The state of the world heritage

INTERVIEW
YOUSSEF CHAHINE
The Union Jack was hoisted outside UNESCO's Paris Headquarters on July 1 after a 12-year absence, at a ceremony held to mark the United Kingdom's return to the Organization it had helped to create half a century ago.

Britain's application to rejoin UNESCO had been formally unveiled in the Queen's traditional speech at the May 14 opening of Parliament.

"It's good to be back," said Ms Clare Short, Britain's Secretary of State for International Development (at left of photo), after raising the flag with Mr. Federico Mayor, UNESCO's Director-General (right). She pointed out that the speed with which the new British Government had moved to rejoin UNESCO underlined the strength of its commitment to the Organization and to the United Nations system.

"Today marks a new beginning in our relations with UNESCO," she went on. "The United Kingdom has experience in education, science, culture and communication which should be shared with UNESCO. But I must emphasize that my priority in working with the organization will be focused on the eradication of poverty and the education of the excluded."

Saluting the United Kingdom's return as a "homecoming", Mr. Mayor described the UK as "a nation summoned by its culture and traditions to contribute to UNESCO's constitutional purpose of advancing the objectives of peace and of the common welfare of humanity."
Youssef Chahine
A major Egyptian film-maker interviewed during the 1997 Cannes Festival, which honoured him with an award for his lifetime’s work.

Greenwatch
A waste-free farm by France Bequette
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Rock paintings in the Tadrart Acacus highlands (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya). Thousands of such paintings were executed in this rocky massif between 12,000 B.C. and 100 A.D. They were placed on UNESCO’s World Heritage List in 1985.
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While we were preparing this issue we often found ourselves thinking of the words uttered by André Malraux on 8 March 1960, at a ceremony held at Unesco Headquarters in Paris to mark the launching of the first International Campaign for the Preservation of the Monuments of Nubia.

Malraux's address on that occasion said admirably all that needed to be said about the emergence of humanity's new sense of responsibility for the invisible masterpieces of its heritage. It would have been impossible not to refer to this text in our introduction to the present issue. On rereading it we decided it would be best to let Malraux speak for himself.

Bahgat Elnadi and Adel Rifaat

“...‘Beauty’ has become one of our age's most potent mysteries, the inexplicable quality which brings the Egyptian masterpieces into communion with the statues of our own cathedrals, or the Aztec temples, or the Indian or Chinese grottoes; with the paintings of Cézanne and Van Gogh, with the greatest dead and the greatest living artists; with, in short, the whole treasury of the first world civilization.

“This is an immense regeneration, of which our own Renaissance will soon seem a diffident prefiguring. For the first time, men have discovered a universal language of art. We feel its influence acutely, even if we only partly understand its nature. This tremendous storehouse of art, of which we are now becoming conscious, draws its force no doubt from its...
being the most signal victory of human effort over death. To the impregnable 'nevermore' that governs the history of civilizations, this art opposes its own mysterious grandeur.

"Of the force that brought Egypt into being out of prehistoric night, nothing now remains; but the impulse which engendered these giants which are threatened today still speaks to us as clearly as the genius of the master-craftsmen of Chartres, or the genius of Rembrandt. The emotion we share with the creators of these granite statues is not even one of love, nor a common feeling for death—nor even, perhaps, a similar way of looking at their work; yet before their work, the accents of anonymous sculptors forgotten during two thousand years seem to us as much untouched by the succession of empires as the accents of mother love.

"This is what brings throngs of Europeans to exhibitions of Mexican art; of Japanese to exhibitions of French art; and millions of Americans to see Van Gogh. This is why the commemorative ceremonies of Rembrandt's death were inaugurated by the last kings of Europe, and the exhibition of our own stained glass by the brother of the last Asian emperor. This is why, Mr. Director-General⁶, so many sovereign names are associated with the appeal you are launching today.

"One could not too highly praise your having conceived a plan so magnificent and so precise in its boldness—one might say, a kind of Tennessee Valley Authority of archaeology. It is the antithesis of the kind of gigantic exhibitionism by which great modern states try to outbid each other. Nor should the well-defined object of your scheme conceal its profound significance. If UNESCO is trying to rescue the monuments of Nubia, it is because these are in imminent danger; it goes without saying that it would try to save other great ruins—Angkor or Nara, for instance—if they were similarly threatened.

"On behalf of man's artistic heritage, you are appealing to the world's conscience as others have been doing, this week, for the victims of the Agadir earthquake. 'May we never have to choose,' you said just now, 'between porphyry statues and living men!' Yours is the first attempt to deploy, in a rescue operation, on behalf of statues, the immense resources usually harnessed for the service of men. And this is perhaps because for us the survival of statues has become an expression of life.

"At the moment when our civilization divines a mysterious transcendence in art and one of the still obscure sources of its unity, at the moment when we are bringing into a single, family relationship the masterpieces of so many civilizations which knew nothing of or even hated each other, you are proposing an action which brings all men together to defy the forces of dissolution. Your appeal is historic, not because it proposes to save the temples of Nubia, but because through it the first world civilization publicly proclaims the world's art as its indivisible heritage. In days when the West believed its cultural heritage had its source in Athens, it could nonetheless look on with equanimity while the Acropolis crumbled away.

"The slow flood of the Nile has reflected the melancholy caravans of the Bible, the armies of Cambyses and Alexander, the knights of Byzantium and Islam, the soldiers of Napoleon. No doubt when the sandstorm blows across it, its ancient memory no longer distinguishes the brilliant notes of Rameses' triumph from the pathetic dust that settles again in the wake of defeated armies. And when the sand is scattered again, the Nile is once more alone with its sculpted mountains, its colossal effigies whose motionless reflection has for so long been part of its echo of eternity.

"But see, old river, whose floods allowed astrologers to fix the most ancient date in history, men are coming now, from all parts of the world, who will carry these giants far away from your life-giving, destructive waters. Let the night fall, and you will reflect again the stars under which Isis accomplished her funeral rites, the star of Rameses. But the humblest worker come to rescue the statues of Isis and Rameses will tell you something you have always known but never heard from men before: that there is only one action over which indifferent stars and unchanging, murmurous rivers have no sway: it is the action of a man who snatches something from death."
An international treaty

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) seeks to encourage the identification, protection and preservation of cultural and natural heritage around the world considered to be of outstanding value to humanity.

The idea of creating an international movement for protecting sites in other countries emerged after World War I, but the landmark event in arousing international concern was the decision to build the Aswan High Dam in Egypt, which would have flooded the valley containing the Abu Simbel temples, a treasure of ancient Egyptian civilization. In 1959, after an appeal from the governments of Egypt and Sudan, UNESCO decided to launch an international campaign, and the Abu Simbel and Philae temples were dismantled, moved to dry ground and reassembled.

The campaign cost about $80 million, half of which was donated by some fifty countries, showing the importance of nations’ shared responsibility in conserving outstanding cultural sites. Its success led to other safeguarding campaigns, e.g. for Venice in Italy, Moenjodaro in Pakistan and Borobudur in Indonesia.

Consequently, UNESCO initiated, with the help of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), the preparation of a draft convention on the protection of cultural heritage.

The idea of combining the conservation of cultural and natural sites comes from the United States. A White House Conference in Washington, D.C., in 1965 called for a “World Heritage Trust” that would stimulate international cooperation to protect “the world’s superb natural and scenic areas and historic sites for the present and the future of the entire world citizenry”. In 1968 the International Union for conservation of Nature (IUCN) developed similar proposals for its members. These proposals were presented to the United Nations Conference on Human Environment held in Stockholm (Sweden) in 1972.

Eventually, a single text was agreed upon by all parties concerned. The Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage was adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO on 16 November 1972.

Objectives

The term cultural heritage refers to monuments, groups of buildings and sites with historical, aesthetic, archaeological, scientific, ethnological or anthropological value. Natural heritage refers to outstanding physical, biological and geological formations, habitats of threatened species of animals and plants and areas with scientific, conservation or aesthetic value.

UNESCO’s World Heritage mission is to:

- encourage countries to sign the 1972 Convention and to ensure the protection of their natural and cultural heritage;
- encourage States Parties to the Convention to nominate sites within their national territory for inclusion on the World Heritage List;
- encourage States Parties to set up reporting systems on the state of conservation of World Heritage sites;
- help States Parties safeguard World Heritage sites by providing technical assistance and professional training;
- provide emergency assistance for World Heritage sites in immediate danger;
- promote the presentation of cultural and natural heritage;
- encourage international cooperation in conservation of cultural and natural heritage.

A gift from the past to the future

By signing the World Heritage Convention, countries recognize that the sites located on their national territory which have been inscribed on the World Heritage List, without prejudice to national sovereignty or ownership, constitute a world heritage “for whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to cooperate”.

Without the support of other countries, some sites with recognized cultural or natural value would deteriorate or, worse, disappear, often through lack of funding to preserve them. The Convention is thus an agreement, signed to date by 149 countries, to contribute the necessary financial and intellectual resources to protect World Heritage sites.

Sites selected for World Heritage listing are approved on
The Convention

The most significant feature of the World Heritage Convention is to link together in a single document the concepts of nature conservation and the preservation of cultural sites. It defines the kind of natural or cultural sites which can be considered for inscription on the World Heritage List, and sets out the duties of States Parties in identifying potential sites and their role in protecting and preserving them.

A World Heritage site differs from a site of national heritage by virtue of its "outstanding universal value". By signing the Convention, each country pledges to conserve not only the World Heritage sites situated on its territory, but also to protect its national heritage whether or not it is placed on the World Heritage List.

The Convention describes the function of the World Heritage Committee, how its members are elected and their terms of office; specifies the professional advisory bodies to which it can turn for advice in selecting the sites to be listed; and explains how the World Heritage Fund is to be used and managed and under what conditions international financial assistance may be provided.

How the Convention Works

The application for a site to be inscribed on the World Heritage List must come from the country itself. UNESCO makes no recommendations for listing. The application has to include a plan detailing how the site is managed and protected.

The World Heritage Committee examines nominations on the basis of technical evaluations, provided by two advisory bodies, the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN). A third advisory body, the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), provides expert advice on restoring monuments and organizes training courses.

Selection Criteria

To be included on the World Heritage List, sites must satisfy the selection criteria which are explained in a booklet entitled Operational Guidelines which, besides the text of the Convention, is the main working document on World Heritage. The criteria have been revised regularly by the Committee to match the evolution of the World Heritage concept itself.

Cultural properties should:

(i) represent a masterpiece of human creative genius, or
(ii) exhibit an important interchange of human values over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, or developments in architecture or town planning or landscape design, or
(iii) bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or has disappeared, or
(iv) be an outstanding example of a type of building or architectural or technological ensemble, or landscape which illustrates a significant stage or significant stages in human history, or
(v) be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement or land-use which is representative of a culture or cultures, especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change, or
(vi) be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas or with beliefs, or with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance (a criterion used only in exceptional circumstances, and together with other criteria).

Equally important is the authenticity of the site and the way it is protected and managed.

Natural properties should:

(i) be outstanding examples representing major stages of the earth’s history, including the record of life, significant ongoing geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features, or
(ii) be outstanding examples representing significant ongoing ecological and biological processes in the evolution and development of terrestrial, fresh water, coastal and marine ecosystems and communities of plants and animals, or
(iii) contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance, or
(iv) contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in situ conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation.

The protection, management and integrity of the site are also important considerations.

Mixed sites have both outstanding natural and cultural values. Since 1992 significant interactions between people and the natural environment have been recognized as cultural landscapes.
PROTECTION AND MONITORING

World Heritage conservation is an ongoing process. Listing a site does little good if it subsequently falls into a state of disrepair or if a development project risks destroying the qualities that made the site suitable for World Heritage status in the first place. The credibility of World Heritage stems from countries' regular reporting on the condition of sites, on measures taken to preserve them, and on their efforts to raise public awareness of cultural and natural heritage. If a country is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention, it risks having its sites deleted from the World Heritage List.

The World Heritage Committee will be alerted by individuals, non-governmental organizations, or other groups to possible dangers to a site. If the alert is justified, and the problem serious enough, the site will be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. This list is designed to call the world's attention to natural or human-made conditions which threaten the characteristics for which the site was originally inscribed on the World Heritage List. Endangered sites on this list are entitled to particular attention and emergency action.

In urgent cases, such as outbreak of war, the Committee will make the listing itself without having received a formal request.

Funding and support

The World Heritage Fund, created in 1972 by the Convention, receives its income essentially from compulsory contributions from States Parties amounting to 1 per cent of their UNESCO dues—and voluntary contributions. Other sources of income include funds-in-trust donated by countries for specific purposes and profits derived from sales of World Heritage products.

The total amount received each year is just under $3 million, a modest sum considering the magnitude of the task. The onus is very much on the World Heritage Committee to allocate funding according to the urgency of the request, which is why priority is necessarily given to the most threatened sites, including those listed as World Heritage in Danger.

The World Heritage Fund assists the States Parties in identifying and preserving World Heritage sites. The work of preparation, conservation and preservation is expensive and not all requests for international assistance can be met from the World Heritage Fund. The World Heritage Committee applies stringent conditions, and requests have to fall into clearly defined categories: preparatory assistance, technical co-operation, emergency assistance, and training.

FURTHER READING

Recent publications on sale at:
UNESCO Publishing, 1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15, France.
Tel: (33) (0)1 45 68 43 00; Fax: (33) (0)1 45 68 57 41; Internet: http://www.unesco.org/publishing.

BOOKS:
- The Unesco World Heritage Desk Diary (published annually)
- The World Heritage, a series for young people from 8 to 15 years of age
- Baalbek, by L. Abad and V. Khoury-Ghata, 1996 (in French)
- Colonia del Sacramento, by M. Cannessa de Sanguinetti, F. Assunção and A. Cravotto, 1996
- La “République” jésuite des Guaranis (1606-1768) et son héritage, by S. Abou, 1995

PERIODICALS:
- The Unesco Courier publishes each month an article on a World Heritage site.
- The World Heritage Review (quarterly) features in-depth articles on World Heritage sites.

CD-ROM:
- Les villes du patrimoine mondial, MAC/PC, 1996, 290 FF.

PUBLICATIONS DISTRIBUTED FREE OF CHARGE AT THE UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE:
- The World Heritage map (folding poster), 1997
- The World Heritage information kit, 1997
- The World Heritage List, 1997

- Brief descriptions of World Heritage sites, 1997
- The World Heritage Convention, Twenty Years On, by Léon Pressouyre, 1993
- Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 1992
- The World Heritage Newsletter (up-to-date accounts of policy-making and issues facing World Heritage)

TO ORDER OR OBTAIN FURTHER INFORMATION:
The Unesco World Heritage Centre,
7, Place de Fontenoy,
75352 Paris 07 SP, France.
Fax: (33) (0)1 45 68 55 70
E-mail: wh-info@unesco.org

All of the above documentation, and more, is available on the World Heritage Web. Visit the home page on: http://www.unesco.org/whc/. You will also find a photograph of each of the 506 sites, a calendar of forthcoming events, meetings and exhibits, as well as information on Unesco radio programmes on the world heritage. You may also consult more detailed documentation concerning the organs of the Convention, the advisory bodies and the WHC Secretariat, and the basic texts of the Committee (rules of procedure, financial regulations) as well as models of ratification and nomination forms.
Who does what?

The General Assembly

includes all States Parties to the Convention. It meets once every two years during the ordinary session of UNESCO's General Conference to elect the World Heritage Committee, to examine the statement of accounts of the World Heritage Fund and decide on major policy issues.

The World Heritage Committee

is responsible for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and has the final say on whether a site is accepted for inscription on the World Heritage List. It also examines reports on the state of conservation of listed sites, and asks States Parties to take action when sites are not being properly managed. The Committee is also responsible for allocating finance from the World Heritage Fund for sites in need of repair or restoration, for emergency action if sites are in immediate danger, for providing technical assistance and training, and for promotional and educational activities. The Committee, which meets in December each year, consists of representatives from 21 of the States Parties to the Convention. Members are elected during the UNESCO General Conference for six-year terms of office. Seven members of the Committee make up the World Heritage Bureau, a smaller executive body that prepares the work of the Committee.

The UNESCO World Heritage Centre

was set up in 1992 to assure the day-to-day management of the Convention. It organizes the annual sessions of the Bureau and Committee, provides advice to States Parties in the preparation of site nominations, organizes technical assistance upon request, and co-ordinates both reporting on the condition of sites and the emergency action undertaken when a site is threatened. It is also responsible for the administration of the World Heritage Fund. Other tasks of the Centre include arranging technical seminars and workshops, updating the World Heritage List and database, developing teaching materials to raise awareness of the World Heritage concept, and keeping the public informed of World Heritage issues. It cooperates with other groups working on issues related to conservation both within UNESCO—notably the Cultural Heritage Division in the Sector for Culture, and the Division of Ecological Sciences in the Science Sector—and on the outside, notably the three Advisory Bodies (ICOMOS, IUCN, ICCROM) and other international organizations such as the Organization of World Heritage Cities (OWHC) and the International Council of Museums (ICOM).

The World Heritage Convention, 25 years on

by Bernd von Droste

On 16 November 1997 we celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption by UNESCO's General Conference of the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. Today the Convention has been ratified by 149 States Parties, which makes it the most universal international legal instrument in the field of heritage conservation. The anniversary is an opportunity to reflect on, and critically review, its implementation.

The Convention is uniquely founded on the premise that certain natural and cultural sites are of "outstanding universal value" and form part of the common heritage of humankind. The conservation of this common heritage is of concern not just for individual nations, but for all humanity. Another unique feature of the Convention is the fact that it seeks to protect both cultural and natural heritage. In view of the many linkages between people and their environment, this holistic approach is both logical and revolutionary.

The Convention is also remarkable in that it has helped to establish systematic international co-operation in the realm of conservation. Every year the 21-member intergovernmental World Heritage Committee approves funding for emergency conservation assistance to World Heritage sites under threat, to support co-operative conservation activities at World Heritage sites around the world, for conservation training, and for preparatory work on nominations of cultural and natural sites for inclusion on the World Heritage List.

So far, 506 sites of outstanding universal value have been included on the List. Of these sites, 380 are cultural, 197 are natural, and 19 are mixed cultural and natural sites. They are located in 154 States Parties. Despite efforts to ensure a more balanced and representative World Heritage List, it is still heavily weighted towards the monumental and religious architecture of Western Europe. In future years more sites from the Arab States, from the Pacific and from Africa should be added to the List.

Part of this heritage is now threatened and considerable ingenuity and resourcefulness are required to ensure its continued survival. The challenges are ever increasing. The World Heritage Committee has included on the List of World Heritage in Danger 22 sites under extreme threat and in need of special conservation actions. There is also growing concern about the state of conservation of four sites in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and of the archaeological site of Butrinti in Albania.

Military and civil conflicts, the growth of mass tourism and uncontrolled and ill-advised development are among the factors that make it difficult to protect the extraordinary natural and cultural sites that constitute our World Heritage. In this the twenty-fifth year of the World Heritage Convention let us recall the splendour of this common heritage and participate, individually and collectively, in protecting it for the centuries to come.
Modern societies' strange knack of erasing their own traces makes the preservation of the world heritage a duty owed to memory. At a time when remembrance of things past is becoming an industry, an instrument of power, the profusion of images and information flowing in from all over the world makes our selection of them ever more arbitrary. This, paradoxically, helps to confuse our standards of judgment and weaken appreciation of our cultural diversity.

And yet it would seem that societies have never felt greater curiosity about each others' ways of life and, especially in the wealthy countries, about great monuments, places rich in historical associations, the arts, and those crafts, traditions and customs of distant peoples that are a heaven-sent boon for the tourist industry.

In Western societies, it is true, the serious exploration of other cultures, at first the preserve of certain categories such as ethnologists, historians, archaeologists and a well-heeled elite of travellers, has long been a fact of life. More recently, we have witnessed the emergence of cultural tourism—which relies for its existence on one part of the world parading its individuality for the delectation of the other part.

The birth of a notion

This is nothing new for Europe. China, India and Persia never quite disappeared from the mental landscape of a cultured few, but it was not until the beginning of the nineteenth century that Ancient Egypt burst upon the European cultural consciousness, while the Arab world only gained admittance thanks to the British obsession with the passage to India and to that concept invented by Romantic writers and painters, "the Orient" (which, incidentally, began at Greece). As for the Amerindian heritage, it only gained recognition in this century, when indigenous peoples began to lay claim to a political existence. African and Oceanian cultures constitute a paradox in the sense that the West has failed to...
put the art and culture of those regions in a historical perspective, although they have had for a century a strong hold on the Western imagination.

It was not until the United Nations was set up and many new countries achieved independence that UNESCO’s work led to the emergence of the notion of a world cultural heritage as a manifestation of the equal dignity of all cultures and to acceptance of the idea that the international community as a whole had a duty to preserve that heritage.

The first thing that had to be done was to draw up a list of that heritage, to display to humanity at large evidence of the splendour of all its component parts. The next step was to explain the background situation, making it clear that there were all sorts of dangers from which it was essential to safeguard the world heritage—not only age and neglect but also war and the destructive fury of those who deny other cultures, past or present, the right to exist. Other, no less serious, threats that at present hang over the heritage include industrial pollution and the feeding frenzy of property developers that is eating away at the world’s major tourist sites.

The non-material heritage

As deeper thought has been given to the world’s different cultures, it has come to be realized that not all of them found material expression in major works, and that a whole area of humanity’s cultural heritage is invisible because it resides in the human mind. For this reason, some cultures such as those of the nomadic peoples of North America or the steppes of Eurasia who for the most part produced only small artifacts, long went unrecorded. It should also be said that, pace Malraux, the production of everyday articles, clothing, domestic utensils and so on is not a matter of reproduction, not involving the kind of creativity that goes into the art produced for the court or for religious celebrations, but embodies a universe of signs that do not need to be ostentatious in order to carry meaning.

Nor can the cultural heritage of any given society be reduced to its material forms. This question first arose in relation to societies whose lore and skills, as well as the memory of their ancestors, were concentrated in the oral tradition. It thus came to be understood that the patrimony of any culture is not only an inheritance from the past but also preserves, through changing circumstances, some of its most lasting models and points of reference. The concept of a non-material heritage thus merges into that of culture as “the whole complex of spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features that characterize a society or social group” and which “includes not only the arts and letters but also ways of life, the
fundamental rights of the human being, value systems, traditions and beliefs”.

The force of change

To this definition, which came out of the Mexico City World Conference on Cultural Policies (1982), should be added that which, in each culture, explains its dynamism, the force of change within it, and the importance of the influences it undergoes and the intercultural exchanges in which it participates, not forgetting the changes that all cultures are experiencing today as a result of the worldwide spread of a global model of development1.

Whereas daily life in “modern” societies is supposed to be governed solely by the tastes and wishes of individuals (it being considered inappropriate for the authorities or the wider community to interfere in such matters), private life in traditional societies is strongly influenced by the community’s rules. It may be true that few purely traditional societies still exist, but of those that do, many are still far removed from the models of social and cultural behaviour that the elites of the countries of the North regard as self-evident. Any high-handed attempt to change these societies’ values could not only fail in its avowed aims but, more seriously, could sap their energy and take away their freedom to choose their own paths to fulfilment.

It has to be acknowledged that human beings are the most important monuments of the cultures to which they belong, and the relevant conclusion should be drawn. The real common heritage of humanity is its creative diversity.

How France became aware of its heritage

In the last twenty years or so, the concept of "heritage" has expanded—or rather exploded—to the point where it has become transformed. Thus, while older dictionaries define it primarily as that which is passed on, e.g. from parents to children, a more recent definition refers also to "the evidence of the past...considered collectively as the inheritance of present-day society".

In France, this idea grew up around that of the "historic monument", itself a notion inherited from the French Revolution. It acquired official status in the early 1830s and was then given a legal definition by a system of listing and preservation that was voted into law in 1913. Historic monuments, the Roman aqueduct known as the Pont du Gard, for instance, or Chartres cathedral, were seen as irrefutable evidence of an ever-present past, acknowledged as such by the nation and therefore designated as representative of the national identity.

This state-run, centralized system of "listing" monuments, which in fact amounted to a takeover by the public authorities, survived with various ups and downs until the mid-1970s. Then the deluge began, with the emergence of an ethnological and rural heritage. A significant event in this connection was the opening, in 1967, of the Museum of Popular Arts and Traditions in Paris. Since then, the ground covered by the concept of the heritage has constantly expanded in three major directions: to include the contemporary, in response to the interest in industrial archaeology and the nineteenth century in general, an awareness of which was stimulated by the demolition of Les Halles, the covered food markets built by Victor Baltard in Paris in the middle...
The château of Chenonceaux, an outstanding example of 16th-century French architecture, was built between 1515 and 1522 on the right bank of the River Cher.

years of that century; to take in the daily life of bygone times, the evidence of a world—of dances, songs, cookery and crafts—that was swept away forever by the winds of change in the years between the late 1940s and the mid-1970s (corresponding to what French economist Jean Fourastié has called the “Thirty Glorious Years of Growth”); and to embrace the non-artistic and non-historic—the natural heritage, the heritage of science and technology and that of traditions and folklore.

A silent transition

This snowballing of the concept has entailed enormous psychological and financial investment in the economy and in tourism. It has been accompanied by a silent but decisive transition from “national history” to “national memory”, i.e. from a historical to a social awareness of the nation. In concrete terms, this shift reflects a kind of emancipation, or perhaps it would be better to say an “internal decolonization”, of such sub-groups within society as manual workers, provincials (Corsicans or Bretons, for example), women or Jews who, because they are becoming more and more fully integrated into the nation as a whole, have a heightened awareness of their past and regard every item of evidence of that past as an indispensable pointer to their identity.

This change is well illustrated by the recent emergence and proliferation of what in France are known as “museums of society”—a pipe museum and a clog museum, for instance—which aim to preserve the memory of a particular industry or local product. The heritage is no longer simply the representation of an idea held by society as a whole. It increasingly tends to be linked to the identity of a given sector within society, a social group that demands to be recognized and registered as “national” and that has ceased to perceive itself in cultural terms alone.

This exponential growth in the area covered by the concept of the heritage clearly reflects a thoroughgoing democratization process and a constant proliferation of the forms in which it finds expression. Crucial as it is, this change lends itself to a linear explanation as the logical culmination of one of those long-term movements that art historians have taught us to decipher.

This movement could be seen as a stage-by-stage process, with first the establishment of a religious heritage (the Church’s relics and treasures), followed by an aristocratic one (stately homes, weapons, textiles) and next the heritage of monarchs and scholars, itself scholarly in character, with its libraries, its manuscripts and its histories of religious orders. Then came the decisive stage, from the confiscation of Church property at the time of the Revolution to the establishment, under the July Monarchy, of major institutions concerned with the heritage. It was at this stage that the concept of heritage really came into being, i.e. that of property not in use for its original purpose but acquiring a totally different kind of use by virtue of its antiquity, and it was also at this stage that the nation would provide the frame of reference for the “togetherness” of the community. This stage was continued into, or rather brought to fulfilment in, its successor, when the idea of the “national” still prevailed but was regulated and given a civic, republican character. This in turn led to, and achieved fruition in, international organizations such as the League of Nations and UNESCO, which have done so

The baroque façade of the cathedral of Our Lady of Las Mercedes in Antigua (Guatemala). The city, which is noted for its superb monuments, was founded in the 16th century and was placed on the World Heritage List as a cultural site in 1979.
much to disseminate the global concept of heritage. Thus we have come to the democratic, community-based, psychologically significant heritage as we know it today.

**An aura of sanctity**

May we then conclude that awareness of the heritage has progressed uninterruptedly? In point of fact, as we well know, quite different factors are involved in the present runaway expansion of the heritage. It is taking us over a threshold and into a new set of circumstances. We have moved on from a heritage simply handed down to us to a symbolic heritage linked with the notion of identity, from a visible and material heritage to an invisible and non-material heritage, and from a state-controlled heritage to a social, ethnic and community-based heritage. To borrow the language of relativity theory, we have moved from a “special” heritage system to a “general” one, in other words from the age of heritage as history to that of heritage as memory.

In this process, the nature and status of the heritage have changed. The heritage now belongs to the same constellation of ideas as memory, identity and culture, and in democratic societies has become the secular equivalent of sanctity.

All countries, whether democratic or not, are feeling this increasingly powerful concern for their cultural property, the only differences being in rates of progress, in degrees of urgency and in the vocabulary employed. The example of France is valid because it makes the evolution of the concept particularly easy to follow for two major reasons.

The first of these reasons derives from the close relationship established by the Enlightenment between the ideas of the nation and of civilization, the nation’s existence being justified by the fact that it is the vehicle of progress and the instrument of civilization. At the watershed of the French Revolution, the preservation of the monuments of the ancien régime and of the achievements of civilization were thus promoted with equal vigour. The French politician and historian François Guizot may rightly be seen as a key figure in this respect: in his *History of Civilization in Europe*, he saw the intellectual merit of the Restauration as residing in “the reawakening of appreciation of France’s ancient monuments”.

The second of these reasons derives from the long history of state power in France and its centralizing, Jacobin tradition, which, via a forceful national conservation policy, has made the recent transition to cultural and community-based conservation all the more striking. A kind of “French model” may thus be discerned within the overall evolution of the heritage concept. This is not so surprising, since in the French language the very word for “heritage”—*patrimoine*—contains within itself, for better or worse, the word *patrie*—“homeland”.

*Period houses, furniture, gardens and workshops bring the colonial period back to life at Williamsburg, Virginia (U.S.A.).*
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Cultural landscapes

BY DAVID LOWENTHAL □

A new category of World Heritage sites shaped by a blend of human and natural forces

Landscapes are all around us, and it is a daunting task to set workable yardsticks for gauging and protecting them. The task is all the more difficult because each culture views landscapes through different lenses. A coherent idea of cultural landscapes has nonetheless emerged under UNESCO's guidance. Global evaluative criteria, consistent yet flexibly workable, specify three distinct cultural landscape types:

- clearly defined and intentionally created sites (e.g., gardens like those of Aranjuez in Spain, Versailles in France, and Olmsted and Vaux's Central Park in New York);
- organically evolved locales (e.g., the enditched Somerset Levels and the stone-walled Yorkshire Dales in England, the river-fronting arable strips of the Côtes-de-Beauvoir in the St. Lawrence Valley of Quebec, Canada, and agricultural palimpsests like the rice terraces of Luzon in the northern Philippines);
- associative sites (e.g., sacred and commemorative places like Uluru in Australia, Tongariro in New Zealand, and Ghana's sacred groves).

Many sites embody more than one such type, depending on the perceiver. To most visitors the Grand Canyon of Arizona is a wonder of nature, whereas many Native Americans view it as a sacred site.

As well as possessing a complex and con-
continuing mix of nature and culture, landscapes differ from other World Heritage sites in several ways. They are by their very nature extensive, occupying more terrain than sites devoted purely to the built heritage. While some cultural landscapes are selected for their spectacular uniqueness, many are even more treasured as representative, embodying qualities that typify human impress over sizeable regions, even over subcontinental areas. Whereas built heritage sites are generally chosen as masterpieces and repositories of high art, landscapes tend to have a broader, more universal appeal.

**A vast mosaic**

These traits make it hard to decide which landscapes to select for inscription. Landscape boundaries are difficult to circumscribe, landscape features multiform and fluid, ever evolving, and subject to periodic change. Every landscape is unique. But it is their representativeness, rather than their uniqueness, that makes most landscapes globally important. Yet to select for global recognition even a sample of the world’s representative landscapes, let alone to demarcate, describe, and protect them, would be impracticable if not impossible. Landscapes already listed or in process of being so are, in truth, tokens of a much larger assemblage of sites that deserve attention and care.

**A difficult choice**

Today cultural landscapes are widely cherished. But their widespread appeal raises another problem of selection. Can we envisage how the inscription of a relatively small number of landscapes “of universal value” will affect all the rest? Unhappily, the listing of a few, whether chosen as uniquely spectacular or as ideally representative, now sometimes signals to governments and entrepreneurs that they are at liberty to do as they wish with any landscape not on the list, and hence deemed to be of lesser aesthetic, historical, and social import. Yet the most modest locales embody profound meaning for folk indigenous to or otherwise familiar with them. And routes linking particular places—the pilgrim tracks of medieval Christians; the desert pathways, invisible to others, of Australian Aborigines; the trails of such explorers as Lewis and Clark in the American West—likewise enshrine essential memories.

In short, in cherishing some landscapes we must endeavour to treat them not as the only locales worth conserving, but as tokens representative of much of the rich diversity of the entire globe. A sense of connection with all these peopled and storied places enriches and humanizes life the world over.

**Universal appeal**

Heritage today is increasingly seen not merely as the property of individual states but as the rightful legacy of all humankind. Of no aspects of heritage is this more true than of its landscapes. Not only are landscapes no respecters of political boundaries; their inherent worth applies alike to natives and to those who love them—and often visit them—from afar. Indeed, the world’s most famed landscapes have achieved their fame largely through the
devoted study, delineation, and stewardship of foreign artists and savants.

Indeed, experience suggests that the universal appeal of landscapes particularly commends them to global care. Insofar as they are in large measure the creations of nature, however much altered and improved by human occupation, they are less vulnerable to nationalist exclusivity than are purely cultural sites and relics. It is often the case that landscapes perceived as of universal value have been protected by concerns voiced internationally. For example, designation by UNESCO enabled the Australian government to rescue the southwestern Tasmanian temperate rainforest, along with its archaeological traces, from destructive development.

Just as all the peoples of the world depend for their physical survival on the shared management of the global environment, so does their spiritual well-being require responsible stewardship of global landscapes. Such landscapes enrich those who admire them from afar, those who may indeed never visit but only envisage them, no less than those for whom they are local or national homelands.

Ancient and modern.

These huge stone slabs silhouetted against the horizon at Stonehenge in Wiltshire (United Kingdom) were erected in neolithic times (3rd-2nd millennium B.C.) and form one of the world’s most impressive megalithic monuments. Stonehenge, Avebury and related sites were added to the World Heritage List in 1986.
The problem of reconciling the safeguarding of cultural sites of historic interest with the creation of a new, vital architecture is one that is peculiar to our own times. For centuries, indeed for thousands of years, buildings of various kinds were erected in a medley of styles without any thought being given to respect for the past. While the attraction of some sites lies in their homogeneity and harmony, the Place des Vosges in Paris, for instance, the Piazza del Campidoglio in Rome or the Campo in Siena, the charm of many cities such as Prague, Venice, Naples or Rome resides precisely in the way that a wide variety of buildings stand there side by side. The fact that such contrasts fail to shock us may perhaps be due to our awareness that, behind the appearance of dissimilarity, there is an underlying unity to the architectural heritage. We are conscious that, between the Doric column and the buildings of Andrea Palladio or Christopher Wren, between the Roman basilica, Istanbul's Hagia Sophia and Romanesque art, and between the Pantheon, St Peter's in Rome and St Paul's Cathedral in London, there are just as many ties of kinship and continuity as there are breaks in tradition. However much they may differ or even clash, the successive styles somehow fit in with one another and get along together. It is worth remembering...
that until the nineteenth century respect for the heritage was unknown in Europe. Our forebears had no hesitation on religious, political or aesthetic grounds in building a cathedral in the middle of the mosque of Córdoba or knocking down the Louvre of Charles V to create the Cour carrée, which they did with a kind of “innocence” quite devoid of scruples about the heritage.

Attitudes have changed. We have gradually come to appreciate the irreplaceable value of what we have inherited from the past, a realization that has become global in scale with the “world heritage” concept that UNESCO has succeeded in putting across. There is, however, another reason for this shift in outlook. Since the end of the last century, art in all its forms has undergone a number of radical
changes which aesthetic factors alone cannot fully explain. Industrial, urban civilization has profoundly altered the design and structure of towns as well as construction techniques and materials.

### Changing attitudes

The results have been twofold: on the one hand, the wholesale destruction of monuments and sites at the very time when a consciousness of the heritage—at first concerned only with preserving major buildings of symbolic significance—was emerging; and on the other, the untimely onslaught of materials and forms that clashed with those of the past—steel, concrete and glass giving birth to a radically different kind of architecture, contrasting utterly with the buildings that have come down to us from former times.

It is for this reason that several opposing attitudes are represented in the modern approach to this issue. One consists in regarding certain sites, monuments or groups of buildings as sacrosanct and not tolerating any visible assertion of modernity. This is the case with the château of Versailles and with some cities that were destroyed by war, such as Warsaw, Nuremberg or Rouen, and have been rebuilt as faithful copies of their old selves.

Another attitude is to advocate a type of construction that is in keeping with, or even a...
pastiche of, that which already exists. A third, conversely, is openly in favour of a dialogue between past and present buildings. There is, unfortunately, a fourth attitude, which I have no hesitation in calling indifferent or ignorant and which is the one that has done the greatest harm to certain grand urban vistas, as in the case of Brussels, London and Paris.

Contrasting styles

The deliberate confrontation of ancient and modern can come in various forms. The new building can be discreetly fitted in: the audience chamber created for Paul VI in the Vatican by Pier Luigi Nervi is uncompromisingly modern in form but crouches in the shadow of St Peter's without having the slightest detrimental effect on that august site. By contrast, while the Pompidou Centre makes an assertive statement in the heart of old Paris, its proportions are in keeping with those of the buildings massed around it, and the piazza in front of it provides a smooth transition between it and its surroundings at the same time as being a successful urban space. Another, less controversial, example in France is Norman Foster's Carré d'art in Nîmes. It faces the Roman temple known as the Maison carrée, but far from overwhelming it, seems to converse with it across two thousand years. In Germany, the Ludwig-Wallraf museums at the foot of Cologne cathedral do not flaunt themselves in any such face-to-face encounter, but give the impression that they were designed with this juxtaposition in mind.

The case of the Pei pyramid in the forecourt of the Louvre is a more subtle one. Classical in form, it might appear, though functional, to be incongruous in such a setting, but in fact its metal and glass construction, all reflections and transparencies, lends a bold and at the same time unassuming new touch to the classical façades of the palace. The same architect was successful in harmoniously integrating a new wing into the National Gallery in Washington. On another level, certain sensitively-sited major civil engineering projects such as the Golden Gate Bridge in San Francisco or the Pont de Normandie in the Seine estuary manage to blend in admirably, thanks to the elegance and refinement of their forms.

In the past, the juxtaposition of styles may have been a happy coincidence. In our own times a construction in a contrasting style runs the serious risk of affronting the eye and striking a discordant note—unless, that is, the juxtaposition is carefully thought out and modern architects, for all their boldness, show themselves willing to accept with a kind of humility the constraints imposed by the presence of such prestigious and awe-inspiring neighbours. If they do this, there is every chance that posterity will be grateful to them for enriching the heritage of the centuries.
20th-century art and architecture are still without their rightful place in the heritage listings

The Modern Movement

BY MARIEKE KUIPERS

The heritage of the period since the industrial revolution, especially that of the twentieth century, is still barely represented on the World Heritage List. It is hard for the recent heritage to compete on equal terms with prestigious works from the more distant past, and it is also particularly difficult to make a well-considered choice from such a vast field.

In addition, the use of experimental building techniques and materials such as iron, reinforced concrete, steel-framed windows and various kinds of cladding gives rise to new conservation problems that have yet to be solved. Some recent buildings and neighbourhoods have not been critically evaluated. They may be in bad condition or have been radically altered; in some cases they are associated with the destruction of monuments and sites of previous ages.

On the eve of the new millennium, it is high time to regard twentieth century architecture as part of our heritage and to protect it. Fortunately, interest in this new category is growing, as shown by a number of recent nominations for the World Heritage List.

A thematic approach

As of today the List contains properties in 108 states. To achieve a well balanced selection it would be a good idea to introduce a certain thematic approach, especially within the vast field of twentieth-century heritage. Three international specialist organizations are currently...
working towards this goal. An International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) working group is studying Art Nouveau buildings dating from around 1900, which often incorporate decorative ironwork, curved lines and floral patterns (e.g. the Casa Milà and the “Guëll Palace” designed by Antoni Gaudi in Barcelona, Spain). The International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage (TICCIH) is studying the industrial heritage (e.g. Ironbridge, in the United Kingdom). And DOCOMOMO is working on the functionalist heritage of the Modern movement.5

**Functionalist architecture**

As well as the Bauhaus sites in Weimar and Dessau (Germany), which were included in 1996, two other modernist sites already feature on the World Heritage List: the serene Woodlands cemetery in Stockholm (Sweden) designed by Erik Gunnar Asplund (1918-1940), and the capital of Brazil, Brasilia, which was inaugurated in 1960. More nominations, however, can be expected, including that of the Schröderhuis in Utrecht (Netherlands), a fine example of De Stijl architecture built in 1924 by Gerrit Rietveld.

The Modern Movement is still influential today by virtue of its fundamentally innovative and international character and its concentration on the essential functions of a building instead of merely its outer appearance. Functionalism, which originated in Europe at the beginning of the twentieth century, had its heyday during the 1920s and 1930s and soon spread across the Americas and elsewhere. Its rapid expansion was made possible by collective action and organizations such as CIAM, whose international congresses were attended by architects and town planners, and by magazines, exhibitions, world-wide commissions and emigration.

The international figures associated with the Bauhaus also played an important role in the spread of modernist ideas on all aspects of design. With its dynamic composition of clear, flat roofed blocks, its spectacular and artistic use of a curtain-glass-wall and its wealth of carefully designed interior and exterior details (including furnishings and colouring), the white plastered building built by Walter Gropius in Dessau (1925-1926) might be regarded as a modern work of total art (Gesamtkunstwerk) and a characteristic example of functionalist, almost abstract architecture.

Modernist architects combined idealism and rationalism and tried wholeheartedly to improve living and working conditions by...
From its premises in Weimar and then in Dessau (Germany), the Bauhaus School revolutionized contemporary architecture and aesthetics between 1919 and 1933. Left, the glass-fronted Bauhaus school in Dessau (1925-1926), designed by Walter Gropius. Below left, the stairwell of the school. The Bauhaus and its sites in Weimar and Dessau were included on the World Heritage List as a cultural site in 1996.

using the resources of modern architecture. They were particularly interested in housing schemes and urban planning—in some cases working on entirely new towns. They introduced new types of housing, including high-rise apartment blocks, and sought a new aesthetic, expressing function and construction in a pure and poetic style without any reference to the past.

These models of modernity now have historic value, and at least a selective group of them are worth conservation as examples of our varied world heritage.

IN YOUTHFUL HANDS
by Ingunn Kvistersøy

Are you good-natured, respectful and respected, humble, tolerant, courageous, unselfish, confident, educated, dynamic, reasonable, diplomatic, intelligent and young in mind and body? If you are all of these things, then why not become a “Patrimonito”—a young heritage guardian—and take part in Unesco’s Young People’s Participation in World Heritage Preservation and Promotion project?

Patrimonito—the name is the diminutive of the Spanish word for “heritage”—is a smiling cartoon character designed on the basis of the World Heritage logo to symbolize young people’s involvement in heritage preservation. He was invented by Spanish-speaking participants in a media workshop organized during the first global World Heritage Youth Forum, held in June 1995 in Bergen (Norway). And because Patrimonito is a catchy-sounding word, it—and he—was enthusiastically adopted by other language groups at the Forum. By the time a regional World Heritage Youth Forum was held a year later at Victoria Falls (Zimbabwe), Patrimonito had really caught on.

The idea behind his creation originated in 1994. After working closely with leading architects, archaeologists, jurists and historians from many countries, Unesco felt that the time had come to get young people involved in protecting the World Heritage. Twenty-five countries worldwide were invited to take part. Unesco proposed a challenging task. The countries were invited to run projects, teach history, geography, science, religion, language and literature from a World Heritage point of view, organize visits to sites and museums and use the students’ creative potential in the arts.

After that first year teacher and student representatives of the twenty-five countries were invited to attend the Bergen Youth Forum and swap their experiences.

Both students and teachers handed out plenty of advice to Unesco on the development of its World Heritage Education (WHE) project, and Unesco adjusted its programme accordingly. In the next two years efforts were made to involve more countries in the scheme, regional gatherings for participating students and teachers were held and produced regional action plans, and WHE teaching materials were developed to cover such issues as identity, peace, environmental questions and tourism.

In 1996 two regional forums were held, one in Dubrovnik (Croatia), the other at Victoria Falls (Zimbabwe). Encouraging students and teacher trainers to become involved, providing WHE teaching materials, organizing youth forums and strengthening national capacities are part of an overall strategy that links Unesco’s standard-setting and instrumental roles. It is helping to provide young people with the knowledge, skills, attitudes and commitment to preserve World Heritage for future generations.
The implementation of the World Heritage Convention is based on the definition of the cultural and natural heritage enshrined in Article 1 of the Convention. This definition is amplified by the criteria set forth in a booklet entitled "Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention".

To some extent the indivisibility of nature makes it easy to choose "natural" sites. "Cultural" sites are another matter. The Convention is open to all the world's cultures and civilizations, and this allows for considerable latitude in the interpretation of the definition and the criteria.

According to the Convention, "the following shall be considered as 'cultural heritage':

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

The Convention thus takes into consideration a wide range of possible cases, monumental and otherwise, but when it comes down to it, "monumentalism" and "aesthetics" often take precedence over the significance of a given site. As one ethnologist has written,
"What justification is there for allowing aesthetic and museological criteria, which are always extraneous, to take precedence over the obvious fact, which can furthermore be verified by looking at the way local societies function on an everyday basis, that a 'nasty' pile of mud coated with dried blood, sticky feathers and broken eggshells often constitutes a 'fetish' more powerful—and doubtless no less rich in spiritual significance—than a superb statue which we regard as 'artistic'?" For whom do we make listings and what criteria do we use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Arab States</th>
<th>Asia and the Pacific</th>
<th>Europe (including U.S.A. and Canada)</th>
<th>Latin America and the Caribbean</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani (left) and Songo Mnara (United Republic of Tanzania) were added to the World Heritage List as a cultural site in 1981. The merchants of Kilwa controlled much Indian Ocean trade from the 13th to the 16th centuries.

The Maya ceremonial centre of Bonampak (600-950 A.D.) in Mexico's Chiapas State, is famed for its murals (detail, right), which vividly depict the life of a small Maya community in the 8th century.

An answer to these questions emerges from a statistical reading of requests for inscription on the World Heritage List, and subsequent acceptances and rejections. Rather than strengthening the universality and unity of the world, the current trend tends to magnify a certain division between countries. There are those which can claim to contribute to universality—and the number of their sites included on the List proves it (see Table 1).
Table 2: PERCENTAGES OF LISTED AND REJECTED SITES BY CATEGORY AND BY REGION 1992-1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Cultural listed</th>
<th>Natural listed</th>
<th>Mixed listed</th>
<th>Total listed</th>
<th>Cultural non-listed</th>
<th>Natural non-listed</th>
<th>Mixed non-listed</th>
<th>Total non-listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabes States</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and Caribbean</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others have only a single site on the List, or none at all. There are also countries which are not Parties to the Convention.

Is this breakdown accidental or does it arise from subtle forms of discrimination? Since 1978, the first year when listings were made, there has been a striking preponderance of sites from countries of the so-called "North". This preponderance, which diminished in relative terms between 1984 and 1989, has again been increasing since 1990. Since 1992, the increase in listed European sites has continued, and has actually become more noticeable because of a slowdown in listing for the other regions.

Between 1992 and 1996, 54 per cent of all sites nominated and not added to the List were European, as were 59 per cent of the sites listed during the same period. European countries thus submit more nominations than all the other regions put together and also garner more listings than they do. Table 2 clearly illustrates this trend.

There are several reasons for this growing imbalance. Firstly, the criteria for inclusion on the list are interpreted in a special way: monumentality or visible representativity are regarded as self-evident criteria. These qualities are less easily perceived in a cultural site in the Pacific region than in a Greek or Roman site.

But other reasons are to be found upstream. Thirty-seven UNESCO Member States have still not adhered to the Convention—including fifteen from Africa south of the Sahara, nine from Asia and the Pacific (eight Pacific islands), six from Latin America and the Caribbean, four from the Arab States and three only from the European region.

Before a site can be nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List, it must already feature on its country’s national inventory of heritage properties, which is itself deposited with the Convention Secretariat according to a set formula. Nomination dossiers, which have been improved since the early years of the Convention, are becoming increasingly complex and call for information which is increasingly difficult to provide. Their preparation calls for technical skills and administrative capacities that are not everywhere available. This penalizes the developing countries.

For several years, efforts have been made by the Committee and the Secretariat to help
these countries to make their national inventories, but the impact of these efforts is limited, on the one hand by the conditions necessary for protection and conservation, on the other by the difficulty of applying criteria of authenticity, representativity and universality to physical representations produced by minority civilizations and cultures.

The big gap between the amounts allocated by the Committee and the amounts of approved requests (see Table 3) is bewildering. At the beginning of June almost $220,000 (over 70 per cent of the available amount) were left for preparatory assistance, and the rate of use of the total approved by the Committee is 37.1 per cent. While the Convention should be rigorously implemented, it should not become an instrument of exclusion or division. New, increased resources should be deployed to obviate this risk.

Table 3: FUNDING ALLOCATED BY THE COMMITTEE FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE AND REQUESTS APPROVED FROM JANUARY TO MAY 1997 (IN $)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total granted for 1997</th>
<th>Africa States</th>
<th>Arab States</th>
<th>Asia and Pacific</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>Latin America and the Caribbean</th>
<th>Amounts approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,422</td>
<td>19,100</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>745,000</td>
<td>184,000</td>
<td>44,700</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td>35,630</td>
<td>184,150</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>57,500</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>119,600</td>
<td>81,500</td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,445,000</td>
<td>283,000</td>
<td>67,200</td>
<td>180,600</td>
<td>134,552</td>
<td>241,250</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between the mid-10th and the early 14th centuries a magnificent series of temples were built at Khajuraho (Madhya Pradesh state, central India), a capital of the Chandella Rajput dynasty. Around 20 have survived. This group of monuments, a cultural site added to the World Heritage List in 1986, constitutes an outstanding synthesis of the architecture and ornamental carving of its period. Right, the temple of Visvanatha.
The North-South gap

The South and the North face different problems and defend different interests when protecting and presenting sites included on the World Heritage List.

In the North, a variety of organizations hope that the state will protect listed sites against the encroachments of tourism. The countries of the South, on the other hand, hope that inscription on the List will make their sites better known, attract more visitors and generate more tourist revenue.

Other problems arise in East European countries where economies dominated for decades by the state are in the throes of transition to the market economy. These countries are creating models of privatization without historical precedent. In this context, some organizations of civil society are doing all they can to obtain stronger state guarantees for the protection of cultural and natural treasures, while others are calling on the state to relax its influence and control. Lack of funds is complicating matters further. In this situation, sale to foreign buyers sometimes seems to be unavoidable.

The practice of selling off certain national properties seems to be gaining ground everywhere, raising the question that in the long term it may weaken the fabric of national life. These properties must be given legal protection. But here too, the answers given differ under different systems of governance. In the North attempts are made to draw up legal regulations that are both detailed and global in scope, whereas in the South the trend is to guarantee certain basic rights. These two attitudes are difficult to reconcile. Let us take the example of two national parks.

Yellowstone Park (United States) attracts so many tourists that in 1995 the World Heritage Committee put the Park on the list of World Heritage in Danger. But is radically reducing the number of visitors the best solution? It would mean that only a minority of privileged people would have access to this natural treasure. What about the rest? Would they have to make do with photos, films, the Internet, virtual reality?

How can we accept discrimination between a minority with the opportunity to enjoy direct experience of sites of universal value and the overwhelming majority which would be excluded from this experience?

The Virunga animal reserve, on the border between Rwanda and the former Zaïre, is a national park which has been invaded by starving refugees from the Rwandan tragedy. Guards protecting the wild animals against poachers have wondered whether they should use their weapons against starving people to protect animals belonging to endangered species or whether they should help the refugees to capture them.

The author has no easy answer. But he would like to believe that the collective wisdom of international organizations, based on freedom and solidarity, will make it possible to find solutions.
The rock carvings in Tanum in northern Bohuslan (Sweden), were added to the World Heritage List in 1994, as an outstanding example of Bronze Age art in Europe. The composition of some of the panels, notably those at Fossum (right), is highly complex and elaborate.

When a site is placed on the World Heritage List, that is not the end of the story. If it is to stay on the List, the characteristics and qualities that justified its inscription must be preserved.

This means monitoring not only changes that directly affect listed monuments and sites but also changes in their management and upkeep. Knowledge derived from monitoring is the necessary basis for a dialogue between national heritage authorities and UNESCO. The chief beneficiaries of such a process are the managers and other professionals who shoulder the day-to-day responsibilities for world heritage sites. It is they who are, or should be, the most closely involved in discussions about monitoring.

Managing a world heritage property is an ever-changing task that calls not only for special knowledge of the site but for awareness of what is going on around it and in society at large. Site managers must always be ready to cope with new situations such as the introduction of facilities for tourists, changes in land-use or threats from pollution from industrial plants or cars. Positive developments also need to be monitored. Co-operation with local people can, for instance, open new possibilities for site protection and for participation in tourism based on cultural values. Increased interest from researchers can help to explain cultural values and counteract threats to them.

It is often hard to detect changes on a day-to-day basis, and those in charge of listed sites need help. They need tools that will enable them to check whether site management and maintenance comply with commitments made when the site was accepted for inclusion on the World Heritage List.

A regular follow up and monitoring system can be such a tool, providing a fine-tuning mechanism for the overhaul of existing management plans and the preparation of action programmes for the future. Such a system could also lead to a constructive national and international exchange of experience about conservation methods and standards that would increase awareness of the values of our common heritage.

The Nordic countries have a tradition of co-operation on matters of mutual interest. This general rule, which applies to the selection of sites for the World Heritage List, has been extended to include monitoring since the foundation of the Nordic World Heritage Office in Oslo (Norway), and a plan for a systematic survey of the Nordic items on the List is now being drawn up. Once implemented, it should stimulate greater public interest in the cultural heritage and encourage a feeling of responsibility for it.
Sacred mountains are the World Heritage sites that enshrine the highest physical and spiritual values. For many the sight of a distant peak looming over lowlands, floating above the clouds, reaching towards the stars, awakens the spirit, evoking intimations of divine mystery and splendour. As the highest features of the landscape, mountains have naturally become associated with the highest values and aspirations of cultures and religious traditions around the world.

Sacred mountains on the World Heritage List range from the wild, uninhabited glaciers of Mount St. Elias on the remote border between the Yukon and Alaska to the densely populated buildings and streets of Jerusalem centred around the Temple mount. Cultural monuments such as Angkor and Borobudur in Southeast Asia are based on architectural representations of a mythical mountain at the centre of the universe in Buddhist and Hindu cosmology. Two of the first three World Heritage sites to receive the new designation of Associative Cultural Landscapes—landscapes whose natural elements have powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations—are sacred mountains: Uluru in Australia and Tongariro in New Zealand.

Sacred mountains highlight some of the most impressive natural landscapes on the World Heritage
Ayers Rock (Australia), the sacred mountain of Australian Aborigines. This spectacular monolith in central Australia is part of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, which also contains another exceptional geological formation, Mount Olga, and several unique desert ecosystems. (Natural and cultural site, 1987, 1994).

Mount Athos (Greece), a rocky promontory jutting into the Aegean Sea from the peninsula of Chalcidice has been a centre of Orthodox Christian spirituality since the 11th century. Today the "Holy Mountain" consists of some 20 monasteries and 700 houses, cells and hermitages. Its school of painting influenced the history of Orthodox art. (Natural and cultural site, 1988).

List—from the red dome of Uluru, the largest isolated rock in the world, to the summit of Mount Everest, the highest point on earth. Mountain sites such as Nanda Devi National Park in India, Kilimanjaro National Park in Africa and Hawaii Volcanoes National Park contain some of the most diverse environments and ecosystems found anywhere on the planet: rivers, lakes, jungles, forests, deserts, grasslands, tundra, lava flows and glaciers.

Many sacred mountains on the World Heritage List preserve cultural as well as natural treasures. Orthodox Christian monasteries perched on the rock pinnacles of Meteora and nestled beneath Mount Athos, the Holy Mountain of Greece, serve as major repositories of priceless works of Byzantine art and literature.

The natural forms and features...
of other World Heritage mountain sites function as the equivalent of sacred scriptures, recording the actions of deities and heroes who created and shaped the world. The volcanic cone of Ngaurohoe in Tongariro National Park tells the story of a priest who came to New Zealand with the divine ancestors of the Maori people and whose servant froze to death on the spot.

Sacred mountains have also played important roles in history, literature and art. People who revere them feel deeply motivated to make sure they are protected. Some of these sites have become important centres for preserving traditional knowledge about the environment and valuable gene pools for replacing plant and animal species lost elsewhere. The protection of sacred mountains associated with important traditional values and identities also strengthens the societies that venerate them.

The modern environmental movement owes much of its origin and continued vitality to the idea of preserving pristine mountain areas as places for people to seek spiritual and physical renewal.
In October 1666 King Louis XIV of France authorized Pierre Paul de Riquet (1604-1680) to start work on what was to become one of the seventeenth century’s most ambitious civil engineering projects, the Canal du Midi.

Built only a few decades after the Briare Canal (1642), on which the technology of locks and the use of reaches of water at high altitude had been perfected, the Canal du Midi was intended to join the Atlantic Ocean with the Mediterranean, to “improve the prosperity of trade by avoiding the Straits of Gibraltar, pirates and the Spanish king’s fleet”, and to give “more considerable advantages to the provinces of Languedoc and Guyenne”. The canal is sometimes called the Languedoc Canal or the Canal of the Two Seas.

The canal, which stretches 240 kilometres between Toulouse and the Etang de Thau, took 12,000 labourers, including 600 women, fifteen years to build and incorporates feats of engineering that were technologically ahead of their time. Among the most remarkable of them are:

- The Saint-Ferréol Dam in the Montagne Noire (Black Mountain) massif. This dam, the biggest of its time (780 metres long at the top and 140 at the base), provides all the canal’s water.
- The number of locks, 63 in all. At Fonserannes an eight-lock staircase takes a stretch of the canal less than Malpas tunnel. 173 metres long, it is the world’s first navigable canal tunnel.
The 8 locks at Fonserannes on the Canal du Midi raise the level of the canal by 21.5 metres over a distance of 280 metres.

280 metres long over a difference in level of 21.5 metres. Riquet dedicated this extraordinary staircase of water to his birthplace, the city of Béziers.

- The Repudre Aqueduct was the first canal bridge built in France and is now the world's oldest. It was greatly admired by Vauban, Louis XIV's great engineer, who used it as the basis for other aqueducts on the canal, most of which are still standing today.

- Lastly, the Malpas tunnel, the world's first navigable underground stretch of canal. The 173-metre-long tunnel was built on a site at the foot of the hill where the Roman oppidum of Ensérune once stood.

Riquet's genius lay in finding water resources for the canal. Working with a team of hydraulic specialists, he explored the Montagne Noire massif, a region he knew well, and dug a 70-kilometre network of channels to drain the waters of small tributaries and bring the waters of the Montagne Noire from the Narouze Pass, the canal's highest point (altitude 194 metres), to the watershed between the Atlantic and the Mediterranean.

Pierre Paul de Riquet died on 1 October 1680, before the work was completed. His son Mathias ordered the first navigation trials on 15 May 1681. For more than two centuries the canal fulfilled expectations and brought prosperity to the regions through which it passed. Both goods and passengers were transported along it. Horse-drawn barges, small boats and lighters carrying wine plied between banks that bustled with the non-stop activity of lockkeepers, drivers, grooms, barges, travelling salesmen and merchants.

Today the Canal du Midi no longer carries goods, but it has taken a new lease on life with the development of waterway tourism. It is used by thousands of amateur sailors who discover a marvel of technological ingenuity and architectural elegance which blends harmoniously with the countryside as they drift down its winding, shady course. It was added to the World Heritage List on 7 December 1996.
Three highland villages in Japan

by Hidetoshi Saito and Nobuko Inaba

Three farming villages in a remote valley in the high central mountains of Japan’s main island, Honshu, were added to the World Heritage List in 1995. The villages, Ogimachi, Ainokura and Senganuma, are located in a region historically known as Shirakawa-go and Gokayama, where the mountains rise to 1,500 metres. The region is crossed by the Sho River, which flows from south to north towards the Sea of Japan, and because of the steepness of the mountain slopes, most of its villages grew up on a narrow strip of land along the river valley.

This is also a region of particularly heavy snowfall. In winter, cold winds blow in from China, picking up moisture while crossing the Sea of Japan. Until quite recently, before long tunnels were constructed and bridges were built across the deep valleys, contacts with the outside world were very limited. Because of the difficulty of access, the area was once known as “Japan’s last unexplored region”.

These geological and climatic conditions gave rise to a unique form of architecture. Larger than the national average, the local farmhouses are entirely constructed of wood, each one being covered with a threesided, gabled thatched roof. This building style is called “Gassho” (“joined hands” in Japanese) because...
the steep slope of the roof recalls the position of the hands in Buddhist prayer. The spacious attics were often used by farmers to raise silkworms. Clustered in small villages surrounded by fields and woods, the farmhouses help create a unique landscape that is expressive of the local culture.

The houses are examples of Japanese wooden house construction in its most highly developed form, both in terms of structure and construction methods and the way in which internal space is used. At the end of the nineteenth century there were still over 1,800 of them in ninety-three villages in the Shirakawa-go/Gokayama area. Then the dramatic improvements in Japan’s economic condition after World War II drastically changed the lifestyle in the mountains. Many of the traditional houses disappeared, and many unique village landscapes were destroyed. In the last century 92 per cent of all Gassho-style houses have been lost, mostly within a quarter of a century.

**Community spirit**

In the 1970s, the villagers of Ogimachi, Ainokura and Suganuma, where Gassho-style houses had survived in relatively good condition, started a preservation movement in co-operation with the local authorities. They felt that if they failed to take action, their village environment would be destroyed.

Wanting to preserve the entire village landscape and the surrounding natural environment—fields, canals, roads and forests, as well as buildings, the villagers established conservation societies, and national legal protection systems were introduced in each village. Subsequently the three villages have been well maintained under the legal and traditional protection systems.
Each village has a mutual help organization called the kumi, comprising neighbouring households and operating under a co-operative system which was established in the Edo Period (17th-19th centuries) and still functions today. The kumi organizes seasonal and daily tasks, performed in co-operation or shared in rotation, such as cutting grass along the mountain roadways, cleaning the canals, firewatching, and performing roles in religious functions. Another traditional mutual help system, the custom of yui or koryaku, comes into play for marriage and funeral ceremonies and for projects such as house-building and roof thatching.

This social system based on mutual co-operation was essential for survival in a high mountain area with a production capacity severely limited by natural conditions, but its evolution was also doubtless influenced by the strong spiritual links between the people.

Thanks to the legal and traditional systems by which they are now protected, the villages of Ogimachi, Ainokura and Suganuma have succeeded in fully retaining their time-honoured spirit.
The fundamental dilemma facing all the world's countries, to varying degrees, is that of the need to safeguard the past while continuing to build the future, the need to balance the demands of development and culture. The international scope of the problems—the details of which have been brought to our attention in recent decades through the rapid growth of communications technology—gives added impetus to the prevention and education efforts tirelessly deployed by UNESCO, in co-operation with all its Member States. UNESCO's Constitution defines one of the Organization's principal tasks as being to "maintain, increase and diffuse knowledge by assuring the conservation and protection of the world's inheritance of books, works of art and monuments of history and science".

In the words of the Spanish scholar and writer Miguel de Unamuno, "Memory is the basis of the individual personality as tradition is the basis of the collective personality of a people. We live in memory and through memory, and our spiritual life is, in the last resort, nothing more than the effort of remembrance to persevere, to become hope, the effort of our past to become future".

Today our world needs to adopt a broader definition of the word heritage. As well as the physical heritage,
the heritage of ideas, the scientific heritage and the genetic heritage—which UNESCO has also begun to preserve as the heritage of all humanity—are part of the ancient heritage that we must safeguard. But I should also like to stress the importance of the ethical heritage, the enormous relevance of a few central values, the universal principles which contain the infinite diversity of our sources of inspiration and can transform it into the unity that constitutes our strength and our hope for the future.

The task of preserving and enhancing the heritage of our ancestors extends far beyond the simple preservation of magnificent landscapes and sublime monuments. For the first time in the history of humanity, our awareness of the repercussions of our actions on the planet at large obliges us to ensure that they do not have irreversible consequences on this heritage. This criterion of irreversibility, of risk reaching a point of no return, creates a moral obligation for decision-makers to take steps now before it is too late to rectify trends that might otherwise lead to irreversible change.

We must be vigilant, we must look ahead, anticipate the future and take the necessary preventive measures. Today these measures are no longer optional; they constitute an ethical imperative. We must look ahead so as to shape our common destiny, and we must never succumb to fatalism.

It cannot be said too often that everything we do depends on consolidating the foundations of peace. It is UNESCO’s mission, in particular, to build peace in people’s minds through education, science and culture. This is our goal and it is this that I wish to emphasize so that, in our day-to-day work, even when we are addressing the most specific issues, we never lose sight of this paramount concern. Because where there is conflict, where there is violence, where there is war, there is only destruction. There is no safeguarding, there are no human rights, no democracy, no rights to education, justice or housing. Without peace there is nothing. Peace is the precondition, and that is why it was so clearly proclaimed by the founders of the United Nations and of UNESCO in the preamble to their respective charters. The overriding aim they set forth is to prevent “the scourge of war”, to stop people killing one another.

I believe that the most important monument we have to preserve is human life. Human beings alone are endowed with the creative spirit. This is their distinctive faculty, setting them aside from all other living organisms. This is the wonder of human life. And in wishing to preserve human life, our first concern must be with children, children all over the world, whatever their nationality, for children have no nationality, they are the children of us all. They are the most important and the most fragile heritage we have to preserve.

Our constant endeavour, then, must be to preserve human life. How is this to be achieved? How is violence to be averted? In seeking answers to these questions we must draw upon our memory of the future so that we can, in the world of tomorrow, safeguard the most important human right, the right to life.

Let us never forget that safeguarding the past is important insofar as it contributes to a new design for the future.
Available food resources are increasing at a slower pace than world population, especially in developing countries. To reverse this critical trend, farmers in these regions require simple and effective farming methods.

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations University (UNU) have devised an integrated farming model adapted to tropical regions. Participants at the Indo-Pacific Workshop held from 5 to 9 May 1997 in Suva, the Fijian capital, as part of the UNU’s Zero Emission Research Initiative (ZERI), had an opportunity to see an experimental farm in action at the Montfort Boys’ Town Training Centre.

Food strategies in industrialized countries are based on raising livestock, the largest consumer of cereal grains and soya bean meal. According to Lylian Rodriguez, a Colombian agronomist specializing in tropical agriculture, 50% of the world grain supply goes to feeding livestock. If this produce were reserved for human consumption, studies estimate there would be enough to feed 10 billion people, a figure around which world population is expected to stabilize.

Rodriguez advocates an integrated farming system based on recycling. Farmers from developing countries would grow plants for feeding livestock and recycle the wastes produced. This circuit has many economic and ecological benefits: livestock produces meat, milk and eggs; animal excrements supply biogas for cooking, heating and light; manure and other residues produce a compost that is used as an organic fertilizer. Earthworms transform waste materials into humus and can be used as animal feed.

**EXPLOITING BIOGAS**

In the rural areas of developing countries, biogas is one of the cheapest sources of renewable energy. It forms naturally in humid environments with no air or oxygen and can be obtained artificially by fermenting animal or plant waste in a basin known as a biodigester, linked by a tube to a large polyethylene bag. Rich in methane and carbon dioxide, this unpurified gas supplies between 5,000 and 60,000 kilocalories per cubic metre.

Biogas has many uses. It provides cooking fuel, which cuts firewood consumption, and converts manure into an improved fertilizer. It reduces manure smells, eliminates cooking smoke and controls pathogens, thereby improving the farm environment.

Biodigesters do more than produce gas. Their effluent can be used to fertilize both soil-based crops and floating aquatic plants like cassava and duckweed, two important protein sources for feeding pigs, ducks and chickens in tropical regions.

For many years, Rodriguez has worked with farmers in Viet Nam to spread this model. The cassava serves as a fence which protects the biodigester and ponds occupying a 61 m² area. Every 45 days, the cassava leaves are harvested, producing a yield of 35 kilos per year, in addition to the 43 kilos of protein produced annually by the duckweed ponds. These are sig-
significant quantities. This type of microproject can improve the daily lot of the most deprived rural families, all too often left untouched by development strategies.

**PRIZED EARTHWORMS**

Earthworms also play a key role in the system. During the workshop in Suva, Rodriguez passed around a plate containing earthworms and talked about them with affection: “When under stress, earthworms become agitated. These ones are obviously happy.” She mainly works with Californian Red worms (Eisenia fetida), the richest in protein. Sexually mature at three months, these hermaphrodites mate every seven days. An earthworm can have up to 1,500 offspring every year. A veritable processing factory, these earthworms feed on all sorts of waste. They eat the equivalent of their weight each day, keeping 40% for their own survival. The remaining 60% is transformed into humus. Although hybrid broiler chickens take ten to twenty days to become accustomed to the red worms, the local chickens and fish seem to savour them.

**FARM OF THE FUTURE**

The ideal is to group these various practices into an integrated farming system. The experimental farm in Montfort is one promising example. It belongs to a vocational training centre set up some thirty years ago following a contract between the Government of Fiji and the Saint Gabriel de Montfort religious order. Every year, the Centre takes on about 100 boys between fifteen and
Mushrooms are a valuable resource. These chlorophyll-free plants can convert agricultural waste materials into human food. Furthermore, they have interesting nutritional and medicinal properties, not to mention their gastronomic attractions. For over 2,000 years, Chinese, Korean and Japanese traditional medicine has used mushrooms for reinforcing the immune system, enhancing memory, delaying the aging process and fighting tumours, according to Shuting Chang.

Developing an integrated farming system like the one in Montfort requires an overall understanding of low-cost production techniques that protect the environment. Horst Doelle, director of the UNESCO Microbial Resource Centre (MIRCEN) in Brisbane, Australia, drew workshop participants' attention to advances in microbiology. He pointed out that at Montfort microbial techniques are put into practice through use of the biodigester for example. MIRCENs grant scholarships and teach technicians from developing countries about the importance of microbiology for sustainable, ecological rural development. Not only does the Montfort farm keep its boarders well fed, it also provides them with a valuable farming model for the future.

**MUSHROOM GROWING**

Shuting Chang, a specialist in mushroom genetics (see UNESCO Courier, June 1994, "Biotechnology: the resourceful gene"), advocates cultivating edible mushrooms on the composted plant waste.

Temperatures in the tropics are too high for growing certain species known in Europe, like the Agaricus mushroom (Agaricus bisporus). Chang selects species adapted to hot climates that only require simple substrates (wood or sawdust, rice or sugar cane straw, waste from cotton or water hyacinths), provided they have been correctly prepared and composted. In the case of pleurotus (Pleurotus ostreatus), the straw and sawdust mix has to be prepared by autoclaving to eliminate toxic substances harmful to the spawn's growth. When this precaution is taken, four to five harvests are obtained every year. Black mushrooms, widely used in Chinese cooking (Auricula juda), grow directly on the wood. Another prized species, shiitake or perfumed mushroom (Lentinus edodes), is rich in protein. One square metre yields five kilos of perfumed mushrooms, which only take one month to reach maturity.

The nerve centre of the integrated farm is the biodigester (below), where plant waste and animal excrement ferment to produce biogas and residues for use as fertilizer.

Crotón, a tropical plant with particularly powerful purgative properties.
Youssef Chahine is a major Egyptian film director with an international reputation. Earlier this year he was awarded a special prize by the Cannes Film Festival on the occasion of its 50th anniversary, as an accolade for his lifetime's work in the cinema. Drama, emotional intensity and humanism are the leitmotiv of his films. As a man Chahine has championed the cause of democratic and progressive intellectuals against the currents of fundamentalism and conservatism.

Interview by Michel Fargeon

Youssef Chahine at the Cannes Film Festival (May, 1997).

After the presentation of your latest film, Destiny, the 1997 Cannes Film Festival jury awarded you its 50th anniversary prize for your life's work. You thus join film-makers like Orson Welles and Luchino Visconti who were honoured with 20th and 35th Cannes Festival anniversary prizes respectively.

Youssef Chahine: For me, the greatest reward of all was the love and warmth expressed by the film professionals from all over the world who gave me a standing ovation in Cannes's huge Louis Lumière theatre. When I walked up to the microphone to thank them, I almost broke down. All those people, who are supposed to be so tough, were opening their hearts to me and love is never a one-way feeling. I couldn't find words to describe the feelings they had aroused in me.

As for recognition of my life's work, I have to say that none of the 33 films I have directed to date has been easy to do. At first I had a hard time winning recognition and acceptance, and I owe a lot to foreign critics like Jean-Louis Bory, who organized screenings of my films at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris. It was a way of paying tribute to the work being done in a country like Egypt, whose cinema was usually regarded with condescension rather than admiration. Many people in Europe thought that all we could do was make light comedies—with belly dancing scenes, obviously—though some of us were working hard and making more worthwhile films, often on shoestring budgets. That is why I feel I am sharing my prize with all the film-makers from poor countries who are still having great difficulty in making films in their own countries. In view of my age—I was born in 1926—I feel that I am in a sense their elder statesman, and it gave me tremendous pleasure to have been to some extent their representative in Cannes.

Have the film festivals that have made you known outside Egypt also enabled you to present your own culture to others?

Y. C: For a long time people like me were largely used as cultural alibis. We were second-string guests at festivals, an extra flag for them to fly and a token of their internationalism. We got what we could out of them. We were working flat out simply to exist as Third World film-makers, and those festivals were, despite it all, wonderful ways for us to make our culture and our hardships known, to break down the walls of ignorance. Knowledge knows no boundaries. It travels from one country to another via sharing. That is, incidentally, one of the themes of my most recent film, Destiny. Without memory, we are doomed to repeat the mistakes of the past, which have sometimes led humanity to its worst excesses. All golden ages have emerged from periods of tolerance, sharing and love for one's neighbour.

Your film The Emigrant was banned in Egypt shortly after its release . . .

Y. C: A fundamentalist group sued me and managed to convince the court that the film was blasphemous. I had spent two years working on it and was very upset by the court's decision, which I considered unacceptable and repellent. The greatest humiliation for an artist is to feel gagged. I don't make films to hide them away. Apart from my own disappointment, a lot was at stake in that trial: the descent into intolerance always has terrible results. It has to be countered at all costs, especially since . . .
the fundamentalist approach is found everywhere, in all religions. Only minorities are involved, but the press often unwittingly serves their interests by giving them a lot of publicity. That's the kind of thing I had in mind when I thought of Destiny. There was also another, more private reason. I had a friend—a charming fellow, open-minded, tolerant, to some extent my alter ego—who acted in several of my films but who suddenly went over to the fundamentalists. I couldn't help but wonder about the deep-rooted causes of such a change of direction.

In Destiny an intellectual is confronted by fundamentalists. What resources does he have to combat them?

Y. C.: It is often said that violence begets violence. Television assails us with scenes of violence, gratuitous, ugly violence, whose only purpose is to fill the pockets of certain producers. As if stories about psychopaths and criminals were the only ones worth filming! But the worst kind of violence is perhaps the worst to say to someone: "Everything you write will be burned." To fight that violence I use joie de vivre, music, dance—and, of course, reason. In Destiny the main character, who is at first conditioned by sectarian thinking, recovers all his joie de vivre when he hears the film's theme song. He also dances, and as he does so, his intolerance and pettiness melt away. Dance is as generous as love.

As far as you're concerned, does the rise of fundamentalism begin when freedom of thought is forbidden?

Y. C.: No doubt about it. But no one today seems to be really thinking about the reasons for the rise of fundamentalism in different parts of the world. Why do so many young people, in many cases college graduates, support these ideas from another age? Economic globalization devours people. Young people today are excluded from the social process and are replaced by machines. Yet a person's dignity is primarily defined by work. I am revolted when I see countries—sometimes rich countries—let a whole section of their population languish in ignorance on the sidelines of society. But some day or other, somehow or other, people eventually start to think and express themselves, overcoming their hesitations and defying censorship. And then things change...

Music and dance play a prominent part in Destiny. Does this represent a return to your first love, the days when you made musicals?

Y. C.: Music and dance are ways of handling tragedy with a light touch. Dance is an invaluable form of expression for communicating joie de vivre. And I love flamenco. It is music that links East and West. The first films I saw when I was young were French music-hall comedies. Music is the opposite of arrogance. It is a form of sharing. Everyone loves to sing and dance. It is always possible to say important things without boring one's audience, and even to give them pleasure in the process.

Of all your films, which is your favourite?

Y. C.: Alexandria . . . Why? First of all because I was born in that city. Secondly because it depicts two aspects of my Alexandria—the Alexandria I knew—that are dearest to me: friendship and tolerance. All religions, all cultures, all kinds of ideas lived side by side in that Alexandria. There were no barriers between people: Arabs, Greeks, Armenians, Italians, Jews, Russians and French, were all friends. No one despised anyone else. We spoke almost all these languages, not very well perhaps, but we made ourselves understood with a few words and phrases. Everyone accepted everyone else. Friendship was the rule. This melting pot of people and cultures has vanished today, and this is something I bitterly regret. In Alexandria . . . Why? the city is a character in its own right and has its own identity and vitality. This explains the title.

Yet you left Alexandria for Hollywood where you went to learn your profession.

Y. C.: Hats off to American technique! In America I learned rules straight out of Aristotle and Plato, which American scriptwriters use to produce see-

A Youssef Chahine filmography
compiled by Michel Fargeon

- Baba Amine (Father Amine, 1950)
- Ibn el Nil (Son of the Nile, 1951)
- El Muharraj el Kabir (The Great Clown, 1951)
- Sayidet el Kitar (Lady on the Train, 1952)
- Nessa bala Rejal (Women without Men, 1952)
- Ser'a fil Wadi (Struggle in the Valley, 1953)
- Saitan el Sahara (Devil of the Desert, 1954)
- Ser'a fil Mina (Struggle on the Pier, 1955)
- Inta Habili (You Are My Love, 1956)
- Wadaat Hobak (Farewell to Your Love, 1957)
- Bab el Hadeed (Caïro Station, 1958)
- Gamila Bohraid (Camilla the Algerian, 1958)
- Hub Ilal Abad (Forever Yours, 1959)
- Bayn Ideak (In Your Hands, 1960)
- Nedaa el Ochak (A Lover's Call, 1961)
- Rajol fi Hayat (A Man in My Life, 1961)
- El Naser Salah el Dine (Saladin, 1963)
- Fajr Yum Jadid (Dawn of a New Day, 1964)
- Baya el Khawatin (The Ring Seller, 1965)
- Rimal min Zahab (Sand of Gold, 1966)
- The Mayrun Celebration (documentary, 1967)
- El Nas wal Nil (People of the Nile, 1968)
- EL Arur (The Land, 1969)
- AL Ekhulair (The Choice, 1970)
- Salwa, the Little Girl Who Talks with Cows (1972, a short made for UNICEF)
- AL Asfour (The Sparrow, 1973)
- Awdat al Ibn al Daïr (The Return of the Prodigal Son, 1976)
- Hadota Misraya (An Egyptian Story, 1982)
- AL Wenada ya Bonaparte (Adieu Bonaparte, 1984)
- Le Sixième Jour (1986)
- Alexandria Again and Always (1989)
- Chahine's Cairo (1991)
- The Emigrant (1994)
- Destiny (1997)

Further reading:
- "Youssef Chahine, the Alexandrian", CinémAction no. 33, 1985
narios that are very well constructed but which, unfortunately, often tell trashy stories. They’re always well packaged, well edited and well acted, but the stories themselves are mediocre. You see films that are remarkably well directed, but devoid of content: a bit of sex, some stunts, explosions, violence and brawling, but when I come out of the cinema, I feel I’ve seen nothing at all. I don’t go to the cinema to waste my time.

And yet we have a kind of complex about the United States. We think that if our films are not distributed there, they don’t exist. But the American market will never be open to us; protectionism in disguise prevails there. Basically, the Americans aren’t interested in films from abroad. Of course this doesn’t stop them flooding our screens with their own productions. We sometimes even manage to invent revolutionary techniques, but they don’t want to know. I actually directed the first chase scene in cinema history filmed using a hand-held camera, an enormously heavy old “Derbie”. I followed the actors down the narrow corridors of an ancient temple. And yet my films, like those of many other film-makers from countries of the South, have been sidelined from major international distribution circuits.

You started out making light entertainment productions before going on to more demanding films.

Y. C: I prefer to talk in terms of cinema that is "more aware". There was a time when my friends were leaving Alexandria, and I asked myself why. In The Land (1969) I tackled the theme of the fellahin, who possess nothing but whose work provides food for us all. But most of all it was after the defeat of the Egyptian army in the Six-Day War in 1967 that I really became aware of the situation in my country. The final scene in The Sparrow (1973), where the women take to the streets to express their refusal of defeat, was a major turning point in my life. Later, when I was faced with death, I said to myself: “What have you done so far?”. I have expressed opinions and portrayed feelings which, in the last analysis, encapsulated an experience and reflected a truth. It is very hard to step back and look at yourself, to see yourself as you really are. As long as you don’t give way to self-absorption, when you talk about yourself in a social and human context, you talk about other people too.

What about your experience in theatre?

Y. C: What a wonderful memory! It was one of the greatest joys of my life! It was an incredible gamble on the part of Jacques Lassalle, the then Director of the Comédie Française in Paris, to ask me—someone from another planet who hadn’t produced anything in the theatre for forty years—to put on a play of my choice. I chose Albert Camus’s Caligula. You can imagine what an honour it was for me to work with the highly professional actors of the Comédie Française. I threw myself body and soul into this production, I gave it all I’d got. It was a tremendous success: seventeen curtain calls on the first night. An unforgettable experience.

Is it hard for Youssef Chahine to make films in Egypt?

Y. C: It’s getting more and more difficult for everyone. Once upon a time we made 120 films a year in Egypt. Then eighty. Now we’re down to sixteen. Without French support even I could no longer make films there. French TV channels buy the advance rights to my films, which is a wonderful show of support. Egyptian television on the other hand stifles talent by only promoting mediocre series. They even dare to use excerpts from my films without my permission! I say to my Egyptian students: “Freedom must be fought for nonstop; it isn’t handed out on a plate.” Technique is not important; you can learn that from books. What needs to be taught is freedom. I also tell them that in order to make films you must have a vision of the world. To the actors, technicians and cameramen who start out in my films I say it takes courage to launch yourself and create your own experience. As for inspiration, that can be found by observing people—with a sympathetic eye. If you love other people, every story is interesting. Everybody has a magnificent story somewhere inside them. The important thing is to know how to listen to the story and then to tell it.
The UNESCO Courier will be taking part in the 11th Bordeaux Book Fair (Salon du Livre de Bordeaux) from 9 to 12 October 1997.

As well as seeking to promote books, reading and professions associated with the book world, the Fair is also a cultural festival in its own right. Two exhibitions feature on this year's programme, one devoted to the Italian writer Dino Buzzati’s work as a novelist, journalist and playwright, and the other to French man of the theatre Jean Villar. The exhibitions will be accompanied by readings, debates and literary panels.

This year's foreign literature prize, which honours the work of a writer from outside the French-speaking world and the quality of its translation into French, has been awarded to the German writer Christa Wolf and her translator.
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**Sur ses 10 000 m² dont 4 000 m² consacrés à la jeunesse**

**250 exposants - 200 écrivains**

---

**des expositions**


**des prix littéraires**

✓ Prix Écureuil de Littérature étrangère décerné à Christa Wolf et à son traducteur français Alain Lance, à l’occasion de la sortie de *Médée* chez Fayard, une exposition de manuscrits et peintures accompagnera cet hommage. ✓ Prix Voyages et Découvertes Air France Europe : un jury de onze lycéens récompensant les plus beaux récits des écrivains voyageurs.

**des débats**

✓ Pendant 4 jours, 25 entretiens et tables rondes auxquels participeront écrivains, critiques et journalistes venus débattre de l’actualité littéraire et des temps forts du 11e salon : le texte de théâtre et la nouvelle.

**de nouveaux rendez-vous**

IN THE NEXT ISSUE:

NATURAL DISASTERS

HERITAGE
TAXILA, CRADLE OF GANDHARA ART (PAKISTAN)

ENVIRONMENT
NEW CALEDONIA’S ENDANGERED BIODIVERSITY