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Canada
Don't talk to me about Matisse . . .
the European style of 1900, the tradition of the studio
where the nude woman reclines forever
on a sheet of blood
Talk to me instead of culture generally -
how the murderers were sustained
by the beauty robbed of savages: to our remote
villages the painters came, and our white-washed
mud-huts were splattered with gunfire.

Lakdasa Wikramasinha, Sinhalese poet
ABSTRACT

Cultural heritage is a Western phenomenon that is rooted within European traditions of museology. The designation, preservation, and protection of certain histories inevitably results in the exclusion of others. Heritage is therefore a contested space that involves issues of whose heritage is important enough to be displayed. During the last thirty years, the UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention [WHC] has become a global standard in defining cultural heritage. Nonetheless, criticism has emerged from the WHC’s members of the developing world who have concerns about their under-representation on the World Heritage List. This lack of inclusion of non-Western peoples inevitably stems from the elitist attitudes of Eurocentric experts that favour Western heritage sites.

Through the application of discourse analysis on a number of UNESCO documents concerning the WHC and cultural heritage between 1992 and 2002, this study assesses the influence of WHC experts and experts from other organizations. Research results point to WHC policy shifts from its experts that emphasize the greater inclusion of non-Western sites over the last decade. However, at the same time the documents also indicate the infringement of other organizations through the encouragement of partnerships by UNESCO. Other experts from non-governmental organizations and the private sector now have influence over the shaping of a globalized cultural heritage. Consequently, the WHC is transforming from a protector of heritage to a promoter of heritage tourism development.
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Questions of science
Science and progress
Do not speak as loud as my heart

From The Scientist by Coldplay
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INTRODUCTION

Cultural sites around the globe suffer the consequences of social and financial neglect, natural disasters, mismanagement, excessive development, mass tourism, and armed conflict. Limited resources of funding and expertise impose difficult questions of gain and loss. What is to be saved? How? What roles should be played by international agencies, governments, concerned citizens, and organizations within the private sector? (Perry, 2001: 411)

‘Cultural heritage’ constitutes an interpretation of history that portrays a selective representation of a social group, building or monument. Enthusiasm for cultural heritage preservation developed in European societies nearly a century ago as an expression of local or national interests. However, during the last thirty years, cultural heritage has become governed globally through the World Heritage Convention [WHC]. As a subsection of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], the WHC deploys numerous cultural heritage experts as advisors for conservation and development purposes. With the establishment of the WHC in 1972 by the UNESCO, a multinational initiative was created to designate and preserve both cultural and natural sites deemed of ‘universal’ significance. Furthermore, the designation of cultural heritage sites on the World Heritage List [WHL] has set a global protocol for defining heritage. The multi-level structure of the WHC is administered by numerous cultural heritage experts from around the world. Coming from a diversity of backgrounds, these heritage experts are crucial for facilitating the bureaucratic processes for designating cultural heritage. The UNESCO promotes combining heritage experts with other various

---

1 The UNESCO was founded in 1946.
governmental and non-governmental professionals for development and conservation purposes.

In this study, I examine the discourses of the WHC through concepts of governmentality that indicate the unequal relationships that exist between power and knowledge (Foucault, 1977c). Experts play a significant role in defining and controlling knowledge and consequently are imbued with varying levels of power (Dean, 1996, 1997, 2002; Isin 1999; Rose, 1993, 1999, 2000; Rose and Miller, 1992). Significantly, the entrance of expert influence on governing mechanisms is linked to the presence of liberal oriented policies, both state and non-state, (Dean, 1997, 2002; Rose, 1993, 1999, 2000; Rose and Miller, 1992). For example, cultural heritage experts such as conservationists, archaeologists, and museologists can be instrumental in the actual designation and use of heritage sites. Inside the context of the UNESCO’s convention on heritage, as a non-governmental organization [NGOS], the UNESCO does not have any direct means - such as military, policing, or government officials - to implement its agendas. Rather, like other NGOs, the UNESCO relies upon experts and their knowledge production in order to exercise their technologies of government (Dean, 1996, 1997, 2002; Rose, 1993, 1999, 2000; Rose and Miller, 1992). These technologies consist of the WHC’s planning, policies and programmes which are influenced by the expertise of employed professionals. As a result, by gaining expert endorsement, such technologies can gain credibility and approval by a wider public. Thus I pose the question: how is cultural heritage governed and to what extent does the UNESCO's World Heritage Convention

2 Liberalism for the purposes of this research is also synonymous with neo-liberalism.
play a role in this process of governance?

In this research, I address how the WHC as an intergovernmental initiative does indeed deploy inherent devices of control and constraint in defining a ‘Westernized’ global cultural heritage. Presently, representatives from both a majority of so-called developed and developing nations are State Party members of the WHC. The WHC appointment of architecture, monuments, and archaeological sites as cultural heritage has consequently become a recognized governing instrument that can reaffirm or exclude social and ethnic groups. However, a discrepancy exists as more than half of all designated sites are located in the developed nations, which comprise only a third of the WHC’s membership. This imbalance of WHL sites may be explained as a result of heritage as being defined through an established Eurocentric museological lens.

Museology, as an international standard, is a Western social construction. Cultural heritage experts, both from the developed and developing world, are therefore typically trained within a ethnocentric tradition and interpret the world through a Western lens. The perpetuation of Eurocentric concepts of cultural heritage can then be linked to the perspectives held by ‘heritage’ experts within the WHC’s administration and global programmes and planning. Arjun Appadurai (2001) and Nikolas Rose (2000) have

---

3 Although debatable terms, developed and developing are used in UNESCO documents to describe ‘(post)industrial’ and ‘industrializing’ nations respectively. These terms are similarly applied in this research

4 Eurocentrism is a perspective that views the world through a Western lens that considers non-Western peoples as socioeconomically inferior (Mehmet, 1995: 8). Eurocentric is also used interchangeably with ethnocentrism, the belief in cultural superiority, in this research.
identified that transnational programmes and policies as global knowledges are contributors to the intensifying processes of globalization. As a transnational organization, the UNESCO is undoubtedly a contributor to the globalizing of cultural heritage through its WHC operations.

My research examines the ways in which cultural heritage is governed, in the context of the UNESCO’s convention on heritage. I explore the mechanisms of expertise through the UNESCO and the WHC documents which discuss cultural heritage planning, programmes and concepts. It is within this literature that the WHC cultural heritage experts themselves address the decision-making processes within the WHC administration and membership. To assess the relationships of expertise and the governing cultural heritage in the WHC, I examine a ten year period from 1992 through to 2002. The time period selected represents the most recent phase of controversy and critique concerning the over-representation of cultural heritage sites in the developed world. During this transitional period in the WHC, new programmes and projects were initiated to address the lack of WHL sites in the developing world. Utilizing discourse analysis as a methodology, I examine the UNESCO documents and pay particular attention to how cultural heritage experts influence and shape the WHC’s projects and programmes. The analysis of these documents, projects, and programmes reveals how this international organization defines a global cultural heritage.

My research contributes to the study of heritage as it demonstrates the intensifying trends towards a globalized cultural heritage. Recently, projects and programmes within the WHC have come to encourage ‘global strategies’ for the inclusiveness of non-Western
cultural heritage. However, expertise partnerships with NGOs and the private sector shape these global strategies. Such partnerships focus primarily on the improvement of heritage site protection in lesser developed nations. Nevertheless, an imposition of Eurocentric norms continues to constrain the intentions for the preservation of non-Western cultural heritage. Economic development and tourism are often the underlying intentions of the new collaborative partnerships formed with the WHC’s cultural heritage experts. The governance of cultural heritage by the WHC, through its expert-advised programmes, has shifted from the original intention of conservation for preservation, to schemes for profit and plunder from the past.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

(i) Governance and Expertise

For my research, I examine the discourses of the World Heritage Convention through a theoretical framework based on governmentality literatures. By utilizing theories of governance it becomes possible to conceptually understand how the changing contexts of power and knowledge in respect to resistance has altered in the last thirty years. Within this postmodern context, grand narratives\(^5\) have encountered resistance, although some individuals and groups continue to support them (Sardar, 1998). Many people have come to recognize they do not possess a singular ‘reality,’ but rather have numerous and even contradictory realities. As a result, realities in the postmodern milieu are not as solid as

\(^5\) Grand narratives such as organized religions and formal theories, political and economic systems.
they once were. With the dissipation of once timeless ‘truths’ as grand narratives, our concepts of reality can be seen as social and linguistic constructions (Foucault, 1977c). Beliefs, religions, gender roles, sexualities, theories and histories can be understood as social and cultural creations. So in place of the grand narratives emerge a diversity of smaller narratives that shape the world as a collection of cultures. The disintegration of grand narratives allows for the liberation of the voices of ‘Others’ who were once repressed (Rose, 1999). Ethnic minorities, women, lesbians and gays, and the formerly colonized are now able to communicate their experiences in their own words (Sardar, 1998).

The WHC has been the defining standard for cultural heritage globally over the last thirty years. Nevertheless, during the last decade, the UNESCO’s convention on heritage has met with criticism from non-Western peoples as their heritages are lacking representation on the WHL. By applying governmentality literatures in this research, it becomes possible to explore these increasing capacities for once marginalized peoples to express their life stories. Writings on governance also recognize that even with the deconstruction of grand narratives there are still unequal relationships of power and knowledge. Michel Foucault postulates that power cannot be explained through large grand theories since power does not exist as an overarching state structure (1977c). Instead, Foucault suggests that power is performed within multiple local contexts such as in institutions like prisons, hospitals, universities, or in personal relationships in terms of sexuality (1972, 1977a, 1977b). Therefore, how power operates in these contexts cannot be explained by a grand theory because power is everywhere. But where there is power,
there is resistance on localized levels which is apparent in the struggles of ethnic minorities, feminists, lesbians and gays, and postcolonial peoples. Since power is in all places, resistance occurs not just against the nation state, but also counters the agencies employed and associated with a state government. NGOs and private sector interests - along with their increasingly globalized planning, programmes and projects - impose their expertise on regional and national jurisdictions. However, the imposition of knowledge by these non-state structures inevitably meets with resistance from people in their local milieus.

Expertise has become an inherent tool of neo-liberal governance, both in state and non-state bodies, in order to facilitate programmes, policies and projects as mechanisms of governing (Dean, 1996, 1997, 2002; Isin 1999; Rose, 1993, 1999, 2000; Rose and Miller, 1992). These various political and so-called apolitical programmes themselves act as mechanisms of governance and function as technologies of government (Dean, 1996, 1997, 2002; Rose, 1993, 1999, 2000; Rose and Miller, 1992). Nikolas Rose notes that such technologies include an “assembly of forms of knowledge with a variety of mechanical devices and an assortment of little techniques oriented to produce certain practical outcomes” (1999: 51-52). These technologies can involve government experts such as programme planners, managers, and administrators. NGOs, such as the United Nations [UN] and its affiliates, have mandates to develop policies and programmes that address social and economic issues like poverty, literacy, and hunger. The WHC’s

---

Postcolonial refers to the peoples of the developing world and Indigenous Peoples who had lived under Euro-American imperial subjugation.
programmes require a diverse number of experts acting as advisors and consultants to implement these technologies. However, certain implications exist with NGOs relying upon expert knowledge. Experts, from scientists to bankers, that are brought into an NGOs to assist can bring their own biases and agendas. Inevitably, the intentions of an NGOs's programmes and policies can be influenced to produce a variety of outcomes that may not reflect the original concept. Anthropological and sociological literatures produce a theoretical account of recent developments that illustrate the ways in which particular forms of expert knowledge influence mechanisms of governance (Brosius, 1999; Ilcan and Phillips, 2003; Larner, 2000, 2002; Li, 1999). Such research applies concepts of govern mentality to interpret how a variety of experts are utilized as influential components within national and multinational projects.

With a disparate number of experts involved with organizational programmes, their influences are not directed at one specific outcome. Nikolas Rose acknowledges that "technologies are not realizations of any single will to govern" (1999: 53). Recent research indicates such a complexity of expertise involvement present within NGOs (Brosius, 1999; Ilcan and Phillips, 2003; Larner, 2000, 2002; Li, 1999). Furthermore, these researchers illustrate the potential in examining the ways in which experts can produce an effect on governance nationally and globally. In the UN's Food and Agricultural Organization [FAO] for example, Ilcan and Phillips (2003) corroborate how specific forms of knowledge and expertise remained integral to processes of globalization. These processes not only governed human capacities and were acted upon by technical means but in fact mapped the different sites around the globe that could be governed in
the name of agricultural progress and development. Extending Rose's (1999) concept of 'technologies of government,' they (2003) investigate those *global technologies of government* (such as groups of experts who are linked to technical devices and practices of calculation) that aimed to transform events, spaces, and relations during the postwar development era. Hence, expert knowledge production by the FAO on a global scale has indeed defined and intervened in food distribution and production within and outside of nation-states. Such global technologies of government are also present in other UN affiliate organizations and their programmes, such as the UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention [WHC].

Experts, as technologies of government in the WHC, use discourses\(^7\) from their special areas of interest to assert influence in planning and programmes. Discourses as knowledge can be used by actors - from individuals to organizations - as a means of power to depict particular views of the world that become axiomatic while others become subverted (Alvesson and Skoldberg, 2000; Deutschlander and Miller, 2003; Foucault, 1977c). Certain actors who gain authoritative roles affirm their 'realities' and restrict others through discourses. As a result, subaltern discourses become problematized and are considered in need of regulation by a governing group (Foucault, 1972). Nikolas Rose (1999: 147) acknowledges that through power and knowledge relationships in discourse, experts acquire authoritative roles. For the purposes of this research, discourse analysis is

---

\(^7\) Discourses involves meaning in language, text, documents, policies, programmes that can be used to disguise motives or influence and control other groups or organization (Alvesson and Skoldberg, 2000).
utilized to interpret how the WHC planning and programmes are influenced through expertise advice as technologies. The analysis of the documents also explores how the WHC discourses are axiomatic for defining and problematizing cultural heritage globally.

(ii) *Heritage Expertise as Technologies of Government*

Heritage is a tangible creation of the past that regulates whose histories are represented in the present. As such, history and heritage are inseparable from one another but are clearly distinct concepts. David Lowenthal, as a historian, (1998) suggests that history addresses the ‘what actually happened.’ History therefore is an investigation into the past which requires an expert researcher to access and interpret it. But multiple histories always intersect in one tangible location. Heritage, usually as the physical form of a single historical period, represents only select parts of history which have been constructed by cultural heritage experts. As such, heritage is produced to create an approachable past shaped for the present as heritage sites, museums, and theme parks (Clifford, 1995; Lowenthal, 1998; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998). Cultural groups or governments can use heritage as either a parochial or a wider nationalist\(^8\) unifying force that is connected to human-made constructions or natural environments (Brown and Davis-Brown, 1998: 19; Gupta, 2002: 93). These places or objects of heritage retain social and even metaphysical meanings that aim to sustain the continuity and collective identities of social groups (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998; Lowenthal, 1998; M'Closkey, 2002; M'Closkey and

\(^8\) For example, archives, libraries and museums help to safeguard national identities through the preservation of artifacts and documents (Brown and Davis-Brown, 1998: 19).
Manuel, 2004). Nevertheless, heritage does have its shortcomings, for it can be “oppressive, defeatist, [and] decadent” (Lowenthal, 1998: xiii). Support for heritage sites can favour groups in positions of power, such as elites and aristocrats, while ignoring the histories of the working class and social minorities.

Experts play a critical role in producing heritage, but such expertise often receives criticism for its Eurocentric origins based on methods of colonial museum collecting. Heritage production emerged at the close of the nineteenth century in Europe where individuals or groups sought to preserve a site of local interest (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998; Lowenthal, 1998). The late 1800s was the zenith of a global European imperialism, both culturally and economically. By using experts - such as census takers, cartographers, and anthropologists - European colonial empires could bureaucratically administrate their subjugated realms. Cultural heritage experts also served as part of the colonial expert infrastructures. Museologists and archaeologists incorporated the heritages of the ‘Other’ into the knowledge base of the West. Such heritage experts inevitably determined the aesthetic and cultural values of the colonized ‘Other.’ (Graburn, 1998; M’Closkey, 2002; M’Closkey and Manuel, 2004; Simpson, 1996).

Western museums and academic institutions, as establishments of ‘high’ culture, have served as a nexus for intellectual rhetoric to define cultural heritage globally. The professionalization of heritage in the twentieth century would come to require the skills of conservation experts (Ehrentraut, 1996). It is, however, crucial to acknowledge that even in the present, the training conservation experts receive is grounded in European traditions of museum collecting and display. Linkages between expertise and a Euro-based training
evidently produces a “language of heritage that suffuses the world is mainly Western” (Lowenthal, 1998: 5). An axiomatic Western concept of heritage consequently perpetuates prejudice towards the cultural heritage of non-western peoples. As a result, this Western museological concept of cultural heritage encounters criticism for frequently devaluing the meanings of non-European cultural objects and places (M’Closkey, 2002; M’Closkey and Manuel, 2004). In terms of heritage representation, experts may choose to conceal the history of cultural oppression. Nelson Graburn notes that the contentions of history, such as colonialism, result in a heritage in which people “pass on those parts of our inheritance that we are proud of and may suppress others” (1998: 15-16). As such, a nation’s history that is perceived as contentious within present-day social milieus may conceal its conflictive past in order to maintain social cohesion (Gupta, 2002: 93). Heritage therefore, as a product of selected histories, continues to repress and exclude particular oppressed pasts of the developing world and national minorities.

Nikolas Rose (1999) points out that expertise is embedded within pre-existing knowledge, authority and judgment. The production of heritage is also imbued with relationships of power and knowledge that can influence how heritage is governed from the local to the global. Researchers concerned with historical conservation raise questions about the governing interests of heritage. For example, Brown and Davis-Brown query

---

9 For example, nations with fascist eras, such as Spain, Italy and Germany, may hesitate to designate architectural or monumental structures from that period to avoid controversy.

10 National minorities can include cultural or ethnic groups as Indigenous peoples or as migrants to another nation.
“who controls, establishes and maintains the archive, and do they do so? Which materials are preserved in the archive and which are excluded?” (1998: 17). In the case of the WHL, non-western sites of cultural heritage were often excluded by ethnocentric cultural heritage experts involved with decision making processes (Cameron, 1997). Cultural heritage experts contribute to these governing ‘technologies’ of heritage representation so that certain projects and initiatives will highlight or exclude parts of history. Heritage is then an exclusionary process and shapes a contested milieu concerning the "truth' about history and heritage" (Graburn, 1998: 17). Different social groups therefore can conflict with one another over whose heritage is represented or repressed.

The production of heritage attempts to reclaim particular histories through the lens of those who control its manufacturing (Clifford, 1997; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998; Lowenthal, 1998; Walsh, 1992). An integral component of heritage production involves the deployment of cultural heritage experts. It is these very experts who can inevitably reaffirm dominant or exclude oppressed histories. For example, up until the late twentieth century, non-Western ‘heritage’ was predominantly appraised by Eurocentric cultural heritage experts. Resistance to the Western monopoly on heritage knowledge and production came as efforts to reclaim cultural heritage and identity. Postcolonial peoples in the developing countries brought forth their demands for preservation, restoration and protection of what they saw as their own heritage (Clifford, 1997; Lowenthal, 1998; M’Closkey and Manuel, 2004; Meskell, 2002). In any case, even with such requests from non-Western peoples, the depiction of heritage can become distorted. Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett acknowledges that “curatorial interventions may attempt to rectify
the errors of history, and make the heritage production a better place than the historical actuality it represents" (1998: 8). Accordingly, when examining issues of expertise as a component of the manufacturing of heritage, it is imperative to recognize how heritage discourses presuppose an ethnocentric construction. As heritage obscures some histories, certainly paternalistic colonial attitudes of an expert Western 'curatorship' of the world's cultural heritage continues to operate. In this sense, heritage has been fabricated as a governing mechanism that engages expert agents - academics, planners, and administrators - as technologies of government.

Although the origins of an ‘international’ heritage date back to the beginning of the 1900s, a significantly global heritage did not develop until the latter part of that century. Political turmoil, warfare, and imperial boundaries prevented the potential to facilitate an international heritage protection programme. However, by the 1970s an escalation in the number of heritage sites around the world would emerge with the founding of the UNESCO’s convention on heritage (Gillam, 2001; Lowenthal, 1998; Walsh, 1992). Since that time, heritage itself - from the regional to the transnational - has become a global preoccupation. Richard Handler points out that this heritage vogue has produced “the proliferation of museums and historic preservation legislation, as well as

\[\textit{For example, “the [World Heritage] Convention is the result of two trends: one, emerging from the Athens Conference, organized in 1931 under the aegis of the Society of Nations, laid down the bases of the concept of world cultural heritage; the other, which is vividly manifested after the Brunnen conference in 1947 and resulted in the founding of IUCN on 5 October 1948, picked up on more systematic bases the objective already established in 1913 in Bern by the first international conference on the protection of nature” (Pressouyre, 1996: 20).}\]
the competition between nations, including relatively impoverished ones, to demonstrate that they have truly “world-class” cultural monuments and museums” (1991: 67). Hence, during the last twenty years, the intensification of heritage production has multiplied exponentially on a global scale (Hackenberg, 2002: 290).

Many social groups around the world, since the late twentieth century, have experienced sensations of cultural displacement, particularly in terms of their histories. This loss of a connection to the past has links to the assimilationist impact of intensifying processes of globalizing, or Westernizing, cultures (Lowenthal, 1998; Stille, 2002). Lynn Meskell comments on the emergence of a globalizing heritage:

> Within the discourse of global heritage there is little room for specific cultural, political or religious positions that diverge from Western, secularist viewpoints. World heritage is but one facet of the move towards globalisation and while a shared world heritage is desired by certain countries, it is not a universal presumption (2002: 564).

Many Western heritage experts may assume that every culture of the world wants to share in a ‘world heritage.’ Nevertheless it seems presumptive to assume that all non-Western cultural groups would want their sacred and religious sites or their communities as a whole turned into ‘disneyfied’ tourist havens. Yet as a reaction to global acculturation, various peoples around the world do attempt to identify with their heritage as a means of reclaiming identities. Lowenthal (1998) relates the legacies of European colonialism to the evolution of heritage as a globalized phenomenon in the postcolonial era. The outcomes, he suggests, are ‘heritage wars’ launched against the Western dominance over
‘world heritage’ as former colonized peoples attempt to recover their histories.\textsuperscript{12} Through these processes, Lowenthal (1998) believes that heritage will continue to expand throughout all cultural spheres and spaces. As a counteractive measure, new non-western experts on heritage work to resist the dominant discourse of the Western heritage knowledge base. At any rate, the production of heritage still consists mainly of ethnocentric museum experts that continue to influence global discourses of cultural heritage.

THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION:
CONSTITUTING A GLOBAL HERITAGE

As reflected in its programmes and projects, the WHC’s technologies of government operate within the administration of the UN affiliate, the UNESCO. Following the devastation of World War II, the UNESCO was founded as a non-governmental organization to promote peace, with programmes in education, science and culture (Dutt, 1995). Issues of heritage were placed within the organization’s Cultural division, one of the UNESCO’s three main branches.\textsuperscript{13} Under the UNESCO’s constitution, heritage is stated to be a "universal" right to be protected and preserved from population growth, pollution, commercial development, and conflict (UNESCO, 2003a). In 1972, a multinational agreement for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage

\textsuperscript{12} These reclamation efforts have consisted of repatriation of objects from Western museums or the reconstruction of heritage sites.

\textsuperscript{13} UNESCO’s three main branches are Education, Science and Culture.
was adopted by the UNESCO General Conference. The WHC was implemented in 1975, and the first twelve sites were designated in 1978 (Conil-Lacoste, 1994: 147). Cultural designations are divided into three categories under the UNESCO’s convention on heritage: i) monuments, which are the most common type of site; ii) groups of buildings; and, iii) sites of archaeological or anthropological significance (UNESCO, 2003b). A global heritage with UNESCO as the curator now exists as a result of the founding the WHC (Graburn, 1998: 16). Cultural heritage sites on the WHC consists mainly of mosques, temples, cathedrals, royal tombs, palaces, castles, fortresses, historic city centres, colonial settlements, and homes of the wealthy and famous. Certainly, recent trends in WHC policy are working other types of sites such as industrial sites, Indigenous and living cultures. Nonetheless, the UNESCO’s list of heritage sites are still overwhelming places of power and opulence.

The designation of sites through the WHC involves a number of non-governmental cultural heritage experts and government officials who discuss and decide on what they consider to be worthy candidates for the WHL. New sites for the WHL are added once a year through nomination by the country in which the site is located and a vote is taken by a committee of government representatives at the annual WHC conferences (Conil Lacoste, 1994; UNESCO, 2003a). In other words, another country cannot nominate a site if it is outside of its national boundaries. It is the imperative of the host nation to put forward sites for WHL designation (UNESCO, 2003a). As a result, minority or oppressed groups within a country may encounter difficulty in putting forward their desires for the protection of a site under the WHC (and WHC administrators
therefore may not even be aware of the potential of these non-nation state sponsored sites!). Other affiliate organizations of the UNESCO and the WHC are also included in the consultation and decision making processes for cultural heritage site appointment. For example, the NGOs the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM) and the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) are very influential to the development of the WHC’s policies and programmes.

Within the discourse of the WHC, cultural heritage is now defined as both tangible and intangible symbols that are supposed to be shared equally as achievements of humankind by communities, ethnic groups, regions, or nation states (UNESCO, 2002d). Currently 730 sites are designated on the WHL, of which the vast majority are cultural and the remainder are natural or "mixed" natural and cultural sites (UNESCO, 2003a). These heritage sites are located within the boundaries of nearly three quarters of the participating countries of the WHC (UNESCO, 2003a). However, controversies are present within UNESCO over the lack of WHL cultural heritage designation, preservation and protection in the developing world (Cameron, 1997; O’Kadameri, 1997; UNESCO, 1997c). Certainly, a lack of WHL representation of the developing world is a reflection of the Eurocentric attitudes of cultural heritage that are reminiscent of the colonial era. As a transnational standard for defining cultural heritage, the WHC extends from the colonial

---

14 Natural sites consist of national parks, biosphere reserves, and wildlife habitats. Mixed sites contain both sites of combined natural and cultural heritage significance (UNESCO, 2003b).
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to the postcolonial, and from the national to the global.

(i) Governing Heritage: The UNESCO and the World Heritage Convention

Previous to the WHC, cultural heritage was constructed as vernacular sites that were designated and managed under a local or national authority (Aplin, 2002; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998; Lowenthal, 1998). With the development of the WHC in the 1970s, heritage appointment and administration became problematized as an international concern. This global emergence has also become apparent in other UN specialized agencies such as the FAO (Ilcan and Phillips, 2003). By signing on to the WHC, a State Party member becomes obliged to abide by the Operational Guidelines (UNESCO, 2003b) set out in the Convention. The WHC’s guidelines were produced by a number of cultural heritage experts that have produced an axiomatic global standard for defining the value of heritage. This global standard for heritage has links to the founding guidelines of the WHC which are based upon European museological traditions.

Consequently, a divide emerges between rich and poor nations as the developing world lacks the financial and expertise resources to support WHC cultural heritage guidelines (Pressouyre, 1996: 34). In order to maintain an international standard for WHL sites between the developed and developing world, the World Heritage Fund [WHF] supplies financial assistance to nations in need. Funding though is not exclusively for the

---

An example of vernacular heritage previous to the WHC included groups such the United Kingdom’s National Trust. The National Trust, operating since 1895, has preserved both natural and architectural heritage in Great Britain (National Trust, 2004).
developing world. Leon Pressouyre\textsuperscript{16} (1996) suggests in a UNESCO publication that if the developed world is refused heritage aid, then they will implement complacent conservation programmes in their own countries. The debate over the discrepancy in cultural heritage funding for conservation between the developed and developing world continues to be problematic. It is the recognition of the inequities of heritage site representation under the WHC that has led to significant changes concerning whose heritage is now included on the WHL.

The expansion of categories of heritage over the past fifteen years within the WHC framework have grown to include greater contrasts of cultural heritage, particularly non-European and 'living cultures'\textsuperscript{17} (Pressouyre, 1996: 14, 46). Even the UNESCO administrators acknowledge that the outlook of the WHC was, up until that point in the early 1990s, considerably "Eurocentric" (von Droste, 1995: 23). The WHC's administrators themselves recognize the imbalance and critique the WHC for not incorporating enough developing world sites (Cameron, 1997; O'Kademeri, 1997; Pressouyre, 1996: 11; UNESCO, 1997c; van Droste, 1995). An example of a UNESCO document addressing the biassed construct of the WHC states that "one of the loudest criticisms of the World Heritage List is that it is too Eurocentric and focussed on monuments" (UNESCO, 1997c: 13). Similarly, other specialized agencies in the UN have

\textsuperscript{16}Leon Pressouyre is a professor of archaeology at the Sorbonne in Paris and is the Chairman of the UNESCO International Scientific Committee (Pressouyre, 1996).

\textsuperscript{17}In 2002 the UNESCO included intangible cultures for inclusion of the WHL (UNESCO, 2003b).
also come under criticism due to their ‘paternalistic’ attitude towards the developing world, such as the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights [UNCESR] (Lyons, 2002: 512). During the 16th general session of the WHC, held in 1992, participants agreed that it was necessary to address the lack of WHL inclusion of non-Western forms of cultural heritage (von Droste, 1995). For example, Director-General of the WHC Bernd von Droste (1995) notes that there was an “over-representation of European cultural properties; of historic centres; of religious properties; particularly Christian properties” (1995: 22). In the following years a number of ratifications and shifts within the WHL appointment procedures criticize the traditional ‘monumental’ standpoint of the WHC.\(^\text{18}\) The UNESCO’s administrators advocate throughout the 1990s that a wider range of sites “will have greater meaning to more of the world’s population” (von Droste, 1996b: 1). Such encouragement for change to the WHC policy often emanates from postcolonial voices of opposition to the WHL status quo.\(^\text{19}\)

The expansion into non-tangible and integrated natural and cultural sites refocused the WHC lens somewhat from its founding Euro-museological principles. A significant number of sites in the developing world were included in WHL in the tradition of monumental and architectural ‘masterpieces,’ but also included living cultures. Von Droste elaborates on this differentiation of cultural perceptions of heritage in that:

\(^{18}\) Monumental sites include the pyramids at Giza, Egypt, the Taj Mahal in India, and the Colosseum in Rome, Italy. These are typically significant tourist sites that are large contributors to local economies.

\(^{19}\) Heritage interest groups from the developing world and Indigenous Peoples addressed concerns about their lack of representation on the WHL.
... the majority of buildings of the world are not monumental, at least not in the European, or colonial sense of the concept. In the indigenous cultures of the Americas, Africa, Australia and the Pacific, most of the architectural achievements might be classified as vernacular even though they were often built for “monumental” reasons... However... there exists no distinct dividing-line between the monumental and the vernacular architecture (1995: 23).

Since State Parties are responsible for putting forward WHL nominations, a national governing power can limit the actual designation of certain aspects of heritage. This is especially the case when certain cultural heritages within a national boundary are considered undistinguished by a state’s authority (Pressouyre, 1996: 9). Nevertheless, even with recent trends of inclusiveness in the WHC, the nation state appointment process still may exclude ethnic minorities and Indigenous groups as some nations exert a nationalist identity through WHC designation.\(^\text{20}\) Some nations however attempt to celebrate, preserve and protect their cultural diversity through WHL designation of a wide variety of heritage sites (Pressouyre, 1996: 36).\(^\text{21}\) Regardless of the state policy towards cultural heritage, many WHL sites are under threat from socioeconomic development. Urban expansion, warfare, pollution, and intensive tourism are becoming the major hazards to cultural heritage, even those sites under WHC protection.

Cultural heritage during the last twenty years has come under increasing danger in all regions of the world through the intensification of a globalizing economy. Heritage

\(^{20}\) For example, China’s enforced occupation of Tibet resulted in Tibetan heritage not being appointed until the 1990s. In another case, Turkey has received international criticism for ignoring the cultural heritage of its ethnic minorities (Pressouyre, 1996: 36).

\(^{21}\) Brazil has received praise for including WHL sites that reflect its cultural diversity (Pressouyre, 1996: 36).
both in the developed and developing worlds is endangered by national and transnational free market development. Neo-liberal policies of deregulation, privatization, cost-cutting, and individualism receive frequent criticism in having low priorities for preserving heritage for future generations. Neo-liberal strategies of development for cultural heritage sites are often not concerned about the long term conservation of a heritage site. Rather they seek to make the highest profitability from a heritage site, such as increasing tourism which can in the end be detrimental to heritage preservation. Harold Williams (2001: 402) recognizes that, “the global trends of redevelopment to increase density, modernize accommodations, to industrialize, and to capitalize on investment returns have contributed to an unprecedented loss of historic fabric in past decades” (Williams, 2001: 402). The World Heritage Committee in 1990 developed a ‘Global Study’ to examine the structure of the WHC and possibilities for expanding its’ scope (Feilden and Jokilehto, 1998: 8). At the 12th General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention held in 1993, Director-General of the UNESCO, Ambassador Koichiro Matsuura noted that “at present two-thirds of the States Parties have fewer than three sites on the List and that their heritage of outstanding universal value is still under-represented or not represented” (Bouchenaki, 2000: 1). As part of the shift towards a greater inclusivity of non-Western cultural heritage, the World Heritage Committee established a Global Strategy in 1994.22 The Global Strategy was designed to create a WHL representation that was more

22 The focus areas for the Global Strategy initiative are accordingly in Africa, the Pacific region, the Arab region, the Andean region, the Caribbean, central Asia and southeast Asia (UNESCO, 2003b).
proportional between the developed and developing worlds. As a technology of
government, the Global Strategy has programmes and projects that employ a diverse
number of experts to increase the non-Western representation of the UNESCO’s heritage
convention sites. The UNESCO is also using these same experts for reconceptualizing
how it defines heritage.

Another transformation that occurred within the WHC framework was the creation
of a new category of heritage by merging the once separate categories of natural and
cultural sites. Some of the experts in the WHC began to recognize that certain cultural
groups, especially Indigenous Peoples, have their cultural heritage inextricably linked to
their natural environment. The administration of the WHC in 1992 created a new
designation of ‘Cultural Landscapes’ that recognized that certain aspects of heritage
involved both tangible and intangible components (UNESCO, 2003b). In 1993, for
example, Tongariro National Park, in New Zealand was designated as the first ‘mixed’
site placed on the WHL as a natural setting that was culturally sacred to the Maori peoples
(Plachter and Rossler, 1995: 17; Posey, 2002: 208). By expanding the horizons of the
WHL from simply having monumental appointments as cultural heritage, the WHC is
attempting to respond to criticism from its postcolonial members. Federico Mayor, former
Director-General of the UNESCO, points out that the WHL “is in no way meant to be an
‘honours list’...it does not establish any order of importance between the world-
renowned or less renowned monuments, buildings and natural sites which feature in it,
each of which has qualities of its own” (Mayor, 1999a: 97). Furthermore, UNESCO
administrators point out that the designation of cultural heritage is part of the promotion
of understanding amongst cultures to bring about international peace and human rights (von Droste, 1997a: 1).

The WHC’s officials are aware of the importance of acknowledging the significance of vernacular heritages. But at the same time, they also stipulate that “a global (holistic) approach appears to be the only option when it comes to reconciling the demands of culture (as heritage) and of development (as improved standards of living)” (von Droste, 1998: 1). During the last decade, the UNESCO’s expansion of its inclusiveness of cultural identities on the WHL and the creation of a Global Strategy are ongoing projects to address issues of WHL imbalance (UNESCO, 2002c). Commendation has come from some cultural heritage experts for the changes in the WHC. Such praise emerges because the “UNESCO, to its credit, has begun to recognise and rectify some of the problems relating to its World Heritage List. It has begun to incorporate ‘extrinsic’ cultural and socio-economic values into its management guidelines for World Heritage sites” (Skeates, 2000: 16). Certainly, the UNESCO has taken some positive moves and has begun to address the over representation of Western cultural heritage. However, in the same breadth of time, the WHC has become entangled in other partnerships that keep it within a Western socioeconomic yoke. In many ways, the WHC has taken one step forwards and two steps backwards. As new heritage sites in the developing world are added to the WHL, they are subject to policies of Western based development schemes. A significant part of the transformations in the last decade within the WHC is the input and influence of various parties of expert interest, from other NGOs to the private sector. These diverse and combining interests inevitably shape the current WHC’s technologies.
of government. As an intergovernmental organization, the UNESCO and its WHC are ensconced within directives to regulate and monitor internal national heritage activities on a global scale.

(ii) Expert Knowledge in the WHC

Following World War II, expanding interests in cultural heritage created the necessity for more heritage experts to evaluate the conservation and restoration of heritage sites (Ehrentraut, 1996: 19). As a diversified field of interests, cultural heritage now involves a profusion of public, political, and private concerns (Bruno, 1997: 64). The WHC provided the framework for these diverse cultural heritage interests to come together - from the local to the international. Cultural heritage expertise became an integral component of the multi-layered governing structure of the WHC. The integration of expertise is also present in other specialized UNESCO agencies, such as the FAO (Ilcan and Phillips, 2003). As technologies of government, these cultural heritage experts combine with similar or competing interests of who designates and constructs heritage and how they conduct it. Former UNESCO Director-General Mayor notes that a diversity

For example, “the list of professionals who might be involved to a greater or lesser extent in the management of cultural heritage is a long one: administrators, anthropologists, antiquarians, archaeologists, architects, architectural conservators, archivists, art historians, biologists, botanists, building surveyors, chemists, conservators (of collections), craftspeople, curators, documentalists, ecologists, economic historians, engineers (all sorts), entomologists, ethnologists, geographers, geologists, heritage recorders, historians, hydrologists, landscape architects, legislators, mineralogists, museologists, petrologists, politicians, property managers, seismologists, sociologists, surveyors” (Feilden and Jokilehto, 1998: 48).
of interests are drawn upon in heritage preservation such as “governments but also . . .
their non-governmental organizations, local authorities and elected representatives,
cultural and scientific associations” (1999a: 98). With non-state expertise including
professionals from NGOs and the private sector, the WHC is a crosscurrent of disparate
expert interests.

The shaping of a global cultural heritage through the WHC’s technologies of
government emerges from the contributions from professionals representing many fields
or disciplines (see footnote 22). Under the WHC, cultural heritage experts, such as
museologists, archaeologists and conservationists, influence the appraisal of potential
candidate sites for the WHL. These experts also assist in constructing WHC policies,
programmes and projects. The complexity of the WHC’s programmes as technologies of
government are made even more complex as they are laden with varying interests such as
tourism and socioeconomic development. The WHC also maintains partnerships formed
in association with other NGOs.24 These NGOs assist in the WHC’s technologies such as
the evaluation of cultural heritage sites for WHL designation and the design and
implementation of the WHC’s programmes and projects (Feilden and Jokilehto, 1998: 33;
UNESCO, 2003b). NGOs had typically consisted of other heritage focussed groups, but
during the last decade within the WHC there has been the inclusion of partnerships, often

24 Specifically the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the
Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Council of Museums
(ICOM) and the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS).
for development purposes. The enhancement of tourism through the development of WHL sites is a technology to improve local economies, particularly in the developing world (Feilden and Jokilehto, 1998: x). The expansion of partnerships in WHL sites includes transnational organizations such as the World Bank (Cernea, 2001: 72; Copps, 1999: 36; UNESCO, 1996: 18). Partnerships with development based institutions have links to the intensification of neo-liberal strategies that encourage economic improvements through the development of market-based economies (Larner, 2000, 2002; Li, 1999). The WHC and the World Bank for instance operate partnerships for expanding tourism in the developing world. One such case of WHC/World Bank collaboration are plans for cultural heritage development for North Africa that aim for economic improvement and poverty reduction through tourism (World Bank, 2001). In order to implement any WHC partnered plan, the prerequisite is the involvement of experts - whether cultural, political, or financial - and it is these experts that are central to the functioning of the WHC.

The WHC relies upon its cultural heritage experts in decision making for World Heritage List (WHL) appointment, site conservation and restoration, and financial aid (Alpin, 2002; UNESCO, 1999). As mentioned previously, the structure of the expert assessment process in WHL appointments involves several different groups, including the UNESCO Secretariat, the States Parties, the World Heritage Committee, and NGOs as expert consultants (Pressouyre, 1996: 33). Francesco Bandarin, the present Director-General of the WHC, explicates the latter when he states that "close and constant co-operation between the various international, national and local institutions concerned can
lead to effective preservation of World Heritage sites and can speed up remedial action in case of damage" (2001: 1). In an advisory capacity, cultural heritage experts in affiliation with the WHC are integral to the decision making process of WHL site appointment and to implement its policies and programmes. Writing for the UNESCO, Pressouyre points out that the initial WHC Operational Guidelines in the 1970’s “were drafted by the assemblies or by groups of cultural heritage experts, among which representatives of ICCROM and of NGO’s such as ICOMOS and IUCN, worked side by side with jurists, administrators and policy-makers” (1996: 9). Over the next thirty years, expertise from various organizations would come to influence programmes and policies developed by the WHC administration.

Expertise can vary in the WHC from the administrative level to site management. Most of the UNESCO literature that I examine in this research concerns how cultural heritage experts focus on site selection. Some of the UNESCO literature however emphasizes the importance of retaining cultural heritage experts for site conservation (Feilden and Jokilehto, 1998: 48, 56-57). In reference to personnel for World Heritage Sites “suitable experts must be selected to advise on the work plan and to assist in its execution” (Feilden and Jokilehto, 1998: 3). In a UNESCO publication, a proposal for the implementation of expertise in the WHC suggests that:

communications among heritage specialists are at an all time high, with best practices and technological solutions being shared from one country to another. Training and technical assistance have been made available through the World Heritage Fund, the UNESCO’s World Heritage Centre, and the scientific advisors to the convention (Cameron, 1997: 7).

These examples depict the types of references and discussions that are made by both the
WHC's administrators and affiliates about the activities of experts and incorporating a diversity of agents to participate in the WHC's activities.

Cultural heritage experts over the last decade have been integral in the implementation of the WHC's global projects and initiatives as 'technologies of government.' This expertise involvement undoubtedly affects the maintenance of WHL sites. The problematizing of cultural heritage by the WHC's projects attempts to address issues of heritage site deterioration, development, and warfare. In this context, is essential to ask which cultural heritage experts become involved in providing solutions to the problems identified by the WHC administration. Again, these cultural heritage experts range from government, NGOs and the private sector - all of whom may have varying interests in a WHL site (Perry, 2001: 411). Other researchers raise questions concerning the multiplicity of expertise involvement as an influencing factor on an organization's programmes (Brosius, 1999; Ilcan and Phillips, 2003; Li, 1999). The reliance on expertise becomes a limitation to operating programmes because the interests of the experts involved must also be taken into account. Therefore, the problem arises that the original intentions of an organization's technologies may transform in order to suit the agendas of other groups. Such influences of expertise become more apparent later in the research in discussion on WHC partnerships with the World Bank and the private sector.

Cultural heritage experts are present in many of the major decision making processes that have shifted the ethnocentric lens of the WHC over the last decade. Reference to these experts is often made in very generic terms within the UNESCO literature. The changing focus of the WHC is exemplified in the following quote from a
UNESCO document:

... a group of experts to address the deficiencies of the World Heritage List and identify ways of correcting them in order to make the World Heritage List more representative. This issue was dealt with by a group of experts who met at the UNESCO Headquarters in June this year [1995]. The experts urged to abandon a basically monumental vision of cultural heritage in favor of a more anthropological and global conception. The experts also proposed to modify cultural criteria for the World Heritage List (von Droste, 1995: 22-23).

During the 1990s, developing nations were brought to the forefront as a new problematizing motivation for expanding the WHC. Developing countries throughout the postcolonial period were voicing their protests to their under-representation from the WHL with their objections intensifying by the 1990s. Heritage specialists, globally, acknowledged the marginalization of WHL sites in the developing world. In response to such calls, since 1995 there has been an intensification in the WHC’s efforts to include more sites on the WHL (UNESCO, 2003a). Presently this initiative continues as “a number of expert missions sent to Afghanistan...intended to speed up the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the country” (Bandarin, 2002b: 1). This development provides an example of the WHC’s intervention into expanding the WHL in the developing world. Additionally, the founding of the World Heritage Centre[^26] in 1992 initiated an information service to developing nations from (mainly

[^25]: For example the 12th century Minaret and archaeological remains of Jam were appointed in 2002 following the American led coalition invasion of Afghanistan (Bandarin, 2002b; UNESCO, 2002e).

[^26]: The World Heritage Centre is the main administrative office for World Heritage Convention staff and is located at the UNESCO headquarters in Paris.
Western) heritage experts (Halonen, 2002: 50; Mayor, 1999a: 100; UNESCO, 2003b).

Nevertheless, some of the WHC's members were concerned that simply increasing the number of sites in the developing world is not addressing the issues of the Eurocentricity of heritage itself as a concept (O'Kadeneri, 1997). Rather, a rudimentary increase of the WHL's sites in the developing world was only masking how cultural heritage continues to be defined through a Western, but also globalizing, lens.

The implementation of transnational policies and programmes, such as the WHC's Global Strategy, affects how various peoples and their cultural contexts become governed by global knowledges. A cultural group's knowledge - from the local to the national - can be marginalised in the face of officiated global expertise. Ilcan and Phillips (2003: 443) acknowledge that particular socioeconomic milieus are governed by global knowledges which are produced through global programmes reliant upon expertise and knowledge.

The Global Strategy as a technology of government involves partnerships and cooperation with a number of experts from the Member States as well as NGOs such as ICCROM and ICOMOS (Feilden and Jokilehto, 1998: 8). By the mid-1990s, the WHC established an agenda for a project on a global scale that would address the lack of WHL sites designated in the developing world (Pressouyre, 1996: 47). In order to achieve a balance on the WHL, the WHC would need to provide "in the form of funds, materials, and experts - [with] the UNESCO involuntarily . . . standing for "globalization" of know-how" (Pressouyre, 1996: 43-44). This trend of developing nation WHL inclusion extended throughout the 1990s and into the new millennium. For example, a UNESCO document referring to the Global Strategy meeting for Africa in 1998 states that "cultural heritage
experts recommended that states that have not yet ratified the World Heritage Convention do so as soon as possible" (UNESCO, 1998: 57). The relationships of expertise and technologies of government to the WHC’s programmes and policies are inherent throughout the infrastructure of the organization. Expertise in the UNESCO’s convention on heritage has also expanded to accommodate a wider range of WHC programmes and projects as technologies of government.

(iii) *Expertise and Partnerships*

The UNESCO, especially over the last five years, has strongly encouraged the WHC to establish partnerships of expertise with other organizations. Many of these joint activities involve cultural heritage experts from the Member States, NGOs, and the private sector. A central focus of these partnerships is to improve heritage conditions in the developing world through research and assistance (Mayor, 1999a: 87). To accommodate the ambitions to widen the scope of the WHL, the administrators of the WHC made “bilateral agreements with several governments . . . and established numerous partnerships with other governments and a variety of institutions, both public and private” (Bandarin, 2002a: 1). The agreements mentioned previously were for technical, resource, and financial assistance. In 2002, the WHCom inaugurated a *World Heritage Partnership* programme to continue to decrease the heritage divide between developed and developing worlds (Bandarin, 2002a: 1). Other partnership programmes have also recently been established, such as the World Heritage Information Management Programme [WHIMP], in which developed nations assist developing countries by providing expertise for
conservation projects (UNESCO, 2002a: 50).

A significant part of the WHC’s promotion of expanding partnerships for its programmes and projects has been the emphasis to develop relationships with other NGOs. The World Heritage Centre located in Paris provides an example of another current technology developed by the WHC is (UNESCO, 2003b). The Centre’s principle task is to find financing for the WHF by soliciting project partnerships with organizations such as the World Monuments Fund, the United Nations Foundation, the Organization of World Heritage Cities, and the World Bank (UNESCO, 2001a: 22). From the collecting of funds by the Centre, the WHC is organizing new projects to engage a variety of cultural heritage and other types (financial, development, tourism) of experts to work together. Expertise collaborations are apparent within the WHC International Congress of Experts [ICE] which links experts from both development and cultural heritage arenas. For example, the ICE promotes “international co-operation for World Heritage conservation . . . enlarging the circle of partners, including the role of local and regional authorities and development agencies . . . [and] the relationship between World Heritage conservation and socio-economic development” (UNESCO, 2002b: 20). Heritage development for socio-economic purposes is usually associated with joint undertakings with tourist industry operatives to improve tourism to WHL sites (UNESCO, 2000: 55). Improving access to resources and expert skills has become a key feature of the WHC’s partnerships. In addition, partnerships that combine expertise in the WHC are now perceived as beneficial since “good governance is an essential condition for a sustainable conservation and management of historic heritage” (Serageldin, Shluger and Martin-Brown, 2001: }
383). Evidently, the new precedent within the WHC is to have combinations of national, NGO and private sector financial and cultural heritage experts as consultants for the WHC's programmes and projects. Therefore, the WHC's technologies of government - as its programmes and expertise basis - are ingrained with various interests that may congeal with or oppose one another.

The WHC encourages partnerships for conservation experience and financing since many nations lack the resources to preserve sites designated under the UNESCO's convention on heritage. State Parties are responsible for primarily maintaining WHL sites within their own boundaries. However lesser developed nations often lack the financial and conservation resources to protect their sites on the WHL. Typically, technical assistance is accomplished through the UNESCO and State Party partnerships, particularly from developed nations (UNESCO, 2001c: 57). The former WHC Director General Von Droste recognizes that “governments and local authorities have a decisive role to play in the conservation and enhancement of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List” (von Droste, 1997b: 1). An example of such development was the restoration of the historic city centre of Riga, Lithuania. All Lithuanian governments, from the municipal to the state, co-sponsored the conservation with the UNESCO after the city was placed on the WHL (Dambis, 2001: 193). Von Droste also noted the importance of “socio-economic development” (1996a: 1) as part of heritage preservation. NGOs\(^\text{27}\) have always played a significant role in the WHC as well, particularly providing an expert advisory capacity for techniques concerning heritage site conservation and restoration. Yet questions have been

\(^{27}\) For cultural heritage, these NGOs include ICCROM, ICOM and ICOMOS.
raised about the validity of the NGO involvement in the WHC. For example, at the 141st
WHC session in 1992, the issue was raised as to whether “scientific opinion compatible
with that of NGO experts charged with its [the WHC’s] implementation?” (Pressouyre,
1996: 41). During the 1990s, discussions held by the WHC’s administrators considered
the potentials of additional expert advice, such as academics and scientists, from outside
the existing NGO consulting process. A central reason behind the inclusion of other non-
NGO cultural heritage experts was to provide greater insights into how to improve the
inclusion of non-western sites on the WHL (Pressouyre, 1996: 46, 48). However, even
with the inclusion of more developing world sites, questions of what benefits can be
reaped from such WHL appointments can be raised. For example, what is the role of
organizations such as the World Bank in association with the WHC and the technologies
they produce for the promotion of WHL site development? Certainly the advocation for
such partnerships of development insist that they will improve socioeconomic conditions
in developing countries.

As a UN affiliate, the World Bank maintains several correlating partnerships with
the UNESCO and the WHC in particular. Many of these joint initiatives focus on
development purposes. It is critical to acknowledge that “in the language of development,
the authoritative statements of international development organisations such as the IMF
and the World Bank are extremely important in representing societies and development
priorities” (Arce, 2000: 34). By the late 1990s, the WHC was advocating for co-funding
cultural projects with the World Bank. Similar projects were already operating in other
UN affiliate organizations, but funded mainly by developed nations (UNESCO, 1996:
Financial experts from the World Bank and cultural heritage experts from the WHC advocated that these joint ventures would make the WHC more efficient and create greater access to private sector sponsorship (von Droste, 1998: 1). As previous Director General of the UNESCO, Mayor encouraged partnerships between the World Bank and the WHC:

We are ready to join hands with the World Bank with a view to establishing a Global Cultural Facility analogous to the Global Environment Facility . . . We have a major stake in mobilizing resources that match the richness of our cultural diversity. By the same token, we would also urge the World Bank to work with us by developing micro-credit programs for a range of cultural endeavours that have a social, political and, above all, economic dimension (1999b: 99).

Changing policies for a wider range of partnerships emerged at the same time the UNESCO was experiencing financial shortfalls. Administrators at the UNESCO had to compromise their policies and programmes to accommodate their new partners. For example, the joint literature from the UNESCO and the World Bank illustrates that ‘development’ of World Heritage sites, primarily for tourism, will help to improve local economies in the developing world (Cernea, 2001; Copps, 1999; Mayor, 1999b; Perry, 2001; Serageldin, Shluger and Martin-Brown, 2001; UNESCO, 1996; Williams, 2001; World Bank, 1998, 2001). There is little mention in World Bank literature on the potential problems of developing WHL sites. One World Bank comment suggests trivially that

28 Such as “the Global Environment Facility (GEF), an international financing mechanism set up in 1991 by the World Bank, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)” (von Droste, 1998: 1).

29 Significant donor nations, such as the United States and Great Britain, had withdrawn as members of the UNESCO for political reasons.
"some of the risks to CH [Cultural Heritage] operations are relatively novel to the Bank" (World Bank, 2001: 67) An almost nonchalant attitude is present within the World Bank discourses of the projected benefits from cultural tourism. It would seem that financial and heritage experts are shaping the terrain of cultural heritage development into an almost ‘risk-free’ enterprise.

Central to the core of cultural heritage planning and development is the involvement of heritage and financial experts. Many of the partnerships between the World Bank and the UNESCO in terms of heritage emerged from expert conferences on urban development in regards to historic city centres (UNESCO, 1996). From these conferences, Ismail Serageldin, Vice-President of Environmentally Sustainable Development at the World Bank acknowledged that "there have been some contacts between the UNESCO and the World Bank, dealing with issues of culture and development" (UNESCO, 1996: 17). Yet the underlying motives for most of these partnered projects are for economic improvement, such as increasing tourism (Goodland and Webb, 1987: 3; UNESCO, 1996: 18; World Bank, 2001: 1). Again, a central recurring feature to these jointly funded WHC activities is the emphasis of, and what appears as neo-liberal, the involvement of several financial and cultural heritage experts. This World Bank statement provides a clear example:

Cultural heritage preservation is a partnership endeavour, requiring the support and participation of large numbers of interested parties, including governments, donor organizations, and the surrounding population. The World Bank’s own interventions must complement, and not duplicate, the many cultural heritage preservation activities ongoing in the region, carried out by a host of partners working in this area, including primarily UNESCO and bilateral donor agencies (World Bank, 2001: vii).
With the World Bank taking on an authoritative role as a financial expert for the WHC’s conservation projects, the landscape of heritage is transforming. By entering into partnership with the World Bank, it raises some serious concerns about the direction for heritage conservation (Hackenberg, 2002). Certain areas may benefit from tourism, but do these World Bank/UNESCO partnership plans really address wider issues of increasing poverty in the developing world? Nor does it seem there is significant concern about the implications for the potential damage to heritage sites, cultures, and the local environment from the intensification of tourism. The UNESCO, in its arrangement with the World Bank, has come to compromise its own directives in the WHC for the preservation of heritage for future generations. Instead the WHC is a participant in partnerships that offer immediate solutions of promise that may be damaging to heritage sites and their surrounding communities and environments alike.

Partnerships concerning heritage conservation have existed between the private sector and the UNESCO prior to the founding of the WHC. For example, before the WHC in 1965, the “UNESCO suggested the need for a private sector organization for worldwide conservation of art and architecture” (Perry, 2001: 412). This led to the creation of the World Monuments Fund [WMF] which received donations from individuals and other organizations for the restoration of heritage sites and eventually became an expert advisory group to the WHC. It was not until the 1990s that the WHC administration intensified the creation of joint private sector/WHC technologies. Recently, the UNESCO International Congress in 2002 met to “discuss ways of strengthening conservation efforts by involving new partners from the public and private
sector" (Bandarin, 2002c: 1). Once again, one of the main concerns in the WHC has been
to develop partnerships for tourism (UNESCO, 1997b). For instance, a private
sector/UNESCO partnership "the TOI [Tour Operator Initiative] comes as a response to a
growing trend of private sector involvement in supporting conservation and restoration
efforts" (UNESCO, 2000: 55). Private sector involvement was not a new phenomenon in
the WHC. Nevertheless, during the last decade the intensification of discourses
encouraging private sector investment in the WHC's projects resonates with neo-liberal
ideologies.

Heritage conservation over the last three decades has shifted from local and
national interests to a global agenda. The WHC plays a significant role in defining an
international standard for evaluating sites that should receive protection and conservation
from neglect, urbanization, plunder, and pollution. However, the technologies in which
these WHL sites are included and regulated are influenced by of a multitude of cultural
heritage experts from a variety of organizations. These experts on cultural heritage
include state representatives, NGOs and private sector consultants; all of whom may have
different interests in the preservation of a heritage site. Nationalism, development, and
tourism are merely some of the pursuits of cultural heritage experts that are deployed to
designate and protect WHL sites. The vested interests of these cultural heritage experts
are not necessarily made apparent by the UNESCO and the WHC. The cultural heritage
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For example, former Director General von Droste of the WHC suggested that "In order to
mobilise the greatest number of people in the effort to protect World Heritage, we could
create national associations, either public or private, whose aim, in accordance with
Article 17 of the World Heritage Convention, would be to encourage donations for the
protection of cultural and natural heritage. With between 100 and 200 million visitors per
year to listed World Heritage sites, a measure of this kind is essential" (1997b: 1)
experts' role in the WHC suggests that they sustain technologies of government that are utilized to achieve often clandestine enterprises within the UNESCO. These initiatives are increasingly associated with the interests of other organizations through partnerships, such as the World Bank and the private sector. Moreover, it is through the discourses of expertise that the WHC has been able to construct a vision for a global heritage.

CONCLUSION

The emergence of a global cultural heritage in the twentieth century calls into question the events that have led to its development. Historically, non-Western peoples were controlled through colonial political, economic and physical measures. But it is imperative to also be aware of the culturally defining factors that shaped their lives. In regard to this particular study, it was Euro-American educated museum and art professionals that established how cultural heritage was initially interpreted. These ethnocentric visions of heritage extend into the postcolonial era and continue to perpetuate an exclusionary relationship with non-Western peoples. Thus within the context of reaffirming cultural identities rests the distinct role of the UNESCO’s convention on heritage. The WHC has certainly contributed to the protection of hundreds of cultural heritage sites from human made and natural endangerment through the maintenance, restoration and rehabilitation of WHL sites. Nevertheless, the WHC - through the influence and shaping of cultural heritage by its technologies of government - is inevitably linked to issues of governance. As a globalized 'technology of government,' the WHC’s experts, programmes, publications, and projects establish a transnational criterion to govern heritage throughout the WHC’s member states.
A global heritage defined through the WHC’s ‘technologies of government’ receives advice from a multiplicity of cultural heritage experts. It is essential to recognize that behind these initiatives as technologies of government there are multiple interests at work, from other NGOs to the private sector. The WHC literature analysed in this study illustrates discourses of expertise that have been constructed and conceptualized to support the WHC’s technologies. The current definition of heritage is based on historical European literature concerned with the conservation and aesthetics of cultural objects as part of museological discourses. Debates over the increase of non-western WHL sites in the 1980s and 1990s eventually created the new WHC policy for appointing new heritage sites. The WHC documents clearly demonstrate the contestations over the inherent ethnocentric attitudes towards cultural heritage. However, recent efforts to expand WHL sites in the developing world is only globalizing cultural heritage further as it regulates and administers more cultural heritage sites through new technologies of ‘inclusivity.’ In this perspective, it becomes apparent that the WHC plays the central and crucial governing role in defining an international standard of cultural heritage.

The research I have conducted in this study illustrates the widening influence of the WHC in governing a global heritage. Through my document analysis, it becomes apparent that the programmes and projects of the WHC as technologies of government are distinctly intrinsic within the organization’s ‘global strategy.’ Certainly the UNESCO’s convention of heritage has made efforts in recognizing non-Western cultural heritage. Nevertheless, the processes of evaluation remains Eurocentric as the axiomatic standard for defining cultural heritage is based upon a Western formula of expertise. Furthermore, the ‘global strategy’ of the WHC now involves a number of other partners who integrate
their own agendas. Development for tourism is now a central part of the WHC's technologies. Calls for the developing world to 'improve' its social and economic position only resonates with overtones of colonial control. Future research could explore the impacts of these development partnerships with the UNESCO and heritage. Such investigations would be useful to query the impact of tourism on local cultures and economies and on the environment. The transitions in the WHC with its increasing emphasis on expertise partnerships indicates a widening neo-liberal vision for heritage. It appears that preserving our world's tangible and intangible cultural heritage for the future is replaced for short term economic gain. The WHC's era for preserving heritage for 'global pride' is vanishing and is being replaced by technologies for socioeconomic development.
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### APPENDIX A

*The WHC Nomination Process* (UNESCO, 1997a)

| **STATES PARTIES** | - Make a tentative list of cultural and natural properties on their territory they consider to be of ‘outstanding universal value’  
- Select properties for nomination to the  

A country becomes a State Party by signing the World Heritage Convention and pledging to protect its cultural and natural heritage. |
|---|---|
| **UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE** | - Checks that the nomination is complete  

Established in 1992, the World Heritage Centre is the focal point and co-ordinator within UNESCO for all matters related to World Heritage. |
| **ICOMOS and/or IUCN** | - Experts visit the sites, evaluate their protection and management  
- Prepare a technical report  
- Assess whether the property is of  

Two non-governmental organizations serve as technical advisory bodies: ICOMOS, the International Council on Monuments and Sites, and IUCN, the World Conservation Union. |
| **WORLD HERITAGE BUREAU** | - Examines the evaluation  
- Makes recommendation on the nomination,  
- Or asks for further information from the State Party  

Composed of seven members of the World Heritage Committee. The World Heritage Bureau prepares the work of the Committee. |
| **WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE** | - Makes the final decision to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List  
- Or defers pending on more in-depth information  
- Or refuses inscription  

Consisting of 21 representatives of the States Parties to the Convention, the World Heritage Committee is responsible for guiding the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. |
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