MMXIX
BIMUN

2019 北京国际模拟联合国大会
Beijing International Model United Nations 2019

Background Guide

United Nations Educational，
Scientific and Cultural Organization

Topic A:
Protection of Cultural Heritage under the South-South Cooperation
Topic B:
Application for the World Heritage List

青年携手 大道同行
Young Partners for a Bright Future

Content

Welcome Letter

Dear delegates,

Welcome to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) of Beijing International Model United Nations 2019 (BIMUN 2019)! It is our privilege to extend the sincerest welcome to all delegates attending the conference.

Cultural heritage, regarded as the conduits to achieve cultural diversity worldwide through inter-cultural communication, is of vital significance for exhibiting archeological, aesthetic and historical values. Nevertheless, nowadays the relics are much more prone to the unstable environment, including natural disaster, armed conflict, looting and illicit trafficking. In response to this increasingly adversary situation, careful protection calls for the implementation of legal instrument, coordination with social development as well as acceleration of financial assistance and technical support. Meanwhile, the World Heritage List, known as the most internationally authoritative catalogue of cultural property protection, is in action to prevent these rare gems from destruction.

Having savored the unforgettable experience in Model United Nations activities, you might become confident in speaking up your ideas and grabbing every opportunity of demonstrating your potentials. Nonetheless, if you just kick the things off and make your debut on stage, you should also be proud of yourself for displaying your courage of handling those delicate issues and sketching out the blueprint for cultural property protection. Bear in mind that in-depth and insightful proposals concerning the problems at hand through your own critical thinking and careful judgment are always welcomed in this conference.

This Background Guide aims at recapping the issues to be addressed and their solutions accordingly, serving as a springboard for your extensive research. In light of this, you are strongly recommended to find out the debates and discussions pertinent to our topics and explore innovative ideas through your independent studies.

Should you have any questions as regards the topics or Beijing Rules of Procedure, feel free to contact us.

You are here to make a difference for the future of cultural diversity!

With kind regards,

Directors of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

Beijing International Model United Nations 2019

Introduction to the Committee

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, abbreviated for UNESCO, is a specialized agency headquartered in Paris with an emphasis on peace-building through multilateral commitments in the fields of scientific, educational and cultural reforms. Targeting at implementing the Sustainable Development Goals in Agenda 2030, it initiates a wide range of programs, including education, natural sciences, social sciences, culture and communication. To be specific, projects backed and sponsored by the Organization cover international collaboration regarding promoting cultural diversity and rescuing cultural heritage worldwide.

Following the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations, the Organization was built in the wartime, 1946. In contrast to the conventional belief that peace should build on the intergovernmental agreements among political and economic issues, the Organization advocates that intellectual and moral solidarity of humanity are the cornerstone of securing human welfare through peaceful development (UNESCO, 2019). Mutual understanding and tolerance of differences are vitally significant when it comes to cross-cultural communication. By virtue of this belief, it has made relentless efforts to accomplish social equality and foster cultural diversity through the dissemination of knowledge, establishment of platforms for dialogue and cooperation, as well as other innovative educational tools. Today, as cultural diversity is exposed to emerging threats of ethnocentrism and attacks from ethnic discrimination, it is the very responsibility of this Organization to take forward the legacies of human ingenuity and discreetly preserve the equality of cultural development through scientific and educational means.

More noticeably, as regards the transformative power of cultural development in human societies, the cultural conventions adopted by the Organization are renowned as the holistic legal instrument of "cultural governance" and the "unique global platform" (UNESCO, 2019) for sharing the gems of social progress. These conventions, ranging from the elimination of illicit trafficking of cultural artifacts to the protection of underwater and intangible heritage, reaffirm the resolution of accelerating the construction of social cohesion and self-identity among different communities through cultural diversity.

UNESCO • Background Guide

Topic A: Protection of Cultural Heritage under the South-South Cooperation

General Introduction

General Idea of the Topic

Cultural heritage, if not properly managed and preserved by local cultural institutions, can be affected by external threats, including precarious environment for restoration and deliberate damage from illicit excavation. Without preventative measures, these problems, beyond doubt, would directly exert negative impacts on the expression of cultural diversity. Compared with those developed countries which are affluent in financial resources, technical support and robust legal instrument regarding cultural heritage protection, most countries from the developing world are suffering from inefficient channels for raising fund, facilitating technology transfer and absorbing professionals and specialists from specialized agencies.

As these thorny questions have been widely recognized by many international institutions, particularly the World Monument Fund as well as other non-profit and non-governmental organizations, concerted efforts to remove the obstacles for cultural heritage preservation are underway. This is best illustrated by UNESCO's concrete contributions to step up the safeguarding of preserving Syrian and Iraqi cultural heritage. These archeological artifacts, whose countries of provenance have been enduring the continuous social unrest, are in immediate need of implementing legally-binding documents for combating against illicit trafficking. So far the Organization has aligned with the Security Council (SC) and the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) and strengthened comprehensive network with the private sector, financial institutions and antiquities agencies in regard to crack down the illegal trade connections. Nonetheless, despite the measures adopted, state-level collaboration among developing countries and other regional commitments to redress the chaotic market transaction still lags behind. Apart from these emergency actions to retrieve these cultural artifacts from illicit trafficking, multilateral efforts under the international framework of South-South Cooperation should also highlight the significance of awareness-raising, capacity-building and sound policymaking mechanism.

Key Terms and Definitions

Cultural Heritage

According to the official definition provided by UNESCO, cultural heritage can be broadly categorized into tangible and intangible properties. As to the intangible ones, they can be respectively characterized as "immovable cultural heritage" (monuments, archaeological sites), "movable cultural heritage" (paintings, sculptures, coins, manuscripts) as well as "underwater cultural heritage" (ship-wrecks, underwater ruins and cities) (UNESCO, 2017). This "top-down" nature of the official definition is in sharp contrast to the "bottom-up" analysis in which individuals can independently sort out those that are related to their local or communal culture and customs (Matthes, 2018). Nonetheless, when discussing the issues under this topic, the term "cultural heritage" will mainly focus on the official definition of the tangible cultural properties, meaning that intangible heritage will be excluded from the debates and discussions given their complexity and obscurity.

Conventions Concerning the Protection of World Culture Heritage

Ever since the Hague Convention (1954) which stresses the preservation of cultural artifacts in armed conflicts, UNESCO has been ratifying a series of cultural heritage conventions, covering effective management of underwater relics and archeological sites. The most well-known convention is the 1972 World Heritage Convention which includes the preservation of cultural and natural heritage. The clear distinction between cultural and natural heritage written in the document serves as the "inscription on the World Heritage List" (UNESCO, 2019). With respect to safeguard the cultural heritage, it applies the strategic objectives (credibility, conservation, capacity-building, communication, communities) to the process of implementation. More significantly, the Convention also shares equal emphasis on the safeguarding of cultural heritage and the conservation of nature, which is fundamentally indispensable for achieving world cultural prosperity.

Current Situation

Currently, among the developing countries, there are a number of challenges that have been impeded the local authorities from developing the capacity for cultural heritage protection. Least-developed countries are constantly plagued by budgetary problems and short of advanced techniques for artifacts restoration owing to deeply-seated social poverty and ignorance of the inherent values of tangible properties. Meanwhile, as regards other developing countries, culture heritages are potentially damaged by the changing environment. Except that cultural artifacts could be impaired by illicit trafficking and deliberate looting during social unrests, social development (in particular modernization) would havoc the preservation of historic relics and marine heritage through overly pursing the economic benefits of urban construction. A dearth of efficient restrictions on reckless exploitation with legal instrument is also problematic given holistic governance of cultural heritage usually builds on robust framework of legal conventions and systematic domestic laws.

Specialists from developed countries and relevant international institutions have projected that sustainable heritage tourism would be a major trend for cultural heritage protection among developing countries, especially less-developed countries and Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Timothy and Nyaupane (1968) in their co-authored literature all agreed upon the empirical evidence that development of cultural diversity through heritage tourism could enrich local communities and facilitate inter-cultural communication. The socioeconomic, environmental and cultural benefits deriving from such activities could offset the downsides of modernization in populated countries as Vietnam. Moreover, primary international institutions have also played pivotal roles in the latest actions of surviving cultural heterogeneity from the verge of disappearance. For instance, specialized databases containing precise statistics of world heritage have been established to accelerate scientific research and development (R&D). Countries which are in urgent need of financial resources for rescuing damaged cultural artifacts could also be blessed by plenty of independent monetary fund provided by the Organization, including the World Heritage Fund.

Nonetheless, there is a broadening gap between the increase of universal attempts organized by UNESCO and stagnant progress in countries involving in the South-South Cooperation. Not to mention those innovative ideas in respond to the emerging problems regarding cultural property destruction, conventional proposals like information sharing and stringent regulations of illegal excavation are still challenged by the controversies over who should be responsible for initiating relevant regional programs and what kind of state-level cooperation should be taken to actively eliminate the loss of intentional destruction. Hence, how to effectively transplant the South-South Cooperation network into the domain of cultural heritage protection is yet to be answered.

Problems to Be Solved

Cultural heritage worldwide is facing old and new perils: From earlier time to date, wars and looting posed grave threats to cultural heritage. However, rapid modernization processes all around the globe and its consequences such as economic growth, urbanization, and climate change have brought new challenges to the preservation of cultural heritage.

Currently there is no comprehensive data on the state and location of endangered cultural heritage worldwide. However, most of the cultural World Heritage sites on the World Heritage in Danger List (World Heritage Center, 2018) are situated in the Global South. Furthermore, the majority of sites on the World Monuments Watch List published by the World Monuments Fund, a NGO dedicated to the preservation of cultural heritage sites around the globe, is also situated in countries of the Global South (World Monuments Fund, 2018). It is safe to say that the majority of endangered cultural heritage is to be found in the Global South. As further elaborated below, imperfect conservation, the lack of funding, a higher risk of violent conflicts, and inadequate management make cultural heritage in countries of the Global South prone to damage and destruction.

Violent Conflicts, Deliberate Destruction and Illicit Trafficking of Cultural Property

During times of war or armed conflict, cultural property is prone to deliberate destruction and illicit trafficking. Firstly, cultural property might be inadvertently destroyed, because combatants fail to protect it. Secondly, combatants might destroy cultural property on purpose, because it does not fit into their world view or because they want to eradicate the culture of their enemies. Thirdly, they might undertake illicit trafficking of cultural property such as antiquities to attain more funds for their war effort.

Illegal Excavation, Looting and Stealing

Deliberate destruction of World Heritage sites, such as the demolition of the ancient city of Palmyra in Syria by troops of the Islamic state in 2015 or the blowing-up of Buddha figures in the Bamiyan valley, Afghanistan, by the Taliban in 2001, have received high media attention worldwide. However, most destruction of cultural property during wars or armed conflicts happens piecemeal and remains unknown to the wider public. For instance, a study found that during the Syrian war between 2011 and 2015, approximately 25 per cent of Syria's archaeological sites have been pillaged (Casana, 2015, p. 147). In addition, not only the Islamic state, but all parties in the war, resorted to looting of archaeological sites (Casana, 2015, p.151). Studies find a link between violent conflicts and the looting of archaeological sites (Hardy, 2015; Brodie, 2006). Illegal excavation of archaeological sites and the stealing of the cultural properties within these sites lead

to a loss of important information for archaeologists (Elia, 1997): for example, once archaeological remnants are unprofessionally unearthed and thereby removed from their original context, archaeologists can no longer investigate how the objects were used. In addition, the theft of cultural objects disrupts the cultural and social structures of indigenous communities which often view cultural objects as an integral part of their identity (Yates, 2016).

Transboundary Smuggling

Even though most countries are members to the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, the illegal trade in cultural property is booming. Factors can be found in three areas: the source country, the transit process (how cultural property can leave the source country), and the market where stolen cultural property is sold and bought (Yates, 2016): Source countries are often seen as the first defense line against illicit trafficking. However, given the huge amount of cultural heritage sites worldwide and the limited amount of funding available in source countries, it is impossible to effectively protect all of these sites. Besides, law enforcement agencies in source countries are often underfunded or corrupt and therefore unable to stop traffickers and hold them accountable. Next, several problems also arise during the transit process when stolen or looted cultural objects leave the source country. Countries in the Global South often have lax import and export regulations, their ports lack good oversight and custom officials are often corrupt or don't have the expertise to distinguish antiquities. What's more, there is no international standard for antiquities export permits. It is difficult for customs officials to determine if paperwork accompanying a shipment of antiquities is valid, relevant, or authentic (Yates, 2006). There is also no formal mechanism through which information on smuggled cultural property can be shared among customs and law enforcement agencies in different countries. Last but not least, opaque business practices at the international market make it easy to sell and buy smuggled cultural property without any danger (Yates, 2016). Most of these markets are situated in the Global North, in countries that have ratified the 1970 UNESCO convention. However, weak regulation of the market and a lack of transparency make it difficult for the law enforcement agencies in these countries to effectively carry out the 1970 UNESCO convention. For example, both seller and buyer of smuggled cultural property can often remain anonymous.

Increased Vulnerability to Natural Disasters and Unstable Social Environment

Natural Disasters

Cultural heritage sites have always been exposed to everyday negative influences such as erosion and have been prone to natural disasters, yet climate change has brought with it an increase of natural disasters, as well as new challenges. One example that

illustrates this trend are the cultural heritage sites in Japan (Sugio, 2015). On 11 March 2011, an earthquake off the east coast of Japan caused a tsunami, wreaking havoc along the Japanese east coast. Next to almost 20,000 casualties, the tsunami caused damage to 295 National Cultural Properties of Japan (Sugio, 2015). Whereas earthquake and tsunamis cannot be directly linked to climate change, typhoons can. In recent years, Japan has witnessed stronger typhoons that caused intensive damage such as landslides to World Heritage sites (Sugio, 2015). Japan is part of a global trend: in recent decades, there have been stronger and more frequent natural disasters (Dominey-Howes, 2015). The example of Japan shows that countries in the Global North and the Global South both have to prepare better for natural disasters, especially when we take into account that these natural disasters are accelerated by climate change.

Until now, it is seemingly manifested that many global plans are not quite effective to decrease the risks that natural disasters pose to cultural heritage sites (Meier et al., 2007). On the ground, many countries don't have an effective risk management plan. Sometimes, even investigations of the potential dangers by natural disasters are not made. At the same time, the world is not prepared for the effects that rising sea levels (due to climate change) might have on cultural heritage sites: The world population, as well as a large number of cultural heritage sites in general and UNESCO Cultural World Heritage sites in particular, is concentrated along coastlines. A study (Marzeion and Levermann, 2014) warns that if current global mean temperature was sustained for the next 2000 years, about 6% (40 sites) of the UNESCO Cultural World Heritage sites will be below sea level. The case of Venice and other low-lying coast cities around the globe shows that this scenario does not belong to the distant past.

Earthquakes, floods and landslides are among the most common natural disasters that affect cultural heritage sites.[1] In recent years, both Nepal and Haiti fall victim to disastrous earthquakes. Besides the enormous amount of casualties and the tremendous destruction of property, valuable cultural heritage and cultural property was also destroyed. In Haiti, some of its most notable sights and attractions, proud symbols of the nations' vivid culture, collapsed. Thousands of art works in museums were also destroyed or damaged (Lacey, 2010). During the earthquake in Nepal 2015 almost a million buildings were fully damaged and 750 cultural monuments destroyed, resulting in irreparable damage to the cultural legacy of Nepal (Bhagat et al., 2017). Besides, the magnitude of the earthquake, deteriorated construction materials and a lack of maintenance were also factors for the huge loss of cultural heritage. By timely restoration, improving the seismic ability of the buildings, and good maintenance major damage could have been prevented (Bhagat et al., 2017, p. 17). The case of Nepal also underscores another dangerous effect of natural disasters: following natural disasters, cultural property is more prone to looting (Yates and Mackenzie, 2018).

---

1   Due to space constraints only the dangers posed by earthquakes shall be elaborated on here. For a more complete overview, cf. Nicu 2017.

Social Modernization

Changing social environment also poses new challenges to cultural heritage. Rapid modernization, for example, has lead to increasing levels of urbanization which in turn often endanger the preservation of cultural heritage. Traditional buildings are often torn down and replaced with new, modern buildings (Timothy and Nyaupaune, 2009, p.29). Tensions between urbanization and cultural heritage are especially notable in Asian countries. In a report the UNESCO (2016) has identified the main conservation challenges that cultural heritage faces in India. Firstly, there's a lack of urban policies on heritage conservation. In comparison with the fight against poverty and economic development, conservation of cultural heritage is not regarded as a high priority. Secondly, there's a lack of skills on cultural heritage conservation. There are simply not enough specialists who have the necessary skills to conserve and protect cultural heritage. Lastly, there's also a lack of public awareness. Local citizens either don't realize the importance of preserving cultural heritage, or—due to a lack of political participation—cannot stop the cultural heritage from being destroyed. These problems are not specific to the Indian case, but can be found in a lot of cities of the Global South that have witnessed increasing rates of urbanization, including Cairo, Mexico City, Zabid, Baku.

Conflicts between Private Ownership and Public Protection

Cultural Heritage sites are often part of residential areas. Therefore, private ownership constitutes at times a challenge to the preservation of cultural heritage sites, because these sites (e.g. historic buildings) are privately owned and the owners lack the finances for "the upkeep or restoration of their properties" (Timothy and Nyaupaune, 2009, p. 22). Besides, the residents living in cultural heritage sites cause damage to the historic structures as well. Sometimes historic structures are dismantled by them in order to acquire building materials. In the same way, agriculture also poses a threat to cultural properties. For example, cultural heritage sites are destroyed and cleared to generate new arable land.

Rapid modernization and the advent of modern capitalism increasingly lead to conflicts between private companies and public protection of cultural property. These conflicts can arise within the border of a country, but can also have cross-border dimensions. The archaeological site of Mes Aynak in Afghanistan is a case in point for this kind of cross-border conflicts. According to archaeologists the site is of special importance, because it features a 40 ha Buddhist monastery complex, as well as a 5,000-year-old Bronze Age site beneath the Buddhist remnants (Dalrymple, 2013). So far only ten per cent of the archaeological remnants of the Mes Aynak site have been excavated. However, in 2008 the Chinese Metallurgical Group bought a 30-year lease of the entire site, in order to exploit the enormous amounts of copper beneath the archaeological remnants. Whereas sources close to the government (Amin, 2017) assert that the archaeological objects are not in danger, others have pointed out that the mining of copper will lead to the destruction of this important archaeological site (Dalrymple, 2013). The case of Mes

Aynak is not an exception——governments in the Global South wishing to speed up the economy and increase their revenues often oppose to protecting cultural heritage.

A special case of conflicts between private companies and public protection is underwater cultural heritage. Underwater cultural heritage—mostly underwater ship wrecks and their cargo—are prone to so-called treasure hunting by private companies. Once these companies find a ship wreck they can legally recover its artifacts and sell them on the market (UNESCO, 2017). With respect to the case of looting on the ground, commercial exploitation violates scientific standards of excavation of archaeological sites and destroys important information about the past (UNESCO, 2017; Hutchinson, 1996). The Belitung Wreck and the Cirebon Wreck are a good example to illustrate the dangers of commercial exploitation of underwater cultural heritage (UNESCO, 2017): The Belitung wreck was found in 1998 in Indonesian waters and is of high historical importance, because it is the only surviving example of the Arab dhow, a special type of ship that was used in the 9th century, and because the biggest collection of Tang dynasty artifacts in one place was found on this site. However, the shipwreck was commercially exploited, destroyed and the artifacts then sold to a private entity in Singapore. The profits that Indonesia received were minimal and important historical information was lost (UNESCO, 2017). A similar case happened in 2003 when a private Belgian company exploited a 9th century shipwreck close to Cirebon, Indonesia. The company "raised some 500,000 pieces of the cargo. However, it threw half of the artifacts (250,000) back into the ocean to destroy them, as they would not fetch a good market price, required too much conservation effort and were not to be left to local pillagers to sell. The commercial exploitation devastated the 10th century site, damaged most artifacts and destroyed many" (UNESCO, 2017). Important archaeological evidence of the Maritime Silk Road was lost forever.

Lack of Technical Support and Funds

Improper conservation methods, inexpert handling of artifacts and budgetary constraints are challenges to cultural heritage that are extremely prominent and widespread in countries of the Global South.

Primitive Restoration Techniques and Inexpert Handling of Artifacts

The problem of improper conservation has its roots in colonial times, when the preservation of indigenous heritage was often of low priority to the colonialists (Timothy and Nyaupaune, 2009, p. 27). However, most cases of improper conservation nowadays can be attributed to bad preservation techniques, inexpert handling of artifacts and lack of funding. The example of temple restorations in Pagan, Myanmar, illustrates this harmful combination of cosmetic cover-ups instead of significant improvements, as well as the usage of workers and materials of low quality: Almost all of the city's 2,000 temples have been fancifully reconstructed without taking the original looks of the temples into consideration. Sometimes new temples have been built instead of reconstructing or

conserving the old temples (Timothy and Nyaupaune, 2009, p. 27). This incompetence with regard to conservation methods of cultural heritage cannot only be blamed on budgetary constraints given the lack of skilled and qualified personnel also aggravates this very problem (Timothy and Nyaupaune, 2009, p. 28).

Budgetary Constraint and Social Poverty

Lack of funding for cultural heritage sites in the Global South leads to several other problems: museums or other institutions who are able to make the population acknowledge the value of cultural property, are often too costly; tense budgets make it impossible for government agencies to hire guards to protect and qualified staff to conserve cultural property; and revenues from tourists are mostly not enough to make ends meet (Timothy and Nyaupaune, 2009, p. 21).

Insufficient Management from Local Authorities

Inefficient Regulation and Legal Instrument

Given the huge amount of cultural heritage sites in the Global South, it is obvious that governments cannot protect all of these sites———a priority list of cultural properties that are more important and should be conserved is inevitable (Timothy and Nyaupaune, 2009, p. 30). However, in many cases governments even cannot manage the most important cultural heritage sites well. A problem that arises in many cases is the lack of cooperation between different stakeholders of cultural properties (Timothy and Nyaupaune, 2009, pp. 30-31): A lack of cooperation might lead to long legal fights, neglect, overuse, or inadequate resources allocation which in turn makes the preservation of the cultural property more difficult. Especially infighting or a lack of cooperation between government agencies (different agencies that deal with infrastructure, environment, culture, tourism all have an interest or say in the development of a cultural heritage site) also lead to adverse effects on the preservation of cultural property.

Unawareness of the Inherent Value of Cultural Heritage

Another common problem in the Global South is that the population is unaware of or unwilling to accept the value of cultural heritage. Preservation and conservation of old cultural property is often seen as a sign of backwardness——an obstacle to development (Timothy and Nyaupaune, 2009, p. 31). As long as the preservation of cultural heritage has no economic benefits for the population it is considered as pointless (Timothy and Nyaupaune, 2009, p. 32). On the government level similar attitudes are prevalent. Governments might see the protection of cultural heritage as an obstacle to economic development and prosperity. Under these circumstances, they might decide to compromise the protection of cultural heritage while boosting economic growth which serves as the cornerstone for strengthening social stability.

Past Actions

Universal Progress

Neither developed countries nor developing countries fail to identify or even eradicate the crimes which cause damage to the world cultural heritage as a state alone. Considering the seriousness and increasing number of the illicit trade of cultural property and other criminal financial activities universal progress has been an overwhelming trend ever since the early 1900s.

International Conventions

The very first attempt to establish a legal document to prevent the practice of pillage is the 1899 Hague Regulation on Laws and Customs of War on Land in which states art. 28 *The pillage of a town or place, even when taken by assault, is prohibited.* Though it is not directly targeted at pillaging of cultural objects, it still marks the start of the establishment of the law system against illegal actions which harm the cultural property of a certain country.

One of the main themes of UNESCO is to ensure that culture takes the rightful place in development strategies and processes. In order to fulfill this aim, the Organization has come up with numerous conventions and declarations to protect cultural heritages. Some of the conventions are listed chronologically below:

The Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (1954) aims at safeguard and respect cultural heritages in certain areas where armed conflict takes place. The Convention mainly addresses the identification, safeguarding and careful preservation of cultural properties, possible military measures as well as special protections and transport of cultural property.

Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property (1970) was the first attempt to prohibit the illicit trafficking of cultural property, taken immediately after World War I. The treaty drafted by the League was put to an end unfortunately because of the beginning of World War II. A panel of experts was established by UNESCO in 1964 to resolve the illicit trafficking. Finally, the 1970 Convention was adopted which mainly addresses the identification of the illicit trafficking of cultural property, relevant national services as well as legislations.

The Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972) links together the concepts of nature conservation and the preservation of cultural properties. The fundamental need to balance human and nature is also recognized in the document. It provides clear definitions of cultural and natural heritage as well as conventions on

national and international protection of the heritage. To be specific, it also includes the construction of (what kind of fund are we talking about?) fund and intergovernmental committee which functions as the complementary tools for the protection. The committee mentioned above is the World Heritage Committee which is established under the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

The Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003) was established by UNESCO in order to safeguard and ensure respect for the intangible cultural heritage as well as the individuals concerned. To be mentioned, an Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage is established within UNESCO.

Institutional Partnership

UNESCO relies greatly on its diverse set of collaborative partnerships to complete its mission and to build peace and sustainable development. Among all UNESCO strategic partners, UNITWIN Networks and UNESCO Chairs play an important role in protecting, promoting and transmitting world heritage.

A UNESCO Chair is created to institute a new teaching and research unit, or to strengthen an existing teaching or research program which is in areas that are a priority for UNESCO. A Chair is established for an initial period of four years by means of an agreement between UNESCO and a university or any other institution of higher education.

UNESCO Chairs play the role of think tanks for knowledge-sharing and dissemination of information. Numerous activities, led by the Chair holders in consultation with UNESCO, are held to achieve the goal. To link researchers and practitioners, the UNESCO Chair Forum University and Heritage of the Polytechnic University of Valencia (Spain) serves as a hub which have done a great job in the publication of a newsletter. The UNESCO Chair in cultural heritage and Risk Management at Ritsumeikan University (Japan) implemented an international training program on disaster mitigation for cultural heritage through its research activities in the field of risk management.

A UNITWIN Network is composed of numerous universities from all countries that has established partnerships and collectively sign a joint agreement with UNESCO to cooperate in an area that is a priority for the Organization. Through this partnership, UNESCO fosters university twinning and networking for North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation with the aim of addressing needs in the development context.

Apart from the UNESCO Chairs and UNITWIN Networks, UNESCO has also designated dozens of International and Regional Institutes and Centers as Category 2 under its auspices. These Institutes and Centers are not legally part of the Organization but they are associated with the UNESCO through formal arrangements approved by the General Conference. At the 37th session of UNESCO's General Conference, the integrated comprehensive strategy for category 2 institutes and centers was amended.

The Second coordination meeting with UNESCO category 2 institutes and centers (C2Cs) and UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs related to the Culture Sector successfully took place on 23-24 November 2017 at the UNESCO headquarters in Paris. During the meeting, presentations on the themes relating to the 2030 Agenda were made, and a new tool, the on-line Network of UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs and C2Cs related to Culture was officially launched.

UNESCO World Heritage Center

According to the Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972) the World Heritage Committee was established. In order to carry out the Convention more effectively, a helping center which generally manages the routines of the Committee is established in 1992.

The World Heritage Center is the focal point and coordinator within UNESCO for all matters related to World Heritage. Ensuring the day-to-day management of the Convention, the Center organizes the annual sessions of the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau, provides advice to States Parties in the preparation of site nominations, organizes international assistance from the World Heritage Fund upon request, and coordinates both the reporting on the condition of sites and the emergency action undertaken when a site is threatened. The Center also organizes technical seminars and workshops, updates the World Heritage List and database, develops teaching materials to raise awareness among young people of the need for heritage preservation, and keeps the public informed of World Heritage issues.

Since the World Heritage Center is at the forefront of the international community's efforts to protect and preserve it has carried out lots of activities ranging from emergency assistance to long term conservation. Here are some activities listed:

Astronomy and World Heritage Thematic Initiative was created in 2003 within the framework of the Global Strategy for the balanced, representative and credible World Heritage List. Its main theme is to create a link between science and culture when it comes to recognition of the monuments and sites related to astronomical observations. The specific kind of heritage it protects is material testimonies of astronomy which to some extents represents regional or national culture by showing the way people describe the sky.

The first international experts meeting on this topic organized by the World Heritage Center was held in Venice, Italy (17-19 March 2004). Its main goal was to provide a clear definition of the sites connected with astronomy which offers state parties a globally recognized standard. As a result, the project "Astronomy and World Heritage" was presented during the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee. On top of that, in October 2008, UNESCO signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the International Astronomical Union (IAU) as a result of which the IAU has become integrally involved in the process of advancing the initiative. Till recently, a meeting focused on "Astronomical Heritage: Progressing the UNESCO–IAU Initiative" was held at the 2015 IAU General

Assembly, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA, 11–13 August 2015. Meanwhile, a group of concerned organizations and individuals brought the issue of the impacts of climate change on world heritage to the attention of the World Heritage Committee. Since then, UNESCO has been exploring and managing the impacts. A practical guide to Climate Change Adaptation for Natural World Heritage Sites was published in May 2014 which helped to build the capacity of site managers to deal with climate change.

Regional Efforts

CASE STUDY: Sub-regional Meeting on the Caribbean Action Plan

Ever since the 37th session (2013) of the World Heritage Committee, the Latin American and the Caribbean (LAC) States Parties started working on the development of regional and sub-regional action plans. The PARALC 2014-2024, also known as the Action plan for World Heritage in Latin America and the Caribbean (2014-2024), was drafted as a result of the regional meeting held in Brasilia from 23 to 25 April 2014. The Committee soon adopted the Action Plan 2014-2024 at its 38th session, and also requested the LAC States Parties to continue working on the development of sub-regional action plans. To meet the request, a sub-regional meeting was held in Havana (Cuba) from 26 to 28 November 2014 with the financial support of the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust at the World Heritage Centre for the development of the Caribbean Action Plan.

The meeting was attended by representatives of 22 Caribbean Member and Associated States, the 3 advisory bodies to the world Heritage Committee (ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM) and Caribbean Universities, as well as the UNESCO Offices in Havana, Kingston and Port-au-Prince, and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre. The meeting had got three objectives which contributed to strengthening South-South cooperation. To develop and approve a Sub-regional Action Plan for the Caribbean (2014-2019); to discuss and approve the follow-up action to the second phase of the Caribbean Capacity Building Program; to enhance the cooperation with the Caribbean University Network. It came to an end with a document Caribbean Action Plan for World Heritage 2015-2019 which depicts general expectations on the future five years' work which includes following aspects: improving the conservation and management of cultural and natural heritage; updating and harmonizing tentative lists and support the submission of nominations; reducing the impact of climate change by increasing capacities in risk management; strengthening the role of local communities in the identification, conservation and management of heritage; creating employment and support local development through sustainable tourism; strengthening capacities, in particular through the Caribbean Capacity Building Program for World heritage (CCBP). The paper calls for promoting partnerships among actors involved in the protection, conservation, management and dissemination of cultural and natural heritage.

Other Attempts

UNESCO has established a close partnership with NGOs and civil groups concerned with matters within its competence and may invite them to assist with specific tasks. One of the NGOs that received the patronage of UNESCO China Folklore Photographic Association (CFPA) is interested in the field of Cultural Heritage. It aims to promote stability and social harmony by arousing national pride of Chinese culture. Thanks to the convenience in the digital age, CFPA creatively explore, preserve, study the changing and vanishing folk customs and carry them forward through photography. By organizing its members to collect and shoot the folk custom throughout China CFPA fully inherit the Chinese cultural heritage. Moreover, it also seeks for international cooperation and has held international researches and cultural exchanges. Humanity Photo Awards (HPA) is an international photographic contest on the subject of folk-custom organized by CFPA once every two years. This award was launched in 1998, which calls upon photographers from all over the world to record the heritage of the folk culture.

Apart from NGOs, UNESCO also arranges expert meeting to reflect on professional topics. International World Heritage Expert Meeting on Integrity for Cultural Heritage was held from 12 to 14 March 2012, in Al Ain, United Arab Emirates. After the meeting a report was presented to the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012. The report provides the summary of the meeting, its recommendations and possible revisions to the text of the Operational Guidelines. Other meetings organized by similar communities with different objectives have been held by the World Heritage Committee throughout the years, which turn to be a great success.

UNESCO • Background Guide

Possible Solutions

Careful Preservation of Cultural Heritages in Post-Conflict Countries

Legal Certification, Registration and Museum Inventory of Cultural Artifacts

Conflict is regarded as the most devastating factor of cultural heritage preservation in countries such as Iraq and Iran. Bombs destroyed a considerable amount of cultural heritage in the north-western region of Iran, where there have been incidences of looting of valuable cultural property, and many works of art are currently unaccounted. In light of this, the implementation of legal certification, registration and museum inventory would exert profound impacts on careful preservation of the properties through systematic management. First of all, the requirement of legal certification and registration requires the directors, the owners of museums and other cultural artifacts collectors to register a legal certification of both their identity and their artifacts before starting any business activities. It would not only demonstrate the legal status and the authenticity of the artifacts but also enhance the effective management at the state level. Without such identification and registration process, the local governments would be impeded from the repatriation and restoration of those cultural properties which are faced with the danger of deliberate destruction during illicit trafficking given the illegal art dealers would conceal the significant identity of the artifacts and hoax the collectors to purchase them at an unreasonable price.

What is more, police forces have found it nearly impossible to return the stolen artifacts to rightful owners as there is no documentation, which makes it possible to identify the victims. Therefore, museum inventory should be a necessary method to preserve cultural objects. The director of the museum should make documents to organize the information of the items. The first step is to collect information from the items in the museum and put the information into a cloud. The second step is to establish a special task force that consists of technological staffs and inspectors to verify the uploaded information. After being verified, the information should be put into a cloud or in a database. The information should be also shared to the foreign government or other international organization so as to make it more convenient for domestic and foreign police officers to trace back the lost items and return them to the rightful owners.

CASE STUDY: Safeguarding Cultural Heritage in Syria and Iraq

Cultural heritage preservation used to be in severe condition in Syria and Iraq because of the long history of war. Numerous archaeological sites are being systematically targeted for clandestine excavations. Also, many museums have had their infrastructure damaged and their cultural property stolen as a result of being caught in the middle of

armed conflict (UNESCO, 2010). The first thing that has done both in Syria and Iraq is raising the awareness of cultural heritage preservation. UNESCO made two awareness-raising videos, one on Iraq, the other on Syria. Both are now available to be disseminated on the internet and social media platforms. UNESCO also works with governments, national and international organizations such as INTERPOL and the World Customs Organization, as well as museums, auction houses, to stop this trafficking. A national campaign called "Save Syria's History" was launched to raise awareness on the current illegal excavation of archaeological sites and plundering of museums. UNESCO has taken part in the "Object ID Project" to help combat the illegal appropriation of art objects by facilitating documentation of cultural property and by bringing together organizations around the world that can encourage its implementation. "Object ID Project" is regarded as a wonderful example of inventory management. Moreover, UNESCO brings together key partners to step up safeguarding of Iraqi and Syrian Cultural Heritage. The result was promising and inspiring. Syrian citizens started to protect their cultural heritage voluntarily; they have also helped recover looted items of cultural significance that were taken illicitly. The inventories and archives of cultural property in Syrian museums are being digitized to simplify the identification and registration of any missing artifacts (UNESCO, 2007).

Restitution of Stolen and Illegal Cultural Artifacts to Countries of Provenance

The illicit trade of cultural property, being one of the world's main criminal activities, ranks only behind the illicit trade of weapons and drugs and becomes the primary cause of the looting of countries cultural property. The theft of cultural objects is recurrent in South America due to the abundant archeological sites (Maria Luz Endere, 2016). Domestically speaking, the country of origin loses crucial identity manifestation and representation of the local history when a cultural object is brutally removed from its original place without proper archeological study. Meanwhile the world at large loses valuable knowledge about this culture. Therefore, Restitution of stolen and illegal cultural artifacts to countries of provenance has become a demanding yet desiderated task worldwide.

For instance, South American countries have strong policies for the return of cultural property and stringent regulations against illicit trafficking. In 1964, UNESCO established a committee of experts to draft a convention that embodies three major principles: preventive measures, restitution provisions, and international cooperation. Today, the Convention has been accepted by 132 States, yet even broader acceptance has been required. Through cooperation and negotiation, in 1983, after seven years of litigation, Ecuador received more than 12,100 pre-Columbian objects from Italy (UNESCO, 2011).

Moreover, the Organization of American States (OAS) also adopted the Convention on the Protection of the Archeological, Historical, and Artistic Heritage of the American Nations in 1972. This treaty establishes procedural rules for the return requests for cultural property: A country has to report the illicitly exported cultural property to the original state

of the objects so that the country of origin can facilitate efficient actions to recover and return the properties.

Some regional mechanisms have been created to fight against the illegal art trade and accelerate the restitution of cultural objects. Take MERCOSUR for example, MERCOSUR was urged to develop a regional policy to combat illicit trafficking as five states including Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay and Venezuela found that UNESCO had not paid enough attention to the challenges faced by South-American countries. In addition to that, along with other actions taken by local South America organizations, the declaration of UNASUR demonstrates a willingness to organize resources and energy to fight against the illicit antiquities trade, as well as promote the return of stolen cultural objects.

Aiming to better the process of restitution, some South American countries, such as Mexico, ratified bilateral agreements. A number of bilateral agreements have been achieved, including but not limited to: Convenio sobre Protección y Restitución de Bienes Culturales, entre el Gobierno de Chile y el Gobierno del Perú (Chile and Peru); Convenio entre las Repúblicas de Colombia y del Ecuador para la recuperación y devolución de bienes culturales robados (Colombia and Ecuador).

Construction of Information Sharing Platform and Specialized Databases

Professional Training and Awareness-raising Initiatives in Regional Workshops

According to the statistics from UNESCO (2010), a remarkable number of people lacks awareness of cultural heritage preservation and even partakes in various types of illicit stealing of cultural artifacts. In response to this, experts and professionals from relevant fields could enhance people's awareness with their abundant knowledge. Regional workshops are allowed to organize competition or forum to inform local citizens of the importance of cultural heritage. Furthermore, regional workshops are also encouraged to shoot some awareness-raising videos. To better the awareness-raising initiative, states that face similar challenges should construct an information sharing platform that ensures everyone an easier access to valuable experience.

Last but not least, experts could design and create a new training mechanism for students with the help of a specialized database under the cooperation with local Education Bureau. The specialized database should contain sufficient sources collected and verified by experts. With sufficient sources, they are capable of creating a feasible and effective professional training mechanism. The mechanism should be limited to the field of cultural heritage. The talents will get properer and more professional education in the training mechanism. For students, their understanding and devotion of cultural heritage will play a critical role in the protection of cultural heritage. After they step into the society, chances are that they would consciously participate in the cultural heritage protection work.

Through long-term publicity and education in this area, with the enhanced understanding of cultural heritage, local people will be able to better understand their history, and to promote the culture.

CASE STUDY: Fostering Underwater Cultural Heritage Protection via Best Practices from International Institutions

People are encouraged to enhance public access to protect underwater cultural heritage for their best interest as the ocean is home to one of the world's largest museum inventories. Targeting at better protect underwater cultural heritage, Technical Advisory Body of the 2001 Convention and The Scientific recommend to the Meeting of States Parties to collect best practice examples of underwater cultural heritage protection from all over the world. The initiatives could include maritime heritage museums, dive trails, and virtual exhibits and so on. There are several examples: First and foremost, some countries with rich underwater heritage decided to recover whole wrecks or artifacts and exhibit them in museums, which have been lasting cultural attractions for their regions through history. The museums provide the public with easier access to their underwater heritage and therefore stimulate awareness, education, and research. Also, completed in 2008, the Min of the Desert is a replica of an Egyptian seafaring ship that sailed the Red Sea to Punt 3,800 years ago under Queen Hatshepsut (UNESCO, 2010). Precise replicas can bring archaeological artifacts back to life and thus very directly promote understanding among the general public. The best practices example provides a perfect pattern for countries with similar circumstances.

Implementation of Holistic Governance with Robust Legal Networks

Thefts, forgery, ransoms, and smuggling of cultural objects, are usually used to fund other criminal activities. The items themselves serve as both a medium of exchange between criminals and an approach to launder the profits of crime. A lack of holistic governance can lead to a more severe condition. The cultural industry of historical and cultural heritage resources should be uniformly supervised by the government to provide guiding and binding management and services. Implementation of holistic governance identifies why and how criminals would be punished. It targeting at elevating criminals' minds and eliminating criminal activities through establishing more robust legal networks. Holistic governance includes market administration and inventory management. The market should be supervised by a special task group with the cooperation of different government and non-governmental organizations. Not only the process of the transaction should be under stringent regulations, the source of the items and identity or qualification of the sellers should also be monitored.

A robust legal network should involve a feasible penalty system, an affordable incentive system, an executive system, and a righteous censorial system. The penalty system

should more clearly identify different crimes and impose administrative sanctions accordingly. The incentive system should ensure a hortative social atmosphere to courage people to protect cultural heritage. The executive system should implement tasks according to what the incentive and penalty system have ordered. The censorial system should ensure the fairness of the implementation of the order implemented by other systems.

To sum up, establishing robust legal networks can promote the efficiency of governance, and then decrease the rates of cultural heritage crimes. The definition of "robust" can be varied from state to state, meaning that different countries could establish different legal networks in accordance with their national conditions.

Equal Emphasis on Social Modernization and Heritage Protection

Sustainable Heritage Tourism

Viewed as an indispensable type of entertainment in sustainable tourism, cultural heritage tourism has been constantly disrupted in tourism development during recent years. Thereby the conflict between cultural heritage preservation and the tourism economy has been intensified. How to realize the development of tourism under the premise of protecting cultural heritage has become a debatable topic for people from all walks of life. There are various means to preserve cultural heritage. The first is to increase ticket prices the scenic spots, which includes rent, user cost, labor cost, external cost, labor cost, and the operator's target profit. In most cases, the increase in attraction tickets will inevitably increase the target profit, and the increased target profit can be used for the protection of cultural heritage. However, the demand for the tourism market will decline as the price rises. The second method is to establish a non-governmental fund-raising organization. Protecting cultural heritage requires a considerable amount of financial, human and technological resources, which cannot rely solely on the state's management. The establishment of non-governmental fund organizations will not only raise funds for cultural heritage protection but also appeal to the public to participate in the protection of cultural heritage and raise the awareness of cultural heritage preservation.

Coordinated City Planning Policies

The first thing that worth noticing is to raise awareness of heritage sites protection by the government and the public. In the preservation of cultural heritage, local governments, as the main body of heritage sites protection, should fully recognize the importance of it and handle the delicate relationship between cultural heritage preservation and economic development. It is encouraged to raise the awareness of cultural heritage preservation at all levels, and meanwhile increase publicity to promote the awareness of the protection of cultural heritage of the whole society. Various cultural heritage activities such as

academic events, special lectures, opening columns, free opening, distributing materials, hanging signs, etc. are welcomed.

The second critical point is to pay special attention to the restoration and utilization of immovable cultural heritage. For the restoration of immovable cultural relics, it should be noted that the original state of the cultural relics cannot be changed during the restoring process. At the same time, special technology should be used to protect the immovable cultural heritage during restoration. On the other hand, reasonable utilization is a vital part of cultural heritage protection. As a premise, the value of cultural heritage should be fully reserved. However, it is allowed to give cultural heritage contemporary functions as long as it is acceptable. Reasonable utilization is a significant means to maintain the vitality of cultural relics in contemporary social life. It triggers further attention to the protection of cultural relics, generates economic benefits while generating social benefits and promoting local economic development.

The last part is the cultivation of talents in the field of heritage protection. Cultural heritage protection is a comprehensive work that involves a wide range of domains and requires a high level of knowledge and capabilities for the protection practitioners of cultural relics. Meanwhile, with the rapid development of the economy and society, the protection of cultural heritage has become more arduous. In other words, the protection of cultural heritage must be well managed through continuous learning of cutting-edge knowledge and development of technical capability, which are also the prerequisites for the professionals to be better equipped with the upcoming challenges in the protection of cultural relics.

Strengthened Multi-stakeholder Cooperation at All Levels

Financial Assistance and Technology Transfer from Developing Countries to Least Developed Countries

Cultural heritage reflects the history of a group of people, and provides people with deep insights into the past through experts' inference. In reality, if relevant stakeholders are not able to balance their respective interests or to achieve effective cooperation in the protection of intangible cultural heritage, the project would inevitably lead to disruption and even complete failure. Nonetheless, such severe situation can be reversed. It has been suggested that the developing countries could assist less developed countries both financially and technologically. In turn, least developed countries could provide labor force or material to the developing countries in order to reach a better cooperation. For example, developing countries can offer technical help in building up an enhanced anti-theft system in a museum that located at the less developed country.

Early Preparedness for Artifacts Protection in Emergency Situations

Prevention is always the best protection, most of the emergencies come for no reason, but if there is preparation for restoration, the loss may be reduced to a minimum.

The first step is risk analysis and cultural heritage assessment. To begin with, public opinions concerning national heritage protection should be in place. The results of the census should be continuously updated. Spatial relationships should be established through geographic information systems (GIS). The GIS enables policy makers and planners to obtain accurate drawings in emergency operations, clearly identifying threats such as earthquakes, fires or landslides.

The second step is the establishment of risk mitigation mechanism. For example, museum display cabinets should be able to withstand earthquakes, and important collections should not be stored in basements in areas prone to flooding. Also, buildings that store important collections must be properly maintained to meet standards for adequate protection.

The third step is training. Cultural heritage experts and professionals should be involved in national, provincial and local disaster planning exercises and should receive information on upcoming natural disasters. Cultural heritage experts are required to receive emergency management training and ensure that they are able to communicate and train their employees and relevant communities.

The last step is knowledge sharing. Relevant knowledge should be shared at the international level to jointly promote the implementation of the principles of cultural heritage risk prevention. This is because different countries will be further aware of the danger of permanent loss of historical cultural wealth due to natural and human-made disasters.

To conclude, cultural heritage prevention needs to be considered in all aspects of disaster management planning, including risk prevention and recovery. It should be noticed and signified not only in emergencies but also in everyday life.

Others

Delegates are suggested to explore other possible solutions besides the suggestions mentioned. Efficiency in careful protection could be enhanced through a variety of approaches, such as conducting censuses and collecting information, establishing a complete database which could capable of processing various information of cultural heritage and formulating and implementation of relevant policies to strengthen the management of cultural heritage development and utilization. Or increasing capital investment, enhancing the strength of cultural heritage protection and attract more talents to devote themselves to the preservation of cultural heritage.

Bloc Positions

Argentina

On 7th July 2017 the Los Alerces National Park of Argentina was inscribed on the World Heritage List as a natural property. By then, Argentina had got 11 World Heritage Sites in total including 6 cultural sites and 5 natural sites. As one of the most powerful countries in the Latin American and the Caribbean (LAC) Region, Argentina has for years been fighting against illicit trafficking of cultural properties for years which often takes place across the border.

In 2016, the biggest restitution was made by Argentina to Peru, including 4150 cultural objects which were seized during an import investigation in 2005. Though it took some time for the Argentinean court to make final decisions in accordance with its domestic legislation, this action marks the beginning of cooperation and consistent actions against illicit trafficking of cultural properties carried out by the governments of Peru and Argentina.

During the process, a tourist who bought 439 cultural objects was later seized by the Argentinean customs and the objects were restituted to their country of origin, Ecuador. It depicts another success regarding restrictions on illicit trafficking of cultural properties and thus leads to the closer partnership between the governments. Both countries signed a bilateral agreement to strengthen such cooperation on December 9th, 2015.

The reservation of world heritage in Argentina is still on the way. The capital Buenos Aires is home to lots of ancient buildings which attract architects from all over the world. However, as the industrialization process is underway, all these cultural heritages were jeopardized. The country now eagerly seeks to create the balance between heritage conservation and social modernization.

Cambodia

The 25th anniversary of the establishment of the international framework to save the heritage at Angkor Wat took place in late 2018. Cambodia possesses 3 World Heritage Sites in total, among which the temple complex of Angkor Wat is the most famous. In the year 1992 the whole territory of Angkor was under the protection of UNESCO and inscribed on the World Heritage List. The site was labeled "in danger" by UNESCO due to years of neglect and the impact of warfare. The conservation of Angkor requires joint effort worldwide. More than 500 delegates from China, France, Japan, Germany, the United States and India, and the international organizations attended the conference in Siem Reap to share their experiences and sought for an appropriate approach to efficient protection.

UNESCO • Background Guide

The great national and international collaboration to safeguard the heritage of Angkor works via the platform of "International Coordinating Committee for the Safeguarding and Development of the Historic Site of Angkor" (ICC-Angkor). The second ICC-Angkor was held in Paris from 14 to 15 November 2003 during which delegates reflected upon the ten-year cooperation between UNESCO and its member states. The conference ended with the adoption of the Paris Declaration of 2003 on the Safeguarding and Development of Angkor.

On December 4th, 2018 the Cambodian government awarded honorary medals to three Chinese cultural heritage conservators in Siem Reap for their outstanding contributions to the protection of Angkor Wat. China assisted the local government with the renovation of Chau Say Tevoda, a temple in Angkor Wat under the ICC-Angkor framework. China and Cambodia signed an agreement earlier this year to form a Sino-Cambodian joint working group to lead the conservation of the ruins of the Royal Palace of Angkor Thom. Though conservation of World Heritage in Cambodia is underway but Cambodia still need cooperation with other countries to complete its conservation process.

China

China holds the second largest amount of World Heritage sites when Fanjingshan was inscribed on the list on July 4th 2018 as its 53rd heritage site. Ever since China ratified the Convention in 1985 it has done great contributions to the conservation of the World Heritage not only at home but also abroad. Renowned as the third largest donor to the World Heritage Fund, China donated $258,588 in 2018 to the fund.

One of the most famous projects on the conservation of cultural heritage in China is the Mogao Caves. It hasn't been inscribed on the list until 1987, but the protection project started way back in the 1940s. Throughout the past 75 years, to explore proper ways of its protection required the joint efforts from domestic and international institutions. Referring as the origin of the grotto, it has always been regarded as a product of cooperation between different cultures combined closely by the Silk Road. The protection of the Dunhuang Grottoes is also a multilateral task to accomplish. It has been a much harder work for the academy to protect the site after its public open in 1979. Over the past 40 years, to publicize Dunhuang culture while achieving its protection, Dunhuang Academy has established partnerships with India Gandhi National Center for the Art (IGNCA) and Ca' foscari University of Venice. With sufficient experiences and best practices of the protection of cultural heritage, China is willing to facilitate multilateral actions of the conservation of the Heritage Sites worldwide.

India

India possesses a large number of World Heritage Sites. It holds 37 properties in total inscribed on the World Heritage List, including 29 cultural properties, 7 natural properties

and one mixed property. Cultural properties like Taj Mahal, the Red Fort Complex, Buddhist Monuments at Sanchi have not only become significant conservation projects but also turn into places of interest. India has taken the lead in the protection of World Heritage Sites by the following three means.

Firstly, the Indian government has granted the conservation projects with sufficient financial resources to achieve the protection and renovation of the World Heritage Sites. The total fund assisted is continuously growing during the recent years. Apart from the government subsidies, the fund also comes from the ticket price of the resorts which derives from heritage sites and National cultural foundation established through taxes and donation by the Indian government.

Moreover, the Institute of archaeology affiliated to the ministry of culture is a state-level institution founded by the Indian government to specialize in the protection of cultural heritage. Other professional organizations and academic groups are also founded to meet the need of figuring proper ways of conserving World Heritage Sites.

More significantly, the Indian government excels in propagating the importance of preserving and conserving World Heritage Sites by establishing special "festivals" such as Museum Day to encourage citizens get to know the cultural heritage and take part in its protection job.

Egypt

Egypt is renowned for its long history of about 7000 years during which a wide range of cultural heritage sites on its territory were created. The culture of Pharaoh, ancient Greece, ancient Rome and Islam all share the same land along the Nile River. According to the statistic released in 2011, Egypt possesses nearly 30% cultural heritage of the world.

Organizations were founded to protect the huge variety of human legacy located in Egypt which covers most of the wisdom of their ancestors. Fekri. A. Hassan and G. J. Tassie founded The Egyptian Cultural Heritage Organization (ECHO) in 1996 aiming to alter the current situation of the cultural heritage in Egypt. The Egyptian government along with the local organizations has achieved great success in the conservation of cultural heritage. The Fayoum Declaration and the Western Desert Alliance are all good practices. Moreover, Egypt has always been seeking for international cooperation on the conservation of cultural heritage sites. The Egyptian and the Sudanese governments required UNESCO to assist in the conservation of the endangered sites. As a result, UNESCO created the Executive Committee of the International Campaign and established a Trust Fund in 1960. On 13th October 2010 China and Egypt signed cooperation deal on protection of heritage and cultural property.

Unfortunately, problems and difficulties still exist. For example, there has been and continues to be illegal encroachment on the UNESCO World Heritage Listed site of

Dahshur. It is high time that the Egyptian to review the existing legislations and figure out more effective ways to carry them out.

Least Developed Countries

In the Pacific region, the number of Small Island Developing States to the Convention rose from 3 in 1998 to 13 in late 2004, with several countries actively preparing nominations for the inscription of sites as well as 'World Heritage Tentative Lists'. In October 2004, a seven-day workshop on Kiritimati (Christmas) Island focused on the possible serial nomination to the World Heritage List of reef islands and atolls of Kiribati.

Intercultural exchange has also been promoted by using the logistic and cooperative frameworks provided by the World Heritage Convention. A typical example was a study tour in late 2004 launched by traditional leaders from Pohnpei in the Federated States of Micronesia to Tongariro National Park in New Zealand, the first property to be inscribed in 1993 on the World Heritage List under the cultural landscapes criteria. A regional round-table meeting at Tongariro in October 2004 provided the occasion for the initiation of a Pacific region version of the World Heritage in Young Hands Educational Resource Kit for Teachers, which seeks to introduce World Heritage education into classroom teaching.

As for the vulnerability of SIDS against critical climate impacts, many of them now seek to move towards low-carbon climate resilient economies. To be more sustainable, SIDS need renewable energies whose price are also lower than fossil fuels. In order to adopt this kind of technology such as solar water heaters (SWHs), partnership and cooperation with other countries are needed. Since the lack of sustainability is the main obstruct on their way to conserve the heritage, cooperating with countries with technology they need is what they ought to achieve.

Topic B: Application for the World Heritage List

General Introduction to the World Heritage Committee

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) have been always endorsing the identification, certification and preservation of both natural and cultural heritage. To that end, it has constructed World Heritage Committee built on the consensus made in the World Heritage Convention (1972) which is the primary intergovernmental organization involving the issues with world heritage protection. Not only does it strictly conform to the implementation of World Heritage Convention, but it also has a decisive word over the distribution of World Heritage Fund and the annual inscription of World Heritage List. Moreover, it serves as a third-party supervisor which scrutinizes the reports from the State Parties concerning the progress made in heritage conservation and prompts the State Parties to be burdened with the responsibility of protection through a variety of channels when the cultural properties demand more sufficient maintenance and efficient management. The Committee constitutes the representatives from 21 State Parties which are in compliance with the Convention and elected by the General Assembly (GA). It has been scheduled that the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee will take place in Baku, Azerbaijan from 30th June to 10th July this year. The current members of the Committee, in an alphabetical order, are Angola, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, China, Cuba, Guatemala, Hungary, Indonesia, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Norway, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe.

UNESCO • Background Guide

Rules of Procedure Concerning the Application Process

In practice, the World Heritage Committee has adopted its own set of Rules of Procedure revisited and revised on a periodical basis. Nonetheless, in this conference, the Rules of Procedure (Application) shall be quite distinct from what has been routinely applied to the sessions in official meetings given the incompatibility between the actual Rules of Procedure applied in official meetings of World Heritage Convention and the Application Procedure to be adopted in this conference.

Thus, while debating over the issues in Topic B, this conference shall implement *Beijing Rules of Procedure (Application)* to be included in the Updated Background Guide and *Special Rules of Procedure Concerning Applications for the World Heritage List*. In contrast to *Beijing Rules of Procedure (Application)* in which the general rules and procedure can be broadly adopted, the *Special Rules of Procedure Concerning Applications for the World Heritage List* is specially designed for the discussions under this Topic, including the qualifications for application, process of nomination and inscription, and the authority which enjoys the final decision of the annual inscription. The *Special Rules of Procedure Concerning Applications for the World Heritage List,* which is a supplement to the terms defined and clauses written in the *Beijing Rules of Procedure (Application)*, shall be prioritized between the two sets of Rules of Procedure. The full text of *Special Rules of Procedure Concerning Applications for the World Heritage List* is presented as follows.

(full text)

Special Rules of Procedure Concerning Applications for the World Heritage List

RULE I. **Scope**

These rules for UNESCO of Beijing International Model United Nations 2019 are self-sufficient, except for modifications provided by the Secretariat, and shall be adopted in advance of a session.

RULE II. **Legitimacy**

Special Rules of Procedure is granted with the absolute priority over any other article in Beijing Rules of Procedure (Application). All countries in this conference shall unconditionally conform to it.

RULE III. **State Parties**

All countries attending this conference shall all be State Parties to the Convention, that is to say, each country shall be endowed with equal entry to application.

RULE IV. **Authority**

The Directors of this conference shall be entitled to the absolute authority of nomination and inscription given the complexity of involving the Bureau of World Heritage Committee into the application process.

RULE V. **Definition**

The heritages to be applied shall include tangible cultural and natural heritage sites, particularly those immovable archaeological relics and natural wonders, either land-based or underwater.

RULE VI. **Criteria for selection**

All heritage sites applied by the countries shall be included in the list of nominations on condition that they are of outstanding universal value and qualified for at least one out of ten selection criteria demonstrated in the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* revised on a regulatory basis.

The current ten selection criteria for heritage are,

(i)   to represent a masterpiece of human creative genius;

(ii)   to exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design;

(iii)   to bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared;

(iv)   to be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history;

(v)   to be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change;

(vi)   to be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance. (The Committee considers that this criterion should preferably be used in conjunction with other criteria);

(vii)   to contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance;

(viii)   to be outstanding examples representing major stages of earth's history, including the record of life, significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features;

(ix)   to be outstanding examples representing significant on-going ecological and biological processes in the evolution and development of terrestrial, fresh water, coastal and marine ecosystems and communities of plants and animals;

(x)   to 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.

RULE VII.   **Identification and registration**

All countries are required to compile the inventory which includes significant cultural and natural heritages within its boundaries by filling the *Tentative List*. On top of that, only one site (either natural or cultural) from the *Tentative List* should be chosen and registered in the *Application form*. Both the *Tentative List* and the *Application form* shall be completed within the time allotted and submitted to the Directors before the conference. The inscription shall be considered only if the properties are enlisted in the inventory. Countries who cannot complete the *Tentative List* and the *Application form* shall be automatically considered as the abstention of their right to vote on final decisions.

RULE VIII.   **Preliminary selection**

The Directors shall review the content and format of all *Tentative Lists* and *Application forms* received within the time allotted and announce of result of the preliminary selection before the meeting. The Directors reserve the right to dismiss any document they consider invalid at their own discretion.

RULE IX.   **Nomination**

Countries whose *Tentative Lists* and *Application forms* are approved by the Directors shall be eligible for nomination which shall take place during the conference. To secure their nomination, countries are suggested to prepare for presentation with brief introduction (i.e. slides, expository

handouts, brochures, etc.) through exploring necessary documentation as exhaustive as possible, particularly visual (maps) and written (historic overview) materials.

RULE X.   **Main Speaker's List**

Details of the Main Speakers' List are elaborated in the Beijing Rules of Procedure (Paper-Oriented). All countries with nominated sites shall be added into the list according to the sequence of submission before the preliminary selection.

RULE XI.   **First-round Voting for Applicants**

A voting will be commenced right after the exhaustion of Main Speaker's List. Each country shall vote for at most fifteen nominees. The first ten countries with the most votes shall be considered as the applicants with nominated sites for inscription. When there is a tie, the Secretariat enjoys the right to decide the applicants for the final contestation.

RULE XII.   **Presentation**

The presentations will officially be set in motion after the first-round voting, the procedure of which shall be consistent with what has been thoroughly explained in *Beijing Rules of Procedure (Application)*. The terms and conditions still hold valid while the compatibility between *Beijing Rules of Procedure (Application)* and the *Special Rules of Procedure* is built.

RULE XIII.   **Voting for final decision**

Voting for final decision will be in nature of an anonymous voting, whose procedure shall partly refer to the related articles in *Beijing Rules of Procedure (Application)*. In contrast to what has been commanded in the general rules and procedures, all countries shall be granted with eight votes for choosing the first eight countries whose nominated sites win the most votes. The eight sites nominated, which survive the final contestation, shall be inscribed into the World Heritage List of 2019.

Tentative List

Tentative List			
	Country		
No.	Name of property	State, province or region of origin	Criteria met

*As regards "Criteria met", please write the Roman numerals corresponding to the proposed criteria only.

Application Form

Application form	
Country	
Name of property to be nominated	
State, province or region of origin	
Description of property (historic background, symbolic significance, uniqueness, etc.)	
Justification of outstanding universal value (Why should it merit inscription on the World Heritage List? What are its inherent values for protection and exhibition?)	
Criteria met (Please write the Roman numerals from (i) to (x) corresponding to the proposed criteria and manifest the use of the property. You can write more than one Roman numerals in this part, each of which should be followed by a few short sentences of justification.) *Example:* *(i); the Great Wall of China embodies the ingenuity and creativity of ancient Chinese people. The architectural value is worth noticing……*	
Statement of authenticity and/or integrity (Please briefly demonstrate why it should be highly valued for its authenticity, i.e. it derives from the unique cultural background of a certain ethnic community/ displays the religious beliefs of a specific tribe, etc.)	
Comparison with other properties in the similar category (The comparison should outline similarities with other properties on the World Heritage List or not, and the reasons that make this property stand out.)	

Questions to Consider

1.   Given the many different challenges cultural heritage protection in the Global South is facing, which are the most pressing ones?

2.   Which of the problems concering cultural heritage protection in developing countries can effectively be solved by existing framework and mechanism within the South-South cooperation?

3.   Does social modernization and cultural heritage preservation always contradict with each other? If not, except for sustainable heritage tourism, what are the other approaches that local authorities can benefit cultural heritage protection while facilitating the process of urbanization?

4.   Is it possible to accelerate the repatriation of cultural artifacts among developing countries? What are the obstacles and challenges that the governments and institutions will be faced with regarding the proper handling of relationship between its ownership and the right to use?

5.   As for technology transfer and financial assistance, what other innovative channels that developing countries can exploit and make full use of?

6.   What advanced experiences and best practices that developing countries can learn from their developed counterparts for careful preservation?

7.   What are the interconnections among the delicate problems? Is there a better solution to resolve the questions orderly and effectively?

8.   Is there a panacea for strengthening regulations of illicit trafficking at the state level? If not, what other stakeholders or actors should be involved to crack down the transboundary smuggling?

9.   What would be envisaged with regard to heritage protection under the framework of South-South cooperation? Will the potential problems be underplayed by the prospects and emerging opportunities of inter-cultural communication?

Recommended Readings

1.   ARCHES (At Risk Cultural Heritage Education Series): https://www.khanacademy.org/humanities/special-topics-art-history/arches-at-risk-cultural-heritage-education-series

2.   Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage 1972. Available from: http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13055&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

3.   Timothy, D. J., Nyaupaune, G. P. eds. 2009. Cultural Heritage and Tourism in the Developing World: A Regional Perspective. [Online]. Oxon: Routledge. Available from: http://ultimatekashmir.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Cultural-Heritage-and-Tourism-in-the-Developing-World-Contemporary-Geographies-of-Leisure-Tourism-and-Mobility-2009.pdf

4.   Yates, D. 2016. The Global Traffic in Looted Cultural Objects. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Criminology. [Accessed 09 February 2019]. Available from: https://traffickingculture.org/app/uploads/2016/10/Global-Traffic-in-Looted-Cultural-Objects-Oxford-Research-Encyclopedia-of-Criminology.pdf

References

Amin, M. 2017. The Story Behind China's Long-Stalled Mine in Afghanistan. The Diplomat. [Online]. 07 January. [Accessed 09 February 2019]. Available from: https://thediplomat.com/2017/01/the-story-behind-chinas-long-stalled-mine-in-afghanistan/

Bhagat, S. et al. 2017. *Damage to Cultural Heritage Structures and Buildings Due to the 2015 Nepal Gorkha Earthquake.* In: Journal of Earthquake Engineering. (10), pp. 1–20.

Brodie, N. 2006. *Iraq 1990–2004 and the London antiquities market.* In: N. Brodie, M. Kersel, C. Luke, Tubb, K. W. eds. Archaeology, cultural heritage, and the antiquities trade (pp. 206–226). Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Casana, J. 2015. *Satellite Imagery-Based Analysis of Archaeological Looting in Syria.* In: Near Eastern Archaeology. 78(3), Special Issue: The Cultural Heritage Crisis in the Middle East, pp. 142-152.

Dalrymple, W. 2013. *Mes Aynak: Afghanistan's Buddhist buried treasure faces destruction.* In: The Guardian. [Online]. 31 May. [Accessed 09 February 2019]. Available from: https://www.theguardian.com/books/2013/may/31/mes-aynak-afghanistan-buddhist-treasure

Dominey-Howes, D. 2015. Explainer: are natural disasters on the rise? The Conversation. [Online]. 25 March. [Accessed 09 February 2019]. Available from: http://theconversation.com/explainer-are-natural-disasters-on-the-rise-39232

Endere, M. L. 2016. Provenance for Cultural Objects: Several Difficulties and Some Lines of Actions: The Issue in Latin American Countries.

Elia, R. J. 1997. *Looting, collecting, and the destruction of archaeological resources.* In: Nonrenewable Resources. 6(2), pp. 85–98.

Hardy, S. A. 2015. *The conflict antiquities trade: A historical overview.* In: F. Desmarais (Ed.), Countering the illicit traffic in cultural goods: The global challenge of protecting the world's heritage (pp. 21–31). Paris: International Council of Museums.

Hutchinson, G. 1996. *Threats to underwater cultural heritage. The problems of unprotected archaeological and historic sites, wrecks and objects found at sea.* In: Marine Policy. 20(4), pp. 287–290.

Lacey, M. 2010. *Cultural Riches Turn to Rubble in Haiti Quake.* In: The New York Times. [Online]. 24 January. [Accessed 09 February 2019]. Available from: https://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/24/world/americas/24heritage.html

Marzeion, B., Levermann, A. 2014. *Loss of cultural world heritage and currently inhabited places to sea-level rise.* In: Environmental Research Letters. 9(3).

Meier, H. R., Petzet, M., Will, T. eds. 2007. Cultural Heritage and Natural Disasters. Risk Preparedness and the Limits of Prevention. Dresden: Technische Universität, Dresden Press.

Nicu, I. C. 2017. *Natural Hazards – A Threat for Immovable Cultural Heritage. A Review.* In: International Journal of Conservation Science. 8(3), pp. 375-388.

Sugio, K. 2015. *Large-scale Disasters on World Heritage and Cultural Heritage in Japan: Significant Impacts and Sustainable Management Cases.* In: Landscape Research.40(6), pp. 748–758.

Timothy, D. J., Nyaupaune, G. P. eds. 2009. Cultural Heritage and Tourism in the Developing World: A Regional Perspective. [Online]. Oxon: Routledge. Available from: http://ultimatekashmir.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Cultural-Heritage-and-Tourism-in-the-Developing-World-Contemporary-Geographies-of-Leisure-Tourism-and-Mobility-2009.pdf

UNESCO. 2010. Return or Restitution Cases. [Online]. [Accessed 2 February 2019]. Available from:http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/restitution-of-cultural-property/return-or-restitution-cases/

UNESCO. 2016. Culture: Urban Future. Global Report on Culture for Sustainable Urban Development. [Online]. UNESCO. [Accessed 09 February 2019]. Available from: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000245999

UNESCO. 2017. The threat of the commercial exploitation of underwater cultural heritage. [Online]. UNESCO. [Accessed 09 February 2019]. Available from: http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/underwater-cultural-heritage/protection/threats/commercial-exploitation/

World Heritage Center: List of World Heritage in Danger. [Online]. World Heritage Center. [Accessed 09 February 2019]. Available from: https://whc.unesco.org/en/danger/

World Monuments Fund: World Monuments Watch List. [Online]. World Monuments Fund. [Accessed 09 February 2019]. Available from: https://www.wmf.org/watch/watch_year/2018-133

Yates, D. 2016. The Global Traffic in Looted Cultural Objects. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Criminology. [Online]. [Accessed 09 February 2019]. Available from: https://traffickingculture.org/app/uploads/2016/10/Global-Traffic-in-Looted-Cultural-Objects-Oxford-Research-Encyclopedia-of-Criminology.pdf

Yates, D., Mackenzie, S. *Heritage, Crisis, and Community Crime Prevention in Nepal.* In: International Journal of Cultural Property. 25(2), pp. 203-221.