

Globalizing Heritage: World Heritage as a Manifestation of Modernism and Challenges from the Periphery

Dr William S. Logan, UNESCO Chair of Cultural Heritage Studies, Director- Cultural Heritage & Museum Studies, Cultural Heritage Centre for Asia and the Pacific, Deakin University, Melbourne campus, Burwood, Victoria 3125, Australia. Tel.: +61-3-9244-3903; Fax: +61-3-9251-7158; Email: wl@deakin.edu.au

Abstract

Government efforts to protect monuments and sites of cultural heritage value have gone on for many centuries. The distinctive new chapter that the 20th Century brought to cultural heritage protection was the establishment of a globalized effort over and above the work of nation states. This led to a new cultural heritage bureaucracy at the international level, the development of new sets of 'universal' standards, and a new set of places deemed to be of world heritage significance. All of this was done in the spirit of goodwill and optimism that infused the modern movement and that made possible the establishment of the so-called Bretton Woods organizations such as the United Nations as well as the parallel organizations specifically dealing with Cultural Heritage – UNESCO, ICOMOS, ICOM and ICCROM. In recent decades cultural relativists have challenged the drive towards uniformity implicit in the global activities of the modernist organizations, and various parts of the periphery have reacted against aspects of the global cultural heritage approach. The Venice Charter is no longer regarded as the single, universal way to conserve heritage places. It has been replaced or supplemented in large parts of the world by alternatives and modifications such as the Nara Document and Burra Charter. If it is no longer acceptable to provide a universal answer to the question of how do we identify and save heritage, the challenge of the 21st Century is to make the most of the complexity of standards that now exists.

Keywords: Bretton Woods organizations; cultural globalization; cultural heritage; cultural relativism; ICOMOS; modernism; postmodernism; UNESCO; universal standards

Bretton Woods, Modernism and Cultural Heritage

Globalization is the buzz word of our time. But the trend towards uniting all parts of the globe and all of the world's people into a single economic system has a long history. The great explorations of the fifteenth to nineteenth centuries and the subsequent formation of colonial empires represented a major wave of economic globalization that had dramatic cultural consequences. The development of electronic information technologies in the second half of the twentieth century was another great wave, creating a time-space convergence and, according to many critics, having the potential to replace local cultures with a bland, global culture.

Earlier in the twentieth century, during the last stage of World War 2, a series of meetings were held in the Bretton Woods in the United States that set in train another major set of globalizing forces, both economic and cultural. At these meetings representatives of nations fighting on the Allied side of the war strove to find ways to prevent another such global catastrophe and to facilitate post-war recovery and development. Out of these meetings grew the United Nations and its subsidiary organizations like the World Health Organization (WHO), Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), UNICEF, and International Labour Organization (ILO), as well as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank and Asian Development Bank (ADB).

The United Nations and other Bretton Woods global organizations have had far-reaching universal effects. Indeed, many commentators see these organizations as key agencies of both economic and cultural globalization. Their various resolutions and charters seek to enforce on the member states a common set of principles governing political, economic, social and cultural attitudes and behaviour. The IMF, World Bank and ADB impose a particular kind of 'development'. The World Trade Organization (WTO) is encouraging a process of trade liberalization that many fear will undermine the right of nation states to determine their own policies. Already since World War 2 we have seen the emergence of large trade

blocs as well as multi-nationals that are more powerful than many nation states.

The economic impact in Australia's own world region – the Asia-Pacific – is recognized in many UN, government, NGO and academic reports. Massive population increase in the Asia-Pacific's cities over the next generation poses major challenges to the prospects for sustainable urbanization. Resource allocations are already acute, and policies are needed to cover the full range of complex development issues, including those related to the cultural environment. Increasingly, all of the countries of the region are being drawn into the global economic system through trade, technology and investment links. This applies to the communist countries of Asia, as well as to the small island economies of the Pacific. The recent Asian financial crisis has led national governments to re-appraise their relationships to the global economic structures.

But economic globalization is being accompanied by cultural globalization. Whether to accept or to attempt to resist this globalizing impact on local cultures is a critical contemporary issue for societies and governments throughout the world and especially in the Asia-Pacific. For many there is a real concern that traditional cultures will collapse under the combined pressures of commercialization and materialism. This is commonly represented as the result of cultural globalization, by which is often meant Westernization, or even 'Americanization'. Such a representation may be inadequate, and it is true that the topic of cultural globalization is hotly debated in cultural studies, anthropology, urban studies, geography and other disciplines (Chen, 1998; Cvetkovich & Kellner, 1997; Meyer & Geschiere, 1999; Wilson, 1997; Zukin, 1995). However even the staunchest defenders of globalization admit that 'there are elements in this picture which have some substance in reality' (Throsby, 2000: 19).

In the introduction to their book *Global Modernities* (1995), Mike Featherstone and Scott Lash write that some observers see globalization leading to 'the negation of identity... , both in the periphery of developing countries brought into the informationalized world, and in the core

itself'. There can be no doubt that some elements of Western culture are influencing people, especially the younger generations, in the non-Western world. But does this mean that eventually all societies will succumb to the powerful forces of Hollywood, American TV, popular magazines and music, and lose their individuality? While no culture is static and immune to outside influences and nor would we want it to be, on the other hand it would be regrettable if ultimately a bland world culture replaced the vibrant variety of local cultures that now exists.

The involvement of the United Nations and its global agencies and partners in aiding and abetting globalization was based on the spirit of goodwill and optimism that infused twentieth-century modernism. The goals reflected the key interlocking elements in the modernist outlook – universalism, utopianism, and belief in humanity's steady progress towards better things, usually defined in terms of the material conditions of life. It was an optimistic and idealistic outlook that led architects, planners, economists, sociologists, development workers and others to cut away from tradition and to embrace new 'modern' ideas and practices that could be applied around the world regardless of differences in local cultures.

Such 'enlightenment' is easily seen in terms of the 'modern movement' in architecture, where Le Corbusier, Mies van der Rohe and others rejected both the design principles and highly decorated facades of nineteenth-century buildings and the vernacular buildings styles of local cultures in order to find a modern architecture in which function was reflected in the form, beauty was redefined in terms of sleek lines and unadorned geometric shapes, and new industrial age materials, inventions and processes were employed. Such modern architecture, it was thought, would have universal applicability.

In the field of cultural heritage concerted efforts by national governments to protect significant monuments and sites value have gone on since at least the time of the Roman emperor Theodoric the Great (493-525AD) (Jokilehto, 1996: 6) while the concept of 'heritage', or a concern for the past, is said to have emerged in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries from a raft of ideas and ideologies that are referred to as 'modernity' (Graham, Ashworth & Tunbridge, 2000). But the distinctive new chapter that the 20th Century brought to cultural heritage protection was the establishment of a globalized effort over and above although still very much dependent on the work of nation states. This led to a new cultural heritage bureaucracy at the international level, the development of new sets of standards for the world to follow, and a new set of places deemed to be of world heritage significance.

The United Nations was established in October 1945 as the result of a conference convened in San Francisco in April-June (Valderrama, 1995: 21). The conference also approved a French recommendation that the governments should convene within the next few months another conference to draw up the statute of an international organization focusing on cultural cooperation. Such a conference was set up in November 1945 at the Institute of Civil Engineers in

London and out of it came UNESCO – the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization. With headquarters in Paris, its operations are divided into the three sectors signaled in its name. The Culture Sector deals with both tangible cultural heritage (places, museums, libraries and archives) and intangible cultural heritage (language, oral history, song, dance, music, intellectual property).

ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) deals with the protection and interpretation of heritage places but has a raft of International Scientific Committees for specialized aspects such as the conservation of stone, timber, stain glass and wall paintings, activities such as heritage education and training and cultural tourism, and themes such as shared heritage and polar heritage. Established in 1964, its headquarters are in Paris close to UNESCO. It is the principal adviser to UNESCO on World Heritage cultural heritage matters under the World Heritage Convention 1972.

ICOM (International Council on Museums) focuses on movable heritage and the means of collecting, safeguarding and interpreting such items. Established in 1946, it is housed on UNESCO premises in Paris. ICCROM (International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property) was established by UNESCO in 1956 to undertake specialist technical conservation training. It is based in Rome.

Together, these organizations play a powerful role on the global scene, laying down international standards for professional practice – 'world best practice' – in the cultural heritage field as well as influencing thinking in those fields in less direct ways. The activities of UNESCO and its associated bodies are said to be imposing a common stamp on cultures across the world and their policies creating a logic of global cultural uniformity. They seek to impose standards of 'good behaviour' onto Member States and other states.

Teasing this out in terms of heritage places, the globalizing impact may be felt in terms of the policies and activities that these bodies have deliberately developed towards:

(a) Improving international practice:

- the establishment of codes of international best practice for cultural heritage professionals (eg, ICOMOS Venice Charter 1964);
- the imposition of a common conservation methodology and management plan requirements (eg. designation of World Heritage sites; provision of advice to museums on design, collections policy, interpretation techniques, etc);
- the provision of training programs and international seminars (through ICCROM, World Heritage Centre, Forum UNESCO: University and Heritage network);
- the provision of support groups for professionals and communities (eg. UNESCO's LEAP or Local Effort and Preservation program).

(b) Promoting particular sets of heritage values and conservation practices:

- the development of international programs designed to encourage Member States to undertake selected conservation actions (eg. 'Memory of the World'; annual Asia-Pacific Heritage Awards);
- the provision of advisory input into national policies on cultural heritage places, museums, folklife protection, and education and training, including through the funding of foreign consultants.

(c) Establishing common management practices in World Heritage sites:

- the funding of consultants to assist Developing Countries prepare World Heritage nominations according to the World Heritage Committee's 'Operational Guidelines';
- assistance in the preparation of cultural heritage management plans for World Heritage sites;
- the monitoring of those plans and policing of World Heritage sites using the World Heritage in Danger mechanism.

But there are also a number of other activities that have an *unintended* impact by:

(d) Setting in train a number of processes of social and economic change:

- the gentrification of residential areas and displacement of traditional residents;
- the attraction of commercial and personal services designed for international tourism in World Heritage sites, in and around museums and site museums, and in folklife performances, processions and festivities.

The Cultural Relativist Challenge

A number of critical development theorists see the economic cores getting richer and countries in the economic periphery becoming poorer, and international agencies such as the World Trade Organization and the World Bank acting to tie Developing Countries into a peripheral status. Such theorists take the pessimistic view that there is little Developing Countries can do to break the core-periphery relationship. The recent Asian financial crisis shows, they suggest, that even the so-called 'Asian Tigers' appear unable to break away from the periphery.

However, despite these predictions for the twenty-first century, for the time being the world is still operating in a situation of partial globalization. Indeed, there has been an upsurge in protests about the social impacts of globalization and calls for the process to be reversed or at least slowed down. One focus of protest has been the WTO's attempt to move on another round of trade liberalization. The 1999 Seattle WTO meeting saw popular anxieties spill over into violent riots. The subsequent WTO meeting in Davos, Switzerland, in January 2000, while calling for further trade deregulation, was forced to address the inequalities being intensified by economic globalization and the feelings of powerlessness that people in developing countries feel in the face of mighty multinationals. These companies are largely based in the developed West, notably the US and Western Europe, and, although Japan is also home to powerful multi-nationals, economic globalization has

become closely linked in many people's minds with Western power. Moreover, the impact of globalization and Westernization is increasingly seen as extending beyond the economic into the cultural realm.

The search for alternative paths to 'development' has already been mentioned. The so-called 'Asian way' has received much media and academic attention as a result of claims by some of the Asian Tigers that they owe their economic prosperity to maintaining traditional cultural values, especially those based on Confucianism, and rejecting Western cultural values. In Vietnam, Western cultural influences have been blamed for many of the social problems emerging since 1986 when it decided to open up to the West under its *doi moi* (renovation) policies (Logan, 2000). Government conservatives have branded these influences as 'foreign social evils' and campaigned for policies to eradicate Western influences and reinforce Vietnamese traditional culture.

If there is an argument that the global economic organizations are becoming more powerful than nation states, this is clearly not yet true in the cultural heritage field. The mechanisms through which UNESCO and partners operate depend still on the cooperation and good will of the national Member States. From time to time UNESCO and partner organizations come into conflict with the sovereignty concerns, policy goals and administrative practices of national governments, including in the fields of environmental management and cultural tourism development. The aim of UNESCO and associated organizations is to establish common patterns of 'civilized' political, economic and social behaviour across the world. However their insistence on universal values and international standards of practice clashes from time to time with the belief systems and behavioural mores prevailing in local communities. That this meets with variable success was shown by the inability to dissuade the Taliban government of Afghanistan from destroying the Bamiyan statues in mid-2001.

To take an example closer to home, tensions existed recently between the Australian Government, UNESCO and ICOMOS over Kakadu National Park in the Northern Territory resulting from the request by the Mirrar traditional owners to UNESCO's World Heritage Committee in 1998 to place the site on the World Heritage in Danger List. The Australian Minister for Environment and Heritage continued to rail until as recently as October 2001 about the interference of international organizations – notably ICOMOS and the IUCN (International Union for the Conservation of Nature). This parallels the criticisms directed by other members of the government at the interference in Australia's sovereign rights in the fields of woman's rights, indigenous people's rights and refugee rights.

The conflict-ridden relationships that develop between national governments and international bodies are far from simple. Some governments make use of the 'external enemy' for domestic political reasons, such as the wish to forge national cohesion, rather than because of real

differences over heritage issues. Other governments 'collude' with UNESCO for similar domestic reasons, hoping to gain prestige and electoral support for being seen to operate 'internationally' or obtain international recognition of the national culture.

The argument that 'local communities know best' has often been graced with the name cultural relativism. Adherents of this world view have enjoyed considerable strength in the 1990s and, building on the earlier critiques of Edward Said and others that the universal values promoted by the global organizations were essentially Eurocentric (sometimes read North American), they have challenged the drive towards uniformity implicit in the global activities of the modernist organizations.

But the growing popularity of the cultural relativist position was also a reaction to 'modernism'. Just as there was a reaction against the products of the modernist movement in architecture, so generally modernism is said to have faced a 'crisis of representation' in the last quarter of the twentieth century. The notion that history could be seen as steady upward progress was rejected in some (notably post-colonial) quarters as a 'meta-narrative' that might apply to the developed West but did not seem to apply to them.

Within the West, others criticized the meta-narrative as applying to whites of northern European background and heterosexual patterns, but not so clearly to blacks or Hispanics, gays or lesbians who, though their material living conditions might have improved in an absolute sense, felt they were falling behind in a relative sense compared with others they observed in their own community or saw, via mass media and education, elsewhere in the world. Moreover, they were still experiencing other forms of disadvantage and discrimination that made them feel that 'progress' was hollow. Intellectual discussion in the media, academic scholarship and teaching and political debates became fragmented around issues of race, ethnicity, gender, and historic or actual status in relation to colonization.

Thus cultural relativism and postmodernism have gone hand in hand, rejecting the notion of a single meta-narrative applying to all humanity and is suspicious of over-arching theories. It accepts that societies are highly fragmented and that there are 'many voices', all of which have an equal right to be heard and respected. The idea that there is a canon in literature, fine art or architecture is dismissed: elitism is supposedly replaced, in postmodernist thinking, by cultural democracy. All cultures, all tastes, all behaviours are of value. Universalism – the belief that it is possible to establish a set of standards applicable to the whole modern world – is replaced by a cultural relativism in which it is argued that different cultures have and need different standards.

What is the relevance of postmodernism as an intellectual attitude, a form of social and economic patterning (more properly 'postmodernization') and an aesthetic style (the 'postmodern') to cultural heritage conservation? There are many identifiable impacts, but we have space to discuss only a small number here.

Firstly, the impact varies according to a nation's or city's position in the new global hierarchy and the intensity of redevelopment pressures that this produces. The so-called 'world cities' face intense redevelopment pressures on their existing built environment, especially on the inner city areas where most heritage monuments, buildings and sites are located. However, in some cases, such as Paris or Rome, the historic inner city environment has been made fashionable and highly sought-after for status and life-style reasons.

In other words, this element of the heritage has been commodified and has become part of the postmodern city spectacle. Where cities are slipping behind, there is less pressure on inner city heritage areas and some cities may seek to develop cultural tourism based on surviving heritage areas as an alternative economic base to manufacturing. In developing countries, confined to the periphery in the postmodern global economic order, there may be a tendency to lower environmental protection standards in order to attract – or even maintain – investment, economic activities and jobs. Cultural heritage conservation, at least in the sense of historic buildings and sites, may take lower priority than other social needs such as poverty alleviation and provision of new housing and transport.

Secondly, it is not at all clear whether the postmodern society, which is characterized by social and spatial fragmentation, will be more interested or less interested in the local environment and conservation issues. Postmodernist urban scholars routinely argue that social fragmentation flows through to a significantly greater degree of interest in the local environment. Perhaps this is so, but there are some reservations. In many Australian cities the peak of local community concern for the neighbourhood and its protection occurred in the late 1960s and 1970s; that is, well before postmodernism took hold. Also, in the postmodern world with its internet, mobile phones and faxes, friendship patterns and communities are much less likely to be based on physical proximity than on factors such as common interests, gender and ethnicity. It is no longer necessarily the case that the community is closely linked to the neighbourhood, and consequently there may be less rather than more concern for conservation in the local area.

Thirdly, as we have seen, postmodernists argue against the practice of identifying a canon in literature, fine art or even heritage buildings and sites, on the grounds that all voices must be heard and every voice is equally significant. This sets a favourable intellectual environment for conservationist to move away from the earlier 'gems' approach to cultural heritage identification and towards a more inclusive approach that takes in examples of vernacular building as well as examples of 'high architecture' and cultural landscapes as well as monuments and buildings.

But can a viable system of cultural heritage conservation be based on such 'equality'? The right for all opinions to be heard should, of course, help democratize public debates

about what is significant and should be protected by state and non-government bodies. But consider whether this argument tends to undermine all efforts to draw up inventories of 'the heritage'. Does it open the gate to arguments for greater variation in conservation practice, including practices that do not accord with the Burra Charter and other ICOMOS prescriptions?

Fourthly, the tendency towards rejecting notions of the 'right way' of doing things and the acceptance of variety, diversity and contestation as part of postmodern life has had enormous effects on architecture and the design of interiors and open spaces. Replicas and pastiche (design incorporating elements from different sources) are acceptable parts of postmodern style. The public mood seems to have shifted in favour of such types of building – or is it that the public was never fully consulted in the past? The spread of the Hollywood back lot into the design of shopping centres and residential neighbourhoods in cities around the world has been already mentioned. Some tourism writers fear that theme parks may become more popular with 'cultural tourists' in the future than the 'real thing'. Is the philosophical basis of cultural heritage conservation practice now not so clear?

Fredric Jameson (1984), Anthony Giddens (1990) and others persist in arguing that what is called 'postmodern' is really just 'high modern', that is, the 'cultural logic of late capitalism'. Fortunately, perhaps, postmodernism is on the wane, the discourse is moving on to new things. The flow of economic, political and cultural life continues on without the rupture that the concept of 'postmodernism' implies. The stylistic features associated with postmodernism in architecture have not been part of a permanent change. In much of urban planning and design, postmodernism had little impact on practice, and was mainly confined to clever debates among academics. In the cultural heritage field, there is a revival of interest in modernist architecture that is reflected, for instance, in the work of DOCOMOMO, an international group founded in 1990 that focuses on documenting and conserving buildings, sites and neighbourhoods of the Modern Movement.

Divergence at the Periphery

The postmodern insistence on cultural relativism rather than universalism has had an important impact on the work of the lead agencies themselves, undermining to an extent the confidence with which they have been able to promote their message. It has given strength to various parts of the periphery in articulating a resistance to some aspects of the global cultural heritage approach.

The postmodern outlook should lead logically to a greater awareness of the need for inter-cultural sensitivity. In the cultural heritage field, this means taking greater note of local opinions and involving local professionals and communities in genuine rather than token ways. It reinforces efforts to protect traditional popular arts and crafts and vernacular buildings alongside the 'high' forms that once tended to dominate official conservation efforts. It means fully engaging indigenous minorities in the

conservation of their own cultural heritage. It also means accepting that relatively newly-established societies have a heritage that is important to them. Europeans are often baffled by the existence of a highly active cultural heritage movement in Australia, a country that they regard as being too young to have any real heritage. Post-colonial societies are particularly upset by the appearance of arrogance on the part of conservation experts from the advanced West who, usually with the best of intentions, want to impose their ideas onto their hosts.

UNESCO's activities in terms of the conservation heritage places are implicated in this postcolonial criticism. The Venice Charter approach that was formulated in a post-World War 2 European setting has been challenged as inappropriate for the cultures of East Asia, Australia and the Americas and modified in such documents as the Nara Document on Authenticity (Larsen, 1995), Burra Charter and Canada's Appleton Charter.

The so-called 'Nara Statement' issued under the names of both UNESCO and ICOMOS is a particularly powerful voice from the periphery. In fact, in terms of cultural heritage conservation, the 1994 Nara statement was a veritable watershed, insisting that conservation practice needs to reflect the cultural values of the society in which the conservation is taking place (Ito, 2000: 15-18). This view is now widely accepted within ICOMOS as the standard philosophical basis of conservation practice. It represents the desire shared by many outside the European conservation world to find approaches more consistent with local and regional cultural traditions. The European approach was developed to deal with monuments made of durable materials such as stone and it largely rejects monument reconstruction (Anon., 1998: 229-233). In East Asia, monuments are often made of timber that requires periodic replacement in order to keep them in a condition that reflects respect to the gods or ancestors. Significance lies in the symbolism and preservation of the craftsmen's skills, rather than in the physical fabric itself.

Thus East Asian cultural values lead to a different heritage conservation approach – one in which greater importance is given to symbolic values, intangible heritage and traditional artisans skills. However, it is now being further complicated by arguments, especially from sub-Saharan Africa, Australia and the Pacific, in favour of re-combining natural and cultural heritage so as to accommodate more effectively World Heritage listing submissions from countries where the two sets of values merge to create significant cultural landscapes (Truscott, 2000). These new statements exacerbate the tensions within UNESCO, where senior officers, including the former UNESCO Director-General, Federico Mayor, recognize that advocacy of universal principles represents the organization's primary *raison d'être* (Mayor, 1997).

Similar regional and national reactions to the universalist vision are seen in the other cultural sub-fields. Museums in the Asia-Pacific Region increasingly reflect local priorities and growing national consciousness, but interact with global bodies that influence building design, collections

policies, content of programs and exhibitions, and personnel selection. Davison maintains that the newly-opened Museum of Australia can be seen as both an indirect creation of UNESCO and a symptom of the new nationalism of the 1970s (Davison, 2000:19). Collections and their interpretation reflect the unequal treatment of racial and ethnic minorities and gender or socioeconomic groups. Universal principles of museum practice are valuable in the struggle to remedy such situations, but can confront enormous local resistance.

With the intangible cultural heritage embodied in folklore and oral history (including myths, dance and music performances, festivals) there is often no physical record that may be re-interpreted by others in the future. This is a new Pandora's box for cultural heritage practitioners, especially since UNESCO's Executive Board in 1998 resolved that an inventory should be drawn up of significant intangible culture. During 2000, the new UNESCO Director-General, Koichiro Matsuura, established a scheme called 'Proclamation of Master Pieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity' and asked Member States to nominate items for consideration. It is perhaps not coincidental that UNESCO under Matsuura is also now developing a Human Living Treasures Program based on the Japanese model. However, the practical difficulties facing the task of identifying and protecting 'world heritage' of this type presents a new set of difficulties in establishing a global system of recognition and protection. It is not a simple matter of transferring concepts and techniques from the tangible heritage to the intangible, although one outcome is likely to be the same: the common issues of subjectivity and authenticity are likely to inflame existing global/local tensions.

Heritage education and training face the same global/local tension. ICCROM has universal responsibilities, but the development of local conservation philosophies and practices, as well as the varying knowledge and skills bases and infrastructure levels in different parts of the world, have led to demands for local education and training programs. This is highlighted by the two Asia-Pacific meetings held at Nara in Feb-March 2000 which discussed the need for a regional training strategy. At the national level, many countries are now developing university courses tailored to local needs.

Conclusion: The Way Forward?

The Venice Charter is no longer regarded as the single, universal way to conserve heritage places. It has been replaced or supplemented by the Nara Document, Burra Charter and other powerful alternatives or modifications in large parts of the world. It is no longer acceptable to provide a single, simple answer to the question of how do we identify and save heritage. This brings us back to the question raised earlier in this paper about whether an efficient and equitable global system can operate under such cultural relativist pressures. Clearly the view that respect is due to local cultures and cultural conditions is unexceptionable. But frequently this becomes the basis for governments, professionals and property owners and

developers in some countries to undertake what is simply poor practice.

But the cultural relativists have not won the day. The twentieth-century mission of setting global standards has not entirely failed; rather, the twenty-first century is meeting the challenge of making the most of the complexity of standards that now exists. This includes both by the centre accommodating the voices from the periphery and by reining in the excesses apparently sanctioned by a misreading of the Nara Document. It is clear that the differing viewpoints from the periphery have had a major influence on 'mainstream' (read Eurocentric) thinking of UNESCO, ICOMOS and the other agencies. For instance, the Burra Charter's shift away from fabric to a more general consideration of 'significance' and from monument, building and site to the general concept of 'place' has become generally accepted at the centre. The extension of the heritage concept from monuments and small historic sites to broader historic precincts and whole towns and cities has helped, meaning that the Venice Charter's 'dead stones' approach required modification, even in Europe. Practitioners are now working with living environments where preservation had to be balanced with keeping urban areas viable as places of residence, work and recreation (Jokilehto, 1998: 17-19; Bouchenaki, 2000: 21-24).

Already in the 1980s some UNESCO officers became aware of the anxiety felt by regional, national and local communities to maintain their own ways of dealing with cultural heritage issues. Following a recommendation of the World Conference on Cultural Policies in Mexico City in 1982, the World Decade for Cultural Development (1988-97) adopted 'cultural diversity' as a key theme (Tohmé, 1992; Lacoste, 1995). UNESCO's 'Culture of Peace' program also aims to create 'a world in which the rich diversity of cultures is cause for appreciation and cooperation' (UNESCO, 1997; Niec, 1998).

At the same time UNESCO has taken steps to check misuse of the Nara Document, notably in the Asia-Pacific region. Spearheaded by the UNESCO regional office in Bangkok, a conference held in Vietnam in early 2000 brought together experts from the region and beyond to establish some basic ground rules for conservation practice in Asian heritage places. The resulting 'Hoi An Protocols' have been drafted and contain many references to the Australian Burra Charter. The protocols will be a valuable tool in the region when promulgated, clarifying the critical linkage between conservation philosophy and practice and putting some limits around the way that the Nara Document may be used. The Hoi An Protocols start from the position that we need to understand well the various regional approaches and why they have emerged. This provides the springboard from which to decide on compromises between them and the global position represented by the Venice Charter or to decide that the regional approaches are simply incompatible.

Notes

This paper is an early output of a CHCAP project entitled 'UNESCO: an agency of cultural globalization?' funded by an Australian Research Council Discovery Grant.

References

- Anon., 1995. Nara Document on Authenticity. In: N. Larsen (ed.), *Nara Conference on Authenticity*. Tapir, Trondheim, 1995.
- Anon., 1998. The context of the Venice Charter (1964). *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites*, 2: 229-233.
- Bouchenaki, M., 2000. Keynote Address. In: Report. Consultative Meeting on Regional Cultural Heritage Co-operation in Cultural Heritage Protection, Nara, Japan, 29 February – 3 March, ACCU, Nara, Japan, pp. 21-24.
- Chen, K-H., Chen, G. (eds.), 1998. *Trajectories: Inter-Asian Cultural Studies*. Routledge, London.
- Cvetkovich, A., Kellner, D. (eds), 1997. *Articulating the Global and Local: Globalization and Cultural Studies*. Westview, Boulder, Co.
- Davison, G., 2000. *The Use and Abuse of Australian History*. Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
- Featherstone, M., Lash, S., 1995. Globalization, modernity and the spatialization of social theory: an introduction. In: M. Featherstone, S. Lash and R. Robertson (eds). *Global Modernities*. Sage Publications, London, pp. 1-24.
- Giddens, A., 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.
- Graham, B., Ashworth, G., Tunbridge, J., 2000. *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy*. Arnold, London.
- Ito, H., 2000. World Cultural Heritage and Self-Enlightenment of Conservation Experts In: Report. Consultative Meeting on Regional Cultural Heritage Co-operation in Cultural Heritage Protection, Nara, Japan, 29 February – 3 March, ACCU, Nara, Japan, pp. 15-18.
- Jameson, F., 1984. Postmodernism, or the cultural logic of late capitalism. *New Left Review*, 146: 53-93.
- Jokilehto, J., 1998. International trends in historic preservation: from ancient monuments to living cultures. *APT Bulletin*, 29, 3-4: 17-19.
- Jokilehto, J., 1999. *A History of Architectural Conservation*. Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.
- Lacoste, M.C., 1995. *The Story of a Grand Design: UNESCO 1946-1993*. UNESCO, Paris.
- Logan, W.S. 2000. *Hanoi: Biography of a City*. UNSW Press, Sydney, University of Washington Press, Seattle, & Select Publishing, Singapore.
- Mayor, F., 1997. *UNESCO: An Ideal in Action. The Continuing Relevance of a Visionary Text*. UNESCO, Paris.
- Meyer, B., Geschiere, P. (eds), 1999. *Globalization and Identity: Dialectics of Flow and Closure*. Malden, MA, Blackwell.
- Niec, H. (ed.), 1998. *Cultural Rights and Wrongs*. UNESCO, Paris.
- Throsby, D., 2000. Cultural heritage in the new economic environment. In: C. Debono (ed.), *The National Trust into the New Millennium: Conference Proceedings*. Australian Council of National Trusts, Canberra, pp. 19-28.
- Tohmé, G.T., 1992. *Cultural Development and Environment*. UNESCO, Paris.
- Truscott, M., 2000. "Intangible values" as heritage in Australia. *News (ICOMOS)*, 10, 1: 4-12.
- UNESCO, 1998. *UNESCO and a Culture of Peace: Promoting a Global Movement*. UNESCO, Paris.
- Valderrama, F., 1995. *A History of UNESCO*. UNESCO Publishing, Paris.
- Wilson, R.A. (ed.), 1997. *Human Rights, Culture and Context: Anthropological Perspectives*. Pluto, London.
- Zukin, S., 1995. *The Culture of Cities*. Blackwell, N.Y.

William Logan holds the UNESCO Chair in Cultural Heritage Studies and is Director of the Cultural Heritage Centre for Asia and the Pacific at Deakin University in Melbourne. His research and publications focus on the heritage and development in Asian cities. His most recent publication is *Hanoi: Biography of a City* (UNSW Press/University of Washington Press, 2000). He has been a consultant to UNESCO since 1986 and to the Australian Heritage Commission and AusAID. He is currently President of Australia ICOMOS and a member of ICOM and the Royal Australian Planning Institute.

Heritage and Globalisation critiques the incorporation of heritage in the world economy through the policies of international development organisations and the global tourism trade. It also approaches heritage from seldom-considered perspectives, as a form of aid, as a development paradigm, and as a form of sustainable practice. The book identifies some of the most pressing issues likely to face the heritage industry at a global level in coming decades, including the threat posed by climate change and the need for poverty reduction. Providing a historically and theoretically rigorous approach A World Heritage Site is a landmark or area which is chosen by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) as having cultural, historical, scientific or other form of significance, and is legally protected by international treaties. The sites are judged important to the collective interests of humanity. To be selected, a World Heritage Site must be an already-classified landmark, unique in some respect as a geographically and historically identifiable place having