



Learning to engage with human rights in heritage

Logan, William. 2013. Learning to engage with human rights in heritage. In Albert, Marie-Theres, Bernecker, Roland and Rudolff, Britta (ed), *Understanding heritage: Perspectives in heritage studies*, Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin, Germany, pp.35-48.

DOI: [10.1515/9783110308389.35](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110308389.35)

© 2012, Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co.

Reproduced with permission.

Downloaded from DRO:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10536/DRO/DU:30052472>

Learning to Engage with Human Rights in Heritage

William Logan

A number of scholars and educators have been arguing for some time that cultural heritage should not be seen merely as a technical matter or from a narrow visitor management point of view. Rather, it should be understood as cultural practice and a form of cultural politics dominated by ruling regimes and social groups in which decisions are made about the future of and access to scarce resources (see, for example, Byrne, 2008; Harvey, 2001; Logan, 2000, p. 11, 2007a; Smith, 2006). Some of us have sought to push this approach further by arguing that Heritage Studies should take on the protection of human rights as a core consideration in the processes of heritage identification, inscription, conservation and interpretation (see Logan, 2006, 2007b, 2008, 2012a; Silverman and Fairchild, 2007a, 2007b; Langfield et al., 2010). This article builds on these previous works to explore what the shift to a rights-based management approach in the World Heritage system might mean for the stakeholders in the heritage protection enterprise as they learn to meet this challenge and find ways to support people's right to access, enjoy and maintain cultural heritage.

Reaffirming the need to maintain a strong relationship between theory and praxis, I draw into the discussion heritage practitioners, decision-makers in governments and government agencies, scholars and educators. Of these, the principal emphasis is on the last two, seeing the scholars and educators as having a fundamentally important role in developing a critical understanding of the cultural heritage concept, how heritage is created, used and misused, and how conservation approaches and programmes sit within the broader context of community attitudes and aspirations and governmental responsibilities. A distinction is made between teachers in universities and trainers offering short courses more focused on specific employer needs. While it is clearly important I do not deal with heritage education in primary and secondary schools here, and have written about it elsewhere (see Logan, 2012b).

I focus on World Heritage and refer to both tangible and intangible aspects, showing how current moves to establish a rights-based approach to the management of World Heritage sites connects with moves elsewhere in global governance, most notably in the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII) and the United Nations Human Rights Commission.

Expanding 'heritage' and early educational responses

UNESCO's World Heritage Convention (UNESCO, 1972) was radical for its time in envisaging heritage as both natural and cultural and bringing these two forms together

into a single normative statement and protective system. In the ensuing forty years both the community and professional views of what constitutes cultural heritage has broadened in many countries. Educational programmes have responded to this conception of heritage and its value for contemporary society. Several important shifts can be discerned. Moving from a mid-twentieth-century focus on iconic monuments and archaeological sites, the criteria adopted for evaluating cultural nominations to the World Heritage List encompassed values that enabled the inscription of a wider range of places, such as vernacular building ensembles, historic towns and villages, and designed parks and gardens. In 1993 cultural landscapes and their associative values were added, while the last decade has seen a greater emphasis on the intangible values of places and debate about the addition of historic urban landscapes.

Another major trend has seen heritage discourse and practice move from a narrowly technical focus to a more ethics-based approach. The World Heritage system has moved to a values-based approach to managing heritage places and increased weight has been put on associative values, especially of indigenous communities. Questions about “Whose heritage?” and “In whose interest is a place being inscribed?” have been given higher priority, as has the development of more inclusive heritage registers. Heritage professionals often stray into projects, particularly as short-term consultants in countries and cultures that are not their own, where they deal with heritage that is of great significance to local people without realizing the political character and social implications of their interventions. It is essential for practitioners to understand the broader economic, political and social context in which their work sits. They also need to recognize that there can be many motives behind official heritage interventions, that such action is sometimes made primarily to achieve political goals, and that this can sometimes undermine rather than strengthen cultural diversity and human rights.

One of the achievements of the global debates of the 1990s was recognition that wide variations exist in the way that heritage is understood from one region to another and from one culture to another, and that variation is part of the world’s rich and creative cultural diversity. The Nara Conference on Authenticity in November 1994 had a major impact on heritage conservation theory and practice, concluding as it did that the ways of conserving heritage should be in accord with local ways of understanding heritage. This widening is seen in the debates about philosophy and practice in the key global heritage organizations – UNESCO, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM) – and is now reflected in the programmes taught and the research undertaken in educational and training institutions at the national and global levels.

Initially education and training providers responded to the global conservation effort spearheaded by UNESCO by creating a series of specialist courses, some dealing with the conservation of monuments and sites and drawing heavily on the disciplines

of archaeology and architecture, others focusing on science- and laboratory-based materials conservation, and yet others on museology or public history (Logan, 2010). In the 1970s and 1980s ICCROM in Rome and the University of York (United Kingdom) were key training institutions, drawing students from around the world. During the 1980s and 1990s, other universities moved into the heritage field and courses were developed that, in relation to heritage places, shifted from technical restoration to focus on broader planning and management issues, often connected to economic development through tourism.

Within the last fifteen years the increasingly holistic conception of heritage has led to a new batch of courses drawing together at least heritage places and museum studies and beginning to focus on intangible heritage and traditional knowledge systems. In some countries such as the United Kingdom, Australia and, more recently, the United States, Heritage Studies has emerged as a new interdisciplinary area in its own right bringing together history and geography, architecture and archaeology, economics and town planning, anthropology, ethnology and folklore studies, art history and museum studies and with strong emphases on the interconnections between philosophy, theory and practice.

UNESCO, World Heritage and the universities

UNESCO's connection with universities has a long and honourable history, dating back to the appointment of former Oxford scholar, Julian Huxley, as its first Director in 1946 and continuing with the regular commissioning of university scholars such as Claude Lévi-Strauss to write key reports. Almost thirty years later, the World Heritage Convention when it was adopted in 1972 called on States Parties in Article 5 to 'foster the establishment or development of national or regional centres for training in the protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage and to encourage scientific research in this field'. Despite this clear request, little was initially done within the UNESCO system to develop mechanisms to link heritage and education (Logan, 2012b, p. 21). It has been academics themselves who, in universities around the world, have responded to the growing awareness of the need to protect World Heritage and have launched Heritage Studies programmes with a specialization in the study of the World Heritage Convention and related issues. Seven such university programmes are listed on the UNESCO website – three in Europe, two in Africa and one in each of Japan and Australia (see UNESCO, n.d.a). Other universities include World Heritage alongside studies that are more focused on heritage at national and local levels.

Since the 1990s there has been a more concerted effort by the World Heritage Centre to influence curricula and bring students and teaching staff in schools and universities into actively supporting the World Heritage programme. In 1991 UNE-

SCO's General Conference decided to create a university network with two interlinking components: the UNITWIN programme under which universities agree to collaborate, usually across the North/South divide; and the appointment of UNESCO Chairs (UNESCO, n.d.b). The aim of both components is to facilitate knowledge and skills transfer and institutional capacity-building through training, research, information-sharing and outreach activities within UNESCO's major programme areas of education, natural sciences, social and human sciences, culture, and communication and information. At 14 October 2012 there were 715 UNESCO Chairs (UNESCO, n.d.c). Twenty-five of these are designated to the field of cultural heritage, although several of the earlier ones created in the 1990s appear to be now defunct. There are no Chairs in the natural sciences specifically focusing on natural heritage.

Apart from a 10th anniversary meeting held at UNESCO Paris headquarters in November 2002, there has been little connection between the various UNITWIN programmes or the UNESCO Chairs. A number of other networks have tried to fill this gap but have also been less successful than hoped. The Forum UNESCO: University and Heritage (FUUH) network was established by UNESCO in 1995, initially under the management of the Polytechnic University of Valencia in Spain but now jointly managed by that university and the World Heritage Centre. The FUUH mission is broad and emphasizes supporting UNESCO action in favour of cultural and natural heritage protection, enhancement and conservation. FUUH is an informal network whose main collaborative activity has been the annual, now biennial international conferences it has run in thirteen university locations around the world (UNESCO FUUH, n.d.).

Other networks have been established at the regional level. For example, in 2001 ICCROM joined forces with UNESCO's Office of the Regional Advisor for Culture in Asia and the Pacific based in Bangkok to form the Asian Academy of Heritage Management (AAHM). This is a network of institutions, mostly universities, that offers professional training in the field of cultural heritage management (UNESCO Bangkok, 2011). Such training is seen to be critically important given the Asia-Pacific context of rapid environmental degradation, urban infrastructure development and mass tourism. Since 2008 the network has become more self-governing and its principal activity is a major regional conference held every one or two years.

It is regrettable that within UNESCO the management of heritage is divided between six separate UNESCO conventions and their associated programmes and that this is being mirrored in many countries with regard to the management of national heritage. Similarly, administrative and programme divisions within universities continue to make it difficult to educate students across the range of disciplines needed to practise heritage conservation in a more holistic way, even to deal with natural and cultural values under the World Heritage Convention let alone work with intangible values, cultural expressions and heritage representation in museums or to deal with growing concerns about rights-based management, heritage sustainability, environmental degradation and the potential impacts of climate change.

Heritage, human rights and rights-based World Heritage management

One of the issues that has been instrumental since the 1990s in shifting the concept of heritage used in the World Heritage system is the need to enable the world's indigenous peoples to have a meaningful role in determining how their heritage is identified and managed. This is a fundamental issue, of course, in countries such as the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Argentina and Chile that were colonized by European settlers. It became a key concern in the World Heritage system following the introduction of the cultural landscape category in 1993. In particular, use of the third associative sub-category – defined as ‘cultural landscapes where the Outstanding Universal Value relates to the powerful religious, artistic, or cultural associations of the natural elements rather than material cultural evidence’ – meant working closely with indigenous peoples. But their involvement in the listing of new places on the World Heritage List and the management of places already inscribed has generally been limited.

Criticism from indigenous peoples on this point came to a head at the World Heritage Committee meeting in Cairns (Australia) in 2000 where it was proposed that a new World Heritage Indigenous Peoples Council of Experts (WHIPCOE) should be created to sit alongside the three Advisory Bodies named in the World Heritage Convention, ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN. I have outlined the WHIPCOE story in a recent paper (Logan, in press). The initiative failed and frontline indigenous action on heritage rights subsequently moved from UNESCO to UNPFII in New York. Nevertheless, the voice of indigenous people had been clearly heard within the World Heritage system. In 2003 the Dutch National Commission for UNESCO hosted a conference in Amsterdam on the theme Linking Universal and Local Values (de Mérode et al., 2004). An outcome of the conference was UNESCO's adoption of the view that heritage protection does not depend alone on top-down interventions by governments or the expert actions of heritage industry professionals, but must involve local communities. UNESCO now routinely argues that it is imperative that the values and practices of the local communities, together with traditional management systems, are fully understood, respected, encouraged and accommodated in management plans if the heritage resources are to be sustained into the future (de Mérode et al., 2004, p. 9).

Meanwhile, a number of international and national non-governmental organizations and other pressure groups around the world were joining forces with the UN to push for more decisive and concerted action in bring human rights into various forms of governance, planning and project implementation. This was kick-started in 1997 when the then UN Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, launched a reform making human rights a “priority in every programme ... and in every mission”. His call was taken up in 2003 when the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) adopted a “Common Understanding” of a “Human Rights Based Approach” (Ekern et al., 2012). Applying such an approach means clari-

ifying the relationships between all the stakeholders in a project or a policy initiative in terms of their rights and duties and looking for ways to overcome the power differentials that might otherwise block the realization of rights. Thus neglecting to build schools, for example, is seen as a violation of the right to education for children; to build schools but forbid girls from attending is a violation not only of the rights of children but also of women. While Ekern et al. (2012, p. 217) see the appeal to human rights as being primarily aimed at assisting the state in question to remedy its policy shortcomings, there are occasions when shaming or sanctioning violating states may be required.

Indigenous peoples have learned to use the language of rights effectively, as a useful part of their battery of political tactics to maintain their cultural heritage and control their own cultural development and one that is difficult to challenge. Their right was clearly reinforced by the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples which had been developed by the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Affairs (UN, 2007). The continuing discussions at Forum meetings in New York have sought to elaborate on the key notion of “free, prior and informed consent” and to require its enforcement in various processes, including World Heritage inscription. The Forum’s Tenth Session in 2011 concluded that such consent is a right to be enjoyed by all indigenous peoples; it should be

“given freely, without coercion, intimidation or manipulation (free); sought sufficiently at all stages, including from inception to final authorization and implementation of activities (prior); based on an understanding of the full range of issues and implications entailed by the activity, or decision in question (informed); and given by the legitimate representatives of the indigenous peoples concerned” (UNPFII, 2011a).

The work of the UNPFII ties in closely with that being done by Farida Shaheed, Independent Expert at the UN Human Rights Commission in Geneva, who focused in 2011 on access to and enjoyment of cultural heritage as a cultural right (UNHRC, 2011; Logan, 2012a; Silberman, 2012). Ms Shaheed’s report was finalized in March 2011 and presented to the Human Rights Council, which at its 17th Session in June 2011 passed a resolution reaffirming:

“while the significance of national and regional particularities and various historical, cultural and religious backgrounds must be borne in mind, it is the duty of States, regardless of their political, economic and cultural systems, to promote and protect all human rights and fundamental freedoms” (UNHRC, 2011).

The Resolution also made clear that cultural rights are included within human rights and reaffirmed the Human Rights Council’s position that “States have the responsibility to promote and protect cultural rights and that these rights should be guaranteed for all without discrimination”.

The UNPFII and UNHRC strategies resonate with efforts by the Advisory Bodies, notably the IUCN and ICOMOS, to move the World Heritage system towards a rights-based approach to site management. The IUCN is already well advanced in developing such an approach to managing the natural and mixed World Heritage sites for which it has responsibility for advising the World Heritage Committee under the Convention (Oviedo and Puschkarsky, 2012). The IUCN experience offers a useful model for ICOMOS and ICCROM as they, too, move towards a human rights-based approach to the management of World Heritage sites in relation to cultural sites, cultural landscapes and historic urban landscapes. Some national divisions of ICOMOS, particularly the Norwegian, have been active in addressing rights concerns (Ekern et al., 2012). In March 2011 ICOMOS Norway hosted an international workshop in Oslo entitled *Our Common Dignity: Towards a Rights-Based World Heritage Management*, the papers from which are now published in a special issue of the *International Journal of Heritage Studies* (May 2012). ICOMOS Norway went on to convince the 17th triennial ICOMOS General Assembly held in Paris in late 2011 to request its Executive Committee to develop an “Our Common Dignity” initiative as a key activity in the ICOMOS 2012–14 Triennial Action Plan.

In short, the application of human rights in the heritage field appears to be building up momentum as the World Heritage system takes on broader conceptions of heritage. An additional factor has been, as noted by Jukka Jokilehto (2012) in his contribution to the journal issue referred to above, the shift of focus in heritage discourse and practice over the last twenty years towards intangible heritage. In the global arena, this has directed attention towards the intangible values of places inscribed under the World Heritage Convention, while, from 2003, intangible heritage (seen as “practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills”) has had its own convention under which representative items could be inscribed (UNESCO, 2003). However, even though, as “living heritage embodied in people”, the intangible form of heritage is the most directly connected to human rights principles and their abuse, the linkage is not clearly recognized by many cultural heritage practitioners, who continue to view their work merely as technical. Even human rights workers fail to make the connection, despite the abundance of opportunities around the world to witness people struggling to assert their cultural rights in order to protect their heritage and identity.

There are many challenges to be met by heritage conservation policy-makers, practitioners, researchers and educators arising out of the extension of practice into the intangible cultural heritage field. How can local communities be more fully engaged in the decision-making processes from the outset? The recognition of human rights, “cultural rights” and community participation in planning and other forms of policy-making vary from country to country, regime to regime, totalitarian through to democratic. And even within the liberal democracies, community dynamics are far from perfect and local ambitions always need to be negotiated between various interests within the local community as well as against broader community, regional and national interests.

Heritage, human rights and education

Heritage is thus increasingly seen not merely as a reflection of the world's rich and creative diversity but as the very underpinning of the cultural identity of peoples, and its maintenance is considered a basic human right. Heritage is essentially a mental construct, a set of values produced through socio-political processes reflecting society's power structures. From this point of view, heritage conservation can no longer be seen just as a technical issue: it always involves fundamental philosophical and ethical questions and these must be incorporated into heritage courses in universities: Why are we doing it? Who for? Who said? Are the local people whose heritage is being "protected" involved? How does it fit with other human rights? How does it fit with social and environmental sustainability?

This shift is already reflected in university courses where the close link between heritage and identity is central to teaching and research programmes, as, too, is the link between official heritage definitions and nation-building and the misuse of "heritage" in some countries to reinforce the power of political elites and dominant ethnic groups. This means that while there remains a very clear need to produce graduates with practical architectural and archaeological conservation expertise and heritage planning and management skills, the social sciences can add skills for analysing the social, political and economic context and for negotiating heritage conservation outcomes in situations where the identification, evaluation and interpretation of heritage items is contested between various groups within the community. The shift towards a more critical approach to heritage practice encourages educators, scholars and practitioners to consider the human rights implications of conservation interventions and to devise ways in which local people, including indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities in particular, can be empowered to play a meaningful role in determining how their heritage is identified and managed. Practitioners in the field will need new skills in facilitating small group discussions, conflict resolution and in listening patiently and respectfully rather than assuming their specialist training gives them ready-made answers.

This new approach has already encouraged a rich stream of research in universities and a number of books are now available that deal with the links between cultural diversity, heritage and human rights. Those by Silverman and Fairchild (2007a) and Langfield et al. (2010) have already been mentioned. Case studies are also starting to mount in number. Gro Ween (2012), for example, grounds the human rights argument and rights-based management approach in her study of the Sami minority in Norway. She focuses on process – how World Heritage sites are created, how their Outstanding Universal Value is articulated and how the Norwegian state's interest in being represented on the World Heritage List weighs up against Sami interests and rights. She also shows how the Sami have used human rights arguments to their own advantage, here exerting their collective right to cultural identity to block Norway's ambition to add another park (Tysfjord-Hellemo) to the World Heritage List.

Bente Mathisen (2012) deals with a site on Africa's east coast, the Ilha de Moçambique (Island of Mozambique), which was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1991. This is a living site with a multicultural population. It has distinctive Portuguese and Indian architectural influences whereas the dominant intangible heritage today is Swahili. The two main settlements on the island reflect this divided social history, the monumental colonial buildings of Stonetown being seen as appropriate for World Heritage status although not part of the local community's heritage, while the religious buildings and houses of Macutitown were considered too unsophisticated for the World Heritage List despite reflecting the cultural identity of the people (*macuti*: straw). The task has been to forge an inclusive heritage vision and collaboration between the various groups. Mathisen's case study shows that the significance of a living World Heritage site cannot be fully understood and safeguarded without considering the interests, aspirations and priorities of all of its inhabitants. This is a fundamental message for those concerned about developing a rights-based approach to World Heritage site management.

As Ekern et al. (2012, p. 218) note, this does not mean that the moral and political practices based on a notion of universal human rights are uncontested, nor that they are a panacea to all the world's ills. Several fundamentally problematic issues require further consideration. Providing an embryonic research agenda, these include:

- clarifying the relationship between individual and group rights;
- finding ways to convince the many states that refuse – on the basis that human rights are a “Western invention”, promote individualism and are contrary to national values – to accept criticism framed in human rights language and to reform governing practices that violate human rights;
- learning how to deal with those communities that practise rules that are discriminatory to women or children.

Emerging perspectives in heritage scholarship, education and training

World Heritage education appears to have started moving in two directions – towards increasingly critical Heritage Studies on the one hand, and on the other hand, towards a greater emphasis on skills training designed to meet the World Heritage system's functional needs. In a carefully managed education system both of these approaches should be able, of course, to co-exist so that students and researchers are able to ground theory in an understanding of practice. The signs are, however, that we may be moving towards a dual system based on conflicting rather than complementary approaches.

In a sense the division is occurring as a result of problems in the World Heritage system, especially the proliferation of inscribed places with severe management and sustainability issues. There are now thirty-eight properties on the List of World Herit-

age in Danger (UNESCO World Heritage Committee, 2012) while 135 were subject to close scrutiny in 2011 by the World Heritage Committee (UNESCO, 2011a). The Committee's attempt to contain the difficulties through its State of Conservation and Periodic Reporting mechanisms is not sufficient. There is a sense among some in UNESCO's Cultural Sector of a need for training more focused on meeting the specific demands of World Heritage sites. But there is also a growing concern, expressed in the media and heritage conferences and publications, that the World Heritage List is becoming too long and serves nationalistic political and economic interests to the detriment of conservation and the vision of those who worked to create the World Heritage Convention and, indeed, the fundamental mission of UNESCO itself.

Such concerns are unlikely to be the subject of short training courses but lie at the core of critical Heritage Studies. Moving in the opposite direction is a growing band of university teachers and researchers who see the need for considerable reform in the way that UNESCO and its World Heritage system operate (Logan, 2012c, pp. 114–116). An Association of Critical Heritage Studies was established in June 2012 and an inaugural conference was held at the University of Gothenburg (Sweden). To some scholars this is a dramatic and recent “paradigm shift”; to others it is another step in the evolution of Heritage Studies that has been taking place since the field emerged a half century ago (Logan, 2012d). No matter whether the change process is interpreted as revolutionary (paradigm turbulence and change) or evolutionary (transition), heritage is understood by all involved in “Critical Heritage Studies” as a cultural practice in which the dignity of human rights should be respected.

Responding to site management concerns, the World Heritage Committee called on its Advisory Bodies to revise its 2001 training strategy. The new strategy was presented to the Committee at its 35th Session in 2011 (UNESCO World Heritage Committee, 2011b) and is significant in moving beyond training to cover institutional capacity-building more widely. At the same time, the World Heritage Centre began encouraging the creation of a new set of training institutions known as the Category 2 Centres or “C2Cs”. While not legally part of UNESCO, the C2Cs are associated with it by way of formal arrangements approved by UNESCO's General Conference. There are now twenty such culture-related centres, of which six focus on World Heritage. Many States Parties are keen to establish a C2C, which is in line with their responsibilities under the Convention, but they must guarantee funding, possess staff with sufficient experience and, perhaps most important, have a genuine commitment to making the C2C function effectively.

The majority of strongest universities in the heritage field will be outside the “Category 2 family” that is being created. There is a concern that the C2Cs will be perceived as having UNESCO's imprimatur but may not attain the same standards of teaching and research. The situation is exacerbated by confusion between the notions of education and training (Logan, 2010). These are two different processes and involve different agencies, universities focusing more on education while professional bodies, government departments and other units focus on training. University education is

broad, questioning, liberating and improving. With regard to World Heritage, university teachers are not trainers merely serving the needs of the World Heritage system. Of course there is a necessity to provide such technical expertise, but they have also to engage students in the larger philosophical concerns, to inculcate in them an appreciation of ethical responsibility and to encourage critical analysis and debate. This must include maintaining a questioning stance towards UNESCO and its World Heritage programme.

Conclusion

It is quite clear that the growth of the World Heritage system requires new responses, including a realignment away from serving the political and tourism interests of the States Parties and towards the original UNESCO mission of building bridges to peace (Logan, 2012c, pp. 125–127). It is perhaps unfortunate that, given the increasingly difficult situation in which UNESCO's flagship World Heritage programme finds itself, exacerbated by another American funding embargo, World Heritage education and training seems to be moving towards a dual system comprising C2Cs and the rest. Promoting such a dual system seems to run against the advice of the Independent External Evaluation of UNESCO when it recommended five strategic directions, the fifth being to develop a partnership strategy that included renewing, not scaling down, links with and between institutes, programmes, universities and centres of excellence that can improve UNESCO's performance (UNESCO Executive Board, 2010, p. 11).

Critical Heritage Studies can provide an invaluable watchdog function, not only on the global heritage and human rights scene but also on the operations of UNESCO's World Heritage system itself. Critical Heritage Studies can encourage UNESCO to live up to its own statements of principle. Relevant to the heritage and human rights nexus is the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (2001), which asserts unequivocally in Article 5 that:

“Cultural rights are an integral part of human rights, which are universal, indivisible and interdependent ... All persons have therefore the right to express themselves and to create and disseminate their work in the language of their choice, and particularly in their mother tongue; all persons are entitled to quality education and training that fully respect their cultural identity; and all persons have the right to participate in the cultural life of their choice and conduct their own cultural practices, subject to respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.”

Being an intergovernmental organization, of course, there are many governance tensions within the World Heritage Committee that limit its ability to adopt a human rights-based approach to management. These include the fact that UNESCO Member States and those that have become States Parties to the World Heritage Convention ultimately operate according to their perception of their own national needs and may not give priority to tackling human rights violations, even if they even admit that

such exist within their own countries (Logan, 2012c). Critical Heritage Studies has an important role to play in encouraging UNESCO to draw attention to the inconsistent position of countries that have signed up to the UN’s Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and yet fail to uphold the human rights of their citizens in the implementation of UNESCO’s cultural, educational and other programmes in their territories.

At a time when both cultural heritage and human rights face challenges across the globe, the best way forward will be to maintain and strengthen partnerships between UNESCO, the World Heritage Committee, Advisory Bodies, universities and training institutions. UNESCO and the World Heritage Committee need strong educational and training institutions and teaching and research programmes encompassing new skills for new problems if the goal of capacity-building is to be achieved. This, after all, is one of the five Strategic Objectives of the World Heritage system, the so-called “5 Cs”: credibility, conservation, capacity-building, communication and communities. It is claimed that capacity-building is “the most cost effective means by which the World Heritage Committee can protect the Outstanding Universal Value and other values of World Heritage properties and ensure a mutually beneficial dynamic between heritage and society” (UNESCO World Heritage Committee, 2011b, p. 4). Resourcing such capacity-building will nevertheless be difficult in today’s economic climate. But resources must be found, such is the essential role that education and training have to play in sustaining the global heritage and ensuring that heritage programmes move steadily towards rights-based management approaches.

References

- Byrne, D. 2008. Heritage as social action. In: G. Fairclough, R. Harrison, J. H. Jameson and J. Schofield (eds), *The Heritage Reader*. London, Routledge, pp. 149–173.
- de Mérode, E., Smeets, R. and Westrik, C. (eds). 2004. *Linking Universal and Local Values: Managing a Sustainable Future for World Heritage*. Paris, UNESCO World Heritage Centre. (World Heritage Papers No. 13).
- Ekern, S., Logan, W., Sauge, B. and Sinding-Larsen, A. 2012. Human rights and World Heritage: Preserving our common dignity through rights-based approaches to site management. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp. 213–225.
- Harvey, D. 2001. Heritage pasts and heritage presents: Temporality, meaning and the scope of heritage studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 319–338.
- Jokilehto, J. 2012. Human rights and cultural heritage. Observations on the recognition of human rights in the international doctrine. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp. 226–230.
- Langfield, M., Logan, W. and Nic Craith, M. 2010. *Cultural Diversity, Heritage and Human Rights: Intersections in Theory and Practice*. London, Routledge.
- Logan, W. S. 2000. *Hanoi: Biography of a City*, UNSW Press, Sydney, U. Washington Press, Seattle, Select Publishing, Singapore; 2010 published in Vietnamese as *Ha Noi: Tieu Su Mot Do Thi*, Hanoi Publishing House, Hanoi.

- Logan, W. S. 2006. Limiting the list: human rights and intangible cultural heritage. In: S. Silaphacharanan and J. W. Campbell (eds), *Asian Approaches to Conservation: Research Conference Proceedings 3–5 October 2006*. Bangkok, Chulalongkorn University, pp. 80–86.
- Logan, W. S. 2007a. Heritage education at universities. In: M.-T. Albert and S. Gauer-Lietz (eds), *Heritage Education: Capacity Building in Heritage Management*. Frankfurt am Main/Cottbus, Germany, IKO – Verlag für Interkulturelle Kommunikation/Brandenburg Technical University, pp. 64–69.
- Logan, W. S. 2007b. Closing Pandora’s box: human rights conundrums in cultural heritage protection. In: Silverman and Fairchild (eds), op. cit., pp. 33–52.
- Logan, W. S. 2008. Cultural heritage and human rights. In: B. J. Graham and P. Howard (eds), *Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*. Aldershot, UK, Ashgate Publishing, pp. 439–454.
- Logan, W. S. 2010. Development of World Heritage studies in university education. In: D. Offenhäuser, W. Ch. Zimmerli and M.-T. Albert (eds), *World Heritage and Cultural Diversity*. Frankfurt am Main/Cottbus, IKO – Verlag für Interkulturelle Kommunikation/Brandenburg University of Technology, pp. 38–43.
- Logan, W. S. 2012a. Cultural diversity, cultural heritage and human rights: towards heritage management as human rights-based cultural practice. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp. 231–244.
- Logan, W. S. 2012b. Patrimonto leads the way: UNESCO, cultural heritage, children and youth. In: K. Darian-Smith and C. Pascoe (eds), *Children, Childhood and Cultural Heritage*. London, Routledge, pp. 21–39.
- Logan, W. S. 2012c. States, governance and the politics of culture: World Heritage in Asia. In: P. Daly and T. Winter (eds), *The Routledge Handbook of Heritage in Asia*. London, Routledge, pp. 113–128.
- Logan, W. S. 2012d. *Heritage: The Emergence of a New Paradigm?* Paper presented to the International Summer Academy ‘Constructing Heritage’, Brandenburg Technical University, Cottbus, 9–22 July.
- Logan, W. S. In press. From Kakadu to Cape York: Australia, World Heritage, governance and politics. *Journal of Social Archaeology*.
- Mathisen, B. 2012. East Africa World Heritage Network and stakeholder priorities. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp. 332–338.
- Oviedo, G. and Puschkarsky, T. 2012. World Heritage and rights-based approaches to nature conservation. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp. 285–296.
- Silberman, N. 2012. Heritage interpretation and human rights: documenting diversity, expressing identity, or establishing universal principles? *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp. 245–256.
- Silverman, H. and Fairchild D. R. (eds). 2007a. *Cultural Heritage and Human Rights*. New York, Springer.
- Silverman, H. and Fairchild D. R. (eds). 2007b. Cultural heritage and human rights. In: Silverman and Fairchild (eds), op. cit., pp. 3–22.
- Smith, L. 2006. *Use of Heritage*. London, Routledge.
- UN. 1948. *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. New York, United Nations. <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/> (accessed 21 December 2011).
- UN. 2007. *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. New York, United Nations. http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf (accessed 14 October 2012).
- UNESCO. 1972. *Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* (World Heritage Convention). Paris, UNESCO.
- UNESCO. 2001. *Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*. Paris, UNESCO.
- UNESCO. 2003. *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Paris, UNESCO.

- UNESCO. n.d.a. *World Heritage Convention. Frequently asked questions*. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/faq> (accessed 14 October 2012).
- UNESCO. n.d.b. *UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs programme*. <http://www.unesco.org/en/unitwin/> (accessed 14 October 2012).
- UNESCO. n.d.c. *List of UNESCO Chairs and UNITWIN networks in the field of cultural heritage by country*. <http://www.unesco.org/en/university-twinning-and-networking/access-by-domain/culture/cultural-heritage/> (accessed 1 October 2011).
- UNESCO Bangkok. 2011. *Asian Academy of Heritage Management*. <http://www.unescobkk.org/culture/world-heritage-and-immovable-heritage/asian-academy-for-heritage-management/> (accessed 14 October 2012).
- UNESCO Executive Board. 2010. *Report on the Independent External Evaluation of UNESCO*. Document 185 EX/18, Paris, 30 August.
- UNESCO FUUH. n.d. *Forum UNESCO: University and Heritage*. <http://universidadypatrimonio.net/eng/home.html> (accessed 14 October 2012).
- UNESCO World Heritage Committee. 2011a. *State of conservation of World Heritage properties inscribed on the World Heritage List*. <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2011/whc11-35com-7Be-pdf> (accessed 18 October 2012).
- UNESCO World Heritage Committee. 2011b. *Presentation and adoption of the World Heritage strategy for capacity building*. whc.unesco.org/archive/2011/whc11-35com-9Be.pdf (accessed 18 October 2012).
- UNESCO World Heritage Committee. 2012. *List of World Heritage in Danger*. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/danger> (accessed 19 October 2012).
- UNHRC. 2011. *Report of the Independent Expert in the field of cultural rights, Farida Shaheed*. Human Rights Council Seventeenth Session Agenda Item 3 (A/HRC/17/38). Geneva, United Nations Human Rights Council. <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G11/122/04/PDF/G1112204.pdf?OpenElement> (accessed 7 November 2011).
- UNPFII. 2011a. *Report on the tenth session (16–27 May 2011)*. E/2011/43-E/C.19/2011/14, Supplement No. 23. New York, United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/session_10_report_EN.pdf (accessed 14 May 2012).
- UNPFII. 2011b. *Joint Statement on Continuous violations of the principle of free, prior and informed consent in the context of UNESCO's World Heritage Convention*. New York, United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. <http://www.aippnet.org/home/statement/489-joint-statement-on-continuous-violations-of-the-principle-of-free-prior-and-informed-consent-in-the-context-of-unescos-world-heritage-convention> (accessed 19 October 2012).
- Ween, G B. 2012. World Heritage and indigenous rights. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp. 257–270.