

WORLD ANTHROPOLOGIES

Special Section on Cultural Heritage/Management

Foreword

Virginia R. Dominguez

Associate Editor for World Anthropologies

University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, United States

In the fall of 2015, I asked my colleague, Professor Helaine Silverman, if she was interested in putting together a special subsection on cultural heritage for this World Anthropologies section of *American Anthropologist*. I wanted the majority of the authors to be based outside the United States and Europe because issues surrounding cultural heritage management are present in many parts of the world, even though a large number of UNESCO World Heritage Sites are in Europe.¹ For years I have known of Helaine Silverman's passion for cultural heritage management, cultural heritage politics, and the role of UNESCO in designating places—many of them archaeological—as World Heritage Sites. She is, among other things, cofounder and director of the Collaborative for Cultural Heritage Management and Policy (CHAMP) at the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign.² She has also made professional connections and official exchanges with cultural heritage management scholars, curators, leaders, and institutions, both inside and outside the United States. When she enthusiastically agreed to take on this task, we worked together to identify possible contributors, the length of their essays, the topics she wanted to cover, and her own role in all this. Afterward, she took on the tasks of contacting contributors, encouraging them, keeping them on track, and making sure their essays dealt with the topics she had assigned them, though she also ensured that they would (and could) write from their own vantage points and experiences. For all this—including the interview she conducted for this collection of essays—I am extremely grateful to Helaine. Including archaeologists and museum curators from seven different countries (Malta, Lebanon, South Africa, Peru, the United States, Thailand, and Australia) was a feat in itself, and the issues they raise will enrich us all.

Here I thought it useful to address a variety of anthropologists, archaeologists, and museum curators to point out some of the issues and angles from which one might explore the matter of cultural heritage, cultural heritage management, cultural heritage politics, and cultural heritage designation—at least as I see them. As many of these issues shape the work our contributors do, and underlie Helaine Silverman's own work in this arena, these

issues recur throughout the individual pieces. But I still consider it worth mentioning them. “Cultural heritage,” after all, intersects in intriguing ways with issues of history and time, materiality and property, “soft power” and “cultural policies,” universalism and particularism, nation-ness and border crossing, wealth and poverty, tourism (both for the tourists and the toured), responsibility and authority, community and recognition, ruins and hope.

In the essays we include here, governments play a visible role. Sometimes contributors refer explicitly to the role of the state, and sometimes they write more of challenges, policies, and hopes that background the state (or some part of a provincial or national government) but still refer to it. Because the countries in which these contributors work vary in size, economic power, demographic makeup, and distribution of income, it might be quite interesting to read the whole set with each particular state in mind and taking those varieties into account while also contemplating them without taking those varieties into account—contemplating their policies toward history, time, culture, peoplehood, and even nation-ness.

Another striking issue that runs through several of these essays is tourism and its management. As Helaine Silverman and her contributors note, millions of people visit these sites precisely because they have been designated World Heritage Sites—and most of these visitors are neither researchers nor scholars themselves. As we ponder this intersection of tourism and cultural heritage designation and management, I wonder if we should not also ponder how much of the everyday challenges our colleagues deal with concern money—funds that come from prosperous locations, funds promised by national or international sources but withheld—and the commodification of history, archaeology, and culture itself that much of that specialized tourism achieves, encourages, or represents. To readers of *American Anthropologist* who work on tourism, it should take little or no effort to spot the connections between tourism and cultural heritage designation and management, but I urge readers in general to contemplate these connections. We are, after all, well practiced as tourists and perhaps even as the toured, even if collectively we seek to stand to the side and watch others do the touring.

For readers of this journal especially interested in materiality, there is much here to contemplate. This set of articles explores material sites and their histories. Intellectual

property is less in evidence, though there is little reason that “cultural heritage” could not also include sound, know-how, lore, and ideas. It seems worthwhile to contemplate the apparent appeal of the material, the three dimensional, and even the archaeological to those designating certain places as cultural heritage sites, places worth preserving and promoting, both domestically and internationally. Is it a matter of scale? Of use of our senses? Of the power of visibility? Perhaps it is all of these and more. I suggest that materiality and its experience play a role in cultural heritage designation, tourism, and management and that it is likely to be very fruitful to ask questions about it as we read our colleagues’ essays here.

Of course, a full analysis of official and unofficial “cultural heritage” sites would require the description and analysis of contestation, including of the role of UNESCO and the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) in promoting cultural heritage; of Europe’s relationship with much of the rest of the world; and of political, economic, linguistic, and social groups’ relationship to those in power. Contestation is often palpable (as Barbara Bender notes in much of her work, including her highly readable book *Stonehenge* [1999]). It is easy to see how contestation is usually about value—often value writ large, and not necessarily about a specific site designated as cultural heritage.

Among the questions we can ask, and that appear in the set of essays that Helaine Silverman has gathered here, are the following: Is indigeneity, for example, valued? In what form is it valued? In other words, is indigeneity valued as ancient history, as a window onto settler colonialism or imperial formations, or as the lives of contemporary people seeking recognition in states not of their own making (as Charles Taylor [1994] would say, as a “politics of recognition”)? Is settler colonialism itself valued and, again, in what form? In other words, whose heritage is being noticed and celebrated, and whose is not? Why, for example, does Malta have more official cultural heritage sites than most places? Is it because it is and is not obviously a part of Europe? Is its location in the Mediterranean what matters? Is its cultural heritage stock a way of recognizing both Christianity and Islam as important in the history of humanity?

Perhaps something else is at play. Are particular kinds of built environments more valued than others? Do visitors want to travel to monumental sites or at least sites that

take hours to reach? Might this favor past societies that built large monuments, temples, aqueducts, and stadiums of various kinds—suggesting powerful entities with an architectural interest and the recruitment of (voluntary or coerced) laborers to build such sites (something suggested already by contributors to Bender and Winer [2001])? The difficulty of presenting unpalatable aspects of past human societies in these sites is something that Richard Handler and Eric Gable (1997) have discussed in their own work on Williamsburg, Virginia. Anthropologists, historians, and archaeologists may seek such disclosure, but what if most people do not? For example, do those millions of visitors to these heritage sites—seeking some educational experience while on a holiday—want to be reminded of slavery or any kind of coerced labor, imperial conquests, or very unequal distributions of income or political power? Most anthropologists would want to make such aspects of past societies visible. What do we do when they are not?

To put it bluntly, what does an anthropologist do—what *should* an anthropologist do—when faced with the reality that many countries and many well-meaning international organizations today deem it a good thing to have cultural heritage sites? What if the great majority of them recognizes and even celebrates some people’s pasts and not other people’s pasts?

NOTES

1. UNESCO stands for the United Nations Educational, Social, and Cultural Organization.
2. CHAMP, a large multi- and inter-disciplinary unit at UIUC with 30 faculty members from more than a dozen departments, has already published six edited volumes in its cultural heritage series with Springer Press and sponsors a graduate minor in heritage studies and in museum studies.

REFERENCES CITED

- Bender, Barbara. 1999. *Stonehenge: Making Space*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Bender, Barbara, and Margot Winer, eds. 2001. *Contested Landscapes: Movement, Exile, and Place*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Handler, Richard, and Eric Gable. 1997. *The New History in an Old Museum: Creating the Past at Colonial Williamsburg*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Taylor, Charles. 1994. *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Interview

Managing the Past, Engaging the Present: An Interview with Douglas C. Comer, President, ICAHM (ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management)

Helaine Silverman

University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, United States

INTRODUCTION

Major challenges of preservation and management confront the 192 state signatories of the 1972 UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (World Heritage Convention), the world's most subscribed treaty. The essays in this section demonstrate that addressing these challenges is important for many reasons: cultural heritage is big business today in relation to tourism (Grima); it is a dramatic propaganda tool of warring parties (Seif); it has a profound relationship to colonialism (Lilley), nationalism (Higuera; Lertcharnrit), and development (Grima; Moyer, Gadsby, and Morris; Ndoro); and it has significance for human and cultural rights (Lilley)—to mention only the most obvious reasons.

The essays were chosen to provide a sample of thinking about several key heritage-management issues from the perspective of local colleagues working in each of ICAHM's (ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management) geographical regions. These topics (and many more) also preoccupy the allied discipline of critical heritage studies, which has resulted in an increasingly productive dialogue between practitioners and academics. Shared by both groups is the fundamental understanding of heritage as a discursive, social, political, and economic construction and practice of global reach, as well as a concern with engagement, empowerment, and equity for less powerful stakeholders.

Exemplifying that globality is the World Heritage system. Although saving and protecting many sites from destruction or deterioration, and admirably striving to achieve worldwide recognition of every country's or people's contribution to the history of humankind, its implementation has at times engendered complicated and even conflictual local-national-international dynamics of heritage administration and cultural politics. Yet, at its best, UNESCO (in addition to national and private agencies of various developed countries, such as the United States—see Moyer, Gadsby, and Morris) effectively deploys the soft power of international diplomacy to provide expertise and assistance in the cultural field to less developed countries.

Importantly, UNESCO is promoting culture as one of the pillars of its agenda for sustainable development. Within

this context, cultural heritage management can contribute meaningfully to the sustainable development effort (Ndoro) and to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. Sadly, however, cultural heritage also can be the venue of massive nondevelopment as a site of conflict, even violence, as when it is destroyed by war and terrorism (Seif) or is unrecognized or denigrated in intangible form (Lilley). UNESCO's concept of "cultural patrimony of humankind" is not shared by everyone.

The meaning of archaeological and historical places is defined by their past in addition to their context in the present. Indigenous peoples lay claim to ancestral, symbolic sites. "Ruins" may be the venue of active devotion by descendant communities and of concern in other ways to a local but unrelated population. Countries may valorize their history and more remote past as a source of national identity and as a resource for tourism. Indeed, one of the defining acts of national self-recognition is the creation of a national museum (Higuera). Different senses and assertions of ownership over cultural heritage are at play everywhere, for instance, among many local populations across the globe that are eagerly telling their own stories in independent community museums (Lertcharnrit).

Cultural heritage is a fascinating and fraught field of action. The papers and interview presented here are a small sampling of cases from around the world.

THE INTERVIEW

Dr. Douglas Comer is president of the International Scientific Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management (ICAHM), the international body that advises ICOMOS and UNESCO's World Heritage Committee on archaeological sites and landscapes, and that also works with professionals and associations around the world to advance the field of archaeological heritage management. He is also principal of Cultural Site Research and Management, a research, planning, and consulting firm that develops and utilizes innovative technologies, data-collection methodologies, and public-involvement techniques to produce and supplement sustainable, resource-driven cultural resource management plans. For two decades he was chief of the National Park Service Applied Archaeology Center, which conducted archaeological investigations associated with historic landscape and structural restoration projects. He is the author of *Ritual Ground: Bent's Old Fort, World Formation, and*

the Annexation of the Southwest (1996), a book that examines how humanly contrived landscapes convey—and sometimes reformulate—culture. He is editor/coeditor of *Tourism and Archaeological Heritage Management at Petra* (2011), *Mapping Archaeological Landscapes from Space* (2013a), *The Archaeology of Interdependence* (2013b), and *Identity and Heritage: Contemporary Challenges in a Globalized World* (2015). He is coeditor (with Helaine Silverman and Friedrich Lüth) of the book series, “Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Archaeological Heritage Management,” published by Springer. He is a former Senior Fulbright Scholar in Thailand, where he worked with the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Centre for Archaeology and Fine Arts (SPAFA) on developing guidelines for cultural resource management in Southeast Asia.

Dr. Helaine Silverman is professor of anthropology at the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign and director of CHAMP/Collaborative for Cultural Heritage Management and Policy, the university’s heritage research center. She is the editor/coeditor of *Archaeological Site Museums in Latin America* (2006), *Cultural Heritage and Human Rights* (2007), *Intangible Heritage Embodied* (2009), *Contested Cultural Heritage* (2011), *Cultural Heritage Politics in China* (2013), *Encounters with Popular Pasts* (2015), and *Heritage in Action* (2017), in addition to her numerous articles concerned with the intersections of heritage, identity and memory, local and national politics, and community rights in historic urban centers.

Helaine Silverman (HS): I indicated in my introduction that heritage scholars and practitioners are dealing with the “present past.” In this regard, how can communities be recognized as stakeholders in the cultural heritage sites around them?

Douglas Comer (DC): Ethnography is a key tool of effective site management, for it must engage local communities. Particularly as a national government agency begins to move forward with the nomination of a site to the World Heritage List, it is important for there to be a dialogue with local communities so that they understand what may happen if the site becomes World Heritage. They need to understand what development opportunities are offered by tourism but also that the creation of a World Heritage Site may impose limits on them, such as impeding other economic development or even imposing some restrictions on altering the appearance of homes or engaging in certain activities.

HS: The Bedouin have been at Petra for generations. At Angkor there are Khmer communities throughout the site, and there’s a bustling community at the base of Machu Picchu. How should site management deal with living residents at ancient places?

DC: Equitably. These communities are stakeholders. Even Machu Picchu Pueblo, which was created tabula rasa just a few decades ago by migrants from elsewhere in Peru coming to the mountain to take advantage of its tourism, has by now become an organic community with its own

place-based heritage and customs. Site management strategy must enable local communities to have property justice if they are persuaded to leave site grounds (ICAHM does not recommend forced eviction), and their livelihoods and the maintenance of a social community must not be impeded. Simultaneously, if a site is put into the touristscape, there is the overt right of outsiders to visit. Clearly, site management plans cannot be developed without community representation in the final configuration. At its best, the site management plan is a fairly negotiated process.

HS: Although tourism can generate income in many ways for a local community, it also can have disruptive effects on the social life of a community, on its sustainability in accordance with its own wishes. What’s to be done if a community is resistant to a World Heritage designation?

DC: There are cases where communities have expressed significant distress about a World Heritage inscription—before or after the fact—such as Quebrada de Humahuaca in Argentina and Pura Besakih temple in Indonesia. Your work in Phimai, Thailand, revealed both a lack of meaningful communication between the national heritage agency and the community and a rather pervasive community wariness about the inscription of the town’s temple. You can’t have sustainable management without the support of the local community, and if planning reveals community opposition that cannot be resolved, then a nomination should not proceed.

HS: What can be done to promote the World Heritage concept in communities that are going to be affected?

DC: The most obvious way of engendering support is to provide local and especially descendant communities with prioritized access, by which I mean the opportunity to profit and benefit from the site. Benefits may be infrastructural. In order to prepare the site for the increased tourism it likely will receive following inscription, better infrastructure is usually developed. In direct terms, communities must have preferential opportunities for exploiting tourism and the capacity to do so, including a strong voice in economic development. Small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs, as they are often called) must be nurtured, and investors from elsewhere must commit to partnering with them, directing visitors to local guiding services, hotels, restaurants, and concerns operated by members of local communities, even training and mentoring them as needed. Also, local communities should be carefully informed of both the opportunities and limitations that accompany World Heritage status, and agreements among community members should be put in place to prevent friction based on competition for economic benefit. As importantly, the community must have a strong and ongoing role in the management of the site. All of this takes considerable time and effort, but a site should not be inscribed until this is done.

HS: Today, 132 countries have Tentative Lists on which potential sites await forwarding to UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee for evaluation. There already are 1,052

sites on the World Heritage List of which the vast majority are cultural sites. Can all of these sites be accommodated by the World Heritage List?

DC: Certainly we want to see UNESCO's *Global Strategy* succeed so that the cultural heritage of underrepresented world regions is represented. UNESCO offers an interactive map showing global distribution of the different kinds of World Heritage Sites, which is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/interactive-map/>. The critical issues—beyond the veracity of the criteria of “Outstanding Universal Value” under which a site is proposed—are the *suitability* and *feasibility* of the nomination. Assuming local community buy-in, the next major issue is whether or not the site can be managed in terms of sustainable development. Several questions follow: Can its physical fabric be preserved? The natural environment protected? Local communities enabled to determine the path of their social and economic lives? Tourism appropriately and effectively administered along its social, physical, and economic transects? If a site is not suitable and its management is not feasible while on the Tentative List, these issues either must be adequately addressed or the nomination should not proceed.

HS: The issues you raise are readily understandable for archaeological sites. Do you think these notions of suitability and feasibility are also applicable to the numerous historic urban centers on the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists?

DC: Absolutely. First of all, we need to consider archaeological sites not as isolated monuments bounded by their buffer zones but as existing in a larger landscape setting, which implicates regional planning. As such, I see intersection with the recent UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape. Second, not only may there be standing archaeological remains within a historic urban center—such as in Rome—but those “remains” may actually be in commercial or residential use—such as in Cuzco. Moreover, beneath these historic urban centers there may be archaeological deposits. Not only must the archaeology be “managed,” but the same kinds of concerns that we have with living communities at and near archaeological sites also pertain to historic urban centers, which are typically huge tourist attractions, and their local communities have analogous concerns.

HS: So tourism is a driver, a benefit, and a problem of the heritagization of interesting places. Tourism means public access. That's where the issue begins. Should all World Heritage Sites be open to the public? Obviously, I don't refer to those natural places on the World Heritage List where inscription has been explicitly designed to save them from damaging human presence.

DC: A goal of the World Heritage system is to disseminate knowledge and respect for the cultural heritage of all peoples. The experience of visiting these sites should immerse the tourist not just in that place but in its much larger cultural context. However, living, cul-

turally continuous communities have the right to prohibit public access to their physically situated, embodied lives. Taos Pueblo, for instance, excludes visitors at particular ceremonial times and insists on a code of tourist behavior. Worldwide, site management will fail without mutual respect by the various categories of actors implicated.

HS: The World Heritage List is not just a beauty pageant of wonderful places around the globe, it is a philosophy. What evidence do you see of that philosophy taking hold among the world's publics?

DC: Perversely, the global outpouring of condemnation and grief over the destruction of cultural heritage in places such as Bamiyan, Afghanistan, Palmyra, Syria, and Timbuktu, Mali, is evidence of an understanding that all human history is the heritage of all peoples. Its physical loss is irreversible. Its emotional toll may be irreparable.

HS: But what is to be done at these sites when, hopefully, the fighting ends?

DC: Even if we restore the damaged sites, we have lost the original fabric and further information to be gained from the original context. Restoration will have to be examined on a case-by-case basis. For some sites there is abundant documentation such that an accurate replacement can be created, but it must—following international guidelines—be distinguishable no matter how “authentic” looking. This is not just a matter of loss of appearance. There has been loss of knowledge and loss of *community* and *local* heritage. A reconstruction would need to be accompanied by interpretation that acknowledges this.

HS: Interpretation is a concern both of ICAHM and another ICOMOS Scientific Committee, ICIP/Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites. Why?

DC: I think it is fair to say that the public is interested in the past—at least those people whose social, economic, and political stability enables them to look beyond a daily struggle for existence. The existence of a massive cultural tourism industry indicates curiosity. But people will only care about the past if they can understand it, and if it is or is made meaningful to them. Heritage is about the present even though it refers to the past. Tangible engagement with sites and a good interpretive platform facilitate understanding. This isn't to deny the validity of “pure” experiential tourism—“I was *at* Machu Picchu”—rather, I'm saying that interpretive centers on-site and especially tour guides can be very important in the enhancement of that experience. There is a large critical literature on tour guides. Cautiously, then, let me say that the local tour guide does not just purvey information about the site; he/she also necessarily puts the site in a living ethnographic context.

HS: What can the World Heritage system contribute beyond its World Heritage Sites of “Outstanding Universal Value”?

DC: The management of World Heritage Sites is a laboratory for local capacity building, technical training in preservation and conservation, community engagement, public

outreach, and testing of sustainable development policies that can be tweaked for application at sites that will never be inscribed but that nevertheless can be put to beneficial use by their communities of interest.

REFERENCES CITED

- Biehl, Peter F., Douglas C. Comer, Christopher Prescott, and Hilary A. Soderland, eds. 2015. *Identity and Heritage: Contemporary Challenges in a Globalized World*. New York: Springer.
- Blumenfeld, Tami, and Helaine Silverman, eds. 2013. *Cultural Heritage Politics in China*. New York: Springer.
- Comer, Douglas C. 1996. *Ritual Ground: Bent's Old Fort, World Formation, and the Annexation of the Southwest*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Comer, Douglas C., ed. 2011. *Tourism and Archaeological Heritage Management at Petra*. New York: Springer.
- Comer, Douglas C., ed. 2013a. *Mapping Archaeological Landscapes from Space*. New York: Springer.
- Comer, Douglas C., ed. 2013b. *The Archaeology of Interdependence: European Involvement in the Development of a Sovereign United States*. New York: Springer.
- Robinson, Mike, and Helaine Silverman, eds. 2015. *Encounters with Popular Pasts: Cultural Heritage and Popular Culture*. New York: Springer.
- Ruggles, D. Fairchild, and Helaine Silverman, eds. 2009. *Intangible Heritage Embodied*. New York: Springer.
- Silverman, Helaine, ed. 2006. *Archaeological Site Museums in Latin America*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Silverman, Helaine, ed. 2011. *Contested Cultural Heritage: Religion, Nationalism, Erasure and Exclusion in a Global World*. New York: Springer.
- Silverman, Helaine, and D. Fairchild Ruggles, eds. 2007. *Cultural Heritage and Human Rights*. New York: Springer.
- Silverman, Helaine, Emma Waterton, and Steve Watson, eds. 2017. *Heritage in Action: Making the Past in the Present*. New York: Springer.

Articles

Heritage Management, Tourism, and World Heritage on Malta

Reuben Grima

University of Malta, Malta

A miniscule archipelago on the southern fringe of Europe is hardly where one would expect to find the nation-state with the highest density of UNESCO World Heritage Sites. Yet with three World Heritage inscriptions in a mere 316 square kilometers, Malta presents precisely this scenario, second only to the Holy See in density of sites. Malta also ranks among the 10 countries or dependent territories with the highest population density in the world. Add to this annual tourist arrivals that have lately been increasing by around 100,000 each year, surpassing 1.8 million in 2015—roughly four times the resident population (Malta Tourism Authority 2016)—and you have an interesting tightrope walk of tempting opportunities and acute vulnerabilities.

Malta's three inscriptions on the World Heritage List are a legacy of the two most iconic and celebrated moments in its past. The first is the extraordinary megalithic culture that flourished on the archipelago between the mid-fourth and mid-third millennium BC, and that created a series of megalithic monuments raised aboveground, as well as funerary sites hewn into the living rock. These two classes of monument are each represented on the list by the serial inscription of the Megalithic Temples of Malta, comprising six sites, and by the Ħal Saflieni Hypogeum, an elaborate rock-hewn funerary complex. The second iconic moment is the sojourn of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem in Malta from 1530 to 1798, represented on the list by the fortified city of Valletta, created ex novo in 1566 and today the country's capital.

The past decade has witnessed the most rapid pace of change on Malta's World Heritage Sites since they were first inscribed on the list in 1980. On the megalithic complexes, a series of infrastructural projects have been undertaken and completed with the twin aims of preserving the monuments and improving their accessibility to the public. Three protective shelters have been installed over the megalithic complexes of Mnajdra, Ħaġar Qim, and Tarxien to protect them from the elements (Cassar et al. 2011). Visitor centers aimed at improving site interpretation and accessibility have been created at Ġgantija and at Ħaġar Qim. These projects represent a multimillion-euro investment made possible by the injection of European Regional Development Funds since Malta's accession to the European Union in 2004. A major project at the Ħal Saflieni Hypogeum was completed in 2000, again with the twin goals of preserving the site and improving its interpretation (Pace 2000). Key measures that were implemented on the site include strict regulation of visitor numbers and measures to maintain the microclimate of the site. The environmental management systems on the site are now due for replacement, which is being funded through a European Economic Area (EEA) Grant.

The most complex and intensive transformations taking place on Malta's World Heritage Sites are occurring in and around Valletta. Once again, European Regional Development Funds have played a part. Projects that received such funding between 2007 and 2013 include the restoration of Valletta's bastions and the creation of a fortifications interpretation center, a lift structure linking the historic city center to the harbor waterfront, and the restoration and

repurposing of Fort Saint Elmo to house an enlarged War Museum. Just across the Grand Harbour, Fort Saint Angelo, which dominates some of the most important vistas from Valletta, was likewise restored, with interpretation facilities created through similar funding. Another ERDF project involves the restoration of important public buildings as well as the creation and embellishment of pedestrian public spaces in Valletta. A project to refurbish the Valletta Harbour breakwater and to replace the bridge linking it to the mainland, which had been destroyed during World War II, received similar funding. Meanwhile, national funds were used to create a new performance space and a new parliament building designed by Renzo Piano, while the city center has been repaved and turned into a largely pedestrian space.

The projects described above represent a colossal investment in a short span of time, on a scale not seen since the postwar reconstruction of Valletta. In the aftermath of the severe damage caused by World War II, Valletta witnessed half a century of progressive population, infrastructural, and economic decline. The investment witnessed in recent years transformed the face of the city, restored dignity to many of its public spaces and monuments, and has drawn a new generation of Maltese and foreign audiences to its vibrant cultural scene. In 2012, when it was publicly announced that Valletta had been awarded the title of “European Capital of Culture 2018,” the city’s future looked bright, its cultural heritage values secure, and the reversal of decades of population decline inevitable. It is therefore astonishing how rapidly a situation considered by most to be so bright and promising has turned into one of concern.

The recognition that historic cities may only be successfully preserved by also addressing social needs is by no means new (e.g., Rodwell 2007). However, the failure to address these needs in Valletta in an adequate and timely manner is worth examining. The management challenges of Valletta are clearly very different from those shared by Malta’s other two World Heritage Sites in several important respects. One fundamental difference is that the archaeological sites are largely state owned and managed by a single entity, whereas a city like Valletta is made up of a complex cacophony of thousands of different owners and interests, at different scales and with a variety of values and expectations. As a consequence, although it is feasible for a curatorial team to define and control the agenda for a state-owned archaeological site, the management of choices and decisions in a World Heritage city requires far more discussion in order to create a consensus around any vision for the future of the city. Largely because of this difference, the ERDF and similar investments in these different sites produce unintended consequences. Whereas the archaeological sites on the World Heritage List are now generally delivering a more sustainable, meaningful, and enriching experience to their visitors, the consequences for Valletta have been more complex and more disquieting. Importantly, these urban issues are paradigmatically expressed at a global scale in “The Valetta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historic

Cities, Towns and Urban Areas,” a doctrinal outcome of the 17th General Assembly of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), one of the bodies advising UNESCO on World Heritage List nominations.

State investment in infrastructure and public monuments, and the resulting shift in perceptions of the city, started a snowball of private investment. A corollary to this is that a clear and widely shared vision for the future of the city, backed by a strong regulatory framework, is required to orchestrate the many different interests that may be mobilized in this way to invest in the city. In the absence of such a vision and framework, divergent agendas are inevitable, and entrepreneurship rapidly turns into speculation. In the case of Valletta, at the time of writing, public consultation on a long-awaited management plan has not yet begun, nor has consultation for the long-overdue revised *Local Plan for the Grand Harbour*.

The absence of clear visions and frameworks is eroding the historic fabric of the city, and developers are taking advantage of this lacuna. Under the pretext of restoring houses, permits are being requested and obtained to sanction rooftop additions that interfere with the urban roofscape, notwithstanding the fact that in 2009 UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee raised concerns and questions about the impact of development on Valletta’s historic rooflines.

The state itself is sometimes directly involved in interventions that will take a toll on the values of the city. St John’s Cathedral, arguably the jewel in Valletta’s crown, is jointly managed by church and state. A proposal for the construction of a massive museum exhibition hall over a historic courtyard and cemetery adjoining the cathedral has been approved, in spite of concerns and reservations raised by several parties. Another development application that is being processed proposes to mutilate another great icon from the period of the Knights of Saint John, the Holy Infirmary of the Knights, by building an enormous viewing platform that would raise the roofline by almost a meter as well as adding a glass parapet wall and punching lift shafts through the historic wards. Meanwhile, in another state-sponsored intervention, long-established butchers and fruit vendors in the popular Victorian covered market have been bought out to vacate the building in order to make way for an upscale supermarket and tourist-oriented gourmet eateries. The number of catering establishments and boutique hotels in Valletta is meanwhile increasing rapidly. Night-time noise is severely degrading the quality of life of residents, some of whom have already decided to move out for this reason.

The decline in Valletta’s population has continued in 2016. Residents of the city increasingly voice concerns about the impact of private investment and tourism on the livability of Valletta. Public debates and letters in the press highlight a series of new threats that have emerged as a direct, albeit unintended, consequence of the very investment that the city has enjoyed. During a seminar on the future of the city organized by an NGO on April 9, 2016, several of the speakers (including this writer) noted that

although attention focused on the city's monuments and material fabric, the social fabric had been neglected (Grima 2016; Valletta Alive Foundation 2016).

Valletta is clearly at a crossroads, and what happens in the next few years will be decisive for the long-term preservation of its values. The current trend is to give priority to speculation and unbridled exploitation of the tourist market over the sustainable management of the values of the city. Unless there is a drastic reordering of those priorities in the near future, the prospects for the future liveability of the city appear grim.

REFERENCES CITED

Cassar, JoAnn, Mario Galea, Reuben Grima, Katya Stroud, and Alex Torpiano. 2011. "Shelters over the Megalithic Temples of Malta:

Debate, Design and Implementation." *Environmental Earth Sciences* 63 (7–8): 1849–1860.

Grima, Noel. 2016. "The Changing Face of Valletta." *The Malta Independent*, April 17. <http://www.independent.com.mt/articles/2016-04-18/newspaper-lifestyleculture/The-changing-face-of-Valletta-6736156489>.

Malta Tourism Authority. 2016. *Tourism in Malta 2015* Malta: Malta Tourism Authority.

Pace, Anthony, ed. 2000. *The Hal Saflieni Hypogeum 4000 BC–2000 AD* Malta: Museums Department.

Rodwell, Dennis. 2007. *Conservation and Sustainability in Historic Cities*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Valletta Alive Foundation. 2016. "Seminar Proceedings: Valletta: Beyond 2020." April 9. http://vallettaalivefoundation.org/vaf_archives/

Article

Heritage Management and the Community in Lebanon

Assaad Seif

Lebanese University, Lebanon

Recent wars and past colonial empires make cultural heritage management in Lebanon, with its archaeological heritage dating back to the Lower Paleolithic period (Yazbeck 2004), quite a challenge. Despite their national and universal values, Lebanese heritage sites suffer from major conservation problems, lack of regular maintenance, and a low standard of visitor facilities. Moreover, heritage management and community involvement in valorization and conservation efforts are still in their early stages.

As early as the nineteenth century, colonial powers, fond of philology and ready to fill their museums' galleries with "curiosities" and relics from the Ancient Near East, were attracted to Lebanon's rich archaeological record. Ottomans, French, and Germans all took their share of the spoils from "orientalist missions" undertaken by their respective archaeological institutions (Hamdi Bey and Reinach 1892; Renan 1864; Scheffler 1998).

When Lebanon came under the French Mandate (1918–1943), archaeology and the appreciation of antiquities (in the "Western" sense) were still confined to a small circle of social elites and were not apprehended by the wider Lebanese citizenry. The French Mandate authorities issued the country's first and only Law on Antiquities of Lebanon in 1933 (Law no. 166 LR), which was dedicated to the definition of antiquities, listing of monuments, regulation of the antiquities market, organizing archaeological works, and other related legal measures. This law has not been updated and remains in use today.

During the French Mandate period, archaeological material discovered at sites across the territory was used to

construct the "national identity" of the newly formed state. The search for the Phoenicians, the so-called ancestors of the nation, was of paramount importance. Sites were tirelessly excavated, mostly by French archaeologists, in order to reveal links to this past and justify the newly promulgated national identity (Seif 2009). Excavations were mainly focused on collecting objects of "national value" to be exhibited in the Lebanese National Museum, which was established in the early 1920s and began to take shape in 1930 (Gelin 2002).

After Lebanon gained its independence in 1943, the newly established Directorate General of Antiquities (the DGA) continued this nationalist agenda. Great archaeological sites such as Byblos, Baalbek, Sidon, and later Tyre became national monuments. When the DGA was transferred to the Ministry of Tourism in 1966, these sites were transformed into tourist attractions. Artifacts from the major sites were stored and displayed in the National Museum, creating an invaluable component of the national patrimony. Lebanon also turned these sites and their artifacts into iconic state symbols, printing images of them on currency, stamps, and other public and official documents. Concomitantly, media interest in the past reduced heritage to archaeological and antiquarian objects, and saw heritage as possessing only financial and aesthetic values (Seif 2009). This widespread mercantile vision of the past led to clandestine digging and looting of archaeological heritage during the dark years of the Lebanese Civil War between 1975 and 1990 (Seif 2015).

During the war, and specifically in 1982, the DGA hastened its work and urged the government to ratify the UNESCO World Heritage Convention because of the imminent threat to several sites. In 1984 Tyre, Anjar, Baalbek, and Byblos were inscribed onto the World Heritage List.

In the aftermath of the Lebanese Civil War, the failure of successive appointed governments to ensure the basic needs of their citizens trumped heritage management. Heritage authorities failed to convey the common heritage values and meanings of the past to the public, and little attention was given to a much-needed introspective and reflexive assessment of the established national identity discourse. Missing was a sustainable vision regarding the management of the country's archaeological heritage.

Finally, in 2008, in an attempt to update laws affecting cultural heritage in line with UNESCO and other international conventions, the Lebanese government issued three additional laws. These dealt with the restructuring of the Ministry of Culture and related departments (Law 35), and the creation of an independent body to manage museums (Law 36) and cultural properties (Law 37). None of these laws, however, dealt with the application of heritage management standards *per se*, or touched upon the need to introduce community involvement in heritage-related matters.

Today, the current legal and heritage administrative systems that adopt a top-down approach with regards to policy and practice are still producing the same patterns whereby local communities and stakeholders still lack a strong sense of ownership in the sites and in heritage in a wider sense. They are alienated by the government approach to archaeological sites that treats these sites as "sacred spaces" preserved only to receive international tourists.

Moreover, heritage management as a field of study and practice in its own right has not been recognized or adopted by academic institutions in Lebanon. Most academic and public administration bodies conflate archaeological studies with heritage studies. Consequently, university curricula do not include heritage management coursework. Instead, and in response to government's plan to initiate several museum projects in the coming years, the focus is specifically on museum studies. This situation contributes to a professional void of qualified heritage personnel in public administration agencies responsible for heritage management.

Furthermore, with mostly on-site and very targeted conservation measures, there is no holistic vision in conservation projects that are implemented by a host of different institutions. This approach is clearly manifested in the recently initiated and ambitious Cultural Heritage and Urban Development (CHUD) project funded by the World Bank, which aims to enhance the cultural heritage and urban setting of five major historic cities in Lebanon (Baalbek, Tyre, Byblos, Sidon, and Tripoli). The CHUD interventions are strictly confined to the upgrade of urban infrastructure, with minor embellishment of selected urban facades within the historic quarters surrounding the archaeological sites. These include superficial "conservation" works inside the archaeological sites of Baalbek and Tyre that are mainly concerned with the enhancement of the general appearance of parts of the sites for improving their appeal to visitors, as well

as accessibility. Urban regeneration (with limited impact), rather than sustainable urban development and proper heritage integration, conservation, and tangible involvement of the local communities, was the major driving force behind such projects.

Recognizing these problems, in 2014–2015 the Ministry of Culture implemented a pioneering project titled ARCHEOMEDSITES, funded by the European Union. The project aimed to enhance the management and valorization of the Tyre World Heritage Site by developing a management plan according to UNESCO standards and implementing awareness activities to engage the local community. As a pilot project, ARCHEOMEDSITES was developed to assess the efficacy and fit of new approaches in management and community involvement, and whether these approaches may be relevant to other heritage sites in the country (Hmeidan, *in press*). The project tested sustainable awareness activities and innovative educational tools designed to reconnect people to their heritage (Charaf 2015).

The project was successful in tapping into people's appreciation of their local heritage, developing their sense of place, and relating the stories of Tyre's heritage to the wider story of Lebanon today. Furthermore, understanding the socioeconomic conditions of the local community in Tyre and the visions of the various stakeholders helped the project organizers design a heritage management plan that recognizes the essential role and responsibility of these stakeholders as well as the local community in protecting and preserving the heritage resources of the Tyre World Heritage Site (El Masri 2015). This plan calls for more effective collaboration between professionals from many disciplines. It also calls for proactive cooperation among government authorities, academic researchers, private and public enterprises, and the general public in a number of proposed strategic projects. If properly implemented, this plan will help to ensure the long-term sustainability of the Tyre World Heritage Site and its "outstanding universal value."

In the same framework, a two-day workshop bringing together academics and professionals of the Lebanese University and the Ministry of Culture was held in December 2015 in order to seek solutions to these heritage management issues. Positive feedback came from both the president of the university and the minister of culture supporting these efforts. A board of academics has already started working on the elaboration of a university curriculum proposal to be presented and hopefully adopted in the near future. It would produce a generation of heritage scholars and professionals equipped to deal with Lebanon's exceptional patrimony.

These recent experiences have shown that change can be achieved when local communities (and not just experts) are more aware of the importance of their heritage and its meaning. Fortunately, both the government and the local communities are recognizing the pressing need for

better heritage management approaches of the Lebanese patrimony. Further guidance and encouragement by the responsible local and national authorities is essential in order to achieve more involvement. Additionally, intelligent and innovative public education programs should become part of an essential strategy to help people reconnect with their past.

At these critical times of political unrest in the region, the Ministry of Culture should elaborate a global long-term strategic vision and plan toward good governance, enhanced legal protection, community involvement, and wise management of the country's heritage to ensure the long-term sustainability of the heritage sites and their values. Government authorities should continue to work to engage the public and local communities in order to better appreciate, protect, manage, and transmit the common heritage of Lebanon to future generations.

REFERENCES CITED

- Charaf, Hanan. 2015. "From the Guest Editor." *Journal of Eastern Mediterranean Archaeology and Heritage Studies* 3 (4): iii–vi.
- El Masri, Sami. 2015. "Tyre WHS Management Plan Framework." *Unpublished document*.
- Gelin, Mathilde. 2002. *L'Archéologie en Syrie et au Liban à l'époque du mandat (1919–1946), Histoire et Organisation* [Archaeology in Syria and Lebanon during the Mandate Period (1919–1946), History and organization]. Paris: Geuthner.
- Hamdi Bey, Osman., and Theodor Reinach. 1892. *Une nécropole Royale à Sidon: Fouilles de Hamdy Bey* [A royal necropolis in Sidon: Excavations of Hamdi Bey], Paris: E. Leroux.
- Hmeidan, Maya. In Press. "Towards a New Approach in Management and Valorization of World Heritage Sites in Lebanon: The ARCHEOMEDSITES Experience in Tyre." In *ARCHEOMEDSITES: Use of Management Models for the Archaeological Sites and Urban Contexts*. Rome: Ministero per i Beni Culturali e del Turismo [Italian Ministry of Cultural Properties and Tourism].
- Renan, Ernest. 1864. *Mission de Phénicie* [Mission to Phoenicia]. Paris: Imprimerie Impériale.
- Scheffler, Thomas. 1998. "The Kaiser in Baalbek: Tourism, Archaeology, and the Politics of Imagination." In *Baalbek: Image and Monument, 1898–1998*, edited by Hélène S. Sader, Thomas Scheffler, and Angelika Neuwirth, 13–49. Beirut: Orient-Institut der Deutschen.
- Seif, Assaad. 2009. "Conceiving the Past: Fluctuations in a Multi-Value System." *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 11 (3–4): 282–95.
- Seif, Assaad. 2015. "Illicit Traffic in Cultural Property in Lebanon: A Diachronic Study." In *Countering Illicit Traffic in Cultural Goods: The Global Challenge of Protecting the World's Heritage*, edited by France Desmarais, 65–81. Paris: The International Council of Museums.
- Yazbeck, Corine. 2004. "Le paléolithique du Liban: Bilan critique" [The Paleolithic of Lebanon: A critical review], *Paléorient* 30 (2): 111–26.

Article

World Heritage and Development in Sub-Saharan Africa

Webber Ndoro

University of Cape Town, South Africa

The first sites on the African continent to be placed on the UNESCO World Heritage List were the Island of Gore in Senegal and the Rock-Hewn Churches of Lalibela in Ethiopia, both in 1978. Africa now has 130 sites on the prestigious World Heritage List (90 in Sub-Saharan Africa), out of a total of 1,051 sites worldwide, and it is generally acknowledged that the African continent is underrepresented (Abungu 2016). Despite this, Africa has the greatest number of sites on UNESCO's List of World Heritage in Danger, accounting for 35.4 percent of the sites on this list. Thus, in addition to being underrepresented, the heritage sites on the African continent appear to suffer from inadequate management. However, a closer look reveals that heritage management (as it has been defined by external actors) is often at odds with infrastructural development and poverty-reduction goals on the continent, which ultimately take priority. Unless discourses of heritage are linked to poverty reduction and sustainable development in the region, World Heritage protection will always be sidelined.

Several reasons for the underrepresentation of Sub-Saharan Africa have been suggested, including the politics of the World Heritage processes (Meskell 2013) and the lack of capacity on the continent to identify and protect heritage places (Makuvaza and Chiwaura 2014). I have argued that the African definition and use of heritage is at odds with the precepts of preservation espoused by UNESCO and its expert groups from the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) (Ndoro and Wajesuriyi 2015). The experts from ICOMOS and UNESCO overemphasize particular aspects of heritage, such as architectural monuments, archaeological sites of ancient civilizations, and historic sites (Cameron and Rossler 2013; Labadi 2013), while failing to recognize others that are important to the African definition of heritage, such as those related to African traditional religions, slavery, or colonial resistance.

One of the most contentious issues with the management of World Heritage Sites in Africa has been the need to reconcile heritage conservation with socioeconomic development around resource exploitation (a concern that began with the construction of the Aswan Dam and the rescue of

the impacted Nubian monuments). The demands of energy (in the form of electricity and fuel) and the projects that will lead to infrastructural development and reduction of poverty are very much articulated in the African Union document called *Agenda 2063*. The development-oriented projects that African governments often promote have come into conflict with the prospects for protecting and conserving World Heritage Sites. This has resulted in the high number of negative *State of Conservation* reports we see. For example, dam building in Ethiopia threatens ecosystems not only of that country but also of Kenya and the rest of the world. But it can be argued that the irrigation and electricity facilitated by these environmentally destructive projects also address some of the issues articulated in the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the *Agenda 2063*—specifically, poverty reduction and economic sustainability for local peoples. There are also positive environmental effects of the dams in terms of non-fossil fuel production and carbon reduction.

Analysis shows that since 1982, when the first UNESCO *State of Conservation* reports were made, most properties in Africa have increasingly been affected by illegal activities (poaching, illegal logging, illegal trade, illegal constructions, looting), civil unrest, war, and deliberate destruction of heritage. Mali, Nigeria, Sudan, Tanzania, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo are especially notorious in this regard. These threats to cultural and natural heritage have had a negative impact on management systems being implemented in Sub-Saharan Africa.

As more African countries scale up exploration for minerals, gas, and oil, management and conservation of heritage in the framework of economic development has increasingly become a challenge. These issues have dominated many World Heritage Committee meetings in recent years. Natural properties are significantly more affected by extractive industries than cultural or mixed properties. The discovery of substantial deposits of minerals, petroleum, and natural gas resources in commercially viable quantities in various parts of Africa near World Heritage Sites presents a growing challenge to effective heritage protection, conservation, and management. Coal mining at Mapungubwe in South Africa, uranium mining in the Selous Game Reserve, and iron mining at Mount Nimba Nature Reserve in Cote d'Ivoire are classic examples of the impact of extractive industries on World Heritage Sites. For most African governments these resource discoveries are seen as a stepping stone to development and prosperity. Given its low priority and its unarticulated role in sustainable development, heritage conservation generally is sacrificed. This is compounded by the fact that the general public's perceptions of heritage are very different from those of experts and heritage professionals. The small number of protected World Heritage Sites in Africa remain the preserve of the few, inaccessible to the general public.

In 1994, in response to concern about the imbalance and unrepresentativeness of the World Heritage List, the UNESCO World Heritage Committee put in place the *Global Strategy for a Balanced, Representative and Credible World Her-*

itage List. Embracing a more anthropological perspective, the strategy aimed to expand the definition of World Heritage (Cameron 2016). The strategy also accepted the more encompassing view of heritage as espoused in the 1994 Nara Document on Authenticity, which represented a shift from Eurocentric views on heritage (see Stovel 2008).

On the African continent the implementation of the *Global Strategy* took the form of capacity-building efforts. These were initially carried out by the World Heritage Centre (headquartered in Paris) and later through the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM) "Africa 2009" program. The mandate was to develop skills and competencies in the management of World Heritage Sites on the continent. While the efforts of the *Global Strategy* were noble and produced relative success in increasing the number of actors on heritage issues, they did not increase the number of World Heritage Sites nor reduce the ones on the List of World Heritage in Danger (Steiner and Frey 2011). Nominations from Europe and Asia continued to increase the imbalance of the World Heritage List. At the time Africa was home to 7 percent of the World Heritage Sites. Today the situation is more or less the same with only 9 percent of the sites in Africa. One could perhaps conclude that the *Global Strategy* did not yield satisfactory results (see Steiner and Frey 2011).

The changes brought about by the strategy were supposed to improve the implementation of the 1972 World Heritage Convention in Sub-Saharan Africa. However, as Cameron (2016) points out, the implementation of the convention depends on three main players: the state parties (signatories to the convention), the UNESCO World Heritage Committee (of changing membership), and the advisory bodies (ICOMOS, IUCN, ICCROM). But Sub-Saharan Africa's role in the World Heritage Committee and Advisory Bodies has been on the decline. By 2014, the region had one representative on the 21-member World Heritage Committee. South Africa is the only country in Sub-Saharan Africa with a functioning ICOMOS Committee. The advisory bodies (including ICOMOS) play a crucial role in the evaluation of nomination documents sent to the World Heritage Committee and in the *State of Conservation* reports (see Comer 2014). It is these materials that form the basis of decisions made by the committee. Very few of these experts come from Africa.

It is critical to note that while the objective of the *Global Strategy* has not been fully successful there have been positive developments in Sub-Saharan Africa. Awareness of the 1972 Convention has risen and state parties have updated their Tentative Lists, which document sites potentially eligible to be formally nominated to the World Heritage List. Today there are more visible actors on World Heritage issues in Sub-Saharan Africa, such as local communities, NGOs and other nonstate actors, and political decision makers.

Still, the trajectory of World Heritage management on the African continent suggests that external actors play larger

roles than do local dynamics. The nomination process for the World Heritage List and the evaluation of management effectiveness are all externally sourced. The fact that there have been capacity-building programs for heritage conservation through the *Global Strategy* has not significantly led to more sites on the list or to any significant improvement in the management and conservation of World Heritage Sites in Africa. Instead, issues around resource exploitation and infrastructural improvements in the name of sustainable development as witnessed in Zanzibar (with hotel construction) and Lamu (with harbor expansions) have tended to present more impediments to the implementation of the 1972 World Heritage Convention in Sub-Saharan Africa.

REFERENCES CITED

- Abungu, George. 2016. "UNESCO, the World Heritage Convention and Africa: The Practice and Practitioners." In *A Companion to Heritage Studies*, edited by William S. Logan, Mairead Nic Craith, and Ullrich Kockel, 373–91. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Cameron, Christina. 2016. "UNESCO and Cultural Heritage: Unexpected Consequences." In *A Companion to Heritage Studies*, edited by William S. Logan, Mairead Nic Craith, and Ullrich Kockel, 322–336. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Cameron, Christina, and Mecthild Rossler. 2013. "The Shift toward Conservation: Early History of the 1972 World Heritage Convention and Global Heritage Conservation." In *Understanding Heritage Perspectives in Heritage Studies*, edited by Marie-Theres Albert, Roland Bernecker, and Britta Rudloff, 69–76. Berlin: DeGruyter.
- Comer, Douglas C. 2014. "The Contribution of ICAHM to the Nomination of African Cultural World Heritage Sites on the World Heritage List through the Africa Initiative Program." In *The Management of Cultural World Heritage Sites and Development in Africa. History, Nomination Processes and Representation on the World Heritage List*, edited by Simon Makuvaza, 33–44. New York: Springer.
- Labadi, Sophia. 2013. *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value: Value-based Analysis of the World Heritage and Intangible Heritage Conventions*. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.
- Makuvaza, Simon, and Henry Chiwaura. 2014. "African States Parties, Support, Constraints, Challenges and Opportunities for Managing Cultural World Heritage Sites in Africa." In *The Management of Cultural World Heritage Sites and Development in Africa. History, Nomination Processes and Representation on the World Heritage List*, edited by Simon Makuvaza, 45–53. New York: Springer.
- Meskel, Lynn. 2013. "UNESCO's World Heritage Convention at 40: Challenging Economic and Political Order of the International Heritage Convention." *Current Anthropology* 54 (4): 483–94.
- Ndoro, Webber, and Gamini Wijesuriya. 2015. "Heritage Management and Conservation: From Colonization to Globalization." In *Global Heritage: A Reader*, edited by Lynn Meskel, 131–49. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Steiner, Lasse, and Bruno S. Frey. 2011. "Correcting the Imbalance of the World Heritage List: Did the UNESCO Strategy Work?" Working Paper, *Center for Research in Economics, Zurich, Management and the Arts (CREMA)*.
- Stovel, Herb. 2008. "Origins and Influence of the Nara Document on Authenticity." *APT Bulletin: Journal of Preservation Technology* 39 (2–3): 9–17.

Article

Indigenous Archaeological Heritage in Australia: Definition and Management of Sites

Ian Lilley

University of Queensland, Australia

At the time of European colonization in the late 1700s, there were more than 200 indigenous languages spoken across what became Australia by a total population probably numbering between 500,000 and 1,000,000 people. Today, people who self-categorize as being of indigenous descent make up less than 3 percent of the national population. Like most things in Australian life, the heritage of indigenous and nonindigenous people alike is managed through three layers of government: federal, state, and local. This structure underpins a stable democracy that was created in 1901 as a federation of sovereign states, which at that time were colonies of Britain. Except in certain circumstances (for example,

on federal land or where federal agencies are involved), the states are responsible for heritage management. The result of this arrangement is that heritage management is conducted across nine jurisdictions, including the commonwealth but not counting local government.

Despite a longstanding anthropological and lay fascination with so-called "traditional" communities in remote areas of the country such as the "Red Center," the fact is that the great majority of indigenous Australians have for at least several generations lived in towns and cities. Regardless of where they live, however, indigenous Australians generally retain a sense of connection to their ancestral lands even if they have never visited them. This can complicate relations with people, usually kin, still residing on these sites of cultural heritage. Problems also arise when people moved by

the authorities onto another group's "country" assert rights to speak on particular issues, including cultural heritage, either through kinship ties or owing to the depth of historical connection to their "new" (though usually of several generations' standing) home. The question of who has the right to speak as the appropriate indigenous authority on a particular issue or in a particular locality must be kept front and center in heritage management.

Continuing urban expansion has a major impact on indigenous and especially Aboriginal Australian archaeological and other cultural heritage. In rural and remote Australia, the principal cause of destruction of sites is through development of agriculture and forestry and the expansion of "extractive" industries such as oil, gas, and mining. Australia's wealth and economic growth are especially dependent on commodities exports from the mining and agricultural sectors rather than manufacturing or the export of services.

Because mining and related activity almost invariably occur on land that is home to or otherwise connected with indigenous communities, indigenous heritage management is a major issue. Historically, relations between miners and indigenous Australians have not been good, but owing to the activism of indigenous people and sympathetic non-indigenous practitioners, the industry has increasingly come to understand that its "social license to operate" is based on sound community relations, especially but certainly not exclusively with indigenous communities, as usually operationalized through "corporate social responsibility" programs. Ciaran O'Faircheallaigh (2008) documents how in recent years this trend in community relations has seen significant growth in negotiated agreements between miners and indigenous people. Many if not most such agreements leave something (and often a great deal) to be desired, but they are getting better overall as indigenous communities explore ways to reduce the power imbalances inherent in such negotiations.

Major corporations have begun to define standards by which to govern their activities in relation to indigenous and other cultural heritage. Río Tinto, a British-Australian multinational and one of the world's biggest mining corporations, has a checkered history in Australia with regard to heritage and indigenous community relations. However, it now has a strong community-relations focus, as exemplified in its 2010 publication, *Why Cultural Heritage Matters*. Río Tinto is seen by many archaeologists and heritage practitioners (including prominent Indigenous activists) as a corporate leader in the field of cultural heritage management.

In part, the foregoing situation results from the emergence of Native Title law since the historic 1992 decision of Australia's High Court in *Mabo and Others v. Queensland (No. 2)*. Again the result of activism on the part of indigenous people and nonindigenous supporters, the *Mabo* decision recognized that traditional or customary indigenous title to land was not automatically nullified with British colonization but could under certain circumstances remain valid

alongside other forms of land (and now also sea) tenure. This gives indigenous Australians a say in land- and sea-use decisions including the management of heritage in impact assessment and mitigation. O'Faircheallaigh (2008, 34) points out that this right to negotiate "does not allow Aboriginal people to stop a development they believe may damage cultural heritage . . . [but] does, for the first time, provide many Aboriginal landowners in Australia with an opportunity to negotiate with mining companies about the terms on which landowners will *provide their consent* for development" (original emphasis).

Mabo affected cultural heritage legislation across the country. Most Australian jurisdictions have developed legislation, policies, and procedures that prioritize community engagement and recognize the social value of heritage, especially but not exclusively regarding indigenous heritage. At the time of writing, one state in particular—the heavily mining-dependent Western Australia—was attempting to water down requirements and standards for indigenous heritage management in development contexts, against substantial legal and community challenge. My home state of Queensland, also a mining state, has had a similarly patchy history in regard to heritage. Yet social and political developments since *Mabo* have resulted in the state giving significant decision-making powers to indigenous communities through separate but effectively identical heritage legislation for Aboriginal people and for Torres Strait Islanders. This legislation gives priority to the interests of Aboriginal people and Torres Strait Islanders rather than archaeologists when it comes to determining how indigenous heritage is dealt with in development (and research) contexts and is accompanied by protocols regarding appropriate consultation with indigenous communities. Similar provisions are in place in the other states and territories as well.

Most jurisdictions separate indigenous and nonindigenous (generally called "historic") heritage for management purposes. This usually means there is different legislation covering these two dimensions of heritage. This is not ideal, because it falsely implies that there is no indigenous heritage from the colonial/historic period and that there is no "shared heritage." Both of these implications are empirically incorrect as well as politically and socially divisive relics of a time when indigenous people were viewed as "people without history," as Wolf (1982) famously coined it. That said, heritage practitioners and the communities with which they work generally find pragmatic solutions to most problems that arise.

Unsurprisingly, the foregoing means that heritage issues—especially but not exclusively regarding indigenous heritage—can prove difficult in development impact assessment contexts, as communities or parts of communities contest development proposals, assessments of heritage significance, and the like. For every protracted high-profile dispute (e.g., Lamacraft [2014] concerning the contentious Whitehaven coal mine in rural northeastern New South

Wales), there are many more instances of relatively straightforward resolutions of the issues on the basis of fair-minded community engagement and the priority accorded in Australian heritage management to social value (e.g., Byrne, Brayshaw, and Ireland 2003).

Byrne, Brayshaw, and Ireland's work on social value accords with the key Australian guidelines on heritage management of Indigenous patrimony as much as any other heritage. The key guidelines are contained in the Burra Charter (ICOMOS 2016), officially titled the Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance. First formulated in 1979, the charter is periodically revised to reflect developing understanding of theory and practice in cultural heritage management. The current version was adopted in 2013. The Burra Charter and a recently formulated set of "Practice Notes" provide practitioners with a globally renowned best practice standard for managing indigenous and nonindigenous cultural heritage places across the nation.

Importantly, linked with the Burra Charter is the Code on the Ethics of Co-existence in Conserving Significant Places, which was adopted in 1998. Heavily focused on social value, it rests on the following assumptions:

- the healthy management of cultural difference is the responsibility of society as a whole;
- in a pluralist society, value differences exist and contain the potential for conflict; and
- ethical practice is necessary for the just and effective management of places of diverse cultural significance. (Australia ICOMOS 1998, 1)

Cast as general propositions, these assumptions are the touchstone of heritage management in Australia, understood by the vast majority of practitioners even if they are not familiar with the Burra Charter. Members of the Australian Archaeological Association, for example, following its Code of Ethics:

- acknowledge the importance of cultural heritage to indigenous communities.
- acknowledge the special importance to indigenous peoples of ancestral remains and objects and sites associated with such remains. Members will treat such remains with respect.
- acknowledge indigenous approaches to the interpretation of cultural heritage and to its conservation.
- negotiate equitable agreements between archaeologists and the indigenous communities whose cul-

tural heritage is being investigated. AAA [Australian Archaeological Association] endorses and directs members to the current guidelines regarding such agreements published by the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies. (Australian Archaeological Association 2016)

In short, over the last few decades, owing in no small part to indigenous activism at various levels of governance and private enterprise, Australian archaeologists and heritage practitioners have developed a pragmatic and continually evolving approach to indigenous archaeological heritage. The approach is based on broad recognition of the primacy of indigenous interests in indigenous heritage. This perspective emerged within the profession itself, albeit not uncontroversially or without conflict. The approach is now enshrined in law, legislation, policy, and procedure at all levels of government across the nation. This situation can still be challenging for all parties, but overall it has fostered a positive environment in which to advance the interests of archaeologists, heritage managers, and indigenous Australians alike.

REFERENCES CITED

- Australia ICOMOS. 1998. "Code on the Ethics of Co-existence in Conserving Significant Places." Accessed July 26, 2016. <http://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/Code-on-the-Ethics-of-Co-existence-in-Conserving-Significant-Places-1998.pdf>
- Australian Archaeological Association. 2016. "Code of Ethics." Accessed March 23, 2016. <https://www.australianarchaeologicalassociation.com.au/about/code-of-ethics>.
- Byrne, Denis, Helen Brayshaw, and Tracy Ireland. 2003. *Social Significance: A Discussion Paper*. Second edition. Sydney: New South Wales National Parks and Wildlife Service.
- Lamacraft, Tim. 2014. "Whitehaven Coal Warned to Respect Aboriginal Traditions at Maules Creek Mine." *Australian Broadcasting Corporation News*, September 2. <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2014-09-03/whitehaven-warned-to-respect-gomeroid-tradition/5716074>.
- O'Faircheallaigh, Ciaran. 2008. "Negotiating Cultural Heritage? Aboriginal-Mining Company Agreements in Australia." *Development and Change* 39 (1): 25–51.
- Rio Tinto. 2010. *Why Cultural Heritage Matters. A Resource Guide for Integrating Cultural Heritage Management into Communities Work at Rio Tinto*. Accessed March 23, 2016. http://www.riotinto.com/documents/ReportsPublications/Rio_Tinto_Cultural_Heritage_Guide.pdf.
- Wolf, Eric. 1982. *Europe and the People without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Article

Archaeological Heritage Management in Thailand

Thanik Lertcharnrit

Silpakorn University, Thailand

Currently, the Thai government has a monopoly on the management of archaeological heritage in Thailand, including the country's three official UNESCO World Heritage Sites and four sites that are on the Tentative List. As I argue here, Thailand has a long history of heritage management and conservation, and this may be different from what we find in other countries. Yet some issues are similar. Like in many other places, in Thailand we have looting, destructive development activities, inadequate public education, and clashes between local beliefs and government actions.

Thailand is rich in cultural heritage with a long history of heritage management and conservation of ancient ruins going back to the mid-nineteenth century (see Lertcharnrit 2014). Cultural heritage management in Thailand, with an emphasis on archaeological resources, has gone through several periods of change in its concepts and practices, and has been influenced by cultural, social, economic, political, and global situations and pressures (Lertrit 2000; Peleggi 2002; Suteerattanapirom 2006).

The first law enacted to protect Thai cultural heritage was called *Pra Kaad Khet Rang Wat Poo Rai Khut Wat* (Proclamation on Temple Boundaries and Temple Looters), which was issued in 1851 at the beginning of King Rama IV's reign (Fine Arts Department 1968).¹ Importantly, while King Rama IV drove an effort to open the country to forge relationships with countries such as the United States, England, and France (see Syamananda 1993), he also took measures to counter the potential negative effects of building relationships with imperial, colonial powers. During King Rama IV's reign, in accordance with the king's personal interests, small groups of elites carried out a number of archaeological research projects and prepared museum displays. While these were the king's projects (and not government projects), they nevertheless made the preservation of the nation's cultural heritage a shared value (see Lertcharnrit 2014). Through what we today call heritage management, the king created an awareness of the nation's culture as a way of developing a sense of national unity and pride (Baker and Phongpaichit 2005; Syamananda 1993; Vella 1978).

King Rama V continued his father's political interest in the past, extending it into the realm of cultural diplomacy during his 1897 trip to Europe, when he visited major archaeological and historical sites as well as historic urban centers. He visited ancient Kandy in Sri Lanka; Thebes and Old Cairo in Egypt; the ruins of Pompeii and Rome in Italy; El Escorial in Spain; and the Tower of London in England. He also

visited Budapest, Florence, Venice, and Warsaw, among other capital cities. Inspired by the great palaces and monuments he saw during his travels, Rama V established a summer palace in the great former capital of Siam, Ayutthaya, now a World Heritage Site, thus creating a link between that venerable dynasty (1350–1767) and the Chakri Dynasty started by his ancestors in Bangkok following the fall of Ayutthaya.

Under the reign of King Rama VI, heritage management entered a modern, bureaucratic phase with a broad emphasis on the conservation, restoration, and preservation of tangible heritage, including ancient monuments, ancient objects, art objects, and archaeological sites, all overseen by the Fine Arts Department (FAD), a government agency established in 1911. Now under the auspices of the Ministry of Culture, the FAD continues its work overseeing all aspects of heritage management through its 13 Regional Offices of Fine Arts located throughout the country. Each office has internal subdivisions, including an Academic Section, a Monument Conservation Section, and a Civil Engineering Section.

Conservation of cultural heritage entered a more "scientific" phase in 1961 with the passage of the Act on Ancient Monuments, Ancient Objects, Art Objects and the National Museum of 1961 (hereafter called the 1961 Act). For example, pursuant to the 1961 Act, the dating of archaeological remains has to be rigorously based on reliable methods, and the act also introduced the technique of anastylosis, a method of restoration, into widespread practice in Thailand. The 1961 Act has been amended occasionally to adapt to changing social contexts, with more public participation and collaboration in the management of cultural heritage, or with more decentralized management. Particularly during the last decade, regulations to bolster the 1961 Act have also been issued on occasion (see FAD 2005), including the Regulations of the Fine Arts Department Concerning the Conservation of Monuments of 1985. A number of articles in the Venice Charter of 1964 were translated for use in accordance with the 1985 regulations (Abhichartvorapan and Watanabe 2015). This was especially influenced by Thailand's participation in a 1985 International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) meeting. These subsequent regulations established more rigid procedures—with clear guidelines, rules, and definitions—for the conservation of ancient monuments.

The FAD manages all Thai cultural heritage sites, including the three that appear on UNESCO's World Heritage List: the archaeological site of Ban Chiang, where artifacts and graves have been dated to the Bronze Age and Neolithic period; the historic town of Sukhothai and associated towns (Si Satchanalai and Kam Phaeng Pet); and the former

capital city of Ayutthaya. Four more sites are on UNESCO's Tentative List to be considered for nomination to the World Heritage List. The main reasons for the nomination of those sites are the worldwide recognition they would receive and the increase in cultural heritage tourism that might result. The significance of these goals was evidenced by the military skirmishes fought between Thailand and Cambodia several years ago over the World Heritage Committee's decision to list an ancient Khmer site on the border between the two nations as Cambodian property rather than a transboundary site (see Silverman 2011). Many archaeological sites, ancient towns, and monuments are key tourist destinations—particularly those on the World Heritage List and Thailand's Tentative List. These sites have become targets for the promotion of heritage tourism by the Tourism Authority of Thailand (TAT), and local and provincial administration offices (Praicharnjit 2005). In addition, national and local festivals, as well as cultural tours by private agents, are held at many of the sites.

The past few decades have seen an increase in the general public's and local communities' participation in the management of both tangible and intangible heritage. More than 1,400 museums have proliferated across the country, most of them nongovernmental, run by volunteers, and privately funded. These include textile museums, archaeology museums, traditional house museums, pottery museums, and ethnographic museums, with the majority (more than 500) classified as "local wisdom" museums. Most museums were established to serve as learning centers and to protect what are perceived as vanishing cultures. However, many museums are facing major problems concerning long-term management: they lack financial support, full-time and experienced curators and museum officers, and management plans.

Despite increased public interest in preserving and celebrating cultural heritage, direct community involvement and participation in the practice of heritage management are poorly developed because the FAD still serves as the sole authorized agent in charge of the conservation of archaeological heritage. There are also cases of significant community opposition to the professional management class, what Laurajane Smith (2006) refers to as "authorized heritage discourse." This problem arises mostly in the context of the restoration of monuments that are currently used as shrines or sacred sites and that are, simultaneously, officially registered national monuments and archaeological parks (see Denes 2012). This friction is due to different understandings and contested values of cultural heritage between government officials and local people. For example, people in Lopburi Province recently protested the restoration of an ancient monument in the city. Archaeologists from the Office of Archaeology wanted to disassemble the monument and restore it through the anastylosis method, but the people in the province wanted to know why the monument had to be taken apart. They were very concerned about the destruction of the monument because it has great spiritual value for them (see Suncharoen 1995).

CONCLUSIONS

Archaeological heritage management in Thailand has long been practiced but needs more development to cope with ongoing problems, many of which are similar to those found elsewhere in the world. Looting continues to be the greatest of these, as sites are illegally unearthed and sometimes completely destroyed in the search for saleable items. Destructive development activities such as land alteration for agriculture, road construction, real-estate development, and dam building also generate significant damage.

Other problems arise in clashes between local beliefs and government actions. For instance, some Buddhists hold the belief that the remains of religious structures are not *ruins* but are rather enduring places of spiritual power requiring veneration (see Byrne and Barnes 1995). These kinds of controversies could be ameliorated by opening the protection law to public participation and providing the opportunity for public input into FAD decisions and actions.

Cooperation among the FAD and other private and government agencies, public audiences, and stakeholders, on both local and national levels, will help upgrade the quality of conservation projects. Additionally, public education programs should become part of an essential strategy to change public perceptions of the past as dead, passive, unimportant, and useless. Finally, building better global alliances with international organizations and heritage professionals across Southeast Asian countries and the world is strongly recommended.

NOTE

1. Rama IV was the king misrepresented in the American movie, *The King and I*, based on the exaggerated 1870 account of Anna Leonowens in her book, *The English Governess at the Siamese Court*.

REFERENCES CITED

- Abhichartvoraphan, Waeovichian, and Kenji Watanabe. 2015. "A Review of Historic Monument Conservation in Thailand: Problems of Modern Heritage." *Proceedings of the School of Engineering, Tokai University, Series E* 40:7–14.
- Baker, Chris, and Pasuk Phongpaichit. 2005. *A History of Thailand*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Byrne, Denis, and Gina L. Barnes. 1995. "Buddhist Stupa and Thai Social Practice." *World Archaeology* 27 (2): 266–81.
- Denes, Alexandra. 2012. "Mapping Living Heritage at the Phnom Rung Historical Park: Identifying and Safeguarding the Local Meanings of a National Heritage Site." *Journal of the Siam Society* 100: 183–215.
- Fine Arts Department. 1968. *A Compilation of Royal Proclamations of King Rama IV, BE 2394–2404*. Bangkok: Fine Arts Department.
- Fine Arts Department. 1990. *Theory and Practice in the Preservation and Restoration of Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites*. Bangkok: Office of Archaeology.
- Fine Arts Department. 2005. *Ancient Monuments, Ancient Objects, Art Objects, and National Museum Act of 1961*. Bangkok: Fine Arts Department.
- Fine Arts Department. 2016. *105 years of the Fine Arts Department*. Bangkok: Fine Arts Department.

- Lertcharnrit, Thanik. 2014. "Cultural Heritage Management in Thailand." In *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, edited by Claire Smith, 7287–93. New York: Springer.
- Lertrit, Sawang. 2000. "Cultural Resource Management and Archaeology at Chiang Saen, Northern Thailand." *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 31 (1): 137–61.
- Peleggi, Maurizio. 2002. *The Politics of Ruins and the Business of Nostalgia*. Bangkok: White Lotus.
- Praicharnjit, Sayan. 2005. *The Management of Ancient Monuments, Ancient Objects, Art Objects, and National Museums by Local Administration Organizations*. Nonthaburi, Thailand: King Prajadhipok's Institute.
- Silverman, Helaine. 2011. "Border Wars: The Ongoing Temple Dispute Between Thailand and Cambodia and UNESCO's World Heritage List." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 17 (1): 1–21.
- Smith, Laurajane. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. Milton Park, California: Routledge.
- Suncharoen, Chutima. 1995. "People of Lopburi Ask for the Return of Ancient Monument." *Jud Pra Kai*, February 16.
- Suteerattanapirom, Kannikar. 2006. "The Development of Concept and Practice of Ancient Monuments Conservation in Thailand." *Damrong Journal: Journal of the Faculty of Archaeology* 5 (2): 133–50.
- Symananda, Rong. 1993. *A History of Thailand*. Third edition. Bangkok: Thai Watana Panish Press.
- Vella, Walter F. 1978. *Chaiyo!: King Vajiravudh and the Development of Thai Nationalism*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Article

The Making of a New National Museum in Peru

Alvaro Higuera

Independent Scholar, Republic of Georgia

A national museum forms an important foundation for the construction of a nation's cultural heritage and identity (Kaplan 1994, 2011; Knell, Aronsson, and Amundsen 2011). Riding atop a burgeoning economy and persistently expanding tourism industry, as well as a successful nation-branding campaign for domestic and international consumption (Silverman 2015; Silverman and Hallett 2015), Peru is now embarking on a project to replace the 90-year-old National Museum of Anthropology, Archaeology, and History. While venerable, the existing national museum suffers from aging infrastructure. Its exhibition scripts are outdated, while its collection is museographically uneven and has not kept up with archaeological discoveries. The last major refurbishing was done in the 1970s. Clearly a new national museum is needed.

Building the new national museum is a challenging endeavor for many reasons. One of these is the proposed relocation of the museum from a middle-class district in the capital city of Lima to the neighboring Lurín Valley, 35 kilometers south of the city, next to the great pre-Hispanic site of Pachacamac. A visit by public transportation would be lengthy and complicated, thus making it difficult for those without a car. Furthermore, its placement next to Pachacamac would require architectural and landscape design sensitive to the important archaeological site that has been on Peru's Tentative List for inscription as a UNESCO's World Heritage Site since 1996. The contents of the new exhibition scripts are bound to be highly debated, especially because of the enormous amount of new archaeological information on Peruvian sites in recent decades. In essence,

Peru is creating a national museum from scratch. Importantly, as *archaeology* is the driving disciplinary framework for the new museum, whose official name is the National Museum of Archaeology, it is the past that will continue to define it. In other words, the *national* museum is looking to the distant past rather than engaging or weaving the evolution of the region with colonial, republican, and modern histories, and their political and social forces. This fact is not helpful for a unitary and evolutionary understanding of the region and its diverse populations in the ebb and flow of native and foreign societies over the last three millennia.

The new national museum project is aimed at celebrating the bicentenary of Peru's independence in 2021. The task of the new museum's heritage managers will be to weave the themes of the exhibition scripts—the essence of the museum—into an attractive discourse with the intent of responding to contemporary Peruvian society. Moreover, the creation of the new museum, combined with a recently completed new archaeological-site museum in Pachacamac, appears to be a coordinated effort to clinch the World Heritage designation as well as promote tourism outside Lima.

The two previous attempts to build a new national museum are worthy of consideration in the context presented above. The first attempt occurred in the early 1980s. It was shelved after the design had been chosen, the foundation dug, and the funds raised in a private donation drive sponsored by a government minister. It was to be located only five kilometers west of the current museum, in the middle of towering pre-Columbian adobe pyramids and next to the two most important universities in the country, both of which have strong archaeology programs. The project stalled and was never restarted.

The second attempt was actually successful but short-lived. In 1986, as part of Peru's involvement with the commemoration of the 500-year anniversary of Columbus's arrival in the New World, then president Alan García decided to create the Museo de la Nación. The project was handed over to Peruvian archaeologists. I was among them. Located in a different district of Lima, the new museum's scripts encompassed the complete pre-Columbian timeline of the country (as did the still functioning old national museum). The scripts we wrote for the Museo de la Nación made a giant leap forward in the way these ancient societies were presented to the public. The museum used an array of models, maps, and landscape renderings, as well as abundant textual information, highlighting materials that had been recovered through archaeological research rather than looting, thereby emphasizing the importance of context. Professional museographers assisted the archaeologists in the creation of truly beautiful exhibits. However, the Museo de la Nación was closed in 2012, without fanfare or protest, by the same president who created it, so that its rooms could host a meeting of the International Monetary Fund. I believe the rationale was that Peru would benefit more by engagement with the international economy than from the achievements of its past.

The current attempt to create a new national museum began in 2013. This project had full government funding based on a strong decade of sustained economic growth in Peru. Moreover, the attempt emerged in the context of several outstanding site museums and regional museums that had opened on the north coast of Peru and that were meant to accommodate and interpret spectacular pre-Inca finds in those valleys. In this atmosphere of economic prosperity and innovative site and regional museums flourishing in the country, the architectural design selection was opened to public bidding. Once the location in Pachacamac was chosen, the government acquired the land adjacent to the ancient site but without archaeological remains. The new museum was presented to the public as a long overdue project to recognize the achievements of the pre-Columbian populations of Peru.

By June 2015 the budget of the museum was rumored to have been diverted for emergency preventive work in light of the El Niño phenomenon. Early in 2016 the minister of culture reassured the public that the allocated budget was still earmarked for the museum: roughly US\$120 million for the building, US\$12 million for building supervision, and US\$31 million for the museographic work (including state-of-the-art storage areas and labs). But at that point the leader of the museographic project was removed from his position and a new, unorthodox leadership model was implemented. In the new model, two United Nations organizations will take control of the project. The Office for Project Services (UNOPS) branch will oversee the bidding, building, and construction of the museum. More interestingly, UNESCO will oversee the museography and content infrastructure and lead a team of Peruvian experts in preparing the new

discourse to appear in the halls of the museum. At the time of this writing, the team has not been assembled.

SUGGESTIONS

The idea of a national museum is more intellectually complicated and practically difficult than just building a museum to house artifacts. The creation of a new national museum must address issues such as contemporary relevance, novelty, shifting perspectives on the content and role of the museum, and interaction with the national and international public. Moreover, a new museum should be informed by contemporary practical heritage politics (Higueras 2013, 2016), which would require consideration of several issues.

First, the museum must address its role relative to the many excellent regional museums now in existence or being built. We, therefore, all need to ask if the new national museum can find a way to learn from these regional museums and at the same time conceive of itself as the "mother" museum, encompassing all of the ancient societies of the country.

Second, the museum's discourse (overall exhibition script) needs to be accessible and attractive to visitors.

Third, in addition to the traditional timeline structure, a good part of the space and effort should be invested in special exhibitions. The topics for special exhibitions should be novel: specific themes provided by researchers, display of collections returned or repatriated from abroad, shows of local private collections to be expropriated or acquired in the future (such as the spectacular artifacts from the Sipán tombs, illegally acquired by local smugglers [see Nagin 1990]), as well as the display of previously unseen artifacts in storage, which will need to be preserved in the new laboratories. Indeed, open storage and glass-walled laboratories would enable visitors to watch the specialists at work. These "new" sources of heritage wealth should be a clear magnet for the museum.

Fourth, the displays should carefully reflect the most important issues that researchers are working on today and not present the data as if researchers have already "solved" these topics. This way the museum will show that working on data from a diverse archaeological heritage is a continuous endeavor in which the museum is taking the lead.

Fifth, the new national museum will need to embrace new audiovisual technologies. The recently closed Museo de la Nación was already making progress in this area. We hope that the new national museum will create an environment geared toward learning.

Sixth, and linked to the learning experience, the museum will need to aim to make visitors aware of the wealth of Peruvian heritage that exists in collections abroad. I am suggesting here that the museum could use such "foreign" heritage in its displays and scripts.

Finally, the new national museum will need to figure out how to relate to contemporary communities' interest in their own past. I believe the script needs to generate awareness in Peru that the new museum is emerging in a social

environment that includes many *communities'* renewed interest in their past, interest that becomes (or should become) amalgamated (or at least included) in the new national institution. Certainly the museum should acknowledge that this grassroots interest has made possible a more rigorous fight against looting and illegal trafficking (see Atwood 2003). The new national museum needs to distinguish once and for all between looted and non-looted artifacts. Looted objects on display should be identified as such (in essence, stigmatized) and separated from the material gathered through proper archaeological excavation in known contexts. Such a presentation would be extremely important in making the public aware of the importance of scientifically excavated materials in generating the foundation for our understanding of the pre-Columbian past.

FINAL REMARKS

The lack of political will or funding for this project is not the only reason for the delays in the creation of a new national museum in Peru. Rather, it is difficult to create this "culture-affirming" institution at a time when the very idea of the national museum seems sidelined by the country's focus on its thriving household economy. At this moment, Peru's flourishing mining sector has more national appeal than the country's museums. Indeed, there might be little patience or interest, in general, in a cultural endeavor of this scope. The most recent proposal for a new national museum lacks strong arguments for why Peru must undertake this huge project given the existing national museum in Lima. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the cultural heritage managers to communicate a clear purpose, to give life and breath to the project, amid a society that currently finds little satisfaction in the adequate preservation of its national treasures.

In 2016 a heated debate was reignited to discuss the merits of the project. Most comments criticized the location of the project; a few remarked on the important issue of the financial sustainability of the museum, underlining the commitment made for its display, research, conservation,

and storage expenses; very few addressed the issue of the purpose, objective, and the need for new discourses in the display of heritage. By October 2016, work was underway on the foundation for the new museum. A plan to conceive the script for the exhibition still does not exist.

REFERENCES CITED

- Atwood, Roger. 2003. "Guardians of the Dead." In *Archaeological Ethics*, edited by Karen D. Vitelli and Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh, 34–41. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- Higuera, Alvaro. 2013. *Repatriación y colaboración: Un modelo para el futuro del patrimonio cultural Peruano* [Repatriation and collaboration: A model for the future of Peruvian cultural heritage]. Accessed on October 25, 2106. <http://revistaargumentos.iep.org.pe/articulos/repatriacion>
- Higuera, Alvaro. 2016. "The (Un)virtuous Cycle in the Land of the Riches: Looting, Trafficking and the Future of Heritage in Peru." Unpublished manuscript. https://www.academia.edu/24894615/The_un_virtuous_cycle
- Kaplan, Flora E.S. 2011. "Making and Remaking National Identities." In *A Companion to Museum Studies*, edited by Sharon Macdonald, 152–69. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kaplan, Flora E.S., ed. 1994. *Museums and the Making of "Ourselves": The Role of Objects in National Identity*. London: Leicester University Press.
- Knell, Simon J., Peter Aronsson, and Arne Bugge Amundsen, eds. 2011. *National Museum: New Studies from Around the World*. London: Routledge.
- Nagin, Carl. 1990. "The Peruvian Gold Rush." *Art & Antiques* May: 98–145.
- Silverman, Helaine. 2015. "Branding Peru: National Tourism Campaigns and the Performance of Heritage." In *Encounters with Popular Pasts: Cultural Heritage and Popular Culture*, edited by Mike Robinson and Helaine Silverman, 131–48. New York: Springer.
- Silverman, Helaine, and Richard W. Hallett. 2015. "Cultural Heritage Under the Gaze of National Tourism Marketing Campaigns." In *Blackwell Companion to the New Heritage Studies*, edited by William S. Logan, Mairead Nic Craith, and Ulrich Kockel, 176–88. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Article

The Scope of US National Park Service Archaeology at Home and Abroad

Teresa S. Moyer, David A. Gadsby, and Stephen Morris
United States National Park Service, United States

The United States National Park Service (NPS) has fundamentally been concerned with respect and stewardship for archaeological resources and the heritage values they represent since its establishment in 1916 under then president

Woodrow Wilson. Here we trace the changing contours of the international relationships that have been at the crux of US cultural heritage management since the earliest protection efforts of the federal government and NPS's crucial role in transnational partnering and global outreach.

The NPS's approach to heritage protection stemmed from the late nineteenth century, when Congress began

to pass laws to preserve and protect US antiquities. Establishment of the first federal archaeological reservation at Casa Grande in Arizona in 1892 and passage of the Antiquities Act of 1906 were among the first governmental protections of archaeological resources. Both actions established the US ethic for the preservation and protection of archaeological resources to benefit all people, a value that undergirds the NPS's ongoing efforts to partner and collaborate with other nations.

As of 2016, the NPS's centennial year, the bureau's scope includes over 400 national park units, a host of community assistance programs, and affiliated areas. Archaeology is an important resource for the National Park System and its work with partners. The strong legislative basis for NPS archaeological activities, in addition to its experience managing thousands of sites on park lands, positions NPS to offer leadership and assistance across the globe. Indeed, the NPS Mission Statement includes the charge to "extend the benefits of natural and cultural resource conservation . . . throughout this country and the world."

Since 1936 the NPS has been guided by a "thematic framework," a charter of guiding principles that aids the organization in its conceptualization of the history and prehistory of the United States and the peoples who preceded it. In 1994 the NPS revised its thematic framework to better take into account the diachronic cultural diversity of the country and evolving scholarship about it. Among eight themes identified by the revised framework is the "Changing Role of the United States in the World Community." Listing international relations, commerce, expansionism and imperialism, and immigration and emigration policies as the four topics that define this theme, the National Park Service (1994) explains:

This theme explores diplomacy, trade, cultural exchange, security and defense, expansionism—and, at times, imperialism. The interactions among indigenous peoples, between this nation and native peoples, and this nation and the world have all contributed to American history. Additionally, this theme addresses regional variations, since, for example, in the eighteenth century, the Spanish southwest, French and Canadian middle west, and British eastern seaboard had different diplomatic histories.

America has never existed in isolation. While the United States, especially in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, has left an imprint on the world community, other nations and immigrants to the United States have had a profound influence on the course of American history.

This international engagement by the NPS is not new. Importantly, the NPS played a fundamental role in the conceptualization of *world* heritage for the UNESCO World Heritage Convention, which extends the US national park idea on a global scale. The United States was the first signatory to the World Heritage Convention, in 1973, and NPS staff participated in the US delegation that negotiated the convention's text. The NPS Office of International Affairs (OIA), under the direction of the assistant secretary of the interior, coordinates US participation in the convention,

including nominating US sites to the World Heritage List and representing the United States at annual sessions of the World Heritage Committee. The OIA provides oversight and coordination for all US World Heritage nominations, including those outside the national park system, such as the Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site in Illinois. NPS manages the majority of the US World Heritage Sites, a number of which are significant for their archaeological heritage. NPS reports to the UNESCO World Heritage Committee on the status of the sites and, in particular, any threats to them.

Formal agreements regarding archaeological resources significant to foreign nations are one way the NPS cooperates with foreign governments. The US and Spain signed one such agreement to conserve artifacts associated with the Spanish royal naval ships *Juno* (sunk in 1802 near Bermuda) and *La Galga* (wrecked off the Virginia-Maryland coast in 1750).¹ A long-term loan agreement signed in 2006 allows NPS to maintain and exhibit the recovered objects. A memorandum of understanding between the United States and Spain enables collaboration on stewardship for Spanish-American cultural resources.² The NPS also signed a memorandum with the United Kingdom regarding the eighteenth-century wreck *HMS Fowey*, which lies in Biscayne National Park in Florida but remains UK property.³

NPS consults with Canada, Mexico, and Russia regarding US national park units at or near their borders. NPS units, such as Saint Croix Island International Heritage Site in Maine, contain archaeological evidence pertaining to Canadian heritage. NPS units on the Mexico border are concerned with, for instance, the impact of illegal border crossings on archaeological sites, such as at Oregon Pipe Cactus National Monument in Arizona. The Shared Beringian Heritage Program resulted from a commitment by Presidents George H. W. Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev to expand US and Soviet cooperation in environmental protection and the study of global change. NPS archaeologist in Alaska have conducted comparative research in US and Russian collections regarding trade and transport of obsidian across the Bering Land Bridge (Rasic, Slobodin, and Speakman 2015).

Foreign museums and heritage agencies collaborate with the NPS on research. Artifacts removed from the United States by a French scientist in 1877 from what is now Channel Islands National Park off California are curated at the Musée du Quai Branly in Paris. NPS archaeologists and French curators identified and inventoried artifacts pertinent to NPS sites (Braje et al. 2010). In 1891 a Swedish geologist took artifacts to Europe from the Wetherill Mesa, now part of Mesa Verde National Park in Colorado. The artifacts are curated at the Finnish National Museum, where its curators and NPS created exhibits and an inventory and photographic documentation of the collection for the park's records. Archaeological materials collected in 1923 from the Virgin Islands were removed to the Danish National Museum in Copenhagen, Denmark. In 2003 a NPS archaeologist inventoried them, including objects from the

Columbus's Landing site (now part of Salt River Bay National Historic Park and Ecological Preserve), and others across St. Croix and neighboring islands. The project improved understanding of the sociopolitical organization and economy of the pre-Columbian Hispanic Saladoid era (ca. 500 BC–AD 500) peoples of the Caribbean (Hardy 2009). More recently, the NPS Submerged Resources Center and Southeastern Archaeological Center have partnered on the Slave Wrecks Project (SWP) with George Washington University, the Iziko Museums of South Africa, the South African Heritage Resources Agency, the Smithsonian Institution-National Museum of African American History and Culture, and Diving with a Purpose (a community-focused, nonprofit organization based in the United States).⁴ The SWP links maritime archaeology research on the global slave trade to training for cultural heritage professionals from partnering nations in order to build their organizational capacity for heritage preservation, protection, and interpretation.

In addition to partnering with foreign nations, the NPS offers fellowship and training programs for international archaeologists that emphasize the NPS approach to cultural resources management, interpretation, and civic engagement. NPS and partners provide internships to fulfill professional training standards, fellowships to support the management and protection of resources, and residencies at US universities. The NPS World Heritage Fellowship Program, which began in 2009, is focused on helping partnering countries, in particular, to manage and protect their World Heritage Sites by training personnel from those countries. The NPS and the US Department of State offer professional development for archaeologists and heritage managers from the Middle East and Central Asia. For example, since 2007, the NPS has sponsored training for Afghani archaeologists in cooperation with the US Department of State's Cultural Antiquities Task Force, the George Wright Society (a Michigan-based cultural resource management non-profit association), and the University of Arizona's Drachman Institute (Luke and Kersel 2013).

NPS-sponsored visitors to the United States also participate in archaeological field schools in national parks. Graduate students from Denmark, for example, have worked in field schools at Virgin Islands National Park. Among the volunteers from Canada and Japan who helped to excavate at Manzanar National Historic Site, where one of ten internment camps that the United States used to imprison Japanese Americans during World War II was located, were former internees as well as descendants of internees of the camps.⁵

The NPS maintains the National Register of Historic Places (NR) and the National Historic Landmarks Program (NHL). International communities are stakeholders in the process of NPS heritage initiatives to identify potential new park units and archaeological properties for the NR and NHL. This is because the sites chosen as representative of US cultures frequently relate to places abroad, such as Africa, Central and South America, and island nations. The African

Burial Ground in New York City contains the direct evidence of slaves brought from Africa, with material and biological markers of those origins (Harrington 1993).⁶ It has been added to the NPS as the African Burial Ground National Monument, and its inscription expands the efforts of the NPS to be more inclusive of African American heritage in the United States. The NPS's American Latino Heritage Initiative has increased the number of Latino archaeological properties on the NHL, such as Drakes Bay Historic and Archaeological District in California and the San José de los Jémez Mission and Gúsewa Pueblo Site in New Mexico (Sánchez and Sánchez-Clark 2013). The Asian American Pacific Islander (APPI) Initiative of the NPS emphasized archaeology's role in recovering APPI history at World War II internment camps, such as Manzanar National Historic Site.

Archaeological resources on NPS lands are part of a broad heritage that extends beyond bureaucratic policy or administrative boundaries. International relationships are a significant component of the NPS mission. In some cases, US laws have been implemented in response to issues with heritage property within the United States or shared with other nations. Other projects use archaeology as a vehicle for collaborative work. Mutual respect for heritage resources begets a greater commitment to diplomacy. To these ends, the NPS continues to engage with foreign partners on training, policy development, collections management, and other aspects of archaeological work. Such collaboration ensures that NPS archaeological resources, or resources cooperatively managed by the NPS with other nations, are preserved and protected for this and future generations.

NOTES

1. International Agreement with Government of Spain (2006).
2. Memorandum of Understanding between the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Sport of the Kingdom of Spain, and the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior of the United States Of America (2013).
3. Memorandum of Understanding between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Regarding the Wreck of HMS Fowey (2013).
4. See websites for the Slave Wrecks Project (<https://www.slavewrecksproject.org/>) and Diving with a Purpose (<http://www.divingwithapurpose.org/aboutus.html>) for more information.
5. See website (<https://www.nps.gov/manz/index.html>) for more information.
6. See website (<http://www.archive.archaeology.org/online/interviews/blakey/>) for more information.

REFERENCES CITED

- Braje, Todd J., Julia G. Costello, Jon M. Erlandson, Michael A. Glassow, John R. Johnson, Don P. Morris, Jennifer E. Perry,

- and Torben C. Rick. 2010. *Channel Islands National Park Overview and Assessment*. Washington, DC: Department of the Interior.
- Hardy, Meredith D. 2009. "The Vesceius Collection, St. Croix Archaeological Survey." *Bulletin of the Peabody Museum of Natural History* 50 (1): 99–118.
- Harrington, Spencer P. M. 1993. "New York's Great Cemetery Imbrolio." *Archaeology* March/April:30–38.
- Luke, Christina Marie, and Morag M. Kersel. 2013. *United States Cultural Diplomacy and Archaeology*. New York: Routledge.
- National Park Service. 1994. Revision of the National Park Service's Thematic Framework. <https://www.nps.gov/parkhistory/hisnps/NPSthinking/thematic.htm>
- Rasic, Jeffrey, Sergei Slobodin, and Robert J. Speakman. 2015. *Prehistoric Obsidian Transport and Human Interactions Across the Bering Strait: Status Report*. Fairbanks, AK: National Park Service.
- Sánchez, Joseph P., and Angélica Sánchez-Clark. 2013. "An Enlightened Beginning: The National Park Service and the American Latino Heritage." *George Wright Forum* 30 (3): 217–224.