Intangible cultural heritage projects – National policies and strategies. The creation of intangible cultural heritage inventories

Teodora Konach
Jagiellonian University, Warsaw, Poland
teodorakonach@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage of 2003 has established a new, holistic approach to cultural heritage, as well as a new set of administrative and legal instruments and strategies for identifying, preserving, managing and promoting intangible cultural heritage. The policy of intangible culture entails the conceptualisation of the elements of intangible heritage in the national cultural policy framework. Administration strategies and methods are often confronted with scientific contextualisation and various policies of representation and identification. Thus, while articulating the idea of the growing importance of intangible cultural heritage, the national authorities increasingly construct the national inventories through processes of worldwide networking and positioning through symbolic meanings such as "national issues" and "national culture". This paper presents a brief review of administrative and legal measures and policies concerning intangible cultural heritage of some selected countries.

"THE FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE CONNECTED WITH THE CONVENTION FOR THE SAFEGUARDING OF INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE IS THE PROBLEM OF INSTITUTIONALISATION".

Introduction

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), for over 70 years, has been working on documents and projects related to the protection of tangible heritage, and subsequently expanding the object of protection to natural, and finally, intangible heritage. The holistic approach to natural heritage – as established by the Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage in 1972 – has influenced changes in categorisation of heritage in general. The conceptualisation of "natural heritage" has served as a model solution for defining the essence of intangible heritage as a group of phenomena and manifestations of intangible culture, which has played a significant role in shaping the life of a given community regardless of whether only in the cultural sense or generally in the social and historical sense.

The UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of October 17, 2003 has established new administrative rules and strategies of identification, preservation and protection of intangible cultural heritage – a turning point in the process of promoting intangible cultural heritage (Nas, 2002). The Convention of 2003 is based on the existing documents of international law concerning cultural and natural heritage. In accordance with the resolutions of the Convention, it is possible to define intangible heritage as all elements and forms of spiritual and social culture which are transferred through generations of a community, or a group, providing them with a sense of continuity and identity (art. 2). The basic responsibility of the state, in the thought of the Convention, is identifying and introducing protection for intangible cultural heritage in its territory. In the process of protecting intangible cultural heritage, the Convention also envisioned the necessity of ensuring wide access to creating descriptions of given objects for local communities, if needed. These principles are also repeated in the content of the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. In addition, the Convention of 2005 emphasised the responsibility of promoting diverse forms of cultural expression. The attempts contained in the UNESCO Conventions to a complete understanding of places and spaces are also a search of formulas of experience, feelings and emotions connecting people with particular places (Leighly, 1963; Relph, 1976; Agnew, 1987). From a sociological perspective, heritage ensures the individual feeling of belonging to a particular community and constructs the shaping of economic and cultural capital within the political scenes.

The fundamental issue connected with the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage is the problem of institutionalisation. Institutionalisation established by the Convention of 2003 was created with the aim of identifying, managing, cooperating and monitoring the administrative and legal aspects of intangible cultural heritage at both international and national levels: foundation of regional and national bodies responsible for intangible cultural heritage, national legal and administrative instruments, the groundwork for further treatment, creation of national inventories, etc. Furthermore, regional or sub-regional networks have been established, which are based on cooperation of international expert teams.

From the time when the "World Heritage List", the most recognizable model of UNESCO activity, came into being, the process of creating knowledge resources about the most significant historical monuments of world heritage has commenced. Unfortunately, from the very beginning of the List's functioning, tendencies of constant rivalry between states within the framework of the created description of historical monuments under UNESCO protection has been noticed. The willingness to acknowledge a country's heritage at the international level has also demonstrated that the registration criteria are strongly rooted in the axiological tradition of Western culture. The UNESCO lists undoubtedly assist in building a feeling of one's own cultural identity and its meaning for the state side of the Convention. The List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding provides actual subsidies and foreign assistance for national intangible cultural heritage, and the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity ensures a prestige distinction for particular expressions as worthy of protection and promotion on the global scale. We can make reference to the theory of the German philosopher Axel Honneth known as the "recognition policy", which states that currently, the main part of entities' activities is set to obtain recognition and prestige (Honneth, 1996). Labelling of cultural

heritage has been still in process since the moment the first UNESCO List was established, and this phenomenon has continued with the creation of the List of Intangible Heritage and its recent entries.

Heritage and its intangible forms may also be determined as a "performative" expression of culture, which is transformed into a highly politicised commodity (Brown, 2005). When making reference to the idea of "cultural policy", it is worth mentioning the theory of Michel Foucault, who stated that the authorities are present everywhere not because they embrace everything, but because they generate everything (Foucault, 1974). It is therefore a term that clarifies not only societal relations, but which also contains in itself an interpretation of representing people and places and an understanding of space and time. From the beginning of the 1990, public debates have opened up many questions focusing on social networks, self-identification, human and minority rights (Castells, 2000; Eriksen, 2001; Brown, 2005). The introduction of the notion of intangible cultural heritage by the Convention of 2003 – as a culturally marked and marking product – has a representative/performative and public character and can be related to the symbolic discourses of interpretation (Foucault, 1972; Hall, 1997).

At present, there are two separate UNESCO Lists of World Heritage for intangible monuments and examples of intangible heritage. Consciousness of the arbitrariness of the division introduced and of the mutual dependencies that exist between them has increased recently. In the context of dividing heritage, it is worth citing Nelson Goodman's conception, who makes a distinction of "autographic" art, in which a material and its form of realisation are identical, and "allographic" art, in which a work and its completion are independent from each other and can be freely interpreted and processed on numerous occasions in time (Goodman, 1976). The "autographic" works are contained completely in their tangible form and their completion, reading and reproduction do not have great significance for their reception (an example of autographic art is painting and sculpture). On the other hand, "allographic" objects are shaped differently and they obtain a different form each time by means of their reproduction (theatre arts, and musical and dance compositions). In its essence, intangible cultural heritage points to a greater resemblance to examples of "allographic" works. Ceremonies, folklore, traditional musical, theatrical, and vocal/instrumental forms are compositions, and they are finally formed by the performers themselves and their interaction with the public. The legal protection of intangible heritage can cause a phenomenon of transition from "allographic" to "autographic" characteristics of intangible culture; the requirement of identification, describing, and making inventories can lead to a partial loss of its "allographic" characteristics in favour of recorded "autographic" forms.

This paper presents policies and administrative and legal instrument regarding the safeguarding, management and promotion of intangible cultural heritage in some selected countries (Bulgaria, Romania, Poland and Canada), especially in the area of constructing national intangible heritage inventories, as well as the key issues concerning the participation of the communities concerned and their role in the protection of authenticity of intangible culture. Poland, Romania and Bulgaria are countries with a similar historical past – all of them experienced the communist regime in the 20th century. Currently, these countries are members of many international organisations and member states of the European Union. While they ratified recently the UNESCO Convention of 2003, their approaches to the text of the document are different, as well as the implementation methods and institutional efforts. Canada is an example of a Western country where efforts have been undertaken to identify and safeguard the intangible cultural heritage of indigenous population.

Methodological approach

In the globally linked word – in terms of economy, politics and societal relations – comparative law needs to play a more crucial role. As an academic discipline, comparative law studies have developed a wide range of internal styles and methodological debates (Zwiegert & Kötz, 1998); however, the essence of these comparisons is the act of juxtaposition of the law regulations of one country to that of another (or to more than two foreign laws). The basic principle of comparative analysis is to look at how a problem is solved in two or more legal systems and explore the differences and similarities in the respective ways of dealing with the problem (Gerber, 2001: 199).

More recently, the main goal of comparative law studies and practice is to obtain some degree of harmonisation over critical issues, or – at least – a measure of common understanding. The convergence of the different legal systems across the EU and the systematic attempt to unify certain laws are the core reason of this development of comparative law methodologies and practice nowadays. Traditionally, comparative law studies have been employed to review existing private law regimes, but now there is a deeper comparative focus on the regulations concerning basic elements of modern states: freedom of speech, freedom of religion, equality and cultural rights. Thus, comparative law could be seen as an attempt to illuminate issues of great importance to humanity. Furthermore, the new non-mainstream approach to comparative law methodology searches for the contextualisation of this method by framing legal practice within specific cultural and social processes. By assuming that law is placed within a given culture, it is considered to be influenced by the culture of the home country in which it operates. The gathering of knowledge obtained through comparative law studies can be used as a portal to a foreign country, and, at the same time, it may serve as a tool for deeper understanding of one's own culture.

Pierre Legrand, the famous opponent to European Legal integration, concerning the convergence of civil law with English common law, regards the role of context to be much more important in the comparative analysis than the rules, principles or institutions themselves. Thus, comparative law studies ought to be *une véritable expérience de la distance et la différence* – a real experience of distance and difference (Legrand, 1999: 36-38). The comparativist must adopt a view of law as a polysemic *signifié* which connotes *inter alia* cultural, sociological, historical, anthropological, linguistic, psychological and economic referents. His ideas of critique of popular functionalism methodology in comparative law studies have been correctly described by Samuel as "a hermeneutical circle" (2004: 60).

However, the principles of functionalism (external framework, explanation, harmonisation) and those of critical philosophy (Foucault, Derrida *via* Legrand) do not differ from each other with regards to their most basic epistemic and methodological assumptions. Functionalist theory (rather than practice) states basically the same as Legrand's "hermeneutical" view: the comparativist must look beyond law, must acquire the socio-legal point of departure to see also the context, the culture, the society and its history that influence legal practice, and not be lured by the façade of language of law provisions.

In the case of UNESCO 2003 Convention, one can compare the different methods of implementation at the national level. Such comparison may serve as a kind of toolbox for European countries concerning the management of intangible cultural heritage.

Intangible cultural heritage in Bulgaria – Living Human Treasures Programme

At present, the following elements of Bulgarian intangible culture have entered the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity: *Bistritsa Babi, Archaic Polyphony, Dances* and *Rituals from the Shoplouk Region* (see photo 1), in 2008; and *Nestinarstvo, Messages from the Past: The Panagyr of Saints Constantine and Helena in the Village of Bulgari* (see photo 2), in 2009.

PHOTO 1. BISTRITSA BABI
Source: V. Lobach.

PHOTO 2. NESTINARSTVO, FIREDANCERS IN VILLAGE BULGARI, BULGARIA
Source: Apokalipto.

The Bulgarian inventory was elaborated by the academic committee of the Bulgarian Academy of Science and the Ministry of Culture in co-operation with UNESCO representatives. Bulgarian national experts have strived to create a synthetic methodology, which would reflect both the theoretical knowledge and research and the current state and form of intangible heritage. In addition, attempts were made to formulate not only contemporary forms of intangible cultural expressions, but also their descriptions that have been preserved from earlier years, including those from the last century, in order to fully show the transparent development and evolution of every form. As a result of that work, the concept of an inventory of Bulgarian intangible heritage arose on the basis of sociological questionnaires conducted throughout the country (Santova, 2007).

The first step was to create the concept of an inventory by making use of the best international practices. After consultation at conferences and seminaries at the national level, forms for pollsters and questionnaires were sent to educational and cultural institutions known as *Chitalishta*. The materials were made available by the Ministry of Culture along with a cover letter signed by the Bulgarian Minister of Culture. It should be emphasised that the *Chitalishta* fulfil a key role in the organisation, management and promotion of Bulgarian folklore, traditions and ceremonies. They are units subject to the Ministry of Culture, numbering over 3,500 throughout the country, and they ensure a proper transmission of intangible culture in specific local communities (Santova, 2007, 2010a & 2010b). They were shaped during the Bulgarian National Revival, which began in the 19th century and played an important role in the formation of feelings of national, cultural and religious identity. The first *Chitalishta* appeared in the 1850 as "reading

made products is extraordinarily wide and includes traditional means of producing wine and other alcoholic and non-alcoholic drinks, production of musical instruments, etc.

This division corresponds to the national administrational division comprised of 28 regions. This type of search allows us to find categories of intangible heritage according to regional divisions. Traditional Bulgarian culture most often entails participation of representatives of the community (local or ceremonial) and, for this reason, the first category of the methodology introduced in the inventory is "holidays and ceremonies". The following category ("traditional songs and instrumental compositions") usually describes individual creativity. However, the accepted sequence of categories is not associated with introducing distinctions or hierarchical organization of forms of intangible heritage. It only reflects the attempt to attain a holistic concept of the more common forms and expressions of intangible heritage in Bulgaria and their representation at the national and local levels.

PHOTO 5. HOREZU CERAMICS
Source: Bogdan29roman.

National Repertory of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Romania

Romania has four entries on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity: *Căluş ritual* (2008) (see photo 4), *Doina* (2009), *Craftsmanship of Horezu ceramics* (2012) (see photo 5) and *Men's group Colindat, Christmas-time ritual* (2013)[2].

PHOTO 4. CĂLUŞARI DANCING IN THE SAXON FORTIFIED CHURCH OF CRISTIAN, SIBIU COUNTY, ROMANIA
Source: El bes.

Starting in 2007, Romania has a National Commission for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage subject to the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs. The National Commission represents a scientific body without legal personality and it is comprised of specialists representing Romanian cultural institutions: Romanian Academy of Science, museums and universities. This Commission coordinates the work of institutions involved in the process of identifying and preserving intangible cultural heritage, both at the local and national levels: Regional Centers for Cultural Issues in each administrative area of the country and the National Centre for Conservation and Promotion of Traditional Culture (Implementation of the Convention for the Safeguarding of ICH in Romania, 8th Annual Meeting of the South East European Experts Network on Intangible Cultural Heritage, Limassol Cyprus, 15-16 May 2014)[3].

The National Commission has proposed a repertory of cultural elements that constitute the national intangible cultural heritage. This resulted in a synthesis of all types of Romanian traditional culture as well as the traditional culture of Romania's minorities. The National Repertory of intangible cultural heritage of Romania is updated periodically and may be considered a central base for concrete actions to identify and define the elements that have a spiritual dominance in Romanian traditional culture. The Repertory of intangible cultural heritage has the following structure.

---

[2] Men's group Colindat, Christmas-time ritual – inscribed in 2013 (8.COM) on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity; countries: Romania, Republic of Moldova.
[3] For more information, see http://www.slideshare.net/UNESCOVENICE/romania-implementation-of-the-convention-for-the-safeguarding-of-intangible-cultural-heritage-in-romania

First tome (published in 2009):

- Oral traditions and expressions
- Traditional music
- Traditional dance
- Children and teenager's games
- Holidays, traditions and rituals
- Traditional medicine
- Traditional handicrafts
- Traditional food

The second tome, part A, "Knowledge and practices concerning man, nature and the universe":

- Astronomy and meteorology
- Earth science (mythology, geology, mineralogy)
- Traditional representation of the human body
- Ethnobotany
- The wild world (ethnozoology)

This year the Commission has started to work on the part B of the second tome of the Repertory, considering space and habitat as elements of intangible cultural heritage. The third tome will be dedicated to minority ethnic groups living on Romanian territory. The Repertory is available in a bilingual version (Romanian-French) on the website of the Ministry of Culture (see photo 6).

PHOTO 6. INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE (MINISTRY OF CULTURE OF ROMANIA)
Source: www.cultura.ro

Questionnaires elaborated by the National Commission for the Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage were distributed to the largest partners of the Ministry of Culture as part of cultural activities throughout the country: The Research Institute of the Romanian Academy of Science, departments of ethnography, departments of philology and history, academies of music, museums, cultural centres, and regional directors of culture. In addition, the expert character of the Romanian process of creating the Inventory is evident in the team of the Commission, which consists of a group of specialists, although not researchers, whose task is to create an interdisciplinary and holistic understanding of intangible culture (Balotescu, 2007). Caring for a high level of methodology and terminology is entirely proper; however, the local communities' lack of active participation is disturbing.

National Heritage Board of Poland – Intangible Cultural Heritage Programme

Expressions of Polish intangible culture have not been registered in the UNESCO Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. The Polish Ministry of Culture and National Heritage decided that the task of planning implementation of the recommendations of the UNESCO Convention of 2003 is to be entrusted to the National Heritage Board of Poland. In 2011, the Institute commenced working on the project of the National Program for Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage. The fundamental assumption of the National Program for Protection of Cultural Intangible Heritage proposed by the Institute is the participation of four groups: central institutions, local self-governing units, non-governmental organisations and representatives of social organisations and representatives of academic and research unites associated with intangible heritage[4].

One of the central activities proposed by the Institute is implementing a National List of Intangible Cultural Heritage (see photo 9). According to the proposed assumptions, the list should promote the elements registered on it in accordance with the directives of the Convention. The authors of the project also emphasised its prestige as it is meant to promote intangible heritage as a whole. In accordance with the Institute's proposal, the National List of Intangible Heritage will be managed by the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, and the National Heritage Board of Poland is responsible for the procedure of accepting applications for entering specific elements of intangible heritage on the list, as well as for their formal evaluation and cyclical verification of the elements registered in the list.

Groups, local communities and their authorised representatives can apply. Once the National Heritage Board of Poland has accepted and verified the applications, they are transferred to the Council of Intangible Heritage of the Ministry of Culture and

---

[4] For more information, see www.niematerialne.nid.pl

National Heritage for evaluation and, in the case that they are approved by the Council, the Minister will enter the given element on the List. In 2014, the following elements of Polish intangible heritage were registered: artistic and historical gun manufacturing, products made according to the tradition of the School of Cieszyń, Lajkonik marches, the Corpus Christi procession in Łowicz (see photo 7), and Krakow Christmas cribs (see photo 8).

PHOTO 7. CORPUS CRISTI PROCESSION
Source: MKiDN-NID.

PHOTO 8. CRACOW CHRISTMAS CRIBS
Source: MKiDN-NID.

The second activity proposed for the National Heritage Board of Poland, to implement the recommendations of the Convention, is to start the "Protection of Intangible Heritage", which is a priority in the framework of the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage's operational program. The funds available for the program need to be made accessible for entities working on the educational and documentary projects which ensure the transmission of intergenerational intangible culture. The National Heritage Board of Poland will also organise cyclical societal campaigns for promoting Polish intangible heritage.

PHOTO 9. THE NATIONAL HERITAGE BOARD OF POLAND – NATIONAL LIST OF INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE
Source: http://niematerialne.nid.pl/Dziedzictwo_niematerialne/

A proposal was also made to create the so-called authorised regional representatives for intangible cultural heritage. This suggestion can raise fears because it creates a new position and the possibility of politicising it. Another proposal was to grant appropriate competencies to the institutions of culture already functioning in the *voivodeships*, whose management and monitoring are part of the responsibilities of the marshal offices. These solutions appear to be based on the numerous activities, in particular documentary and educational, which are recorded in the statues of these institutions.

From the point of view of documentation of Polish intangible culture, the Digital Library of the Polish Institute of Anthropology seems to be a valuable initiative. It completes tasks specified by the National Heritage Board of Poland and those connected with the protection of intangible cultural heritage in Poland, by gathering information about the cultural tradition in Poland and carrying out activities associated with documentation, archiving and distribution of intangible culture. The Digital Library of the Polish Institute of Anthropology contains the most important ethnographic journals which appeared after the Second World War in Poland: *Lud, Etnografia Polska* and *Polska Sztuka Ludowa* (Koźmińska, 2013). With regard to the creation of a database of intangible culture in Poland, the question of the informational strategy for the visual documentation

(video, pictures) of Polish intangible heritage on the Internet poses a problem. The most important issue associated with this is often the unregulated question of legal liability for contemporary and archival materials which present the traditions and ceremonies and the shortage of Polish copyright.

In Poland, the promotion of intangible culture is focused in particular on supporting expert projects. This situation has been changing over the last couple of years, and in particular after the establishment of 2014 as the Year of Oskarg Kolberg and due to the activities of the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage at the central level. In 2013, Polish Parliament – on request of the Minister of Culture and National Heritage, Bogdan Zdrojewski – adopted a resolution declaring 2014 the Year of Oskar Kolberg[5]. Zdrojewski entrusted the Institute of Music and Dance with the organisation of the Kolberg Year. The Minister also announced a special program "Kolberg 2014 – Promesa", which aims to support projects concerning the artistic, scientific, educational and documentation works related to the Oskar Kolberg's heritage and to traditional Polish art and culture. The results of the competition under the "Promesa" project were announced in December 2013[6].

One of the problems associated with the identification of intangible culture in Poland is the question of territories with interrupted cultural continuity. The area of the West Pomeranian voivodeship is a combination of several traditions: Prussian and Mennonite (Dutch) since before 1945; Ukrainian ethnic traditions (from 1947) and migration and repatriate intangible cultural heritage of a multiregional nature (after 1945). The Second World War completely destroyed the social structure of this region: the population of German and Dutch ancestries were forced to leave these territories, as a result of the resolutions of Yalta and Potsdam Conferences in 1945, and the population from the Central and Southeastern parts of Poland and repatriates from the East were resettled there (Kubiak, 2007).

The territories with disrupted cultural continuity raise many doubts and controversies in the question of protecting their intangible culture. The UNESCO Convention excludes the registration of elements of intangible culture of communities which do not possess cultural continuity simultaneously in three dimensions: relations with the environment, the influence of nature, and historical continuity. According to article 2 of the Convention of 2003:

> This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to

their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity (UNESCO, 2003).

The transmission of tradition in regions with disrupted cultural continuity often takes place between certain units and not in a particular territory, and it often has an ahistorical nature (Paprocka, 2013). However, efforts should be made to recognise the necessity of protecting the intangible culture of these regions, because they create important bonds, which actually link cultures and communities with complicated cultural and social structures.

Interactive Database – The tangible and intangible heritage of Quebec

Canada has not yet achieved any entries on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. Quebec is the first Canadian province to recognise intangible cultural heritage at the legislative level. The province has given special cultural heritage status to Inuit throat singing, or *katajjaq*[7], the first element of intangible culture that has been given this status in Canada.

PHOTO 10. INUIT WOMEN
Source: Ansgar Walk.

In the recent Cultural Heritage Act adopted on October 19, 2011, Quebec has included clauses inspired by the 2003 Convention. The article 6 of the Quebec Sustainable Development Act (2006) states that:

> The cultural heritage, made up of (…) traditions and knowledge, reflects the identity of a society. It passes on the values of a society from generation to generation, and the preservation of this heritage fosters the sustainability of development. Cultural heritage components must be identified, protected and enhanced, taking their intrinsic rarity and fragility into account

The principal means for the promotion and development of intangible cultural heritage within the Cultural Heritage Act are official statutes of recognition. Two levels of recognition are specified: first, Quebec's ministry of culture will be able to "designate" an element of intangible cultural heritage as part of the shared national heritage of Quebecers; second, municipalities and native band councils will be able to "identify" local elements of intangible cultural heritage. All these recognised elements will be added to the Quebec Cultural Heritage Register. The Act calls for municipalities to create a local heritage council responsible for receiving requests and analysing intangible cultural heritage cases. Municipalities will also be able to delegate this task to their existing planning advisory committee (Gauthier, 2013).

In 2004, the Ministry of Culture, Communications and the Status of Women (MCCF) began the process of creating an informational system in order to manage and promote cultural heritage. The main resources used in the beginning phases were derived from the Historic Places Initiative (*L'Initiative des Endroits Historiques*), which came into being as a result of co-operation with the government of Quebec. One of the components of this project was the Canadian Register of Historic Places (*Le Répertoire canadien de lieux patrimoniaux* – RCLP). The RCLP system is a database which embraces the whole territory of the country and is additionally enriched with specific provinces and regions. It presents information about key historical sites for communities, regions, provinces and the whole country. Before commencing the RCLP project, the MCCF elaborated the database *Le Patrimoine immobilier, mobilier et immatériel du Quebec* (PIMIQ) and its interface on the Internet, known as the Cultural Heritage Register of Quebec (*Le Répertoire du patrimoine culturel du Quebec* – RPCQ). The work on this project lasted until the beginning of 2009.

Both the PIMIQ database and the RPCQ are based on the principle of management according to values, that is, their authors have accepted the thesis that every cultural good (regardless of its form, tangible or intangible) always functions in reference to the values and traditions of its perception and interpretation. For this reason, the databases strive to secure knowledge about historical monuments and their material conditions, and also to transfer intangible cultural resources which are mediums. Therefore, these databases are particularly careful in the presentation of historical monuments in their social and historical context.

The main purpose of the RPQC database is to manage and promote the tangible heritage of Quebec. Cultural goods of ethnological nature, artefacts, art works, archives and expressions of tangible heritage are represented in it. The basis for creating the accepted categorisation of the database is the Cultural Property Act (amended in 2011 – The Cultural Heritage Act). Work on including intangible culture to the existing database started as a pilot project related to religious intangible culture. Since 2006, the MCCF, in co-operation with the Canada Research Chair in Ethnological Heritage (*Chair de recherche du Canada en patrimoine ethnologique*), have been working on the innovative project of creating a database related to religious intangible heritage. The project was started at the same time that the elaboration of an inventory of sacred cultural historical monuments by the Quebec Museum Society (*Société des Musées Québécois*). The program enables information searches for religious traditions grouped according to confession and geographical territory. The descriptions refer to places, objects, cultural practices and traditions. They were methodologically elaborated on the basis of a network of cultural practices, however, the information will be made available by means of a search engine with the help of key words or a list of values (Lauzon, 2007).

Conclusion

The process of defining and safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage may be called "the phase of standardisation" – the introduction of international criteria due to the needs of international law regulations and administration. There is a certain hierarchy in managing elements of intangible culture – it entails that the bureaucratic cooperation should be implemented in the activities of international bodies, national commissions/centres, NGOs and communities concerned. The state institutionalisation made of intangible culture a nation-related issue, or even nationalised, which means that states could be

---

[7] Inuit throat singing or *katajjaq* is a type of musical performance where two women sing rhythmic patterns, usually standing and facing one another.

seen as the primary holders of the intangible cultural property rights.

Administrative processes and methods are confronted with scientific contextualisation and many kinds of representation and identification strategies and policies. The first area of significant tension is the opposition between the area of academic research and the activities of state administration. Academic and research environments create platforms for searching for symbolic protection of expressions of intangible culture in general. However, the activities of state authorities are focused on protecting particular examples of heritage (to this point, intangible) and developing and implementing a catalogue of the means for their protection. The state's activities are dependent on political conditions, and, as a rule, they are limited to the territory of a given country. Research activity is to a great extent independent, and certainly goes beyond the frames of territorial boundaries.

The second question is associated with the institutionalisation of the concept of intangible cultural heritage and its protection. Along these lines, the first possible threat could be using the intangible cultural heritage concept for creating (or re-creating) identities for cultural and social groups and countries in their negative form, that is to say, as a way to determinate the difference from others. In its *soft* version, it can serve to build cultural differences; in its *hard* version, it can support independence activities by communities striving to separate themselves from others (local and/or national), and in its *extreme* version, it can be used as an argument for obtaining territorial or political independence. In the understanding of this process, it is necessary to emphasise that the reshaping of governmental systems and social structures, daily practices and language mutually complement themselves, constituting a space semantically characterised. The link of nations with a particular territory also depends on the connection of their communities and their history with certain places and particular features of the landscape, as well as on their representation in tradition and culture. On the other hand, all representations are made from a particular point of view and have their own emotional and political value. Hence, the question of constant processes of exclusion always arises as a means of legitimising a specified community in a given area (Pred, 1984; Anderson, 2006). The second danger can be posed by activities intended exclusively to obtain financial support from international entities. The third risky question is related to the rejection of elements in real need of protection according to the Convention's recommendations, in favour of searching for more prestigious expressions of intangible culture. In this way, forms of intangible heritage which fulfil the conditions set by the Convention's regulations might be excluded. The activities of countries can be two-tracked in relation to using the UNESCO lists: on the one hand, they can be used only for symbolic identification promoting elements, to emphasise specific elements of national cultural characteristics; and, on the other hand, they can be intended to the development of national tourism, by creating a context of "authenticity" for traditions and customs, to be employed by the tourist industry (recognition on the international arena increases the attractiveness of a specific touristic product).

> " ENTRUSTING THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE FORMS OF INTANGIBLE HERITAGE TO STATE INSTITUTIONS CONSTITUTES A THREAT FOR THE CONTINUITY OF ELEMENTS OF HERITAGE WHICH ARE NOT NECESSARILY ACCEPTED BY THE AUTHORITIES OF PARTICULAR STATES".

A third important tension is related to time. Protection of heritage assumes the existence of its timeless aspect and the possibility of developing an inventory creates the necessity of introducing a contemporary context for the objects and forms of intangible culture. Inventories, databases and graphic representations will not be "eternal", since they will also be exposed to gradual degradation or expiration.

The objective of the 2003 Convention was to protect and promote local heritage; however, due to the imposed mechanisms of protection of intangible heritage, it can be used for preserving the monolithic model of cultural policy in force in a given state. An undoubtable merit of the UNESCO regulation is the introduction of the requirement for states to take into consideration the existing interaction between societal development and cultural processes, which are a result of their members' activities (Boylan, 2006). However, entrusting the identification of the forms of intangible heritage to state institutions raises several doubts and constitutes a threat for the continuity of elements of heritage connected to communities but which are not necessarily accepted by the authorities of particular states.

REFERENCES

AGNEW, J. (1987) *Place and Politics: The Geographical Mediation of State and Society*. London: Allen & Unwin.

AIKAWA, N. (2004) An Historical Overview of the Preparation of the UNESCO International Convention for the Safeguarding for the Intangible Cultural Heritage. *Museum International*, 56 (1-2), 137-149.

ANDERSON, B. (2006) *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

BALOTESCU, I. (2007) La grille d'enquête ou l'intangible de l'immatériel, *Le patrimoine culturel immaterial de l'Europe: inventer son inventaire*. In Actes du colloque du 30 novembre 2007, http://mediatheque-numerique.inp.fr/index.php/actes_de_colloque/rencontres_du_patrimoine/le_patrimoine_culturel_immateriel_de_l_europe_inventer_son_inventaire

BOKOVA, I.; GANEVA-RAICHEVA V. (2012) *The Cultural Diversity of Bulgaria*. Plovdiv: Lettera Ltd.

BOYLAN, P. (2006) The Intangible Heritage: a Challenge and an Opportunity for Museum and Museum Professional Training. *International Journal of Intangible Heritage*, 1, 53-65.

BROWN, M. (2005) Heritage Trouble: Recent Work on the Protection of Intangible Cultural Property. *International Journal of Cultural Property*, 12, 41-61.

CASTELLS, M. (2000) Materials for an Exploratory Theory of the Network Society. *British Journal of Sociology*, 51 (1), 5- 24.

COLLINS, H. (1989) Methods and Aims of Comparative Contract Law. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 11, 396-406.

ERIKSEN, T. H. (2001) Between Universalism and Relativism: A Critique of the UNESCO Concept of Culture. In: Cowan, J. K.; Dembour H.-B. and Wilson R. A. (eds.) *Culture And Rights: Anthropological Perspective* (pp. 127-148). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

FOUCAULT, M. (1972) *The Archeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock.

FOUCAULT, M. (1974) La vérité et les formes juridiques. In Foucault, M. (2001) *Dits et Écrits I*. Paris: Gallimard.

GAUTHIER, A. (2013) Intangible Cultural Heritage in Canada: Political Context, Safeguarding Initiatives and International Cooperation. In *2011 Expert Meeting Report Building and Sharing ICH Information «Intangible Heritage in Canada: Political Context, Safeguarding Initiatives, and International Cooperation»*. From Building and Sharing ICH information, South Korea, ICHCAP.

GERBER, D. J. (2001) *Sculpting the Agenda of Comparative Law: Ernst Rabel and the Façade of Language*. In Riles, A. (ed.) *Rethinking the Masters of Comparative Law* (pp. 190-208). Oxford: Hart.

GOODMAN, N. (1976) *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols, 2nd edition*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.

GRANCHAROVA, E. (2008) Natsionalen seminar "Zhivi choveshki sakrovishta – Bulgaria" [National Seminar "Living Human Treasures – Bulgaria"]. *Balgarski folklor*, 1, 154-156.

HALL, S. (1997) Introduction. In Hall, S. (ed.) *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* (pp. 1-11). London: Sage.

HILTY, R.M. (2009) Rationales for the Legal Protection of Intangible Goods and Cultural Heritage. *International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law*, 40, 883-911.

HOFFMAN, B. (2006) *Art and Cultural Heritage: law, policy and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HONNETH, A. (1996) *The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*. Great Britain: MIT Press.

KOŹMIŃSKA, J. (2013) Dziedzictwo niematerialne na platformie cyfrowej Polskiego Instytutu Antropologii [Intangible Heritage on the Digital Platform of the Polish Institute of Anthropology]. In Adamowski J.; Smyk K. (eds.). *Niematerialne dziedzictwo kulturowe: źródła – wartości – ochrona Intangible Cultural Heritage: Origins – Values – Protection* (pp. 289-297). Lublin – Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej Narodowy Instytut Dziedzictwa.

KUBIAK, H. (2007) *U progu ery postwestfalskiej. Szkice z teorii narodu*. Kraków: Universitas.

LAUZON, D. (2007) La base de données: Patrimoine immobilier, mobilier et immatériel du Québec et le Répertoire du patrimoine culturel du Québec? État des lieux et perspectives pour l'inventaire du patrimoine immatériel. *Symposium Le patrimoine culturel immaterial de l'Europe: inventer son inventaire*, Institut National du Patrimoine, 30 novembre 2007, http://mediatheque-numerique.inp.fr/index.php/actes_de_colloque/rencontres_du_patrimoine/le_patrimoine_culturel_immateriel_de_l_europe_inventer_son_inventaire.

LEGRAND, P. (1997) The Impossibility of Legal Transplants. *Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law*, 4, 111-124.

LEGRAND, P. (1999) *Le droit comparé*. Paris: PUF.

LEIGHLY, J. (1963) *Land and Life: A Selection of the Writings of Carl Ortwin Sauer*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

NAS, J.M. (2002) Masterpieces of Oral and Intangible Culture: Reflections on the UNESCO World Heritage List. *Current Anthropology*, 43 (1), 139-148.

PAPROCKA, A. (2013) Niematerialne dziedzictwo kulturowe w regionach o przerwanej ciągłości kulturowej (przykład Żuław i Powiśla) [Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Regions of Interrupted Continuity of Culture (Żuławy and Powiśle)]. In Adamowski J.; Smyk K. (eds.). *Niematerialne dziedzictwo kulturowe: źródła – wartości – ochrona Intangible Cultural Heritage: Origins – Values – Protection* (pp. 317-329), Lublin – Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej] Narodowy Instytut Dziedzictwa.

PRED, A. (1984) Place as Historically Contingent Process: Structuration Theory and the Time Geography of Becoming Places. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 74, 79-97.

RELPH, E. (1976) *Place and Placelessness*. London: Pion.

SAMUEL, G. (2004) Epistemology of Comparative Law: Contributions from the Science and Social Science. In Van Hoecke, M. (ed.) *Epistemology and Methodology of Comparative Law* (pp. 35-77). Oxford: Hart Publishing.

SANTOVA, M. et al. (2004) *Zhivi choveshki sakrovishta – Bulgaria [Living Human Treasures – Bulgaria]*. Sofia: "Marin Drinov" Academic Publishing House.

SANTOVA, M. (2007) Construire un inventaire: L'example bulgare. *Symposium Le patrimoine culturel immaterial de l'Europe: inventer son inventaire*, Institut National du Patrimoine, 30 novembre 2007, from http://mediatheque-numerique.inp.fr/index. php/actes_de_colloque/rencontres_du_patrimoine/ le_patrimoine_culturel_immateriel_de_l_europe_ inventer_son_inventaire

SANTOVA, M. (2010a) Chetvarti godishen seminar na eksperti po nematerialno kulturno nasledstvo v strani ot Yugoiztochna Evropa [Fourth Regional Seminar of Experts of 55 Intangible Cultural Heritage of Countries of Southeastern Europe] (3-7 May 2010, Ramnicu Valchea, Romania). *Balgarski folklor*, 3 (4), 189-191.

SANTOVA, M. (2010b) Pravata na choveka i nematerialnoto kulturno nasledstvo [The Rights of Man and the Intangible Cultural Heritage]. *Balgarski folklor*, 3 (4), 150-159.

SZABÓ, I.; PÉTERI, Z. (1977) *A Socialist Approach to Comparative Law*. Leyden & Budapest: A.W. Sijthoff & Akademiai Kiads.

UNESCO. Convention on the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, adopted on 16 November 1972 and entry into force on 17 December 1975. See www.unesco.org, legal instruments.

UNESCO. Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, adopted on 27 October 2003, entry into force 20 April 2006. See www.unesco.org, legal instruments.

UNESCO. Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, adopted on 20 October 2005, See www.unesco.org, legal instruments.

UNESCO/WIPO. Model Provisions for National Laws on the Protection of Expression of Folklore Against Illicit Exploitation and Other Prejudicial Action, 1982, published: UNESCO, Paris, 1985. See http://unesdoc.unesco.org/ images/0006/000684/068457mb.pdf

UNITED NATIONS. United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 10 December 1948. See http:// un.org/Overview/rights.html#a27

ZWEIGERT, K.; KÖTZ, H. (1998) *An Introduction to Comparative Law*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Internet sources

http://www.treasuresbulgaria.com/main.php?act=-html&file=analiz.html

http://niematerialne.nid.pl/

http://www.mct.government.bg/

http://www.chitalishta.com/

http://www.cnr-unesco.ro/en/index.php

http://www.cultura.ro