THE CONSTRUCTION OF INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE: A Foucauldian critique

Claudia Melis
Donna Chambers

Abstract

Within tourism studies, there has been limited attention to the concept of World Intangible Cultural Heritage, its discursive normalisation and its effects at the level of the nation or public sphere. Through a discourse analysis of a public institutional document on intangible cultural heritage in Scotland, we demonstrate how Foucault's power/knowledge dyad unfolds at one of its points of application. Our key findings include that discursive strategies of conviction (such as inventorying) are deployed to frame intangible cultural heritage within an existing discursive field of relationship that articulates with Scotland's contested political position within the United Kingdom; and that notions concerning the importance of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage have been constructed through discourses of its fragility and immateriality.

Key words: Foucault, power/knowledge, discourse, World Heritage, intangible cultural heritage, Scotland.

1. INTRODUCTION

The recognition of the intangible dimension of cultural heritage, formally established by the 2003 UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (hereafter referred to as 'The Convention'), emphasises narratives of mutual understanding. However, there is a democratic deficit in the World Heritage process, which has witnessed the elision of participation from persons at the 'grass roots' level of our societies (Labadi, 2007). Fraser (1981) observes that the World Heritage process is superficial as it does not fundamentally disrupt structural inequalities. Several authors have discussed the political nature of heritage (Lowenthal, 1998; Wright, 1985). Tunbridge & Ashworth (1996) emphasised the commoditisation of heritage and applied the concept of dissonance to heritage interpretation and management. They questioned who could lay claim to heritage, who could legitimise it, for what purpose, and who was necessarily disinherited. Indeed, it would appear that knowledge about heritage is produced through competing discourses that together create meaning, and in this paper we draw from Foucauldian thought (1972, 1977, 1981, 1989, 2008; Foucault and Deleuze, 1980; Foucault & Gordon, 1980), to explore the role of The Convention in the emergence of intangible cultural heritage as an object of knowledge.

The importance of intangible cultural heritage for tourism has been well documented (Casey, 2013; Chen, Suntikul & King, 2020; Esfehani & Albrecht, 2018; Park, 2011; Su, 2019) as has the political underpinnings of the concept of 'World Heritage' and its tourism implications (Nicholas & Thapa, 2013; Rakic & Chambers, 2008). However, the discursive construction of the very concept of intangible cultural heritage has not thus far been problematised within tourism studies. Our contention in this paper is that the conceptualisation of intangible cultural heritage provided by The Convention dominates the literature. It is this understanding that has, arguably, been uncritically embraced by academics and other key stakeholders and which has become the main point of reference for its study and management, including in tourism. We explore the mechanisms of objectification that have shaped intangible cultural heritage and the power relations behind this consolidating order (Butler, 2004). Specifically, we investigate how the hegemonic practice of World Heritage constructed this concept as a programmatic object of knowledge and the mechanism through which it authorises a will to truth (Foucault, 1989) through inventorying and documenting.

Further, while studies have examined the discursive shaping of heritage and nation states (Chambers, 2005) less attention has been dedicated to how heritage knowledge and values have been appropriated by, and considered intrinsically linked to, the public domain (Nuryanti, 1996). A seminal text in this regard is that of McKay (1994) who, drawing primarily on Gramsci, and to a much lesser extent Foucault, problematised how institutions within the public realm (including in tourism) constructed the idea of 'the Folk' as integral to a politics of cultural selection. In our paper, Foucauldian discourse theory is central to our contention that while the debate on intangible cultural heritage is more preoccupied with the duality between intangible/tangible in an ontological sense, less attention has been dedicated to the discursive shaping of the concept or the power relations underpinning the tensions between what are tautological and contradictory expressions of "intangible" and "tangible" cultural heritage values (Smith & Campbell, 2017).

Key to our analysis is the Foucauldian duality of power/knowledge (Foucault & Gordon, 1980). This framework can highlight how the representation of cultural heritage is linked to the discourse around its materiality/tangibility and immateriality/intangibility. Foucault embraces an ontology in which reality can only be known through representation. For Foucault, reality, through discourse, produces objects of knowledge (Foucault & Gordon, 1980). Reality is thus only accessible through the interplay between power and knowledge (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Power must be observed at its points of application (Foucault & Gordon, 1980) and in this paper we focus our exploration at the level of UNESCO and how this supranational political context has been articulated within the institutional setting of Scotland, a nation within the United Kingdom.

2. THE EMERGENCE OF INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE AS AN OBJECT OF KNOWLEDGE

Discourses produce and authenticate objects of knowledge. They contribute to the emergence and shaping of these objects and make it possible to organise ideas, programmes, and concepts around them and to reproduce them in other discourses (Danaher, Schirato & Webb, 2000). In the next section we discuss Foucault's conceptualisation of discourse as a necessary theoretical foundation for our study.

2.1. Foucault: discourse, power/knowledge

Discourse is conceptualised by Foucault as "the general domain of all statements, sometimes as an individuable group of statements, and sometimes as a regulated practice that accounts for a number of statements" (Foucault, 1972, p. 80). That is, Foucault regards discourse in a twofold way: first as referring to utterances possessing meaning and producing effects, and second, as an 'unwritten rule' that produces utterances and effects (Mills, 2003). Foucault is interested in the specific mechanism that enables unwritten rules to circulate specific statements and utterances and ultimately to solidify objects of knowledge. For Foucault, nothing meaningful exists outside of discourse. But this is not to deny the realm of the material world. Indeed, as Hall (2013, p. 45) clarifies, Foucault argues that discourses unavoidably "shape our interpretation of reality", inherently involve selection, and are thus always political. For Foucault, "all knowledge implies a particular form of power and vice versa" (De Souza & Furlan, 2018, p. 331).

Power is not a repressive but rather a productive force (Caputo & Yount, 1993). Discourses have the power to create specific institutions, and once these are established, they are invested with the authority to regulate social contexts and behaviour and to create further problematisations

(Hannam & Knox, 2005). Caputo & Yount (1993) suggest that problematisation creates a field which in turn regulates the subsequent discourses and strategies it requires. Objects of discourse do not exist *a priori,* but they have emerged because of the presence of a discursive field that makes it possible to talk about them (Duineveld & Van Assche, 2011). Discourses are therefore historicised. Moreover, for Foucault, objects come into being through 'scientific articulation' that make them what they are. Just like madness as an object of knowledge and of discourse did not exist before the discipline of madness, intangible cultural heritage we suggest, did not exist as an object of knowledge before UNESCO and other satellite cultural heritage institutions brought it into existence.

A more detailed mechanism can be identified in which objects of knowledge are constructed. There are in fact forces that operate from within, that is, conditions governing the production of statements within a discourse. Other forces (procedures of exclusion) are imposed from the outside. Regarding the former, the argument here is that a mechanism emerged at a certain point which made it possible to recognise an area of discussion on intangible cultural heritage and where scholars and experts were referring to the same realm of knowledge. Another mechanism imposed the rules to speak about this concept. This is what is referred to as 'historical *a priori'* and it is defined as "a group of rules that characterises a discursive practice" (Sheridan, 2003, p. 97). The output of the discourse on intangible cultural heritage, the statements produced by these conjoint mechanisms that constitute an historical *a priori* is what Foucault calls the archive. The matter of discussion is therefore objectified, reified, recognisable and responds to specific rules of discourse. This contributes to the creation of intangible cultural heritage as an undisputed object of knowledge. Consequently, The Convention can be interpreted as a programme in Foucauldian terms:

> Every programme also either articulates or presupposes a knowledge of the field of reality upon which it is to intervene and/or which it is calculated to bring into being. The common axiom of programmes is that an effective power is and must be a power which 'knows' the objects upon which it is exercised. (Foucault & Gordon, 1980, p. 248).

As suggested in the above quotation, for a programme to be actualised there must be a target, an object of that programme. Drawing on Nietzsche's genealogical approach, Foucault problematised what he deemed as this 'will to truth', that is, that set of exclusionary practices whose function is to establish distinctions between those statements which will be considered as false and those which will be considered as true (Foucault 1981) within a certain historical context. For Foucault, power is a relational force as it is produced through emerging discourses by means of a mechanism of authorisation of certain truth claims and marginalisation, subjugation and exclusion of others which could be equally true. There could be no power without relation to other, subjugated, marginalised, alternative knowledges (Hollinshead, 1998).

In modern societies, discourse (i.e. power/knowledge) is not solely invested in macro institutions such as the state but is everywhere (Foucault, 1972). It is capillary and exists in a variety of micro-organisations and is manifested in micro-practices and techniques. Indeed, discourse relies on three major elements to circulate: disciplines, commentary and the authors (Danaher et al., 2000). Disciplines do this by means of practitioners and institutions. They have themselves learnt their expertise from discourses and texts that provide commentaries of legitimised authors who have contributed to build and normalise the object of knowledge. Thus, in contrast to a positive view of knowledge as enriching humanity, to Foucault, the information so produced might be used instead for the maintenance of the status quo, a "voracious appetite for information" (Mills, 2003, p. 71) that rests upon institutional support, 'reinforced' and renewed by institutional practices such as pedagogy and others like publishing (Foucault, 1977).

While Foucault attempted to remove any traces of a central sovereign body from the power equation, like Gramsci's idea of hegemony (Gramsci, 2007), he emphasised the mechanisms through which dominant ideas have permeated society, creating a moral and intellectual leadership. According to Foucault (2008), the Western states' apparatuses have progressively assumed an integral role whereby functions previously embedded in other societal institutions (such as the church or the family), are now internalised under the State administration. Influence however, is not exercised through the mechanisms of law and coercion but rather through a complex assemblage of organisations, technologies, and programmes, (what Gramsci deems civil society). Foucault speaks here also to the notion of governmentality which suggests that there are subjects in society such as political institutions, media, and academics more able than others to create and disseminate discourses.

2.2. Discourse and Intangible Cultural Heritage

Regarding cultural heritage, expert knowledge is, arguably, instrumental to its shaping and subsequent authentication (Bruner & Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1994). Smith (2006) drawing from Lowenthal (1998), contends that the creation by the elites of cultural heritage knowledge has the effect of controlling that knowledge. Experts' knowledge and competence are manifested in books (including guidebooks) and certification programmes. Experts also include [tourism] academics and hence the widespread use of academic books, scientific conferences, tradeshows, and conventions. Experts' knowledge contributes to the construction of a notion of cultural heritage that assumes the condition of its authentication (Bruner & Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1994). That is, experts have the power to circulate truth claims about cultural heritage and the knowledge thus created is legitimised and accepted. Such knowledge is used as a reference point and as an object of comparison for new knowledge to be created, and programmed, thus constituting what Smith (2006) named as 'Authorised Heritage Discourse'.

The involvement of the World Heritage apparatus within local practices introduces another significant agent of power that further contributes to the authentication process. Smith & Campbell (2017) point to the tensions that emerged with the idea of intangible cultural heritage, in part connected with concerns about safeguarding mechanisms, and they critique its political nature. They also observe that the same concerns did not characterise tangible cultural heritage. Despite this, the introduction by UNESCO of intangible cultural heritage has been largely applauded as a significant development that contributes to the expansion of the scope, nature, and value of cultural heritage (Smith & Akagawa, 2008). The Convention undoubtedly played a significant role in the establishment and global acceptance of this concept. A review of academic sources (Alivizatou, 2016; Bendix, Eggert & Peselmann, 2016; Logan, 2012) confirms that this concept has been widely embraced as the one that univocally identifies specific cultural expressions classified as intangible. This conceptualisation of 'intangibility' normalises the understanding of those cultural heritage expressions. Despite a few attempts to examine intangible cultural heritage critically (Jeffery & Rotter 2019; Loiacono & Fallon, 2018; Stefano, Davis & Corsane, 2014) there are still a number of studies that unreservedly embrace the definition proposed or inspired by UNESCO (Esfehani & Albrecht, 2018; Jones, 2018; Schmitt, 2008; Su, 2018).

Other studies (Bakar, Osman, Bachok & Ibrahim, 2014; Vidal Gonzáles, 2008) do not even define the concept in specific terms, but from the approaches adopted, it is evident that the framework used is the same one proposed by The Convention , a sign that said conceptualisation is unquestioned, speaks for itself and the bifurcation between tangible/intangible is taken for granted. Another aspect that suggests the normalisation of The Convention's conceptualisation is the significant number of studies (Severo & Venturini, 2016; Zhang, Hang & Chen, 2018; Zhou, Sun & Huang 2019) about the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, which have implicitly adopted its recommendations. Not only has the concept been established by The Convention but this also introduced a paradigmatic innovation into the cultural heritage debate in that this is no longer perceived solely as something “material, monumental and aesthetic” (Cominelli & Greffe, 2012, p. 45). It appears therefore that the conceptualisation of intangible cultural heritage has become normalised and has crystallised around the notion proposed by The Convention and is often used in practice as a point of reference for countries to interpret cultural heritage expressions that are distinct from monuments, artefacts and architecture.

2.3. Critiques of Foucauldian discourse

There have been critiques of Foucault’s thesis but only a few will necessarily be enumerated here. Fraser (1981), while praising Foucault for his new approach to the conceptualisation of power in modern society as localised, capillary, and exhaustive, nevertheless argued that this view was value-neutral and bracketed the normative. Indeed, Foucault failed to theorise any alternative to dominant discourses perhaps due to his resistance to ideology and essentialising frameworks. What is missing is a real emancipatory intent to enfranchise human subjects from dynamics of domination and subjugation (Philp, 1990). While Foucault saw resistance as inherent to discourse, he failed to theorise a politics of resistance or suggest what emancipation might look like. In a related point, Laclau & Mouffe (1985) argued that Foucault did not clearly theorise the relationship between the discursive and the non-discursive world. This has implications for how resistance might emerge as if everything is discourse then from whence might resistance or counter-narratives emerge?

For Laclau & Mouffe (1985) there must be an extra-discursive world in tandem with the discursive which points to its lack of fixity. This extra-discursive world, they suggested, is a social antagonism which, under certain circumstances and in specific historic moments, will destabilise the existing dominant discourse and replace it with another and so on. At the same time discourses are never totally disrupted as alternative discourses will still bear their traces. The point is that discursive formations can never be totally closed and can never be wholly totalising due to the existence of social antagonisms in a discursive exterior and this paves the way for political action. Which social antagonisms will be destabilising are a matter of historical contingency (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985).

Another critique of Foucault’s work is that his focus on discourse obscures the performative dimension embedded in every human practice. This is the argument of non-representational and more-than-representational theorists (Thrift 1996; Lorimer, 2005). Non-representational theory is based on the premise that places are shaped and produced by performances and are an outcome of the interplay between the social and the material (Haldrup & Larsen 2006; Thrift, 1996;). Non-representational theory tends to see performance as embodied and multi-sensuous. Haldrup & Larsen (2006) draw attention to the fact that tourist worlds, for example, are not only made by humans. Thus, conferring to the mind a privileged position in the acquisition of knowledge obscures the action of human bodies as well as non-human agents such as objects and technologies that enable and enhance human performances. For Haldrup & Larsen (2006, p. 282), tourism worlds are not only discursive, but they should be understood as “a hybrid of technologies, discourse, and practices that all act”. Despite these critiques, Foucault’s approach to discourse is still widely used in the social sciences and we have found that it offers a plausible theoretical framing for our interrogation of the construction of intangible cultural heritage. Thus, in this paper we provide a discursive analysis of the production of this concept, highlighting how dominant regimes of truth are constructed and how they serve to silence alternative narratives. We do this using the exemplar of the discursive construction of intangible cultural heritage in Scotland.

3. STUDY METHOD

A discursive approach is consistent with interpretative inquiry and must be embedded within the context under study (Hollinshead, 2009). Following McKay (1994) this investigation of the discursive construction of intangible cultural heritage as an object of knowledge, was contextualised first through an analysis of The Convention's conceptualisation, and second, through an interrogation of the complex assemblage (Coleman and Ringrose, 2013) of the socio-cultural and political dynamics in Scotland. We focused on Scotland for two reasons. First, although the United Kingdom has not yet ratified The Convention, the Scottish government (a devolved administration) has made it clear in a White Paper (Scottish Government, 2013) that it supports the safeguarding of its own intangible cultural heritage as conceptualised in The Convention. UNESCO provides a mechanism through which interested bodies (such as regions, communities, and other institutions) can apply as non-governmental organisations and become advisors. Museums Galleries Scotland (the national development body for the Scottish museum sector), is accredited as such by UNESCO and can actively network and collaborate with World Heritage best practices and programmes pertaining to intangible cultural heritage. This indicates that devolved administrations (such as exists in Scotland) which are part of countries (the United Kingdom) that at a central state level have not yet ratified The Convention, are nevertheless keen to subscribe to its postulates and guidelines.

Countries that are in the process of implementation of The Convention are expected to articulate their own representation of intangible cultural heritage. One of the instruments advocated to do so is inventories which UNESCO, through The Convention, invites States Parties to construct. Scotland, regardless of its status as part of a non-ratifying country, is in the process of operationalising such an inventory. This action by Scotland must be seen within the context of its historically fractious relationship with the rest of the United Kingdom (particularly England) and increasing calls for independence from the Scottish devolved government. This has been exacerbated in recent years due to Britain's exit from the European Union (Brexit). The Scottish government has argued that Brexit is against the will of the Scottish people where a majority voted to remain in the referendum on European Union membership held in 2016 (see McCorkindale, 2016 for a problematisation of Scotland's politico-legal status within the United Kingdom). The second reason for our choice of Scotland as an exemplar is due to the apparent dynamism of the intangible cultural heritage sector both at an institutional and grass roots level. Indeed, Scotland has adopted an inclusive and broad notion of the concept with the aim to embrace not only Scottish intangible cultural heritage but also intangible cultural heritage ***in*** Scotland thereby including those expressions that are not indigenous (e.g. Chinese New Year; South Asian Melas) as well as relatively contemporary expressions (McCleery, McCleery, Gunn & Hill, 2008). The intangible cultural heritage of Scotland is also acknowledged as an important tourism asset, is increasingly included in portfolio strategies, and is used to promote Scotland as a destination (Visit Scotland, 2015).

Foucauldian discourse analysis has no systematic method *per se* and the only attempt by Foucault to articulate a methodology can be found in his *Archaeology of Knowledge* (Wight, 2016). Our application of discourse analysis aims at capturing the scepticism that characterises Foucault's work, and to adopt Foucault's themes and approaches not as prescriptive instruction but, as Deleuze (citing Marcel Proust) puts it "a box of tools" […] a pair of glasses directed to the outside […] an instrument for combat" (Foucault & Deleuze, 1980, p. 208). By applying Foucauldian discourse analysis, we join a small canon of academics in tourism studies (Wight 2016; 2018) who have heeded the call made by Cheong & Miller (2000) over 20 years ago for such analyses. Our study also addresses a gap in the tourism literature where more attention to Foucault's notion of power and its application has been advocated (Hollinshead, 1999; Ong, Ryan & McIntosh, 2014).

Discourse analysis first involves a selection of relevant documents. What is considered relevant is dependent on the extent to which these documents can explore the general logics of hegemonic discourse and praxis/the field of application (Howarth, 2000). As such many discourse theorists select "exemplary or crucial cases" (Howarth, 2000, p 138) as we have done in our study. Specifically, we selected an official report commissioned by Museums Galleries Scotland in partnership with the Scottish Arts Council (now Creative Scotland) which is a public body for the support of arts, screen and the creative industries in Scotland, and written by academics from Edinburgh Napier University. The report, published in 2008, is titled 'Scoping and Mapping the Intangible Cultural Heritage in Scotland' and according to the academic authors its purpose is to establish parameters for intangible cultural heritage in Scotland (McCleery et al., 2008). An institutional document is deemed to be a very appropriate source to examine discourse as here the institutions involved in the development of the report are speaking subjects in a position of privilege (Hook 2001). In addition to being appropriate, this report was adequate because as qualitative researchers we focus on depth of analysis rather than quantity of data (Tonkiss, 1998).

Our analytical approach was guided by the logics of Foucauldian post-structuralist discourse theory. It was crucial for our deployment of this approach that we first become conversant with the concepts and logics of the Foucauldian thesis which then made it possible to utilise and to adapt some of its logics to lend conceptual clarity to our investigation. Our aim in reading through the mentioned report was to problematise how intangible cultural heritage has been discursively constructed in Scotland. Specifically, we read the report several times and in doing so we sought to uncover the existence of discursive formations which Foucault (1972) explains as the organising principle of an episteme. That is, we were able to highlight specific statements, constructed as the only thinkable object, and to look for the presence of absence.

The aim of this strategy was to present a plausible argument about an item that is accepted as unproblematic, unquestionable, and natural. We were able to identify statements that highlighted tropes of power, authorisation, normalisation, immateriality and fragility all of which spoke to the discursive construction of intangible cultural heritage in Scotland and revealed its inherent elisions. However, as a qualitative technique discourse analysis has attracted criticisms associated with the 'soft sciences' including accusations of bias and lack of generalisability. Jamal & Hollinshead (2001) have emphasised that what is important for qualitative research (like discourse analysis) is the ability to gauge the results of the research against its own objectives rather than against some external reality. We do not seek to establish empirical generalisations and acknowledge the possibility that there might be multiple, different and even competing interpretations of our results.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Intangible Cultural Heritage in Scotland: Power, Authority, Normalisation

Our discursive analysis of the report commissioned by Museums Galleries Scotland indicates that The Convention is regarded as the predominant framework for the safeguarding of cultural expressions identified as intangible. It does not only limit itself to promote safeguarding, but it also provides a conceptualisation, a target of such safeguarding measures. In The Convention, the conceptualisation of intangible cultural heritage is not intended to be prescriptive, but when it is applied in the context of the public domain of Scotland it does become prescriptive. This is defined by Foucault as a 'Conditioning-conditioned' relationship (Foucault, 2008, p. 122-3) which contributes to the creation of intangible cultural heritage as an undisputed object of knowledge. The report clearly declares that "The study has been shaped by the definition of intangible cultural heritage contained within [The Convention]" (McCleery et al., 2008, p. 7).

This suggests a normalisation of the understanding of intangible cultural heritage around UNESCO frameworks. However, Foucault contends that institutions and the State *in primis* should not be regarded as the centre of power relations. In fact, "the State can only operate on the basis of other, already existing power relations" (Foucault, 1977, p. 122). For Foucault, power is much more diffuse and pervasive as well as decentralised and articulated in a myriad of micro-relations that also contribute to the normalisation of the notion of intangible cultural heritage. Undeniably, UNESCO, endorsed by other institutions (such as in the case of Scotland the Government and the University) has played a significant role in what Foucault refers to as 'exclusionary practices', that is in reinforcing truths about intangible cultural heritage as an object of knowledge and in so doing excluding alternative statements.

Far from regarding The Convention and its conceptualisation as a grand underlying theory, we suggest that utterances expressed by UNESCO have tapped into the space of existing discourses and 'field of relationship' in Scotland that go beyond cultural heritage safeguarding and involve, broader political governance issues associated with Scotland's contested position within the central state (the United Kingdom). The Scottish nation has in fact demonstrated its willingness to develop cultural heritage policies autonomously as suggested below:

> Although it is not mandatory for constituent administrations to meet its requirements at national level, nevertheless, especially in Scotland and Wales, there is a willingness to adhere to best practice in the matter of the safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (McCleery et al., 2008, p. 6)

Interestingly, in the report, regions that claim a strong nationalism in Europe have also been used as examples of best practices. The report mentions Navarra and Galicia (Spain) and the Flemish (Belgium). (McCleery et al., 2008, p. 8). While both Spain and Belgium have ratified The Convention, this suggests that Scotland, regarding intangible cultural heritage, associates itself with those regions that claim a strong nationalism. It could be argued therefore that in this sense Scotland uses The Convention's narrative to resort to a supranational body to bypass the problematic of its national sovereignty. This narrative has paved the way for The Convention to contribute to a normalisation of intangible cultural heritage in Scotland. This is achieved through the deployment of strategies of conviction (Tonkiss, 1998). These include resort to an academic discipline such as science; an authoritative, trustworthy method (statistics, inventorying, and mapping); a commentary by a key spokesperson (e.g. a quotation) (see Foucault, 1981). The purpose of these strategies is to produce utterances on a certain object of knowledge (intangible cultural heritage) that make it appear unproblematic, and natural. Within the document under examination, we have observed several such strategies, calling upon institutions such as UNESCO itself *in primis*.

Drawing on best practices adopted by regions (e.g. Navarra, Galicia and Flanders), and the appeal to experts' knowledge are also strategies of conviction that contribute to the creation of a 'consultative body'. This is instrumental to the layout of standards and best practices that can be conveniently reproduced in other countries (whether they have ratified The Convention or not). The ultimate objective is to seek some degree of international compatibility and comparability (McCleery et al., 2008). Safeguarding measures are being aligned to those best practices recommended and coordinated by UNESCO as evident in the passage below:

> A number of sources of data/approaches to data collection were rejected as they failed to fulfil the UNESCO Convention guidelines (McCleery et al., 2008, p. 22).

This illustrates that UNESCO guidelines were privileged for the data collection required to build the inventory while alternative approaches were "rejected". By cohering around UNESCO guidelines, the knowledge and measures undertaken to understand and deal with intangible cultural heritage result in a normalising discourse that inevitably rejects alternative ways of knowing about and dealing with it. Also notable is the presence of three strategies of conviction as mentioned earlier:

first, the recourse to UNESCO together with its apparatuses of expertise, programmes, and institutions. Second, the reference to other member states as well as experts whose joint effort succeeded in the achievement of a ‘definitional workability’. Through such expedients, the knowledge thus produced emerges as legitimate, natural, and incontestable, as it is validated by the authority of a range of experts and institutions. The third strategy of conviction is the highlighting of the prominence that intangible cultural heritage is gaining internationally so far as it is not only seen as a local concern but also as a priority “of international cooperation”:

> In recent years, [intangible cultural heritage] has received international recognition and its safeguarding has become one of the priorities of international cooperation. This owes much to UNESCO's adoption and subsequent promotion of its Convention for the Safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage (McCleery et al., 2008, p. 6).

However, the knowledge thus created is completely powerless if it is not circulated. What Foucault (1981) calls ‘commentary’ is one of the mechanisms of circulation for that knowledge to unleash its power. Foucault defines a commentary as:

> An internal procedure of exclusion which is concerned with classifying, distributing and ordering discourse and ultimately to understand those who are authorized to speak and those who are not (Mills, 2003, p. 59).

The text under examination can itself be interpreted as a commentary. Commenting on a text confers on that text a peculiar status in that it is deemed to be spoken about. Furthermore, the commentary has the prerogative to express what the text cannot (Mills, 2003). The University and the Scottish Government have the power to write commentaries and in so doing the text of The Convention is not only circulated through their institutional apparatuses, but its content is also authorised, endorsed and legitimised. Another example of a commentary in the document is the one below:

> The UNESCO Convention states that intangible cultural heritage to be safeguarded ‘is transmitted from generation to generation’. Therefore, intangible cultural heritage in Scotland should not be considered without a parallel concern for the mechanisms available for the transmission of intangible cultural heritage knowledge […] (McCleery et al., 2008, p. 33).

This passage first reports a statement from The Convention and then presents an attempt to interpret it in the context of Scotland. It expresses the authors’ “concern for the mechanisms available for the transmission of intangible cultural heritage knowledge”. What is interesting in this commentary is the choice of expressions such as “should not be considered without a parallel concern for and mechanisms available for the transmission of intangible cultural heritage knowledge” which is quite a strong statement on the nature of this concept. Safeguarding seems to be the central concern and particularly mechanisms of safeguarding such as UNESCO’ s claimed technocratic power (see Meskell, 2018 for more on World Heritage and technocracy). It is experts such as the drafters of The Convention who have the authority to ‘transmit’ knowledge and this results in a de-legitimisation of alternative knowledge subjects who might be equally able to elaborate and circulate such commentaries.

This alludes to the presence of another procedure of exclusion, namely the rarefaction of the speaking subject. That is, procedures that have the effect of limiting the number of subjects who have the authority to speak (Foucault, 1981). Thus, the subjects speaking about intangible cultural heritage are only a few, namely UNESCO, the University (through its academic experts) and the

Scottish Government, through Museums Galleries Scotland. Consequently, the discussion is shaped by the interaction of a limited group of agents. We suggest that what results is that intangible cultural heritage in Scotland is mainly developed and is clustering at an institutional level, at a distance from where it is performed and lived. That is not to deny that in Scotland initiatives at a grassroots level do not exist, but rather that the conceptualisation of intangible cultural heritage in Scotland has been developed primarily as a result of the implementation of The Convention and the significant contribution of institutional bodies such as the government and the University (in a Foucauldian sense 'agents of power').

4.2 Immateriality and Fragility of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Scotland

A discursive regularity that informs the report is the establishment of intangible cultural heritage as immaterial. To say that cultural heritage is intangible suggests that it lacks a materiality, a physical form, an enduring presence and visibility, an essence. Thus, the report problematises the nature of intangible cultural heritage defining what it is not: it is not a material artefact. So, first, the concept is defined in negative terms and directly in relation to its counterpart: tangible cultural heritage. This polarisation, however, appears to be uncritically accepted and transposed into the Scottish context. Specifically, there appears to be a dominant and well acknowledged, well represented tangible cultural heritage and an unacknowledged intangible cultural heritage:

> The intangible cultural heritage of Scotland requires to be accorded a status which is equal to that of the material culture of Scotland. If this is not currently the case, this in part reflects difficulties inherent in identifying the existence of, far less capturing the essence of, something which is not a material artefact. The creation of an accurate inventory of intangible cultural heritage in Scotland will constitute an important step towards safeguarding its future (McCleery et al., 2008, p. 4).

For intangibility of cultural heritage to become a programmatic knowledge, it must be described as problematic, its immateriality difficult to capture, to understand, conceptualise and ultimately to manage (safeguard). Thus, intangible cultural heritage is first made invisible and then such invisibility is regarded as a problem. This also justifies the 'will to know' about it: it resides everywhere and yet, within any given region, is often both invisible and located nowhere in particular, at least in no physical location (McCleery, et al., 2008, p. 21).

Impermanence is interpreted as non-presence. That said and given that intangible cultural heritage is not something ontologically invisible or unsubstantial, questions arise about its epistemological status, namely how we come to know it as being heritage. In other words, it is legitimate to consider why it is constructed as such and what the purpose of such a construction is. To describe it as invisible and difficult to capture justifies its documentation and therefore the will to know about it. But conceptualising it as invisible also means those people who care about it, and practice it are also rendered invisible. The subjects who actively perform this heritage are elided and as such, intangible cultural heritage becomes an object, something that is more suited to be included in an inventory. One could ponder how performers and other actors who are actively involved with its expressions would themselves conceptualise it. In this sense, there appears to be no evidence within the document of the contribution of these subjects to its construction.

Also, the fact that intangible cultural heritage is orally transmitted is seen as a problem in so far as this is not seen as a valid tool for its transmission. Oral transmission is the way it has been traditionally passed on and as such its activation is a deliberate decision of the performers. Intangible cultural heritage has also been described as in need of emancipation. We contend that this narrative also contributes to the legitimisation of the position and authority of UNESCO as a privileged speaking subject. This therefore underestimates the ability/competency and the agency of its bearers and performers to themselves activate those emancipatory mechanisms, thereby justifying an external intervention. Besides, we also question the concept and purpose of safeguarding and consider whether safeguarding is the response of a Western obsession for documenting and inventorying (Russel, 2010), or what can be perceived as a a Eurocentric essentialising of the concept. This is rejected for example by scholars in the decolonial canon (see Mignolo & Walsh, 2018) and perhaps elides the fantasmatics of postcolonial populations (see Hollinshead & Suleman, 2017 for a more extensive discussion of fantasmatics).

Another aspect associated with the intangibility of cultural heritage is that it is regarded as *living culture*. Living is used as one of the main characteristics of intangible cultural heritage "practices and knowledges" (McCleery et al., 2008, p. 37) that distinguishes it from tangible cultural heritage:

> […] cultural heritage is not limited to material manifestations, such as artefacts, monuments and other objects which have been preserved over time. It also encompasses living expressions and the traditions that countless groups and communities worldwide have inherited from their ancestors and transmit to their descendants, in most cases orally…This living heritage, known as 'Intangible Cultural Heritage', provides each bearer of such expressions with a sense of identity and continuity (McCleery et al., 2008, p. 6).

Intangible cultural heritage is alive, it is living, while tangible cultural heritage seems lifeless. This suggests a Cartesian dichotomy, as matter is regarded as something lifeless that acquires meaning and life only through our interpretation and usage. However, the 'livingness' of intangible cultural heritage is not celebrated for its vitality in the present but rather regarded with concern for its fragility suggesting that it is seen as something vulnerable, finite, that has, therefore, to be safeguarded. We contend also that even though it is defined as 'living culture' there are two main time frames used to speak about it - the past (inheritance) and the safeguarding for the future (transmission). In this sense, its usage in the present, is overlooked (Smith, 2006) and reinforces the authority and the power of those institutions which will survive the present practitioners, and which have responsibility to adopt the measures for its transmission. Past experience of documenting suggests that the knowledge thus created is amenable to manipulation (Pratt, 1991) by the heritage and tourism industries. The conservation effort is also amenable to serving the wider national interest of Scotland's global positioning within powerful international fora. It can be discerned also that even if it is defined as living, the action to be undertaken (such as safeguarding) suggests that the dominant perspective is to perceive intangible cultural heritage in the future. The adjective 'living', ignores its organic aspect and therefore the capacity of bearers to renew it.

Further evidence of the 'fragility' associated with an intangible cultural heritage that is living can be discerned from the sentences below:

> Living heritage is very fragile (McCleery et al., 2008, p. 6).
>
> Intangible cultural heritage resides everywhere and yet, within any given region, is often both invisible and located nowhere in particular, at least in no physical location…Specialized knowledges may be retained as an oral tradition only by small

> subgroups of specific regional or ethnic minorities within Scotland and, as a general rule, the more invisible…, the more fragile it is and therefore the more urgently it requires safeguarding (McCleery et al., 2008, p. 21).

Thus seen as fragile, it needs protection. It is not able to safeguard itself. Safeguarding is spoken about as a challenge, as a need, a matter of international concern and priority. It is associated with the idea of safeguarding practices and safeguarding knowledges. In this context the agency of practitioners is neglected. If an expression is said to provide bearers with identity and continuity it means that it is the responsibility of these bearers to decide whether and what aspects should be continued. If a certain practice no longer has meaning and certain effects in a society, then in keeping with the definition of intangible cultural heritage as something living, it is legitimate that it might come to an end. However as emphasised by Smith & Campbell (2017) one of the tenets of the Authorised Heritage Discourse is to construct heritage as inherently valuable. Therefore, this does not facilitate a reality where the enactors or bearers of that heritage might decide to suspend a certain practice or to forget about it. This justifies collective practices of remembrance such as inventories and archives.

Documentation is seen as the main safeguarding mechanism. This point is defended by affirming that those practices that seem to be more insular and therefore not documented as much, are those more vulnerable and therefore in need of safeguarding (McCleery et al., 2008). However, this narrative does not appear to have relevance to those non-indigenous practices that have also been included as part of the intangible cultural heritage **in** Scotland. One of the reasons might certainly be the fact that the introduction of such practices is a relatively recent initiative. However, it is interesting that the main timeframe used to speak about non-indigenous practices seems to be the present and as such, the discussion of safeguarding does not seem to apply to these practices, at least within the context of this report. On the contrary, when these practices are mentioned they are not described as in need of protection. For example, referring to the South Asian Edinburgh Mela, it is described as a:

> ***Robust mechanism*** for supporting and transmitting knowledge of the diverse range of intangible cultural heritage in Scotland (McCleery et al., 2008, p. 17) (emphasis added).

However, as highlighted by Carnegie & Smith (2006), these non-indigenous festivals are at risk. The evidence of this is the fact that the festival appears to be under threat due to severe lack of funds (The Newsroom, 2019). There seem to be tensions therefore in the notion of inclusivity advocated by Scotland, not only because non-indigenous heritage is not described, at least at this stage as fragile, but also because it is not clear what aspects of non-indigenous heritage are authorised in Scotland. According to the report, on one hand, the non-indigenous expressions should be "an accepted part of life in Scotland" (McCleery et al., 2008, p. 12) and on the other, it should be an item of ***cultural significance*** (McCleery et al., 2008, p. 12) (our emphasis) which seems to set it apart to mark it as 'different'. We propose that this narrative of inclusivity is used as a strategy of conviction to justify the fact that intangible cultural heritage is a "force of cultural diversity" (McCleery et al., 2008, p. 6) and therefore to sanction an external international endorsement for its safeguarding.

It seems plausible to affirm that at this stage of the ratification of The Convention in Scotland there are tensions with fully attributing equal status to non-indigenous intangible cultural heritage. This might be because in the face of the fluid geolocation of heritage practices, the structure of the World Intangible Heritage project is still solidly based on the idea of nation states (Brumann, 2014). Further, in relation to its 'non-indigenous' forms in Scotland, the perception is that the need to safeguard is secondary to the need to document. The former justifies and provides a strategy of conviction for the latter. As mentioned before, the need for an inventory seems to respond to a desire, a will to know that, according to Foucault needs to be looked at with suspicion (Foucault & Gordon, 1980).

5. **CONCLUSION**

Our focus on the discursive construction of the very notion of intangible cultural heritage has not to date been problematised within tourism studies despite its significance for tourism. Further there have been no studies within tourism which, to the best of our knowledge, have unpacked how The Convention has been discursively appropriated at one of its points of application, in this case in a politically contested public domain. This paper has also heeded the call for more attention to be devoted to the Foucauldian notion of power and its application in tourism (Ong, et al, 2014). Using a Foucauldian lens, we have thus made six central contributions to the interdisciplinary field of tourism studies. First, influenced by The Convention's discourse, one can observe increasing interference by the normative apparatus of the state in Scotland into a previously vernacular dominion of cultural heritage expressions, now deemed as intangible. Second, utterances about intangible cultural heritage have been articulated into an existing discursive field of relationship in Scotland that exceeds cultural heritage safeguarding and involves broader political governance issues associated with Scotland's contested political position within the United Kingdom. That is, we have argued that Scotland resorts to a supranational body to transcend the problematics of national sovereignty.

Third, the normalisation of intangible cultural heritage in Scotland is achieved through the deployment of strategies of conviction (Tonkiss, 1998) namely the resort to an academic discipline such as science; an authoritative, trustworthy method (statistics, inventorying, and mapping); and a commentary by a key spokesperson (e.g. a quotation). Such strategies authorise a will to truth that further reinforces UNESCO as an influential technocratic body and the main centre through which programmes and knowledge about intangible cultural heritage are created and disseminated. Fourth, the discursive construction of intangible cultural heritage as invisible and fragile, and a focus on inheritance and transmission are instrumental to justify a will to know, through mechanisms of collective remembrance (such as inventories and archives). Simultaneously, this serves to disempower the people who actively perform intangible cultural heritage and paves the way for manipulation from institutions and technocrats. Not only is the World Heritage narrative uncritically transposed in the context of Scotland but what emerges from it is constructed as functional knowledge (Tribe & Liburd, 2016) that uses a central problem (the alleged fragility of intangible cultural heritage) to justify the intervention of its technocratic apparatus, and in so doing distancing it from the individuals who perform it.

Fifth, we detected tensions even in the notion of inclusivity advocated by Scotland. Non-indigenous heritage is in fact not described, at least at this stage, as fragile or invisible. Moreover, it is not clear what aspects of non-indigenous heritage are authorised in Scotland. We have contended that the narrative of inclusivity is used as a strategy of conviction to justify the fact that intangible cultural heritage is a force of cultural diversity (McCleery et al., 2008, p. 6) and therefore to endorse international intervention for its safeguarding. It seems plausible to affirm that at this stage of ratification of The Convention in Scotland there are tensions associated with fully attributing to this dimension equal status with that accorded to indigenous cultural heritage. It can be argued that Scotland, by embracing the World Heritage narrative, has also embraced its mainstream multiculturalism, thus lacking polycentrism (De Cesari, 2010) in the dialogue about intangible cultural heritage and identity in Scotland.

Sixth, methodologically, this paper has provided an example of how a Foucauldian approach can be practically utilised to interrogate the complex discourse that authorises truths about intangible cultural heritage in the public realm, highlighting how power acts at one of its points of application. Tourism researchers who seek to draw on Foucauldian discourse analysis must first have an in-depth understanding of context (in our case that of the The Convention's conceptualisation of intangible cultural heritage and also the messy assemblage of the socio-cultural and political forces of Scotland), select appropriate and adequate documents as data and then problematise these documents through Foucauldian lens in order to discern the existence of dominant discursive formations and the presence of absence. Still, it is important to restate here that there is no universal technique for conducting Foucauldian discourse analysis, and like other qualitative methodologies its results are tentative, open to alternative interpretations and "limited to the analytical method out of which they arise" (Wight, 2018, p. 131).

It is also important to acknowledge here that as academics we are also 'experts' and complicit in the production and dissemination of discourses (power/knowledge). It is therefore necessary to be critically reflexive about your own positionality and motivations. Both authors live in England but are not natives of the United Kingdom and have, throughout our careers, been preoccupied with the interrogation of dominant discourses to expose the existence of inequalities. We started this paper by acknowledging the 'democratic deficit' in the World Heritage process and its inherent disparities (Fraser, 1981; Labadi, 2007) and this paper seeks to add to the limited voices in tourism studies arguing for its democratisation. Specifically, a Foucauldian approach has enabled us to reveal that the discursive construction of intangible cultural heritage necessarily excludes counter-narratives such as those of its active bearers and performers. Still, Foucault provided no theorisation of how counter-narratives might lead to change. However, Laclau & Mouffe (1985) argued that counter-narratives existing in a discursive exterior act as social antagonisms. These could disrupt the hegemonic discourse of intangible cultural heritage at particular historical moments and could themselves become hegemonic and so on.

Future research should examine what other counter-narratives are circulating in a discursive exterior. Research should also seek to re-visit the immateriality discursively ascribed to intangible cultural heritage to reveal what cannot be detected only through discursive, representational frameworks. Our findings are important for tourism because for many destinations intangible cultural heritage is seen as a unique tourism resource. Therefore, how it is discursively constructed has implications for the way in which cultural heritage tourism is practically managed and experienced. Indeed, for Foucault, discourse and practice are inextricably linked. Intangible cultural heritage has the potential to produce social spaces for tourism which are novel if a multiplicity of interpretations is accommodated. Such tourism spaces should also allow for the freedom not to conceptualise, not to identify, and not to document.

REFERENCES

Alivizatou, M. (2016). *Intangible heritage and the museum: New perspectives on cultural preservation*. New York: Routledge.

Bakar, A., Osman, M., Bachok, S., & Ibrahim, M. (2014). Analysis on community involvement level in intangible cultural heritage: Malacca Cultural Community. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 153(C), 286-297.

Bendix, R.F., Eggert, A., & Peselmann, A. (2016). *Heritage regimes and the state*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.

Brumann, C. (2014). Shifting tides of world-making in the UNESCO World Heritage Convention: Cosmopolitanisms colliding. *Ethnic and Racial Studies: Books, Bodies, and Bronzes: Comparing Sites of Global Citizenship Creation, 37*(12), 2176-2192.
Bruner, E.M., & Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (1994). Maasai on the lawn: Tourist realism in East Africa. *Cultural Anthropology*, 9(4), 435-470.

Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing gender*. New York: Routledge.

Caputo, J., & Yount, M. (1993). *Foucault and the Critique of Institutions*. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Carnegie, E., & Smith, M. (2006). Mobility, diaspora and the hybridisation of festivity: The case of the Edinburgh Mela. In D. Picard & M. Robinson (Eds.), *Festivals, tourism and social change: remaking worlds* (pp. 255-268). Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

Casey, S. (2013). Okinawan heritage and its polyvalent appropriations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 42, 130-150.

Chambers, D. (2005). Heritage and the nation: An exploration of a discursive relationship. *Tourism Analysis*, 9(4), 241-254.

Chen, Z., Suntikul, W., & King, B. (2020). Constructing an intangible cultural heritage experiencescape: the case of the feast of the Drunken Dragon (Macau). *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 34, 100659.

Cheong, S., & Miller, M. L. (2000). Power and tourism: A Foucauldian observation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2), 371–390.

Coleman, R., & Ringrose, J. (2013). Introduction: Deleuze and Research Methodologies. In R. Coleman and J. Ringrose (Eds.), *Deleuze and research methodologies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Cominelli, F., & Greffe, X. (2012). Intangible cultural heritage: Safeguarding for creativity. *City, Culture and Society*, 3(4), 245-250.

Danaher, G., Schirato, T., & Webb, J. (2000). *Understanding Foucault*. London: Sage.

De Cesari, C. (2010). World Heritage and mosaic universalism: A view from Palestine. *Journal of Social Archaeology*, *10*(3), 299-324.

De Souza, P.F., & Furlan, R. (2018). The question of subject in Foucault. *Psicologia USP* 29(3), 325-335

Duineveld, M., & Van Assche, K. (2011). The power of tulips: Constructing nature and heritage in a contested landscape. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, *13*(2), 79-98.

Esfehani, M., & Albrecht, J. (2018). Roles of intangible cultural heritage in tourism in natural protected areas. *Journal of Heritage Tourism, 13*(1), 15-29.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Translated by A. Sheridan. London: Allen Lane.

Foucault, M. (1981). The Order of Discourse. Translated by I. McLeod. In R.J.C Young (Ed.), *Untying the Text: A Post Structuralist Reader* (pp. 48-78). Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Foucault, M. (1989). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences*. London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (2008). *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-79*. Translated by G. Burchell. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, M. & Deleuze, G. (1980). Intellectuals and power. In Bouchard, D.F. (Ed.), *Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews by Michel Foucault*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, pp. 205-217.

Foucault, M., & Gordon, C., (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. Brighton: Harvester Press.

Fraser, N. (1981). Foucault on modern power: Empirical insights and normative confusions. *Praxis International*, 3, 272-287.

Gramsci A. (2007). *Quaderni dal carcere*, 4 Vols. Torino: Einaudi.

Haldrup, M., & Larsen, J. (2006). Material cultures of tourism. *Leisure Studies*, 25(3), 275-289.

Hall, S. (2013). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. London: Sage.

Hannam, K., & Knox, D. (2005). Discourse analysis in tourism research: A critical perspective. *Tourism Recreation Research*, *30*(2), 23-30.

Hollinshead, K. (1998). Disney and commodity aesthetics: A critique of Fjellman's analysis of 'distory' and the 'historicide' of the Past. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1(1), 58-119.

Hollinshead, K. (1999). Surveillance of the worlds of tourism: Foucault and the eye-of-power. *Tourism Management*, *20*(1), 7-23.

Hollinshead, K. (2009). The Shift to Constructivism in Social Inquiry: Some Pointers for Tourism Studies. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 31(2), 43-58.

Hollinshead, K. and Suleman, R. (2017). Time for fluid acumen: A call for improved tourism studies dialogue with the decolonizing world. *Tourism Culture & Communication*, *17*(1), 61-74

Hook, D. (2001). Discourse, Knowledge, Materiality, History. *Theory & Psychology*, 11(4), 521-547.

Howarth, D. (2000). *Discourse*. Buckingham: Open University Press

Jamal, T., & Hollinshead, K. (2001). Tourism and the forbidden zone: The underserved power of qualitative inquiry. *Tourism Management*, 22 (1), 63-82.

Jeffery, L., & Rotter, R. (2019). Safeguarding Sega: Transmission, inscription, and appropriation of Chagossian intangible cultural heritage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *25*(10), 1020-1033.

Jones, T. (2018). International intangible cultural heritage policy in the neighbourhood: An assessment and case study of Indonesia. *Journal of Cultural Geography, 35*(3), 362-387.

Jørgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage.

Labadi, S. (2007). Representations of the nation and cultural diversity in discourses on World Heritage. *Journal of Social Archaeology*, *7*(2), 147-170.

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.

Logan, W. (2012). Cultural diversity, cultural heritage and human rights: Towards heritage management as human rights-based cultural practice. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *18*(3), 231-244.

Loiacono, V., & Fallon, J. (2018). Intangible cultural heritage beyond borders: Egyptian belly dance (Raqs Sharqi) as a form of transcultural heritage. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 39*(3), 286-304.

Lorimer, H. (2005). Cultural geography: the busyness of being "more-than-representational". *Progress in Human Geography*, 29(1), 83–94.

Lowenthal, D. (1998). *The heritage crusade and the spoils of history*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

McCleery, A.; McCleery, A.; Gunn, L., & Hill, D. (2008). Scoping and Mapping the Intangible Cultural Heritage in Scotland. Retrieved December, 2020, from https://www.napier.ac.uk/~/media/worktribe/output-229389/ichinscotlandfullreportjuly08pdf.pdf.

McCorkindale, C. (2016). Scotland and Brexit: The state of the Union and the Union State. *King's Law Journal*, 27(3), 354-365.

McKay, I. (1994). *The quest of the folk: Antimodernism and cultural selection in twentieth-century Nova Scotia*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Meskell, L. (2018). *A future in ruins: UNESCO, World heritage, and the dream of peace*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mignolo, W., & Walsh, C. (2018). *On decoloniality*. London: Duke Unievrsity Press.

Mills, S. (2003). *Michel Foucault*. London: Routledge.

Nicholas, L., & Thapa, B. (2013). The politics of world heritage: a case study of the Pitons Management Area, St Lucia. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, *8*(1), 37-48.

Nicholls, D. A. (2008). Putting Foucault to work: An approach to the practical application of Foucault's methodological imperatives. *Aporia*, 1, 30-40.

Nuryanti, W. (1996). Heritage and postmodern tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(2), 249-260.

Ong, C.E. Ryan, C. & McIntosh, A. (2014). Power-knowledge and tour-guide training: Capitalistic domination, utopian visions and the creation and negotiation of UNESCO's Homo Turismos in Macao. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 48, 221-234.

Park, H. (2011). Shared national memory as intangible heritage: Re-imagining Two Koreas as One Nation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(2), 520-540.

Philp, M. (1990) Foucault. In Skinner, Q. (Ed.) The return of grand theory in the human science. 65-82 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 65-82.

Pratt, M.L. (1991). *Imperial eyes: Travel writing and transculturation*. London: Routledge.

Rakic, T., & Chambers, D. (2008). World Heritage: Exploring the tension between the national and the 'universal'. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, *2*(3), 145-155.

Russell, I. (2010). Heritage, identities and roots: A critique of arborescent models of heritage and identity. In G.S. Smith, P.M. Messenger & H.A. Soderland (Eds.), *Heritage values in contemporary society* (pp. 29-41). New York: Routledge.

Sarup, M. (1993). *An introductory guide to post structuralism and post modernism*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Schmitt, T.M. (2008). The UNESCO concept of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage: Its background and Marrakchi roots. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *14*(2), 95-111.

Scottish Government (2013). Your guide to an independent Scotland [White Paper]. Retrieved September, 2019, from https://www2.gov.scot/resource/0043/00439021.pdf.

Severo, M., & Venturini, T. (2016). Intangible cultural heritage webs: Comparing national networks with digital methods. *New Media & Society*, *18*(8), 1616-1635.

Sheridan, A. (2003). *Michel Foucault: The will to truth*. New York: Routledge.

Skinner, M. (1990). Introduction: The return of grand theory. In Q. Skinner (Ed.), *The return of grand theory in the human science* (pp. 1-21). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, L. & Akagawa, N. (2008). Introduction. In L. Smith & N. Akagawa (Eds.), *Intangible heritage* (pp. 1-10). New York: Routledge.

Smith, L. (2006). *Uses of heritage*. New York: Routledge.

Smith, L., & Campbell, G. (2017). The tautology of "intangible values" and the misrecognition of intangible cultural heritage. *Heritage & Society*, *10*(1), 26-44.

Stefano, M.L., Davis, P. & Corsane, G. (2014). *Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage* (Vol. 8). Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer Ltd.

Su, J. (2018). Conceptualising the subjective authenticity of intangible cultural heritage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *24*(9), 919-937.

Su, J. (2019). Understanding the changing intangible cultural heritage in tourism commodification: the music player's perspective from Lijiang China. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 17(3), 247-268.

The Newsroom (2019, September 3). Bosses warn Edinburgh Mela future 'under significant threat' due to funding cuts. Edinburgh Evening News. Retrieved October, 2019 from https://www.edinburghnews.scotsman.com/whats-on/arts-and-entertainment/bosses-warn-edinburgh-mela-future-under-significant-threat-due-funding-cuts-541747 .

Thrift, N. (1996). *Spatial formations* (Vol. 42). London: Sage.

Tonkiss, F. (1998). Analysing text and speech: Content and discourse analysis. In C. Seale (Ed.), *Researching society and culture* (pp. 367-382). London: Sage.

Tribe, J., & Liburd, J. J. (2016). The tourism knowledge system. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *57*, 44-61.

Tunbridge, J.E. & Ashworth G. J. (1996). *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. Baffins Lane, Chichester: Wiley.

Vidal González, M. (2008). Intangible heritage tourism and identity. *Tourism Management, 29*(4), 807-810.

Visit Scotland (2015) Scotland the Perfect Stage. Scotland's event strategy 2015-2025. Retrieved January, 2020, from http://www.eventscotland.org/assets/show/4658

Wight, A. C. (2016). Lithuanian genocide heritage as discursive formation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *59*, 60-78.

Wight, A.C. (2018). Putting Foucault to work in tourism research. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 21, 122-133.

Wright P. (1985). *On living in an old country*. London: Verso.

Zhang, Y., Han, M., & Chen, W. (2018). The strategy of digital scenic area planning from the perspective of intangible cultural heritage protection. *EURASIP Journal on Image and Video Processing, 2018*(1), 1-11.

Zhou, Y., Sun, J., & Huang, Y. (2019). The Digital Preservation of Intangible Cultural Heritage in China: A Survey. *Preservation, Digital Technology & Culture*, 48(2), 95-103.