

HERITAGE, IDENTITY, CULTURAL HERITAGE, CULTURAL DIVERSITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS: PROFESSIONAL CHALLENGES

HUMAN RIGHTS, CULTURAL HERITAGE CONSERVATION AND CULTURAL TOURISM - CONFLICT OR COLLABORATION?

ICOMOS CAIRNS JULY 2007

BY P. C. James AM, LL.B.

This paper addresses the relationships between and the potential, but essentially unfounded (unless the Convention and the Charter are improperly implemented), conflict between the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (the Declaration)¹, the World Heritage Convention (the Convention)² and the ICOMOS Cultural Tourism Charter (the Charter)³. It also deals briefly with the Vienna Declaration⁴, the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity⁵ and the Draft UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples⁶.

The topic raises an interesting question which has been much ignored by those on the conservation side but addressed on many occasions by those whose primary interest is that of human rights. In the conservation field the emphasis is, understandable in our (Western) culture, on the conservation of fabric with little attention given in many cases to the fundamental rights of owners of properties which may be controlled by various heritage authorities.

This paper does not address in depth these issues in so far as they affect or are affected by the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. This is not because the issue is of lesser importance but because the UN Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples is presently (as at the writing of this paper) stalled in the United Nations, it having been opposed at various times recently by New Zealand, Canada and of course Australia. It is of little surprise that these three countries should be opposed to it as they all share a problem of cultural and social reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples.

The Draft Declaration has been around for years and in many ways demonstrates the potential for conflict between conservation (and of course development) and cultural and social rights. However it is worth noting in the context of this paper that the Draft Declaration contains in Part III, Articles 12, 13 & 14 the following interesting and sensible – and not at all confronting – statements about cultural issues:

¹ UN Declaration of Human Rights 10th December 1948

² UNESCO Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage 1972

³ ICOMOS International Cultural Tourism Charter 1999

⁴ UN World Conference on Human Rights, Vienna 1993

⁵ UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity 2001

⁶ UN Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, adopted by the UN Human Rights Council 2006

“Article 12

Indigenous peoples have the right to practise and revitalize their cultural traditions and customs. This includes the right to maintain, protect and develop the past, present and future manifestations of their cultures, such as archaeological and historical sites, artefacts, designs, ceremonies, technologies and visual and performing arts and literature, as well as the right to the restitution of cultural, intellectual, religious and spiritual property taken without their free and informed consent or in violation of their laws, traditions and customs.

Article 13

Indigenous peoples have the right to manifest, practise, develop and teach their spiritual and religious traditions, customs and ceremonies; the right to maintain, protect, and have access in privacy to their religious and cultural sites; the right to the use and control of ceremonial objects; and the right to the repatriation of human remains.

States shall take effective measures, in conjunction with the indigenous peoples concerned, to ensure that indigenous sacred places, including burial sites, be preserved, respected and protected.

Article 14

Indigenous peoples have the right to revitalize, use, develop and transmit to future generations their histories, languages, oral traditions, philosophies, writing systems and literatures, and to designate and retain their own names for communities, places and persons.

States shall take effective measures, whenever any right of indigenous peoples may be threatened, to ensure this right is protected and also to ensure that they can understand and be understood in political, legal and administrative proceedings, where necessary through the provision of interpretation or by other appropriate means.

The issue of the Draft Declaration is supposed to come before the General Assembly of the United Nations later this year and hopefully will receive endorsement and become a UN Declaration. It is interesting, looking at the wording above, how almost 60 years of practice the wording is far more in accordance with proper treatment of such issues than was the rather scant, although effective, wording in the original Declaration of Human rights.

But to return to the major topic of this paper.

As Ayton-Schenker said in her paper⁷ prepared for the United Nations as one of the descriptors of the Declaration:

‘How can universal human rights exist in a culturally diverse world? As the international community becomes increasingly integrated, how can cultural diversity and integrity be respected? Is a global culture inevitable? If so, is the world ready for it? How could a global culture emerge based on and guided by human dignity and tolerance? These are some of the issues, concerns and questions underlying the debate over universal human rights and cultural relativism’.

(Incidentally I quote at length from this document of which I was unaware until I started the preparation of this paper. Not wishing to plagiarise, nor re-invent the wheel, I have liberally quoted from her excellent paper on the Declaration of Human Rights. Her whole discourse is available on the Internet under ‘United Nations, Declaration of Human Rights’.)

It is also one of the major problems facing international heritage conservation today. How do we maintain the World’s Cultural Heritage when it is owned by multitudes of people of different races, creeds and cultures, many with very different cultural and conservation values.

It has been said, admittedly by people who may have been ignorant of the full subject matter, that the Convention and the Charter are potentially damaging documents which could be used to breach Human Rights – and that the Charter could be used in such a way as to damage the conservation values of World Heritage Places. As this paper will show neither of these inferences is correct.

The most important issue was again well expressed by Ayton-Schenker in her paper on the Declaration when she said:

‘Universal human rights do not impose one cultural standard, rather one legal standard of minimum protection necessary for human dignity. As a legal standard adopted through the United Nations, universal human rights represent the hard-won consensus of the international community, not the cultural imperialism of any particular region or set of traditions.’

This is a highly accurate and acute assessment of the purpose of human rights as incorporated in the Declaration. However, and more importantly following on from that quotation this paper puts forward a proposition which follows on from the analysis in this paper and which adds another dimension to the universal benefits which conservation and cultural tourism can bring to the weapons used to strengthen human rights! It may seem an odd proposition coming from ICOMOS but it is a valid one – and one which has not so far been widely discussed or acted upon.

Incidentally as this is a topic which crosses all the world’s cultures it is essential to look at ‘culture’ in its wider (though not widest) term to incorporate intangible as well

⁷ The Challenge of Human Rights and Cultural Diversity, UN Background Note 1995, Author Diana Ayton-Schenker

as tangible heritage. The paper does not address all written works, nor oral heritage, except in so far as they are of effect in the conservation of elements of the cultural environment.

It is also necessary to look at the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity – especially Articles 4, 5 & 6.

It says, under the Heading of Cultural Diversity and Human Rights:

Article 4 - Human rights as guarantees of cultural diversity

The defence of cultural diversity is an ethical imperative, inseparable from respect for human dignity. It implies a commitment to human rights and fundamental freedoms, in particular the rights of persons belonging to minorities and those of indigenous peoples. No one may invoke cultural diversity to infringe upon human rights guaranteed by international law, nor to limit their scope.

Article 5 - Cultural rights as an enabling environment for cultural diversity

Cultural rights are an integral part of human rights, which are universal, indivisible and interdependent. The flourishing of creative diversity requires the full implementation of cultural rights as defined in Article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in Articles 13 and 15 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. 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.

Article 6 - Towards access for all to cultural diversity

While ensuring the free flow of ideas by word and image care should be exercised that all cultures can express themselves and make themselves known. Freedom of expression, media pluralism, multilingualism, equal access to art and to scientific and technological knowledge, including in digital form, and the possibility for all cultures to have access to the means of expression and dissemination are the guarantees of cultural diversity.

As I said in the synopsis of this presentation

“A people’s cultural heritage is an integral part of their identity and thus of great importance to them in identifying as a race or people or cultural group. How they maintain and conserve their cultural heritage can be argued to be entirely up to them. This raises an interesting issue in so far as another international document is concerned – The World Heritage Convention – it could be argued that this

Convention is in fact in breach of the Declaration of Human Rights, or certainly of the tenor of it.

There are benefits to a population in maintaining its cultural identity, not just for its sake but to maintain diversity from other cultures and thus make the cultural tourism of that people a more interesting and different experience. One may then ask – how does the ICOMOS Charter on Cultural Tourism interact with the Declaration of Human Rights and The World Heritage Convention?”

The ICOMOS Charter on Cultural Tourism is not normally thought about as interacting with the Declaration of Human Rights and The World Heritage Convention but it does. Much of the Charter deals with issues which could easily be claimed as matters of Human Rights and matters affecting World Heritage Areas.

This paper endeavours to show that despite arguments to the contrary, properly administered and applied, all the documents mentioned above can be used by the heritage professional together and in harmony for the benefit of mankind and conservation generally and for each and every culture and its heritage. In fact it goes further and demonstrates that the use of conservation and cultural tourism can be used to aid in the support of human rights.

Let us look briefly first of all at the relevant Charter, Declaration and Convention and see what each has to say in relation to the issue before us. And, without being overly legalistic, at the same time consider what is the relevant relationship between a Charter, a Declaration and a Convention? Clearly the Charter is subservient to the Declaration and the Convention – but how do those two relate to one another – is one subservient to the other? Or do both have equal status?

The answer is I think quite clear – the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is a United Nations Declaration and thus is the superior document. The World Heritage Convention is a convention of UNESCO, a subsidiary as it were, of the United Nations and thus is subservient to the Declaration on Human Rights. The Charter on Cultural Tourism is an ICOMOS document and thus does not have the authority of a UN or UNESCO document despite ICOMOS's connection with UNESCO.

Thus the hierarchy is quite clear:

- 1 UNITED NATIONS - The Universal Declaration of Human Rights –(and the Vienna Declaration and in due course the (Draft) Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples)
- 2 UNESCO - The World Heritage Convention (and the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity)
- 3 ICOMOS - The Charter on Cultural Tourism

Thus, in essence, the Charter cannot contravene the terms of the Convention or the UN Declarations, the Convention (and the Declaration on Cultural Diversity) cannot

contravene the terms of the Declarations and the Declarations are untrammelled by either the Convention or the Charter.

The term cultural relativism needs to be addressed as it is an integral part of the arguments being put forward in this paper - I have again used the words of Ayton-Schenker:

Cultural relativism is the assertion that human values, far from being universal, vary a great deal according to different cultural perspectives. Some would apply this relativism to the promotion, protection, interpretation and application of human rights which could be interpreted differently within different cultural, ethnic and religious traditions. In other words, according to this view, human rights are culturally relative rather than universal.

This is a point which some heritage professionals, overly imbued with the 'heritage conservation culture' of their own country should heed and remember when looking to imposing 'standards' in other countries and cultures. Ayton-Shenker goes on:

Taken to its extreme, this relativism would pose a dangerous threat to the effectiveness of international law and the international system of human rights that has been painstakingly constructed over the decades. If cultural tradition alone governs State compliance with international standards, then widespread disregard, abuse and violation of human rights would be given legitimacy.

Accordingly, the promotion and protection of human rights perceived as culturally relative would only be subject to State discretion, rather than international legal imperative. By rejecting or disregarding their legal obligation to promote and protect universal human rights, States advocating cultural relativism could raise their own cultural norms and particularities above international law and standards.

This consensus is embodied in the language of the Universal Declaration itself. The universal nature of human rights is literally written into the title of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Its Preamble proclaims the Declaration as a "common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations"

.

Whilst the use of the word 'culture' in these statements was not primarily intended to refer to the cultural heritage to which our conservation practitioners are primarily concerned this heritage is inextricably interwoven with the international United Nations concept of 'culture' and 'cultural' activities. It raises many interesting issues relating to cultural diversity and cultural relativism, many of which are not of concern to us here. But it does strengthen the need for countries, especially Western Countries, to more fully appreciate the depth of spiritual and social cultural mores which make up the approach of countries and cultures different to ours.

It is informative to consider the background to the documents under consideration in some detail and to comprehend the purpose for which they were intended.

The Declaration

Shortly after World War Two the (then relatively) few sovereign countries in the World on behalf of them selves and their colonies (of which there were dozens at that stage) first established the United Nations in an endeavour to over come the problems and failures of the League of Nations formed after WWI. In the light of the atrocities of WWII and the sufferings of so many of the people of the World, and with a view by some countries that colonization should end, these countries formulated and signed in to effect the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It was never meant to be a prescriptive document, rather one which set down what all those countries, essential the successful powers following WWII saw as the basic rights and freedoms of nations and their peoples.

Since then the Declaration has formed the underlying philosophy for the Nations of the World to set free and allow to remain free all countries and peoples of whatever race, colour or creed.

Clearly we still have a long way to go. Many countries still, some blatantly, defy the terms of the Declaration and keep their peoples in servitude, poverty and allow no democratic rights.

However the World is a better place for the Declaration and certainly there are many, many more countries with freedoms and democratic ideals then there were in 1948! Countries who are signatories to it (and in theory every member of the United Nations has to accept it as part of their terms of membership) are expected to abide by it and the majority do. It has many side effects which were not appreciated at the time – or sometimes until very recently. For example the Australian Native Title Act, whilst it can and has been amended over the years cannot be repealed or amended so as to affect any Aboriginal Human Rights as to do so would breach the Declaration and thus caste the Australian Government in to disrepute. So whilst it may be ignored in part by some countries, those like Australia which hold to its principles, have to look at all their legislation to ensure that it does not breach the Declaration – and once legislation is passed which improves Human Rights in this Country – it cannot be amended or repealed if so doing would diminish the human rights of a sector of the community.

The Convention

In the 1960's UNESCO, and particularly a number of its constituent members were becoming increasingly concerned about the deterioration and damage being caused to a number of the Worlds great Monuments and Sites. Thus once again Countries came together to establish a mechanism which would first of all identify and nominate places of 'outstanding universal value' and then make provision for their conservation and protection. Again many countries adopted the concept and the need to identify and protect – some for not necessarily the right reasons but nevertheless the ultimate object was achieved.

Australia is amongst the leading countries which have used the Convention to manipulate internal issues. Australia in many cases nominated places to the World Heritage List for the primary purpose of enabling the Commonwealth, under its Foreign Affairs powers, to take control of State owned or controlled property which the Commonwealth was not otherwise entitled to administer under the terms of the Australian constitution. Nevertheless it must be said in defence of the Commonwealth that the actions were not 'power for power's sake' but to improve the conservation opportunities for the areas in question.

The World Heritage Convention requires the nomination of places submitted for inclusion in the World Heritage List to have the imprimatur of the National Government of the Country in which the place is situated and for the nomination to come from that Government. Thus for example the Australian Government could not nominate a place in New Zealand for inclusion in the World Heritage List however eligible that place may be.

There is clearly no conflict with Human Rights in these provisions – unless of course the nominating party was submitting the place with a view to – for example – dispossessing peoples living in and owning land in such an area so that the Government could take over the land for exploitative purposes. But this is highly unlikely. A unitary State would not need that mechanism as a means of dispossessing its citizens. It could in theory (and in practice such as in Zimbabwe) just legislate to dispossess them and then face sanctions from other countries for breaches of the Declaration. A federal country such as Australia would of course have also to contend with the member States' powers and objections and would be even less likely to be able to use the Convention for these purposes though it could in areas such as Kakadu – use the assumed powers under the convention to allow activities opposed by other sectors of the community or other State or Territory Governments – such as uranium mining!

To enable it to do this the Commonwealth Government had of course to enact the World Heritage Properties Conservation Act⁸. This Act was not needed to bind Australia to the World Heritage Convention but it was needed to ensure that the Commonwealth could exercise its powers over the States to override actions by the States in respect to such areas. Whilst it did not quite get it right the first time the High Court of Australia has made it abundantly clear that with the Amendments the Commonwealth had full power to administer and introduce controls for areas on the World Heritage List and for places which had genuinely been nominated for inclusion on that list. These statutory provisions have now been subsumed in to the EP&BC Act.

The issue is a complex one and the Commonwealth Government got it partially wrong the first time – as evidenced by the High Court's decisions in relation to the World Heritage listings of both the Tasmanian South West Wilderness Area and The Queensland Wet Tropics Area. But the subsequent amendments ensured that all the States and Territories of Australia are bound by Commonwealth decisions in respect

⁸ This Act has now been repealed and the necessary provisions incorporated in the Environment Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (as amended)

to World Heritage Areas – except where there is a specific agreement between the Commonwealth and the State or Territory concerned. But even then, whilst powers may be exercised by the State or Territory they are only being exercised because they have been delegated by the Commonwealth.

In fact, whilst it is theoretically possible that the Convention could be used to overcome Human Rights protection it is hard to imagine that a Government so inclined would go to this trouble and expense when there would be easier ways to avoid having to comply with those rights – for example just ignoring them altogether as a number of members of the United Nations continue to do.

The provisions of the Convention dealing with Places in Danger is not quite so clear cut as intervention is, under some circumstances, allowed. However it is again hard to see that it would be worth the while of a Country or Countries to try and use any interventionist powers which could be devised from the Convention to protect a World Heritage Site and in so doing defy the Declaration.

The Charter

It should be born in mind that the Charter covers more than just World Heritage areas - it applies to Cultural Tourism the world over– so there will be cases where the WHC does not apply and thus the Charter relates directly to the Declaration. I have already addressed the relationship of these two documents in another place (See the publications flowing from the ICOMOS Colombo Meeting in 1999 especially paper by P. C. James⁹) although admittedly the Charter has been redrafted and much improved since that date. However the comments made in that paper still apply and there is nothing in the Charter which could in any way damage any of the outcomes of the Convention and in fact there is much in the Charter which can be of great assistance in controlling and administering cultural tourism in World Heritage places.

The Charter is of no legal effect – unlike, to a greater or lesser degree, the Declaration and the Convention. It does not need, in fact there is no power to adopt it by any Country except in so far as a Country may wish to do so for its own purposes. It is a statement, a good statement, by the International Conservation Community through the ICOMOS General Assembly as to how cultural tourism should be conducted throughout the world.

It would not have been hard to word this Charter in such a way as to provide very strong grounds to dispute that it could potentially lead to breaches of the Declaration. But this has been avoided. Whilst the Charter provides for ‘intervention’ in other people’s lives by encouraging tourists to visit areas, observe customs and purchase cultural items it does so with a very strong provision that the interests of the host community are paramount.

The Objectives of the International Cultural Tourism Charter are:

⁹ The Role of ICOMOS in Cultural Tourism at World Heritage Sites, ICOMOS General Assembly, Colombo,

- To facilitate and encourage those involved with heritage conservation and management to make the significance of that heritage accessible to the host community and visitors.
- To facilitate and encourage the tourism industry to promote and manage tourism in ways that respect and enhance the heritage and living cultures of host communities.

It is clear from this, provided the clauses of the Charter are observed, that there should be no interference with human rights – either those declared by the UN or any others. Thus any criticism of the Charter is not justified – certainly not if it is based on any branch of human rights under the Declaration.

Let us look also at the Vienna Declaration.

The Vienna Declaration (1993) states at the outset that ‘the universal nature’ of all human rights and fundamental freedoms is ‘beyond question’.

Article 1

- 1 *Each culture has a dignity and value which must be respected and preserve*
- 2 *Every people has the right and the duty to develop its culture*
- 3 *In their rich variety and diversity, and in the reciprocal influences they exert on one another, all cultures form part of the common heritage belonging to all mankind*

Article 6

International co-operation, while promoting the enrichment of all cultures through its beneficent action, shall respect the distinctive character of each.

This means that cultural rights cannot be invoked or interpreted in such a way as to justify any act leading to the denial or violation of other human rights and fundamental freedoms. As such, claiming cultural relativism as an excuse to violate or deny human rights is an abuse of the right to culture.¹⁰

The issue of returning or otherwise Aboriginal remains to Tasmania from the UK is a point in question here. Of cultural (in its scientific sense) to the UK scientists it was totally contrary to the cultural heritage of the Tasmanian aboriginal population. If you want to get involved in universal conservation then you have to take the good with the bad – you cannot be choosy as to which elements you select to practice and maintain!

Traditional culture is not a substitute for human rights; it is a cultural context in which human rights must be established, integrated, promoted and protected. Human rights must be approached in a way that is meaningful and relevant in diverse cultural contexts.

¹⁰ Ayton Shenker

Rather than limit human rights to suit a given culture, why not draw on traditional cultural values to reinforce the application and relevance of universal human rights? There is an increased need to emphasize the common, core values shared by all cultures: the value of life, social order and protection from arbitrary rule. These basic values are embodied in human rights¹¹.

Having looked at these documents I think it is appropriate to say to oneself – what is the best inter-relationship between them? There should not be any conflict – so long as the cultural imperative is not enforced to the detriment of human rights – perhaps some documents – such as the Convention and the Charter should, for more abundant caution end as does the Vienna Declaration of the Principles of International Cultural Co-operation – it ends up with a statement *that ‘The principles of this Declaration shall be applied with due regard for human rights and fundamental freedoms’!!* That is to say – no document or action shall be applied contrary to the Declaration of Human Rights.

Following on from this proposition I think it is fair and reasonable and valuable to say that properly presented heritage conservation and cultural tourism can in fact be used to encourage the implementation of human rights. It is just important to ensure that cultural imperialism is not, through unintentional international goodwill on the part of organisations such as ICOMOS used to solve other cultures conservation problems.

This leads on to another topic – take the Burra Charter for example. When applied overseas does it amount to a contravention of the Declaration? Just because it is purpose built for Australia does not mean that it is acceptable in other countries with different cultures and beliefs. Is there a difference in accepting a philosophical approach to an issue because one does not know any better or because one does not know any alternative? This could be seen as an imposition of a philosophy of one country on another.

I take the Burra Charter as an example only – the same remarks apply though in a wider forum to the Cultural Tourism Charter. To indicate a need is not to impose the cultural values of one country on another but to attempt to impose such cultural values certainly is, following the Declaration and the Vienna statement an invasion of human (cultural) rights and could be in breach of the Convention. This is especially so if the recipient country is given no option in the way it conserves its cultural heritage but to adopt that which is imposed upon it.

Take Japan as an example – where for centuries it has been good conservation practice, and in accordance with their cultural practices and Confucian beliefs to replace materials as they reach the end of their life ensuring that there is no visible difference from the original. For example cutting yew from a tree in the same place as the old timber came from to repair the roof of a temple – certainly not in accordance with the Burra Charter!

¹¹ Ayton Shenker

In conclusion and looking at the issues from the viewpoint of the cultural heritage practitioner I think it is fair to say that properly applied, documents such as the Burra Charter, the Cultural Tourism Charter and the World Heritage Convention can be bridges rather than obstacles to the furtherance of Human Rights in the World today. With the very great need today in a sadly large number of countries the protection of and furtherance of human rights is perhaps the greatest task facing us as human beings. It is thus comforting to know that with professional skills applied in a professional manner in the area of heritage conservation we can in fact be aiding that cause rather than impeding it!

The importance is, in all these areas, to ensure that it is the tenor as well as the actual wording of the treaties, conventions, declarations and charters and other documents which is observed. Beware the professional heritage practitioner who becomes so obsessed with the wording of a conservation document that he or she cannot see the wider picture of the effect this approach will make in countries and cultures other than our own.

Think first of the context in which the conservation issue is being approached, think of the culture in which the action is being taken, think of the philosophical and cultural approach of the people to whom the site belongs or in whose care it is and tread softly in trying to impose your (western) ideals, particularly in fabric conservation and remember that the spirituality of a site is frequently more important to many cultures than the retention of the physical remains of the place. This can lead to potential conflict when trying, for example, to protect a World Heritage site. Many western countries see the conservation of the physical fabric as paramount. Just do not forget that if to the host country's peoples that is not the case you have no right to impose it upon them.

The World Heritage Convention, although it does not specifically say so, must have by implication the qualification stated above from the Vienna Declaration the words 'The principles of this [Convention] shall be applied with due regard for human rights and human freedoms' – in other words do not impose ones cultural values on the practices of others. Cultural diversity is one of the great gifts of this world of ours – do not use our values to diminish those of others – however well meant the proposed practice or application of principles may be.

It is fair to say I believe, that properly used and administered the three documents under review, the Declaration, the Convention and the Charter are complementary in assisting in all three areas of endeavour - Human Rights, conservation and tourism. Whilst it would take a very serious misuse of the Charter to breach the Convention or the Declaration and a very serious misuse of the Convention to be in breach of the Declaration it is always conceivable albeit highly unlikely. From the point of view of conservation practitioners it is important to be aware of these documents, their purposes and their powers. But properly administered in accordance with the tenor and wording of them no conservation practitioner should be in fear of their implications.

Finally this paper can only, in the time and space allowed, scratch the surface of the inter-relationship between these various international and national documents. No

doubt someone better qualified than I will address the cultural heritage and conservation issues at greater length for the benefit of cultural heritage practitioners. Hopefully they will, even after much more research and deliberation, reach the same conclusions as does this paper.