RESEARCH ARTICLES

Marc Jacobs[*]

Marc.ml.jacobs@vub.be
UNESCO Chair on Critical Heritage Studies
and the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage
Faculty of Arts and Philosophy
Vrije Universiteit Brussel
Building C – Room 5.439B
Pleinlaan 2
BE-1050 Brussels, Belgium

The Ví of Visibility, Visitability, and Viability in Vietnam: pHD and the Safeguarding Paradigm of the 2003 Convention After a Decade

Abstract: In this contribution, first the importance of a Vietnamese episode in the genealogy of the paradigm of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage is highlighted. Second the evolution and bandwidth of this heritage paradigm are explored using a sensitizing distinction between AHD (Authorized Heritage Discourse) and pHD (participatory or popular Heritage Discourse) and via a discussion of the importance of appropriate vocabulary, focussing on interactions between Vietnamese policy makers and other actors on the one hand and UNESCO on the other hand. Third is a critical discussion of recent case studies of inscribed ele-

* **Marc Jacobs** is Professor of Critical Heritage Studies at the Department of Art Studies and Archaeology, Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB), Belgium, and Director of FARO-Flemish Interface for Cultural Heritage. In his work he focuses on the 21st-century cultural heritage paradigm as a trans-discipline, with attention for both policy and practice. At the VUB, he coordinates the UNESCO Chair on critical heritage studies and safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage, particularly dealing with the implementation of the 2003 Convention. The research agenda of the Chair includes studies on how intangible heritage (policy) functions and evolves in cities in Africa, Europe, and Asia. Professor Jacobs also publishes on popular culture and food studies, with special attention on the relation between liminality and identity. Other research interests are collective actions (like political charivaris) in 19th-century cities, book history (in particular connected to 17th-century Antwerp) and the functioning of neighbourhoods, processions, and crafts guilds in early modern cities in the Spanish and Austrian Netherlands.

Marc Jacobs

ments on the UNESCO lists (Articles 16 and 17) by Oskar Salemink, Barley Norton, and Lauren Meeker, next to a close reading of recent nomination files and films submitted by Vietnam for the Representative List of the 2003 Convention. The notions of visibility, viability, and visitability are used to discuss the criteria of the nomination procedure and how Vietnam deals with this as a Member State. The more general conclusion is that working together and other participatory methods are the way to go in the safeguarding intangible cultural heritage paradigm, not only to manage the effects of visibility and visitability, but above all in trying to "ensure" viability.

Keywords: safeguarding, intangible heritage, UNESCO, Vietnam, participatory heritage discourse, Representative List

Introduction

In some hotels, guests (for instance members of the same family) can choose "connecting rooms". These are rooms with individual entrance doors from the outside and a connecting door in between. The latter door can be closed or even locked, resulting in two relatively separate rooms, hence more possibilities for differentiated use and room service. In order to understand the making of the room (for manoeuvre), and its connection with the first two decades of implementing UNESCO's Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage ("the 2003 Convention"), you have to imagine an elephant in the connecting room. That large animal is the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage ("the 1972 Convention"). A mixture of criticism, envy, and opportunity motivated the successful attempts to expand and strategically compartmentalize the semantic field of "cultural heritage" via a new UNESCO treaty. The struggle in the 21st century to push the elephant aside and to try and create a quasi-autonomous breathing and working space for something else in an additional new room, was – and is – not easy. In any case, "World Heritage" is no longer the only entrance door in the metaphorical "Main Heritage Corridor of UNESCO". Thanks to the adoption of the 2003 Convention, an "intangible heritage room" is now also available for users, including specialized room service via a specialized Section in the UNESCO Secretariat and dedicated Funds. While waiting for stronger instruments than recommendations, the museums, memory institutions, documentary heritage, or digital heritage not only miss connecting doors, but also the official front doors and adequate room space in the UNESCO Hotel. It would make sense to also include "movable heritage" to fully and adequately represent, balance, and manage the 21st century heritage paradigm in UNESCO, beyond the present superficial impression of two sides of one heritage coin – "1972" and "2003".

Analysing evolutions in the heritage field in the United Kingdom in the late 20th century, Laurajane Smith coined the concept "authorized heritage discourse" (AHD): elitist, expert-driven, focused on prestigious heritage, conservative, and prone to the Matthew Effect.[1] But also highly Eurocentric (or, in light of Brexit, "Old Empires" centred), open to tourist-marketability and with a cocktail of very pretentious words such as unique, universal, outstanding, etc. Today, AHD can be appropriated and used as a shorthand or even a shortcut in other contexts. In the form of a caricature, it can perform functions such as an eye-opener (or even a motivation to cultivate alternatives).

The 2003 Convention can be interpreted as an attempt to construct and validate a new, alternative heritage category that is also recognized by humankind, but more modest, debunked, and with lighter and less institutionalized or politicized procedures (and unfortunately, less monitoring and follow up). We could call it the (small letter) pHD. In the tested UNESCO-style tradition of finding consensus via ambiguity and fuzziness, the p could stand for either or both "participatory" and/or "popular" (culture) Heritage Discourse. It uses Article 15 ("ensure the widest possible participation of communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals that create, maintain and transmit such heritage, and [...] involve them actively in its management") of the 2003 Convention or, since 2016, the new tool of the "12 Ethical Principles" as power sources.[2]

Although of course they should be debunked and deconstructed or in any case never reified, as false dichotomies like global and local, elite and popular, 1972 and 2003, AHD and pHD can function as sensitizing devices to understand the tensions, differences, and contact zones. Not only to feel the elephant's trunk, tail, or other body parts (coming) through the connecting door, but also to better understand what "safeguarding" "intangible cultural heritage" is becoming and how it was created, maintained, and transmitted by the "epistemic community" that made the convention and the groups that are and will be managing it.[3]

---

[1]   L. Smith, *Uses of Heritage*, Routledge, London – New York 2006; eadem, *The Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention, a Challenge to the Authorised Heritage Discourse?*, in: *Evaluating the Inscription Criteria for the Two Lists of UNESCO's Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention. The 10th Anniversary of the 2003 Convention. Final Report*, International Research Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (IRCI), Osaka 2013, pp. 122-128.

[2]   UNESCO, *Basic Texts of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. 2016 edition*, UNESCO, Paris 2016, pp. 111-114; M. Jacobs, *Glocal Perspectives on Safeguarding. CGIs, ICH, Ethics and Cultural Brokerage*, in: T. Uesugi, M. Shiba (eds.), *Glocal Perspectives on Intangible Cultural Heritage: Local Communities, Researchers, States and UNESCO, with the Special Focus on Global and National Perspectives*, Seijo University, Tokyo 2017, pp. 49-71; idem, *La sauvegarde du patrimoine culturel immatériel et l'éthique*, in: F. Lempereur (ed.), *Patrimoine culturel immatériel*, Presses universitaire de Liège, Liège 2017, pp. 247-259.

[3]   "An epistemic community is [an international] network of professionals with recognized expertise and competence in a particular domain and an authoritative claim to policy-relevant knowledge within that domain or issue-area". See P. Haas, *Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination*, "International Organization" 1992, Vol. 46(1), pp. 1-35 and M. Cross, *Rethinking Epistemic Communities Twenty Years Later*, "Review of International Studies" 2013, Vol. 39, pp. 137-160 and, in order to identify

Marc Jacobs

In this contribution we will apply a case-study methodology and focus on Vietnamese experiences. In her beautiful book *From Antiquities to Heritage*, Anne Eriksen explains how a case differs from an example:

> A case, on the other hand, represents a challenge to generalizations, existing theories, dominant categories or habits of thought. It will often originate from a conflict between established rules and the expected outcome of their application. This conflict will produce considerable ambiguities and ambivalences […] It remains a site for explorations and in-depth probing, and its outcome will be new questions just as much as answers to old ones.[4]

I also share the methodological approach of the eclectic use of heuristic or sensitizing concepts, and in particular I agree with Eriksen that mobilizing the notion of "historicity regimes", developed by François Hartog, is an important tool in the toolbox to analyse heritage paradigms and the words and discourses used to discuss and organize the ways of experiencing the relation between past, present, and future.[5] Furthermore, I also use a tested model from actor-network theory, Michel Callon's basic interpretation scheme of translation sociology (distinguishing problematization, interessement, enrolment, and mobilization) to describe the process of mainstreaming the 2003 Convention Paradigm.[6] Next to the relatively undertheorized notions of "viability" and "visibility", featured in the Blue Book of the *Basic Texts* and hence part of what Cécile Duvelle aptly called "an internationally viable vocabulary for the Convention",[7] we also mobilize the concept of "visitability" from the recent literature focusing on developments in how places and "cultures" are placed on display. In particular we will use recent work of Bella Dicks about theming, the exhibitionary complex, tourism, and heritage, as she has introduced

first the basic epistemic community and the groups, trace the recurrent names in the lists of participants in the Intergovernmental expert meetings, the delegations, observers and members of the Secretariat in the General Assemblies and Intergovernmental Committee meetings, and facilitators' roster of the capacity building programme, on https://ich.unesco.org/en/organs-of-the-convention-00025 and on https://ich.unesco.org/en/facilitator.

[4] A. Eriksen, *From Antiquities to Heritage: Transformations of Cultural Memory*, Berghahn Books, New York – Oxford 2014, pp. 10-11.

[5] Ibidem, pp. 23-27; F. Hartog, *Time and Heritage*, "Museum International" 2005, Vol. 57(3), pp. 7-18; idem, *Regimes of Historicity: Presentism and Experiences of Time*, Columbia University Press, New York 2015.

[6] M. Callon, *Some Elements of a Sociology of Translation: Domestication of the Scallops and the Fishermen of St Brieuc Bay*, in: J. Law (ed.), *Power, Action and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge?*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1986, pp. 196-233. With respect to an application on an ICH nomination process for inscription on the Representative List of the 2003 Convention, see: M. Jacobs, *Domesticating and Harvesting Shrimps – Fisher Communities and the Sea: Blue Ocean Strategies, Translation Processes and the UNESCO Paradigm of Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage*, in: F. Barata, J. Rocha (eds.), *Heritages and Memories from the Sea: 1st International Conference of the UNESCO Chair in Intangible Heritage and Traditional Know-How: Linking Heritage*, University of Évora, Évora 2015, pp. 174-189.

[7] C. Duvelle, *A Decade of Implementation of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, "Ethnologies (Québec)" 2014, Vol. 36(1-2), p. 28.

a concept that can provide good services in studying heritage policy and paradigms where the UNESCO effect can play an important role. Dicks emphasizes that two potentially competing forces are intertwining in heritage as visitable history of all kinds, and not just in the guise of museums, i.e.

> its visitor-oriented market relations, on the one hand, and its claims to stage and pay tribute to 'authentic' culture, on the other. Heritage production involves both salvaging the past, and staging it as a visitable experience. It makes the two interdependent. […] some giving greater space and some less to people's active participation in their own self-display via heritage.[8]

This case-study zooms in on recent documents from and studies about intangible cultural heritage items, safeguarding practice and policy in Vietnam, the 22nd country to ratify the 2003 Convention (on 20 September 2005). Vietnam can be considered as an early adopter of the new instrument for safeguarding intangible heritage, at least on paper and as far as ratification is concerned. One of the crucial challenges was to make the word "safeguarding", or the Vietnamese concept of "Bảo vệ", take on a new and richer meaning in the 21st century and to stimulate innovation. Is "intangible cultural heritage" "patrimoine culturel immatériel" or "sản văn hóa phi vật thể", just a new word or mask for "folklore", "traditional culture", or "popular culture", while everything stays the same? Has something changed compared to UNESCO's 1989 Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore? Was the emancipation (or escape) attempt in relation to the 1972 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage a success in Vietnam? Have most of the actors been able to leave behind the Program of the Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity and to really go beyond (a superficial or tourist interpretation of) the "world heritage" frame of reference?

In this contribution, we will first start with an attempt to complement the official genealogy of the paradigm of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, which is presented in the information kit on the UNESCO website and in several publications telling the history leading up to the Convention. A Vietnamese episode in 1994, and publication in 2001, is usually overlooked and this is the proper occasion to reintroduce it. After introducing a number of ideas about the performative power and the importance of language, and in particular appropriate vocabulary, we will specifically focus on interactions between Vietnam and UNESCO. UNESCO can stand for many actors: Member States, organs of conventions or intergovernmental assemblies, working groups, committees, several sections of the Secretariat, chairpersons and director-gener-

---

8   B. Dicks, *Culture on Display. The Production of Contemporary Visitability*, Open University Press, Berkshire 2003, p. 119.

als, etc.[9] And often combinations of them as well. A hypothesis I will test is whether, next to the epistemic community of the drafters of the 2003 Convention in the first decade since the start of the negotiation process in 2001, the successive Secretaries of the 2003 Convention and their teams (the Intangible Cultural Heritage Section of the Secretariat – "ICH Section") have played an important role in creating, guiding, and steering the pHD into the safeguarding intangible cultural heritage paradigm, and even influencing/mainstreaming the policies in several Member States. Another question I will explore in this contribution is the hypothesis (that is backed up since 2016 by the wording of Operational Directives 170 and 171) that cultural brokers, translators, and mediators are critical success (f)actors in the paradigm of ICH (and pHD).[10]

A Missing or Underestimated Vietnamese Link in the Genealogy of the New Paradigm of Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage? The 1994 Meeting

One of the earliest episodes of the movement in the 1990s, which crystalized as an ICH unit in the UNESCO Secretariat and that boomed in the 21st century, was an International Expert Meeting for the Safeguarding and Promotion of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Minority Groups, which took place in Hà Nội in March 1994. A report was already produced a year later and a proper UNESCO publication in three languages in 2001.[11] The co-organization, together with the UNESCO's emerging Unit of Intangible Heritage in Paris (and the French and Japanese investments and cultural brokers in this new body) was one of the first swallows to announce the coming spring of ICH in the next century.[12] In a speech

[9] See for instance A. Seeger, *Understanding UNESCO: A Complex Organization with Many Parts and Many Actors*, in: M.D. Foster, L. Gilman (eds.), *UNESCO on the Ground. Local Perspectives on Intangible Cultural Heritage*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington 2013, pp. 131-142.

[10] M. Jacobs, J. Neyrinck, A. Van der Zeijden, *UNESCO, Brokers and Critical Success (F)Actors in Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage*, "Volkskunde" 2014, Vol. 115(3), pp. 249-256; M. Jacobs, *Cultural Brokerage. Addressing Boundaries and the New Paradigm of Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage. Folklore Studies, Transdisciplinary Perspectives and UNESCO*, "Volkskunde" 2014, Vol. 115(3), pp. 265-291; idem, *Development Brokerage, Anthropology and Public Action. Local Empowerment, International Cooperation and Aid: Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage*, "Volkskunde" 2014, Vol. 115(3), pp. 299-318; J. Law, *On the Methods of Long Distance Control: Vessels, Navigation, and the Portuguese Route to India*, in: J. Law (ed.), *Power, Action and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge?*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1986; idem, *Actor Network Theory and Material Semiotics*, 25 April 2007, http://www.heterogeneities.net/publications/Law2007ANTandMaterialSemiotics.pdf [accessed: 22.01.2018].

[11] UNESCO, *International Expert Meeting for the Safeguarding and Promotion of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Minority Groups in Viet Nam (Hanoi, 15-18 March 1994). Final Report*, 19 September 1995, UNESCO Doc. CLT/ACL/94/IH/02; O. Salemink (ed.), *Viet Nam's Cultural Diversity: Approaches to Preservation*, UNESCO, Paris 2001.

[12] O. Salemink (ed.), *Viet Nam's Cultural Diversity…*, pp. 5-6.

given by UNESCO director Madeleine Gobeil in Hà Nội in 1994, she revealed the outlines of new strategic plans involving the concept of intangible cultural heritage.[13] This 1994 Vietnamese event, and the following publications in 1995 and 2001, seems to have been downplayed or overlooked in the official genealogies of the 2003 Convention. It is not mentioned in 2009 by Noriko Aikawa-Faure in her classic framing of the recent official history.[14] But Oscar Salemink, one of the anthropologists present, who was also designated as rapporteur, continues to refer to that event, usually with mixed feelings. The title of his contribution speaks volumes: *Who Decides Who Preserves What?* Note that at that time it was not yet a new interpretation of safeguarding that was propagated, but "preservation". But at the same time, Salemink emphasized the importance of involving many stakeholders.

In his Ph.D. in 1999, Salemink noted with concern that in several contributions presented by Vietnamese actors at that 1994 conference, "international tourism" and the "mass media" were singled out as "scapegoats for the alleged cultural disintegration among minorities", and that no attempts were made to contextualize the process of cultural change and to look at the effects of national policy in other fields:

> Most of the projects which came out of the conference would concern the recording or collection of handicraft, music, choreographs, literature, and other aesthetic cultural expressions, for the purpose of conservation and display. Thus, UNESCO may salvage for the world a sterile cultural diversity which seems no longer feasible in the reality of Vietnam today and tomorrow.[15]

Salemink was worried about the danger that "safeguarding the threatened cultural heritage of minority groups becomes an essentially conservative operation of trying to halt the work of time".[16] He criticized these ideas for their colonial flavour and origin, their lack of evolution, dynamics, and actors (whom he called "culture-carriers"). He contested the idea of using research to identify a starting point (the illusion of an authentic traditional culture), whether it be 1948, the French invasions, 1471, or further back. He also warned against the folklorization and the selection of specific practices. He feared it would result in the selection and documentation of a set of decontextualized practices, handpicked by experts

---

[13]   UNESCO, *International…*, pp. 37-45.

[14]   N. Aikawa-Faure, *From the Proclamation of Masterpieces to the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage*, in: L. Smith, N. Akagawa (eds.), *Intangible Heritage*, Routledge, London – New York 2009, pp. 13-44.

[15]   O. Salemink, *Beyond Complicity and Naiveté: Contextualizing the Ethnography of Vietnam's Central Highlanders, 1850-1990* [Ph.D. diss.], Universiteit van Amsterdam 1999, pp. 13-44.

[16]   Idem, *Who Decides Who Preserves What? Cultural Preservation and Cultural Representation*, in: O. Salemink (ed.), *Viet Nam's Cultural Diversity: Approaches to Preservation*, UNESCO, Paris 2001, p. 205.

or State officials, transformed and professionally performed for tourists and audiences. These kind of processes could result in a sterile cultural environment: "Nothing could be more deadly to living culture".[17]

A more fruitful and influential meeting was held in Washington D.C. in 1999. The global assessment of the 1989 Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore made it clear that it was time for something new, for rebooting the system. This was an operation based on two major principles, evoked in the title of the meeting: "Local Empowerment" and "International Cooperation". It was time for more participation, more actors and stakeholders, more groups and communities, more sustainable development, responsible tourism, benefit sharing, prior and informed consent, more dynamics, and a new framework.[18] In the Washington conference in 1999, the terms "folklore and traditional culture" were not yet abandoned. But in 2003, the words "safeguarding intangible cultural heritage" – which had been proposed in the Hà Nội meeting in 1994 – were launched to function in a major, global operation aimed at starting anew. It was no longer about preservation and other connotations that Salemink had criticized, but a new paradigm embracing the aspirations of local empowerment and global cooperation, willing to find an alternative for the authorized heritage discourse (*avant-la-lettre*) and calling for innovative methods.

Words, Forms, Lists, and Reports

As a specialized agency of the United Nations without Blue Helmets, UNESCO tries to have an impact, not only via programmes, funding, and projects, but also via "performative speech acts": proclamations, inscriptions, declarations, symbolic consecrations, etc. In addition to putting elements on lists and registers, the 2003 Convention provides a framework of policy advice and instruments for nation States, establishes temporary dedicated bodies (like a General Assembly, an Intergovernmental Committee) and a Secretariat as a clearing-house and administrative network.

One of the strategies and techniques the promoters of the 2003 Convention cultivated was to limit the number of words that can be used, to create a specific bandwidth of discourse. One aspect was to use neither the letter nor the spirit of world heritage (group) thinking. A glossary was compiled in 2001, but it was not added to the Convention text itself. The importance of this semantic exercise was not so much to provide clear definitions (which would have been and still is counterproductive when dealing with heritage, a concept which thrives on what Ludwig

---

[17]   Ibidem, p. 210.

[18]   P. Seitel (ed.), *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment*, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C. 2001.

Wittgenstein called "family resemblances"), but to reject or "defriend" a whole se-
ries of words, constructions, and associations.[19] It is an invitation to try to stick to
a limited set of words, whose semantic space could be adapted and manipulated –
a so-called "appropriate vocabulary". This does not prevent the introduction, rein-
forcement, or mobilization of alternative concepts with strings attached (e.g. cul-
tural brokerage, boundary spanning, wicked problems, access and benefit sharing,
etc.), for instance via operational directives, forms, reports, or ethical instruments.

The first two operations (excluding and restricting) are exactly what has been
rolled out in the first 15 years, while using the 2003 Convention and the Operation-
al Directives (2008, 2010, 2012, 2014, 2016). The operation of introducing, propa-
gating, monitoring, and enforcing the appropriate language is done through docu-
ments from the Secretariat, reports of the meetings of the General Assembly, and
the Intergovernmental Committee and its Advisory Bodies. Special instruments,
such as analytical documents entitled *Transversal Issues Arising in the Evaluation and
Examination of Nominations, Proposals and Requests* – which among other things re-
fer to using appropriate language – try to consolidate this movement. The former
Secretary of the Convention and now consultant Rieks Smeets coined the term
"the third source of guidance" to capture the effects of using UNESCO's ICH forms.
Both the compilation of these forms and the fine art of filling them in or evaluat-
ing them have a convergence effect.[20] The heavy investment of the funds of the
2003 Convention and of the ICH Section of UNESCO in so-called "capacity-build-
ing" all over the world reinforces this process of trying to propagate and conform to
this pHD, which is slowly emerging within (the ICH Section in) UNESCO's spheres
of influence. It is a fragile process, but not yet a lost cause. Facilitators and consult-
ants (like Smeets and his predecessor as head of the ICH Section Noriko Aikawa,
after they officially left the Secretariat, remaining influential in this way) provide
services to teach key figures in nation States and NGOs to fill in the forms correct-
ly and convincingly, learning to respect both the explicit and implicit criteria,[21] un-
derstanding and using at least the rhetoric and ideally also the practices and spirit
of the alternative heritage discourse of the 2003 Convention paradigm, learning

---

[19]   W. Van Zanten (ed.), *Glossary: Intangible Cultural Heritage*, Netherlands National Commission for
UNESCO, The Hague 2002.

[20]   R. Smeets, *On the Third Source of Guidance for the Implementation of UNESCO's Intangible Heritage Conven-
tion*, in: *The First ICH-Researchers Forum. The Implementation of UNESCO's 2003 Convention. Final Report*, In-
ternational Research Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (IRCI), Osaka 2012,
pp. 71-86.

[21]   See for instance M. Jacobs, *Criteria, Apertures and Envelopes. ICH Directives and Organs in Operation*, in:
*Evaluating the Inscription Criteria for the Two Lists of UNESCO's Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention. The 10th
Anniversary of the 2003 Convention. Final Report*, International Research Centre for Intangible Cultural Her-
itage in the Asia-Pacific Region (IRCI), Osaka 2013, pp. 129-137 and idem, *Bruegel and Burke Were Here!
Examining the Criteria Implicit in the UNESCO Paradigm of Safeguarding ICH: The First Decade*, "International
Journal of Intangible Heritage" 2014, Vol. 9, pp. 99-117.

to "translate" the pHD, and trying to implement these ideas (and/or ideals) in documentation.[22]

In 2013, UNESCO's Internal Oversight Service (IOS) made an assessment of the first decade of working with this normative instrument. The researchers also identified a series of misunderstandings and challenges, regarding which the following enumeration speaks for itself:

> 178. In fact, in the context of this evaluation, lack of awareness and understanding of the Convention and insufficient capacities were identified as some of the major challenges encountered in the implementation of the Convention. This manifests in many ways, such as in a general lack of familiarity with the Convention; confusion of the concepts and principles of the 2003 Convention with those of the 1972 Convention (authenticity, outstanding universal value, etc.); a focus on 'preserving' past 'authentic' forms of ICH, rather than safeguarding them as living heritage that is constantly recreated by community; lack of understanding of legal issues pertaining to the Convention by legislators; insufficient understanding of how ICH relates to sustainable development, both by people working in the culture sector and in other sectors; limited understanding of the need (or commitment to) recognise the central role that communities play in the safeguarding of ICH; lack of understanding of the relationship between gender and ICH; lack of appreciation by communities of their ICH; and insufficient knowledge in communities about the Convention and national safeguarding programmes etc.[23]

Periodic reports have to be submitted by Member States every six years. Given that 178 States have ratified the Convention as of 2018, this could provide very interesting global images of the impact of the Convention and the Operational Directives, of national policies, of the effects of listing systems and registers, and of other issues. The first batches of reports have undergone active editing and steering by the UNESCO Secretariat in Paris to enhance the compatibility of the image with the 2003 Convention paradigm and the alternative pHD as it emerged in the first decade.[24] The attempts via the periodic reports of what Michel Callon called "enrolment" seem to be failing at present.[25] Many periodic reports are not being submitted on time, and many countries do not respect the deadlines or obligations in reporting, and hence a chance to mainstream and to exchange information is not activated. This is one of the reasons why a new reporting system, linked to a Results Based Framework is being considered in 2018.

---

[22]   M. Callon, op. cit.

[23]   B. Torggler, E. Sediakina-Rivière (with J. Blake as consultant), *Evaluation of UNESCO's Standard-setting Work of the Culture Sector. Part I – 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. Final Report*, UNESCO, Paris 2013.

[24]   See the case examined in: M. Jacobs, *"Mag het iets meer zijn?". La politique de sauvegarde du PCI en Flandre au XXIe siècle*, in: F. Lempereur (ed.), op. cit., pp. 329-334.

[25]   Ibidem. A new, even more ambitious attempt to realize a translation process in the form of "a theory of change" or "results based framework" is made in the second decade of the 2003 Convention.

The periodic report of Vietnam was submitted on time and has been on the UNESCO website since 2012. Thanks to the image-building competences of Vietnamese governmental experts and to active feedback by staff at UNESCO headquarters, the periodic report in 2012 fits, on paper, into the bandwidth (of the pHD) of the 2003 Convention. Also, in the IOS assessment of the first decade, Vietnam is showcased several times as a good pupil and learner, a Member State that takes the 2003 Convention seriously, and it has been spotlighted for its achievements several times in recent years, e.g. at a central government level for the search for adequate legislation and the quest to operate in the spirit of the Convention, as well as for successful educational projects by the Vietnam Museum of Ethnology. In the global assessment by UNESCO's IOS, Vietnam is granted a special box to highlight the way it was willing to listen and adjust its legislation:

> In 2008 Viet Nam carried out a survey related to the amendment of the Law on Cultural Heritage. This project was supported by UNESCO. In 2009, at the debate of the National Assembly of Viet Nam for the approval of the draft amendment of the Law on Cultural Heritage, the issue about ranking ICH elements arose. Responding to the request of Viet Nam, the 2003 Convention Secretariat was able to clarify that ranking ICH elements was not in the spirit of the 2003 Convention. The Amended Law on Cultural Heritage was then passed. It contains regulations regarding ICH inventorying and the inscription of ICH elements on the National ICH List.[26]

This passage provides a clue about the special relationship between Vietnamese officials in the cultural and heritage sector and the ICH Section in Paris. The presence, until 2015, of an American scholar (Frank Proschan) – with decades of research experience in Vietnam and neighbouring countries, who speaks Vietnamese and who is trained as a public folklorist and cultural broker – in a key position at the Secretariat (in the ICH Section) is one of the factors that explains this remarkable phenomenon in the translation process, involving a communist country. Other key figures involved in the project at the Vietnamese Museum of Ethnology in Hà Nội are considered to be inspiring examples, building on the work of French museologists and a tradition that has also yielded the Quai Branly museum.[27] The case of Vietnam, during the first decade of the Convention, also seems to support the thesis that cultural heritage brokers and translators are a critical success (f)actor in the 2003 paradigm of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage.[28]

Vietnam is one of the cases studied in a recent Ph.D. on the governance of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in the Asia-Pacific realm. Seong-Yong Park, attached to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Centre for Asia and the Pacific

---

26   B. Torggler, E. Sediakina-Rivière, op. cit., p. 32, box 2 and p. 47, box 7.

27   N. Van Huy, *The Role of Museums in the Preservation of Living Heritage: Experiences of the Vietnam Museum of Ethnology*, "International Journal of Intangible Heritage" 2006, Vol. 1, pp. 34-41.

28   M. Jacobs, J. Neyrinck, A. Van der Zeijden, op. cit., and M. Jacobs, *Cultural Brokerage…*

Marc Jacobs

(ICHCAP), makes it clear that Vietnam has tried its best to inscribe and align its activities in the framework of the 2003 Convention. He points at several collaboration efforts with UNESCO, Norway, Japan, and other countries and intensive help from ICHCAP; in the spirit of Article 19 (international collaboration) of the 2003 Convention.[29]

Misunderstandings?

The general Law on Cultural Heritage, issued in Vietnam in 2001, was amended in 2009 to bring it into line with the 2003 Convention, followed by Circular No. 04/2010/TT-BVHTTDL. Seong-Yong Park draws attention to Articles 17 and 18, where the amendments are explicitly trying to move away from the AHD, the 1972 Convention, and the masterpieces programme and try to make clear that ranking should be avoided and that "comparing intangible cultural heritage of a community with that of other communities to rank by value and influence is unreasonable and also inconsistent with the principle of respect for cultural diversity".[30]

In its periodic report, there is a statement that Vietnam is implementing policies on the safeguarding and promotion of ICH values in order to "build an advanced culture imbued with Vietnam's national identity".[31]

In several publications, the Dutch anthropologist Oscar Salemink urges readers to look not only at the 2001 Law on Cultural Heritage, but also to devote sufficient attention to the impact of Resolution No. V of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, which was adopted in 1998. Resolution No. V proclaimed that it aims to "build a progressive culture, imbued with national identity".[32] The Resolution functioned as an umbrella for more local, bottom-up approaches to revitalizing or reinventing traditions, and also as an entry point for the State to coordinate and participate in this movement and organize new rituals, festivals, and forms.[33]

Salemink, now a professor of anthropology in Copenhagen (Denmark), but also formerly active at the University of Amsterdam and in Vietnam, has published several articles on the safeguarding of intangible heritage in Vietnam in the previous *two* decades. In order to explain why UNESCO-related experiments with the

---

[29] S. Park, *On Intangible Heritage Safeguarding Governance: An Asia-Pacific Context*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne 2013, pp. 128-136.

[30] Ibidem, p. 130.

[31] Periodic report no. 792, Viet Nam, http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/download.php?version-ID=18524 [accessed: 1.03.2017].

[32] O. Salemink, *Appropriating Culture: The Politics of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Vietnam*, in: Hue-Tam Ho Tai, M. Sidel (eds.), *State, Society and the Market in Contemporary Vietnam: Property, Power and Values*, Routledge, Oxon 2013, p. 161.

[33] Idem, *Embodying the Nation: Mediumship, Ritual, and the National Imagination*, "Journal of Vietnamese Studies" 2008, Vol. 3(3), pp. 261-290.

notion of intangible cultural heritage were conducted in Vietnam at quite an early stage, Salemink on one hand refers to the influence of French anthropology via Claude Lévi-Strauss and Georges Condominas, and on the other hand underlines the Japanese connection, with academic and government interventions and contributions.[34]

One of the remarkable aspects in Salemink's oeuvre is that often the UNESCO paradigm for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage is mixed up with the world heritage paradigm or "brand". In a recent discussion of the application for inscribing the Space of Gong Culture on the Representative List of the 2003 Convention, published in 2012, Salemink used the expression "the world's cultural heritage".[35] The professor also did so in his inaugural lecture in 2006 at Amsterdam, and seems to keep on repeating the same "deadly sin" over and over again. In a publication in 2016, he discusses the Space of Gong Culture "which UNESCO aims to safeguard through its inscription in the World Intangible Cultural Heritage List".[36] He does it again in a recent contribution, where the title explicitly addresses the "politics of intangible cultural heritage" (and, I may point out, not safeguarding ICH). Salemink wrongly connects the inscription of the two "masterpieces" Nha Nhac, Vietnamese court music (2008) and the Space of Gong culture (2008) to Article 17 (instead of Article 16).[37] He even strangely argues that "[i]n Article 2, the Convention itself speaks of 'world heritage properties' and refers to intellectual property rights with reference to heritage".[38] This is simply not correct.

Notice how Salemink uses several taboo words (unique, universal, etc.) in his discussion of the two Vietnamese items that were inscribed in the Representative List:

> The UNESCO "stamp of approval" is important to the Vietnamese leadership, both in terms of foreign policy and domestically. Internationally, the prestigious recognition by UNESCO on behalf of the entire world renders specimens of Vietnam's cultural heritage both unique – as specifically Vietnamese – and universal – of cultural value for all of humanity – at once.[39]

But this is absolutely not the spirit or official goal of the 2003 Convention. Salemink (dis)qualifies and criticizes the available literature on (safeguarding) intangi-

---

[34]   Idem, *Appropriating Culture…*, p. 166.

[35]   Idem, *Is There Space for Vietnam's Gong Culture? Economic and Social Challenges for the Safeguarding of the Space of Gong Culture*, in: I. Kopania (ed.), *South-East Asia. Studies in Art, Cultural Heritage and Artistic Relations with Europe*, Polish Institute of World Art Studies and Tako Publishing House, Warsaw – Toruń 2012, p. 127.

[36]   Idem, *Described, Inscribed, Written Off: Heritagisation as (Dis)connection*, in: P. Taylor (ed.), *Connected and Disconnected in Viet Nam: Remaking Social Relations in a Post-socialist Nation*, ANU Press, Canberra 2016, p. 324.

[37]   Idem, *Appropriating Culture…*, p. 158.

[38]   Ibidem, p. 159.

[39]   Ibidem, p. 166.

ble heritage: "it is produced by those who are involved in the research, assessment, valuation and management, either on behalf of UNESCO or of a national institution or agency. They are insiders and 'expert professionals', both authors of and participants in what Laurajane Smith calls the 'authorized heritage discourse'".[40] But is this not missing the point that for many cultural brokers the liminal operation under the flag of "intangible" or "safeguarding" (after a 21st-century control-alt-delete operation) is performed to try and construct an *alternative* heritage discourse, which we have nicknamed "pHD"?

In recent publications, Salemink explains that in 1994 he was involved in *two* conferences where the concept of "intangible cultural heritage" circulated. Next to the aforementioned meeting in Hà Nội on safeguarding ICH and so-called ethnic minorities in Vietnam, he also participated in a conference in and about Hue; formerly an imperial city, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1993. At that conference, the connection with and impact on the so-called intangible heritage (values) connected to the monumental world heritage site were discussed. Is this the explanation for the lasting bias, as if the world heritage paradigm overarched all heritage policy? Or is Salemink mainly echoing or representing what most actors actually are saying and doing in Vietnam, notwithstanding the correct policy versions?

In addition to the explicit option to cultivate the difference from "world heritage thinking", there was also a choice among the protagonists of the making of the 2003 Convention to avoid references to ethnicity and essentialist ethnic identities. Nevertheless, Salemink suggests that the official national discourse about "ethnic groups" is compatible with the presumption that (allegedly) "the UNESCO notion of heritage is clearly associated with a notion of culture as a bounded entity linked to a clearly delineated ethnic group".[41] But I have to re-emphasize here that the 2003 Convention tries to get rid of "ethnic group" thinking.

Salemink also suspects a "folklorization" process in the 2003 Convention paradigm and he warns against the fact that the "heritagization" process would be

> decontextualized from the cultural setting in which they acquire locally specific (social, economic, ritual, religious) meanings, and re-contextualized for a different public for whom aesthetic meanings are paramount criteria. The result of policies predicated on such notions is the ossification of these cultural practices, studied, preserved, safeguarded, and promoted out of context.[42]

If one reads the reports of experts who actually participated in the 21st-century UNESCO meetings and working groups, one sees the contrary repeated over and over again. The Operational Directives of the 2003 Convention, in all the versions (2008, 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016), explicitly state in Paragraph 102 that

---

[40] Ibidem, p. 164.

[41] Ibidem, p. 168.

[42] Ibidem.

"All parties are encouraged to take particular care to ensure that awareness-raising actions will not: de-contextualize or denaturalize the intangible cultural heritage manifestations or expressions concerned". Paragraph 120 explicitly emphasizes: "When publicizing and disseminating information on the elements inscribed on the Lists, care should be given to presenting the elements in their context and to focusing on their value and meaning for the communities concerned, rather than only on their aesthetic appeal or entertainment value". Should Salemink update his knowledge of the letter and the spirit of the 2003 Convention? Or is he once again presenting phenomena, views, and practices heard in Vietnam? My guess would be "yes" to both questions.

Salemink argues that his local experience has taught him that "[t]his market-driven folklorization and exoticization takes place in Vietnam – and in Vietnam's Central Highlands – as well, as may be clear from any tourist brochure or website about that region".[43] It is worrying that the conclusion of his empirical research seems to be that the folklorizing effects of State-driven cultural policies and the effects of a market-driven tourism prevail; as if

> particular cultural practices are taken out of context, re-interpreted and re-packaged by cultural "outsiders," and presented to an outside audience as "authentic heritage" which should be preserved and revitalized. […] Through this appropriation culture becomes property – no longer of the "culture carriers" (UNESCO's unfortunate term which implicitly reduces "culture" to a thing, or even a burden to carry) but of state- and market-mandated cultural experts.[44]

List(en)ing

Vietnam is actively using the international lists of the 2003 Convention: the instruments that momentarily interpret Articles 16 and 17. As of the autumn of 2017 there are 11 Vietnamese elements inscribed. In 2016, practices related to the Viet beliefs in the Mother Goddesses of Three Realms were included in the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity ("RL", Article 16) and in 2015 Vietnam participated in an international file on "tugging rituals and games", effectively added onto the same list. Several items concerning music and songs from Vietnam were inscribed on the RL: in 2014 the Ví and Giặm folk songs of Nghệ Tĩnh; in 2013 the Art of Đờn ca tài tử music and songs in southern Viet Nam; in 2010 the Gióng festival of Phù Đông and the Sóc temples; in 2009 the Quan Họ Bắc Ninh folk songs; and thanks to a transfer from the Masterpieces program, in 2008 the Nha Nhac court music and also the Space of gong culture.

---

[43]   Ibidem, p. 169.

[44]   Ibidem.

Marc Jacobs

Vietnam was one of the few countries that, right from the start, also actively used the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding ("USL", Article 17). In 2009, *Ca trù* singing was placed on that list, followed by the Xoan singing of Phú Thọ Province in 2011. It is remarkable that Vietnam is the first Member State that, with respect to the last mentioned item, is trying to push the international listing system into a new phase and to put "follow up" evaluation of the effectiveness of the proposed safeguarding plan (criterion U3 in §1 of the Operational Directives) on the agenda. In 2015, Vietnam managed to set in motion an exceptional procedure to transfer, in the meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee in Jeju (Korea) in December 2017, the Xoan singing of Phú Thọ Province from the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding to the Representative List, hence to construct a bridge between RL/Article 16 and USL/Article 17 (thus establishing an important precedent). Their successful action will reopen the discussion about transfers from one list (or register) to another (list or register), an issue to be regulated in the Operational Directives, with possible effects for discussing follow up, evaluation, and monitoring of elements after inscription.

In recent years, a number of studies about the evolution of the intangible cultural heritage in Vietnam, both before and after their inscription on the lists of Articles 16 and 17, have been published. In a well-documented case-study, Barley Norton focused on the making and follow up of the *ca trù* file. He framed his exploration in the following suggestion of the policy context:

> So what has led Vietnam to wholeheartedly embrace UNESCO policies on cultural heritage? The current enthusiastic promotion of cultural heritage is fueled in equal measure by nationalist anxiety and pride – nationalist anxiety about the loss of Vietnamese cultural identity due to the forces of globalization and the influx of foreign culture, and nationalist pride concerning Vietnam's cultural status in the world [...] Such pride stimulates a competitive spirit in which Vietnamese officials increasingly measure the country's international cultural standing by whether nominations to UNESCO are successful.[45]

As one of the few Member States to take this path, Vietnam saw the lists of both Articles 16 and 17 as tools in this endeavour. Norton makes it clear that *ca trù* needed to be framed in a special way to embrace the criteria of the USL: "For *ca trù* to become recognized as intangible cultural heritage in urgent need of safeguarding, Vietnamese officals responsible for governing cultural heritage have forged a new discourse on revival".[46] A lot of work had to be done to capture a very complex and diverse repertoire of performance practices and expressions under the single umbrella term of *ca trù*, presenting it as "an item" that can then be subjected

---

[45]   B. Norton, *Music Revival, Ca Trù Ontologies, and Intangible Cultural Heritage in Vietnam*, in: C. Bithell, J. Hill (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Music Revival,* Oxford University Press, Oxford 2015, p. 162.

[46]   Ibidem.

to a number of safeguarding measures supporting "its" "viability". Norton's analysis shows how difficult and sometimes artificial such a process is, and how UNESCO 2003 Convention's framework bumps into the complex histories and challenges of *ca trù*.

Norton admits that the Vietnamese authorities, and in particular the Vietnamese Institute for Musicology, have been and are investing relatively significant amounts of money and resources into safeguarding *ca trù*. He questions whether the choices to privilege research, documentation, and investments in visibility, through the organization of large-scale festivals, concerts, and publications over transmission and training, is the best option to stimulate viability and revival. While interviewing the teachers and musicians themselves, he noticed that they are doubtful about whether raising awareness and increasing visibility are the crucial or first steps in a strategy aiming at viability:

> Indeed, the lack of state support of *ca trù* activities since the nomination has caused many musicians to be extremely sceptical of the grassroots benefits of the UNESCO inscription. The issue of musical transmission is crucial for revival because very few musicians are competent *ca trù* performers in Vietnam today. Despite the acknowledgment of this fact in the UNESCO file, to date, the Vietnamese Ministry of Culture and Information has spent funds on conferences and festivals, rather than on encouraging teaching.[47]

At the same time, Norton underlines how difficult it is to find a balance and correct wavelength in such training programmes, so that they actually support creativity and not impose styles, fixed formats, and stagnation. Norton offers the important insight that safeguarding intangible cultural heritage is more a "wicked problem" than a simple one that can be easily solved by following certain steps, a model, or a safeguarding plan.

The performers and other members of the *ca trù* heritage community, who do not want to be reduced to "tradition bearers", are making a very sharp analysis of what the new UNESCO paradigm can cause. As Norton notes:

> in the case of *ca trù*, the nomination to UNESCO seems to have contributed to tensions and rivalry between groups of performers. Although most musicians I spoke to acknowledge that UNESCO recognition raises prestige and status, some voices within *ca trù* circles are wary of the sudden increase in attention stimulated by the nomination and are critical of the progress that has been made in developing a viable musical culture […] Some performers and aficionados fear that *ca trù* will be damaged if training programs are not properly executed […] The weight of cultural heritage threatens to limit *ca trù*'s musical and ritual meanings, to define its contemporary social relevance in primarily nationalistic terms, and to make it more difficult for a vital, innovative musical culture to emerge.[48]

---

[47] Ibidem, p. 173.

[48] Ibidem, p. 177.

One of the ways to understand the importance of Norton's analysis and his use of so-called "historic ontologies" is to see it as a plea to escape the presentist focus of the contemporary historicity regime that is privileged in the 2003 Convention paradigm, and to consider the complexity of longer term frameworks, e.g. of dealing with what moves under the umbrella term "*ca trù*". This is in line with the argument that the aforementioned ethnologist Anne Eriksen proposed for enhancing critical heritage studies and moving beyond AHD or pHD, to include the sensitizing historicity regimes framework that François Hartog introduced.[49] The potential of incorporating the notion of historicity regimes into the safeguarding ICH paradigm cannot be understimated: "there is scope for imaginative revival projects that are informed by historical research on *ca trù*'s diverse ontologies and for initiatives to forge new styles that do not aim to adhere to historical precedents".[50]

Since 2013, a book-length study of another Vietnamese UNESCO-listed case involving music has been available in English. Quan họ was inscribed in 1999 on the RL (decision 4.COM.13.76). Lauren Meeker analyses how discourses on quan họ have been constructed and used by various actors in Vietnam since the Second World War. In a first phase, "folk culture" in general and "folk songs" in particular were seen as building blocks for the construction of new culture/music under the communist regime. The wars in the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s caused a massive "interruption". In the late 1960s, representations of quan họ followed paths diverging from "traditional/old/rural" and tending toward "new/modernized/urban". After the Dô'I Moi of 1986 a new phase began. As time went by and the heritage paradigm became crystalized, the reference date of 1945 became more important as a boundary for what is called, in English, "authenticity". The older generations that had not only actively witnessed the 1940s but had also been introduced to the quan họ tradition earlier were now disappearing. In ethno-musicology and other scholarly disciplines, the year 1945, marker of the origin of the new socialist nation, was institutionalized as a marker to refer to the (older) building blocks of authenticity. Meeker states that for the villagers, that year had no special significance in the "continuum" of quan họ practice, while

> [f]or the Party and government and for all who read through the UNESCO inscription, however, 1945 indexes authenticity by drawing a line in the sand between the past and the present. In the name of culture, the UNESCO inscription has reinforced and made permanent what continues to be a politically expedient symbol of Vietnamese nationhood.[51]

---

[49] A. Eriksen, op. cit.; for a potential European challenge, see M. Jacobs, *Bruegel…*, pp. 99-117.

[50] B. Norton, op. cit., p. 177.

[51] L. Meeker, *Sounding Out Heritage. Cultural Politics and the Social Practice of Quan Họ Folk Song in Northern Vietnam*, University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu 2013, p. 149.

This not only sheds light on the overlap of historicity regimes, but it also illustrates that in the 21st century, partly due to the increasing interaction between UNESCO and Vietnam in the recent past, the challenge and opportunities to promote culture connected to Vietnam on the global stage have become ever more important.

In the last chapter of her book, "Heritage and the Afterlife of Songs", Meeker discusses not so much the notion of safeguarding, but an "intangible cultural heritage model". She claims that "intangible cultural heritage *forms*, despite the rhetoric that culture is process, rely upon an identifiable *standard* that can be registered (for example on the UNESCO lists) and against which all other forms can be measured". But is this an adequate way to approach the Convention? The 2003 Convention's jargon refers to "items" or "elements" and is driven by the power of performative language acts rather than with measurable forms. The following passage in Meeker's book is quite interesting, but according to me also quite problematic and ambiguous:

> [T]he emphasis on intangible cultural heritage introduced a new and different form of ambiguity into how the new/old binary is applied to quan họ by enforcing the adoption of an internationally defined concept of authenticity along with a preservation agenda that may not be entirely compatible with local (indigenous) concepts and agendas.[52]

But it is precisely the concept of "authenticity" that is problematized and avoided in the safeguarding ICH frame of reference or paradigm. If something is "enforced" (by "UNESCO" or the Secretariat managing and developing the 2003 Convention), then it is *not* to use a concept of authenticity, internationally or otherwise defined, and not to go for just a "preservation" agenda.

While doing a research project in 2009 about tourism development in Diê'm Village, Meeker interviewed the secretary of the Youth Union, who stated that hope was put in UNESCO

> today, above all, the wish of the Ministry of Culture is to try and get quan họ accepted as world heritage. Because this wish belongs to all Diê'm villagers, in particular, and all of Vietnam, in general. Once the "world" [i.e. UNESCO] accepts it, quan họ will be famous all over the world, many guests will know about it and come here for a visit.[53]

Neither dialogue, stakeholder involvement, awareness-raising, nor viability appear to be the main priority in such reasoning, but rather the effect of listing in terms of visibility, translatable into visitability.

Listening to the perception of the effects of listing is one of the tasks Meeker took up. She heard a feeling, voiced by members of "the local community", that

---

the cultural gatekeepers are "somewhere above" and are "foreigners": "These comments also complicated the claims that the cultural heritage inscription process through UNESCO includes the full participation of local populations".[54] Two alarming words in the quote from the Youth Union official – that is, alarming to me but not flagged as problematic nor discussed by Meeker – are "world heritage". That this brand name effectively circulated and circulates in the field can also be deduced from a transcription of an interview with a candidate for a Living Human Treasures programme (nghệ nhân) in Vietnam: "They said UNESCO was going to recognize quan họ [as belonging to] the world's cultural heritage".[55]

The follow up field trip only six months after the inscription also speaks volumes about the substantial but unrealistic expectations of developers, managers, local populations, and, indeed, researchers. Meeker returned to Bac Ninh and Diê'm Village in the summer of 2010 to "see firsthand what changes the September 2009 inscription of quan họ to the UNESCO Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity had brought to the village and quan họ practice. In fact, very little had changed with regard to quan họ and the expected tourists had not yet arrived".[56]

Meeker did immediately notice the commercialization or the increasing importance of money. While friendship and the gift economy seemed to be characteristic of (the stories about) quan họ in the village context, the impact of the attention of the State, mass media, and academia and of the international heritage tourism industry seems to result in commodification: "Quan ho thus practiced is no longer a long-term, deeply-felt relationship of exchange based on 'relatedness' but rather a short-term financial transaction: the cash payment preempts any relationship of social indebtness".[57] Meeker pushes the argument about this latest evolution in Vietnamese music:

> Once culture, as heritage, has a market value, authenticity is seen to lie less in doing culture than in visibly representing culture as heritage […] Representation […] depends less upon a community of different cultural actors doing things than upon a community where all actors contribute to fixing culture into what John and Jean Comaroff would call a "brand".[58]

A hopeful message in Meeker's book is that this kind of heritage regime does not succeed in capturing everything, and something always remains beyond the control of any authoritative statement of authenticity.

---

[54]   Ibidem, p. 145.

[55]   Ibidem, p. 146.

[56]   Ibidem, p. 145.

[57]   L. Meeker, *How Much for a Song? Local and National Representations of Quan Họ Folksong*, "Journal of Vietnamese Studies" 2010, Vol. 5(1), p. 153.

[58]   Ibidem, p. 154.

Visibility, Visitability, and Viability

Since 2014, a professional video is available on the UNESCO website as part of the nomination file 1008 for the so-called Ví and Giặm folk songs of Nghệ Tĩnh. There are versions in three languages (Vietnamese, English, and French). Providing this sort of a video as part of a nomination file, in addition to ten photos and a completed form, together being an "obligatory passage point",[59] is all part of the procedure that leads to inscription on the Representative List in November 2014. This procedure, in accordance with Article 16 of the 2003 Convention, was established in order to ensure better visibility of the intangible cultural heritage and awareness of its significance, and to encourage dialogue which respects cultural diversity. The term "visibility" can be interpreted in many ways, in the sense of exposure in the media, intercultural understanding, or raising sensitivity, but it is often instrumentalized as visitability (by domestic and foreign tourists).

The first full minute of the 10-minute video is a song in Vietnamese for which translations in English and French are available as subtitles. One sees and hears a Vietnamese woman with a conical hat singing in a field, looking over a picturesque landscape featuring mountains and a river. The song (in its English version) goes as follows:

> My friend! The mountain is green and the water is blue.
> The road to Ngê is as beautiful as a picture.
> Whose singing voice resounds over the mountains and rivers?
> It sounds as if the Lam River and Hóng Mountain are singing a love song together.

This scene is immediately followed by a map, situating the region where you can enjoy these divine songs and landscapes. A travel agency or tourist office could easily use this clip, and in particular its first minute, to try and convince visitors to come.

A similar message and incentive is given in other scenes in the video. The most explicit publicity is conveyed "en passant", as a not-so-hidden persuader, in the last part of the video. The English translation in subtitles reads as follows:

> People who come to Hè Tinh, my homeland,
> Put on Hạ silk tunics and drink Húróng Són tea,
> The Hu'óng Són tea is tasty and fresh as well
> Châu Phong silk is beautiful and long-wearing,
> Four seasons have white rice and fresh fish.
> If you do not come to Hà Tinh, you would regret it.[60]

---

59   M. Callon, op. cit.

60   https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/vi-and-giam-folk-songs-of-nghe-tinh-01008http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?pg=00581&include=film.inc.php&id=21416&width=500&call=film, 7:54-8:30 [accessed: 1.03.2017]. See also the extended version of 30 minutes on the DVD *Dân Ca Ví, Giặm Nghệ Tĩnh. Ví and Giặm Folk Songs of Nghệ Tĩnh*, VICAS, Hà Nội 2013.

Marc Jacobs

The message is appealing, subtle, and, as part of a song, well-framed. "Our region is worth seeing" is only one of many subjects in the Ví and Giặm songs, next to love between boys and girls or work activities. But it is an important issue, as we learn from a reflection published in 2011 by the Vietnam Chamber of Commerce and Industry, in the chapter on Tourism, under the title "Preserving and Developing Local Folk Songs". After an overview of the evolution of the Ví and Giặma genres, the following motives were shared:

> With its adaptive ability, Vi, Giam folk songs should be included in tours as a local spiritual specialty. Regrettably, there have been no travel agents in Nghe An introducing Vi, Giam folk songs into their tours. In future, the combination will be an opportunity to introduce Nghe area's culture in general and Vi, Giam folk songs in particular to tourists, contributing to boosting the provincial economy and tourism.[61]

Up to now, not much research has been conducted into the increasing number of 10-minute videos available on the UNESCO site. Since 2009, Wim Van Zanten has been repeating that the audiovisual material needs more attention, both from the makers and from researchers. He has emphasized that the advisory bodies explicitly underscored in 2011 that the videos submitted should not be aimed at promoting tourism.[62] Indeed, the information documents mention that: "The Body noted a tendency in some cases to submit videos that were aimed at promoting tourism, and it encourages States to use the videos for information and not for such promotion or advertising".[63] In other words, to focus on viability rather than visitability. In the document *Transversal Issues Arising in the Evaluation and Examination of Nominations, Proposals and Requests*, several challenges concerning the videos are addressed, including those relating to tourism.[64] Such instruments try to make

---

[61] T. Lam Thuy, *Preserving and Developing Local Folk Songs*, "Vietnam Business Forum", 18 October 2011, http://www.vccinews.com/news_detail.asp?news_id=24514 [accessed: 1.03.2017]; see also the *Do You Know Trần Quang Hải – Việt Nam?* blog, http://tranquanghai1944.wordpress.com/page/127/?themes_on_signup_preview=1 [accessed: 1.03.2017].

[62] W. Van Zanten, *The Relation Between Communities and Their Living Culture as Represented by Audiovisual Files*, in: *The First ICH-Researchers Forum. The Implementation of UNESCO's 2003 Convention. Final Report*, International Research Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (IRCI), Osaka 2012, pp. 87-92.

[63] Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, Sixth Session, Bali, Indonesia, 22 to 29 November 2011, *Item 8 of the Provisional Agenda: Evaluation of Nominations for Inscription in 2011 on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding*, 23 November 2011, UNESCO Doc. ITH/11/6.COM/CONF.206/8, para. 24.

[64] Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, Eighth Session, Baku, Azerbaijan, 2 to 7 December 2013, *Item 7.a of the Provisional Agenda: Examination of Nominations for Inscription on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding*, 3 December 2013, UNESCO Doc. ITH/13/8.COM/7.a, para. 32 (USL); Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, Eighth Session, Baku, Azerbaijan, 2 to 7 December 2013, *Item 8 of the Provisional Agenda: Report of the Subsidiary Body on Its Work in 2013 and Examination of Nominations for Inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity*, 4 December 2013, UNESCO Doc. ITH/13/8.COM/8, paras. 31, 52 (RL); Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural

States, regions, and companies aware that they should refrain from tourist promotion and devote more attention to the benefits to local communities and groups, a process that Callon called "interessement".

Looking at the Ví and Giặm clip for the nomination procedure in 2014 as a whole, one can say that it manages to stay within the boundaries, or within the requested bandwidth. A nice, safe story is presented. In addition to a general indication of the spatial context, in the sense of the landscape, villages, and, in the very last seconds of the video, on a stage, there are time indications and clues for dealing with historicity regimes. In most of the video, an impression is given of an age-old tradition of "hundreds of years", in the hands of "peasants, craftsmen, and fishermen". There is one passage (7:00-7:15) where suddenly a specific and dated historical source is given – the "Saturday Novel Journal, no. 468" in 1943, containing another reference, to a specific earlier year, "1927". It was then that an allegedly new era in Giặm started, due to the collaboration between intellectuals and members of the workers' guild. Just like the interventions by Confucian scholars previously, this yielded more sophisticated and complex texts and forms. In the last few seconds of the video a new phase is suggested, the adaptation for and presentation on stage, with images from a 2012 festival.

In addition to ten photos, documentation about the inclusion in a national inventory, and declarations of prior and informed consent, the candidature application also contains the official form. As we have mentioned before, the format and the small printed instructions function as a crucial "guiding" instrument. The official file of the Nghệ Tĩnh's Ví and Giặm folk songs for the Representative List is a good example of a finely-tuned discourse between the expected boundaries and explicit and implicit rules.[65] Although it is clear that some rhetorical statements are too strong, e.g. the answer to box C of the nomination dossier ("Name of the communities, groups or, if applicable, individuals concerned"): "The Việt people in Nghệ An and Hà Tĩnh provinces (hereafter abbreviated as Nghệ Tĩnh) all know and love Ví and Giặm Folk Songs", they correspond to what the world and the pHD like to (make) believe. The story presented in the UNESCO form basically builds on and adds a new chapter to the story of decades, if not centuries, of evolution of the Ví and Giặm repertoire, which is presented in three languages in the history booklet. It happily ends with the rosy conclusion that the

> safeguarding and promotion of intangible cultural heritage value of Ví and Giặm folk songs of Nghệ Tĩnh in two provinces of Nghệ An and Hà Tĩnh in the recent years have

---

Heritage, Sixth Session, Bali, Indonesia, 22 to 29 November 2011, *Item 8 of the Provisional Agenda…*, para. 24 (USL); Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, Fifth Session, Nairobi, Kenya, 15 to 19 November 2010, *Item 6 of the Provisional Agenda: Evaluation of Nominations for Inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity,* 6 October 2010, UNESCO Doc. ITH/10/5.COM/CONF.202/6, para. 37 (RL).

[65] http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/download.php?versionID=30331 [accessed: 1.03.2017].

Marc Jacobs

been creating good results [...] the intangible cultural heritage [...] goes beyond the cultural space and the geographical boundary of a land [...] [and will] accompany the people of Nghệ An and Hà Tĩnh to go into the future.[66]

The nomination file comprises a big surprise. An unusual attached file that is presented to prove that there is an "inventory" is the *General Report on the Scientific Inventory*.[67] It is a detailed and critical assessment of the distribution of, opportunities for, and threats to the Ví and Giặm repertoire in the region of Nghệ Tĩnh, which sheds a different light on the rather idyllic and picturesque image presented in the video, and debunks the all too rosy parts in the public transcript presented in the form. Yet the *General Report* is not so much a hidden transcript from below (to use James Scott's words), but a reality check for both UNESCO and the Vietnamese officials. It addresses the difficult problems of "viability" of the form of intangible cultural heritage in situ, telling stories that challenge and shatter romantic notions of the "local community", and is not just an exercise in "itemization" on a list or a special focus on the coupling of visibility and visitability. Making places or regions assume a visitor-friendly face is the result of a complex process involving strategies of cultural display. "To be visitable, public places must be seen to be consumer-friendly, accessible, interactive, performative and safe [...] the idea of the world as a mosaic of distinctively colourful, performable identities, the pleasurable experience of which is available for purchase".[68] But what if they do not conform (yet)? Is there more to be seen at second sight? What if the needs and aspirations of the "communities, groups, and individuals" are broader than that? What if viability is not so easy to "ensure"?

Safeguarding, Ví and Giặm

The surprising comments of scholars like Salemink and Meeker about "intangible world heritage" (although per definition impossible) most likely echo what they hear from their many informants in Vietnam and elsewhere in the world. Or from policy-makers and entrepreneurs, in particular in the tourist industries. Some musicians seem to be prepared to go along with processes of commodification and transformation of their performances into a product, as musician Le Ham spelled out recently: "The tourists also listen to Nghe An folk songs, a special local product that is part of the cultural and spiritual treasure which was passed down from gen-

---

[66]   N. Chi Bèn, B. Quang Thanh, *Dân ca ví, giặm Nghệ Tĩnh*, Culture and Information Publishers, Hà Nội 2013, p. 36.

[67]   B. Quang Thanh, *General Report on the Scientific Inventory of Ví and Giặm Folk Songs of Nghệ Tĩnh*, Vietnam Institute of Culture and Arts Studies, Hà Nội 2012, http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/download.php?versionID=28936 [accessed: 1.03.2017].

[68]   Series Editor's Foreword in B. Dicks, op. cit.

eration to generation".[69] How does this "commodifiable product" way of thinking, in particular with respect to outsiders, match the idea of intercultural communication and an emphasis on processes and participatory approaches? Vietnam is an interesting testing-ground for this type of culture and cultural policy within UNESCO frames of reference insofar heritage (ranging from AHD to pHD) is concerned, also in view of the special but evolving ideological framework (i.e. cultivating "communism" in a world where the WTO and the World Bank are so powerful).

The 2001 UNESCO report of the 1994 meeting, edited by Salemink, remains important in the international perception of Vietnamese policy on intangible cultural heritage.[70] But it has to be updated in the light of the paradigm shift since 2003. I strongly disagree with Salemink's thesis that insiders and experts operating in the 2003 Convention "are not really willing or able to step outside the 'authorized heritage discourse' and take seriously the 'unauthorized' views and interests that Laurajane Smith focuses on in her *Uses of Heritage*".[71] Not all of them think the same way and there have been debates and controversies, even in the Intergovernmental Committee meetings and in the parallel meetings of accredited NGOs. I also have a problem with accepting Salemink's statement, in particular for the next decade, that "Vietnam competes with other countries on a competitive playing field over UNESCO recognition of its cultural practices as world heritage or masterpieces of intangible cultural heritage".[72]

On the one hand, more work needs to be done in the international scholarly community to really understand and take more seriously the principles, goals, and ideals of the 2003 Convention paradigm. On the other hand, these misunderstandings probably signal or reflect problems in understanding this paradigm, and a continued problematic flirtation with the world heritage paradigm in the field and among policy-makers, not only in Vietnam but around the globe. This was also one of the major conclusions UNESCO's IOS reached regarding the first decade of the 2003 Convention. The same report spotlights an interesting dialogue between UNESCO Headquarters and policy-makers in Vietnam. Here the work of (former) key figures in the ICH Section of UNESCO headquarters should be mentioned, in particular Frank Proschan, who played an important role in the process of constructing and defending the alternative discourse, both globally and in Vietnam. The periodic report on Vietnam is a good example of the results of this dialogue.

In an intermediary assessment of policy mentioned in the periodic report, Nguyễn Kim Dung published an excellent evaluation of the ICH inventories availa-

---

[69]   Musician Le Ham, *Hát Ví (Ví Singing) – Vietnamese Folk Song in Nghe-Tinh*, "Vietnam Social Sciences" 2013, Vol. 2(154), p. 52.

[70]   L. Lixinski, *Intangible Cultural Heritage in International Law*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2013, pp. 131-133.

[71]   O. Salemink, *Appropriating Culture…*, p. 164.

[72]   Ibidem, p. 174.

ble in Vietnam in 2008. She pointed out that the paradigm shift of community participation had not been digested by all Vietnamese researchers or institutes and that a number of projects failed, but on the other hand she emphasized that a number of small-scale and in-depth projects showed promising results. She particularly mentioned the work of the Vietnam Museum of Ethnology in Hà Nội.[73] In 2015, the former director of that museum Nguyen Van Huy and the former civil servant Nguyễn Kim Dung joined forces to coordinate experimental pilot projects identifying and safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in Hà Nội.

The cases in Vietnam and some of the critical studies about them show how carefully the relationship between increasing visibility and visitability due to the effects of the UNESCO listing complex, and viability has to be dealt with. Barley Norton's analysis of the *ca trù* case led to important insights and conclusions, to which I subscribe:

> Establishing a sustainable, diverse, and dynamic *ca trù* musical ecology in contemporary Vietnamese society is a process that (a decade into the twenty-first century) is only just beginning, and it is not going to be an easy task. Yet it is a task in which musicians, clubs, and audiences are enthusiastically engaged in. The challenge for the government and international agencies that have shaped the revival process is to facilitate a system of stewardship that encourages diversity and participation, rather than seeing *ca trù* solely as a resource for bolstering national identity and promoting Vietnamese culture on the national and international stage.[74]

The ICH Section in the UNESCO Secretariat and other members of the epistemic communities and groups have attempted to mitigate the effects of the presence of the word "visibility", and the shadow of the tempting notion of "visitability" and the elephant in the adjacent room, in Article 16 of the 2003 Convention. They have been emphasizing, in the forms, in documents like the *Transversal Issues*, and in the capacity building courses, that the application of criterion ("Inscription of the element will contribute to ensuring visibility and awareness of the significance of the intangible cultural heritage and to encouraging dialogue, thus reflecting cultural diversity worldwide and testifying to human creativity") does not refer to the visibility (and visitability) of the element that is inscribed, but to a contribution to the visibility of intangible heritage in general, and that "in general" is neither visitable nor marketable. This has caused much confusion and several candidatures have stranded on this rhetorical exercise to fill in the requested right answer. Also the way another criterion (R3: "Safeguarding measures are elaborated that may protect and promote the element") has been used addresses and tries to manage

---

[73]   N. Kim Dung, *Synthesis Report on Preliminary Evaluation of the Existing Inventories of Intangible Heritage in Vietnam*, in: *Workshop on Inventories of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Viet Nam: Experiences and Lessons, Hanoi, January 7-11, 2008*, Department of Cultural Heritage Ministry of Culture and UNESCO, Hanoi 2008, pp. 10-11.

[74]   B. Norton, op. cit., p. 177.

the consequences of visibility and visitability. In the reports of the Evaluation Body (and their predecessors) it becomes clear that measures and plans are expected to deal with the probable increase of visitors due to the inscription on the Representative List. Even this box is relatively easy to satisfy (create a monitoring committee and establish a platform where security forces and organizers can meet), and still nomination files fail. But there are more interesting and complex things to be said about safeguarding and monitoring its effects, focusing on interventions in transmission or education rather than on increased visibility (and visitability). Who dares to tell stories about multivocality, ambiguity, and uncertainty, about intertwining histories and complex networks of groups, communities, and stakeholders (with sometimes diverging agendas), or about wicked problems and the complexity of viability, when answering the five easy criteria to be inscribed on the Representative List?

This is why the inclusion, as an answer to the formally easy to satisfy criterion R5 ("The element is included in an inventory of the intangible cultural heritage present in the territory(ies) of the submitting State(s) Party(ies), as defined in Articles 11 and 12"), of the *General Report on the Scientific Inventory of Ví and Giặm Folk Songs of Nghệ Tĩnh* in nomination file 1008 was so important and courageous. Several paragraphs of the *General Report* provide critical remarks and more realistically explain the challenges:

> As old places have evolved into towns and cities, the old language has been replaced by modern language. There are few people remaining who really understand the Ví and Giặm heritage. Artists are generally uninterested in transmitting heritage. Young people have not been transmitted information on the heritage in a sustainable and systematic manner [...] Many trade villages have been destroyed or altered. Many religious customs and festivals are not practiced to the same extent as in previous periods (especially when compared to 1945 and earlier), which is consistent with the dominance of contemporary over traditional culture. The continuation of traditional cultural activities between generations has also been interrupted by war, as well as other socio-historical events.[75]

It is actually precisely such a realistic analysis that gives hope that viability issues and the participation of groups and communities can be discussed and addressed. Then it will become possible to shake off the old paradigms and to develop and share interesting safeguarding methods to face or deal with these challenges and wicked problems. We hope that Vietnam and other countries will continue to explore possibilities and continue experiments in order to cultivate the new safeguarding paradigm. According to the *General Report*, this is also a challenge for NGOs, government officials, and other actors: "In many communal areas of inventory, cultural management staff and leaders are often young, unqualified or poorly informed about traditional culture, resulting in them unsatisfactorily meeting cul-

---

75   B. Quang Thanh, op. cit., p. 4.

tural management requirements, and unable to help communities collect, study and preserve their local heritage".[76] A training programme, more capacity-building and – why not? – more paragraphs in the Operational Directives on the role and training of cultural heritage brokers would be welcome.

The words Ví and Giặm not only refer to styles of singing or types of songs, but they can also be appropriated to metaphorically present keys to develop safeguarding methods. "Giặm" can be translated and understood as "bringing something to insert or filling in something missing". It is connected in the local dialect of Nghệ Tĩnh to the word "Dặm", which means "growing the dead or missing crops in a field again". It has associations with weaving new parts into existing parts and refers to singing in repartee, where the line sung by the respondent must connect to the end of the line sung by the questioner. This captures the challenges and possible remedies that can be derived from a creative analysis of the *General Report*. The word "Ví" has several meanings, including "comparison", and it also refers to forms of dialogue, rapprochement, and movement, as in "singing towards". Working together and other participatory methods are the way to go, not only to manage the effects visibility and visitability, but above all in trying to "ensure" viability.

References

Aikawa-Faure N., *From the Proclamation of Masterpieces to the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage*, in: L. Smith, N. Akagawa (eds.), *Intangible Heritage*, Routledge, London – New York 2009.

Bortolotto C., *Authenticity: A Non-Criterion for Inscription on the Lists of UNESCO's Intangible Heritage Convention*, in: *Evaluating the Inscription Criteria for the Two Lists of UNESCO's Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention. The 10th Anniversary of the 2003 Convention. Final Report*, International Research Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (IRCI), Osaka 2013.

Callon M., *Some Elements of a Sociology of Translation: Domestication of the Scallops and the Fishermen of St Brieuc Bay*, in: J. Law (ed.), *Power, Action and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge?*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1986.

Chi Bèn N., Quang Thanh B., *Dân ca ví, giặm Nghệ Tĩnh*, Culture and Information Publishers, Hà Nội 2013.

Condominas G., *Researching and Safeguarding the Intangible Heritage*, "Museum International" 2001, Vol. 56(1-2).

Cross M., *Rethinking Epistemic Communities Twenty Years Later*, "Review of International Studies" 2013, Vol. 39.

Dicks B., *Culture on Display. The Production of Contemporary Visitability*, Open University Press, Berkshire 2003.

Duvelle C., *A Decade of Implementation of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*, "Ethnologies (Québec)" 2014, Vol. 36(1-2).

---

[76]   Ibidem, p. 5; see the new Operational Directives 170 and 171, in the new chapter added in 2016.

Eriksen A., *From Antiquities to Heritage: Transformations of Cultural Memory*, Berghahn Books, New York – Oxford 2014.

Haas P., *Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination*, "International Organization" 1992, Vol. 46(1).

Hafstein V., *Claiming Culture: Intangible Heritage Inc., Folklore©, Traditional Knowledge™*, in: D. Hemme, M. Tauschek, R. Bendix (eds.), *Prädikat "Heritage": Wertschöpfungen aus kulturellen Ressourcen*, LIT Verlag, Münster 2007.

Hartog F., *Regimes of Historicity: Presentism and Experiences of Time*, Columbia University Press, New York 2015.

Hartog F., *Time and Heritage*, "Museum International" 2005, Vol. 57(3).

Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, Eighth Session, Baku, Azerbaijan, 2 to 7 December 2013, *Item 7.a of the Provisional Agenda: Examination of Nominations for Inscription on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding*, 3 December 2013, UNESCO Doc. ITH/13/8.COM/7.a.

Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, Eighth Session, Baku, Azerbaijan, 2 to 7 December 2013, *Item 8 of the Provisional Agenda: Report of the Subsidiary Body on Its Work in 2013 and Examination of Nominations for Inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity*, 4 December 2013, UNESCO Doc. ITH/13/8.COM/8.

Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, Fifth Session, Nairobi, Kenya, 15 to 19 November 2010, *Item 6 of the Provisional Agenda: Evaluation of Nominations for Inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity*, 6 October 2010, UNESCO Doc. ITH/10/5.COM/CONF.202/6.

Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, Sixth Session, Bali, Indonesia, 22 to 29 November 2011, *Item 8 of the Provisional Agenda: Evaluation of Nominations for Inscription in 2011 on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding*, 23 November 2011, UNESCO Doc. ITH/11/6.COM/CONF.206/8.

Jacobs M., *"Mag het iets meer zijn?". La politique de sauvegarde du PCI en Flandre au XXIe siècle*, in: F. Lempereur (ed.), *Patrimoine culturel immatériel*, Presses universitaire de Liège, Liège 2017.

Jacobs M., *Bào vệ: sàn văn hóa in Vietnam. Immaterieel-erfgoedbeleid, het Vietnamees etnologiemuseum en het loslaten van en terugkijken op de 'subsidie-economie'*, "Faro. Tijdschrift over Cultureel Erfgoed" 2009, Vol. 2(2).

Jacobs M., *Bruegel and Burke Were Here! Examining the Criteria Implicit in the UNESCO Paradigm of Safeguarding ICH: The First Decade*, "International Journal of Intangible Heritage" 2014, Vol. 9.

Jacobs M., *Criteria, Apertures and Envelopes. ICH Directives and Organs in Operation*, in: *Evaluating the Inscription Criteria for the Two Lists of UNESCO's Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention. The 10th Anniversary of the 2003 Convention. Final Report*, International Research Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (IRCI), Osaka 2013.

Jacobs M., *Cultural Brokerage. Addressing Boundaries and the New Paradigm of Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage. Folklore Studies, Transdisciplinary Perspectives and UNESCO*, "Volkskunde" 2014, Vol. 115(3).

Jacobs M., *Development Brokerage, Anthropology and Public Action. Local Empowerment, Inter-national Cooperation and Aid: Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage*, "Volkskunde" 2014, Vol. 115(3).

Jacobs M., *Domesticating and Harvesting Shrimps – Fisher Communities and the Sea: Blue Ocean Strategies, Translation Processes and the UNESCO Paradigm of Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage*, in: F. Barata, J. Rocha (eds.), *Heritages and Memories from the Sea: 1st International Conference of the UNESCO Chair in Intangible Heritage and Traditional Know-How: Linking Heritage*, University of Évora, Évora 2015.

Jacobs M., *Glocal Perspectives on Safeguarding. CGIs, ICH, Ethics and Cultural Brokerage*, in: T. Uesugi, M. Shiba (eds.), *Glocal Perspectives on Intangible Cultural Heritage: Local Communities, Researchers, States and UNESCO, with the Special Focus on Global and National Perspectives*, Seijo University, Tokyo 2017.

Jacobs M., *La sauvegarde du patrimoine culturel immatériel et l'éthique*, in: F. Lempereur (ed.), *Patrimoine culturel immatériel*, Presses universitaire de Liège, Liège 2017.

Jacobs M., *The Spirit of the Convention – Interlocking Principles and Ethics for the Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage*, "International Journal of Intangible Heritage" 2016, Vol. 11.

Jacobs M., Neyrinck J., Van der Zeijden A., *UNESCO, Brokers and Critical Success (F)Actors in Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage*, "Volkskunde" 2014, Vol. 115(3).

Kim Dung N., *Synthesis Report on Preliminary Evaluation of the Existing Inventories of Intangible Heritage in Vietnam*, in: *Workshop on Inventories of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Viet Nam: Experiences and Lessons, Hanoi, January 7-11, 2008*, Department of Cultural Heritage Ministry of Culture and UNESCO, Hanoi 2008.

Lam Thuy T., *Preserving and Developing Local Folk Songs*, "Vietnam Business Forum", 18 October 2011, http://www.vccinews.com/news_detail.asp?news_id=24514 [accessed: 1.03.2017].

Law J., *Actor Network Theory and Material Semiotics*, 25 April 2007, http://www.heterogeneities.net/publications/Law2007ANTandMaterialSemiotics.pdf [accessed: 22.01.2018].

Law J., *On the Methods of Long Distance Control: Vessels, Navigation, and the Portuguese Route to India*, in: J. Law (ed.), *Power, Action and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge?*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1986.

Lixinski L., *Intangible Cultural Heritage in International Law*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2013.

Logan W., *Protecting the Tay Nguyen Gongs: Conflicting Rights in Vietnam's Central Plateau*, in: M. Langfield, W. Logan, M. Nic Craith (eds.), *Cultural Diversity, Heritage and Human Rights: Intersections in Theory and Practice*, Routledge, London 2010.

Meeker L., *How Much for a Song? Local and National Representations of Quan Họ Folksong*, "Journal of Vietnamese Studies" 2010, Vol. 5(1).

Meeker L., *Sounding Out Heritage. Cultural Politics and the Social Practice of Quan Họ Folk Song in Northern Vietnam*, University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu 2013.

Musician Le Ham, *Hát Ví (Ví Singing) – Vietnamese Folk Song in Nghe-Tinh*, "Vietnam Social Sciences" 2013, Vol. 2(154).

Norton B., *Music Revival, Ca Trù Ontologies, and Intangible Cultural Heritage in Vietnam*, in: C. Bithell, J. Hill (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Music Revival*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2015.

Park S., *On Intangible Heritage Safeguarding Governance: An Asia-Pacific Context*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne 2013.

Quang Thanh B., *General Report on the Scientific Inventory of Ví and Giặm Folk Songs of Nghệ Tĩnh*, Vietnam Institute of Culture and Arts Studies, Hà Nội 2012, http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/download.php?versionID=28936 [accessed: 1.03.2017].

Quoc Vuong T., *A Geographical-Cultural Perspective of the Nghệ Region in the Context of the Central Part*, "Vietnam Social Sciences" 2013, Vol. 2(154).

Salemink O., *Appropriating Culture: The Politics of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Vietnam*, in: Hue-Tam Ho Tai, M. Sidel (eds.), *State, Society and the Market in Contemporary Vietnam: Property, Power and Values*, Routledge, Oxon 2013.

Salemink O., *Beyond Complicity and Naiveté: Contextualizing the Ethnography of Vietnam's Central Highlanders, 1850-1990* [Ph.D. diss.], Universiteit van Amsterdam 1999.

Salemink O., *Described, Inscribed, Written Off: Heritagisation as (Dis)connection*, in: P. Taylor (ed.), *Connected and Disconnected in Viet Nam: Remaking Social Relations in a Post-socialist Nation*, ANU Press, Canberra 2016.

Salemink O., *Embodying the Nation: Mediumship, Ritual, and the National Imagination*, "Journal of Vietnamese Studies" 2008, Vol. 3(3).

Salemink O., *Is There Space for Vietnam's Gong Culture? Economic and Social Challenges for the Safeguarding of the Space of Gong Culture*, in: I. Kopania (ed.), *South-East Asia. Studies in Art, Cultural Heritage and Artistic Relations with Europe*, Polish Institute of World Art Studies and Tako Publishing House, Warsaw – Toruń 2012.

Salemink O., *Nieuwe rituelen en de natie Nederland in de spiegel van Vietnam*, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam 2006.

Salemink O. (ed.), *Viet Nam's Cultural Diversity: Approaches to Preservation*, UNESCO, Paris 2001.

Salemink O., *Who Decides Who Preserves What? Cultural Preservation and Cultural Representation*, in: O. Salemink (ed.), *Viet Nam's Cultural Diversity: Approaches to Preservation*, UNESCO, Paris 2001.

Seeger A., *Understanding UNESCO: A Complex Organization with Many Parts and Many Actors*, in: M.D. Foster, L. Gilman (eds.), *UNESCO on the Ground. Local Perspectives on Intangible Cultural Heritage*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington 2013.

Seitel P. (ed.), *Safeguarding Traditional Cultures: A Global Assessment*, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C. 2001.

Smeets R., *On the Third Source of Guidance for the Implementation of UNESCO's Intangible Heritage Convention*, in: *The First ICH-Researchers Forum. The Implementation of UNESCO's 2003 Convention. Final Report*, International Research Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (IRCI), Osaka 2012.

Smith L., *All Heritage is Intangible: Critical Heritage Studies and Museums*, Reinwardt Academie, Amsterdam 2012.

Smith L., *The Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention, a Challenge to the Authorised Heritage Discourse?*, in: *Evaluating the Inscription Criteria for the Two Lists of UNESCO's Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention. The 10th Anniversary of the 2003 Convention. Final Report*, International Research Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (IRCI), Osaka 2013.

Smith L., *Uses of Heritage*, Routledge, London – New York 2006.

Taylor P., *Modernity and Re-enchantment in Post-revolutionary Vietnam*, in: P. Taylor (ed.), *Modernity and Re-enchantment. Religion in Post-revolutionary Vietnam*, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore 2007.

Torggler B., Sediakina-Rivière E. (with J. Blake as consultant), *Evaluation of UNESCO's Standard-setting Work of the Culture Sector. Part I – 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. Final Report*, UNESCO, Paris 2013.

UNESCO, *Basic Texts of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. 2016 edition*, UNESCO, Paris 2016.

UNESCO, *International Expert Meeting for the Safeguarding and Promotion of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Minority Groups in Viet Nam (Hanoi, 15-18 March 1994). Final Report*, 19 September 1995, UNESCO Doc. CLT/ACL/94/IH/02.

Van Huy N., *The Role of Museums in the Preservation of Living Heritage: Experiences of the Vietnam Museum of Ethnology*, "International Journal of Intangible Heritage" 2006, Vol. 1.

Van Zanten W. (ed.), *Glossary: Intangible Cultural Heritage*, Netherlands National Commission for UNESCO, The Hague 2002.

Van Zanten W., *The Relation Between Communities and Their Living Culture as Represented by Audiovisual Files*, in: *The First ICH-Researchers Forum. The Implementation of UNESCO's 2003 Convention. Final Report*, International Research Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (IRCI), Osaka 2012.