see: S. Vujović, *Kako očuvati i koristiti kulturno nasleđe. Doprinos Vekova Bača*, Novi Sad 2017.

27 Plan područja posebne namene kulturnog predela Bač, Novi Sad 2015, Službeni glasnik APV 14/2015.

the landscape, lush waters and fertile lands. Each generation has woven itself into the landscape and left traces behind. Each succeeding generation continued to remember, live, create and hope, living on the shoulders, branches, foundations, knowledge and fossils of previous generations. Mutual learning, respect and togetherness across generations and many forms of life in this area has enabled for many centuries, as it allows today, a good life. Without the heritage of previous generations and the joy of life of the present, there is no landscape that will enable the same, good life for the next ones. Preservation of that trace of good life which is inseparable from the landscape and which is not reserved, nor is it consumed by any generation, species or ideas, is a guide for thinking about future practices of preserving and managing the Bač Cultural Landscape²⁸.

Such definition avoids telling the story of the landscape from human-centered perspective, and instead considers the principles of inheritance that actively recognises and involves more-than-human factors. The territory is understood as a participant, while rivers Danube and Mostonga are not only geographical categories, but active participants and beings defining greatly the histories and futures of the landscape and other species that inhabit it. This is further reflected in several aspects of approaching BCL and its management, and we will underline five of these aspects.

First, such thinking implies the post-anthropocentric understanding of the site and embraces an *expanded understanding of an integrative approach to heritage*, in which landscape is a living organism, which is the product of changes, dynamic patterns and new relationships between past ecosystems, histories and cultures. Hence, the Bač Cultural Landscape and its specific values can only be nurtured in the long term through embracing multiple integrations, interrelations and interspecies approach to heritage.

This leads us to the second aspect of decentring human exceptionalism when understanding and valuing a place, which is rootedness in interdisciplinarity, as well as localized traditional knowledge. In this case, the wider team enabled mutual learning and new insights, appreciation of local knowledge and practices and conception of intersectoral and participative governance. Those trained as geologists or biologists have brought understandings of how more-than-human world inhabits, influences and uses this landscape. What we have failed to do however, is to try and bring non-human perspectives deliberately into our valorisation and management processes, using, for example, some of the participative methods for more-than-human world (fig. 2).²⁹

The third aspect of decentring human exceptionalism is rooted in the core principle which we have selected for protection and management of BCL, which is the principle of 'good life', foreseen within the Management Plan.³⁰ The good life implies

28 V. Kisić, G. Tomka and K. Živanović, *Management Plan for Bač Cultural Landscape*, Novi Sad 2020, 5.

29 M. Bastian, O. Jones, N. Moore and E. Roe, *Participatory Research in More-than-human Worlds*, London 2017.

30 V. Kisić, G. Tomka and K. Živanović, *op. cit.* 49.

an approach to safeguarding that is broader than conservation or restoration. It implies the regeneration of the environment, the revitalization of local communities and the improvement of the quality of life, as well as the connections, relationships and solidarity between all those who make up the landscape, human and more-than-human. It also asserts that there is no such thing as successful heritage preservation if the living processes around it are suffering.

The fourth aspect of decentring is rooting safeguarding and care for the landscape in regenerative practices that are not necessarily human-centered. This included concepts and methods such as re-wilding, self-regenerating capacities of ecosystems, as well as conservation practices based on mimicking sustainable ecosystems, such as permaculture, as is envisaged in Strategic goals 6.2.3. and 6.4.1. of the Management Plan.³¹

The fifth aspect refers to the way in which we have interpreted interculturalism as a consequence of mixing various human and non-human cultures. In such view, the territory with all its inhabitants is a key determinant of people's lives. Anthropological research has shown that more than 20 different ethnic and religious communities in this landscape actually share the same culture, understood in the broadest sense. They practice the same way of life, construction, subsistence and economy, water management, soil cultivation, while differing only in the symbolic folklore elements. Thus, more-than-human life – climate, soil, available plants, present animals – determines much more fundamentally how people will live than the practices and patterns inherited from places of origin of these ethnic groups, whether these are hills of Germany or mountains of Herzegovina. Consequently, the future nurturing of interculturalism envisaged by the Management Plan is based on the interweaving and mutual exposure of cultures, species, generations in this territory.³²

These five aspects are far from sufficient when trying to embrace post-anthropocentric approach to heritage. Both within the Nomination Dossier and the Management Plan one can find numerous dominant modern concepts of heritage, care, subjectivity and management that are centred on humans and that maintain anthropocentric worldview. Nomination Dossier and Management plans are, in its core, a human exercise, in which it is required to follow internationally recognised scientific and professional pathways for heritage protection. The WHC and its mechanisms and tools do not encourage in any aspect the move towards post-anthropocentric or symbiotic approach to heritage. However, despite all these conditions, there are many concepts, sections and mechanisms within the Management Plan for BCL, which try to introduce more-than-human agency and care within the web of life in this territory. Even if these are tiny steps, they can serve as an encouragement and inspiration for future work not only within this landscape, but many other heritage places and processes, including within World Heritage.

31 *Ibid.* 58, 61.

32 *Ibid.* 59–61.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR WORLD HERITAGE BEYOND ANTHROPOCENTRISM

What would it take to have a World Heritage that recognises the value of all beings of the Earth and of all practices of inheritance that take place on this Earth? How would heritage include examples, considerations, ways of understanding the world in past times and societies which fostered a more equal and harmonious coexistence among beings? These questions are too complex and overarching to be addressed in a single article. However, there are some hints that we have offered towards such turn. These hints include attempts to move beyond anthropocentrism in several aspects. Primarily, decentering the human subject and human experience with introducing more-than-human participants into attempts to understand, valorise and care for heritage. Instead of just recognising humans as stakeholders, World Heritage should embrace mechanisms and methods through which more-than-human factors are better understood, recognized, appreciated and supported through heritage practices. As one of the beekeepers in Bač Cultural Landscape told us: “We should learn from the bees. They have been here for millennia”.

Secondly, we indicated how moving beyond the division natural and cultural heritage is possible, and what understanding of heritage could be if we observe it as a mash of different forms and layers of existence, as introduction to Management Plan demonstrates. In such moves, pre-modern and indigenous ontologies and knowledge systems might offer inspiring alternatives to modernist separation of humans from the rest of the web of life. Their contribution to the World Heritage, including through the the International Indigenous Peoples’ Forum on World Heritage which was created in 2017. Thirdly, instead of approaching heritage with clear divisions of scientific disciplines and professions, we need interdisciplinarity and un-disciplining of knowledge to be able to see the complexity of the world and links between professions, generations, knowledge systems, beliefs, species and ecosystems. In pursuit for heritage beyond nature-culture divide, we need to attempt seeing heritage beyond tangible-intangible divide and recognise inseparable interrelations between matter and practice. Only then would it be possible to practice a holistic approach to heritage that is truly all-encompassing and immersed in the ecosystems formed by different forms of life, including humans.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research has been carried out as part of the project EPICA – Encouraging Participation in Architecture and Culture: Activating Public Resources for and with Communities, ID 7744648, supported through the Science Fund of the Republic of Serbia.

REFERENCES

- Agrawal D. P., Jamal S., Shah M., *Traditional Knowledge Systems and Archaeology: With Special Reference to Uttarakhand*, 2007.
- Albrecht G., and Horn G. V., *Exiting the Anthropocene and Entering the Symbiocene*, 2016. Available online: <https://humansandnature.org/exiting-the-anthropocene-and-entering-the-symbiocene/>.
- Bastian M., Jones O., Moore N. and Roe E., *Participatory Research in More-than-human Worlds*, London 2017.
- Bennett T. and Joyce P., *Material Powers: Cultural Studies, History and the Material Turn*. New York 2010.
- Braidotti R. A Theoretical Framework for the Critical Posthumanities, *Theory, Culture & Society* 36 (6) (2019) 31–61.
- Coole D. and Frost S. (eds.), *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*. Durham 2010.
- DeSilvey C., *Curated Decay: Heritage Beyond Saving*. Minneapolis and London 2017.
- Escobar A., *Designs for the pluriverse: Radical interdependence, autonomy, and the making of worlds*, Duke University Press 2018.
- Fogarty I., Coloniality, Natural World Heritage and Indigenous Peoples: A Critical Analysis of World Heritage Cultural Governance. In: Albert, M.T., Bernecker, R., Cave, C., Prodan, A. C., Ripp, M. (eds.) *50 Years World Heritage Convention: Shared Responsibility – Conflict & Reconciliation*. Heritage Studies. Springer, Cham (2022).
- Haraway D., *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature*, New York 1991,
- Haraway D., *When Species Meet*, Minneapolis, 2008; and R. Braidotti, *The Posthuman*. Cambridge 2013,
- Harrison R. Beyond 'Natural' and 'Cultural' Heritage: Toward an Ontological Politics of Heritage in the Age of the Anthropocene, *Heritage & Society* 8 (1) (2015).
- Hassan I., Prometheus as performer: Towards a posthumanist culture? *Georgia Review* 31 (1977) 830–850.
- Kimmerer R. W., *Braiding Sweetgrass: Indigenous Wisdom, Scientific Knowledge and the Teachings of Plants*, Minneapolis 2015.
- Kisić V., Tomka G., and Živanović K., *Management Plan for Bač Cultural Landscape*, Novi Sad 2020.
- Kopnina H. et al. Anthropocentrism: More than Just a Misunderstood Problem., *J Agric Environ Ethics* 31 (2018) 109–127.
- Latour B., *We Have Never Been Modern*. Cambridge 1991; T. Morton, *Hyperobjects: Philosophy and Ecology after the End of the World*, Minneapolis & London 2013.
- Moore J. W., The Capitalocene, Part I: On the Nature and Origins of Our Ecological Crisis, *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 44 (3) (2017) 594–630.
- Morton T., *The ecological thought*. Cambridge 2010.
- Morton T., *Ecology without Nature: Rethinking Environmental Aesthetics*, Cambridge 2007.
- Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, WHC.21/01 (2021).
- Sousa Santos B., *Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide*, London and New York 2014.
- Steffen W. et al., Anthropocene: Conceptual and Historical Perspectives, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc.* 2011 369.
- Sterling C., Critical heritage and the posthumanities: problems and prospects, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 26(11) (2020).
- Vujović S., *Kako očuvati i koristiti kulturno nasleđe. Doprinos Vekova Bača*, Novi Sad 2017.
- Plan područja posebne namene kulturnog predela Bač, Službeni glasnik APV 14/2015.
- Vujović S., Džamić V. and Kisić V., *Bač Cultural Landscape – Nomination Dossier*. Novi Sad 2021.
- Watts V., Indigenous Place-Thought and Agency Amongst Humans and Non-humans (First Woman and Sky Woman Go on a European World Tour!), *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 2 (1) (2013) 20–34.
- Wynter S., Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, After Man, Its Overrepresentation – An Argument, *The New Centennial Review* 3(3) (2003) 257–337.
- World Heritage Convention, UNESCO 1972.

ВИШЊА С. КИСИЋ

ГОРАН Д. ТОМКА

EDUCONS Универзитет, Факултет за спорт и психологију ТИМС;
Шумски Универзитет, Фрушка Гора

СВЕТСКО НАСЛЕЂЕ ИЗВАН АНТРОПОЦЕНТРИЗМА: УВИДИ ИЗ КУЛТУРНОГ ПРЕДЕЛА БАЧА

Усред растућих еколошких криза, глобалног загревања, здравствених пандемија, насилних миграција и неоколонијалних пракси, неопходно је преиспитати контуре и идеолошке основе светске културне и природне баштине. Овај рад се бави критиком Светске баштине са становишта постантропоцентризма – филозофског, политичког и активистичког покрета који преиспитује централну улогу човека у светском поретку и заговара потребу другачијих онтолошких утемељења који препознају агенсност више-од-људи у мрежи живота. У првом делу рада нудимо критику антропоцентризма, ослањајући се на предмодерне и индогене онтологије, као и на растућу литературу у пољу новог материјализма, постхуманизма и онтологије засноване на објектима да бисмо поставили теоријски оквир за редефинисање Светске баштине. Истичемо какве изазове пост-антропоцентрично разумевање света доноси модерним праксама и оквирима баштињења, дубоко утемељеним у антропоцентричном виђењу света – поготово подели на културну и природну баштину и утемељености на човекове технолошке, менаџерске и легалистичке праксе очувања делова стварности као наслеђа. У наставку рада анализирамо Конвенцију о светској баштини из перспективе постантропоцентричне критике, тврдећи да Конвенција репродукује јасну поделу на Културу и Природу, те природу као одвојену од човека. Уз то, Конвенција види светско наслеђе као искључиво власништво и предмет бављења човечанства, искључујући више-од-људског света. Коначно, осврћемо се на случај номинације Културног предела Бача на УНЕСКО Листу светске баштине као случаја који нуди увид у могућности и ограничења постантропоцентричног приступа наслеђу. Издајамо и дискутујемо пет искорака који су нашли место у Плану управљања Културним пределом Бача, а који указују на перспективе пост-антропоцентричног приступа баштини. Закључујемо са тезом да се Светска баштина може и треба редефинисати тако да укључује идеје и праксе у којима се не-људске форме живота препознају и укључују као актери у стварању здравијег, праведнијег и инклузивнијег живота на земљи.