Introduction

The notion of human rights at national, international and supra-national levels is premised on the existence of agreed protocols for recording adherence to norms and standards and for documenting breaches and violations of the agreed codes of behavior in relation to these rights. The approaches to recording and documentation are largely driven by the standards of human rights monitoring and reporting within the international human rights regime and the many standards developed by human rights advocates and scholars. In the majority of states, national human rights institutions or civil society-based human rights advocacy groups lead the work on human rights monitoring, which systematically documents and records human rights violations perpetrated by the state or third parties. The stories told by witnesses to abuse or victims of abuse are usually structured in similar ways, suggesting the existence of a genre. To become part of the formal record, these accounts from individuals are often mediated or processed through human rights advocates, including national human rights institutions, pressure groups and non-government organizations.

 A key feature of monitoring within a human rights regime is the practice of witnessing. Without the practice of witnessing, the tales of abuse would not be told. With the emergence of electronic technology, the media, with audio and video recording of first-hand accounts, have brought testimonies to the notice of those far beyond the immediate context of the abuses. In recent times, social media, including websites, blogs, Facebook and Twitter, have been shown to bring the concerns of individuals to the attention of the authorities, and to bring pressure to bear on governments (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). Social media campaigns, developed around Facebook pages and Twitter hashtags, have created communities of followers, who, in turn, may have created an archive of their own witnessing and experiences through their posts and this may have had the effect of taking the event into the everyday, expanding it beyond its own limits. Despite the high level of proliferation and the significant use and impact, the question of whether Facebook or Twitter postings constitute a document from a human rights documentation perspective remains without a clear answer (cf Skare and Lund, 2014).

This study explores the use of Facebook and Twitter as a platform for documenting human rights concerns and generating political action in the context of the disappearance of a journalist in Maldives and their relationships to statements made by human rights NGOs and by UN agencies and in foreign parliaments. On 13 August 2014, the online newspaper, *Minivan News*, reported that Ahmed Rilwan Abdulla, a journalist, well known by his social media nickname *Moyameehaa*, had disappeared, not having been seen by his family and friends since 7 August. Rilwan can be seen on CCTV footage getting off the ferry from the capital, Male’ to the nearby island of Hulhulmale’. The same night, a report was made to police about an abduction of a person at knife-point just outside the apartment where Rilwan lived, the timing coincided with the time he would have reached home after arriving in Hulhumale’ that night. Although Rilwan himself did not report of any serious direct threats to his life, a few days earlier, on 4 August 2014, he had written an article on death threats received by journalists reporting on gang-related activities.

Shortly after his family notified the disappearance and possible abduction of this 28-year old journalist and human rights activist to the police, his family and friends instituted a social media campaign, FindMoyameehaa, through a website [**www.findmoyameehaa.com**](http://www.findmoyameehaa.com), containing material ‘made available for and by friends and family of Ahmed Rilwan (@moyameehaa) to help find him urgently’. Social media were also activated. A Twitter hashtag, #FindMoyameehaa began to be used from 14 August 2014. On 17 August, a Facebook page, FindMoyameehaa was established ([**https://www.facebook.com/findmoyameehaa**](https://www.facebook.com/findmoyameehaa)) and on 24 August, a YouTube channel with the same name was set up ([**http://www.youtube.com/channel/UCDkpcl8oRtEVn8PqT7FMRnQ**](http://www.youtube.com/channel/UCDkpcl8oRtEVn8PqT7FMRnQ)).

These social media outlets carried messages expressing grief and sorrow, organizing actions such as marches and a Twibbon campaign, and calling on the Maldivian Police Service and others including ministers of the government and members of parliament to carry out their responsibilities. Subsequently, organizations including Reporters without Borders, the International Federation of Journalists, the United Nations and Amnesty International issued statements on the issue of Rilwan’s disappearance, the need to protect the rights of journalists to report on contentious issues and the importance of governments being able to protect their citizens, and questions were asked and speeches made in the Parliaments of United Kingdom and Australia, among others.

At a simple level, this study asks whether this social media campaign meets the standards and expectations of a document in the context of human rights practice. At a more complex level, the study uses Genette’s concepts of text and transtextuality (1997) to explore the relationships between the website, tweets and posts, and contributions from external organizations, such as Reporters without Borders and so on. Bringing together responses to these two questions, the study is then able to explore how the ‘stories we tell’ in the Facebook page and the tweets brought together by the hashtag #FindMoyameehaa are related to statements from external organizations as human rights documents, and to explore how the documentary practices of this campaign create the potential for new documents to emerge.

Discussions of definitions and criteria by which to judge if something is a document are considered of limited value (Buckland, 1997, Frohmann, 2009, Lund, 2009). From the time Briet first placed emphasis on access to evidence, the text itself has been of less significance. However, the complexities of communications in social media and the relationships among and between people and among and between messages indicate that an approach which takes into account a document as text may be of some value in understanding these relationships. Thus, in this study, an analytical frame to describe the intricacies of relationships in social media, among and between the website, Facebook posts and the tweets is necessary.

Genette’s notion of transtextuality is proposed as an appropriate approach. It is an analytical frame that is concerned with the relationships among and between texts. Genette’s concern was with literary text, and his theoretical works were published even before the advent of the internet. Yet, the distinctions he made in his concept of transtextuality are very useful in exploring the relationships established between the claims of the social media campaign FindMoyameehaa and the documents produced by organizations such as Reporters Without Borders, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and Amnesty International, as well as those created within and beyond the posts and tweets of the campaign.

 Genette defines transtextuality as ‘all that sets the text in a relationship, whether obvious or concealed, with other texts’. From this basic notion, he establishes five types of textual relationships. The first is intertextuality, where content from one text is inserted in another, usually through the conventional process of quoting; the second is paratextuality, a process involving content which surrounds and situates the text, making it more accessible, for example through a preface or foreword; the third is metatextuality, which permits commentary on the original; the next is architextuality, which links a text to others of the same genre. The final type he calls hypertextuality, and which is concerned with the relationship between text A and text B, the original text being referred to as a hypotext (Genette1997, pp. 1-7).

In this paper, the social media posts for the first 100 days of the campaign were analyzed using each of the five types of transtextuality, first to understand whether they constituted a human rights document themselves; second to understand their relationship to the documents posted by other organizations; and third to consider relationships which may have led to the emergence of other documents.

Being a Human Rights Document?

From a human rights practitioner’s perspective, human rights documents are usually created in a legal or quasi-legal context. According to McClintock (2012), Amnesty International created the prototypes for reporting human rights violations in the 1960s. As a general practice, these documents tend to follow standards and guidelines established through organizations and bodies, such as the United Nations, which monitor the supra-national oversight of adherence to the international human rights covenants and treaties and the activities of governments which are signatories to these conventions. The purpose of these documents is usually to document human rights violations and to show who is alleged to be responsible for the abuse and which institutions and policies facilitate it. The work of Amnesty International is well known in this regard. Amnesty International’s documentation of human rights violations often focus on the cases of individuals, which is then used to demand accountability on national governments and create international political pressure. Other organizations, such as Reporters without Borders, focus on monitoring, reporting and calling institutions and governments to account in relation to media freedom and rights of journalists, but to a large extent, the documentation of cases is similar, following patterns established by Amnesty International.

Our understanding of a document and our justification of this understanding are to be found in the stories we tell – in the ways we talk about documentation and the document (Frohmann, 2009). The discussions of documentation in the field of human rights are therefore important in establishing what constitutes a document. According to McClintock, documentation in human rights has two meanings. Practitioners understand the term to refer to the process of recording violations and abuses of human rights whereas librarians and documentalists are concerned with a notion of documentation which involves the collection and organization of documents, including the outcome of the documentation which practitioners have engaged in. Certain underlying principles emerge for documents created in the documenting of human rights abuses: it is assumed that there is some original text, which may be in the form of photographs, audio or video recordings; it is an example of ‘hard evidence’ (Guzman and Verstappen, 2003, p.12); it has an author who was a witness; it has been validated through the support or acceptance of a human rights organization.

Without the practice of witnessing, the tales of abuse and violations of human rights would not be told. In the case of the disappearance of Rilwan, although someone went to the police to report an apparent abduction outside Rilwan’s residence shortly after the arrival of the ferry on which he is known to have travelled and before he was known to be missing, the police discounted this report and failed to take action. This firsthand account of the incident, thus, did not form a witness statement in the context of this case. Although witness statements are given significant evidentiary weight in the Maldivian criminal justice system, the authorities’ decision not to record or seriously consider the witness accounts resulted in a failure to document a vital narrative. Civil society in the Maldives is relatively under-developed, with few if any effective institutionalized means, such as non-government organization, available to support citizens in such cases. Thus, individuals , in this case Rilwan’s family and friends, moved into the gap where an NGO might have been and set up their own institutional structure for communication of this human rights abuse, the social media campaign run through the web page, the Facebook page, and the Twitter and YouTube account.

The social media campaign itself cannot be considered a human rights document from a documentalist’s perspective. The website, Facebook pages and tweets are unlikely to be collected by any human rights research center or library, one of the ways in which they might have been acknowledged as a human rights document.

The tweets make up the bulk of the social media campaign (1,180 ‘Top Tweets’, excluding re-tweets in the first one hundred days), and while the genesis of the tweets is in the disappearance of Rilwan, they do not set out to present the facts of the case. On the other hand, both the website and the Facebook page can be seen as stating the facts of the case:

‘Ahmed Rilwan Abdulla (@moyameehaa) a Maldivian Journalist has been missing since 8 August 2014. He was last seen on CCTV at the Hulhumale' ferry terminal. He was wearing a black shirt, black trousers, black shoes with white soles and carrying a black backpack. Rilwan is 28 years old, of medium build and 5 feet 10 inches tall, sporting a short beard and moustache’.

However, using Genette’s category of architext – the idea that a text meets the expectations of its genre – it is difficult to be certain that either meets the requirements for a human rights document. The social media campaign does not have the hard evidence to present; and neither the website nor Facebook gives an eye-witness account of the abduction. Although each shows the surveillance video of Rilwan at Hulhumale’ ferry wharf and the Facebook page refers to the statement of a witness who saw a man forced at knifepoint into a car, the ‘authors’ were not witnesses and the social media messages are not based on the practice of witnessing which would be expected in such cases (Guzman and Verstappen, 2003; McClintock, 2012). Both website and Facebook page encourage members of the public to pass on any information they have to Rilwan’s friends and family, who are the administrators of the social media campaign, rather than to a human rights organization or NGO.

Further, witnessing was missing from other processes involved in the reporting of this disappearance – no statement was taken by the police, and answers to questions about police investigation of the disappearance were vague and appeared obfuscating. Thus, there is no ‘hard evidence’, no witness to author a statement and no validation by a human rights organization. The campaign does not incorporate the principles expected of a human rights document.

Becoming a Human Rights Document

Among the Facebook posts and tweets are documents authored by a range of organizations. These are documents in their own right, in Genette’s terms, hypertexts. This renders the original, the expressions of the social media campaign, a hypotext– something from which other documents are developed. These hypertexts are of six types, each a different architext or genre: press releases, open letters, a petition, questions and speeches in Parliament recorded in Hansard, newspaper articles and formal statements issued for example by the United Nations.

These press releases, issued by the Committee for the Protection of Journalists (CPJ); the International Federation of Journalists (IFJ), Reporters without Borders and the Centre for Law and Democracy (CLD), a Canadian NGO, are short, factual statements and following the convention of the genre each engages the reader to further action. Reporters without Borders encourages anyone with information about Rilwan’s disappearance to contact the police and ends with a statement about the low ranking of Maldives in the Press Freedom Index. The CPJ statement provides a link to an online petition established as an adjunct to a physical petition. The IFJ statement, made jointly with the South Asia Media Solidarity Network, is addressed to the Maldivian government and ‘called on the government to respond to the media’s criticisms of the slow response to the journalist’s disappearance’. This statement encourages readers to join the online campaign at #FindMoyameehaa. The CLD similarly called on the government of Maldives to ‘do everything in its power to rescue Mr. Rilwan, to take effective steps to protect the media and to bring the perpetrators of crimes against journalists and the media to justice’.

Three Open Letters were issued in the first 100 days of the campaign. Two follow the conventions of such texts, setting out the concern, placing it in the context of international human rights law and the duties of member states of the UN and reminding the President that his government ‘needs to do more to fulfil its obligations under international human rights law …’. One was Executive Director of CLD to the President of Maldives and the other by the Maldivian Democracy Network to the Commissioner of Police. The third letter is written by Rilwan’s mother, addressed to the mothers of other young men and to the citizens of Maldives on the occasion of Rilwan’s birthday. Her letter follows the format of an open letter on a human rights topic, but it is a letter based on emotion and fellow feeling, on supposition and lack of information. It is included here as a hypertext, although not of the same order as the others.

A petition sponsored by a Member of Parliament, with over 5,000 signatures, was submitted to the *Majlis* [Parliament] asking MPs to investigate if the police had been negligent in investigating Rilwan’s disappearance and to find out if an abduction reported on 8August 2014 in front of Rilwan’s apartment building was connected to his disappearance. This petition is also an example of an architext, a text which must conform to certain standards of wording and presentation to be recognized as a petition. In this case, the criteria for petitions are set down in regulations of the *Majlis*. In spite of the evidence presented during discussion that the petition met the standards as set out in these regulations, and acknowledgement that this was the case, the *Majlis* rejected the petition – it was not a document according to their interpretation of the regulations.

The disappearance of Rilwan and subsequent inaction of the government of Maldives was raised by three governments, UK, Canada and Australia. Questions were asked in the UK Parliament about actions being taken by representatives of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office eliciting a response noting that ‘Officials at our High Commission in Colombo, which is also accredited to the Maldives’ had raised these concerns and that ‘the Maldives government has expressed deep concern following the disappearance, and noted that they are committed to ensuring the safety and security of all Maldivians’. The Canadian Foreign Affairs Minister John Baird issued a statement expressing concern over the current human rights situation and noting that ‘The likely kidnapping of a leading local journalist and threats and attacks against other journalists, politicians and activists are particularly disturbing’. In Australia, Senator McGrath used an Adjournment Debate (an opportunity for politicians to raise an issue of topical concern for debate without the need for a vote) to address ‘judicial corruption, political violence, suppression of the media and the abduction and possible murder of journalist Ahmed Rilwan Abdulla’. Each of these is recorded in the formal record of the Parliament.

The website and associated social media sites and the activities of the social media campaign run through these channels have spawned many newspaper articles, in newspapers in the Maldives as well as in newspapers in the UK and a number of other countries. While local Maldivian newspapers have focused both on the activities associated with the social media campaign and on the case of a missing journalist and potential threats to freedom of expression, overseas newspapers have tended to focus on attacks against free speech.

Formal Statements have been made by UN agencies and also by Amnesty International. As early as 19 August 2014, acting on a statement from the Human Rights Commission of the Maldives, the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights issued a press briefing note expressing concern about the disappearance of Rilwan and urging ‘the relevant authorities’ to ensure that journalists can work without ‘fear for their safety’. At the 27th Session of the UN Human Rights Council, in the general debate on the safety of journalists, a statement was delivered on behalf of the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, in association with FORUM-ASIA and the Maldivian Democracy Network. Both documents are part of the formal record. Amnesty International has issued two statements which include reference to the disappearance of Rilwan, both with formal reference numbers. One, ASA 29/002/2014, is a Public Statement calling on the Maldives Police to “intensify efforts to find those responsible for death threats, abductions and violent attacks against journalists, politicians and civil society activists … and bring them to justice.” The other, ASA 29/003/2014, the report which Amnesty submitted to the Universal Periodic Review, part of the UN Human Rights Regime, mentions Rilwan’s disappearance alongside reports of attacks on other journalists, members of parliament and other public figures. Each of these documents follows the conventions of Amnesty International documents, setting out names, dates and places when violence took place.

Documents arising here as hypertexts are each recognizable through their genre as documents or architexts. Each could be collected by a human rights research center. To a greater or lesser extent, each can also be considered human rights documents. Those issued a UN agency are immediately part of the supra-national human rights regime. The communications of one government with another or transactions of a parliament are recorded as part of a national democratic system, supporting the upholding of the obligations of signatories to international conventions.

Becoming something else

The analysis using Genette’s notions of transtextuality demonstrates that other entities are produced through interactions within the social media campaign. If the original ‘text’ is the statement of Rilwan’s disappearance, then the subsequent Facebook comments and tweets are metatexts in Genette’s terms – commentaries on the original statement. The metatexts become more significant than the original text which contains no more than the bare facts of Rilwan’s disappearance. The tweets show powerfully how the metatexts strengthen the original in several ways. In this campaign, there are several examples of commentary on the original. These include an insight into contemporary Maldivian political society, and a sense of the relentlessness of the passage of time without resolution. The most common example is to be found in tweets and Facebook comments marking the passage of time:

‘30 days 11 hours 27 minutes 37 [secs] since Ahmed Rilwan (@moyameehaa) was abducted. help #findmoyameehaa’ Sept. 7

‘74 days 08 hours 44 minutes 11 secs since Ahmed Rilwan (@moyameehaa) was abducted. help #findmoyameehaa Oct 20’

‘100 day 07 hours 35 secs since Ahmed Rilwan (@moyameehaa) was abducted. help #findmoyameehaa’ Nov.15:

These regularly occurring statements provide a kind of refrain, which brings the reader back to the original message of Rilwan’s disappearance, reinforcing this disappearance but without reiterating the original story.

The disappearance and lack of information mean that there is little content in the tweets and posts, apart from the urgings to take part in local events. Yet, it is not true to say that because they are lacking content, the messages lack substance. To the contrary, they demonstrate the emotional aspects of sadness and outrage felt by friends and the wider community:

‘Shock, anger, sadness, confusion and holding on 2 all hope’ Oct 14;

‘A mother torments [sic] not knowing whether her child is dead or alive’ Sept 16.

‘Day 31. @PoliceMv FAILS repeatedly ’n’ consistently to #FindMoyameehaa. Incompetence and negligence bleeds [sic] public trust’ 8 September.

‘It is not pleasant to see a close friend’s face staring back at you from a poster at every meal at a local café.’ 22 October.

‘Seeing her [Rilwan’s mother] is always heartbreaking.’ 16 November

The posts and tweets in social media, originally seen as working outside of established conventions, are now being recognized as having a significant capacity to communicate emotion. Castells (2012) notes that expressions of outrage are one of the elements fundamental to the establishment of a social movement. In the context of this Facebook page and the tweets with the #FindMoyameehaa, the tweets allow individual expressions of grief as well as expressions of a collective sadness.

Posts, comments and tweets give a glimpse into the wider societal debates in contemporary Maldivian political society, from time to time. In so doing, they show something of the relationship between these institutions of government and the citizens of Maldives. Many tweets use the @ function to make a direct address to the police and others stating that the actions of these government officials are unsatisfactory (Honeycutt & Herring, 2009). For example, there is a sense of a society where the rule of law may be breaking down when one tweeter states:

‘Majlis secretariat decision to reject 5055 [signatures] very irresponsible, says Family’ 29 October;

when another tweeter states:

‘Over 5000 of us Maldivians signed a petition asking @mvpeoplesmajlis [Parliament] to pressure authorities to #FindMoyameehaa. They threw it out. #100days’ 15 November;

or when a third tweeter notes:

‘Integrity of our Maldives police is lost, took 5 days to locate a criminal but can’t #FindMoyameehaa’ October 22 .

Posts frequently call the Maldivian Police Service, government ministers and members of parliament to account:

*‘#FindMoyameehaa please, Mr @PoliceMv. It’s been too long now. And no, I won’t stop badgering you until you find him or tell us you won’t’;*

or express frustration: ‘*100 days of incompetence & excuses by @PoliceMv. 100 days of pain for a family determined to find the truth. #FindMoyameehaa*’ 15 November.

The lack of response, especially from @PoliceMv, led to the re-introduction of another hashtag, #PoliceMvFail.

The analysis also demonstrates that an element of a post or tweet fitting in to one category can be transformed into something which has a different relationship to the original and then has the characteristics of a different category of transtextuality. This was found in the categories of intertextuality, metatextuality and paratextuality.

This practice of intertextuality is a feature of commenting in Facebook and retweeting in Twitter, built into the logic of the system, recognized as quoting and retweeting. The song “*Moyayas Hevey Dheyshey*”, by Mezzo Mohamed, has been shared hundreds of times and uploaded into YouTube, Facebook and Soundcloud among other sources. This has been a very powerful way to extend the message of the missing journalist into the everyday lives of young Maldivians, wherever they may be. Another example involves the quoting and repetition of images. A frequently repeated photo of Rilwan was turned into a missing person poster early in the campaign. This poster has in turn been used repeatedly in posts in Facebook and Twitter, as seen in a post above; the weathering and fading of the images has become a meme for the passage of time since Rilwan’s disappearance: ‘For every faded poster, a fresh one is put up. This is the spirit to #FindMoyameehaa’. The quoting/repeating of the image has been sufficient to turn it into a text in its own right.

Aspects of paratext, those factors which help to provide access to the message, have also been transformed in the practices of using social media, becoming memes. An obvious example is to be found in the simple title of the campaign, FindMoyameehaa, which unites all of the social media forms and therefore helps the reader to bring together the content and messages in the various forms. The twitter hashtag #FindMoyameehaa is also an example of paratext, which links together thousands of tweets from many hundreds of twitter users. The phrase itself indicates that something or someone is lost or missing; something which needs to be found. The use of *Moyameehaa* is also interesting. In Maldivian culture, it is unusual to refer to someone in public by anything other than their formal name. Thus, it would have been conventionally more appropriate to refer to the missing journalist as Ahmed Rilwan Abdulla, his formal name. However, the naming conventions in Maldives are such that there would be many individuals known by this name. Instead, the name used is a nickname, the name this young man used in his blog. Thus, the meme extends its meaning, incorporating the idea that also missing is the young blogger, known in Maldives as an activist for a democratic civil society.

Photos are a key feature of social media posts. As such, they are often texts in their own right. Many of the photos incorporated in the tweets or posted on the Facebook page can be seen as paratext, illustrations of key messages, for example the photos of the event held in New York or of the Question March or other actions which have taken place. At least one of these photos has also taken on the status of a meme. It is a photo of Rilwan’s mother, with a look of grief and despair on her face, holding out her hand in a gesture of supplication and prayer. It encapsulates the sorrow of all mothers whose children disappear and who are left with no answers; further, it conveys societal outrage at her suffering and her treatment by the police and institutions of government. This example shows that in social media, textual elements can change their relationship to the original, in this case, putting the suffering of a mother at the center of attention, displacing the absence of substantiated content in the incident.

Other memes widely adopted in this social campaign are more appropriately seen as metatext, emerging from comments and focus on the lack of evidence and lack of answers from authorities. These include the Twibbon, a question mark in the Thaana script, and the naming of a public demonstration of concern the Question March (*Suvaalumarch*). Both emphasize the asking of questions which receive no response. Like the meme, FindMoyameehaa, they serve to situate the social media campaign in the contemporary Maldivian context.

Discussion

The social media campaign itself cannot be considered a human rights document. Although its origins are in the disappearance and presumed abduction of Rilwan, it is not based on the practice of witnessing which would be expected in such cases (McClintock, 2012; Guzman and Verstappen, 2003). Interestingly, witnessing was missing from other processes involved in the reporting of this disappearance, since the police did not take a statement from the person reporting an abduction, indicating that the stories told of this incident already had cast it as something happening outside of normal practices. The website, Facebook pages and tweets are unlikely to be collected by any human rights research center or library, one of the ways in which they might have been acknowledged as a human rights document.

On the other hand, the analysis using Genette’s notion of transtextuality, shows a more complex picture in the relationships of website information, Facebook posts and tweets to other texts. Two factors here are significant. The first is the possibility of significant hypertexts developing from a hypotext with relatively little content. The second is the capacity of social media to allow one type of transtextuality, in this case, paratext, to evolve into another, metatext, or one example of metatext to develop into another example in the same category.

The analysis shows that the lack of content in the original did not prevent a range of types of document developing from it, each corresponding to well-established conventions, and including ones recognizable as human rights documents. The Facebook page and use of the Twitter hashtag #FindMoyameehaa along with the website were developed originally by the family and friends of the young journalist. The posts and tweets are mostly posted by friends and acquaintances and by supporters of democratic processes, and they cannot add substantive content to the case. There are multiple audiences for the posts and tweets, including the local supporters of the campaign, supporters of the campaign based overseas, supporters of democratic processes both in Maldives and elsewhere, and champions of freedom of expression and the role of journalists in society, especially significant overseas and international organizations. The use of the @ function in Twitter identifies other intended audiences, such as the police and politicians. The collective sense emerging from these posts and tweets is of recurrent requests for answers, frustration at the lack of communication from government officials, including the police and an increasing sense of sadness and despair. In other words, the messages transmitted are ones based on emotion and lack of content, and collectively they form a hypotext which allowed hypertexts in the form of press releases, open letters, petitions, questions in Parliaments overseas and formal statements from NGOs and supra-national bodies to be written.

It is these hypertexts which can be seen as stabilizers of information (Frohmann, 2004); through them, the acknowledged practices of human rights can be demonstrated. The statements from Amnesty International statement and the UNHCR each have a series number which marks them as a unique and formal document within a large system of documentation. These and the other hypertexts are documents that would be collected by a human rights research center or library (Guzman and Verstappen, 2003). These are the documents which exist in a wider context, with the capacity to inform the Human Rights community and supporters of journalists and freedom of expression. These documents have audiences well beyond the level of friends and family and local supporters in the context of Maldives including human rights activists, members of parliament in other countries and bureaucrats and national representatives in a supra-national body.

The documentary practice can make the information contained a powerful instrument (Kosciejew, 2010 p. 223). In this social media case study, there are no forms to complete, no bureaucratic processes that lend layers of meaning to the processes of interpretation, as Kosciejew found in his exploration of the workings of apartheid South Africa. In the context of this social media campaign in Maldives, the absence of documentary practices and lack of bureaucratic processes are at the heart of the establishment of the campaign to call for action in finding the missing journalist. Yet, this lack of institutionalized documentary practices within the state has allowed the documentary practices of the campaign to develop its own power.

This social media campaign contains practices which are a powerful instrument, helping to move information both locally and globally. It would appear that while some of these practices were developed by the administrators of the website, Facebook page and the first user of the Twitter hashtag, they have been adopted, quoted, repeated and re-used by the people who post and tweet. From these practices, memes have developed (Shifman, 2013). These memes are examples of how ‘the stories we tell’ justify our understanding of documents and documentation (Frohmann, 2009). The phrase FindMoyameehaa as a meme becomes a unit of social information transmission, and allows both a common purpose or identification, the need to find the missing young man, and the framing of a political claim through the reference to the blogger and activist, the need to find a missing voice for democratic freedoms (Bennett and Segerberg, 2012). Similarly, the recurring photo of Rilwan’s sorrowing mother allows for identification through its re-use – the appeal to all parents to imagine themselves in her position, with no answers about what happened to her son. According to Gerbaudo (2015, p.1), the adoption of a Twibbon is a meme that can be seen as a mild form of political activism. The question mark Twibbon, with 2,326 supports, can be considered a political act. All three memes are vehicles for cultural meaning making which can be seen as an expression of democratic power, spreading a message which can be understood by users of social media in a global sense (Rowell, 2011, p. 14), outside of the specific context of Maldives.

Returning to Genette’s categorization of transtextuality, this study has shown that in social media, the context of the original is constantly being modified through metatexts, the Facebook posts and tweets contributed every day, and thus notions of what is paratext, that which surrounds the text and makes it more accessible, can also be transformed. Here, the title of the website, Facebook and the twitter hashtag have a dual existence as paratext and metatext, depending on whether they are used by the original creator, as a title or hashtag, or by other participants in the discussion, as a meme. This transforms the original, extending its communication to a wider audience and placing it in a broader context. Similarly, while re-tweeting is clearly an example of intertextuality at one level, on another level, it forms part of the complexity of the metatexts as stories are woven together, in telling and re-telling, commentaries and elaborations.

This transformation demonstrates a key aspect of the documentary practices in this social media campaign, with the memes being interesting examples of ‘the stories we tell’ in justifying support for action in a human rights issue where the normative practices of witnessing, recording and documenting are not possible.

Conclusion

This study has followed Skare and Lund (2014) in acknowledging that Facebook posts and tweets can be seen as both a document and not a document. It was concerned with whether a social media campaign about a missing journalists could be considered a human rights document. It is clear that the Facebook posts, tweets and website on which this social media campaign is based do not constitute a human rights document. They do not encapsulate the documentary practices of human rights notifications and witnessing. The most striking feature of them is the lacks which they represent: lack of evidence, lack of documentary practices, lack of bureaucratic processes, lack of political will and even lack of compassion towards a grieving mother. Yet, in human rights terms, these very lacks permit the creation of other documents. These documents, hypertexts as the analysis using Genette’s notion of transtextuality has shown, are ones that would unquestionably be recognized as human rights documents.

At the same time, the social media campaign has created memes, which are not human rights documents, but which strongly encapsulate the stories told around the disappearance of Rilwan, the frustration with the inaction of the police and their lack of communication and the grief shared with Rilwan’s family and friends, especially his mother. Memes may be considered ephemeral and trivial, but in the absence of evidence, in this context, they are the mechanism through which information is shared beyond the immediate location in Maldives.

This study has shown the complexities involved in categorizing and interpreting messages communicated using social media and the Internet. New analytical frames are needed to understand documents and documentation. Genette’s framing of transtextuality has been shown to be useful in identifying complex relationships among and between texts. Here in the context of social media, it has been useful in showing how one form of textuality can evolve into another as authors and audience merge into a collectivity concerned with the re-working and dissemination of a particular message. Transtextuality allows memes to be considered within this context of a multiplicity of texts, but it does not allow for a sound analysis of memes, and whether they constitute a document and if so, how that document might be understood. Further research could investigate the extent to which memes conveying lack or absence of content can constitute a document in a political context which discourages open communication.
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