Conclusion

Cityness in and beyond the Adriatic borderland

This study has examined the historical continuities and discontinuities of distinct geographies of ‘cityness’ in the Adriatic borderland, in which experiences of belonging and citizenship have been subject to a series of abrupt ruptures from the last decades of the Habsburg Empire onward. I have explored the historical practices of city-making that have framed and shaped Trieste and Rijeka as Adriatic border cities across the long twentieth century. In so doing, I have told the story of how a range of cultural and political actors have created and recreated these two cities, forming their histories, landscapes, and geopolitical imaginations, both discursive and material. It is a story of how these actors—whom I have presented as city-makers—experienced Trieste’s and Rijeka’s cityness in relation to near-constant political turmoil and shifting borders in the wider Adriatic region over the course of the long twentieth century. In tracing continuities and discontinuities in the historical trajectories of the urban imaginations surrounding these border cities, I hope to have shed new light on three main problematics. The study has traced, first, how Trieste’s and Rijeka’s urban imaginations emerged historically. Second, it has shown how a distinct sense of cityness could persist during periods in which nationalism laid exclusive claim to citizenship practices. Indeed, during periods of changing ideologies and nationalist conformity, the imaginations studied here have held out an alternative experience of belonging. Third, it has shed light on how the urban past was reimagined and staged for new cultural and political urban projects in the 1990s and 2000s.

By providing a comparative analysis that takes in a *longue durée,*
this study has established insights into how these two Adriatic cities developed historically. Having first been imperial free states, they then become contested cities within national states, then Cold War border cities, before finally being cosmopolitanized as ‘global’ yet European cities. In this last iteration, Trieste and Rijeka figure as sites of intersection among changing senses of belonging and citizenship on urban, regional, national, and international scales. The study combined an examination of cultural and historical-political representations with a corpus of in-depth interviews with contemporary city-makers. As such, it provides a unique research space in which to explore how cultural representations and practices of cityness in Trieste and Rijeka emerged in relation to the historical and socio-political contexts of their production. For many city-makers during the long twentieth century, my analysis demonstrates, a distinct sense of cityness presented an alternative possible way in which to express their Adriatic border experience—in terms not only of cultural belonging, but also of economic and political organization. For them, urban imaginations served as a means of negotiating the various shifting worlds inhabited by Triestines and Rijekans.

Senses of cityness in Trieste and Rijeka

This study has traced the histories and spatialities of senses of cityness, emphasizing how they constitute unique experiences of citizenship in the Adriatic borderland. In the introduction to this study, I positioned the research within wider historiographical debates on both multinational belonging, nationality, and citizenship in the nineteenth- and twentieth-century Adriatic region and the contemporary memory politics of imperial nostalgia. As I explained, this scholarship has highlighted how ideas of citizenship and nationality do not ‘naturally’ coincide and, moreover, that there were multiple possible routes leading to the development of contemporary nation-state-based societies. The Adriatic border region’s distinct approach to belonging and citizenship was largely conceived and fought for in key urban centers, which have long functioned as the region’s intellectual and economic hubs. Indeed, scholars have undertaken extensive research on how Trieste and Rijeka have been subject to the wider region’s geopolitical dynamics, in both the past and today. Building on this scholarship on the culture, memory, and identity-politics, my study has critically interrogated the urban imaginations and narratives of my chosen cities’ pasts. As such, it adds to previous work by viewing Adriatic border cities as being more than simply reflections of the contested cultural politics prevailing in the states surrounding them. Rather, Trieste and Rijeka are also places in which generations of local city-makers have actively remade and reimagined
their own characteristic senses of cityness. In shown this, this study indicates how imaginations of Trieste and Rijeka have been continuously produced anew. The open and intersectional processes through which cityness is created have turned Trieste and Rijeka into focal points of the politics of belonging and citizenship in the Adriatic region.

Combining a historical perspective on identity politics in the Adriatic region and contemporary geographical perspectives on place-making, I have approached the urban places in question, here, as processual. Distinct senses of place emerge through cultural processes, woven through routes and networks across time and space. Adopting Massey’s notion of ‘global sense of place’ enabled me to highlight how urban identity politics in Trieste and Rijeka emerges not only in a local context or time-space. Rather, these political discourses and practices were also constructed over much longer historical periods and in much broader spatial frames. These wider, tendentially global processes also contribute to shape the sense of place in the present (Massey 1991; Agnew 2011). At one level, the seven chapters presented in this study have explored the role of representational strategies in shaping senses of cityness. At another, they have shown how these imaginations and representations enable contemporary political, economic, and cultural projects of city-making. Together, the chapters show the importance of understanding historical place-making processes in Adriatic cities. Place-making projects bring into focus the ways in which urban citizens have engaged and interacted with their local urban landscape and negotiate their relations to the world around them. Through place-making, interests and loyalties intersect at local urban, regional, national, or international scales. I have approached these intersecting imaginings of cityness as activist ‘acts of cultural citizenship.’ My argument emphasizes how the city presents a kaleidoscope of urban imaginations. Looking into it, we can see how inhabitants of Trieste and Rijeka, both historically and today, have formed alternative ways of imagining and experiencing their distinctive urban identities.

Despite remaining constant in many respects, the senses of cityness characteristic of Trieste and Rijeka have often changed in response to the identity politics of the time and the changing conceptions of citizenship. On a political level, my analysis has both followed how the shifting fortunes of states and governments in the region have affected politics in Adriatic border cities, and traced changing understandings of citizenship. Despite these transformations, though, my study has also revealed the persistence of a sense of cityness over time. Although discourses of autonomous cityness in the region derive from a common origin in port-cities under Austrian or Hungarian rule, histories and cultural representations of cityness in Trieste and Rijeka have developed
along two divergent paths. The articulation of Trieste’s urban imaginations is strongly linked to its rich literary history. In chapter 1, I argued that this has given the Triestine sense of cityness a distinct inflection, which has manifested itself in and through literary representations of the city as alternative form of belonging to the nationalism prevailing in the twentieth century. For its part, Rijeka’s sense of cityness developed along a broadly similar trajectory in that it too has formed through cultural representations of urban autonomy. And yet, in chapter 2 I argued that Rijeka’s urban imaginings were entangled in urban Autonomists’ political struggle. In contrast to Trieste, then, Rijeka’s citizenry has engaged in a highly charged political campaign to reclaim ownership of the city they had lost. Both manifestations of cityness, I have argued, can be considered acts of cultural citizenship.

In the case of Trieste, I discerned four stages and tropes through which a distinct sense of cityness (often formulated as *triestinità*) emerged. First, during the nineteenth century, Trieste enjoyed a relative degree of economic and political autonomy under Habsburg imperial rule, which gave rise to the trope of Trieste’s civic *municipalismo* (‘municipalism’). As part of this *municipalismo*, the city developed a rich cosmopolitan imaginary as a heterogeneous and modern port—a place of encounter for people from all over the world. A second trope emerged in the years leading up to the World War One (1910-1918). As part of the rising prominence of national questions in the wider Adriatic region, a discussion rose among Triestine intellectuals concerning the formulation of a distinct and rooted tradition of *triestinità* (Triestenness). Increasing, this discussion came to center on intellectual questions of national belonging and urban life in the modernizing city. The trope found its way into literary representations of the urban landscape authored by modernists including Italo Svevo, Scipio Slataper, and James Joyce. As I demonstrated in chapter 1, with this phase of *triestinità* cosmopolitan imaginations of the city gathered momentum. The image of a cosmopolitan Trieste was no longer an everyday urban experience belonging to the legacy of the city’s past as imperial port, but rather became central to literary aesthetic practice and as an intellectual project.

A third trope of *triestinità* developed in response to the city’s Fascist and Nazi governments in the years after World War One. Although Trieste had become highly nationalized and politicized between 1918 and 1947, Trieste’s sense of cityness morphed into a trope of ‘Trieste as a non-state.’ Through their practice, Trieste’s writers created imaginative alternative worlds of urban belonging, outside of formal politics. In the literary cityscapes conjured up by these writers and intellectuals, notions of *triestinità* seemed to float in their own self-contained separate time-space. Suspended between past and future, they stood apart from
the harsh nationalizing identity politics promulgated by the Fascist and Nazi regimes. After World War Two, a fourth trope emerged, in which Trieste is presented as ‘a city of nowhere.’ These urban imaginations were largely formulated among historical scholars and were disseminated at local public debates. These intellectuals were concerned to critique prevailing imaginations of Trieste, which they argued had become an empty signifier. Indeed, Trieste’s post-war intellectuals sought to retrieve the civic significance of their city amid wider political and historical debates in Italy and Europe more widely. The imaginative cityscapes of *triestinità* betrayed a desire to overcome the nationalizing—and often ethnically exclusionary—identity-making processes that were so common in twentieth-century Europe. A Rijekan sense of cityness, in contrast, expressed a desire among Rijeka’s cultural and political actors to reclaim ownership to their city, which had been taken over politically.

In the case of Rijeka too, I have discerned four stages and tropes in the development of its sense of cityness. First, discourses asserting the city’s particular character were strongly embedded in the historical legacy of liberal autonomy. It was premised on the power of the city’s councilors, that had been lost in 1896 with the assertion of central Habsburg rule. This experience of losing political autonomy inspired several generations of cultural and political figures in Rijeka to mobilize urban patriotism. Chapter 2 showed how this was a key moment of urban myth-making. From the late 1890s into the 1910s, new political imaginaries of urban autonomy invoked past experiences of the *corpus separatum* in the struggle to achieve political ownership of the city. In the years leading up to World War One, Rijekan discourses of urban autonomy clashed with Italian claims over the city. Indeed, *Fiume irredenta*—the wish to redeem ‘Fiume’ from foreign influence and incorporate the city into Italian territory—constitutes a second trope of Rijekan cityness. In this move from the Rijekan Autonomists’ project to the Italian nationalist trope of *Fiume irredenta*, the city’s sense of urban autonomy was subsumed into a non-Rijekan struggle. The aim was to create a revolutionary, avant-garde free state. During the interwar years, under Fascist rule and harsh Italianization politics, Rijeka’s sense of autonomy disappeared, at least in the political arena. It did return culturally, however, in the form of a third imagination of the city as a ‘delta of cultures.’ This urban imagination persisted despite Fascist policies of harsh Italianization. Produced by the local cultural elite, it depicted Rijeka as a multicultural tolerant city that served as a bridge between Italy and its neighboring Slavic cultures. This iteration of the city bravely remained standing in the face of nationalizing politics. In a fourth twist, this idea of the city as a delta of cultures has had a long afterlife in the literary representations and historical autobiographies of Rijekan exiles. Despite being forced to
leave their home city, their memories and sense of belonging remained wedded to ‘Fiume.’ I have defined this trope as the imagination of ‘Fiume in exile.’ With this term, I have meant to grasp how migrants have both processed exile and territorial loss while continuing to claim ownership of the memory of a city no longer their own.

By and large, scholarship on the histories of the forms of autonomy enjoyed by both Trieste and Rijeka has tended to posit autonomy as a constant concept. Autonomy, in this work, simply names an independent status. This study, in contrast, has demonstrated how understandings of urban autonomy are dynamic historical phenomena, which express the cities’ changing position with respect to dominant ideologies and political identity politics in the Adriatic region and Europe more broadly. These findings have guided me toward an important conclusion: the urban experience of citizenship peculiar to Rijeka and Trieste under the Habsburg state—in which both urban autonomy and multiple loyalties (to the city, region, and even nations) were permitted—did not disappear with the appearance of radical political nationalisms and exclusive nationalized forms of citizenship. Instead, urban citizenship has had a long afterlife in both cities. Persisting through cultural expressions and practices, notions of citizenship continued to inspire a sense of ownership of the city among inhabitants. Despite the city councils having lost their political and juridical power under imperial and national regimes, cultural and political actors in the cities continued to frame their politics and relation to the state through the framework of urban cultural citizenship. Long after formal autonomy ended, they retained a distinct sense of cityness beyond the limits of the state.

As I have explained above, a similar dynamic of urban cultural citizenship emerged in Trieste for the first time around the years 1910 to 1918. In this period, triestilità reflected an intellectual approach to national belonging and modern urban life: this form of cultural citizenship was first fashioned by Trieste’s writers. In Rijeka, acts of cultural citizenship had already come to the fore in 1896, when cultural imaginaries of urban autonomy started to inform political struggles for urban autonomy. This form of cultural citizenship was first fashioned by the local elite associated with the Autonomist movement. Accordingly, the concept of cultural citizenship that has emerged from this study confirms existing scholarship on ‘acts of citizenship,’ for which the state is not only relative but an institutionalized script to be performed and reiterated (Delanty 2002; Isin and Nielsen 2008; Isin 2012; Prak 2018). Underlying these concepts is a common understanding of citizenship as a citizen-state relation primarily engaged in by the individual citizen, not the state. Cultural citizenship, then, entails a series of cultural competences and intellectual processes through which civic conditions can be shaped or established. In examining
how generations of cultural and political actors in Trieste and Rijeka have engaged in writing and enacting the scripts and setting the scenes that comprise the public sphere, this study has provided a contextually sensitive examination of some key dynamics and practices of cultural citizenship.

**City-making as acts of cultural citizenship**

Ways of imagining Trieste and Rijeka as border cities have been retrieved, cultivated, and restaged in local marketing and city branding projects from the 1990s onward. Such projects, this study has shown, are often built on memories of a grounded, actually existing cosmopolitan past. In exploring these reworkings of the past in the present, I have emphasized the forms of urban cultural politics to which they give rise. The dynamics of contemporary city-making, it appears, are also acts through which urban actors perform cultural citizenship.

Chapters 3, 4, and 5 have explored the reworking and cultural mobilization of historical urban imaginaries in contemporary cultural policies of heritagization and city branding in Trieste and Rijeka. The formal modes in which the cities’ historical experience has been represented—literary in Trieste and activist-political in Rijeka—have fed into the ways in which contemporary cultural policies have deployed cosmopolitan narratives surrounding the cities. This can be seen in the case of Trieste, which is geographically located on the frontlines of the Cold War. After the disappearance of the Iron Curtain in 1990, this memory was evoked in imaginations of Trieste as hopeful symbol for a borderless Europe. What is more, from the 1970s onward, Trieste’s ‘border-literature’ developed in tandem as both a distinct literary ‘specialty’ and as new urban marketing strategy. This urban imagination of a borderless Trieste resonated widely in European political and scholarly discourse. Playing into nostalgic reconstructions of the city’s Habsburg past, it was cultivated through marketing campaigns put out by Trieste’s municipal government in the 1990s. In these campaigns, Trieste was presented as the historical site of a ‘grounded’ or ‘actually existing’ cosmopolitanism. This grounded cosmopolitanism was embedded in ‘naturally cosmopolitan’ historical places in the city, such as the Porto Vecchio or Citta Vecchia. In analyzing this, my discussion has showed how cosmopolitan narratives of Trieste’s past have been drawn into global discourses of urban renewal. Motivated by a desire to remake Trieste into a prosperous European cultural and economic hub, these cosmopolitan imaginaries stage Trieste as a tourist destination.

In Rijeka, too, local city-makers restaged narratives of a cosmopolitan past as part of urban renewal plans. Yet the political
and historical frames of reference were very different. From the 1990s onward, Rijekan projects of heritagization and city branding developed in a formerly Yugoslav context. Memories of Yugoslavia were retrieved within broader regional discourses as part of the dynamics of post-socialist recovery. What is more, claims about Rijeka’s particular position as one of Yugoslavia’s major port cities and a gateway to the ‘West’ draw upon narratives of Yugoslav socialism’s success in Rijeka, whether in relation to the labor system or the old politics of ‘brotherhood and unity.’ At the same time, Rijeka’s geographical and economic position in the Yugoslav state was somewhat peculiar: in many ways, the city developed along its own a distinct path.

Chapter 5 showed how projects of urban renewal and heritagization, which aimed at ‘recovering’ Rijeka after the collapse of Yugoslavia in the 1990s and 2000s, intermingled various ‘cosmopolitan’ narratives of Rijeka’s past. Moreover, I have highlighted how Rijekan policy-makers, the municipal government, and cultural practitioners and scholars have cultivated cosmopolitan historical narratives. Addressed to a new Europeanized cultural discourse, these narratives present Rijeka as key example of a society ‘united in diversity.’ With EU support, Rijekan city-makers employed the city’s cosmopolitan imaginaries to critically disengage from what they perceived as the national Croatian government’s right-wing nationalist politics. Rijeka capitalized on this strategy—of restaging cosmopolitan narratives of Rijeka’s past in the context of Europeanized notions of unity in diversity—in winning the nomination to be the European Capital of Culture in 2020. Rijeka’s ‘rediscovered’ and restaged cosmopolitanism was not only calculated to boost the faltering local economy. It has also allowed city-makers to reclaim ideological ownership of the city, which has been subjected to both Europeanized discourses of democracy and nationalizing tensions stemming from Croatia and the wider region.

This reworking of cosmopolitan narratives was by no means self-evident. In rebranding cosmopolitan narratives of their city, Rijekan city-makers managed to speak to a wider European audience. Similarly, Triestine plans to renew the Porto Vecchio or host an international MetaCarso project reached a wide audience through the international press. However, my analysis of city-branding and heritagization projects in both Rijeka and Trieste has also pointed out the difficulties faced by local policymakers in translating narratives of past placehood into simplified city branding able to speak to a broad contemporary, international audience. The challenge of concretizing a complex sense of cityness was even more acute in the case of Trieste, where city branding has drawn upon the city’s rich literary heritage. As I have described earlier in this conclusion, in this literary tradition triestinità evokes an embodied encounter with a city,
through which inhabitants and visitors alike inscribe personal narratives into the city. Indeed, to make sense of Trieste’s literary past, local city-makers created ways of reenacting, experiencing, and embodying literary cosmopolitanism ‘in place.’ These involved establishing a literary museum and inviting inhabitants and tourists to participate in literary walks and interactive engagements with statues of literary figures in the city center. These cultural projects did not present visitors to literary Trieste with fixed official account of literary aesthetics and the cosmopolitan past; instead, it invited them to experience and create their own narratives of the city. This research has shown how contemporary engagements with Trieste’s literary heritage have played a crucial but understudied role in creating a distinctly Triestine sense of cityness. In particular, these tourism and city-branding projects have shaped the meanings attributed to the idea of the ‘cosmopolitan city.’ As early as 2001, literary scholar Katia Pizzi observed that the idea of the literary ‘cosmopolitan border city’ might be Trieste’s best-known export, both in Italy and abroad (2001, 48-54). Nevertheless, almost two decades on, this is the first study to have explored the role of Trieste’s literary heritage in its city and tourist branding in detail.

To establish an account of how past experiences of cityness and imaginative cityscapes were cultivated and restaged in contemporary imaginations of Trieste and Rijeka, chapters 6 and 7 examined how cultural narratives were enrolled to remake the cities at particular urban sites. In the case of Trieste, I examined the place and significance of Caffè San Marco and the Pedocin beach in historical urban imaginations, showing how they have been functioned as key places in which to experience a distinct sense of a Triestine cityness. Recently, everyday experiences at the beach and the cafe have figured prominently in cultural representations. These places of encounter, these representations suggest, no longer belong solely to the elite poetic imaginations that have predominated in cultural narratives of Trieste. Indeed, the contemporary marketing of Caffè San Marco as a literary Habsburg coffeehouse is not only an economic venture but also an attempt to reclaim Trieste’s cultural past. The sense of place assigned to this cafe—which has proven central to its current success—has been generated through a restaging of historical narratives associated with the site. Presented as a historically significant cosmopolitan cafe, it has a complex global sense of place. A very different approach is taken by a documentary about the Pedocin beach, which critically moves away from Trieste’s intellectual poetic imaginations. Whereas the city’s beaches and sea have long been presented as a mythical and reflexive horizon connecting past and present, the filmmakers presented the beach instead as a site of tension between normalcy or everydayness on the one hand and conflicted historical imaginations on the other. In so doing, the documentary reconfigures experiences of the
beach as a ‘grounded’ cosmopolitan site, moving away from the received idea of the cosmopolitan encounter being a fundamentally intellectual act and embrace of openness towards difference. The cosmopolitan encounter is located instead in the *triestini’s* capacity to move between the various political and historical worlds that have always surrounded their city.

I have shown that in Rijeka, too, cultural narratives of the city have been actively remade at particular urban sites. My chosen sites in Trieste evoked forms of ‘cultural citizenship,’ in that they relate to intellectual processes of writing scripts for the public sphere. My analysis of sites in Rijeka, in contrast, showed how imaginative cityscapes encouraged not only acts of cultural citizenship, but political activism too. Chapter 7 discussed the Rikard Benčić factory and Rijeka’s National Theater, showing how these sites have inspired imaginations of wealth, decay and experiences of change. Both sites have been presented as embodying the ‘soul’ of the city. Recent cultural representations of these urban sites—a documentary film about the factory and performance in front of the theater—have been critically interrogated and reactivated existing cultural narratives concerning them. In these representations of the factory and theater, my analysis has shown, cosmopolitanism is associated not with a past flourishing industrial and cultural activity, but rather with the ability to criticize and rise up against the municipal government and Croatian state. Through these embodied representations, both sites come to evoke civic empowerment. Both the documentary and performance staged Rijeka’s heritage sites as places of cosmopolitan critique leveled against to the nationalizing politics put forward by state governments.

Through these analyses, this study has shown how particular urban sites in Rijeka and Trieste were not only subject to wider geopolitical forces in the region. Beyond this, they have been instrumentalized by local city-makers as means of remaking of the city and realigning the urban citizenry in relation to a wider globalizing world.

**Rediscovering Cosmopolitan Border Cities**

The making and remaking of senses of cityness in Trieste and Rijeka constitutes a key dynamic in the politics of belonging and citizenship in the Adriatic region. My study has brought to the fore three strongly interrelated manifestations of the senses of cityness characteristic of the two cities: cultural citizenship, borderland experience, and a cosmopolitan imaginary.

As I have outlined in the above discussion, historical processes of city-making are acts of cultural citizenship. Various forms of cultural citizenship have cropped up in accounts of city-making throughout my
research. Yet, they were all based on a common starting point: namely, a relationship between the citizen and state that defines citizenship not legally or geographically, but through common experiences, learning processes, empowering discourses, and imaginations of being-in-the-world. Moreover, whether in cultural practice or political performance, acts of cultural citizenship often indicate an acute awareness of the past. Often knowingly, they reclaim a particular historicity. The Triestine and Rijekan city-makers examined in this study revealed multiple manifestations, imaginations, and experiences of cityness. Expressions, representations, and performances of these imaginations figure acts of empowerment. Through them, urban citizens have autonomously established ways of relating to the ruling governments and political discourses circulating around them. Cultural citizenship involves creating novel civic conditions and forms of belonging. In these tasks, cultural citizenship has dovetailed with practices of cultivating cityness.

Alongside the focus on particular cities and their cultures, my conclusions in this study also highlight the importance of borderlands as a key force in the formation of citizenship in Europe. My research connects up with a growing body of scholarship concerned to open up existing approaches to belonging, nationalism, and citizenship. Even today, the development of modern ideas of citizenship is still often traced back to the aftermath of the French Revolution, as it played out in western European capitals. My study has espied another, parallel path along which a European public sphere developed: historical experiences of cityness in the Adriatic borderland. In showing how the Adriatic borderland has been a site of significant intercultural transmission and political transformation in Europe, my findings confirm arguments made by scholars of European borderlands and transnational regional spaces (Balibar 2004a, 2004b; Zanou 2018; Kirchner Reill 2012; Chambers 2008). Experiences, imaginations, and representations of border cities—with all their various shifting forms and meanings—have been crucial in the development of characteristic senses of cityness in Trieste and Rijeka. Imagining themselves as citizens of a border city has provided city-makers with an opportunity to fashion alternative ways of being-in-the-world.

Urban border experiences are a prominent feature of the cosmopolitan imaginations that have emerged in both cities. In Trieste and Rijeka, the condition of being, or belonging to, a border city has been overdetermined, that is, shaped by multiple interests. That condition has been performed in a number of media, from literary novels, through European Capital of Culture, to theater performances. These ‘performances’ tend to emphasize urban pasts. In my investigation, it has emerged that these imaginations of the border city have been central
to processes of cosmopolitanization of Trieste and Rijeka. Indeed, the condition of being border cities has been taken as the focus of both cultural production and a distinct cultural-political European discourse. The cities have functioned as nodal points in this discourse: models for the post-Cold War and post-conflict European ideal of open, tolerant, and inclusive societies. Drawing on the insights from the field of critical border studies, I have approached borders as a series of practices and performances. In so doing, I have highlighted the contingency and historical dynamism of borders and conceptions of borders (Parker and Vaughan-Williams 2012; Parker et al. 2009). To this field, this study contributes a grounded analysis of border imaginations, which does not take the border as a pre-given geopolitical phenomenon. Instead, it problematizes imaginations of borders, seeing them as in a constant state of becoming and aiming to understand the work that border imaginations perform (Parker and Vaughan-Williams 2012, 728).

The ‘rediscovery’ of Trieste and Rijeka as cosmopolitan border cities in contemporary city-marketing and tourist branding, I have shown, has discursively reimagined the ‘cosmopolitan European city.’ It is also a peculiarly reflective form of nostalgia. As Svetlana Boym has put it (2001, xviii), this nostalgia works not by longing for a past that no longer exists or even never existed. Instead, it thrives on longing in its own right, dwelling on the ‘ambivalences of human longing and belonging.’ In Rijeka, this revival of an imagined cosmopolitan past draws on intersecting imperial memories of Hungarian and Yugoslav histories; in Trieste, it draws on memories of the Austrian Empire and the Cold-War. Svetlana Boym has remarked that surges of nostalgia often follow revolutions. What she writes about the cultural manifestations of longing that accompanied the French Revolution also holds true for the ‘revolution’ of the nation-state in the Adriatic region: in France it was ‘not only the ancient régime that produced the revolution, but in some respect the revolution produced the ancient régime, giving it a shape, a sense of closure, and a gilded aura’ (2001, xviii). A similar situation can be seen in the former Habsburg Adriatic: although the heterogeneous cosmopolitan empire preconditioned the emergence of national consciousness, national consciousness also produced the cosmopolitan empire, at least to a degree. The new national dispensation gave rise to ‘unrealized dreams of the past and visions of the future that became obsolete’ (2001, xvii). This is not to say anything especially new about the mythologization of the Habsburg past. Scholars of the nostalgia for not only the Habsburg Empire but also the idea of Mitteleuropa more generally have emphasized how these longings largely arose in response to the rise of exclusivist nationalism. It expressed a desire to recover local or individual forms of agency that preceded nationalist or totalitarian centralization (Baskar 2004; Magris [1963] 1982; Kundera
In addition, my research has shown how cosmopolitan imaginaries of the Habsburg past in my chosen cities have intersected with different memories of cosmopolitanism in the Adriatic. In the case of Trieste, these memories have to do with its history as a Cold-War border city; in Rijeka, they concern its strong civil society in the period of the Yugoslav state. From the 1990s onward, the reinvention of Trieste and Rijeka as cosmopolitan border cities has brought these various legacies together to produce new geopolitical imaginations. Through these nostalgic discourses, citizens participate in performing forms of metropolitan longing and belonging against the backdrop of national politics and global flows.

This study has problematized the processes of cosmopolitanization, critically highlighting what imaginations of border cities do. What is more, I have set out the various implications of the cosmopolitan narrative frames that have been imposed on histories of Trieste and Rijeka. Attributing a cosmopolitan past to the city has done more than simply lay claim to empowering civic histories. Among some, celebrating the image of the cosmopolitan city is also a way of critiquing the indifference of urban society, in that in a cosmopolitan city citizen can easily withdraw from critical debate in the public sphere. In other cases, a cosmopolitan narrative of a flourishing past made the contemporary city seem stagnant, for in this discourse the future can never be so prosperous as what has come before. In exploring the imaginative power of cityscapes, then, my study has broached the fraught and complex processes through which cities are ‘cosmopolitanized.’ These dynamics, I would suggest, merit further research.

**Future Research Directions**

This research has attempted to show how an appreciation of grounded histories and geographies of cityness allows us to understand how citizens fashion alternative imaginations and experiences of their way of being-in-the-world. In so doing, it raises a number of questions and several new research directions concerning the concept of cultural citizenship. This concept, I have suggested, involves the creation for new conditions of citizenship and belonging. As such, it works in tandem with the cultivation of ‘cityness.’ In a borderland, where states and governments are constantly changing, cultural citizenship has and still does provide a channel through which citizens can express their relation to the other and the world. This form of citizenship operates ‘between the lines’ or ‘beyond’ the juridical and political institutionalized scripts of the state.

As a persistent form of political practice beyond the state, cultural
citizenship should be distinguished from another well-known borderland phenomenon: political regionalism. This study has not discussed the regionalist movements in and around contemporary Trieste and Rijeka, including Istria, in any great detail. The reason for that is that the aim of these movements (which include Movimento Trieste Libera, Movimento Territorio Libero di Trieste, Lista za Rijeku, and Istarski Demokratski Sabor [IDS-DDI]) is to establish territorial, juridical, and political autonomy on the basis of their city or region’s multicultural, linguistic, and historical distinctiveness.\(^{452}\) Autonomous movements’ claims are often strengthened by EU regional policies, which emphasize the uniqueness of small European regions and importance of regional minority rights. Moreover, the EU provides regional movements with an institutional platform on which to voice their struggles.\(^{453}\) Despite these movements’ critiques of existing states, they often define themselves according to the same logics of citizenship and state belonging that prevails in the states and system they rail against. In the case of Istrian regionalist movements, for instance, Pamela Ballinger remarked that:

> the Istrian regional identity contains its own exclusions and has not succeeded in maintaining certain forms of intercultural communication across the Istrian peninsula. The territorialized understanding of identity – of belonging to a place, as well as to a community of speakers of various linguistic variants – means that this multiculturalism does not entirely escape the logics of territorialized states, even when it positions itself against the state (and beyond that state, below the state, and so on) (Ballinger 2014 2017, 116).

New research into the dynamics of cultural citizenship in relation to regionalism in the Adriatic and other European borderlands might offer answers as to why certain regional identities spawn political movements while others do not. It is important to stress, though, how the visibility of autonomist movements, and their strongly politicized regionalist discourses, tends to overshadow non-separatist expressions of alternative belonging and citizenship in the Adriatic.\(^{454}\)

What is more, focusing on cultural citizenship might offer new perspectives on the highly complex and contentious dynamics of citizenship formation in the territory of former Yugoslavia. Scholars of post-Yugoslav citizenship have recently established new frameworks for grasping how citizens have fashioned activist forms of citizenship within, and in response to, highly nationalized post-Yugoslav societies (Shaw and Štiks 2012). Investigating citizenship dynamics through the lens of cultural citizenship would afford insights into how citizens have
defended and claimed their rights, and, in the process, leveled a critique at nationalized state cultures and identity politics. Furthermore, it would help us to understand the intellectual processes at work in empowering discourses of activist citizenship in the post-Yugoslav region.

The lens of cultural citizenship also opens up new avenues of research that reach beyond the Adriatic borderland. Perhaps the most pressing of these to be highlighted in this study concerns the ‘rediscovery’ of the city’s significance in the geopolitical and social structures of twenty-first century European societies. Increasingly, cities are being envisioned as the sites of putative solutions to a host of challenges in contemporary Europe. Indeed, the cosmopolitanization of Rijeka and Trieste within a Europeanized discourse promoting a united and inclusive future forms part of a wider set of dynamics in urban geopolitical imaginings. Cities are acting as quasi-state actors, taking the lead in questions of climate change, the management of migrants, security strategies, and issues of diversity and cohabitation. Indeed, sometimes they even engage in international relations through urban diplomacy. In fact, the EU has recently assigned cities a formal role in the creation of inclusive, diverse societies: the forceful EU Urban Agenda includes not only the European Capital of Culture program but also the EUROCITIES network. Cities are therefore regaining—indeed, perhaps they never lost—their geopolitical prominence. When taken as the subject of positive urban narratives, cities are presented as places of social experimentalism. When framed negatively, however, these same cities are perceived as the refuges of an estranged cosmopolitan elite, detached from the concerns of ordinary people.

The challenge in all this is not only that of making cityness productive as an imaginative discourse, but of having it resonate beyond state frameworks. In the geopolitical games in which contemporary cities are engaged, the city is still often imagined as an alternative to the state. The trope of ‘Mayors who rule the world’ draws upon an idealistic and in many ways erroneous assumption that cities are the new nation-states. Moreover, this idea is also often bound up with neoliberal understandings of urban governance, drawing upon the imagination of creating ‘productive’ cultural opportunities for a given city. More research on cultural citizenship across a range of European cities might offer opportunities for looking beyond these neoliberal discourses of cityness. Indeed, such work would be able to grasp how urban inhabitants make sense of their world beyond and in between state-bound logics. This is especially interesting in relation to those EU cultural policy instruments that are inherently state-centric. The support of cities by means of EU funds, policies, and programs only underlines the fact that cities are also part of a different, multi-state political community, for such instruments
can only be assigned to cities from ‘Europe’. Given this, it is worth exploring the opportunities offered by approaching cityness and geopolitical imaginations of the city through the lens of cultural citizenship. What acts of cultural citizenship are performed daily in Europe’s cities, and how do urban denizens and city-makers mobilize these to engage questions as diverse as climate change, migration, security, and diversity that shape everyday life in urban societies? It would also be worth exploring whether and how cultural citizenship could offer opportunities for the EU’s quest to refashion understandings of European citizenship.

Further developing a method able to reveal the dynamics of cultural citizenship could thus provide crucial insights into various fields of research. It could allow scholars to read ‘between the lines’ of pasts and presents beyond or outside the institutionalized state scripts. This study has contributed to explanations of the distinct senses of cityness that prevail in the Adriatic borderland. Instead of adopting a state-based perspective, I have underlined the importance of studying how Adriatic cultural and political actors create and enact their own scripts. Whether in the domain of belonging, historicity, identity politics, or borders, these acts of citizenship lie beyond and between the institutionalized frameworks of the state. Cityness and imaginative cityscapes have indeed been key forces in the politics of belonging and citizenship in the Adriatic region. Urban imaginations of Trieste and Rijeka have been perpetually reimagined and cultivated. Nevertheless, in this study I hope to have established that the symbolic capacities of border cities and urban cultural politics should not be underestimated.