Laurajane Smith

Centre of Critical Heritage and Museum Studies, School of Archaeology and Anthropology, the Australian National University.
CAMBERRA_AUSTRALIA

Professor of heritage and museum studies, director of the Centre of Critical Heritage and Museum Studies, School of Archaeology and Anthropology, at the Australian National University, Canberra. She is working on a long-term research project concerned with identifying the memory and identity work visitors undertake while visiting heritage sites and museums. She is editor of the *International Journal of Heritage Studies* and co-general editor of Routlege's Key Issues in Cultural Heritage Series.

Intangible Heritage: A challenge to the authorised heritage discourse?

The Unesco Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage has significantly raised international and community awareness of the legitimacy of the concept of intangible heritage. Although, in raising this awareness, the Convention has not yet provided a framework that privileges the community/sub-national orientation of intangible heritage. This paper argues that definitions and ideas of heritage developed by national and international agencies such as UNESCO and ICOMOS need challenging and reconsidering. The dichotomy between tangible and intangible heritage needs re-thinking, and indeed, I posit all heritage is intangible.

La Convenció de la UNESCO per a la Salvaguarda del Patrimoni Cultural Immaterial ha fet augmentar de manera considerable la consciència internacional i comunitària de la legitimitat del concepte de patrimoni immaterial. Així i tot, a l'hora de fer augmentar aquesta consciència, la Convenció encara no ha proporcionat un marc que prioritzi l'orientació comunitària-subnacional del patrimoni immaterial. Aquest document planteja que les definicions i les idees de patrimoni desenvolupades per les agències nacionals i internacionals, com la UNESCO i l'ICOMOS, necessiten nous reptes i consideracions. La dicotomia entre el patrimoni tangible i l'intangible s'ha de repensar i, certament, jo suggereixo que tot el patrimoni és immaterial.

Introduction

Through its development and implementation of a range of Conventions and other treaties, UNESCO, since the late 1950s, has provided the dominant intellectual and policy framework for international understandings and debates about the nature and value of heritage. The World Heritage Convention, 1972, in particular has not simply influenced management practices; it has defined the ways in which heritage as a cultural phenomenon has been understood. This understanding was potentially challenged by the implementation of the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage,* 2003 (hereafter, ICHC). Indeed, Chérif Khaznadar (2012: 18), President, La Maison des Cultures du Monde, likened the advent of this Convention to the opening of 'Pandora's Box', its implementation he suggested presented significant challenges to established international understandings of heritage embedded in the World Heritage Convention.

Keywords: Intangible Heritage, cultural heritage, UNESCO

Paraules clau: patrimoni immaterial, UNESCO, patrimoni cultural

The tenth anniversary of the adoption of the ICHC has marked assessments of the impact of the convention, in terms of not only its achievements in safeguarding intangible heritage, but also its intellectual impact on heritage debates (see for example, IRCI, 2012, 2013). One of the key issues emerging in this assessment is the problem presented by the way the ICHC has addressed the issue of 'community' (Khaznadar, 2012; IRCI, 2013). The issue of 'community' had been a central focus in the development and drafting of the Convention and the various debates around it (Blake, 2009). However, the Convention is facing increasing criticism over its inability to deal meaningfully with concepts of community, and this criticism reveals a range of limitations with the framing and implementation of the Convention. Rather than opening Pandora's Box, the development of the ICHC has tended to add yet another category to established international understandings of heritage (natural and cultural), and has yet to fundamentally redefine

Revista d'Etnologia de Catalunya _ Juny 2015 _ Núm. 40

the conceptual frameworks within which heritage is understood. Indeed, the drafting of the Convention was significantly constrained by the dominance of the European Authorized Heritage Discourse (AHD) within UNESCO, and its implementation has become restricted by the subsequent requirement written into the Convention to operate through state parties, rather than directly with communities and other sub-national groups. In 2004, Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett warned that the development of an Intangible Heritage List based on state sponsored nominations had the potential to create a list that was: 'a list of that which is not indigenous, not minority, and not non-Western, though no less intangible' (2004: 57). This prediction, I argue, may well have been realised. In developing this argument, the paper re-asserts my point that 'all heritage is intangible' (Smith, 2006: 3, 2011a) and argues that this, rather than UNESCO ratified definitions of heritage as natural/cultural and/or intangible/tangible, is a more useful point from which to think about the phenomenon that is defined as 'heritage'.

Pandora's Box?

The opening of Pandora's Box (or jar), so the tale goes, saw the release of a range of evils on humanity, and, as such, is a curious metaphor for Khaznadar to have use in assessing the impact of the Convention. Perhaps the metaphor is illustrative of the uncertainty that the Convention has caused in some arenas. While the Convention was adopted unopposed in 2003, there was nonetheless some trepidation expressed about the nature and utility of the Convention, particularly in the context of Western heritage scholarship and practice. For some, this concern focused on what were perceived as the inherent and highly political nature of intangible heritage and its potential impact on human rights (Logan, 2007); others were concerned that such a Convention would lead to the fossilization of dynamic cultural practices (for example, van Zanten, 2004), while others found the very concept simply difficult to grasp or understand (see Kurin, 2004; Hafstein, 2009; Smith and Waterton, 2009a for a critique of this). This unease centred on the challenges the Convention posed to dominant conceptualisations of heritage at work within UNESCO, ICOMOS and other international agencies.

Celebració del *Nowruz*, que cada 21 de març assenyala l'inici de l'any nou dins una gran zona geogràfica repartida entre els països d'Azerbaidjan, la *Índia*, Iran, Kirguizistan, Pakistan, Turquia i Uzbekistan. L'any 2009 el *Nowruz* fou inclòs a la Llista Representativa del Patrimoni Cultural Immaterial de la Humanitat de la Convenció 2003 de la UNESCO. Abril de 2011. JIM.HENDERSON. WIKIMEDIA COMMONS (CC0 1.0).

As I have argued elsewhere (2006, 2011b), the conceptualisation of heritage and the practices and policies that flowed from that conce´ptualisation were, and continue to be, framed by the authorised heritage discourse (AHD). This professional discourse emerged from nineteenth century debates in western European architectural and archaeological scholarship about the need to protect material culture that scholars deemed to be of innate and inheritable value (Smith, 2006). The AHD defines heritage as material, non-renewable and fragile.

WHAT IS OFTEN AT STAKE FOR SUB-NATIONAL INTERESTS IN ANY HERITAGE CONSULTATION PROCESS WILL FOCUS ON MORE THAN WHETHER OR NOT AN INSTANCE OF HERITAGE IS SAFEGUARDED, BUT MAY ALSO INCLUDE CONCERNS ABOUT CULTURAL SOVEREIGNTY AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OR RECOGNITION OF IDENTITY CLAIMS (SMITH AND WATERTON, 2009B:77F)

It privileges aesthetically pleasing material objects, sites, places and/or landscapes. Their fragility requires that current generations must care for, protect and venerate these things so that they may be inherited by future generations. Within this framework heritage is something that is 'found', it has an innate value, the authenticity of which that will 'speak' to a common and shared sense of human identity. This understanding of heritage became entangled with discourses of nationhood, citizenship and nationalism. Within the AHD heritage is primarily understood as being of value to and intimately linked to national identities or collectives. Heritage needs to be protected, as the AHD intones, as something that will not only 'speak to' present and future generations and ensure their understanding of their 'place' in the world, but will define those generations as citizens of particular national collectives. However, it falls to those experts who are concerned with the material world, such as archaeologists, architects and art historians amongst others, to reveal and protect the 'authenticity', value and meaning of this fragile material heritage. Within the AHD, these experts are defined as the custodians of the human past, whose professional duty it is to not only safeguard but to also provide stewardship for the way the value of heritage is communicated to and understood by non-expert communities.

The AHD underwrote the development of the World Heritage Convention (Smith, 2006). Consequently, UNESCO and many of its practices came under sustained criticism for its Eurocentric understanding of heritage, but also for providing a forum within which nation states may assert their historical and cultural legitimacy and international worth, a process which inevitably favoured western Europe (for example, Byrne, 1991; Lowenthal, 1996; Meskell 2002; Munjeri, 2004 amongst others). This criticism came not only from scholars, but also from Indigenous communities and countries whose perception of heritage tended to be excluded by the AHD generally, and the World Heritage Convention in particular, indeed UNESCO faced intense lobbying from a number of countries to address this omission (Aikawa-Faure, 2009). The ICHC, it was hoped, offered a remedy to this exclusion, and aimed to champion a wider and more inclusive understanding of heritage.

The advent of the ICHC has indeed marked a significant shift in debates over the nature and meaning of heritage in both academia and professional practice. In drawing attention to intangible heritage, the Convention not only added a new category to material cultural and natural heritage, it potentially offered a challenge to the AHD, not simply by drawing attention to the variety of ways in which intangible heritage could be expressed, but also by aiming to privilege the heritage of communities and other sub-national groups. In doing so, the Convention drew attention to the possibility that sub-national heritage (either intangible or material) had legitimacy within an international arena. Scholars and practitioners have been working to reconsider and assess the impact the idea of intangible heritage has had on general heritage practices (see for example Silverman and Ruggles, 2009; Skounti and Tebbaa, 2011; IRCI, 2012) and museum practices (Kreps, 2009; Alivizatou, 2012), and the concept has also been used to reassess ideas of natural heritage (Dorfman, 2012). Certainly the ICHC has had a significant intellectual impact in widening the debate about the nature and meaning of heritage, but to what extent the AHD has been challenged and to what extent the aims of community inclusion have been met is as yet uncertain. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett's (2004) prediction that the Convention would simply produce another list may seem harsh, given the debate that has been sparked. However, the implementation of the ICHC, and the issues this has highlighted, are revealing and suggest that she may be right.

Just Another list?

In reviewing the impact of the Convention, the issue of community has been a key concern (ICRI, 2012, 2013). Lucus Lixinski's (2011) recent assessment is particularly telling. In analysing the content and listing processes of the Convention, Lixinski points out that the Convention's reliance on State Parties to nominate and assess items for the list results in both the marginalisation of community interests and ensures the appropriation of community heritage as a state or national asset (see also ICRI, 2013). As he argues, the requirement for national governments to oversee the nomination and listing process has meant that in many cases an often problematic and cursory process of consultation with communities has been entered into. While the convention may be designed to promote the development of national measures for the safeguarding of intangible heritage, it is also 'incapable of offering remedies for misappropriation by third parties, particularly when the third party is the state' (Lixinski, 2011: 94). As Lixinski argues, China's successful inscribing of the Tibetan Opera in the Representative list can be seen on one hand as a positive outreach and inclusive initiative. On the other hand, it can also be seen as an attempt by central government to control cultural manifestations and 'subordinating its political caveats to tourism, promotion, and other economic interests, as well as to a larger national Chinese identity, ultimately diminishing the political strength of the Tibetan cultural and all political claims of Tibetans' (2011: 96). As Lenzerini (2011: 118) observes, the ephemeral nature of intangible heritage makes it easily appropriated 'by the stereotyped cultural models prevailing at any given time'. In effect, the ICHC, much like the World Heritage Convention, becomes an arena through which nation's may parade and assert 'their' heritage. Moreover, expertise has becoming increasingly employed by states to ratify and reassure state parties about the 'authenticity' and legitimacy of community heritage. This recreates and perpetuates, as Lixinski notes, the prominent role of heritage professionals over that of heritage bearers set out under the AHD (2011: 96). In short, the promotion of heritage bearers and

> **WHILE THE CONVENTION WAS ADOPTED UNOPPOSED IN 2003, THERE WAS NONETHELESS SOME TREPIDATION EXPRESSED ABOUT THE NATURE AND UTILITY OF THE CONVENTION, PARTICULARLY IN THE CONTEXT OF WESTERN HERITAGE SCHOLARSHIP AND PRACTICE**

Actors de l'Òpera Tibetana, espectacle teatral i musical que l'any 2009 va ser inclosa a la Llista Representativa del Patrimoni Cultural Immaterial de la Humanitat de la Convenció 2003 de la UNESCO. circa 1932. WIKIMEDIA COMMONS.

their communities that was aimed for by the development of the Convention appears to have been increasingly marginalised by national priorities. Moreover, it reaffirms that heritage is not only 'naturally' the responsibility of national agencies, but is also reinforces the AHD's assertion that heritage *is* representative of 'the nation'.

Lixinski (2011) calls for a reconsideration of the operational guidelines for greater community involvement and re-framing and strengthening of the obligations of state parties to engage in more effective and meaningful consultation with communities. This was a call echoed by many of the chapters in the IRCI (2013) report, which stressed that the role of expertise should focus on ensuring that State Parties undertook effective and fully informed consultation with communities and heritage bearers to be affected by proposed listings. However, any increase in the role of experts at the international level should concurrently see, as Lixinski (2011) argues, an increase in the participation of sub-national interests and representatives in not only the processes of the convention, but also in the development of policy and guidelines and inscription criteria.

While Lixinski (2011) has identified some of the operational problems with the Convention, there are four conceptual issues, linked to the AHD, that have also worked to impede the development and implementation of this Convention, and that stand in the way of increasing community parity in participation. In addition, these issues have limited the wider conceptual impact of this Convention. These issues stem from the way UNESCO and wider heritage practices and debates address issues of consultation, community, politics and the economic valuation of either material or intangible heritage. I will look at each of these in turn.

Consultation

One of the significant issues faced by the implementation of the ICHC centres on the idea of 'consultation'. What is meant by consultation is often not clearly defined. However, a significant body of literature now exists that has explored the relationships between communities and heritage professionals, particularly around the vexing concept of 'consultation'. A frequent observation that emerges within this literature is the degree to which the discourse of 'consultation' is often identified by community and other sub-national interests as simply a cynical exercise of 'box ticking' (see Lagerkvist, 2006; Tlili, 2008; Drake, 2009; Smith and Waterton, 2009b; Waterton and Watson, 2010). Consultation without negotiation becomes simply an exercise in canvassing opinion. The importance of dialogue and the ability to negotiate are key issues in any heritage consultation process (Lagerkvist, 2006; Smith and Fouseki, 2011). What is often at stake for sub-national interests in any heritage consultation process will focus on more than whether or not an instance of heritage is safeguarded, but may also include concerns about cultural sovereignty and acknowledgement or recognition of identity claims (Smith and Waterton, 2009b:77f). The degree to which consultation often fails is the primacy of place given to expertise within the AHD; this makes it hard for expertise to engage with consultation practices that incorporate a sense of negotiation.

IN ANALYSING THE CONTENT AND LISTING PROCESSES OF THE CONVENTION, LIXINSKI POINTS OUT THAT THE CONVENTION'S RELIANCE ON STATE PARTIES TO NOMINATE AND ASSESS ITEMS FOR THE LIST RESULTS IN BOTH THE MARGINALISATION OF COMMUNITY INTERESTS AND ENSURES THE APPROPRIATION OF COMMUNITY HERITAGE AS A STATE OR NATIONAL ASSET (SEE ALSO ICRI, 2013)

Ideas of community

The idea of community is also not clearly defined in the Convention as various commentators have noted (Blake, 2009; Khaznadar, 2012). However, there is nonetheless an unacknowledged and problematic definition at play in the Convention. Commonly used words, such as 'community', can take on 'common sense' definitions. Community, at least within European and larger Western contexts, has, as Zygmunt Bauman (2001) notes, taken on a warm, feel good sentiment. 'Community' is often mobilised as a catch phrase within cultural and other forms of public policy as it promotes a sense of doing 'good works'. As 'community', as Bauman observes, feels good, whatever the term may actually mean, it feels good to be *in* a community, to *have* a community or to be working *with* a community:

> Community is a 'warm' place, a cosy and comfortable place. It is like a roof under which we shelter in heavy rain, like a fireplace at which we warm our hands on a frosty day. Out there, in the street, all sorts of dangers lie in ambush…In here, in the community, we can relax – we are safe… (2001: 1-2).

To what extent can we regard the ICHC as UNESCO's 'good works'? This question may seem overly sceptical, but nonetheless it raises a serious issue: how

Revista d'Etnologia de Catalunya _ Juny 2015 _ Núm. 40

seriously and to what extent can the ICHC influence wider UNESCO and other international understandings and heritage practices? The universalising importance of the World Heritage list is effectively insulated from any sense that the ICHC represents outreach to non-Western conceptualizations of heritage because it is perceived and handled as a 'special' project. The advent of the idea of intangible heritage has not challenged assumptions about the legitimacy or inherent universal relevance of the World Heritage List, as intangible heritage has been treated as another concept to be tacked on to existing definitions. There is a sense that it is treated as something 'special' to certain non-western groups, rather than as something more universally applicable. Research with non-expert communities is starting to reveal that public or community understanding of the concept of 'heritage' in Western contexts does not necessarily share the core definitions offered by the professional AHD, and often incorporates understandings of heritage that finds synergy with the concept of 'intangible heritage' (see Smith, 2006; Robertson, 2012; chapters in Smith et al., 2011). The degree to which engagement with community or sub-national groups in the ICHC is compromised by issues of, or at least rhetorical claims to, state sovereignty is in part an international administrative problem, but also a problem of commitment to the idea of heritage as non-material and as a legitimate non-national project.

The issue of politics

Complicating the above issues further is the way in the question of politics and power is dealt with within the AHD. Within this dominant discourse, heritage professionals are defined as objective actors in the management process, and 'politics' is something communities have but professionals do not. Indeed, there is a tendency to relegate and thus dismiss political issues tied to questions over the disposition and management of either material or intangible heritage as simply 'identity politics'. The idea that the cultural phenomenon that is heritage is inherently political should be understood, after all conflicts over heritage abound. However, an understanding of these conflicts, and the dissonant nature of heritage, continually fail to be addressed in the way that heritage is defined, valued and managed. During and following the drafting of the ICHC there was considerable debate by academics and practitioners about the so-called inherently political nature of intangible heritage, and that such heritage had immediate implications for human rights issues (see commentary in Aikawa-Faure, 2009; Logan, 2007). What was interesting about this debate was that it was carried on in such a way that strongly implied that in some way tangible heritage did not suffer from these political issues. But of course, all heritage is dissonant (Smith, 2006: 82; see also Graham et al., 2000) and it is so because no heritage site, place or intangible event can be universally or uniformly valued or perceived to have the same meaning to all cultures or peoples. The discourse of universal value championed by UNESCO is a rhetorical device designed to give legitimacy to World Heritage listing. However, what it also does is mask the political nature of heritage – if something is of universal value, there cannot be dissonance, there cannot be conflict and thus it is not political.

THE ADVENT OF THE IDEA OF INTANGIBLE HERITAGE HAS NOT CHALLENGED ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT THE LEGITIMACY OR INHERENT UNIVERSAL RELEVANCE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST, AS INTANGIBLE HERITAGE HAS BEEN TREATED AS ANOTHER CONCEPT TO BE TACKED ON TO EXISTING DEFINITIONS

To understand the political nature of heritage it is useful to consider the politics of recognition. There is considerable debate in political philosophy over the conceptualisation of the 'politics of recognition'. For some this recognition centres of a desire or emotional need for recognition (Taylor, 1992; Honneth, 2005 [1995]). However, recognition as defined by Nancy Fraser (2000, 2001) and Iris Young (2000), is conceived as addressing more than a human need, and is understood to be explicitly linked to negotiations over social justice issues. Indeed, the recognition or misrecognition of identity claims by marginalised or disenfranchised groups and communities is understood as having direct consequences for that group's inclusion or exclusion in policy negotiations over the distribution of resources. Appeals to heritage and the past, or in Sharon Macdonald's' (2013) terms, making the past present through heritage, lend historical and cultural legitimacy to claims to difference and particular claims to identity. Within the politics of recognition claims to identity cannot be dismissed as identity politics as the aim is not to simply cultivate mutual identification (Young, 2010: 107). Rather, identity claims that seek recognition seek legitimisation not only of identity, but also of the special claims to redress the experiences and material consequences of injustices that being a member of a particular identity group may have entailed. This does not mean that all claims for recognition of identity claims need necessarily be listened

to or addressed. As Fraser contends, not every claim to recognition should necessarily be legitimised, and those requiring recognition must show, firstly, that majority cultural norms deny justice and, secondly, that any remedies to injustice do not themselves deny equality to group or non-group members (2001: 35). The important point for understanding the political nature of heritage is that firstly, the politics of recognition allows for the observation that different community groups, with different histories, needs, aspirations and identities, make claims for recognition in both symbolic and material forms, and that these claims for recognition will have material consequences for equity and justice. Secondly, heritage in both material and intangible forms has become taken up as a specific resource in the negotiations of recognition and identity claims; it *is* a political resource.

UNESCO is a project of legitimization, an authorizing institution that provides recognition and authority to certain expressions of culture and heritage. As such, UNESCO is daily engaged in political acts of recognising and/or misrecognising claims to identity and cultural diversity. Heritage, entangled as it is in the contemporary politics of diversity and recognition, is a concept or a discourse that has acquired the power to represent and legitimise senses of place and belonging, all of which are embroiled in conflicts within the politics of recognition. However, rather than engage with these issues, heritage practices and the Conventions and other treaties that frame those practices work to de-politicise management practices. In focusing heritage practices on the management of the material or intangible heritage element, the wider political context within which the heritage item or event may sit becomes obscured or deemed irrelevant. However, 'heritage', whether intangible or material, cannot be 'protected' or safeguarded unless it is used, and made meaningful, in the context of contemporary needs and aspirations of the communities to whom it is significant. Heritage management, as I have argued elsewhere (Smith, 2004), becomes a process of de-politicising recognition claims as the focus of concern becomes issues of safeguarding the 'authenticity' of a heritage item or event. Heritage management is a process in which not only cultural change is 'managed' through the way items, events and ideas of heritage are controlled, but it is also a process fundamentally concerned with 'managing' and regulating cultural conflicts. The European AHD itself can be viewed as a project in maintaining, and indeed recognising and legitimising, a particular understanding of human history and the role of particular regions within that history.

Economic values

The forth issue that helps to impede the conceptual impact of the idea of intangible heritage is that of the concept of the economic value of heritage. Tourism is often reviled in the UNESCO listing processes – it is seen as something that, through commodification, will inevitably debase the purity of intangible or tangible heritage (Ashworth, 2009). State parties are criticised for listing as a cynical aim to raise tourist revenue. The idea of the tourist is dominated by the image of shallow and gullible seekers of entertainment, banal, loud, naïve and, most damning of all, uncultured (Graburn and Barthel-Bouchier, 2001:149). This perception appears to drive expert reactions to tourism, which while often economically driven, nonetheless also poses a complex cultural and political engagement with heritage. The AHD defines 'tourism' associated with heritage as a 'problem' to be solved, a threat to the sustainability and authenticity of all forms of heritage or as a threat to the physical fabric of tangible heritage. This issue links back to the way the AHD tends to frame the relationship between expertise and other users of heritage. The idea of the expert as steward, facilitates the way other users interact with either intangible or tangible heritage, and other users need to be managed so that they do not alter the values of heritage that have been defined by the expert. The relationship tends to be conceived by the AHD and associated heritage practices as a one-way linear flow of communication and information rather than as a dialogic interaction one over a shared interest. The point to stress here is that visiting heritage sites and intangible cultural practices is an integral part of the heritage moment, which also serves a political and cultural purpose for both visitors and those visited. Tourism cannot be simply dismissed as something that 'happens' to world heritage sites or expressions of intangible heritage once they appear on an international list, but rather heritage tourism is an integral process of heritage making (Smith et al., 2012). Indeed, the cultural as well

THROUGH ITS DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A RANGE OF CONVENTIONS AND OTHER TREATIES, UNESCO, SINCE THE LATE 1950S, HAS PROVIDED THE DOMINANT INTELLECTUAL AND POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDINGS AND DEBATES ABOUT THE NATURE AND VALUE OF HERITAGE

Revista d'Etnologia de Catalunya _ Juny 2015 _ Núm. 40

Cartell que anuncia que l'any 2003 la UNESCO va declarar el treball artesanal de la fusta del poble Zafimaniry (Madagascar) Obra Mestra del Patrimoni Oral i Immaterial de la Humanitat. Novembre de 2007. AQUINTERO82. WIKIMEDIA COMMONS.

as economic 'work' that tourism does is not well understood, but the various ways in which non-expert groups use and engage with heritage is key to understanding why heritage matters. The concept of intangible heritage opens up interesting and new ways to consider how tourists and other visitors interact and engage with cultural heritage, however, the sense to which the AHD defines and regards visitors to heritage sites and events continues to impede this possibility.

All heritage is intangible

Given the limitations imposed by the AHD outlined above, it becomes necessary to move away from the binary divide between tangible and intangible heritage (and for that matter cultural/natural heritage) to consider more useful ways of understanding heritage. Various commentators have argued that heritage may be more usefully understood as a 'verb' (Harvey, 2001). Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1998) has explored heritage as a form of cultural production, Dicks (2000) makes the point that it is a form of communication and Macdonald (2013) explores the processes of negotiation that occur with the interplay between memory and heritage. The idea that heritage is an active process underlies these analyses, and is crucial for broadening understanding of the heritage phenomena, moving it away from a concern with technical issues of management in order to understand the cultural and political contexts and consequences that phenomena may have. The definition of heritage as a thing, place or single event works to focus concern on safeguarding particular visions and memories about the past; if heritage is simply a 'thing' it can not only be 'found', it can be defined, measured, catalogued, and thus its meanings are more easily controlled and confined. The idea of heritage, however, as a cultural processes, rather than a 'thing' or an 'intangible event', allows an opening up of the critical gaze and facilitates an examination of the consequences of defining or making certain things heritage.

Heritage is *not* the thing, site or place, rather all heritage is intangible, as it is the processes of meaning making that occur as heritage places or events are identified, defined, managed, exhibited and visited or watched (Smith, 2006). Heritage can be usefully under-

stood as a subjective political negotiation of identity, place and memory, that is it is a 'moment' or a process of re/constructing and negotiating cultural and social values and meanings. It is a process, or indeed a performance, in which we identify the values, memories and cultural and social meanings that help us make sense of the present, our identities and sense of physical and social place. Heritage is a process of negotiating historical and cultural meanings and values that occur around the decisions we make to preserve, or not, certain physical places or objects or intangible events and the way these are then managed, exhibited or performed. They also occur in the way visitors engage or disengage with these things and events. Places and intangible events of heritage are given value by the act of naming them heritage and by the processes of heritage negotiations, performances and re/creations that occur at them. 'Heritage' is thus a discourse involved in the legitimatization and governance of historical and cultural narratives, and the work that these narratives do in maintaining or negotiating societal values and the hierarchies that these underpin. Consequently, the AHD is itself a process of heritage making and of regulating and governing the political and cultural meaning of the past, and the role that the past then plays in defining certain social problems or issues. The AHD is just one, albeit the dominant, heritage discourse, but the heritage that it makes is the continual affirmation of consensus and elite historical narratives. In doing so, it also regulates and controls the legitimacy given to non-authorized expressions of heritage and a hierarchy of heritage appreciation that, as yet, privileges material and 'world' heritage over intangible and sub-national expressions.

However, the AHD is not the only discourse or framework for understanding heritage, and indeed challenges to the AHD occur continually through the ways in which sub-national and community groups use and define heritage. Research that focuses on understanding expressions of heritage that sit outside of, or in opposition to the AHD, and/or western conceptualisations is expanding (see for instance; Ashworth et al., 2007; Smith et al., 2011; Winter and Daly, 2011; Howard, 2012; Robertson, 2012). What is also emerging, however, is research revealing the ways in which community or other interests and groups are working not only to express their own understandings of heritage, but how that is itself being safeguarded and protected in ways that do not reference amenity societies, national or international expert organisations. As several researchers have begun to document, online forums such as YouTube, Flickr and other social media sites are providing platforms for individuals and groups to assert, document and showcase their heritage (Pietrobruno, 2009, 2013; Freeman, 2010; Giaccardi, 2012). In particular, Pietrobruno (2013) documents how YouTube has allowed a number of different expressions and readings of the intangible heritage of the Mevlevi Sema (or whirling dervish) to be expressed and displayed, revealing gender issues not identified in the official documentation and listing by UNESCO in 2005. The ability of users to develop, control and continually update the content of web sites finds not only synergy with the changeable and ephemeral nature of the concept of intangible heritage, but also provides communities and individual heritage bearers with greater control over how this heritage is represented and sustained.

Conclusion

The Convention has significantly raised international and community awareness of the legitimacy of the concept of intangible heritage. Although, in raising this awareness, the Convention has not yet provided a framework that privileges the community/sub-national orientation of intangible heritage. This is perhaps because UNESCO, and international heritage practice more generally, draws too much on established cannons within the AHD that heritage is 'naturally' reflective of national identity (Smith, 2006). The Convention's support of community heritage needs re-evaluation, as the expertise driven AHD does not appear to have been sufficiently challenged or modified. Indeed, the paper has argued that definitions and ideas of heritage developed by national and international agencies such as UNESCO and ICOMOS need challenging and reconsidering. The dichotomy between tangible and intangible heritage needs re-thinking, and indeed, I posit *all* heritage is intangible. ■

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aikawa-Faure, N. (2009) «From the Proclamation of Masterpieces to the *Convention for the Safeguarding of Immaterial Heritage*». A SMITH, L.; Akagawa, N. (eds) *Immaterial Heritage,* 13-44. Londres: Routledge.

Alivizatou, M. (2012) *Immaterial Heritage and the Museum*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

Ashworth, G.J. (2009) «Do tourists destroy the heritage hey have come to experience?» *Tourism Recreation Research* 34(1): 79–83.

Ashworth, G.J.; Graham, B.; Tunbridge, J.E. (2007) *Pluralising Pasts*. Londres: Pluto.

Bauman, Z. (2001) *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*. Polity Press.

Blake, J. (2009) Convenció de la UNESCO del 2003 sobre el patrimoni cultural immaterial. Implicacions del compromís comunitari

en la 'salvaguarda'. A SMITH, L.; Akagawa, N. (eds) *Immaterial Heritage,* 45-73. Londres: Routledge.

Byrne, D. (1991) «Western hegemony in archaeological heritage management». *History and Anthropology,* 5:269-276

DICKS, B. (2000) *Heritage, Place and Community*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Dorfman, E. (2012) *Immaterial Natural Heritage.* Londres: Routledge.

Drake, A. (2009) «An interview with Alison Drake. Interviewed by Gary Campbell». A WATERTON, E; SMITH, L. (eds) *Taking Archaeology out of Heritage,* 66-70. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.

Fraser, N. (2001) «Recognition without ethics?» *Theory, Culture and Society* 18(2-3):21-42.

Freeman, C. G. (2010) «Photosharing on Flickr: immaterial heritage and emergent publics». *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 16(4-5):352-368.

Giaccardi, E. (ed.) (2012) *Heritage and Social Media.* Londres: Routledge

Graburn, N.; Barthel-Bouchier, D. (2001) «Relocating the tourist». *International Sociology*, 16: 147–58.

Graham, B.; Ashworth, G.; Tunbridge, J.E. (2000) *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy.* Londres: Arnold Publishers.

Hafstein, V. (2009) «Immaterial heritage as a list: from masterpiece's to representation». In SMITH, L.; Akagawa, N. (eds) *Immaterial Heritage,* 93-111. Londres: Routledge.

Harvey, D.C. (2001) «Heritage pasts and heritage presents: Temporality, meaning and the scope of heritage studies». *International Journal of Heritage Studies,* 7(4): 319-338.

Honneth, A. (2005 [1995]) *The Struggle for Recognition.* Cambridge: Polity Press

HOWARD, K. (ed.) (2012) *Music as Immaterial Cultural Heritage.* Farnham: Ashgate.

IRCI (2012) *The first ICH-Researchers forum: The implementation of UNESCO's 2003 Convection.* Osaka: IRCI.

IRCE (2013) *IRCI Meeting on ICH – Evaluating the inscription criteria for the two lists of UNESCO's Immaterial Cultural Heritage Convention*. Osaka: IRCI.

Khaznadar, C. (2012) «Ten Years After – Pandora's Box». In *The first ICH-Researchers forum: The implementation of UNESCO's 2003 Convection,* 18-20. Osaka: IRCI

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (1998) *Destination Culture*. University of California Press.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (2004) «Immaterial heritage as metacultural production». *Museum International,* 56(1-2): 52-64.

Kreps, C. (2009) «Indigenous curation, museums, and immaterial cultural heritage». In SMITH, L.; Akagawa, N. (eds) *Immaterial Heritage,* 193-208. Londres: Routledge.

Kurin, R. (2004) «Safeguarding immaterial cultural heritage in the 2003 UNESCO Convention: A critical appraisal». *Museum International,* 56 (1-2): 66-76.

Lagerkvist, C. (2006) «Empowerment and anger: learning to share ownership of the museum». *Museum and Society*, 4(2): 52-68.

Lenzerini, F. (2011) «Immaterial cultural heritage: The living culture of peoples». *The European Journal of International Law*, 22(1): 101-120.

Lixinski, L. (2011) «Selecting heritage: the interplay of art, politics and identity». *The European Journal of International Law*, 22(1): 81-100.

Logan, W. (2007) «Closing Pandora's Box: Human rights conundrums in cultural heritage protection». In Silverman, H.; Ruggles, D.F. (eds) *Cultural Heritage and Human Rights,* 33-52. Nova York: Springer.

Lowenthal, D. (1996) *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Macdonald, S. (2013) *Memorylands.* Londres: Routledge

Meskell, L. (2002) «The intersections of identity and politics in archaeology». *Annual Review of Anthropology,* 31: 279-301.

Munjeri, D. (2004) «Tangible and immaterial heritage: from difference to convergence». *Museum International,* 56(1-2): 12-20.

Pietrobruno, S. (2009) «Cultural Research and Immaterial Heritage». *Culture Unbound*, 1: 227–247.

Pietrobruno, S. (2013) «YouTube and the social archiving of immaterial heritage». *New Media & Society*, DOI: 10.1177/1461444812469598.

Robertson, I. (ed.) (2012) *Heritage from Below.* Farnham: Ashgate.

Silverman, H.; Ruggles, D.F. (eds) (2009) *Heritage Embodied.* Nova York: Springer

Skounti, A.; Tebbaa, O. (eds) (2011) *De l'immatérialité de patrimoine culturel.* Marràqueix: UNESCO

Smith, L. (2006) Uses of Heritage. Londres: Routledge

Smith, L. (2011a) *All heritage is immaterial: Critical Heritage Studies and museums*. Amsterdam: Reinwardt Academy.

Smith, L. (2011b) «El 'espejo patrimonial'. ¿Ilusión narcisista o reflexiones múltiples?» *Antípoda* 12: 39-63

Smith, L.; Fouseki, K. (2011) «The role of museums as 'places of social justice': community consultation and the 1807 Bicentenary». A Smith, L.; Cubitt, G.; Wilson, R.; Fouseki, K. (eds) *Representing Enslavement and Abolition in Museums,* 97-115. Nova York: Routledge.

Smith, L.; Shackel, P.A.; Campbell, G. (eds) (2011) *Heritage, Labour and the Working Class.* Londres: Routledge.

Smith, L.; Waterton, E. (2009a) «'The envy of the world?': Immaterial heritage in England». A SMITH, L.; Akagawa, N. (eds) *Immaterial Heritage,* 289-302. Londres: Routledge.

Smith, L.; Waterton, E. (2009b) *Heritage, Communities and Archaeology*. Londres: Duckworth

Smith, L.; Waterton, E.; Watson, S. (eds) (2012) *The Cultural Moment of Tourism.* Londres: Routledge.

Taylor, C. (1992) «The politics of recognition». In Gutmann, A. (ed.) *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition,* 25-73. Princeton University Press.

Tlili, A. (2008) «Behind the policy mantra of the inclusive museum: receptions of social exclusion and inclusion in museums and science centres». *Cultural Sociology*, 2(1): 123-147.

van Zanten, W. (2004) «Constructing new terminology for immaterial cultural heritage». *Museum International,* 56(1 and 2): 36-44.

Waterton, E.; Watson, S. (eds) (2010) «Heritage and Community Engagement: Collaboration or Contestation?». Special issue, *International Journal of Heritage Studies,* 16(1-2).

Winter, T.; Daly, P. (eds) (2011) *Routledge Handbook of Heritage in Asia.* Londres: Routledge.

Young, I. (2010) *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford University Press.

Article originally published in Catalan in **Revista d'Etnologia de Catalunya (no.39. year 2014)** under the title **Patrimoni immaterial: un repte per al discurs de patrimoni autoritzat?**