

CHAPTER 13

The Coexistence of Transhumance Shepherding Practices and Tourism on Bjelašnica Mountain in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Manca Filak and Žiga Gorišek

Introduction: Written and Visual Research

This chapter analyzes the coexistence of transhumance shepherding practices and tourism in Lukomir, the highest village (1472 m above sea level) in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, located on the southern slopes of the Bjelašnica mountain massif (see Figure 13.1). In order to understand the village of Lukomir, we must consider it as an integral part of the Bjelašnica mountain, therefore in the text we usually refer to both, the Bjelašnica mountain in general and the village Lukomir in particular.

From a long-term ethnographic fieldwork conducted from April 2014 to May 2017, both a written anthropological analysis *Transhumance at the Crossroads of Changes: Transhumance and Tourism as Strategies of Survival in Lukomir on the Bjelašnica Mountain (BIH)* (Gorišek 2017), and an ethnographic film *Lukomir, my home* emerged (Filak and Gorišek 2018). The film is a visual ethnography of the daily lives of an elderly couple, Ismet and Tidža Čomor who live in the village. They are the main protagonists in the film as well as our hosts in the village.

The dissertation presents social, historical, and geographical contexts describing how daily life in Lukomir has changed due to many different factors. The film conveys the couple's connection to the land and the animals as well as the general changes in their social world, tracing the various spatial and material dimensions of their annual migration from



Figure 13.1. Lukomir village, Bjelašnica mountain, 2014. © Žiga Gorišek

the Bjelašnica ridge to the villages near Sarajevo and their relationship to a lifestyle that is slowly disappearing.

To a certain extent, these written and visual ethnographies complement each other. Nevertheless, they must be experienced (read or watched) separately. For this reason, we advocate multimodal representations, as they allow multiple identifications and multilayered understandings (see also Pink 2011; Collins, Durlington, and Gill 2017). The writing itself can be multimodal, as it includes field research diaries, dialog transcriptions, interviews, evocative descriptions, and photographs to add qualitatively richer information (Lunaček Brumen 2018: 97; see also Turk Niskač 2011).¹ The Slovenian visual anthropologist Naško Križnar emphasizes the peculiar paradox of where to publish the findings of our visual research (based for instance on filming), we have to translate this visual information into words (Križnar 2002: 91; see also Biella 1993). The combination of different methods (filming, participant observation, semi-structured and unstructured interviews, fieldwork diary notes), therefore serves as a basis for discussion of the anthropological understanding that can be gained through audio-visual material in comparison to written research (see also Filak 2019).

Each research topic leads us to expand our methodologies in different ways in order to explore how to *look at* a particular topic. The mutually constitutive examination of one's own research topic and the use of different visual media can reveal connections, sensorial dimensions, and world-views that might otherwise not be recognizable. In the following sections we will analyze the anthropological insights we have gained through the use of written and visual ethnography in order to understand *when* and *how* we create new meanings and new knowledge through participant observation and visual methods. More than just data from which we can read/observe cultural meanings, we consider both the written text and

the final film as complementary processes from which new meanings and knowledge can emerge.

Transhumance on Bjelašnica Mountain

It is the same for me as for those who get a job somewhere and go to work every day. You cannot leave your job. It is the same for me, I have to herd sheep every day, I feed myself from them, buy my daily bread, buy flour and similar. I have to wake up every day and do the same thing as you—look at my watch so that I am not late for work. I have no schedule, but every morning and every evening I have to herd sheep so that I can sell them later to make money. That is my life. (Interview with an older shepherd from Lukomir, 19 July 2014)

The Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina is located in the central part of the Balkan Peninsula. With its varied relief, the Bjelašnica mountain massif is part of the Dinarid mountain system. Due to the mixing of Mediterranean and continental air masses on the Bjelašnica mountain, there is a lot of rain, constant wind and snow, which can remain on the northern slopes and certain sinkholes until the beginning of June (Sarajlić 1983: 6). The mountains of the Dinarides were already inhabited in the Late Neolithic and Bronze Age when sheep breeding was one of the most important economic activities (Čović 1990: 73; Marković 2003: 13). Livestock breeding, seasonal migration, and transhumant shepherding² allowed the communities in this area to gradually settle in the Bjelašnica region, which would otherwise be much more difficult in these harsh conditions.

Shepherding communities on Bjelašnica mountain have practiced vertical transhumance at different altitudes and built seasonal or temporary settlements with sheds standing on the edges of the grazing areas and smaller parcels that were used for farming. In these sheds, shepherds lived, processed milk, and stored milk dairies during summer. Most of the sheds enabled only the necessities of survival. The locals call them *stanovi*, *katuni*, or *mahale* (Chabbouh Akšamija 2009: 159–80). Until 2010, there were nine shepherd settlements or “permanently”³ inhabited villages on Bjelašnica mountain and ten seasonal settlements where shepherds lived during the summer season, as in the past most shepherds moved their herds to lower-lying villages during the winter. The reverse process took place on Bjelašnica mountain in spring. Because of the lack of food in winter, the shepherds were forced to seek food for their herds outside their usual place of residence. In this sense the shepherds on Bjelašnica mountain could have more animals than their parental territory allowed them

(Perović, Čopić, and Milišić 1990: 604; see also Bartosiewicz and Greenfield 1999). The transhumant practices on Bjelašnica mountain enabled contacts and exchanges between the shepherds who settled “permanently” on the mountain and those who settled “permanently” at the foot of Bjelašnica mountain. In search of pasture, both groups of shepherds spent part of the year away from their “permanent” residence, which in fact contributed to a mixing of people⁴ and customs.⁵

It is important to recognize that traditional sheep breeding as we know it today has changed over time. In the last fifty years, transhumant shepherding on Bjelašnica mountain has experienced a sharp decline or transformation and adaptation to new forms of animal husbandry for various economic, political, and social reasons. Similar processes can be observed in other parts of the world (see Bartosiewicz and Greenfield 1999: 9). Therefore, we see transhumant shepherding on Bjelašnica mountain as a survival strategy that is constantly changing and shifting its form over time.

The Case of Lukomir

From the abovementioned seasonal settlements on the steep slopes, nucleated mountain villages gradually emerged.⁶ *Dolnji Lukomir* (Lower Lukomir) and *Gornji Lukomir* (Upper Lukomir) are examples of transformations of seasonal settlements on Bjelašnica mountain between which the shepherds migrate. Most of the houses in Upper Lukomir, now known only as Lukomir, were built of rocks, the longer side being sunk into the steep ground. The space dug out of the ground was for the animals, while the space above ground was for the shepherds and their families (Chabouh Akšamija 2009: 159–80). Up to ten people could live in such a dwelling. New houses and barns next to them began to appear in the 1970s and it was common to use former houses as barns. In 1985, forty-three permanent households were still active in (Upper) Lukomir, while Lower Lukomir was already abandoned (Općina Konjic 2017).

The villagers of Lukomir have experienced various waves of migration between the different villages, valleys, and settlements on Bjelašnica mountain. During the period of gradual settlement between 1952 and 1974, a school with compulsory first four years of primary education and a mosque were established in Upper Lukomir. As there was less food for the animals during winter, the shepherds still had to look for better pastures on other parts of the mountain. Therefore, the “permanence” of the place of residence we mention is always in some sense temporary. We

have to consider the movements between different settlements and the associated transhumance shepherding as constantly changing practices over time.

Slowly, in the second half of the twentieth century, many of the seasonal settlements like Lower Lukomir on Bjelašnica mountain were abandoned. Consequently, shepherding communities were “permanently” settled in villages and towns, especially in Sarajevo and its surroundings. This was mainly due to the industrialization of Yugoslavia and various measures taken by the communist party, such as the collectivization of agriculture, taxes on animals and land larger than ten hectares, and the ban on nomadic grazing in the forest (Halpern 1975: 86–90, 163). During the same period, the inhabitants of various villages on Bjelašnica mountain, such as Lukomir, began to work in the new factories in Sarajevo and received social security, which they had not known as shepherds (Ljiljana Beljkašić Hadžidedić, pers. comm., 3 June 2014). The villages on Bjelašnica mountain, where their parents had normally stayed, became places where they returned during holidays or when help was needed on the mountain.⁷ When most of the young people left, Bjelašnica’s population began to age and consequently schools were closed, which until then had had a great impact on the literacy of the rural population.

The biggest change on Bjelašnica mountain came with the disintegration of Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav War between 1992 and 1995. Lukomir is one of the few villages on Bjelašnica mountain (as well as Čuhovići and seasonal settlements like Gradina above Umoljani) that was not burned down during the war, although the frontline between the Bosnian Army of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the Serbian Army (Army of Republika Srpska) traversed the area. Despite the long-term tendency of depopulation from Lukomir to the urban settlements around Sarajevo, many returned to Lukomir during the Yugoslav War, and stayed until the end of the war, as it was known to be safer there than around Sarajevo.

In the postwar period many people in Bosnia and Herzegovina were left without work, pensions or other means of earning a living. During this period, many people from Bjelašnica mountain, who worked in Sarajevo or the surrounding area before the war, decided to return to shepherding and transhumant shepherding practices, which served as a main source of income for those who were not able to earn a living in the cities. Nevertheless, the process of emigration continued in the second half of the 1990s, mainly to the growing town of Hadžići, as well as Iliđa, Tarčin, Pazarić, and similar towns at the foot of Bjelašnica and Igman. Many of the villagers from Lukomir and other villages from Bjelašnica mountain had built their houses in a settlement above Hadžići, where Orthodox residents had lived before the war. They also bought pastoral land on which they

built barns. Despite the official change of their “permanent” (in this case winter) residence in a relatively urban area, they continued the tradition of transhumant shepherding. And despite the migration of the population and the increase in tourism in recent decades, transhumant shepherding has remained one of the most important economic strategies in the villages of Bjelašnica as well as an important social aspect throughout the year.

Due to the aging of the population and the poor transport connections in winter, the inhabitants of Lukomir decided not to spend the winter of 2010 in the village. Since then, the village has been inhabited only in summer, with around twenty-two households still active. The seasonal migration of families and their flocks of sheep characterizes the life of the villagers, which may be divided roughly into two seasons: summer on Lukomir (see Figure 13.1) and winter in the lower settlements near Sarajevo.

The summer season consists of bringing sheep to the mountain pastures, drying hay, and doing various jobs that provide the inhabitants of Lukomir with their livelihood all year round. In winter they continue their grazing, mainly in the area called Bare near Hadžići, where they have to deal with problems concerning the grazing land (see Figure 13.2). In Bare, for example, investors from Dubai are building a so-called Ourika Resort, a luxury settlement with fifty-eight plots and up to 996 m² of land (Ourika 2017), which will use a lot of shepherds’ grazing land. There are also many locals from the area who disapprove of grazing, as the land is mostly private and already divided among the population.



Figure 13.2. Ismet while shepherding in Bare, with snowy Bjelašnica in the background, Hadžići, 2014. © Manca Filak

Tourism in Lukomir, a New and Innovative Survival Strategy

The season for agrotourism here runs from May to autumn. In winter it lasts for only two months. I came here mainly to make money, to survive. Later everything else came. I came to Umuljani [on Bjelašnica mountain] because I could earn more money here than in Sarajevo. If I had a better salary in Sarajevo, I would build myself a weekend cabin here. (Interview with a caterer, Umuljani, 25 September 2014)

Most of the villages on Bjelašnica mountain were burned down during the Yugoslav War. After the war, many donations came from abroad, which enabled various NGOs and small entrepreneurs to begin a gradual reconstruction of the houses. Most of them got running water, indoor toilets and the like for the first time. Stones and wood were replaced by newer materials such as bricks, concrete, and sheet metal.⁸

Lukomir, Gradina, and Čuhovići were among the few settlements that were not burned down during the war. Therefore, Lukomir has preserved some of its traditional architecture and appearance, which is the main attraction for the increasing number of visitors. In brochures for domestic and foreign tourists, Lukomir is presented as a picturesque village above the Rakitnica Canyon, one of the most authentic and untouched villages in Bosnia and Herzegovina (see for example Crevar 2018). In 2009 the village was protected as a monument of cultural importance, but there are nevertheless many new buildings and reconstructions, sheet metal roofs, and new catering facilities. The whole area is popular among hikers as well as skiers in the winter season, who can stay in some of the huts and eat or drink in Lukomir's catering facilities.

The first forms of organized tourism on Bjelašnica mountain appeared in the twentieth century with the development of mountaineering and the 1984 Winter Olympics in Sarajevo. Before that period, the area saw mainly regional tourism. The first regular visitors to Bjelašnica mountain and Lukomir were mountaineers from the countries of former Yugoslavia, who stayed in some of the mountain huts or with the locals in their barns. Besides the introduction of electricity, a very important contribution to the modernisation of the villages was the development of Olympic infrastructure.

We can only speak of larger and more organized forms of tourism in Lukomir after the end of the war in 1995, when many international and nongovernmental organizations came to the city of Sarajevo to help repair the war damage. Due to the large number of foreigners living and working in the city, the need for organized and safe trips to the countryside arose. One of the first agencies in Lukomir was Green Visions, established

in 2000 in cooperation between people from BiH, Holland, and the US to offer their guests safe travel to areas where there were no mines or other dangers. Since its foundation Green Visions has been promoting so-called responsible tourism and stands for the protection of the natural environment and cooperation with the local population. The groups they take to Lukomir are small, usually comprising less than twenty people. The highlight of their trip is an overnight stay with locals in their house (Interview with one of the founders of Green Visions, 20 August 2014).

There are many different and complex views on the development of tourism on Bjelašnica mountain. On one hand, we see some of the government plans and strategies that, with the help of European funds and NGOs such as Green Visions, follow the guidelines of sustainable development for tourism, especially on the southern side of Bjelašnica mountain. The growing number of tourists in recent years has led to an increase in so-called heritage tourism, which is based on the desire of tourists for genuine contact with the villagers, a taste of homemade food, and insight into local traditional stories, etc. (Dinero 2002: 69–73; Brandth and Haugen 2011: 41). Tourist agencies and locals are following these global heritage trends promoting ecotourism, rural tourism, heritage tourism, or even slow tourism, as noted by Ledinek Lozej in this volume (Chapter 10). In rural areas, these trends are often emerging because of the needs of urban consumers who want to spend their time outside urban areas (see also Kozorog 2012). This is one of the main reasons why ecological and agro forms of tourism have emerged in the context of rural development in Lukomir and the village of Umuljani in the last decade. These uses of rural spaces connect two aspects: on one hand locals from Lukomir are returning to their land with new or rethought ideas about how to make a living related to sheep farming or gastronomic establishments, and on the other hand small (urban) businesses and entrepreneurs are developing ecotourism and other agro forms of tourism in mountain areas. In this perspective, we can see transhumance as a cultural and touristic heritage, as Mannia notes (Chapter 12).

Tourism with connotations such as alternative, responsible, green, sustainable, conscious, etc., is moving away from the normal practices of mass tourism (see Weber 1997; Skočir 2011). This is not so on the northern side of the mountain and in the valleys around Sarajevo, where standard practices of mass tourism focus on the development of ski slopes and hotels by (mostly) Arab states. For example, in the Babin dol ski resort new hotel complexes are being built and skiing capacity is being expanded. Investors from various Arab states like Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, or Turkey are investing in infrastructure and want to bring more people to Bjelašnica mountain to cover the large investments that are being made.

There are several cases where the locals in Lukomir have started to use tourism as their survival or economic strategy, especially in the last five years. The most interesting case is that of the Lijetna Bašta (Summer Garden) catering facility, which was built by a local couple.

Since they were shepherds themselves in the past, they understand the needs of local villagers and often work with them. In the catering facility, which they run together with their children, they sell various items, including wool products made by the local people. They also buy kaymak, cheese, and meat from the villagers. In recent years, Lijetna Bašta has become a local meeting place, where villagers socialize daily and on special occasions. They cooperate with the Green Visions tourist agency, which brings guests to Lukomir two or three times a week. In 2017 they moved from a simple wooden building in the center to a new one at the main entrance of the village, which is visited by most of the tourists who come to Lukomir (see Figure 13.2.). Here they offer meals to guests, as well as toilets with running water, a real rarity in Lukomir. Two rooms of the restaurant have been furnished in bed-and-breakfast style, and as the number of tourists continues to grow, they plan to set up shared beds in the attic. In 2019, many other tourist facilities similar to Lijetna Bašta were built in the village, which is obvious even at the main entrance of the village, from where visitors are directed to many of the “ethno” houses. Competition for tourists is increasing in the village, as many more locals try to eke out a living from tourism during the summer months.



Figure 13.3. New location of Lijetna Bašta at the main entrance of Lukomir, 2017.
© Žiga Gorišek

Mostly older villagers decide to set up tourist activities, usually with help from their children. Tourism allows them to earn extra money and presents opportunities for them to stay on the mountain. At the same time, they can later help their children who live in Sarajevo or in the surrounding area. In recent years, in addition to the catering industry, wooden spoons and wool products with traditional patterns have been produced in Lukomir and in other villages on Bjelašnica mountain. The locals themselves sell wool products in Lukomir, but the informal market causes many disputes among the women, which can be unpleasant for tourists who are often annoyed by the pushiness of the locals. Otherwise, the locals in the village are very hospitable and willing to accept people as guests in their homes. In return for coffee, food, and a bed, guests usually give some money or buy wool products.

The Effects of Tourism on Life in the Village

By promoting Lukomir as one of the most authentic, traditional, isolated, and remote “ethno” villages in Europe, tourism agencies as well as various bloggers, articles, and similar media content (see for example Viator 2020; Meet Bosnia 2020; Green Visions 2020; Funky Tours 2020) have created a myth of the “Bay of Peace” (a literal translation of the name Lukomir is *luka miru*). Due to the growing number of visitors, the purpose of many agricultural buildings and plots of land has changed and adapted to the new requirements and desires of tourism. This has often been accompanied by the process of creating the heritage and identity of the place, which includes local hospitality, cuisine, wool products, music, singing, and storytelling, etc. (see also West, Igoe, and Brockington 2006; Brandth and Haugen 2011; Grasseni 2013). Interestingly, the abovementioned model of ecological and agrotourism only became successful when part of the local population took the initiative to switch from shepherding to catering for tourism. At the same time, due to the high unemployment rate and the low level of social welfare and retirement in the country, an important change had taken place. The land on Bjelašnica mountain, especially in Lukomir, had become valuable for many, enabling villagers or their descendants to return to the village and earn additional income from tourism. Therefore, for many families and individuals, tourism enables modest survival under otherwise rather harsh conditions, which are prevalent throughout the country.

Lukomir and several other villages like Umljani on Bjelašnica became important starting points or destinations for many local and foreign visitors. The development of tourism in this part of BiH has caused many

changes that will have a long-term effect on the local population. As one of the most visited places in the region, Lukomir faces a great challenge. The phenomenon of tourism has created many new opportunities to earn extra money and new survival strategies. Infrastructure has been expanded and the social conditions of the local people have improved. At the same time, however, there are many negative consequences such as environmental pollution, increased use of natural resources, rising prices of land and real estate, and financial disputes. All of these aspects can impact not only the daily life of the village but also the shepherding practices. Namely, their preservation, modification, and gradual abandonment.

Reactions to the growing number of tourists are of course diverse and complex. The locals usually like to receive guests and are not against tourism per se. A problem for most of them is the conflict between the main summer tourist season and work that needs to be done on the mountain, such as haymaking for winter. Today there are fewer shepherds in the village, but more of them have a larger flock (more than one hundred sheep on average).⁹ Because of the larger number of sheep, as well as the larger number of tourists, there is less space in the village. Therefore, bigger sheep breeders have their flocks on the outskirts or in front of the village. Among them are some who do not like tourists and oppose the development of tourism with various techniques to deter visitors, such as the accumulation of animal entrails and garbage in the places where most tourists pass by. While most villagers support tourism, some do not really know what would be best for the village. Most of the older inhabitants shrug their shoulders when asked such questions and say that it is always better for the village to be alive and full of life than empty.

Working with animals is extremely hard work, most of the families in Lukomir do not have time to take a holiday, let alone go to the sea. Sometimes they go to the *Boračko jezero* (lake) or to the Baščaršija market in Sarajevo. They do not experience the kind of tourism that is enjoyed by the tourists who visit Lukomir. In this sense, many locals would change their way of life for something different at the first opportunity.

Tourism in Lukomir through the Camera's Lens

On the way to Lukomir we met a group of shepherds who were bringing their sheep down to the village. I had to film the scene because it was so picturesque. The villagers were angry with me. They asked me why I was filming and what I was going to do with the footage. I apologized and explained that I only wanted to film the sheep on their way to the village. That was the truth. I took a long shot so that the shepherds were not recognizable in the video. When they saw that I spoke their language, they were reas-

sured. They asked me where I was sleeping. When I told them at Ismet's, they started laughing and said that he was the most important "glumac" (actor) in the village. Since he often stands in front of the camera, the villagers often make jokes like that. (Notes from the fieldwork diary, Lukomir, 12 July 2014)

The use of a camera has helped us to better understand the possibility of coexistence between shepherding practices and tourism in Lukomir. The topic we initially wanted to explore with the camera was the influence of tourism on the way of life in the village. But while we continuously participated in the daily life routines of our protagonists, we slowly started to see the camera as an obstacle. We began to compare ourselves with the other tourists who came to the village and carelessly used their cameras without asking for permission or thinking about their position with regard to the inhabitants. We felt restrained because we felt like them, taking images *of* and *from* the people without their permission.

Similarly, we began to realize that the focus on tourism as an obstacle or potential threat reinforced the binary relationship of *hosts and guests* (Smith 1977) that is often mapped onto tourists and locals. Consequently, after some uncomfortable situations, we decided not to use the camera in the initial phase of fieldwork. We were also too concerned in some ways for the process of visual ethnography to affect our friendship, so we turned our camera instead to the landscape surrounding us and looked at Lukomir from a more photographic angle. Later, we began to follow the natural flow of events regardless of whether tourists were present or not, and instead adapted ourselves to the relationship we had with our main protagonists, Ismet and Tidža. The locals also seemed to be afraid of foreigners because of many previous experiences (including those on film). Because Lukomir is often portrayed in different ways by various tourist and commercial organizations, the villagers are aware of the power images can have (see Koevorden 2010).

Later on, the protagonists themselves began to insist and point out things that should be recorded and documented, such as pie making, pulling wool thread, *mevlud* (the biggest festival of the year), etc. These are elements of their everyday lives that are considered to be traditional and are perceived as such by them as well as outsiders. Therefore, the creative and relational use of the camera helped us to involve our protagonists in the process of meaning-making, and thus to bring about the processual aspects of social relations instead of just documenting things "out there" (Favero 2013: 70). With the help of the camera, we were able to understand more about what is important to the villagers, for example *mevlud* as a form of social display or elements of daily life that they perceive as traditional.

Another good experience was connected with the use of the small handheld camera with built-in projector, with which the film material was shown on the wall inside their small house. In this way family members could see the things we recorded and they were excited to see themselves and the landscape in the film; also, through their comments and enthusiasm when watching the footage, we could see what was important to them (the nature, animals, other villagers, etc.). Each visual representation is consumed (not just created) in different social contexts that evoke certain feelings of similarity, distance, recognition, or empathy (Banks and Ruby 2011: 9; Vávrová 2014: 3; see also MacDougall 1992: 25, 32). Thus, viewing visual ethnographies is not only about *looking at* but also about positioning yourself in a particular time and space through the sensory experiences and perceptions of other people. This enables one to better understand, relate to others, and create new meanings about the topic (MacDougall 2005: 4, 58; Vávrová 2014: 25).

When protagonists become their own audience, they become phenomenologically bound to their own representation in a way that is not possible for those who are not part of their community (Banks 1998: 124 in Grossman 2010: 186). When we showed the video material, or in this case the final film to our protagonists, they did not appreciate the aesthetics or the narrativity of the film so much, but reacted to details that were more significant to them, for example which period of the year it was according to the greenness of the grass in the footage, which sheep are still alive, etc. Overall, they appreciated the final film as a form of personal inheritance for their descendants, namely their children and grandchildren. The final film was a result of our cooperation, as Tidža and Ismet proposed that we film the abovementioned tasks or areas which were important to them. Therefore, we saw the potential of a filmmaking approach to depict and explore transhumance and tourism, and to create a common understanding of their everyday lives (see also Barabantseva and Lawrence 2015: 23).

Peter Ian Crawford suggests that the strategy or aesthetics of a particular film fits a particular culture by basing his argument on the connection between the narrative quality of a film, the culture portrayed, and the audience (1992; see also Postma 2006; Henry and Vávrová 2016). In our case, the video material follows various spatial and material dimensions of seasonal migration in general, and shepherding in particular. It follows the intrinsic flow of the annual cycle of the shepherds and depicts village life. The film material also shows the slow pace of our protagonists' everyday lives in space and time. It contrasts stillness and movement, work and leisure, mountains and city, summer and winter, waiting and working.

The "how" to film and "how" to show a certain phenomenon (i.e., cinematographic strategy) comprises a combination of one's own views with

the protagonist's worldview (Piault 2006: 372). The camera has encouraged us to examine more closely what Lukomir and shepherding means to our protagonists, through which elements they identify themselves, how they see the future of Lukomir, how they anticipate ascending the mountain the following spring, and how they enjoy the clear air, routines, and exchanges with neighbors and tourists, and visiting family members. In this way, the process of visual ethnographic research (including the fear of the influence of the camera) and the re-viewing of the video material led us to look beyond our original theme: the impact of tourism. Visual ethnography made it easier to shift the focus of our interest to the tactile aspects of their lifestyle. These included the gentle and close relationship with the animals, the routines of daily sheep care and the hard work that seems to be embodied in their movements. By adapting our cinematographic strategy (Piault 2006; Postma 2006)—refocusing on everyday life and shepherding—we realized that tourism is in fact only one of the changes taking place in Lukomir. Although tourists are often present in the area, moving in and out of their lives, as well as from the footage, we do not believe that this is the only important aspect of change.

By using a camera in Lukomir, we have understood what it feels like to take images of and from the people in the village, the impact of tourism, and the interpretation of a specific traditional, local culture by tourists. We could also feel the intrinsic rhythm and flow of the people in Lukomir by observing different elements of their daily lives. By letting them show us what we should film (wool threading, *mevlud* festivities, flowers, sheep, etc.), we came to better understand what is important to them and what they consider important for their way of living. Furthermore, we were inspired to reflect on whether there are differences in the methodological and analytical procedures of obtaining anthropological understanding. A camera offers visual particularities of a certain time and space that are concrete, visible, and audible. Finally, it also captures what is happening in the background, which can provide an excess of information that can be useful for research (see also De Bromhead 2014: 234).

Conclusion

There are numerous factors that change the cultural landscape of Bjelašnica mountain, which throughout history has been shaped mainly by transhumance shepherding practices. The biggest obstacles to the maintenance of these practices are not only tourism and its infrastructure, but also the aging population and lack of pastoral land near Hadžići (the suburbs of Sarajevo), where most of the villagers from Lukomir migrate to in winter.

The pasturelands are shrinking due to the construction of many luxurious settlements built by investors from Turkey, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, and Kuwait, as well as local disputes over land. The state subsidy system is active, but not strong enough to help all farmers to maintain and expand their shepherding activities. As a result, the village community in Lukomir has an important decision to make for their future—whether or not to maintain a lifestyle linked to sheep breeding and the seasonal transhumance practices of herding.

Like written text and visual material, we see tourism (despite its different impacts) and transhumance practices in Lukomir as complementary to each other rather than conflicting. The research with the camera and the subsequent viewing of the film material helped us to better understand this coexistence. Field notes are useful in this sense, but the writing always takes place after the experience, while every film recording is made at the moment of shooting (Devereaux 1995: 72; see also Barabantseva and Lawrence 2015: 9). With the help of both, the camera and usual fieldwork methods, we have understood the traditional transhumance practices as a persistent survival strategy in this area, where—due to many different factors in the country, such as the lack of political unity, inconsistent funding, political conflicts, poor welfare state—there is often no other or better option.

Even though shepherding and its distribution area has changed throughout history, the people of this area have always kept it as part of their way of life, which usually involves the help of extended family members. Despite changes in the country's policies, changes in financing, the type of subsidies, varying interests, the financial and political crises, there are still people who insist on this seasonal way of life. That is why we do not see transhumance exclusively as an economic strategy, but also as a livelihood strategy, with an emphasis on its cultural, social component, as the villagers of Lukomir migrate to the Bjelašnica mountain in the summer even when they do not have sheep. And when the villagers move to the valley in autumn, they mostly move together into the same area.

We also see the seasonal shepherding practices as an important attempt to be self-sufficient. During the past ten years, these practices have been complemented by new tourist offers and facilities, which are increasing in scope and number. Although there are many different local reactions to tourism (rejection as well as acceptance) and although tourism is a relatively new aspect of everyday reality in the village (changed infrastructure, new facilities, etc.), it does not refute or hinder the transhumance practices on Bjelašnica mountain. The question that remains open is therefore related more to the future of tourism in Lukomir. If fewer tourists come to the mountain due to the COVID-19 pandemic, there is a good chance that people will decide to increase their herds and thus the

practices of transhumant shepherding. In the opposite case, with a possible expansion of tourism, these shepherds are in the line of fire, as they are still one of the groups most at risk due to their age, lack of insurance, and retirement planning, etc.

We can therefore see that the practices of transhumance shepherding change over time (and in space) and should not be understood as rigid. These changes are a consequence of various factors such as tourism, valuations, emigration of young people, privatization of public spaces, diseases, urbanization, etc., but the practices of transhumance shepherding will continue in this area, as history has proven.

Acknowledgments

This research was conducted during the master's studies at the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology (University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts) under the academic supervisor Prof. Bojan Baskar. However, the chapter was completed within the Young Researcher Program at the Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Institute of Slovene Ethnology.

Manca Filak is a Young Researcher at the Research Center of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts at the Institute of Slovenian Ethnology. She is the director of award-winning ethnographic films and documentaries that have been screened at various festivals in Europe and abroad. She is co-organizer of the festival Days of Ethnographic Film and the Summer School of Visual Ethnography in Ljubljana.

Žiga Gorišek is an ethnologist and cultural anthropologist, photographer and award-winning ethnographic and documentary filmmaker. His passion for mountains and high mountain cultures led him to devote himself to the study and documentation of transhuman pastoralism.

Notes

1. Žiga's thesis is an example of this, as he included photographs and fieldwork diary excerpts in the text.
2. In the broadest sense, we understand transhumance and transhumant shepherding to mean seasonal migration of people and their livestock between different vertically (at different altitudes) or horizontally separated grazing areas. Both movements are adapted to the season in which the shepherds

look for suitable pastures. Therefore, transhumance is an important factor in the Alpine world and in Southern Europe, where it is mainly associated with sheep breeding (Burns 1963: 140). Transhumance on European ground is interesting mainly because of its diversity, as there are many different organizational structures and strategies that have survived throughout history to this day (Chang 1993: 699).

3. We do not use the word “permanent” in a literal sense. For the people of Bjelašnica mountain, “permanence” is more related to a sense of belonging or identity. “Permanent” settlement is a term also used to refer to the place or land where part of the family lives, farms, or gathers hay for the winter.
4. Bjelašnica mountain was a meeting place for shepherds from the northern, Bosnian side of the mountain and shepherds from the southern side, who came from Herzegovina. According to our interlocutors, many people came to Bjelašnica from the area of Ljuboški, Nevesinje, Podvelež, Konjic, and other places in Herzegovina. Interestingly, there are only two surnames in Lukomir, Čomor and Masleša.
5. Some shepherds who were also herding sheep for other people did not practice shepherding as their main occupation.
6. The nucleated mountain villages characteristic of Bjelašnica mountain can be divided into two types, the southern one, where the houses were mostly built of rocks, and the northern one, where the houses were made of wood.
7. In addition to transhumant shepherding practices, Claudia Chang speaks of social transhumance, where people, like shepherds with their animals, move from urban settlements to rural settlements every year, usually to places where they have previously practiced transhumant shepherding (1993: 690–91). In this way, these communities maintain a community identity that is shaped by life in different places.
8. On the southern, Herzegovinian side of the Bjelašnica mountain, the houses were mostly covered with wooden shingles or *šindle* (Sarajlić 1983: 46). In the second half of the twentieth century, these wooden shingles were often replaced by sheet metal from old barrels.
9. Parallel to the livestock subsidies, that is, the increase in the size of the flock, the number of families renting pastures is growing. Most of the younger sheep breeders see the subsidies as something positive, especially in combination with renting pastures from other villagers and the possibility of grazing on Bjelašnica mountain. By comparison, in the 1990s, before the Yugoslav War, people had an average of fifty sheep per family.

References

- Banks, Marcus, and Jay Ruby. 2011. “Made to Be Seen: Historical Perspectives on Visual Anthropology.” In *Made to Be Seen: Perspectives on the History of Visual Anthropology*, ed. Marcus Banks and Jay Ruby, 1–18. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Barabantseva, Elena, and Andrew Lawrence. 2015. "Encountering Vulnerabilities through 'Filmmaking for Fieldwork.'" *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 43(3): 911–30.
- Bartosiewicz, László, and Haskel J. Greenfield, eds. 1999. *Transhumant Pastoralism in Southern Europe: Recent Perspectives from Archaeology, History and Ethnology*. Budapest: Archaeolingua alapítvány.
- Biella, Peter. 1993. "Beyond Ethnographic Film: Hypermedia and Scholarship." In *Anthropological Film and Video in the 1990s*, ed. Jack R. Rollwagen, 131–76. Brockport: The Institute, Inc.
- Brandth, Berit, and Marit S. Haugen. 2011. "Farm Diversification into Tourism—Implications for Social Identity?" *Journal of Rural Studies* 27: 35–44.
- Burns, K. Robert. 1963. "The Circum—Alpine Culture Area: A Preliminary View." *Anthropological Quarterly* 36(3): 130–55.
- Chabbouh Akšamija, Lemja. 2009. *Autentičnost ruralnog graditeljstva kao preduvjet aktivne zaštite: Pilot projekat bjelašničkog sela Ledići*. PhD diss., University of Sarajevo.
- Chang, Claudia. 1993. "Pastoral Transhumance in the Southern Balkans as Social Ideology: Ethnoarchaeological Research in Northern Greece." *American Anthropologist* 95(3): 687–703.
- Collins, Samuel, Matthew Durlington, and Harjant Gill. 2017. "Multimodality: An Invitation." *Multimodal Anthropologies* 119(1): 142–53.
- Čović, Borivoj. 1990. "O strukturi stočarstva na sjeverozapadnom Balkanu u bronзанom i željeznom dobu." In *Godišnjak knjiga 28: Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja*, ed. Alojz Benac, 65–73. Sarajevo: Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine.
- Crawford, Peter Ian. 1992. "Grass, the Visual Narrativity of Pastoral Nomadism." In *Ethnographic Film Aesthetics and Narrative Traditions: Proceedings from NAFA 2*, ed. Peter Ian Crawford, Jan Ketil Simonsen, and the Nordic Anthropological Film Association, 121–40. Aarhus: Intervention Press in association with the Nordic Anthropological Film Association.
- Crevar, Alex. 2018. "High in the Mountains, this European Village Stands Frozen in Time: Lukomir is Home to 17 Families and Medieval Traditions." Retrieved 26 November 2018 from <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/travel/destinations/europe/bosniaherzegovina/things-to-do-high-mountain-village-lukomir/>.
- De Bromhead, Toni. 2014. *A Film-Maker's Odyssey: Adventures in Film and Anthropology*. Aarhus: Intervention Press.
- Devereaux, Leslie. 1995. "Experience, Re-presentation, and Film." In *Fields of Vision: Essays in Film Studies, Visual Anthropology and Photography*, ed. Leslie Devereaux and Roger Hillman, 56–76. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dinero, C. Steven. 2002. "Image is Everything: The Development of the Negev Bedouin as a Tourist Attraction." *Nomadic Peoples* 6(1): 69–94.
- Favero, Paolo. 2013. "Picturing Life-Worlds in the City: Notes for a Slow, Aimless and Playful Visual Ethnography." In *Archivio Antropologico Mediterraneo—AAM* 15(2): 69–85.

- Filak, Manca. 2019. "A Long-Term Visual Ethnography in a Bosnian Village: Tracking Epistemological and Methodological Issues." *EthnoAnthropoZoom/ ЕтноАнтрополоЗум* 16(16): 251–303.
- Filak, Manca and Žiga Gorišek, dir. 2018. *Lukomir, My Home*. Ethnocinema production (Slovenia). Color, 61mins.
- Funky Tours. 2020. "Lukomir Nomad Village Hiking—Full Day Tour from Sarajevo." Retrieved 10 June 2020 from <https://sarajevofunkytours.com/tour/lukomir-hiking-tour/>.
- Gorišek, Žiga. 2017. "Transhumantno pašništvo na razpotju sprememb: transhumanca in turizem kot strategiji preživetja v vasi Lukomir na Bjelašnici (BIH)." Master's thesis, University of Ljubljana.
- Grasseni, Cristina. 2013. "Re-inventing Food: Alpine Cheese in the Age of Global Heritage." Retrieved 14 June 2013 from <http://aof.revues.org/6819>.
- Green Visions. 2020. "Lukomir Highland Village Tour." Retrieved 10 June 2020 from <https://greenvisions.ba/en/activity/240100/lukomir-highland-village-tour>.
- Grossman, Alyssa R. 2010. "Choreographies of Memory: Everyday Sites and Practices of Remembrance Work in Post-Socialist, EU Accession-Era Bucharest." PhD diss., University of Manchester.
- Halpern, M. Joel. 1975. "Some Perspectives on Balkan Migration Patterns (with Particular Reference to Yugoslavia)." In *Migration and Urbanization: Model and Adaptive Strategies*, ed. Brian M. Du Toit and Helen I. Safa, 77–115. Paris: Mouton Publishers.
- Henry, Rosita, and Daniela Vávrová. 2016. "An Extraordinary Wedding: Some Reflections on the Ethics and Aesthetics of Authorial Strategies in Ethnographic Filmmaking." *Anthrovision* 4(1): 1–19.
- Koevorden, Niels van, dir. 2010. *Winterslaap in Lukomir*. Fermfilm (Holland). Color, 30mins.
- Kozorog, Miha. 2012. "Proti 'urbanosti': Ohlapno strukturne misli o ohlapno definirani temi." In *Antropološki načini življenja v mestih*, ed. Jaka Repič and Jože Hudales, 59–74. Ljubljana: Zupaničeva knjižnica.
- Križnar, Naško. 2002. "Etnologija in vizualna antropologija." *Traditiones* 31(2): 85–92.
- Lunaček Brumen, Sarah. 2018. "V iskanju skupne antropologije." *Bulletin of the Slovene Ethnological society* 58(3–4): 91–106.
- MacDougall, David. 1992. "Whose Story Is It?" In *Ethnographic Film Aesthetics and Narrative Traditions: Proceedings from NAFA 2*, ed. Peter Ian Crawford, Jan Ketil Simonsen, and the Nordic Anthropological Film Association, 25–42. Aarhus: Intervention Press in association with the Nordic Anthropological Film Association.
- . 2005. *The Corporeal Image: Film, Ethnography, and the Senses*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Marković, Mirko. 2003. *Stočarska kretanja na Dinarskim planinama*. Zagreb: Naklada Jesenski i Turk.
- Meet Bosnia. 2020. "Lukomir Village Tour from Sarajevo." Retrieved 6 June 2020 from <https://meetbosnia.com/tour/lukomir-village-tour-from-sarajevo/>.

- Općina Konjic. 2017. "Kulturni krajolik—selo Lukomir." Retrieved 22 September 2017 from <http://www.konjic.ba/index.php/o-opcini/nacionalni-spomenici/item/278-selo-lukomir>.
- Ourika. 2017. "Ourika Hills—3D Modelling and Animation by BNpro Sarajevo." Retrieved 16 July 2017 from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=enYFn7xK9nY>.
- Perović, M., Č. Čopić, and M. Milišić. 1990. "Organizacija ovčarskih kretanja iz sela sa područja planine Bjelašnice." In *Zbornik Biotehniške fakultete Univerze Edvarda Kardelja v Ljubljani*, ed. M. Perović, 603–12. Ljubljana: VTOZD za agronomijo Biotehniške fakultete Univerze Edvarda Kardelja.
- Piault, Colette. 2006. "The Construction and Specificity of an Ethnographic Film Project: Researching and Filming." In *Reflecting Visual Ethnography: Using the Camera in Anthropological Research*, ed. Metje Postma and Peter Ian Crawford, 358–75. Leiden: Routledge.
- Pink, Sarah. 2011. "Multimodality, Multisensoriality, and Ethnographic Knowing: Social Semiotics and the Phenomenology of Perception." *Qualitative Research* 11(3): 261–76.
- Postma, Metje. 2006. "The Construction to Narrative: What's Left of Ethnography?" In *Reflecting Visual Ethnography: Using the Camera in Anthropological Research*, ed. Metje Postma and Peter Ian Crawford, 319–57. Leiden: Routledge.
- Sarajlić, Vesna, ed. 1983. *Bjelašnica: Priroda i ljudi*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Skočir, Melita. 2011. "Turizem kot dejavnik ohranjanja planinskega pašništva v Zgornjem Posočju." PhD diss., University of Primorska.
- Smith, Valene L., ed. 1977. *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Turk Niskač, Barbara. 2011. "Some Thoughts on Ethnographic Fieldwork and Photography." *Studia Ethnologica Croatica* 23(1): 125–48.
- Vávrová, Daniela. 2014. *Skin Has Eyes and Ears: Audio-Visual Ethnography in a Sepik Society*. PhD diss., James Cook University.
- Viator. 2020. "Lukomir Village Hiking Day Trip: Outdoor Activities in Travnik." Retrieved 6 June 2020 from <https://www.lonelyplanet.com/bosnia-and-hercegovina/central-and-northern-bosnia-and-hercegovina/travnik/activities/lukomir-village-hiking-day-trip/a/pa-act/v-71408P7/358726>.
- Weber, Irena. 1997. *Kultura potepanja*. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.
- West, Paige, James Igoe, and Dan Brockington. 2006. "Parks and Peoples: The Social Impact of Protected Areas." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 35: 251–77.