The zones of silence in documentary heritage management
On diversity on the UNESCO Memory of World International Register

Master's thesis
University of Jyväskylä
Department of History and Ethnology
MDP in Records and Archive Management
Autumn term 2016
Reetta Hanhikoski

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Historian ja etnologian laitos
Tekijä – Author Reetta Hanhikoski	
Työn nimi – Title The zones of silence in documentary heritage management: On diversity on the UNESCO Memory of World International Register	
Oppiaine – Subject Etnologia, arkistonhallinnan maisteriohjelma	Työn laji – Level Pro gradu – tutkielma
Aika – Month and year Marraskuu 2016	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 81

Tiivistelmä – Abstract

Tämä pro gradu-tutkielma tarkastelee Unescon Maailman muisti-ohjelman periaatteita valittaessa arkistollista kulttuuriperintöä kansainväliseen Maailman muisti-rekisteriin. Unescon muita ohjelmia, Maailman kulttuuriperintö- ja Aineettoman kulttuuriperinnön ohjelmia on tutkittu kriittisen kulttuuriperinnöntutkimuksen piirissä ja esille on nostettu keskeisissä sopimuksissa esiintyvää asiantuntijoiden vallan legitimointia sekä puutteellinen kulttuuriperinnön määritelmä. Tutkielmassa pyrittiin selvittämään, liittyykö myös Unescon Maailman muisti-ohjelmaan samankaltaisia ongelmia. Samalla tutkimuksen tarkoituksena oli selvittää mahdollisia syitä siihen, miksi rekisteri on nykyisessä muodossaan voimakkaan eurosentrinen, eikä sen lisäksi sisällä monien vähemmistöjen ja syrjittyjen ryhmien dokumenttiperintöä. Oletuksena oli, että länsimaiset käsitykset säilyttämisen arvoisesta arkistomateriaalista vaikuttaa Maailman muisti-rekisterin valintoihin.

Tutkielma on tehty osana arkistonhallinnan maisteriohjelman opintoja. Tutkimusaineisto koostuu erilaisista Maailman muisti – ohjelman kansainvälisen asiantuntijaraadin pöytäkirjoista, oppaista ja muista asiakirjoista. Tutkielmassa tulkitaan näitä tekstiaineistoja käyttäen kriittistä diskurssianalyysia.

Tutkielmanteon aikana ilmeni, että rekisteri on paitsi Eurooppa-painotteinen, mutta siinä on myös muita vinoumia, esimerkiksi liittyen sukupuoleen ja etnisyyteen. Keskeisimpiä tuloksia on se, että Unescon Maailman muisti-ohjelmassa valintoihin vaikuttaa yleisesti kulttuuriperintöalalla vaikuttava asiantuntijoiden kyseenalaistamaton valta, joka estää ei-asiantuntijoiden äänen pääsemisen kuuluville kulttuuriperintöä valittaessa. Toinen havainto on, että rekisteriin pyritään valitsemaan dokumenttiperintöä, joka ei loukkaa ketään osapuolta. Tämä saattaa kuitenkin johtaa tilanteeseen, jossa syrjitään kaikkein heikoimmassa asemassa olevien ryhmien poliittista dokumenttiperintöä.

Asiasanat – Keywords etnologia, kansatiede, arkistot, arkistoaineistot, kulttuuriperintö, kulttuurihistorialliset suojelukohteet, kansainväliset järjestöt

Säilytyspaikka – Depository

Muita tietoja – Additional information

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

IAC– International Advisory Committee

ICA– International Council of Archives

ICH– Intangible Cultural Heritage

IFLA– International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions

ICOM– International Council of Museums

MoW–Memory of the World

MOWCAP- Memory of the World Regional Committee for Asia and the Pacific

MOWLAC- Memory of the World Regional Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean

MoWIR– Memory of the World International Register

UNESCO- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

WCH– World Cultural Heritage

1. Introduction

1.1. Background of the Study

The UNESCO[1] Memory of the World Programme (MoW) was established in 1992 by the UNESCO Director General to safeguard the world's documentary heritage, or, as it is expressed on the programme's website, to "guard against world's collective amnesia". The goal of the Memory of the World is to preserve the world's significant documentary heritage collections, to promote the access to it and to raise awareness about the importance of documentary heritage.

The impetus for its establishment in 1992 was the destruction of the National Library in Sarajevo (Harvey 2007, 263). The foundation meeting of International Advisory Committee (IAC) was held in Pultusk, Poland in 1993. At this meeting, an action plan was created to get UNESCO Member States to act to safeguard documentary heritage (UNESCO 2016). Since then the IAC has convened every two years. The International Memory of the World Register, the most visible part of the Programme, was founded in 1997.

In autumn 2016, the International Register contains 348 archive holdings from all continents (UNESCO 2016). Examples include manuscripts such as the diaries of Anne Frank, audiovisual material such as the film *Metropolis* and artifacts such as *Confucian Printing Woodblocks* (UNESCO. Memory of the World. Register). The items are tested against the criteria of authenticity and world significance. To be of world significance, the item has to be unique and irreplaceable and to fulfill one or more of the six criteria of world significance: 1) it has to be evocative of an important time, 2) place or 3) people in world history, or 4) represent important subject and theme, or 5) form and style, or 6) it must hold social, spiritual or community significance within a community. (Edmondson 2002, 21-22) Emphasis is put on the influence that the items in the Register have had at the global, regional, or national level. (Edmondson

[1] [1] UNESCO (*United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization*) was founded on November 16th 1945 as a special agency of the United Nations. UNESCO has 195 Members and 8 Associate Members. (UNESCO 2016)

2002, 21-23) Finally, items may be evaluated by additional criteria such as rarity, integrity, threat (documentary heritage is under threat of being destroyed or vanished) and management plan.

In addition to the International Register, two regional Memory of the World Registers, MOWCAP and MOWLAC, and a number of national Memory of the World Registers have been founded. An item can be registered in more than one register: national, regional or international. Thus, the Programme operates at these three levels. Countries are divided into five geographical and cultural regions, according to the United Nations geoscheme: Africa, Arab States, Asia and the Pacific, Europe and North America Latin America and the Caribbean.

As a UNESCO programme, the Memory of the World Programme is relatively unknown compared to the other two heritage programmes, the World Heritage Programme, which was founded in 1972, and the Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity, (Intangible Heritage Programme), which started in 2003. Whereas the UNESCO World Heritage and the Intangible Heritage Programme have conventions that guide their operation and selection of heritage (Convention on World Heritage, 1972, and the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Heritage, 2003), Memory of the World is yet to produce a convention.

All of these programmes have their own areas of focus. The World Heritage Programme protects built heritage, such as temples, churches and nature sites. The Intangible Heritage Programme is interested in oral traditions, dances, music, and practices. It maintains two lists: the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity and the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding ("Intangible Heritage List"). Memory of the World has registered collections and items that are held in archives, libraries and museums but also some that are owned by private organizations or reside in temples. Overall, items of cultural heritage are usually listed in only one of these registers. However, there are some exceptions: for example, the traditional South American dance tango has been registered both in the Memory of the World in 2003 by Uruguay with the name *Original records of Carlos Gardel – Horacio Loriente Collection (1913-1935)* and in the Intangible Heritage List by Argentina and Uruguay in 2009 (UNESCO. Intangible Cultural Heritage 2016). Similarly, the traditional Malay dance

Mak Yong has been registered in the Intangible Heritage List as a heritage coming from Malaysia. However, the Mak Yong has also been nominated for the Memory of the World by Indonesia three times, in 2009, 2011 and 2013, without success (UNESCO 2009, 2011, 2013).

Therefore, there seems to exist a wide variety of perceptions on heritage and the category to which it belongs, whether it is material or immaterial, or whether it is a document. The stretching of categories is not unique to UNESCO heritage programmes. For example, the musician Bob Dylan was nominated for the Nobel Prize for Literature on several occasions since 1996 (The Guardian September 19th 2012), and in 2016, he was finally awarded (The Guardian October 13th 2016). In 2015, the surviving "comfort women", war-time sex slaves for Japanese soldiers, were proposed as a nomination for the Nobel Peace Prize (The Korea Times April 29th 2015). Overall, it appears that categories can be changed so as to be more inclusive. As to the Memory of the World, the Programme has been rather conservative in this sense. Could the Memory of the World Programme expand its notion of an archive so as to include more varied types of documentary heritage in its registers? The aim of this study is to elaborate on the possibility of acknowledging categories such as carvings, music and dance as *documentary* heritage.

1.2. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of this thesis draws on the postmodern archival discussions in the 1990s that continue to influence the field of archives. In the mid-1990s one of the most influential works that shaped the archive field is *Archive Fever* (1996), by French deconstructionist Jacques Derrida. Derrida discussed archives from a Freudian perspective, focusing on the death drive and the contradicting conservation drive that prevail in an archive. This work has provided the concept of "archivization", a phenomenon in which the structure of an archive and the technology of archiving determine what can be archived (Derrida 1996, 17).

In the early 2000s postmodern archival theory was most notably developed by Canadian archivist Terry Cook. Cook (2000, 3) views archivists as active mediators in formatting the world's collective memory. Archivists will inject their own values in the process of appraising documents. With postmodern sensitivity, historical perspective, and transparency in actions,

archivists should consider which functions, organizations and people are included in the world's collective memory. (Cook 2000) This school, represented most notably by Cook, is called societal or archivization school of archives (Piggott 2005, 309).

The paradigm shift also manifests itself in what we nowadays perceive as worthy of archiving. Postmodern archive discourses have brought up traditionally marginalized groups such as women and ethnic and sexual minorities. Consequently, there has been more interest to collect and document a greater variety of histories. For example, institutions like Iowa Women's Archives (Iowa Women's Archives 2016) and The LGBT Community Center National History Archive (The LGBT Community Community Center National History Archive 2016) in the United States or the Sámi Archive in Finland (Sámi Arkiiva 2016), are working to collect the histories of groups that regularly face discrimination in society. Another occurring theme in postmodernist archivist discourse is the paradigm shift from the actual document or fold to the record-creating process. Nowadays, the focus is on the purpose a document has been created for and the actual process of creation. (Cook 2000).

Meanwhile, the scope of the term "archive" has been re-elaborated and stretched to include performances, dances, music etc. In South Africa, several researchers have applied deconstructive methods to the conceptualizations of archives, drawing on Jacques Derrida's writings on postcustodiality in archives. In these explorations the documentary aspects of things like literature, art, performances, and sites have been studied. (Hamilton et al. 2002, 10). Moreover, scholars representing the record continuum model (most notably McKemmish (2005), Upward (2005) and Russell 2005) have been innovative in their explorations of archives. In this thesis, it is not perhaps not illegible to delve into the details of the records continuum model. To note briefly, the records continuum model consists of four dimensions that represent different stages in the records. The fourth dimension is called pluralization and it means largely going into the moment when a record is created. The aim has been to separate the concept of document from a physical record and recognize different forms that a record or a document can take. For example, to McKemmish (2005, 4) knowledge is mediated within a community through a variety of "texts", that may be in any form, including written and oral texts, landscapes, buildings, rituals and performances.

Records continuum theorists have also criticized the traditional notions of about archive. Old ideas about archives and authenticity continue to be present in the everyday practices of anthropological fieldwork. Until recently, the storyteller has been referred to as "the subject". The researcher has been considered as bringing up the voices of the voiceless. It has been understood that the history of indigenous groups has to be "saved" on tape or on paper, or, in other words, to some western medium. In this setting, the traditional roles of a western savior and indigenous "subject" appear to be renewed by default. There has not been much consideration for the special needs: the transmission of indigenous knowledge is often performative and may not be easily converted to modern media (see for example Russell 2005, 168). According to McKemmish et al. (2005) the best practices, guidelines, metadata, and other tools are often formulated with the idea of "one size fits all". In this process, local and indigenous ways of documentation are constantly neglected. (McKemmish et al. 2005, 3- 4).

The paradigm shift in archival science means the acknowledgement of indigenous knowledge, and a wider inclusion of communities as to appraisal and preservation of documents (McKemmish 2005). To quote the Sydney Peace Prize winner Arundhati Roy: "There's really no such thing as the 'voiceless'. There are only the deliberately silenced, or the preferably unheard." (Roy 2004). In sum, the indigenous groups have been documenting their own history for quite long. In contrast, the western archival science has been slow to include a wider variety of carriers. The paradigm shift in archival science means acknowledging indigenous knowledge, and a wider inclusion of communities regarding appraisal and preservation of documents (McKemmish 2005).

Another aspect considered in this thesis is the selection of items of documentary heritage for permanent preservation. The French historian Michel Foucault discussed the role of archives in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1982). One of the major theses of Foucault is that archives are systems of accepting and reformulating statements that are deemed acceptable. Thus archives define what can and cannot be said (1982, 129-130). For my research, I seek to combine Foucault's notion with critical heritage studies. Critical heritage studies is a branch of cultural anthropology that developed in the first decade of the 21st century. Critical heritage studies

acknowledge that heritage management is affected by nationalism, imperialism, colonialism, cultural elitism and social exclusion based on class and ethnicity among others. A prominent feature has also been the fetishizing of expert knowledge. Critical heritage studies seek to bring the interests of the marginalized and exclude to the fore (ibid.). In the words of the Manifesto of Association of Critical Heritage Studies, critical heritage studies require "the 'ruthless criticism of everything existing'" (Association of Critical Heritage Studies, 2016)

Of special interest here is the critique posited towards fetishizing of expert knowledge. It has been notably developed by Laurajane Smith, who has also coined the term authorized heritage discourse. According to Smith (2006), authorized heritage discourse views heritage as tangible, aesthetically pleasing material, objects, sites, places or landscapes that are immutable. It is assumed that the value of the heritage is innate, in the fabric. That makes heritage vulnerable and in need for protection from external factors. Because of its vulnerability, generations of today have a duty to protect it and pass it on tothe future unchanged. However, the protection is supposed to be left to thefor experts. This may exclude indigenous communities from participating in the preservation of their own heritage. According to Smith, this type of discourse is present in organizations like UNESCO and ICOMOS that also further disseminates it. (Smith 2012) While the Memory of the World has not produced an international convention, it, nevertheless, may affect the selection of documentary heritage in the UN Member States also outside the Programme, because of its established position in the field of management and preservation of cultural heritage.

Although Smith (2006) and Waterton & Smith (2006) have studied mainly cultural and nature sites protection, and intangible heritage protection (2008), I view that the concept of Smith's authorized heritage discourse may be applied to documentary heritage preservation as well. Feather's definition of documentary heritage (2006, 4) that considers books and documents as artefacts supports my view. I represent the approach in which authorized heritage discourse affects the selection of cultural heritage in UNESCO. Moreover, these evaluations disseminate along with the Programme's development and has an impact on the cultural heritage field at large.

1.3. Previous research

Established in 1992, the UNESCO Memory of the World Programme is a relatively new programme yet to receive publicity and authoritative position similar to the other UNESCO cultural heritage programmes. Some articles have been published by those active in the Memory of the World programme, most notably by members of the Memory of the World Australian National Committee. Ross Harvey (2007), Annemaree Lloyd (2007) and Robyn Sloggett (2005) have brought up the problems of significance in the MoW programme. Harvey (2007) points out that the perceived significance is dependent on the viewer's background. Sloggett (2005) is of the opinion that significance is not utile in the appraisal of documentary heritage. Moreover, Sloggett (ibid.) along with Water-Lynch et al. (2015) demonstrated how the evaluation of significance is never an easy task in the field of conservation due to cultural and conceptual differences that become visible in cross-cultural fieldwork. Similarly, Lloyd (2007) finds problematic that it is mostly western scholars who evaluate the significance of indigenous heritage. Regarding the geographical bias in cultural heritage protection, Lloyd (ibid.) also raises an interesting question: should we focus on representability instead of significance? (Lloyd 2007, 64) Hilary Charlesworth (2010) discusses human rights and their relation to cultural heritage in the programme. Charlesworth is concerned that Memory of the World may not be attuned to acknowledge the often less visible heritage of marginalized groups. Robertson–von Trotha and Hauser (2010) address the Memory of the World Programme from the point of view of the audience. What kind of image of the past is the Programme promoting to us? They point out how the justifications for inscriptions may give a distorted image of the document's provenance and functions.

The doctoral dissertation of Anca Claudia Prodan (2014) explores Memory of the World and its ways of evaluating nominations containing digital documentary heritage. Prodan notes that the concept of document as a fixed entity is problematic in the electronic era and has led to exclusion of electronic materials from the Register (ibid.). Prodan's findings are fruitful as I seek to elaborate on how the persistent ideal of a fixed carrier may exclude also other types of intangible documentary heritage from the Memory of the World Register.

This thesis can perhaps be located in a wider domain of studies on UNESCO. The studies on other UNESCO programmes are more numerous and equally relevant for this thesis. For example, Keough (2011) discusses the selection process of the World Heritage sites. In spite of the good intentions, the selection process has become a playground for politics and cultural nationalism. Keough's description appears to apply tobe suitable for the Memory of the World as well. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (2004) has elaborated on the UNESCO Intangible Heritage Programme. She criticisinges the programme for its failure to address indigenous cultures, and furthermore for the division into two programmes, one for tangible heritage and the other for intangible heritage programme, which seems to create a false dichotomy between the tangible and intangible. Moreover, this division to two programmes works to create a division between western and other areas. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (ibid.) does not discuss Memory of the World Programme. However, I feel that the division between concepts of documentary heritage and intangible heritage also requires further elaboration.

Lastly, the aforementioned Smith (2006) and Waterton et al. (2006) have brought up the power imbalance between the local peoples and the conservation specialists in valuing, using, managing, and preserving tangible heritage. They have demonstrated how western paradigms and values manifest in other UNESCO texts, such as in the World Heritage Convention and Burra Charter, and how they contribute to the power relations between western heritage experts and indigenous groups.

1.4. The Research Questions

In a speech at *the UNESCO Memory of the World Programme turns 20* report, Programme, a member of the UNESCO Memory of the World Australian Committee Roslyn Russell, made the following observation:

> A persistent problem for the Programme that is around half of the inscriptions on the International Register have come from Europe, a situation described recently as "the memory of nineteenth-century power structures. (Russell 2012, 2)

As Russell implies, the UNESCO Memory of the World Register is, despite its intentions, not as inclusive as it could be. A brief glance at the International Register (UNESCO 2016) appears to support Russell's observation. As of 2016, the majority of the register's approved documents are of European origin. Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa and most parts of Asia are underrepresented in the International Register, let alone minorities and indigenous groups within nation states (see Table 1 on page 17). The geographic imbalance and the poor representation of ethnic minorities have been discussed within the MoW Programme (see, for example, Harvey 2007; Russell 2012; Bos 2015). However, there appears to be a lack of discussion regarding other representational biases, such as those of gender, class and race. Overall, Russell's term, "the memory of nineteenth century power struggles", seems to be quite accurate. As this is quite interesting from an ethnological point of view, my first research question is: what other biases are there, in addition to the geographical bias?

It is possible that these representational biases derive from the same factor, namely the Western archival concepts that are deeply rooted in the Programme. These concepts and ideas regarding proper documentary heritage find expression in the Memory of the World Programme through authorized heritage discourse. This discourse is defined by heritage professionals, and the socially marginalized are not equal participants in this process of definition. This can lead to unintentional discrimination based on race, gender, nationality, class, disability and other qualities when selecting entries for the International Register. My second research question is therefore: does authorized heritage discourse affect the selection process in the Memory of the World? My presumption is that authorized heritage discourse is conveyed in the *General Guidelines to safeguard documentary heritage* (2002), the Programme's most authoritative document, which affects the workings of the International Advisory Committee, and the *Memory of the World Register Companion* (2011), which serves as a guideline for nominators, press releases, the educational material used in workshops and similar documents.

1.5. Data and Methods

While this thesis focuses on documentary heritage, the data used also consists of documents. The revised 2002 version of the *General Guidelines to Safeguarding World's Documentary Heritage* (Edmondson 2002) is currently the main tool used in the selection process. Another important

resource is *The Register Companion* (UNESCO 2011*)*, which assists nominators in filling out the MoW Nomination Form and explains some of the principles used in making decisions. These documents are interesting, as they include information regarding the principles of selection. Open access to these documents is provided by the Memory of the World Programme's web page. All of the IAC meeting documents are listed on this page, except for the meeting document of the 2015 IAC meeting in Abu Dhabi, the United Arab Emirates.

Other research material includes the IAC meeting documents, particularly the sections in which the selected and excluded items are discussed. In most cases, the IAC has included the comments on nominations as annexes to meeting documents. The meeting documents can be accessed on the UNESCO Memory of the World website (UNESCO 2016). However, the meeting document of the 12th meeting of the IAC in 2015 does not include comments on nominations, unlike the minutes of previous meetings (UNESCO 2015). The documents that include the IAC's comments are interesting, as they represent discourses on the nominations, why the selected nominations are of "world significance" and why the rejected ones are not. In addition, I use news material that covers the MoW Programme and its selection process. I have singled out a few nominations that are interesting for the same reason: They demonstrate what is considered "non-acceptable" documentary heritage. For example, I have selected nominations that represent oral traditions that are seen as a form of documentation by some scholars (see e.g. Hamilton et al., 2002; McKemmish 2005; Hofman 2005) but are not considered as documentary heritage by Memory of the World. *The Liberation Graphic Collection of Palestinian* poster, nominated by Dan Walsh, is of particular interest for the controversy its submission caused during the nomination round of 2013-2015. The examples indicate that nominations may be rejected for various reasons. All of the rejected nominations, however, challenge the norms of acceptable documentary heritage in some way. The norms are, naturally, defined by the authorized heritage discourse.

As a method I have used critical discourse analysis, which has been most notably developed by the linguist Norman Fairclough. This choice may be justified by the fact that it has been successfully used in the critical heritage studies of Waterton et al. (2006), to analyse the Burra Charter of 1979, and also by Smith (2006), to analyse the Burra Charter, the Venice Charter and

the World Heritage Convention, as well as discourses on intangible heritage (2015). According to Waterton et al. (2006), the advantage of critical discourse analysis is that it does not merely concentrate on the content of the text but also addresses "[what] it is doing" (Waterton et al. 2006, 342). Although Smith and Waterton have used critical discourse analysis in the context of built heritage, this approach seems to be equally useful when analysing guidelines for the assessment of documentary heritage.

Discourse analysis is a rather vague term that refers to several types of analysis of either written or spoken language. To put it into the context of language studies, such as phonology or morphology, discourse analysis is not primarily interested in the order of words, sounds, or the parts that a word consists of; while these may sometimes be relevant to an analysis, discourse analysis as a method seeks to study the interaction between a text or speech and its audience (Linguistic Society of America 2016). Analysis may involve the study of structure of expression, such as sentences, words and word order, or the structure of meaning. Similarly, discourse analysis may focus on the actions in a conversation, such as turn-takings, hesitations, pauses and interruptions (van Dijk 2013).

Research principles distinguish discourse analysis from critical discourse analysis; critical discourse analysis has a certain socio-political aspect. The aim of critical discourse analysis is to examine subjects through the perspective of those who do not hold power in society (van Dijk 1993, 252). Topics of interest in critical discourse analysis include gender studies, studies of nationalism, racism, anti-Semitism and political studies (van Dijk 2015, 475-479). In sum, critical discourse analysis is not a method per se, but it encompasses all forms of discourse analysis (van Dijk 2015, 466). To distinguish critical discourse analysis or CDA from other forms of discourse analysis, its proponents have started to use the term "critical discourse studies" (van Dijk 2015, 466).

Essential to critical discourse analysis is the analysis of power, referring to how dominance is reproduced and challenged in discourses. It is also noted that dominance is formulated outside of discourse (van Dijk 1993, 252). In critical discourse analysis, it is, however, noted that, in addition to social power, personal power is present in discourses (ibid., 254). Dominance is the

exercise of social power by the elite, and it contributes to social inequality. In this setting, some groups are in disadvantage for various reasons, such as certain political groups, women and gender minorities, as well as those groups that are racialized (van Dijk 1993, 249-250).

This paper employs critical discourse analysis to demonstrate how Western notions regarding the documentation, archiving, collection and preservation of documentary heritage are present in Memory of the World Programme texts and lead to indigenous, minority and other marginalized heritage being undervalued.

Norman Fairclough (2003) has analysed various discursive devices that texts use to affect the reader and sway him or her to accept certain truths. Of particular interest here is the analysis of how readers are made to accept certain ideas (for example, that of significance) or authorities through discursive practices. Assumptions present in a text reveal the ideology and values behind it. Often, these values are embedded in texts and may be revealed only through discourse analysis (Fairclough 2003, 212-213). These assumptions do not leave space for a dialogue, since, by making an assumption, the writer takes it for granted that the reader agrees. Instead of considering other voices, the writer assumes a common ground (Fairclough 2003, 41).

For example, in the Memory of the World Programme, values are embedded in evaluative statements about certain heritage items, such as in the sentence "[Beethoven's 9th Symphony] is obviously of world significance" (UNESCO 2000) or "The items are not of world significance". These assumptions regarding common values also manifest in the choice of words (Fairclough 2003). Pivotal concepts in Memory of the World are the ideas of the "expert" and "world significance", as well as the "documentary heritage of humanity". All of these concepts are rather vague and include numerous assumptions.

Another interesting concept in Fairclough's work is modalisation. In sentences, modalisation is expressed with uncertain verb forms, such as "may", "might" or "could". By using such verb forms, the writer or speaker does not totally commit to the statement that the sentence proposes. When a sentence is non-modalized, the writer is certain that what he or she is expressing is valid. These statements reveal what is assumed as common ground. (Fairclough 2003, 170)

Particularly important in the archival field are the classification systems used to evaluate documents. Through classification, the IAC redefines heritage, by comparison, making claims of equivalences and differences. In the Memory of the World Programme, heritage is classified in a number of ways: when the IAC considers whether the nominated documentary heritage belongs to the Memory of the World, whether it should be considered as falling under another UNESCO Programme or whether it is actually significant.

Finally, Fairclough identifies three levels of analysis: micro, meso and macro. At the micro-level, the researcher analyses syntax, metaphors and other linguistic devices. At the meso-level, the text is examined in the contexts of the institution that produced the text (such as UNESCO) and its target audience. Finally, the macro-level analysis concentrates on inter-discursive elements, referring to the text's relations to other texts (Alvesson & Karreman, 1143-1144). In this thesis, I move between all of the three levels. At the micro-level, I analyse documents with critical discourse analysis, with a particular interest in the core concepts of "world significance" and "heritage of humanity". At the meso-level, I examine the texts regarding the UNESCO framework, which affects how much liberty the organization and its staff members have in the selection process. At the macro-level, I compare Memory of the World texts with other UNESCO texts, seeking similarities and differences.

1.6. Overview of the thesis

In the chapter titled *UNESCO Memory of the World Programme*, I aim to shed light on the research problem by presenting tables that identify the geographical and gender biases in the International Register, as well as a table that reflects the scarcity of indigenous entries. In the following chapters, I explore the possible factors that contribute to these biases. In the chapter titled *Analysis of the General Guidelines and Register Companion*, I analyse these documents using critical discourse analysis, concentrating on the recursive, commonly used terms, intertextuality with other UNESCO texts and the relationships between texts and their target audiences. In these chapters, I operate from a point of view that assumes that the studied discourses can be labelled as authorized heritage discourse. In the chapter titled *Authority-*

approved heritage, I shift this analysis to the practical level and determine what de facto consequences these discourses have. My presumption is that the discourses in the Programme's authoritative documents affect, define and limit the actions that can be taken during the selection process. In this chapter, I use as an example the discourses that have been used against the inclusion of certain forms of indigenous heritage. In the chapter titled *Memories of the marginalized*, I elaborate on the other aspect of authorized heritage discourse, in which a heritage object is reduced to a visually or otherwise pleasing thing. This notion makes it difficult to acknowledge politically loaded cultural products as documentary heritage. Lastly, in the chapter titled *Conclusions: Towards greater diversity in Memory of the World***,** I present these findings and, by combining them, attempt to reach a conclusion about how authorized heritage discourse affect heritage classification and evaluation in the Memory of the World Programme.

2. UNESCO Memory of the World Programme

2.1. Programme Structure

The highest authority in the Memory of the World Programme is the International Advisory Committee (IAC), which consists of 14 members. Every two years, half of the members of the Committee are renewed (UNESCO). The IAC is assisted by subsidiary bodies, including the Bureau, the Technical Subcommittee, the Marketing Subcommittee, and the Register Subcommittee. The UNESCO Director-General participates in the meetings of the IAC, the secretariat and subsidiary bodies, without the right to vote (UNESCO 2015). The IAC is also assisted by the Programme Secretariat. In the evaluation of submitted nominations, the IAC seeks expert guidance from notable organizations such as the International Council of Museums (ICOM), the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) and Institutions and the International Council of Archives (ICA).

The Memory of the World Programme operates at three levels: international, regional and national. In addition to the Memory of the World International Register, there are regional registers that follow the lines of the UNESCO regions, including Africa, the Arab states, Asia and the Pacific, Europe and North America and Latin America and the Caribbean. Of these, the

regions of Asia and the Pacific and Latin America and the Caribbean have their own regional committees and registers: UNESCO's Memory of the World for the Asia-Pacific (MOWCAP) and the UNESCO Memory of the World for Latin America and the Caribbean (MOWLAC). The African Regional Committee for the Memory of the World (ARCMOW) was established in 2007, but to date, it has not visibly acted. Regional committees maintain regional registers and annually select new items for inclusion. They also make proposals for regional registers, as well as for the International Register, lead projects, encourage countries that do not have their own national committees to set one up, provide guidance and background support and encourage cooperation between countries, as well as co-ordinate publicity and awareness-raising. They also select the archival holdings or library collections for the regional register. Finally, there are National Memory of the World Registers that raise awareness about the Memory of the World Programme in UNESCO member countries and select items for the national registers.

The International Advisory Committee examines the nominations and selects items for the Memory of the World International Register. Thus, the IAC has significant power over what will be commemorated as global heritage. The IAC may use external sources and referees in the evaluation process. However, it may choose the experts itself, as stated in the *General Guidelines* of the Memory of the World Programme:

> [The IAC] will seek *expert evaluation* and advice on each nomination from *whatever appropriate* sources it considers necessary, and will compare it to similar documentary heritage, including material already listed in the registers. (Edmondson 2002, 27)

This extract reflects the fact that the IAC is given authority to select the organization "from whatever appropriate sources it considers necessary". The IAC is thus given a great deal of freedom in choosing these sources. It is noteworthy that the IAC is not obliged to consult indigenous groups during the assessment of nominations. Consequently, it is possible that the IAC might not seek advice from the community which created the nominated heritage. This could also result in the consultation of a source whose interests are in conflict with those of the community in question.

In practice, the sources consulted are prominent organizations in the museum, library and archive sectors. It may be safe to assume that these experts are often not necessarily familiar with the indigenous culture from which the nomination originates and/or do not have first-hand experience of what it is like to be socially marginalized.

Regarding the national MoW committees, the *General Guidelines* recommend that one of the members of the national MoW committee should be a member of an indigenous group (Edmondson 2002, 58). This is, however, only a recommendation, and thus it does not insure increased minority representation on a national MoW committee. Furthermore, there is no such recommendation concerning the International Register.

The UNESCO Director-General has a relatively large amount of influence on what can be selected for the Register. The Director-General appoints the members of the International Advisory Committee and draws the agenda for its biennial sessions after consultation with the chairperson. The Director-General, or the Director-General's representative, participates in the work of the Bureau, the IAC or its subsidiary bodies, without the right to vote. The Director-General can also request the Bureau to convene between sessions of the Committee and may submit written or oral statements on any matter to the IAC, the Bureau or the subsidiary bodies. Lastly, the Director-General endorses or rejects the International Advisory Committee's recommendations for nominations. In the majority of cases, the Director-General has accepted the proposals of the International Advisory Committee (Nuorteva 2015). However, during the nomination round of 2013-2015, Director-General Irina Bokova took a strong stance against the *The Liberation Graphics Collection of Palestinian Posters.*

2.2. Memory of the World International Register

Table 1, below, presents the countries that are representated in the International Memory of the World Register (MoWIR), along with the number of their accepted inscriptions on the register:

Region	Number of inscriptions	Number of countries
Africa	18	11
Arab States	9	5
Asia and the Pacific	103	24
Europe and North America	207	40
Latin America and the Caribbean	72	27
International Organizations	5	5
Private Foundation	1	1
Total	Registered items 348	107 countries, 5 international organizations, 1 private foundation

Table 1. Source: UNESCO. Memory of the World International Register. *Official Website of the Memory of the World Register*. 2016.

The region of Europe and North America is most represented, with 207 inscriptions from 40 countries. The second most-represented region is Asia and the Pacific. The region of Latin America and the Caribbean holds the third place. The region of Africa is fourth, with 18 inscriptions from 11 countries. Consequently, of all the regions, the Arab states are the least represented in the International Register, with only nine items from five countries (UNESCO. Memory of the World Programme 2015). Clearly, the number of items does not correspond with the population size of a country or continent. With regard to individual countries, the region of Europe and North America is still most represented. Of all of the individual countries, Germany has the most inscribed entries in the International Register. It is followed by Poland, Great Britain and South Korea (UNESCO. *Official Website of the Memory of the World Register* 2016). Three of these countries are located in Europe, while South Korea belongs to the group of the fast-growing Asian economies. Overall, representation seems to be linked with status in world politics.

Likewise, there are fewer entries from indigenous communities. The relatively low number of indigenous items that have been accepted are listed below, in Table 2. I have classified them based on their descriptions on the Memory of the World website (Memory of the World. Full list of registered heritage. 2016):

Indigenous group	**Nomination**	**Year of registration**
Skolt Sámi people	*The Skolt Sámi Archive*	2015
Ecuador	*Gaze of the Other*	2015
Indigenous peoples in contemporary Mexico	*The work of Fray Bernardino de Sahagún (1499-1590)*	2015

Various indigenous groups (submitted by the Netherlands)	*Selected data collections of the world's language diversity at the Language Archive*	2015
Indigenous peoples in the Americas and Asia	*Indigenous language vocabulary from the New World translated into Spanish*	2015
Indigenous people in Vanuatu	*The Arthur Bernard Deacon (1903-27) collection MS 9098*	2013
Sámi people (Norway)	*Sophus Tromholt Collection*	2013
Bugis (Sulawesi, Indonesia)	*La Galigo*	Registered in 2011 (rejected in 2009)
Various indigenous groups	*Historic Ethnographic Recordings (1898 – 1951) at the British Library*	2011
The Sanis	*John Marshall Ju/'hoan Bushman Film and Video Collection, 1950-2000*	2009
Indigenous groups in Mexico	*Coleccion de Lenguas Indigenas*	2007
Indigenous Philipinos	*José Maceda Collection*	2007
Andean indigenous peoples (nominated by Denmark)	*El Primer Nueva Coronica y Buen Gobierno*	2007

Indigenous communities in Latin America	*American Colonial Music: a sample of its documentary richness*	2007
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	*The Mabo Case Manuscripts*	2001
The Pawnees	*Early cylinder recordings of the world's musical traditions (1893-1952) in the Berlin Phonogramm-Archiv*	1999
The Maoris of Aotearoa New Zealand	*Treaty of Waitangi*	1997
Total: 18		

Table 2. Indigenous heritage in the International Register. Source: UNESCO. *2016.*

On the left, I have listed the indigenous groups which provided the heritage item. As the table indicates, the items appear to come from a variety of communities. However, the nominator is not always the community which created the heritage item. For example, the entry *El Primer Nueva Coronica y Buen Gobierno* was nominated by Denmark in 2007 as the item resides in the Royal Danish Library in Copenhagen. This calls for investigation into the provenance of the items nominated (Kellerhals 2013, 211).

The MoW International Register contains only a few items that could be clearly defined as originating in minority or indigenous heritage. The items related to minority and indigenous communities tend to be material *about* indigenous people rather than material *created by* indigenous people. As such, they can be called archives about indigenous people but not necessarily indigenous archives. While there are many archives compiled by anthropologists, explorers, missionaries, etc., for an archive to be called indigenous, it must have been compiled, preserved and valued by an indigenous community (McKemmish et al. 2005). In this way, the Sophus Tromholt Collection, inscribed in 2013 and related to research Tromholt conducted

among the Sámi people in Norway, is not indigenous material, since it is written from the perspective of the researcher and not by the indigenous people themselves. A notable exception is the Skolt Sami Archive, nominated by the Finnish National Archive and the Skolt Sámi community in the nomination round of 2013-2015 and accepted by the International Register in 2015. This collection was owned by the Sámi community and was donated to the Sámi Archive, which is a part of the National Archives of Finland. This entry can possibly be called an indigenous archive, as the Skolt Sámi community has considered it as worthy of preservation. Another example is the *Mabo Case Manuscripts*, nominated by Australia in 2001. *La Galigo*, documents relating to the traditional theatre of the Bugis people of Indonesia, was inscribed in 2011 (UNESCO 2016). Overall, there are not a large number of examples. Therefore, there is a lack of material related to indigenous peoples and even less material that could be rightly called indigenous archives.

Most indigenous items in Table 2 are recordings of language samples. Since the indigenous items are preserved in Western countries and not in the countries where they were recorded, they are listed under the Western countries, sometimes the very country that participated in the colonization of the indigenous group concerned.

Regarding entries that include documents related to notable individuals, there is also a lack of representation of heritage other than that of European white men. In Table 3, I have separated personal paper nominations, based on the alleged gender of the person and on the basis of the region where they were submitted. Personal papers here refer to papers written by a subject, such as diaries, drafts and other such documents, which are revered because of the significance of the owner.

Region	Alleged male	Alleged female
Africa	5	0
Arab states	1	0
Asia and the Pacific	16	0

Europe and North America	45	3
Latin America and the Caribbean	14	1
Total: 81		

Table 3. Source: UNESCO Memory of the World. International Register 2016.

The Register includes the papers of prominent figures from different fields of science, humanities and the arts. Much of the content of these documents has become canonized in the Western world. The Register contains several notes of classical music, from Beethoven, Schubert, Chopin, and Bach, as well as the papers of scientists like Rousseau, Goethe, Newton and Luther. It is worth noting that only a handful of these archives originate in regions other than Europe. Moreover, in cases like *Farquharson's Diary,* the nomination originates in the region of Latin America and the Caribbean, but the person the collection focuses on is European, as Charles Farquharson was a white European plantation owner.

There is another issue related to gender.[2] Of all the 81 personal archives related to famous individuals, only a handful are related to women: The *Astrid Lindgren Archives*, nominated by Sweden in 2005, the *Nita Barrow Collection*, nominated by Barbados in 2007, the *Anne Frank diaries,* nominated by the Netherlands in 2007 and the *Permanent Collection of Eleanor Roosevelt Papers Project,* nominated by the United States in 2013. The Register, therefore, lacks gender diversity. Moreover, there seems to be a lack of diversity among the women whose stories have been seen as worth preserving. The *Nita Barrow Collection* is the only collection related to a racialized woman. Documents related to the lives of women from lower social strata are also scarce. One example is the *Old fonds of the historical archive at Colegio de Vizcaínas: women's education and support in the history of the world*, inscribed in the International Register in 2013, and, as the most recent example, the *Archives about Comfort Women*.

[2] Unfortunately, it is out of the scope of this thesis to research how people in question have experienced their own gender or genderlessness. I use the concept of gender to refer to how I presume other people have classified these individuals.

There are also groups that are completely missing from the register. Documents from people who are non-binary or do not fall within Butler's (1991) heterosexual matrix are completely absent. Moreover, archives related to the history of disabledness have not been nominated. While the register does include several human rights documents, it appears to lack documents that are concerned with civil society movements, such as animal rights movements.

Lastly, there is bias towards certain modes of transmission, or "carriers", as the Programme calls them. The register contains a variety of carriers, from stone inscriptions to Hollywood films. However, even though the Programme is open to various types of carriers, the majority of the items accepted tend to be manuscripts or other paper documents. With regard to non-traditional carriers (by which I mean those documents that are not usually preserved in archives), the Register includes 18 stone inscriptions and two Kanjurs (Tibetan Buddhist canons). Non-textual carriers are even less numerous. Representatives of these include music and maps, though maps often contain the names of places. *The Nebra Sky Disc*[3], nominated by Germany, appears to be the only representative of this category. There is also a complete absence of electronic material.

2.3. Nominators

In a way, the Memory of the World is more open to public participation than the World Heritage Programme, as items of documentary heritage may be nominated by countries, organizations, governments, NGOs or individuals–authors can even nominate their own works! (Edmondson 2002, 23-24). This opens more possibilities for wider public participation. Indeed, many people have items of documentary heritage at home that are, if not of global relevance, significant at least on the individual level: diaries, fan posters, autographs, records, etc. In addition, many grassroots organizations may have accumulated documentary heritage that could be used to promote significant social change, such as photos or videotapes of racist attacks or police violence that can be used as forensic evidence.

[3] The Nebra Sky Disc is a bronze disk with inlaid golden symbols that represent the sun or the full moon, the lunar crescent and stars. This object has been considered as one of the oldest depictions of the lunar system. For more see: Haughton B. The Nebra Sky Disc- Ancien Map of stars <http://www.ancient.eu/article/235/>

However, as far as in 2016, only a few private archive holders have submitted nominations in the at the Memory of the World nomination rounds. Perhaps this is partly because agents other than archival institutions are cautious about highlighting their heritage if it is not approved by experts or by society at large. Harvey (2007, 268) is of the opinion that nominations from individuals are not likely be accepted. Harvey's doubts seem justified: during the Programme's 25 years of existence, there have been very few nominations submitted by individual or private archives: the movie director Jacques Grandclaude's *Rossellini Triptyche* and *The Christopher Okigbo Collection* are examples of items that have been nominated by a private archive holder. One exception is from the nomination round of 2013-2015, when a US curator, Dan Walsh, nominated his collection of posters that address Palestine, under the name *The Liberation Graphic Collection of Palestinian Posters*. As it is a private collection nominated by a private individual, the nominator may have more freedom in the nomination process, such as in the selection of the items and in their description. For instance, Walsh's nomination to Memory of the World is out of step with the United States' political stance towards the Gaza conflict. Another example could be the *Archives about Comfort Women*, nominated by China for the nomination round of 2013-2015. The IAC rejected this nomination on the basis that the issue has also affected women in other countries. It was again submitted during the nomination round of 2016-2017, this time along with the support of Korean women's organizations, despite Japan's opposition. It may be possible that a nomination submitted by a private person could be compiled and described in a more independent manner when compared to nominations submitted by archives, libraries or museums, since these organisations are more dependent on the official heritage discourses.

2.4. Debates

Throughout the Programme's existence, there have been various discussions on topics concerning the Programme. First, the uneven representation has been addressed on various occasions (Russel 2012) and in Jan Bos's speech. There have been attempts to make the register more representative of different nations by educating archival professionals in different countries. Training has taken place in Santa Lucia in 2007, in Barbados and South Korea in 2009 (ibid. 2) and in Bishkek, South Korea, and in Muscat, Oman, in 2014 (UNESCO). These

workshops are organized in regions that have little representation on the International Register, particularly Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. In these workshops, participants are given guidance on how to fill out the nomination forms correctly and how to improve the nomination's chances of being selected. Training and raising awareness of the Programme has been considered as key in increasing the amount of non-Western material in the International MoW Register. However, these workshops may be problematic in the sense that they disseminate Western ideas about what kind of material is worth preserving. Workshops, though well intended, may contribute to the authoritative heritage discourse where the West decides what is worth preserving.

In many cases, workshops provided for the indigenous communities by archivists from Western Europe, North America and Australia are filled with concepts used in these countries. An alternative approach might be that indigenous communities, when large enough, could develop their own forms of archival education (McKemmish et al. 2005, 8).

One occurring theme in the MoW discussions is the concept of the carrier. The main question in this regard is what kind of objects can be considered as documentary heritage? For example, electronic material, such as websites, has caused problems, since the archive is intended to be static, a characteristic that electronic material usually does not possess. At the meeting of the Subcommittee of Technology, one of the participants raised the issue that the publication "Preserving Our Documentary Heritage", produced by the Subcommittee in 2005, did not provide advice for the preservation of carriers such as palm leaves, papyrus, or tree barks. Later during the meeting, it was also questioned whether rock and stone inscriptions should be even included in Memory of the World (UNESCO 2008, 5). This implies that these types of carriers are generally not considered, even by some of the staff members of Memory of the World, as part of documentary heritage, despite the Programme's emphasis on content over carrier.

The question about carriers also has other dimensions. For example, Prodan (2014, 74) argues that not only the content of a document but also its carrier may have value. Carriers are cultural artefacts and should be adequately recognized and preserved as such. As such, carriers should also be a target of conservation practices, not only the document's content (Prodan 2014, 74).

Indeed, who should preserve document carriers if not a documentary heritage programme such as Memory of the World?

Moreover, the issue with carriers is linked to power, since, historically, it was mostly those who belonged to upper classes who were literate[4]. The capability to produce written documents is related to power. Oral archives may be linked to a lower social status for the majority of history, including in Europe (Norman 2011). Since the majority of the world's communities rely on non-written ways of mediating information, I see the absence of non-textual material as being of major importance. Concerns regarding the validity of oral archives as reliable evidence seem to demonstrate an implicit assumption regarding which written records would be more objective in terms of their content.

Another major concern is the limited scope of information a document in a national archive is capable of providing. Scholars in gender studies have discussed how little a document actually reveals about the everyday life of an individual (see Lerner 1986). For this reason, turning to only official memories in the archives and libraries may lead to a one-dimensional, monolithic depiction of world history.

The Memory of the World does not necessarily shun women or minority history from the Programme intentionally. The problem seems to be rooted in the structure of the Programme, the notions of archives and documents, the concept of evidence and the "common heritage of humanity." These structures have been built by and for the privileged in the first place. Structures and ideologies are often reflected in language, and for this reason, in the next two chapters, the focus is on the texts the Memory of the World Programme uses as guidelines.

[4] However, this division is not quite clear. Not everyone who could read could also write. Also, the ability to sign one's name cannot be considered a sign of literacy. (Fox & Woolf 2002).

3. The voice of authority in Memory of the World

3.1. Authorized heritage discourse in UNESCO

Smith (2006) sees UNESCO charters as forming a line of texts that interact with each other, reinforcing the discourses in them. The texts as a whole constitute authorized heritage discourse (Smith 2006). In a way, it appears that the *General Guidelines* and other similar texts used in Memory of the World form a part of this genre of UNESCO heritage texts. The *General Guidelines* is also intertextual with those texts, using similar concepts, such as significance and heritage of humanity. In a way, it both borrows and, at the same time, reinforces the ideology present in the other UNESCO charters.

When analysed with critical discourse analysis, the *General Guidelines* and the *Register Companion* appear to be evenly saturated with authorized heritage discourse. In the context of Memory of the World, authorized heritage discourse entails the discourse regarding the carrier of the document, significance, and the "authenticity", or the evidentiary value, of the document. In a manner that is similar to that of the Burra Charter (Waterton & Smith 2006) and the World Heritage Convention (Smith 2006), heritage is discussed as something that is endangered and about to disappear if not correctly preserved. Therefore, what is valuable is intrinsic in the document, in the carrier itself, and it is the carrier that must be preserved. Consequently, heritage is by definition tangible. As the significance is intrinsic, it is therefore also assumed that certain types of heritage must be valuable to *all* nations and communities of the world (Smith 2006). The discourses regarding documentary heritage in Memory of the World appear very similar to the discourses regarding built heritage in UNESCO World Heritage Programme.

3.2. Common heritage of "mankind"

First, it seems necessary to begin by discussing the Memory of the World Programme's mission. What is it and who are its audience? How is it discussed?

> The Memory of the World is the documented, *collective memory of the peoples of the world* – their documentary heritage –, which in turn represents a large proportion of *the world's cultural heritage*. It charts the evolution of thought, discovery and achievement of human society. It is the legacy of the past to the world community of the present and the future. (Edmondson 2002, 2)

The above extract contains a collection of statements about the Memory of the World's mission. The MoW Programme is described to be the collective memory of the world and to chart the evolution of thought, discovery and achievement in human society. The Programme is presented as the legacy of the past to the present and future "world community". At the same time, several existential assumptions are made, of which the most prominent are the presumption regarding the "world community" and the statement about the MoW Programme representing the collective memory of the world. The use of the passive and impersonal form reinforces the voice of authority (Fairclough 2003, 181).

Similarly, in other parts of the *General Guidelines*, documentary heritage is often discussed as something that belongs to all of humanity. The term "world's documentary heritage" appears six times in the *General Guidelines*. An associated term, the "world's cultural heritage," appears once, as an umbrella term that includes different types of heritage. "The documentary heritage of humanity" that appears later in the document (Edmondson 2002, 8) is an expression of the same concept. Again, the "common moral property of all mankind" can be found at point 4.3.1 (Edmondson 2002, 23), as well as the "world's film heritage" at point 2.2.4. (Edmondson 2002, 6). All of these expressions—"the world," "humanity" and "mankind"—are evocative of a single (male) entity.

The term "mankind", which was also used by the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 1972), is particularly revealing. In her analysis, Smith notes that the concept of universality is a plea for the "brotherhood of mankind", which at the same time assumes a masculine identity of the subject (Smith 2006, 99). To some extent, referring to documents and archives as the heritage of mankind is accurate. Indeed, a large amount of what are usually called documents was created by

upper-class literate men in the past. Calling this the heritage of humanity is, however, not truthful, as these documents mostly reflect elite, privileged masculine worldviews.

Overall, "mankind," or humankind, to use a slightly less male-centric alternative, should perhaps not be seen as a single entity, but rather as a totality of different groups, all of whom have different positions. Being "colour-blind", as in not seeing race as a relevant factor in representation, or denying the differences between human experiences, is most likely to reinforce racial biases (Richeson & Nussbaum 2004). Different positions lead to multiple ways of viewing documentary heritage and its conservation, protection and management. It is noteworthy that, while geographical imbalances have been noted, the *General Guidelines* do not mention other representational biases, such as gender or racial biases, nor how internalized attitudes may disadvantage some documentary heritage items when nominated.

3.3. World significance

World significance is a recursive term throughout both in the *General Guidelines* and the *Register Companion*. The simplistic ideology behind the term could possibly be condensed to a single sentence: "There is a common concept of what is significant to the world." In practice, unanimous consensus regarding world significance rarely exists. For example, at the 7th IAC meeting of 2005, while the Register Subcommittee endorsed 32 items for inscription (Memory of the World 2005, annex C), the International Advisory Committee later endorsed only 29 of them (Memory of the World 2005). According to Waterton et al. (2006, 105), the continuous cultivation of phrases like "universal significance" in the preservation of built heritage reduces the plurality of values and meaning to the singular. Therefore, there is no room for challenging the concept. In this scenario, non-expert and indigenous values are abandoned (ibid.) In Memory of the World, the preferred term is "world significance", but, in practice, significant differences do not seem to exist. Therefore, my assumption is that that the notion of Waterton et al. (ibid.) also applies to the use of the concept "world significance". "World significance," in the *General Guidelines*, performs the same function as the term "cultural significance" does in the Burra Charter, erasing the actors that are engaged in the preservation of cultural heritage and persuading the reader to accept the view that there is some heritage that is meaningful to all.

As such, the assumption that there is a unanimous view of what is culturally significant can be used to hide the politics embedded in the decision-making process. If something is of universal value, it cannot be dissonant (Smith 2015, 138). This may be problematic when it comes to evaluating the heritage of groups that are in conflict. According to Smith, part of the consequences of the AHD is the delegitimization of the debate and contestation over the interpretation of the past and present (Smith 2012).

A related problem concerns the geographical influence of a given heritage item. The IAC has emphasized that, for an item to be accepted on the International Register, it must have clear significance within more than one UNESCO region. If it does not possess world significance, the item may nevertheless have regional or national significance. Being registered in any of the registers means the heritage item is recognized by UNESCO. "**The registers are not intended to be a hierarchy**" (UNESCO. Memory of the World Register Companion 2011, 6, emphasis original). However, the very fact that this sentence has been emphasized with bold font appears to highlight the impression that a certain hierarchy of registers does exist.

It is also worth noting that, as of 2016, there is no regional register for the region of Europe and North America. Therefore, European and North American nominations are included either on national registers, if there is one, or on the International Register. This consequently could contribute to Eurocentric bias. The requirement of "geographical influence" by which nominations are accepted by the International Register appear to favour European heritage by default, as Europeans have been rather enthusiastic about colonizing other geographical regions. Non-European documentary heritage can be relegated to national or regional registers, but European documentary heritage, if assessed as significant (and, as has been noted before, European heritage tends to be acknowledged as significant), gets to occupy a revered place on the International Register. The division into international, regional, and national registers may not be a bad idea per se, but the lack of a European-regional Memory of the World Register means that the current situation appears to be biased.

Another issue at stake is the relation of geographical influence to societal power. Who are usually the most well-known and praised on the world scale if not the ones who are most privileged? Minorities and people from the lower classes, as well as women, have long been marginalized in public life (Charlesworth 2010, 28). Thus, for these groups, it has been more challenging to create material the impact of which could be "felt geographically", and, as a consequence, these groups may be underrepresented in all of the MoW Registers. This becomes more obvious when considering the nominations that contain personal archives, libraries or the correspondence of a renowned individual. Female artists and artists who belong to a cultural minority seldom enjoy the reputations of their white male counterparts. Christine Battersby (1989) has noted that the gender of geniuses is most often male. Also, as Smith notes (2006, 30), the concept of a national community leads to the exclusion of the historical, social and cultural experiences of certain groups and also constrains and limits the critical evaluations that those groups can express.

The regional registers have been offered as a solution to increase the representation of minorities and subcultures: "They may afford opportunity for minorities and subcultures to be appropriately represented" (Edmondson 2002, 20). However, as of 2016, a glance at the MOWCAP and MOWLAC does not clearly indicate that indigenous and minority material is any better represented in those registers than in the International Register. Perhaps this is due to the fact that, while there may be certain differences between the national Memory of the World committees, the selection criteria used for the International Register form the basis for the regional and national registers as well (Edmondson 2002, 20-21). For this reason, the selection criteria for the International Register continue to be relevant.

Some scholars have expressed concerns about whether the existence of regional and national registers is sufficient to address the problem of underrepresentation. At the 1997 IAC meeting, Jean-Pierre Wallot noted that there have to be other ways of safeguarding the heritage of minorities than through the national MoW Registers, because otherwise "minorities might suffer" (UNESCO 1997). Similarly, van Albada noted at the seventh meeting of the IAC in 2005 that there are "zones of silence": Not all memories are honoured and seen worthy of preserving. In some cases, registration does not please the ruling elite (UNESCO 2005, 9).

The idea of world significance also seems problematic when considering the controversies that arose over certain previous nominations. While heritage can indeed be significant in a "good" or "bad" sense, highlighting some aspects of history cannot be neutral. The manner in which an item is perceived depends largely on the background of the viewer. Recent examples include the *Documents of the Nanjing Massacre*, the *Archives about Comfort Women* and the *Liberation Graphics of the Palestinian Posters,* all of which were submitted for the nomination round of 2013-2015.

In the MoW Programme's past, political correctness was not always considered important to the same extend. For example, at the fourth meeting of the IAC, the following statement was made:

> We should avoid political correctness, which is not a criterion for evaluating a nomination, but rather deal objectively with the merits of each proposal for nomination, in its own right. (UNESCO 1999)

It appears that, at that time, the item was considered more important than the possibility of offending someone. However, in recent years, there may have been a shift to a more cautious approach in this aspect. This is perhaps most explicit in the *Register Companion* (2011), in the part where the inclusion of the papers of political leaders or parties is discussed:

> However, the need to be–and to be seen to be –even-handed and objective can conflict with the current political circumstances in which every MoW committee operates. MoW registers cannot be open to any accusations of political partisanship. (UNESCO 2011, 16)

At the 12th meeting of the IAC, the Register Subcommittee, however, expressed its concern about nominations that were not written in a "neutral, objective way." The RSC stressed that the nominations should not be written in "aggressive" or "offensive" language and that unprovable claims should be avoided (UNESCO 2015, 5).

A release from 2016, presented below, which discusses updating the *General Guidelines*, addresses sensitivity as one of the issues that has to be tackled in the development of the guidelines:

> 11. Setting standards of acceptance of nominations in terms of objectivity of argument and language, accuracy and adequacy of information and neutrality of intent. (UNESCO 2016, 2)

In the above quotation, the workgroup stresses the importance of creating standards of objectivity regarding "argument and language", "neutrality of intent" and the terms "aggressive" or "offensive." It is, however, problematic if those in power are allowed to decide what is offensive or aggressive. In feminist circles, this kind of decision-making is called "tone policing". Tone policing typically occurs in group situations where a member of an oppressed group is hurt by a more privileged person and, when confronting the offending person, is scolded for being "too angry" or "not polite" or for not recognizing the good intentions or qualities of the person who has been hurtful. The principle of neutral language can be used against people who are simply seeking to have their perspectives recognized. Although academic research may not have been conducted on tone policing, in everyday activism this term has become common in the 2010s. Tone policing has been considered as a form of *ad hominem* argument. In *ad hominem*, the argument focuses on the personal attributes of the opponent. In short, the language used in the nomination form should not affect the decision about whether or not the item is culturally significant.

In summary, the concept of world significance as something that the whole world can agree on—in a manner that is similar to the concept of heritage being something that is universally agreed on—may be problematic for oppressed groups, such as minorities, women and members of certain political or ideological movements. Registers based on geographical influence have not seemed to increase the number of indigenous heritage items listed by Memory of the World. Also, even if more indigenous heritage was included, it might be challenging to avoid the emergence of a hierarchy between the MoW International Register and the other MoW registers.

3.4. Documentary heritage

To give a better understanding of the division of work between the different UNESCO Programmes, this section explores how heritage has been defined and divided into three categories in the three programmes.

In the *Convention for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage*, intangible heritage has been defined as follows:

> ...traditions or living expressions inherited from our ancestors and passed on to our descendants, such a, performing arts, social practices, rituals, festive events, knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe or the knowledge and skills to produce traditional crafts. (UNESCO 2002)

The World Heritage Convention defines cultural heritage as follows:

> …monuments: architectural works, *works of monumental sculpture and painting*, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, *inscriptions*, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;
>
> groups of buildings: groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;
>
> sites: works of man or the combined works of nature and man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view. (UNESCO 1972)

Finally, documentary heritage is defined as follows in the *General Guidelines*:

> A document is deemed to have two components: the information content and the carrier on which it resides. Both may be of great variety and both are equally important as parts of the memory. (Edmondson 2002, 8)

This is clarified using examples:

- Textual items such as manuscripts, books, newspapers, posters, etc. The textual content may be recorded in ink, pencil, paint or other medium. The carrier may be of paper, plastic, papyrus, parchment, palm leaves, bark, textile fabric, stone or other medium.
- Similarly, non-textual items such as *drawings*, prints, maps, *music*.
- Audiovisual items such as films, discs, tapes and photographs–whether recorded in analogue or digital formats and by mechanical, electronic or other means–comprise a *physical carrier* with an information-bearing layer where the content *resi*des.
- Virtual documents such as websites reside on servers: the carrier may be a hard disc or tape, the content is electronic data. (Edmondson 2002, 8-9, emphasis mine)

When comparing the criteria of the other two UNESCO Programmes to that of Memory of the World, it can be noted that there are similarities, if not even overlaps, in these definitions. For instance, drawings are considered as documentary heritage in Memory of the World and paintings are listed in the World Heritage Convention. In addition, the World Heritage Convention mentions inscriptions, a form of heritage that has been also covered by the Memory of the World Register. It is clear that distinguishing between different types of heritage is not simple. The definition of documentary heritage in the Memory of the World Programme has been relatively inclusive; it includes items such as stone and palm leaves, items that people are accustomed to see in museums rather than in archives.

Despite the inclusiveness of the above definitions of documentary heritage, it appears that there has been a tendency to favour certain types of heritage, and definitions have constantly been re-negotiated. For example, discussions about whether a painting or another work of art can be included have led to rather arbitrary conclusions. Eventually, it was decided that a painting can be considered as a document (if it documents some event) but a statue cannot. Therefore, the

Mona Lisa could be registered but the *Venus de Milo* could not (UNESCO 2011?). The definition of documentary heritage was again expanded at the 2015 meeting of the Register Subcommittee in Paris, where the Committee decided that coins and other numismatic items could be considered documentary heritage (UNESCO 2015).

The biased selection was also noted in the revised *General Guidelines*:

> In the early years of the Programme a bias towards older materials, especially manuscripts, and against "modern media," has been apparent. There has also been a tendency to favour items created in western countries. Perhaps *this reflects the practicality of identifying "easy" items first*. (Edmondson 2002, 23, emphasis mine)

The writers note that there has been bias towards certain types of documents. The sentence can be considered as being between a factual statement and an evaluative statement. In "There has also been a tendency," the actor is erased by the use of passive. After this, the writer appears to attempt to justify this bias; perhaps this reflects the practicality of identifying "easy" items first. The sentence is somewhat modalized; the writer uses the word "perhaps", which insinuates that he is not quite committed to this statement. The word "easy" has been placed in quotation marks, as if it would be said or written elsewhere or that it would be a universally accepted truth. However, it is not explained who considers identifying certain items easy and why they are easy. It is assumed that the author and the reader both share a common view of that. To Fairclough (2003, 41), such assumptions in texts may reveal the ideology behind them.

All of the examples in the above list of definitions of documentary heritage are material, tangible objects. This may reflect the Western archival discourses where a document is often seen as tangible and, preferably, on paper. As McKemmish (2005, 18) notes, orality has not been considered as a form of archive in modern Western literature. The same applies to works of literature, art, architecture, dance, ceremonies and rituals that have evidentiary power. Thus, oral forms of archive tend to be excluded from the professional meanings assigned to terms like record, archive, and archives in these discourses. Nevertheless, it is unclear if these changes or

the shifts in archive paradigms have been recognized in Memory of the World. For example, oral history recordings have been delegated to the Intangible Heritage Programme, as stated below:

> While oral history recordings, once in existence, are part of the documentary heritage, and their creation is encouraged – especially in cultures where oral tradition is an important factor - the *Memory of the World* Programme does not duplicate other UNESCO Programmes which deal with this specific area of heritage. (Edmondson 2002, 9)

The text acknowledges the role oral tradition plays in some cultures, stating that they fall under the purview of other programmes. In the above quotation, it is also presupposed that oral tradition has to be recorded in order to be recognized as documentary heritage. Consequently, oral history, as such, does not fulfil this definition. These definitions can lead to the exclusion of the marginalized.

3.5. Tangible and intangible heritage

The reluctance to see intangible forms of archives as documentary heritage may be partly due to the division of labour in UNESCO programmes. While an initiative has been undertaken to increase cooperation between the three programmes (see Engelhardt & Ornager 2008), as of 2016, the traditional division still appears to be rigid. Nevertheless, oral history, performing arts and rituals that are relegated to the Intangible Heritage Programme cannot be simply distinguished from memory, archives and documents. Nor are intangible heritage and tangible heritage separate from each other. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett asserts that tangible heritage is "a mere husk or inert matter" without the intangible heritage (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2004, 60). In similar vein, Kurin (2004, 70) is of the opinion that separating tangible and intangible is not possible for many peoples:

> While the concept of a document is universal, it is acknowledged that some cultures are more "document oriented" than others. Therefore—for this and other

> reasons—not all cultures *will be* equally represented within the global documentary heritage, and hence within Memory of the World. The intangible and oral heritage, for example, is the province of other UNESCO Programmes. (Edmondson 2002, 8)

The above quotation implies that the problem of imbalanced registers is acknowledged, but the author notes that there are other UNESCO programmes that are appropriate for these forms of heritage. An assumption is made regarding some cultures being more "document oriented" than others. The assumed cultural differences regarding the attitudes towards documents are used to justify the unequal representation of cultures in the Memory of the World Programme; "not all cultures will be represented within the global documentary heritage." This is presented as a statement, as a "fact of life": "The intangible and oral heritage, for example, is the province of other UNESCO Programmes." It appears that the imbalance in the Register has not been considered as a serious problem, since the other UNESCO programmes are intended to represent the marginalized or non-European regions of the world

The ideology behind the text may be reduced to a single statement: Not all cultures will be equally represented because they do not all have documentary heritage. This implies that the concept of documentary heritage cannot be expanded. It is problematic not only because it excludes orality but for at least two other reasons.

According to Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (2004, 57), the Intangible Heritage Programme has partly failed in its mission to include indigenous and minority heritage. Currently, the Intangible Heritage List does indeed preserve significant amounts of intangible heritage that do not originate from minority or indigenous sources. Moreover, the list includes heritage from countries that are already significantly represented in other UNESCO lists, such as Japan. Applied to the Memory of the World Programme, it appears that the presence of other UNESCO programmes does not necessarily mean that they would preserve the oral histories excluded from Memory of the World.

Therefore, one of the main issues is that the other UNESCO programmes do not necessarily complement the representation of cultural heritage as they are presumed to. Another issue lies in

the division of European and non-European heritage into two separate registers. In effect, what makes the Intangible Heritage List different from the World Heritage List appears to be the fact that it, in the words of Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, "preserves the division between the West and the rest." Under this scheme, European heritage will probably not be listed, but the Japanese *Nôgaku* theatre has been, although they all involve the transmission of knowledge from generation to generation (ibid.)

3.6. Expert hegemony

Authorized discourse heritage also manifests itself in discussions concerning the role of experts and expertise. This is further seen in the guidelines for the evaluation, preservation and management of documentary heritage. As in the UNESCO conventions on the preservation of built heritage (Smith 2006, Waterton et al., 2006), in the *General Guidelines*, documentary heritage is depicted as something that should be safeguarded by experts with appropriate skills and knowledge:

> The integrity of documentary heritage itself should be inviolate: for example, documents should not be mutilated, censored, manipulated, or falsified. The long-term survival of the heritage must not be put at risk in the interests of short-term exploitation. Conservation and restoration work *should not distort or change the heritage beyond the intentions of its creators*. (Edmondson 2002, 7, emphasis mine)

Put simply, the message appears to be that documentary heritage should be immutable. The documentary heritage "should not distort or change the heritage beyond the intentions of its creators." While the idea is to preserve the heritage from destruction, it does not take into consideration the fact that some heritage items are fluid and variable by their very nature; for example, the acts of storytelling and dance vary with each performer.

The *General Guidelines* appear to validate different means of protecting heritage. However, when one examines the text, it appears that some practices are more appreciated than others:

> Many cultures have traditional and effective means of preserving their own forms of documentary heritage, which reflect *their own ethos and customs. Conversely,* modern methods have often developed from a *scientific* understanding of the nature of materials and the mechanisms of deterioration, and come from a "western" tradition. In individual countries, finding an accommodation between these two approaches *may be* important in developing management plans. *Both* areas of knowledge are essential if collections are to be adequately maintained. (Edmondson 2002, 14)

Here, a contrast is made between traditional means and modern methods. By using the word "both," the writer presents only two options; on the one hand, there is traditional knowledge with its own ethos and customs and, on the other, there is scientific understanding, which comes from the Western tradition. The use of the word "conversely" makes the two approaches seem to be opposed to each other. However, it must be acknowledged that there are multiple forms of indigenous knowledge that are not necessarily similar to each other (Green 2012, 108). Overall, lumping all indigenous knowledge together is generalizing and harmful.

One may also question the dichotomy between Western and indigenous practices. Indigenous knowledge ontologies are often considered as incompatible with globalized Western or scientific knowledge (Turnbull 2004, in McKemmish et al. 2006, 4). However, these forms of knowing are not only seen as different from each other but are also seen as complementary and necessary so that collections are maintained "adequately". It is noted that both areas of knowledge are deemed essential to ensure that the collections are "adequately" maintained. It is of interest how the sentence also embeds the ideology in which Western intervention in indigenous evaluation and preservation of documentary heritage is justified. As it is later declared in the *General Guidelines*, "In preservation, no one can afford to be an island" (Edmondson 2002, 14). This can be interpreted as meaning that experts from the countries that provide the cultural heritage items are seem as necessary participants in the conservation of local material and in developing management practices.

The concerns regarding the deterioration or disappearance of documentary heritage appears at a number of locations in the *General Guidelines*. Special concern is expressed for the unequal division of preservation resources:

> There is no necessary relationship between cultural riches and economic riches, but communities and nations vary in their individual capacity to protect their documentary heritage. (Edmondson 2002, 10)

> The skills and facilities needed to achieve this are unevenly distributed around the globe. (Edmondson 2002, 2)

In these quotations, it is claimed that cultural riches do not equal economic riches, meaning also perhaps that countries that are not particularly wealthy do have patrimony that is worth preserving. However, the text continues to state that some communities and nations are not capable of protecting their heritage, which is a value-laden statement. Similarly, the skills and facilities needed for preservation are unevenly distributed. Consequently, it is assumed that certain skills and facilities are inadequate.

The issue with preservation has been addressed before. At the 1997 meeting of the IAC, Joan van Albada was concerned that the strict storage parameters required of the nominating institutions were too strict to be used in the global south. However, while this was considered, eventually it was decided that countries should aim at providing the best care for documents that they can and therefore the standards should be set high (UNESCO 1997). Therefore, the conflict between the requirements and the resources available remains unsolved. The preservation of material was deemed more important than the participation of a variety of nations and communities in the Memory of the World Programme.

One of the issues addressed in preservation is the lack of heritage conservation literature in non-European languages:

> Since much professional discussion and literature is still in European languages, other language groups remain *disadvantaged* until the rate of translation increases. (Edmondson 2002, 14)

While the concern may be genuine, the lack of skills and facilities could be used as an excuse for Western intervention in preservation. The sentence also makes the value-laden assumption that the only heritage conservation literature worth reading is in European languages. The lack of literature available in translation is presented as a reason for this disadvantage:

> Assistance and advice from any convenient point in the Memory of the World structure is available if needed. *This especially applies to countries, regions or categories of heritage that are under-represented.* (Edmondson 2002)

In her discussion of governmental heritage projects that seek to increase community participation, Smith notes that these policies are assimilationist and top-down, rather than bottom-up, and thus they are not able to challenge the authorized heritage discourse by and of themselves (Smith 2006, 37). In a certain sense, indigenous communities are allotted a place in the preservation of their documentary heritage, but they cannot challenge the dominant discourses regarding heritage protection. Ellen Ndeshi Namhila seems to emphasize how important it is that the expansion of the African Memory of the World Programme (ARCMOW) is initiated and supported by the local community. As she noted, taking heritage to Western countries under the pretext of preservation and safekeeping would not be a desirable outcome. On the contrary, "It is about time to restore to Africa what has been robbed over a century of colonialism" (Namhila 2008, 7).

After the postmodernist paradigm shift in archival science, the selection and preservation of documentary heritage must be carefully considered. Naturally, this concerns the Memory of the World Programme as well. Preservation raises many questions: When should digital heritage be preserved? If, for example, indigenous rock inscriptions listed for the MoW International Registers are altered in some way by the community in question, is their value destroyed? The

concept of a document as fixed and immutable has become no longer applicable. The views regarding preservation in the *General Guidelines*, however, seem to favour tangible documents.

Overall, preservation is understood in the *General Guidelines* as the preservation of physical objects, which excludes archives of orality. In oral cultures, recordkeeping is managed orally by relegating it to an entrusted person, whose role is to enact the memorizing. Archives of orality may, therefore, exist in the minds of only a few individuals, specifically the ones who "do" the remembrance (McKemmish et al. 2005, 160). However, the *General Guidelines* express the traditional concepts of document and archives and the traditional roles of experts and the community. Although studies have been conducted on how community participation in preservation and management could be increased (see McKemmish et al. 2005), the Memory of the World Programme appears to remain rather conservative when it comes to how it considers the roles of experts and communities.

In addition to preservation, the parts of the *General Guidelines* that discuss the IAC are areas where authorized heritage discourse is dominant. In these sections, the authority of the IAC in selecting heritage for permanent preservation is not questioned:

> The definition of **documentary heritage** will require interpretation from time to time, and the final arbiter is the IAC. It will have regard to the primary purpose, perception or intent of the item concerned. For example, when is a painting documentary heritage, and when is it not? Was the primary purpose of the painting to document, or is it primarily the subjective expression of the artist? (Edmondson 2002, 9)

In this extract, the IAC is presented as the final arbiter on matters concerning the value of nominated documentary heritage: The IAC "will have regard to the primary purpose, perception or intent." Here, the IAC is seen as capable of determining whether the primary purpose of a painting is to document or to reflect the thoughts of the artist. According to this outlook, the capabilities of the IAC include mind-reading abilities.

In summary, it seems that the IAC is considered as one of the expert bodies, similar to those that it consults when it makes decisions. After the IAC, the professional NGOs have a significant role in the selection process, as they are understood as being able to identify whether the nominated item is of world significance or not. As in other UNESCO conventions that contribute to authorized heritage discourse (Smith 2006; Waterton 2006), the authority of experts is unquestioned. Experts are apparently capable of recognizing if an item is authentic and/or unique and whether it documents a significant time, place, people, subject and theme, form and style or has social or spiritual value. However, Western expertise in archives, museums, and libraries is not, by default, sufficient to assess an item's value.

3.7. The evidentiary value of a document

The first criterion mentioned in the *Guideline*s is that of authenticity (Edmondson 2002, section 4.2.3). Authenticity is tested using the following questions:

> **[A]uthenticity.** Is it what it appears to be? Has its identity and provenance been reliably established? Copies, replicas, forgeries, bogus documents or hoaxes can, with the best intentions, be mistaken for the genuine article. (Edmondson 2002, 21)

The document is described as an "article," which means it is considered as a physical entity. It is not made clear who can reliably establish its identity and provenance. However, the nomination form attached to the document implies that "expert examination" can confirm these characteristics and also establish that the provenance is "well established."

Furthermore, in the MoW nomination form, authenticity is described as an object having well-established provenance and as something that is established by experts:

> Authenticity (4.2.3): explain how the documentary heritage is known to be authentic. For example, this may be because its provenance is well established, or because *expert examination* has *demonstrated* that it is genuine. (Edmondson 2002, 44, my emphasis)

“Well established” requires that a document is associated with an archival institution or the provenance of the document has been reliably recorded according to the Western model of recordkeeping. “Experts” are given authority; their examinations demonstrate that a document is genuine. The use of the non-modalized form makes the sentence a statement.

For Sir Hillary Jenkinson, the authenticity of a record is attested through transmission of custody from the record’s creator to the archival institution. However, an archival institution is not necessarily the ideal place to house documents when establishing their authenticity. This is even more evident for virtual archives. It may be more plausible to consider that the authenticity of a record commences at the moment of its creation. This would also remove the unnecessary link between authenticity and the archive building. The moment of creation cannot happen in an archive (Cunningham 2005, 45).

Nevertheless, authenticity is not a simple matter, and even experts are not, by default, able to confirm it. Today, both in archival science and in cultural heritage studies, it is largely agreed that the authenticity of a document does not necessarily imply that the content is reliable (The Society of American Archivists, 2016). In a similar vein, the discourse of “inauthenticity” can be seen as a means of maintaining the authority of expert knowledge (Smith 2006, 69). However, alternative models have been created for assessing the value of a document. In the records continuum model, the dichotomy between “record as evidence” and the “record as memory” disappears (McKemmish 2002, 352). Applied to Memory of the World, the nominated document could be evaluated on other bases than that of its “authenticity” or evidentiary value.

3.8. World significance as a tool of reassessment

The core concept of world significance requires further consideration:

> Second, the IAC must be satisfied that the nominated item is of world significance. That is, it must be: unique and irreplaceable, something whose disappearance or deterioration would constitute a harmful impoverishment of the heritage of humanity. It must have

> created great impact over a span of time and/or within a particular cultural area of the world. It may be representative of a type, but must have no direct equal. It must have had great influence–whether positive or negative–on the course of history. (Edmondson 2002, 21-22)

"It may be representative of a type, but must have no direct equal." Here, the value of the document depends on the physical quality that can be measured and its status as a representative of a type, which can be confirmed by an expert. Another requirement is that the item must have no direct equal. This leads to a question: Whose item will be the one that will be considered irreplaceable, "whose disappearance or deterioration would constitute a harmful impoverishment of humanity"? When an item has to be unique in order to be of world significance, some communities will inevitably be excluded.

The Memory of the World criteria regarding world significance are imbued with Western values. To be of world significance, the nominated item must fulfil at least one of the six criteria of world significance. This means that the item must be either a representative of an important 1) time, 2) place, 3) people, 4) subject, and theme, 5) form and style and/or 6) have social/spiritual or community significance (Edmondson 2002, 21-22, 67).

The manner in which significance is evaluated seems to be an example of circular reasoning. What is meant, exactly, by "important people" or "form and style"? For example, criterion 3 is defined as follows:

> The social and cultural context of its creation may reflect significant aspects of human behaviour, or of social, industrial, artistic or political development. It may capture the essence of great movements, transitions, advances or regression. It may reflect the impact of key individuals or groups. (Edmondson 2002, 22)

In logical terms, I view this criterion as an example of circular reasoning: An item of documentary heritage is considered as significant because it is significant. This criterion mentions "key individuals and groups". In a world that still favours men over women and certain

nationalities over others, this results in the possibility that the majority of the "key individuals" on the Register may end up being Western white men. In addition to gender and ethnicity, other factors may prevent the recognition of valuable heritage as well, such as disability, poverty or being a member of the LGBTIA+ community. As with any other work that deals with equality, if the intersectionality of oppression is not considered and appropriate measures are not taken, change may take significant time to occur.

The terms used, "great impact" or "great influence", are very vague and contain many existential assumptions. This is reminiscent of the field of built heritage protection and the World Heritage Convention, which contain similar embedded assumptions, such as what constitutes "a significant development in human history" in built heritage. As Smith (2006, 97) argues, these concepts must be indefinite to be inclusive of as much heritage as possible. However, this approach contributes to the impression that the reader already knows what is meant by these terms (ibid.). In this way, the reader is led to accept the underlying ideology of the text (Fairclough 2003, 41).

Another example is criterion 5, form and style, which has been defined as follows:

> The item may have outstanding aesthetic, stylistic or linguistic value, be a typical or key exemplar of a type of presentation, custom or medium, or of a disappeared or disappearing carrier or format. (Edmondson 2002, 22)

This prompts several questions: What constitutes outstanding aesthetic value? How do I know if this is a key exemplar of something? How do I know that John or Jane Doe would find it as appealing as I do?

The problem is not limited to the Memory of the World Programme. Similar problems have arisen in other cultural heritage protection fields. For instance, Waters-Lynch et al. (2015) discuss the problem of cross-cultural aesthetic assessment of items in *Significance 2.0*, a tool used to assess museum objects. Water-Lynch et al. (2015, 19) bring up the case of the church paintings of the Wadeye people. The researchers noted that aesthetic values may differ between

cultures, and, for this reason, it is not clear which model the assessor should privilege and which criteria should be considered when evaluating the Church paintings (Water-Lynch et al. 2015, 20). Similarly, cultural differences in the assessment of significance are not assessed in any point in the *General Guidelines*. This shortcoming implies that the members of the IAC and the Register Subcommittee hold unquestioned authority as impartial and objective evaluators. This is in conflict with the current view that the archivist is no longer regarded as an impartial and objective keeper of documents (Pederson 2005).

In 2009, a guidebook named *Significance 2.0* was published, to assist heritage professionals in the difficult task of heritage assessment. In *Significance 2.0*, the aesthetic significance of the object is described as "well-designed", a "good example of a style", "innovative in its design" and "pleasing" (Russell & Winkworth 2009, 39). This is similar to the *General Guidelines*, which require that the documentary heritage item should be of "outstanding aesthetic, stylistic or linguistic value, be a typical or key exemplar of a type of presentation, custom or medium, or of a disappeared or disappearing carrier or format" (Edmondson 2002, 22). In these definitions, many existential assumptions are made. Assessment of aesthetic value is perhaps a challenging task, as the old saying "beauty is in the eye of the beholder" implies. It is easy to come up with at least one example from everyday life wherein there is a significant discrepancy between aesthetic values, whether it is a couple's argument over the colour of curtains or a discussion about music between a heavy metal fan and a pop enthusiast.

Lastly, there is the criterion of social/spiritual and community significance. This criterion was present in the original 1995 draft of the *General Guidelines* but is missing from the revised version of 2002 (Prodan 2014, 30). However, it was again proposed by Roslyn Russell and Ray Edmondson in the of Register Subcommittee meeting of 2006 (UNESCO 2007) and accepted as one of the assessment criteria. Later, Russell clarified the importance of this criterion in her presentation at the third Memory of the World Conference. According to Russell, the sixth criterion was added in order to increase the number of items that seemed to be of world significance but that could not be accepted because they did not successfully meet any of the other five criteria (Russell 2008, slide 3):

> Application of this criterion must reflect living significance – does documentary heritage have an emotional hold on people who are alive today? Is it venerated as holy or for its mystical qualities, or reverenced for its association with significant people and events? (Once those who have revered the documentary heritage for its social/ spiritual/ community significance no longer do so, or are no longer living, it loses this specific significance and may eventually acquire historical significance.) (Memory of the World-Register Nomination Form)

The text acknowledges that there are certain communities that have an "emotional hold" on certain documents. For the other criteria, a document's value is presented as an intrinsic quality, but, for this criterion, the item's value is tied to the emotional hold a community has on the item. The community is "allowed" to demonstrate its emotional attachment. Using this choice of words, the text puts the community in a passive role. It implies that the community is given an opportunity to participate in the nomination. In a sense, they are invited to participate, but the problem is that they are not imagined to be already present at the beginning of the evaluation. A contrast between "living significance" and "historical significance" is made. Having living significance does not automatically mean that an item will also have historical significance.

Even though the inclusion of the sixth criterion aims to promote the representation of minority and indigenous heritage, the text seems to contain another problematic assumption. As Lloyd (2007, 61) points out, it is questionable whether or not Western experts could assess indigenous heritage, given that in those communities the very act of interpreting material of significance may be restricted to only certain members. Therefore, the problem is that the final arbiters still represent Western views when it comes to archives, documents, heritage and significance.

In summary, authorized heritage discourse appears to be as present in the *General Guidelines* as in other UNESCO conventions. It can be discerned in the assumptions that the text makes about concepts such as "world significance" or "significant development". These statements assume that there is some consensual view of what is significant. This value is supposedly embedded in the carrier and in the content and can be identified by experts; the appropriateness of Western evaluation is not questioned. The guidelines also assume that the carrier is by definition tangible,

fixed, immutable and manageable, which precludes the use of many non-Western approaches to documenting. Over the next two chapters, I elaborate on the effects of these ideas on the selection process.

4. Authority-approved heritage

4.1. Defining and redefining heritage

In the field of UNESCO World Heritage, nominations for inclusion are defined, redefined, framed and, to a certain degree, recreated, with the goal of satisfying the requirement of being of "universal significance" (Smith 2006, 100). Likewise, in the Memory of the World Programme, a nomination may be submitted several times over subsequent nomination rounds before acceptance. In the words of Robertson-von Trotha and Hauser (2010, 73), "the item is defined and redefined until it finally becomes part of the documentary heritage of the globalized world."

During its biennial meetings, the International Advisory Committee of the Memory of the World Programme decides whether a nomination is suitable for the International Register, whether it would better suit a regional or national register or whether it should be considered for any of them. As UNESCO is a significant actor in the cultural heritage sector, the IAC, to some extent, exerts power over the views of the public regarding what constitutes cultural heritage. According to Robertson-von Trotha and Hauser (2010, 73) in the Memory of the World Programme, national memories are intentionally internationalized. Gaining the approval of UNESCO adds a certain stature to an object of documentary heritage. It may also increase the item's value in the eyes of the general public.

The expert status of UNESCO may be used for imposing political and nationalistic views. Robertson-von Trotha and Hauer (2010, 72) point out how items are presented without a great deal of information and without sufficient context on the Memory of the World website. Thus, Memory of the World appears to be a programme that rebuilds and reconstructs cultural identity (ibid.). Using the Grimm Brothers' fairy tale anthology (nominated by Germany and inscribed on the International Register in 2005) as an example, Robertson-von Trotha and Hauser note that

the explanations of the item's value were explicitly nationalistic as well as one-dimensional. In the nomination form, the Grimm Brothers' anthology was described as containing the nation's best folktale traditions (UNESCO 2004), although, according to Robertson von-Trotha and Hauser, the compilation of the anthology conducted by Wilhelm and Jacob Grimm was more a project that reflected the national romanticism of its time. Since the beginning, this compilation of fairy tales was a revaluation of a cultural asset (2010, 73). Nevertheless, Grimms' fairy tales are presented as "the most well-known and most widely distributed book worldwide of German cultural history" on the Memory of the World website (UNESCO 2016).

In the rationales, the IAC also presents non-modalized evaluative statements (Fairclough 2003, 201) about the value of a nominated heritage item. These statements and texts have concrete consequences, as the UNESCO Director-General usually accepts the IAC's report as authoritative. As a consequence, some items become considered part of the world's documentary heritage and some memories are allowed to be forgotten.

In the following section, I move on to consider some examples that represent unofficial collective memory instead of the memories that are preserved in state archival institutions. These examples were rejected because they could not fulfil the requirements set for acceptable documentary heritage. They either challenged the traditional concept of a document, that is, a written record kept in an archive, or failed to be pleasing. Both of these two factors are considered as "flaws" in the selection process because they challenge authorized heritage discourse.

4.2. Value as an intrinsic quality

As discussed in chapter three, Memory of the World criteria include authenticity, uniqueness and global influence. Memory of the World nominations must also be fixed, immutable and moveable. The documents included in the Memory of the World Register are, by this definition, tangible and small enough to be moved. This, of course, would normally exclude murals or inscriptions in rock. Memory of the World items are also pleasant and "feel-good", as their value, as dictated by authorized heritage discourse, has to be agreed upon by everyone who

views them. As documents, their value is tied to their ability to function as evidence, defined by discourses that maintain the ideal of objectivity in archives and archivists. The nominated items are weighed against these concepts and criteria, and their inclusion or exclusion is then justified based on how well they meet these standards. What is remarkable is that the IAC's comments on nominations often discuss significance as an intrinsic quality of the document, rather than as a process of various discourses and definitions that have evolved over the course of history.

This can be seen in the way the IAC discussed the *Brahms Collection*, nominated by the Archives of the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* in Vienna, when it recommended the *Collection* for inclusion in the MoW International Register in 2005 (UNESCO 2016):

> Brahms was a highly influential 19th century Romantic composer. His music was and is widely and frequently performed. It evokes its time. His music is an integral part of Western culture, and its influence is pervasive. The collection contains manuscripts and other unique materials that are, by definition, irreplaceable. The collection, assembled by Brahms himself, has the significance of the stamp of his own personality (UNESCO 2005).

Brahms and his music are praised and stated as being part of "Western culture". The collection is deemed important *because* it is related to a famous composer. The manuscripts and other material are described as unique and irreplaceable. The collection is described as having the stamp of Brahms' personality. Stamping refers to a physical act, which leaves a visible mark; it also seems as if Brahms himself contributed to the significance to the documents. There is no modalization in these sentences; they are all statements, giving them the impression of objectivity and truthfulness.

In general, works of Western art, literature and music in seem to be appreciated by the Memory of the World Programme, which can also be seen in the IAC's decisions and in the language used in its commentary. Their inclusion is justified by referring to *obvious* value. For example, Ludwig van Beethoven's Symphony No. 9 in D minor, nominated by the State Library, Berlin, and inscribed in 2000, received the following comment from the IAC: "The symphony is

obviously of world importance and global impact" (UNESCO 2000,). Likewise, the film *Metropolis* is considered as undoubtedly of world significance: "The film *unquestionably* is one of the great works of the cinema and has had profound worldwide impact" (UNESCO 2002, my emphasis). In both of these sentences, the value of the item is described in a simple, non-modalized statement, which does not provide space for dissenting voices. The item is described to be "obviously" or "unquestionably" of world importance. However, to whom are they significant? It might be considered that statements regarding global significance are automatically erroneous, as noted by Bob Pymm (2006, 71), who argues that there is no such thing as the general public, but rather that there are different publics for whom it is necessary to collect material that satisfies as many of their needs as possible.

The text makes an assumption about the shared view of the world significance of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony and *Metropolis.* Their importance is presented as being based on common knowledge, and defining them as important is deemed as common sense. In this way, the reader is compelled to accept a certain ideology (Fairclough 2003, 166).

On occasion, the value of an item is not as evident to the IAC. In these cases, the nominators may be requested to send more evidence to justify their claims regarding the item's significance. For example, the *Anchi Gospel*, nominated by Georgia in the nomination round of 2009-2011, was rejected because the IAC felt that its significance had not been proved and the nominator was required to provide more evidence:

> The IAC was of the view that while the nomination may have had global influence and impact, its uncertain provenance, as well as questions about its age, prevented a proper assessment of its significance. Consequently, it recommended that the nomination be revised and resubmitted in a later round with more precise information about the document and with the names of *specialists on Caucasian scripts* and *international referees* who could be contacted to *confirm the global significance*. (UNESCO 2011)

Here, the position of the writer is against the nomination. A possibility is presented: The nomination "may have had" global influence. However, by using the modalized form "may have had", the writer expresses some uncertainty about this; therefore, the writer is not quite committed to this "truth" (Fairclough 2003, 164-165, 170). The nomination is rejected based on its uncertain provenance. The questions regarding its age are said to prevent an assessment of its significance. It is not made clear who questioned the document's age. In the last sentence, it is speculated that, should the document be resubmitted in a later round, specialists on Caucasian scripts and international referees could assure the IAC that the item is of world significance. Here again, the value of the document lies in the script and can be confirmed by the people who have the appropriate expertise for doing so.

Another example could be the *Arabic and Persian Manuscripts and Miniature paintings of Mughal, Central Asian & Iranian Schools,* a nomination from India in the nomination round of 2003-2005:

> A large and varied collection of more than 21,000 manuscripts, some of them extremely rare, in Arabic, Persian, Urdu, Pashtu, Pali, Turkish, and Sanskrit languages. However, the size and range of the collection makes the nomination difficult to evaluate. In addition, the lack of *independent referees* and the lack of evidence to justify the importance of the collection in international terms.
>
> The Register Sub-Committee recommends that the nominators be invited to consider how the proposal can be given more focus. (UNESCO 2005, 28, my emphasis)

This nomination is criticized, among other things, for a lack of independent referees. The referees the nominator had chosen were not considered reliable. The implication here is that the process of determining value can be relegated to some other, better experts. However, truly independent or objective evaluation is impossible. The experts have their own interests and preferences.

There are certain similarities between the two nominations presented above and their assessments. In both, the issue of the item's significance is reduced to questions regarding certain qualities, such as age or authenticity. It is assumed that experts can define the value of an item on behalf of the community which created the item, which seems problematic (see Lloyd 2007). In addition, these experts are considered to be objective in their assessments. This reinforces the unequal position of the nominator and the community he or she represents in relation to the position of the experts.

4.3. Preserving relics instead of living tradition

A general principle in heritage management has been that the heritage item should be conserved in its original form, or "conserved as found" (Smith 2006). Similarly, in archival management, the original document is usually preserved. In addition, as noted in the previous chapter, documentary heritage is described in the *General Guidelines* as vulnerable and in need of protection. Therefore, it must be safeguarded, restored and protected. To do so, organizations and individuals that nominate items for the Programme are required to submit a management plan. The requirements, however, are strict, and it is unclear whether all nominators can fulfil them. In the early years of the MoW Programme, there was discussion regarding this topic. At a 1997 meeting, Joan van Albada expressed his concern that the preservation requirements were too strict for use in the global south.

The Chair of the Sub-Committee on Technology, Dietrich Schüller, replied that the group responsible for the drafting of the criteria was of the opinion that it would be better to expect the nominator to offer the best preservation possible than run the risk that some bodies might offer less than ideal preservation conditions (UNESCO 1997).

Van Albada's concern regarding the consequences of these strict preservation requirements for the global south seems valid. Throughout the MoW Programme, preservation and management issues are constantly discussed in the assessment of nominations. At times, a nomination is

rejected if the nominator fails to provide sufficient information regarding how the item will be managed. A specific management plan is required for the acceptance of an item.

An example includes the Apartheid Living Archive Collections, a nomination from South Africa in the nomination round of 2003-2005:

> The Apartheid Living Archive Collections consists of audio-visual material filmed in South Africa and in Southern Africa, spanning the 20th and beginning of the 21st century. The earliest material in the collection is from the Boer War, the first filmed war ever, which is significant as it *undeniably* forms part of the foundational matrix of what became the Apartheid system. The material contains *the basis of an excellent nomination* for the International Register. It is, however, in great need of further work to fit it for inscription. The material is *scattered* between many owners and places. A management plan *is urgently needed* to c*o-ordinate* the collection. Then there is the need for restoration and digitization of the material to ensure its future safety. Finally, there is the need to produce a proper catalogue of the images and sounds. The nomination also requires improvements. The Register Sub-Committee does not feel, therefore, that the collection is ready for inscription. More work needs to be done to make both *the collection* and the nomination *suitable* to be considered. The members of the Register Sub-Committee are prepared to advise the proposers on the *best actions* to take to both *preserve* this important collection and to revise the nomination papers. (UNESCO 2005, 24-25, my emphasis)

This text was written by the Register Subcommittee, which makes preliminary evaluations before presenting them in meetings of the IAC. In this field, it constitutes an official statement of the value of the nomination. The position of the writers is against the inclusion of the Apartheid Living Archive Collection in the International Register. The writers acknowledge that the collection is significant but require changes in both the collection and in the nomination. Certain aspects of the document do not meet the selection criteria and therefore the Register Subcommittee feels unable to recommend the nomination for inclusion. The Committee is of the opinion that the nomination needs a management plan, restoration and digitization and a

"proper" catalogue. The words used create an impression that the documentary heritage in question is vulnerable and possibly even threatened. A need to ensure the nomination's "safety" is expressed: "Best actions" must be taken to *preserve* the collection. The Register Subcommittee portrays itself as a body of experts with knowledge of these best actions. It appears that, in order to be eligible for the International Register, the nomination must also be "coordinated", which apparently means that the material must be restored and catalogued. To be controlled, the collection has to be preserved in one place.

The nomination was eventually included in the next round of nominations in 2007, apparently after the nominator had done a great deal of work to make the nomination fulfil the standards. It appears that the nomination may be rejected if the nominator is unable to provide the ideal preservation conditions as defined by the experts. This affects who can nominate an item. While the Memory of the World Programme aims at being inclusive of all institutions, organizations and individuals, strict criteria restrict who can nominate submissions. To some extent, it appears that preserving a limited number of material items well is more important than collecting a variety of memories. Focusing on the material aspects may lead to dismissal of the intangible. The requirement that the archive must be kept in one place is also a part of Western archival thinking.

4.4. Sites as documentary heritage

"What is a document?" seems to be a question for which there is no clear, unanimous answer. As mentioned in the third chapter, the definition of documentary heritage is relatively inclusive in the *General Guidelines*, allowing for a variety of different types of documents (rock inscriptions, palm leaves, parchments, etc.) to be included in the International Register. In practice, however, the majority of nominated documents are Western products, such as charters, records or ancient manuscripts (UNESCO2016). This likely reflects how the institutions that submit material understand the term "document".

At times, however, there are nominations that do not fit the traditional concept of a document's carrier. For example, stelas and tapestries can rarely be found in archives but are rather found in museums. In these cases, the IAC has to discursively construe the item as a document. One

example examined here is the comment the IAC made regarding the nomination of the *Earliest Islamic (Kufic) Inscription*, nominated by Saudi Arabia in 2003. These inscriptions have characters that distinguish them from the traditional concept of a document: They were inscribed on red sandstone, and they are immovable. The Inscriptions mention the dates of the death and burial of the second Caliph of Islam, Omar bin al-Khattab (UNESCO 2016).

It appears that the inclusion of such documents has to be justified in greater detail in order to make the reader accept them:

> The IAC is of the view that first and foremost what the committee is inscribing to the Memory of the World is the inscription or document rather than the carrier. It is also in recognition of the fact that various cultures have different traditions of creating memories of their world which could be recorded *through tablets, wooden board, parchment, palm leaves, bamboo* etc. *It is probable that at this time in this part of the world, the only way to document the Kufic inscription was through the rock.*
> Recommendation: For inclusion on the International Register
> (UNESCO 2003, my emphasis)

Here, the position of the author is that this item should be recommended for inclusion on the International Register. The text takes the stance, already mentioned in the *General Guidelines*, that the inscription or document, in and of itself, is more important than the carrier that transmits it. They acknowledge that various cultures have different methods of documentation. The diversity of carriers is made clear to the reader who might have a more conservative concept of the term "document" in mind. Subsequently, various exemplary carriers are listed— however, all of them tangible carriers, such as tablets and parchments. No examples of intangible carriers are given.

Lastly, the IAC speculates that the rock inscriptions were "the only way" to document the Kufic inscription "at this time in this part of the world". Attention is drawn to the time and place, and these qualities are used as justification for the unusual type of carrier of the document. It is as if

the Kufic inscriptions would have been recorded in some other form, such as on paper, if this had been possible in that time and context.

Not all stone inscription nominations are as successful. An example of an unsuccessful nomination is the *Foum Chenna Rock Inscriptions*, nominated by Morocco in 2009-2011. The *Foum Chenna Rock Inscriptions* are a series of engravings, belonging to the Libyco-Berber script family, which are situated in the region of Oued Draa (Pichler 2000). The IAC commented on this nomination in the following manner:

> There *was no doubt* about the importance of the site even if this was not fully described or presented. Concern about the conditions of the site was expressed, and more information on measures taken as well as advice from the government on whether this was a protected site was considered necessary. *A nomination to the World Heritage List was also suggested*. (UNESCO 2011, 23)

The comment begins by making an evaluative statement about the importance of the site. The first sentence erases all actors by the use of the passive form. The evaluator (the IAC) is not rendered visible. What is of most interest to this thesis is the last sentence, in which the nomination is recommended to be proposed for World Heritage List, which appears to imply that the site is not considered as documentary heritage. Here, the division of work between the World Heritage Programme and Memory of the World Programme is reflected and demonstrated. While the Earliest Islamic (Kufic) Inscriptions are considered as a document, the Foum Chenna Rocks are not, despite the similarities between their carriers. Whether a nomination is considered as documentary heritage or as some other form of heritage seems to depend on the composition of the IAC at the time.

However, the global south is not the only area with rock inscriptions or oral archives. Unconventional forms of heritage from Western countries may also be discriminated against. As an example, the nomination of the *Cimitero di Porta a Pinti cosidetto Cimitero 'degli Inglesi', Florence's 'English' Cemetery*, nominated by Italy for the 2010-2011 nomination round,

proposed that an entire cemetery be included in the International Register and was criticized as follows:

> The "collection" comprises the cemetery including its graves and monuments, the cemetery archives, a collection of 19th and 20th century photographs of Florence and other locations and a "mediatheque" which collects books, offprints and sound recordings. As such, the nomination *did not meet the criteria for inscription* as it is not *a cohesive body of records*, which moreover is still growing and consequently not finite. Its significance seems to lie primarily in it being a place to be visited, and as a result, it would perhaps be more *relevant* for the World Heritage List. (UNESCO 2011, 22)

The above quotation implies that the IAC was strongly against the nomination being included on the Memory of the World Register. Some words that were used in the nomination, such as "the collection" and "mediatheque", are placed in quotation marks to emphasize the fact that that the IAC did not accept these definitions. The rejection of the nomination is rationalized by the statement that the nomination is not a cohesive body of records but instead is growing and not finite. Consequently, it does not meet the criteria set out by the Memory of the World Programme. This is an intertextual reference to the part 4.5.2 of the *General Guidelines*: "The documentary heritage nominated must be finite and precisely defined; broad, general or open-ended nominations will not be accepted" (Edmondson 2002, 25).

In the last sentence, an evaluative statement is made about the nomination's significance; its value seems to "lie primarily in it being a place to be visited". The intrinsic value of the cemetery archive and documents related to the cemetery is denied. Finally, it is noted that the nomination is "perhaps" more relevant for World Heritage List. As was the case with the Foum Chenna Rocks, this nomination is seen as non-relevant for the Memory of the World Programme.

Overall, it seems that the concept of archive or documentary heritage affects the IAC's decisions. Countries in both the industrialized north and the global south are rejected if their nominations do not conform to these ideals. To conclude, McKemmish's remark about how reluctantly non-typical carriers are considered as documents (see page 8) appears to be relevant here. The

preference for manuscripts and other paper documents over oral and other non-archival tangible carriers affects nominations that come from all over the world, including from Europe, as was the case with the last example, but it may discriminate even more against the documentary heritage of groups for whom this type of documentary heritage is more common than written documents.

The Foum Chenna Rocks and the Florence's English cemetery could be viewed as a collection of documents if authorities would be willing to relax their fixation on the written word. Built heritage, such as sacred sites and burial grounds, can also be considered as documents. The changes and purposes that built heritage sites experience are documented in the sites themselves may be seen to lie in the interaction between the places and the people (McKemmish et al. 2005, 76). On the other hand, Hofman (2005) has investigated the possibility that the Dreamtime of the Australian Aboriginal Community could be considered as an archive. Although it is potentially problematic to apply Western cultural notions to an oral culture, there seems to be certain similarities, such as the roles of an archive keeper and the Elder. Some landmarks can perhaps be seen as archives that serve as a source of stories (Hofman 2005, 150-151).

However, these examples of alternative notions of archive are rather conservative, as they all revolve around physical material. Not a single word has not been written regarding electronic carriers, orality, and a number of other documentation forms. The non-static carriers in general confuse the archives and the Memory of the World alike. If the Memory of the World's authorities have problems with tangible archives, they have even more problems with archives that are intangible, non-static, living or mutable.

4.5. Oral and intangible carriers

The exclusion of oral history has been seen as one of the flaws of the Memory of the World Programme (see, for example, Harvey 2007, 268). Since a significant proportion of the memories of the world have not been captured on records or are stored in archives (Piggot 2005, 314), focusing only on written records may hinder Memory of the World in achieving its goal of preserving the world's memories. To do so from the intersectional point of view, the Memory of

the World Programme should perhaps include more orality, more ephemera and more material from the areas that traditionally do not rely on written documents. The President of the International Council of Archives, Jean-Pierre Wallot, notes that, although the percentage of illiteracy in the global south is significant, its oral culture is vivid (Wallot 1997, 19). If these forms of archives are excluded, the Memory of the World loses much—if not the majority—of the world's documentary heritage. Verne Harris (2002, 80) has also noted that, in the South African context, "giving voice to the voiceless" means a solid commitment to documenting orality.

The exclusion of "open ended" nominations that was stated in the *General Guidelines* (Edmondson 2002, 25) makes it almost indispensable that the proposed item must exist in some tangible form. However, occasionally there have been nominations that represented "intangible" documentary heritage. In her doctoral dissertation, Prodan (2014) identifies three digital archives that were submitted to Memory of the World: the PANDORA, the AEGIS and the World Foundation. Prodan (2014, 209) notes that, although they seemed to fit the criteria, they were rejected for not being fixed, as they were constantly growing.

Prodan claims that, in these cases, the value of the digital carrier was denied. According to Prodan's analysis, there appears to be little justification for these rejections. Of even more concern is the fact that the rationales used to reject these submissions can be considered to be against the MoW Programme's principles. Prodan's conclusion is that the carriers of these documents should be noted as well as their content. From this interesting perspective, which is almost opposed to the one demonstrated by the IAC's comments on the *Earliest Islamic (Kufic) Inscriptions*, Prodan emphasizes that archives should aim to collect a variety of carriers, from a variety of eras. Digital carriers may have value as cultural artefacts (Prodan 2014, 72, 75, 203), and they should be considered not merely as information carriers (ibid. 73).

In addition to the digital carriers, other intangible carriers (such as stories, dance or theatre) tend to get rejected by Memory of the World. Drawing on Prodan's findings, I next study other nominations that have been rejected for having a "living" carrier. My first example is the nomination of the *Storyteller Kenje-Kara and Historical Collection (1903-1975) of Archive*

Phonograms from Kyrgyzstan in the nomination round of 2001-2003, which contains recordings of traditional storytelling. The second example is the nomination of *Mak Yong: The Icon of Malay Tradition*, a traditional Malay performance, first nominated by The Indonesian National Committee of the Memory of the World Program in the nomination round of 2009-2011. The last example is the *Medu Art Ensemble*, nominated by South Africa in the nomination round of 2011-2013.

The *Mak Yong* was nominated to the Memory of the World first in 2009 and again in 2011 and 2013. The nomination was submitted unsuccessfully twice. In the first submission, *Mak Yong* was described as "the icon of Malay culture". The *Mak Yong* originates among the Malay people of Nara Yala, South Thailand. Today, it is still occasionally performed in parts of Nara Yala, Kelantan (Malaysia), and the Batam and Bintan islands in Indonesia. The performance involves a repertoire of dance, song, slapstick and theatre. Typically, the performers do not receive any formal training. The stories concern rulers of the past and and serve as models of how people should handle how people should handle state businesses and interacting with people (UNESCO 2008, 1).

As such, the *Mak Yong* could be considered as a form of documenting the past, as discussed by Hamilton et al. (2002) and McKemmish et al. (2005). While the IAC disapproves of nominating a theatre for a documentary heritage list, some archive professionals (McKemmish et al. 2005, 76) are of the opinion that the way a performance is passed down from generation to generation through experience and testimony makes it similar to documentation.

What may have been the problem is the carrier. The *Mak Yong* dance exists in the minds of the performer but also in a variety of carriers, such as the 17th and 18th century manuscripts, audio visual materials and film footage. Therefore, the material resides in several carriers, in several places. This is against the principle of provenience, according to which the archives from the same archive holder are kept in the same place: "The living performance (intangible heritage/oral traditions) and documentary materials (tangible heritage) interact in the continuation of the art. *Mak Yong* is the icon of Malay culture and Malay culture is continued in *Mak Yong*" (Nomination form 2008, 1). The *Mak Yong* is therefore depicted as something that is constantly

evolving, which contradicts the broadly accepted view of an archive as something that is to be preserved and safeguarded in its original form.

In the nomination round of 2007-2009, the IAC seemed to hold the same belief, which could be seen in its justifications for not including the *Mak Yong* in the International Register:

> The IAC concluded that this nomination in its current form was more *appropriate* for consideration under the Intangible Cultural Heritage Programme. *If it is to be assessed* under the Memory of the World Programme, the *tangible* "carriers" such as the manuscripts and recordings related to the performance *should* be nominated. The IAC consequently recommended that the nomination *should* either be revised in accordance with this *suggestion* or be submitted under the Intangible Heritage Programme. (UNESCO 2009, 28)

The style of the text is formal, brief and concise. In this extract, the IAC objects to the nomination in its present form. The nomination is considered more *appropriate* for the Intangible Heritage Programme, which includes dances and performances on its list. Conversely, it is considered inappropriate for Memory of the World due to the lack of a tangible carrier. The writer considers the appropriateness of considering the nomination under the Memory of the World Programme: "*if it is to be assessed*". The sentence continues with a modalized, prescriptive demand: The nomination *should* include a tangible carrier.

"If it is to be assessed under the Memory of the World Programme, the *tangible* 'carriers' such as the manuscripts and recordings related to the performance *should* be nominated." The IAC makes a statement that, without a definite carrier, the nomination cannot be accepted. It also makes a notably Western assumption that indigenous forms of art could be captured in some tangible format. In practice, it may be difficult to convert fluid orality to a material form without losing the very thing that was meant to be preserved (Harris 2002, 84; Cunningham 2006, 32).

Two courses of action are suggested in the last sentence: The nomination should be revised in accordance with the IAC's "suggestions" or be submitted to the Intangible Heritage Programme.

The fact that the nominator has considered the *Mak Yong* as documentary heritage when submitting it to the Programme is ignored. The party that decides where the nomination is best suited is the IAC.

Another case that concerns the Memory of the World Programme and intangible forms of documentation is the *Storyteller Kenje-Kara and Historical Collection (1903-1975) of Archive Phonograms*, which was nominated by the Central State Archives of Audio-visual Media of the Kyrgyz Republic in 2002 (UNESCO 2002). The nomination was similar to the *Mak Yong* in that it included intangible elements. Stories, the act of storytelling and the performance are passed down from generation to generation (UNESCO 2002):

> The IAC noted that the three *most imminent* recording of this collection have already been listed in the Memory of the World list as part of St. Petersburg Phonograms. IAC *felt* that this epic tradition *would be better placed* if nominated for inclusion in the Intangible Heritage Programme. Recommendation: Not for inclusion on the International Register.
> (UNESCO 2003, 32, my emphasis)

The IAC comment starts with a statement that makes it clear that some of the nominations have already been listed. The writer makes an evaluative statement of the nomination's value *vis à vi*s the items in the Russian Phonograms Collection, which were previously submitted by Russia in 1997 and listed on the International Register: "three most imminent recording...". In this evaluative statement (Fairclough 2003, 166) the records are valued less than these already registered records. There appears to be two embedded evaluations, which are that imminence is a quality desired of the recording and that some recordings have more imminence than others. In other words, some recordings of the collection are more desirable, since imminence in this context is a desirable quality. Which of these recordings are more imminent is apparently an opinion held by (the majority of) the members of the IAC, but it is not explicitly made clear. In the second sentence, the writer makes an affective statement on the behalf of the IAC: the "IAC felt that...". Another evaluative statement is made about the appropriate placement of the nomination: "this epic tradition would be better placed". It seems that epic traditions are not

considered as documentary heritage or as material that is suitable for the Memory of the World Programme.

Storytelling is still a vivid, living tradition in Kyrgyzstan, as the nominator notes in the nomination form (Nomination Form Storyteller Kenje-Kara and Historical Collection [1903-1975] of Archive Phonograms 2003). Perhaps it is this very quality that makes it seem unsuitable for the archive programme. As Verne Harris (2006, 32) puts it, it appears that, in the archival and museum sectors, memories are considered as an archive by themselves, whereas indigenous conceptualizations of orality are largely ignored. It appears that a tradition such as storytelling should almost have vanished before it can be captured and stored in an archive. As the French historian Pierre Nora notes, an archive seems to be destined to be a place for preserving the surrogate of a thing, rather than the original (1989, 12). Nora notes that museums, medallions and monuments are material for a generalized history, and they are most likely to be preserved. However, the fact that they are emptied from their content that makes them *lieux de mémoire*, or sites of memory (Nora 1989, 9).

It is also interesting to notice that, while the Memory of the World International Register includes storytelling, it is most often in literal form, such as Grimms' fairy tales (registered in 2005), the German folklore treasure *Song of the Nibelung* (2009) and the *Book of Kells* (2011) or in audiovisual form, as in *The Wizard of Oz* (2005) and *Metropolis* (2003). All of these works are stories about mythical characters and are significant for certain groups. However, only those items that are in written form are accepted by the Memory of the World Programme. Non-Western ways of storytelling are seen as falling under the Intangible Cultural Heritage List. In this respect, a division between Western and non-Western heritage is produced (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2004).

The last example I intend to explore is *the Medu Art Ensemble*, nominated in 2011. Similar to the *Mak Yong*, this nomination contained a form of art that is often not regarded as documentation in the traditional sense. The word *Medu* means "roots" in the sePedu language. A group of black artists in Botswana formed a group with this name to resist Apartheid in South Africa. The collection contained a list of poster titles, newsletters and newspaper clippings. The nomination

form also mentioned that "the authenticity will be backed up by interviews of the survivors", and that "audio visuals will be sent later" (UNESCO Nomination Form).

> This appears to be substantially an art project, with much of the actual nature of the documentary heritage to be nominated undefined, apart from a list of poster titles. No information has been provided regarding the documents or their significance. In addition, much of what can properly be defined as documentary heritage, such as oral histories, appears to be prospective rather than currently in existence. There is no real indication of the lasting impact of the documents themselves, apart from the fact that they have been exhibited. (UNESCO 2011)

The nomination was rejected based on inadequate information. The IAC requires more information regarding nominations: "What can properly be defined as documentary heritage, such as oral histories, appears to be prospective than currently in existence" and "No real indication of the lasting impact" imply that the IAC doubts the significance of this nomination. The sentence also contains an assumption that there is some method of predicting what will be significant for the generations to come.

The problem appears to be that the nomination is living and mutable, and therefore it does not fit the concept of a fixed and immutable archive. Overall, it appears that the *Medu Art Ensemble* is considered to have been captured too early. Thus, a common problem in preservation arises: When should a record be archived and how can its significance be determined? For the Memory of the World Programme, the solution seems to be to favour older documents that are no longer subject to change. This approach, however, does not remove the problem: The future may produce carriers that cannot be anticipated. As Prodan (2014, 209) notes, archivists are already struggling to come to terms with digital documents. It is, however, debatable whether the preservation of digital documents should be put aside until MoW succeeds in understanding them (ibid.). In addition, the idea of a fixed carrier only seems to apply to a very narrow range of documentary heritage, which is mainly European. Therefore, the rigid standard for carriers may be one factor that leads to the biases in the MoW International Register.

4.7. Authenticity in oral records

Why is intangible heritage considered as unsuitable for documentation? Could it be related to the issue with evidence? Traditionally, one of the most important qualities of a document is its authenticity, which was long thought to be established in the act of transmission from the creator of the record to the archival institution (Cunningham 2005, 44). From this perspective, only those items that are held in archives are considered to be reliable. In history, memories are often considered of less value because interviewees may remember incorrectly or selectively, forget things and/or embellish their memories. On the other hand, oral histories may be seen as a way of making marginalized voices heard. In this case, Memory of the World seems to have chosen to favour historical evidence over diversity of voices.

Authenticity is also prerequisite for a document in the Memory of the World Programme, which is perhaps demonstrated by the fact that it is the first criterion identified in the selection criteria of the *General Guidelines*. The criterion of authenticity, seen as an intrinsic quality of the document that can be proven by its established provenance, may be problematic for certain items of documentary heritage.

In the Memory of the World International Register, there are substantially no oral history recordings per se. However, there have been two nominations that included oral war memories: The *Oral Histories of Cretan Resistance during World War II*, nominated in 1998, and the *Japanese Occupation of Singapore Oral History Collection*, nominated in 2013.

The *Oral Histories of Cretan Resistance during World War II* was nominated by Greece in 1998. In the nomination form, the Bureau made the following statement:

> Oral Histories of Cretan Resistance during World War II - The Bureau wished to have more information about the methodology employed in the collection of these oral history recordings. It was also felt that comments from experts in the field should be sought to help confirm or otherwise the importance of these recordings as a record of

> the Cretan theatre of war. The Bureau cannot recommend this nomination to the IAC at the moment. (UNESCO 1998, 24)

The Bureau appears to be against this nomination's inclusion. It makes an appeal for more information regarding two factors, namely the methodology used for collecting oral histories and expert opinion. It appears that the appropriateness of the methodology used is in doubt. Expert comments are seen to "confirm or otherwise the importance of the nomination as a record of the Cretan theatre of war." With this statement, the expertise of the nominating institution is brought into question. In addition, a significant deal of power is relegated to the experts; it is stated that it is these experts who make the final decision regarding whether the recordings are important or not. The value of these records depends on whether they have evidentiary value, which is seen as an intrinsic quality of the recordings. "The Bureau cannot recommend this nomination": with this phrasing, the recommendation is rendered a matter of ability rather than a deliberate decision.

Another example is the *Japanese Occupation of Singapore Oral History Collection*, which was submitted in the nomination round of 2013-2015. In the nomination form, it was stated that this nomination included voices from different social classes and women (Nomination Form 2011). The archive also included vernacular languages:

> While noting that these recordings and the use of vernacular languages of those interviewed differentiated them from the many other written sources on the topic, it was nevertheless unclear which *historical gaps* these documents were intended to *complete*. (UNESCO 2013, 25)

This sentence may be divided into two statements: There is an embedded statement that there are "many other written sources", which makes it appear that this recording is not considered to be unique. Moreover, it is stated that it is not clear if there are historical gaps to be completed. It appears that a document's value is mainly limited to its evidentiary value. While it is noted that the recordings include rarely heard vernacular languages, this was not considered sufficiently significant. The voices of people, women and the marginalized who were mentioned in the

nomination form are not commented on and therefore perhaps do not have value in the evaluation process.

Based on these two examples, it appears that, in the selection of documentary heritage, a traditional image of the document as an objective carrier of information is pervasive. This is a manifestation of the principles of Western archival science, where the written word is privileged over oral accounts. Prioritizing evidentiary value over any other quality may lead to the social aspect of the item of documentary heritage being ignored. The additional sixth criterion of social/spiritual and community value in the Memory of the World Program challenges this hierarchy. However, it seems that, as recently as 2013, many of the archive and library professionals who formed the IAC, were of the opinion that a document must be an objective carrier of truth.

5. The Memories of the Marginalized

5.1. Gender and minorities in Memory of the World

In the two previous chapters, I argued that in the Memory of the World Programme, the carrier is still largely seen as something that is physical, immutable and resides in one place. It is assumed that the carrier has to be physical for its value, be it evidentiary, aesthetic or artefact, to be evaluated. In this chapter, I examine how the idea that an item's value resides in its material form is problematic in another sense. As discussed earlier, various scholars from the archive field, such as Harvey (2007) and Water-Lynch et al. (2015), have criticized the concept of world significance for its vagueness and potential to be abused. When an item is discussed as inherently significant, the social and power aspects of this evaluation are not taken into consideration.

Memory of the World's evaluation process is extremely similar to that of the World Heritage List. Like the Memory of the World Programme, the World Heritage Programme has an International Committee. The Committee evaluates and chooses sites of "outstanding universal significance" for inclusion on the World Heritage list (UNESCO 1972). Keough notes that, since the final arbiter of value is the World Heritage Committee, the definition of "outstanding

universal value" can be easily altered. Keough is concerned that the World Heritage Convention gives enormous autonomy to the Committee in terms of choosing sites for the World Heritage List, since, after being evaluated by the Committee, sites do not have to be subjugated to any other evaluation before being listed (Keough 2011, 601- 602). Likewise, Edmondson has noted that the final arbiter for Memory of the World, the International Advisory Committee, seems to not always be objective and consistent in its evaluation of documentary heritage and in the way it interprets the selection criteria (Edmondson 2008). The evaluation process may be particularly harsh for marginalized groups whose heritage has not been appreciated historically.

As an example, I present the scarcity of the personal archives of (alleged) women. Female authors have rarely been nominated for the International Register over the history of the Memory of the World Programme. There have been barely a handful of nominations related to individual notable women or women's history: the *1893 Women's Suffrage Petition* (1997), the *Karen Blixen Archive*, the *Astrid Lindgren Archives*, the *Nita Barrow Collection*, the *Anne Frank diaries*, the *Permanent Collection of Eleanor Roosevelt Papers Project* (2013), the *Bubusara Beishenaliyeva (1926 to 1973) and Historical Collection of Cinema Documentary Heritage*, the *Marriage document of the Empress Theophano* (UNESCO 2013), the *Karen Brahe Bibliothek* (2013), *The Estate of Ingeborg Bachmann* (2015) and the *Archives about Comfort Women* (2015).

The MoW International Register not only lacks material from women but also content from other marginalized groups. One explanation for this is that such material has not been submitted during the nomination rounds. It perhaps reflects the fact that such material has not been collected by archives in the first place. By default, archival institutions represent official history, or the history of the most powerful. For this reason, a more open-minded approach to non-archival material would be needed for the Memory of the World Programme.

The concept of the heritage of humanity erases differences caused by race, class, gender and able-bodiedness. In the words of Smith (2008), heritage often reflects the elite Anglo-masculine vision of the past (Smith 2008, 159). Unless the biases in the Register are consciously addressed

and the principle of inclusiveness formalized and entered into the rules, it is unlikely that the situation will change.

5.2. Feel-good Documentary Heritage

One of the main claims of authorized heritage discourse is that heritage is pleasant and feel-good (Smith 2006). For the Memory of the World Programme, this ideology appears to be embedded in phrases such as "world significance" or the "common heritage of humanity". In this approach, the significance of an item is understood as something that all parties should agree on. In addition, the IAC often justifies the inclusion of nominations as a result of the humanitarian qualities they display. For example, the IAC described a nomination from Poland, the *Peace treaties (ahdnames) concluded from the mid-15th century to late-18th century between the Kingdom (or Republic) of Poland and the Ottoman Empire*, as follows:

> It characterizes the period of "eternal peace" that was a defining moment of modern foreign policy an*d a documented lesson in coexistence*. (UNESCO 2003, 21)

The IAC defines how the item in question should be interpreted, as evidence of a peaceful time and a lesson in coexistence. Similarly, the nomination *Mongolian Tanjur*, submitted in 2011, is described as having educational value:

> Its [Mongolian Tanjur's] survival for nearly three centuries is a history in itself and s*hould be a lesson to others*. (UNESCO 2011, 17)

In both of these cases, the documents are given a purpose by the IAC.

As discussed previously, the Memory of the World Programme states one of its aims as being the promotion of knowledge regarding the world's documentary heritage. One of the tools for achieving this goal is the Register, which is intended to make people care not only for single items but for all documents and archives by highlighting the significance of these single iconic items (UNESCO 2016).

It is possible that this will lead to a situation where heritage is polished and embellished for the audience. Offensive documents do not fit this picture or the picture of world heritage or common heritage of humanity. However, not all heritages can be "feel-good". There are and will be documents that fail to please, the significance of which as the "documentary heritage of humanity" may not be clear to everyone. In some cases, it becomes very obvious that there is no such thing as the common heritage of humanity (Smith 2006); furthermore, the fact that a document is a product of the time and space it was created in means that its power to authenticate certain views of historical events or to provide evidentiary value is, by definition, partisan.

5.3. The Liberation Graphics of Palestinian posters: A case study

5.3.1. The hoax

For Foucault, the archive is the "system of discursivity", which regulates what can be said (Foucault 1982, 219). The Memory of the World Programme appears to have its own system of discursivity regarding what can be said. Any digressions will be sanctioned by the authorities of the Programme.

In the nomination round of 2013-2015, one of the most controversial nominations was the *The Liberation Graphic Collection of Palestinian posters*. The collection was nominated by the founder of the Palestine Posters Project Archives, Dan Walsh. The nominated collection consisted of some 1,600 posters from the 1960s to1990s by a number of Palestinian and international artists, such as Ismail Shammout, Kamal Boullata and Sliman Mansour. The posters portrayed the Palestinian liberation movement as well as the everyday life of the Palestinian people (The Palestine Project 2016). Had the nomination been accepted, it would have been the first entry to be listed under the name of Palestine. As of 2016, the Memory of the World International Register contains only one item related to Palestinian people, the UNRWA Photo and Film Archives of Palestinian Refugees, which was inscribed in 2009. On the website, this entry is listed under the category of international organizations (UNESCO 2016).

The collection had been already accepted for the formal review, when it was reported that the UNESCO Director-General Irina Bokova described the posters as "anti-Semitic", "totally unacceptable" and "counter to UNESCO's values" and declared she would use her veto right even if the IAC recommended this item for inclusion. This would have been the first time in the Programme's history for a nomination to be vetoed (International Business Times, February the 4th 2015).

"In my capacity of Director General of UNESCO, I will oppose any such proposal for inscription", Bokova wrote to the head of the IAC in a letter on 23rd of December 2014 (*The Times of Israel* February 4th 2015). "[Some of the posters] would seem totally unacceptable and run counter to the values of UNESCO and its aspiration to build peace in the minds of men and women," Bokova was quoted as saying.

"Some of the posters are offensive", Bokova stated in her letter to Robert Singer, the CEO of the World Jewish Congress. "It is my conviction that Unesco should not associate itself with such documents whose inscription could fuel hatred and anti-Semitic perceptions".

After some time, it was reported that a mistake had been made and the posters would still be eligible if some of the most violent posters would be removed. The *Jerusalem Post* reported that Walsh, the curator who submitted the nomination, was asked to change the title of the nomination from *The Liberation Graphic Collection of Palestinian posters* to "Historical collection of Palestinian posters" and "to make it more balanced and representative to be in line with UNESCO's constitution and peace building mission" (*The Jerusalem Post* February 6th 2015).

"It is absolutely normal for the committee to ask for revisions and improvements of the nominations to make them meet the program's selection criteria", an unnamed "UNESCO representative" had told the *Jerusalem Post* (*The Jerusalem Post* February 8th 2015).

However, as Bokova clarified later, the documents would have been refused nevertheless, even if changes would have been made. In an interview, Bokova claimed "I think that very many of the

posters run counter to the values of UNESCO and that is why I oppose them". The collection includes "very, very alarming posters." "I don't think that by changing one or two posters the issue will be settled," Bokova said, according to *The Times of Israel*. "I think this is wrong and UNESCO should not be behind it" (*Times of Israel* February 9th 2015).

Walsh also replied to Bokova's accusation. Walsh noted that numerous collections, though not necessarily aligned with UNESCO's values, have been recognized by the organization. He mentioned the Russian Federation posters from the 19th and 20th centuries and archives of police repression in Paraguay as examples (*The Electronic Intifada*, Sep 10th 2015).

Boyan Radoykov, head of UNESCO's preservation department, told *The Electronic Intifada* that some of the Palestine-themed posters were considered "offensive." Radoykov also admitted that UNESCO had previously inscribed on the Register archives that were controversial in nature.
"For instance we have collections from the Holocaust, but we are of course not endorsing their content," Radoykov said. He added that each case is specific and that there are some cases where the content may be considered unacceptable (ibid.).

Bokova's stance caused uproar on the Internet. A petition called "Irina Bokova recuse yourself!" was initiated to prevent Bokova from participating in the Memory of the World selection process for nominations (Avaaz 2015). In addition, an appeal was made to Elias Sanbar, the Palestinian UN delegate. Nonetheless, Sanbar did not want to interfere in the controversy.

"Some of the posters, as I have been told, are 'anti-semitic,'" Sanbar was quoted as saying. "As I have not seen the posters, I have no opinion on this fact. But this is the official opinion of the DG of UNESCO. And you will understand that I won't let my delegation enter into this debate" (*Electronic Intifada* September 10th 2015).

5.3.2. Analysis of Bokova's statements

As a Director-General of UNESCO, Bokova's speech is imbued with power, which is linked to her de facto real-world authority. She can use her veto right to deny the inscription of the poster

collection on the International Register. As the UNESCO Director-General, Bokova must seek to avoid any accusations of political partiality. Moreover, she had recently received criticism from the Jewish community for her decision to cancel an exhibition on the history of the Israel (*The Algemeiner*, January 16th 2014). The UNESCO could not afford to tarnish its reputation.

By stating "I think this is wrong and UNESCO should not be behind it", she makes two statements. In the first statement, it is not clear what "this" refers to; possibly it suggests that the act of nominating the *Liberation Graphics* was improper or the fact that the MoW Programme accepted the nomination for the selection process. Second, "UNESCO should not support it"; here, the Director General expresses her own judgement in another statement in which she decides what UNESCO should do about the matter.

In the sentence "I think that very many of the posters run counter to the values of UNESCO and that is why I oppose them", Bokova expresses her commitment to UNESCO's values. In Fairclough's terms, she is speaking in a special style, in the role of a character that Fairclough (2003) calls a politician. A politician typically speaks personally, using "I" sentences. A politician also talks about how things "should" be morally (Fairclough 2003, 174). The sentence contains an embedded moral statement, which is that the posters run counter to the values of UNESCO. Coming from a person in such a powerful position, this statement becomes truth. In a way, Bokova convinces the reader that the posters are not in line with UNESCO's values.

One may also focus on the choice of words. Bokova refers to the posters as "anti-Semitic", "totally unacceptable", "very, very alarming" and counter to UNESCO's values". Bokova chooses to use emotionally loaded words. For instance, the word "anti-Semitic" contains a strong accusation, which vividly reminds the reader of the Holocaust; Bokova could have instead used the word anti-Zionist. Records themselves do not deliver information, as they can merely reflect what their creator intended (Ketelaar 2005, 294). Moreover, as Jacques Derrida (1996, 68) has noted, the user of a record chooses what information he or she wishes to see in the document. Likewise, the act of perceiving the posters as anti-Semitic is a deliberate choice. The use of the word anti-Semitic is also significant with regard to the Gaza Strip conflict.

These interpreted qualities are discussed as qualities that are intrinsic in the posters rather than interpretations that are made in a given time and space. For example, the sentence "The collection includes 'indeed very, very alarming posters'", when broken down, contains the claim that "the collection includes posters" and "the posters are very, very alarming". She could have noted that "These posters may be considered as alarming", which would have made the speaker less committed to what she stated. However, this may be a deliberate choice. By claiming that something—for example the alleged anti-Semitism—is an intrinsic quality of the posters, differing interpretations are excluded from the dialogue (Smith 2006).

What also requires attention is the point at which Bokova expresses her concerns about the possible consequences of the inscription: "It is my conviction that Unesco should not associate itself with such documents whose inscription could fuel hatred and anti-semitic perceptions."

This sentence can be divided into two statements: "It is my conviction that Unesco should not associate itself with such documents" and "[The inscription of such documents] could fuel hatred and anti-semitic perceptions". In the first part, Bokova again takes the role of the politician by clearly committing to the ideology of UNESCO. The sentence is ostensibly an appeal to peace and anti-racism. The second part, however, is not expressed as Bokova's own opinion, but rather in the form of a modalized statement: "inscription could fuel hatred and anti-semitic perceptions". The embedded message aims to sway the reader into thinking that the inscription of the Palestinian posters would disseminate anti-Semitism.

To conclude, Bokova's public statements regarding the issue of the Palestinian posters appear pro-Jewish. Bokova's stance may have had an impact on the IAC's decision to not include the Palestinian posters on the International Register. The final impact of Bokova's influence is, however, beyond the scope of this thesis.

5.3.3. The Liberation Graphics as records of liberation

Finally, I intend to study the documents themselves as forms of documentary heritage. Posters may be considered as ephemera, a form of documents that are not intended to last (Kluitenberg

2010). The *Liberation Graphics Collection* also includes handbills, announcement and other material (Walsh & Davis 20). Walsh notes that only a few of the political posters have survived as a result of the cheap paper they were printed on and because they were not intended to be archived (Davis & Walsh 2015).

Ephemera are often perceived as merely irrelevant noise, which has resulted in their exclusion from archives. Subsequently, a significant part of people's lived experience is excluded from institutional memory (Kluitenberg 2010). Because of their transient nature, posters are tied to the time and space in which they are created. In the words of Walsh, "Posters are a reflection of their moment" (Caldwell 2011). While not all ephemera have long-lasting significance, the Palestinian posters, however, continue to be relevant. Piggott (2005, 314) is of the opinion that print-supported memory should not be given the same role that is given to orality, which is the voice of collective memory. The *Liberation Graphics* reflect the struggles and everyday life of Palestinians and perhaps function in a manner that is similar to oral recordings.

The core issue regarding the Palestinian posters appears to be the authenticity of historical events in the Gaza Strip conflict. The controversy that the Palestinian posters caused appears to be a consequence of the old-fashioned positivist idea that records are intended to provide objective information (McKemmish 2005, 19). Certain images and texts in the posters are perceived as providing false information. The images which depict Israel as a perpetuator of violence, as an oppressor, are perceived as offensive and wrong. Therefore, in this case, the intrinsic qualities of the documents make them unsuitable for the MoW International Register. When world significance is seen as an intrinsic quality of documentary heritage, inversely, certain physical content, such as offensive images, may also render it *not* worthy of world significance. In the case of the posters, the content seems to perhaps turn the item into something that is opposed to the heritage ideal.

The required name change from "liberation graphics" to "historical graphics" perhaps also derives from the need to present the posters as constituting world heritage. The word "liberation" implies that there is someone that is being liberated and therefore that there is someone who is depriving the first party of liberty. As such, the original name of the collection is political.

Nevertheless, the suggested name would also have political implications. Changing the name to "Historical graphics" would simultaneously imply that the events and topics depicted in the posters belong to the past. Lastly, the name change also seems to be an attempt at creating an impression of the posters being part of the common heritage of humanity, which would bring them into alignment with UNESCO's goals.

Walsh was also told to modify the nomination "to make it more balanced and representative to be in line with UNESCO's constitution and peace building mission". It is slightly unclear what "balanced" or "representative" means in this context. Perhaps it was a reference to the content of the collection, which also included posters from Israeli artists. Moreover, the nomination is required to have an equal amount of both Israelite and Palestine items or perspectives. This is possibly seen as a way of including "both sides", namely Israel and Palestine. Consequently, this approach would have presented Israel and Palestine as equal participants in this conflict.

According to Ketelaar (2005, 287, 291, 297), records may be instruments of empowerment and liberation. The Palestinian posters seem to fit this description. Because of their nature, records of liberation may be hard to fit into the "common heritage of humanity", which is what the Memory of the World collects. However, perhaps this is an ideal which would be impossible in the first place. Overall, the concept of world significance fails to include heritage that is tied to one community and one place (Sloggett 2005, 124 in Harvey 2007, 270). In the words of Maurice Halbwachs (1992), there are as many histories as there are nations. For example, Palestinian heritage is created for the Palestinian people. It seems inevitable that not all historical perspectives can be considered at the same time. In such a situation, one approach would be to focus on those voices that are otherwise largely dismissed. Perhaps the Memory of the World Programme could also be directed to safeguarding memories that are most likely to be forgotten, such as those of the marginalized?

6. Conclusions: Towards greater diversity in Memory of the World

My thesis has shed light on the UNESCO Memory of the World program, which to date has not achieved a great deal of public visibility when compared to World Heritage and Intangible

Heritage Programmes. This thesis supports the arguments of the scholars of critical heritage studies who have analysed UNESCO documents, such as Smith and Waterton (2006).

In this thesis, I intended to explore topics that affect the selection of documentary heritage, since this involves several societal issues. Power manifests itself in blatant cases of discrimination, but, more importantly, it also finds expression in the structures, in the ways in which what constitutes reliable evidence are conceived.

Norman Fairclough's critical discourse analysis has been used to interpret heritage texts, and it appears to be useful in unravelling ideologies and power differences in the Memory of the World Programme. As texts, the *General Guidelines* and the *Register Companion* belong to the genre of heritage documents. While there is, at present, no charter to protect documentary heritage, developing such a document is one of the goals of the Memory of the World Programme. As an international organization, UNESCO and its charters and statements have influence on the ways in which documentary heritage is collected and preserved globally. To better serve its purposes, there seems to be a demand for updated selection and preservation principles in the Memory of the World Programme.

When compared to the World Heritage Programme, the Memory of the World Programme is more democratic in that anyone can nominate an item to the latter Programme. However, it maintains the status of nations and experts in the appraisal process. Drawing on Smith (2006), I pointed out that bias may be a result of the hegemony of authorized heritage discourse. It appears that authorized heritage discourse, which in this case is informed by the Western concept of documents, affects the selection of documentary heritage. Similar to the management and preservation of built heritage, where heritage is described as "grand", "old", "tangible", "aesthetically pleasing", "feel-good" or "pleasant" and seen as needing be conserved in its original form (Smith 2009), the documentary heritage that will be accepted is likely to be inoffensive and in the form of a fixed, tangible and immutable carrier.

I presented a number of examples of discourses regarding a variety of selected nominations from various nomination rounds. With these examples, I attempted to demonstrate how the Western

concepts of documents and archives affect how the Memory of the World Programme chooses heritage for permanent preservation. There appears to be a tendency to relegate non-Western forms of documents to other programmes, such as oral traditions. This reinforces a division between the Western world and other cultures. The idea that an archive is finite and immutable may lead to exclusion of various living archives, such as web archives, as previously studied by Prodan (2014). I argued that it may also discriminate against non-Western archival forms, such as storytelling or theatre. The interpretation of global significance as linked to geographical influence is not justifiable, since, as a result of Western patriarchal hegemony, most globally renowned people tend to be white Western men. The tendency to avoid "offensive" material may lead to a situation in which the voices of the oppressed are not heard.

The vague concepts, underlying assumptions and assumed universality in the selection criteria result in the likelihood that historically oppressed groups may not be able to express their heritage. The criterion of authenticity especially appears problematic. It contains in itself the positivist idea that documents are free of values at the time of their creation. With this line of thinking, some documents may be considered offensive, while others are considered objective. Nevertheless, all documents the values, culture, or circumstances of the time and place of their creation.

If heritage is seen as inherently intangible, the focus on preservation efforts can be shifted to the impact of heritage, as suggested by Smith (2006, 56). For indigenous people, Memory of the World may present an opportunity to draw the world's attention to the problems they face; an example might be land rights. The Skolt Sámi Archive, accepted in 2015, and the Mabo Case Manuscripts, accepted in 2001, are promising examples. In this way, documents and Memory of the World can be used as instruments of empowerment. The Memory of the World Programme has the potential to actively change how people perceive the past and present. Today's decisions will affect future interpretations of the past. A more diverse selection of documentary heritage, which should cover the heritage of as many groups as possible, would give a more authentic picture of today's world to future generations.

References

Original Sources

Avaaz (September 19th 2015). Irina Bokova, Director-General of UNESCO: Recuse Yourself! <https://secure.avaaz.org/en/petition/Irina_Bokova_DirectorGeneral_of_UNESCO_Recuse_Yourself/> Retrieved May 16th 2016.

Edmondson, R. 2002. Memory of the World Programme. General guidelines to safeguard documentary heritage. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001256/125637e.pdf>

Electronic Intifada. "PA refuses to defend bid for UN recognition of posters archive". September 10th 2015. < https://electronicintifada.net/content/pa-refuses-defend-bid-un-recognition-posters-archive/14832> Retrieved August 29th 2016.

Ndeshi Namhila, E. 2008). The African Perspective: Memory of the World. UNESCO Memory of the World 3rd International Conference. Canberra, Australia. 19-22 February 2008.

Russell, R. & Winkworth, K. 2009. *Significance 2.0: A Guide to Assessing the Significance of Collections.* 2nd ed. Australia: Collections Council of Australia.

The Guardian. 2012**.** Bob Dylan's Nobel odds rise, but not his chances. September 19th Retrieved August 29th 2016 <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2012/sep/19/bob-dylan-nobel-odds-rise-literature>

The Guardian. October 13th 2016 .Bob Dylan wins Nobel prize in literature. Retrieved October 15th 2016.<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2016/oct/13/bob-dylan-wins-2016-nobel-prize-in-literature>

The International Council on Archives and the Memory of the World Programme: A position paper. Washington, United States of America April 29th 2005. Retrieved May 5th 2015 <http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/mow/The%20International%20Council%20on%20Archives%20and%20the%20Memory%20of%20the%20World%20Programme%20A%20Position%20Paper.pdf>

The Jerusalem Post. February 6th 2015.UNESCO dismisses reports that Palestinian poster collection nixed due to anti-Semitism. <http://www.jpost.com/Arab-Israeli-Conflict/UNESCO-dismisses-reports-Palestinian-poster-collection-nixed-by-anti-Semitism-fears-390208> Retrieved Feb 26th 2016.

The Jerusalem Post. February 8th 2015. Will Palestinian posters get UNESCO honor? Retrieved Feb 26th 2016.http://forward.com/news/breaking-news/214381/will-palestinian-posters-get-unesco-honor/

The Korea Times. 2015. Plan to nominate comfort women for Nobel Peace Prize. April 29th Retrieved August 29th 2016. <http://www.koreatimesus.com/plan-to-nominate-comfort-women-for-nobel-peace-prize/>

Times of Israel. February 9th 2015. UNESCO head reiterates veto of Palestine poster collection. Retrieved Feb 26th 2016. <http://www.timesofisrael.com/unesco-head-reiterates-veto-of-palestine-poster-collection/>

The Jewish Press. February 4th 2015. UNESCO Director Rejects Palestine Entry to 'Memory of the World' Program" <http://www.jewishpress.com/news/breaking-news/unesco-director-rejects-palestine-entry-to-memory-of-the-world-program/2015/02/04/0/?print> Retrieved Feb 26th 2016.

The LGBT Community Center National History Archive <https://gaycenter.org/archives> Retrieved Aug 23rd 2016.

The National World. Emirati to lead Unesco programme to preserve 'Memory of the World". Retrieved Feb 26th, 2016. <http://www.thenational.ae/world/emirati-to-lead-unesco-programme-to-preserve-memory-of-the-world>

United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization

- *Convention for the Protection and Promotion of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, adopted by the General Conference at its seventeenth session*, 16 November 1972. Paris, 1972.

- *Final Report of the Third Meeting of the International Advisory Committee of the "Memory of the World" Programme, Tashkent, 29 September - 1st October 1997. Paris: UNESCO, 1997.*

- *Report of the First Meeting of the Bureau of the International Advisory Committee of the "Memory of the World" Programme, London, United Kingdom, 4-5 September 1998*. Paris, 1998.

- *Final Report of the Fourth Meeting of the International Advisory Committee of the "Memory of the World" Programme, Vienna,10-12 June 1999. Paris: UNESCO, 1999.*

- *Final Report of the 6th meeting of the International Advisory Committee 6th meeting of the International Advisory Committee of the Memory of the World Programme, Gdansk, Poland, 28-30 August 2003.*

- *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Heritage. 2003. Retrieved August 29th 2016. < http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/convention>*

- *Final Report of the 7th meeting of the International Advisory Committee 7th meeting of the International Advisory Committee of the Memory of the World Programme, Lijiang, China, 13-17 June 2005*

- *Preserving our Documentary Heritage – UNESCO Memory of the World Programme. Report of the Sub-Committee on Technology of the Memory of the World Programme*. Paris: UNESCO, 2005.

- *Report of the Third Meeting of the Register Sub-Committee of the International Advisory Committee of the "Memory of the World" Programme, Paris, 21 March 2005. Paris, 2005.*

- *Report of the Tenth Meeting of the Sub-Committee on Technology of the International Advisory Committee of the "Memory of the World" Programme, Bibliotheca Alexandrina, Egypt, 20-21 November 2008.Alexandria, 2008.*

- *Final Report of the 9th meeting of the International Advisory Committee 9th Meeting of the International Advisory Committee of the Memory of the World Programme, Christ Church, Barbados, 29-31 July 2009*

- *Nomination Form "The Mak Yong": Nomination form submitted by Indonesia to the International Memory of the World Register, 2008. Retrieved August 28th 2016.*

  <http://wa1.portal.unesco.org/ci/en/ev.php-URL_ID=27243&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html>

- *Nomination Form "The Medu Art Ensembe": Nomination form submitted by South Africa to the International Memory of the World Register, 2010. Retrieved August 28th 2016.*

  <http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/mow/nomination_forms/south_africa_medu_art_ensemble.pdf>

- *Final Report of the 10th Meeting of the International Advisory Committee of the*

"Memory of the World"
UNESCO, 2011.

- *Memory of the World Register Companion. Official Website of the Memory of the World Register. (2011).*

<http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/mow/Register%20Companion.pdf>

- *Final Report of the 11th Meeting of the International Advisory Committee of the*

"Memory of the World"
UNESCO, 2013.

- *Final Report of the 12th Meeting of the International Advisory Committee of the*

"Memory of the World" Programme, Abu Dhabi, The United Arab Emirates, 4-6 October 2015. Paris:2015.

- *UNESCO News. Oct 9th 2015. "International Advisory Committee inscribes 47 new nominations on UNESCO Memory of the World Register".*

- *International Advisory Committee of the Memory of the World Programme - Rules of Procedure.*
  <http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/mow/mow_iac_rules_of_procedure_en.pdf> Retrieved Feb 26th 2016.

- *Official Website of the Memory of the World Register.Full list of registered heritage. 2016. <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/memory-of-the-world/register/full-list-of-registered-heritage/registered-heritage-page-1/>*
- *Official Website of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Lists. 2016. <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/>*
- *UNESCO. Memory of the World. Nomination Form. <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/flagship-project-activities/memory-of-the-world/resources/other-memory-of-the-world-documents/>*

Research Literature

Alvesson, M. & Karreman, D. Varieties of Discourse: On the Study of Organizations through Discourse Analysis. Human Relations. 53:9, 1125–1149. <http://ejournal.narotama.ac.id/files/varieties%20of%20discourse%20(organization%20theory).pdf>

Association for Critical Heritage Studies. Frontpage. Retrieved February 26th 2016 <http://archanth.anu.edu.au/heritage-museum-studies/association-critical-heritage-studies>.

Battersby, C. 1989. *Gender and genius: towards a feminist aesthetics*. London: Women's Press

Bos, J. 2015. The Bleek-Lloyd Collection and the UNESCO Memory of the World International Register. <http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/rare-books-and-manuscripts/Capetown-2015-presentations/rbsc_preconference_paper_jan_bos.pdf> Retrieved August 25th 2016.

Butler, J. 1990. Gender Trouble. New York & London: Routledge

Charlesworth, H. 2010. Human rights and UNESCO Memory of the World Programme. In Logan et al. (eds.) (2010). *Cultural Diversity, Heritage and Human Rights: Intersections in Theory and Practice*. 21-30. London: Routledge.

Cook, T. 2000. Archival Science and Postmodernism: New Formulations for Old Concepts. In *Archival Science*, vol. 1, no. 1 (2000): 3-24. <http://www.mybestdocs.com/cook-t-postmod-p1-00.htm#_edn4> Retrieved Aug 21st 2016

Cunningham, A. 2005. Archival institutions. In McKemmish et al. 2005. *Archives: Recordkeeping in society*. Centre for Information Studies. Charles Sturt University. Wagga Wagga New South Wales. 21-50

Derrida, J. 1996. *Archive Fever: a Freudian impression*. Translated by Eric Prenowitz. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Engelhardt, R. & Ornager, S. 2008. Progress report on the development of a methodology for complementing the three UNESCO programmes – intangible, tangible and documentary heritage. *Paper presented at the Third International Memory of the World Conference, 19-22 February 2008, Canberra, Australia*. 2008.

Fairclough, N. 2003. *Analysing Discourse. Textual analysis for social research*. London & New York: Routledge.

Feather, J. 2004. Managing the documentary heritage: issues for the present and the future. In *Preservation management for libraries, archives and museums*. London: Facet Pub.

Foucault, M. 1989. *The Archaelogy of Knowledge*. Translated from the French by A. M. Sheridan Smith. London: Routledge.

Fox, A. & Woolf, D. 2002. *The spoken word: oral culture in Britain 1500-1850*. Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press.

Green, L. 2012 Beyond South Africa's 'indigenous knowledge – science' wars. *South African Journal of Science.* 2012. pp.108. <http://sajs.co.za/system/tdf/publications/pdf/631-9704-2-PB.pdf?file=1&type=node&id=33089&force=>

Halbwachs, M. 1992. *On Collective Memory.* Translated by Lewis A. Coser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hamilton et al. 2002. *Refiguring the Archive in South Africa.* Dordrecht: Springer Science+Business.

Harris, V. 2002. The Archival Sliver: Power, Memory, and Archives
in South Africa. In *Archival Science* 2: 63–86, 2002
Retrieved May 16th 2016: <http://www.nyu.edu/classes/bkg/methods/harris.pdf>

Hartland et al. 2005. Documents. In McKemmish et al. 2005. *Archives: Recordkeeping in society*. Centre for Information Studies. Charles Sturt University. Wagga Wagga New South Wales. pp. 75-100.

Harvey, R. 2007. UNESCO's Memory of the World Programme.
Library Trends 56, no. 1 (2007): 259-74.

Haughton, B. 2016. The Nebra Sky Disc-Ancient Map of Stars. Retrieved: October 3rd 2016. <http://www.ancient.eu/article/235/>

Kellerhals, A. 2013. Das Gedächtnis der Menscheit. *Archivar* 66. Jahrgang. Heft 02 Mai 2013.pp. 211. <http://www.archive.nrw.de/archivar/hefte/2013/ausgabe2/ARCHIVAR_02-13_internet.pdf>

Ketelaar, E. 2005. Recordkeeping and societal power. In McKemmish et al. (2005) *Archives: Recordkeeping in society*. Centre for Information Studies. Charles Sturt University. Wagga Wagga New South Wales. pp. 277-298

Keough, E.B. 2011. Heritage in Peril: A Critique of UNESCO's World Heritage Program. *Washington University Global Studies Law Review* (vol. 10: issue 3) <http://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_globalstudies/vol10/iss3/5>

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. 2004. Intangible heritage as metacultural Production. *Museum*, vol. 56, no. 1–2, pp. 221–222 <http://kodu.ut.ee/~cect/teoreetilised%20seminarid_2010/etnoloogia_uurimisr%C3%BChma_seminar/KirshenblattGimblett_Barbara_Intangible_heritage2004.pdf>

Kurin, R. 2004. Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in the 2003 UNESCO Convention: a critical appraisal. *Museum International*, vol. 56, pp. 66 -77

Logan, W. 2010. Intersecting concepts and practices. In Logan et al. 2010. *Cultural Diversity, Heritage and Human Rights*. <http://samples.sainsburysebooks.co.uk/9781135190705_sample_826109.pdf>

Lloyd, A. 2007. Guarding Against Collective Amnesia? Making Significance Problematic: An Exploration of Issues. *Library Trends*, Vol. 56, No. 1, pp. 53–65.

McKemmish, S. 2005. Traces. In McKemmish et al. 2005. *Archives: Recordkeeping in society*. Centre for Information Studies. Charles Sturt University. Wagga Wagga New South Wales. pp. 1-21

McKemmish et al. 2005. 'Communities of Memory': Pluralising Archival Research and Education
Agendas. *Archives and Manuscripts* 33, pp. 146-174

Nora, P. 1989. Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire. Representations, No. 26, Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory. (Spring, 1989), pp. 7-24
Retrieved: <http://www.timeandspace.lviv.ua/files/session/Nora_105.pdf>

Norman, J. 2011. *History of Information. Transitional Phases in the Form and Function of the Book before Gutenberg.* <http://www.historyofinformation.com/narrative/oral-to-written-culture.php>Retrieved Aug 20th 2016

Robertson von Trotha, C. & Hauser, R. 2010. UNESCO and Digitalized Heritage. New Heritage – New Challenges. In *World Heritage and Cultural Diversity Challenges for University Education*, edited by Dieter Offenhäußer, Walter Ch. Zimmerli and Marie-Theres Albert, 69-78. Bonn: German Commission for UNESCO.

Roy, A. 2004. The 2004 Sydney Peace Prize lecture at the Seymour Theatre Centre, University of Sydney. Retrieved August 29th 2016. < http://www.smh.com.au/news/Opinion/Roys-full-speech/2004/11/04/1099362264349.html >

Russell, L. 2005. Indigenous knowledge and archives: accessing hidden history and understandings, Australian Academic and Research Libraries, 36:2, 169-180.

Russell, R. 2012. The UNESCO Memory of the World Programme turns 20.
<https://www.nla.gov.au/pub/nlanews/2012/jun12/the-unesco-memory-of-the-world-programme-turns-20.pdf>

Pederson, A. 2005. Professing Archives. A very human enterprise. In McKemmish et al. 2005. *Archives: Recordkeeping in society*. Centre for Information Studies. Charles Sturt University. Wagga Wagga New South Wales. pp. 51-74

Pichler, W. 2000. The Libyco-Berber inscriptions of Foum Chenna (Morocco). *SAHARA 12/2000.* pp.176-178. Retrieved August 29th 2016. < http://www.lbi-project.org/lbs/data/pichler%20sah12.pdf>

Piggott, M. Archives and Memory. In McKemmish et al. 2005. *Archives: Recordkeeping in society*. Centre for Information Studies. Charles Sturt University. Wagga Wagga New South Wales. pp. 299-328

Prodan, A. C. 2014. *Digital Memory of the world. An Exploration of Documentary Practices in the Age of Digital Technology*. Brandenburg University of Technology: Faculty of Mechanical, Electrical and Industrial Engineering.

Richeson, J.A. & Nussbaum, R. 2004. The impact of multiculturalism versus color-blindness on racial bias. Retrieved October 10th 2016. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022103103001574>

Sloggett, R. 2005. Valuing significance or signifying value?: culture in a global context. [The UNESCO Memory of the World Programme.] *Archives and Manuscripts* Vol 33 Issue 2

Smith, L. 2006. *Uses of Heritage.* London: Routledge

Smith, L 2008, 'Heritage, Gender and Identity', in Graham, B. & Howard, P. (eds.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*, Ashgate Publishing Ltd, Aldershot, pp. 159-178.

Smith, L. 2012. Discourses of heritage : implications for archaeological community practice. *Nuevo Mondo.* Retrieved: August 28th 2016. <https://nuevomundo.revues.org/64148 >

Tannen, D. What Speakers Do in Conversation. Linguistics Society of America. Retrieved October 5th 2016 < http://www.linguisticsociety.org/resource/discourse-analysis-what-speakers-do-conversation >

Turnbull, D. 2004. Performing and Narrating Knowledge and Space: William Dawes and the First Australian Meteorological and Astronomical Observatory. Delivered at Monash University, May 26th 2004.

Van Dijk, Teun A. 2015. Critical Discourse Analysis. In Tannen, D. & (Eds.) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Retrieved: October 5th 2016 <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Critical%20Discourse%20Analysis.pdf>

van Dijk, Teun A.1993. Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, Vol. 4(2), 249-283. Retrieved: 3rd of October 2016. <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Principles%20of%20critical%20discourse%20analysis.pdf>

van Dijk, Teun A. What Do We Mean by Discourse Analysis? (van Dijk's website) Discourse in Society. Retrieved October 5th 2016. <http://www.discourses.org/journals/das/whatisdiscourseanalysis/index.html >

Wallot, J.-P. 1996. Archival Oneness in the Midst of Diversity. *American Archivist.*59, Winter, pp.19.

Waterton, E., Smith, L. and Campbell, G. 2006. The utility of discourse analysis to heritage studies: The Burra Charter and social inclusion. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 12(4): 339–55.