



UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND
CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Third Session of the World Heritage Committee
(Luxor, Arab Republic of Egypt, 23-27 October 1979)

Item 6 of the Provisional Agenda: Principles and Criteria for Inclusion
of Properties on World Heritage List

1. All properties, cultural and natural, qualifying for inclusion on the World Heritage List must:
 - (i) fall within the definitions of "cultural heritage" and "natural heritage" given in Articles 1 & 2 of the Convention; and
 - (ii) meet the criteria of "outstanding universal value" adopted by the World Heritage Committee.
2. The Bureau of the Committee, faced with a number of problems over the application of the criteria, asked Mr. Michel Parent to draft a paper on the subject for consideration by the Bureau and Committee at their next meeting in October 1979. The full text of this paper is attached.
3. Mr. Parent's paper outlines a classification of cultural property, based on the definitions given in Article 1 of the Convention. It draws attention to the fact that some properties belong to several categories, and to the difficulties caused by occasional lack of precision in the wording of the Convention itself.
4. The paper then examines a number of specific questions, illustrated by reference to nominations received
 - the question of "historic places";
 - the problem of comparative assessments;
 - the question of immovable property which might become movable;
 - the inclusion of a series of properties in a single area, with proposals as to the homogeneity and density of such series within a given area;
 - the question of outstanding monuments within towns already listed.

There follow notes on the criteria, and in particular the criterion of authenticity, on the notion of vulnerability and the effect of restorations, and on "positive" and "negative" historical values.

5. The need for scrupulous attention to consistency in the compilation of the World Heritage List is evident. In view of the number and the complexity of the issues involved, the Committee may, however, wish to restrict itself to fundamental questions of principle, and set up a special working group to formulate specific guidelines and to redraft the criteria as necessary.

6. The Secretariat has, therefore, attempted to identify those questions of principle which must be resolved in order to enable the Committee to proceed to the next point on its Agenda (Inclusion of Properties on the World Heritage List) and to guide the working group in its deliberations. It is suggested that the Committee address itself as a matter of priority to the following questions (reff. in brackets to the relevant pp. of Mr. Parent's report):

A. CLASSIFICATION OF PROPERTIES (pp. 1-7, 8, 11-12, 23-26)

- (i) Can a systematic classification of cultural/natural properties be established
 - on basis of Articles 1 and 2 of Convention?
 - on any other basis?
- (ii) Does the Committee wish States Party to situate each property in terms of such a classification on the nomination form? (p. 25, para. 4(b,c))
- (iii) Does the Committee wish the World Heritage List as published to reflect such a classification?(p. 25, para. 4(d))

B. NOMINATIONS COVERING MORE THAN ONE PROPERTY (pp. 11-14)
(cf. para. 16 of Bureau Minutes)

- (i) Should all properties covered by a single nomination be situated in a single, uninterrupted, geographical area?
Is the Committee prepared to accept nominations covering more than one geographical location or area?
- (ii) Will the Committee accept nominations for:
 - area(s) whose precise geographical boundaries are not given?
 - area(s) within which those (cultural or natural) properties which justify the nomination are not individually described and identified?
- (iii) Should the properties covered by a single nomination be members of a homogeneous series?
- (iv) Should the properties covered by a single nomination be the characteristic/dominant/sole elements of interest within their area?

C. HISTORIC PLACES (pp. 8, 21-22)

Does the Committee wish at this time to give higher priority to historical (or mythological) sites which contain tangible features evoking their historical, etc. significance than to those which do not? (If so, criterion (vi) should be amended accordingly - see below.)

D. COMPARATIVE DATA (pp. 9-10)

Although each State Party has a clear responsibility for providing the data necessary for the Committee to decide on the relative importance of comparable properties within its boundaries, it is not clear whether it is expected to provide all the data needed for an international comparison. The Committee may wish to confirm that States Party should, insofar as they are able, present a complete justification of the "outstanding universal value" of each property they propose, including such international comparisons as may be appropriate to support it.

E. CRITERIA OF UNIVERSAL VALUE (pp. 17-18)

The Bureau called for the critical reexamination of the criteria. Some need strengthening so as not to give rise to an unreasonable number of applications: e.g. criterion (vi). In others there is need for a greater rigour in their wording: although properties may and often do meet more than one criterion, there is no justification for overlapping between the different criteria. Thus it is merely confusing to find the word "unique" in two different criteria, or the recurring reference to "developments" in (ii) and (iv).

Secondly, in order to fulfil its function as a criterion "for the inclusion of cultural properties in the World Heritage List" it is important that each criterion should be applicable to the whole range of cultural properties as defined in the Convention. It therefore seems anomalous that certain criteria should be restricted to given types of property ("structures" in (iv); "style of architecture, method of construction, form of town planning or traditional human settlement" (sic) in (v)).

The Committee may wish to instruct the special working group (see above, para. 5) to remove these inconsistencies, and generally to redraft the criteria in the light of its decisions on the other points mentioned in paras. 6. A-D.

7. The Committee may decide to consider the following points raised by Mr. Parent's report as and when they arise in relation to specific nominations under agenda item 7, or to refer them to the working group for discussion:

- immovable property which may become movable (p. 10)
- individual monuments within historic towns (pp. 15-16)
- authenticity and vulnerability (pp. 19-20)
- positive and negative historical values (pp. 21-22)

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Paris, 20 September 1979

Report by Mr. M. PARENT
Vice-Chairman, Rapporteur

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF NOMINATIONS AND CRITERIA
FOR WORLD CULTURAL HERITAGE

The Bureau of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage invited me, at its meeting of 28-30 May 1979, to prepare a paper "to define more precisely the criteria for the choosing of properties to be included on the World Heritage List (Minutes of Bureau, Paris, 20 July 1979, III, para. 11).

In doing so, and in requesting ICOMOS and IUCN to prepare papers on "the procedures used by these organizations in evaluating nominations", the Bureau wished to take stock of the nominations already accepted, or about to be considered, and the criteria which have been applied, in order to insure that the List is drawn up in a consistent manner, in the light of all the discussions which its compilation has already provoked.

MULTIPLICITY AND DIVERSITY OF "CULTURAL PROPERTY"

It is above all in relation to cultural property that a number of problems have arisen, and that it seems to be possible and indeed necessary to draw methodical and systematic conclusions from the work already done.

Nominations of cultural properties

- (i) already listed (7)
- (ii) recommended by the Bureau for consideration at the next Committee meeting (34)
- (iii) to be reexamined by the Bureau (26)
- (iv) put off sine die (2), and
- (v) received too late to be examined at the last Bureau meeting (15)

make a total of 84 files covering a wide variety of situations. But this variety, which is of the nature of cultural property poses problems of terminology and of comparative assessment, to a far greater extent than is the case for natural property.

THE CONVENTION: FUNDAMENTAL POINTS OF REFERENCE - ART, HISTORY, SCIENCE.

In order to simplify, it can be said that the choice of natural properties is made by reference to the natural sciences, while, as the Convention itself states, that of cultural properties is by reference, at once, to Art, History, and Science: This introduces all sorts of subjective elements and both intrinsic and extrinsic criteria, in which the notion of "universality" itself is particularly difficult to grasp.

To the extent that the situation is inherently ambiguous, it therefore seems sensible to analyse our methods of approach, and first to review such proposals as have already been adopted or at least put forward.

In fact, the text of the Convention, Article 1, on the definition of "cultural property", itself lays the foundations of a genuine typology.

THE CONVENTION: TYPOLOGY OF CULTURAL PROPERTY

Three major types are distinguished:

- monuments, groups of buildings (fr. "ensembles") and sites.

Let us recall that no cultural property of any kind can be placed on the World Heritage List unless it is of outstanding universal value from the historical, artistic or scientific point of view.

These points of reference are explicit for the first two types: "monuments" and "groups of buildings". For sites, the effect is similar if we consider that the "ethnological and anthropological" points of view belong to the scientific field (in this case "Human Sciences"), alongside the "historical and artistic" (History and Art).

Specific definitions are also given, breaking down each of these three types into further categories.

On the sole basis of the text of the Convention, we can make preliminary attributions, to these categories of the cultural properties already included in the List or recommended by the Bureau for inclusion. A few examples suffice however, to make it clear that many properties belong simultaneously to several categories.

Thus the nomination of "Ancient Thebes and its Necropolis" might belong to "monuments" (sub-type architecture); to "monuments" (sub-type archaeology); and to "sites" (archaeological zones).

In such a case, the category suggested by the title of the nomination should probably prevail. Furthermore, the right attribution may be indicated by the contents of the nomination file.

We should thus deduce from the title "Ancient Thebes and its Necropolis" that this nomination would normally be attributed to the category "Monuments: sub-type archaeology", although we remain aware that it is also a component (and an eminent one) of the other categories mentioned.

Similarly, "Mont Saint-Michel and its Bay" would be classified as:

- type: site: Sub-type: "combined works of nature and of man"

even though the proposal includes property which is of universal importance from a purely architectural point of view.

Thus, although the "Tomb of Kazanlak" with its mural painting might well be classified:

- type: monument: Sub-type: "works of monumental sculpture and painting"

the presentation would incline us towards "monument": sub-type archaeology".

With these reservations, which imply certain a priori decisions, we can propose the following classification in tabular form:

The column "See Note" refers to analytical notes on pp. 8 ff.

The column "A.H.S." refers to criteria of universal value:

A = Artistic point of view

H = Historical point of view

S = Scientific point of view

T A B L E

TYPE	SUB-TYPE	COUNTRY	PROPERTY	DECISION (Status)	SEE NOTE	A.H.S.
MONUMENT	M. 1 Architecture	R.F.A. Ethiopia	Aix-la-Chapelle Cathedral Rock Churches of Lalibela	entered entered		A.H. A.
		Egypt Ethiopia Bulgaria Bulgaria Norway France France Yugoslavia Iran U.S.A. Italy	Abu Mena Fasil Ghebbi, Gondar Region Boyana Church Rock-hewn churches of Ivanovo Urnes stave church Chartres cathedral Palace and Park of Versailles Stari Ras and Sopocani Meidan-e Shah, Esfahan Independence Hall Convent of St. Giuliana/ St. Salvatore	proposed proposed proposed proposed proposed proposed proposed proposed proposed proposed proposed proposed	(1)	A. A. A. A. A. A. A.H. A.H. A.H. H. A.
	M. 2 Monumental Sculpture and Painting	Bulgaria Italy	Madara Rider "The Last Supper" by da Vinci	deferred deferred	(2) (3)	A. A.
	M. 3 Archaeology	Tunisia Tunisia Bulgaria Egypt Egypt Iran Iran	Archaeological Site of Carthage Amphitheatre of El Djem Thracian tomb of Kazanlak Memphis and its Necropolis Ancient Thebes and its Necropolis Persepolis Tchogha Zanbil	proposed proposed proposed proposed proposed proposed proposed		H. A. A. A.H. A.H. A.H. A.

T A B L E (cont'd)

TYPE	SUB-TYPE	COUNTRY	PROPERTY	DECISION (Status)	SEE NOTE	A.H.S.
M Monument	M. 4 Inscriptions		nil			
	M. 5 Cave dwellings and combinations of features ("groupes d'éléments")	France Italy	Decorated grottoes of the Vezere Valley Rock drawings in Val Camonica	proposed proposed	(4) (4)	A.S. A.S.
G Groups of Buildings ("Ensembles")	G. 1 Separate buildings for architectural importance	Nepal Ghana	Kathmandu Valley Forts and castles of Volta, of Greater Accra, etc.	proposed deferred	(4 bis) (4 bis)	A.H. A.H.
	G. 2 Separate buildings for homogeneity	Norway	Valley of Heidal	deferred	(4 bis)	A.S.
	G. 3 Connected buildings for architectural importance	Poland Ecuador Tunisia Guatemala Egypt Yugoslavia Norway Syria Yugoslavia	Historical and architectural Centre of Cracow City of Quito Medina of Tunis Antigua Guatemala Islamic Cairo Old City of Dubrovnik Bryggen Ancient city of Damascus Historical complex of Split and the Palace of Diocletian	entered entered proposed proposed proposed proposed proposed proposed	(5) (5) (5) (5) (5) (5) (5) (5)	A.H. A.H. A.H. A.H. A.H. A.H. A. A.H.

T A B L E (cont'd)

TYPE	SUB-TYPE	COUNTRY	PROPERTY	DECISION (Status)	SEE NOTE	A.H.S.
	G. 3 (cont'd)	Italy Syrian A.R. Syrian A.R. Poland	The Historic Centre of Rome Ancient City of Aleppo Ancient Town of Bosra Historical Centre of Warsaw	deferred deferred deferred deferred	(5 ter) (5 ter) (5 ter) (6)	A.H. A.H. A.H. A.H.
	G. 4 Connected buildings - for homogeneity	Senegal Ghana	Gorée Asante traditional buildings	entered deferred	(7)	A.H. A.S.
	G. 5 & 6 Separate or connected buildings for place in landscape		Refer to general classification "works of man or combined works of man and nature"			
S Sites	H N Works of man or combined works of man and nature	Poland France France Tanzania	Wieliczka Salt Mine Mont St. Michel and its Bay Vezelay Church and Hill Ngorongoro conservation area	entered proposed proposed proposed	(8)	A.S. A.H. A.H. A.H.
	Z A Areas, including archeological sites	Egypt Guatemala Ethiopia U.S.A.	Open Air Museum of Nubia and Aswan Tikal National Park Lower Valley of the Omo Mesa Verde	proposed proposed entered	(9) (10)	A.H. A. S. A.H.S.

These tables cover all cultural properties

(i) already on the World Heritage List (as decided at the 2nd Session of the Committee, Washington 1978) or

(ii) recommended by the Bureau for inclusion,

except for Auschwitz, which poses a problem of classification not easily resolved in terms of the notions "Monument", "Group of Buildings" and "Site" as defined by the Convention. (See below, Note 11).

Finally, two notes are devoted to properties whose consideration has been deferred, and whose place in the typology of the Convention is unclear. These are:

(i) USA: Edison National Historic Landmark (Note 12)

(ii) Cyprus: Paphos, Birthplace of Aphrodite (Note 13)

A. "HISTORIC PLACES"

Note 1 - USA - Independence Hall

The outstanding historical importance of a "monument" which is also of architectural value clearly places this property in sub-category M. 1, and it was without hesitation recommended by the Bureau.

It is, however, worth noting that its listing is justified by its nature as an "architectural work", and by its "outstanding historical value": one alone of these qualifications would not have been enough for this property to be included in the classification, as laid down by the Convention.

Pursuing this line of inquiry, we come to a question of principle:

what of the "place" which is neither a monument (M)
nor a group of buildings (ensemble) (G)
nor a site (S)
according to the definition given -
"works of man or the combined works
of nature and of man" and
"areas including archaeological
sites",

but which has outstanding historical value, comparable to that of Independence Hall: for example a famous battlefield: Waterloo, Wagram,

The answer is dictated by the following considerations:

If such a "property" is neither (M) nor (G), can it be counted as (S)? Within (S) it is certainly not in the category (HN). What then is the connotation of the category (ZA): "Areas including archaeological sites" in the Convention?

The word "including" does not limit such "areas" to those which have an archaeological component. In English at least, "areas" is a term which could be used to refer to battlefields. Thus, in principle, we may accept "properties" which are empty spaces, without distinctive natural or architectural features; but the fact that the Convention fails to establish any principle for the exclusion of this or that "battlefield" suggests that the Committee's own criteria should be applied in the strictest manner. The credibility of the World Heritage List is at stake. We shall return to this point in our Conclusions.

B. COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENTS

Note 2 - Bulgaria - Horseman of Madara

The attribution of this property to M. 2 in the classification is unassailable, but the nomination was referred back by the majority of the Committee for lack of any comparative study of similar properties.

By its physical nature - i.e., rock sculpture - this property belongs to a long series, starting with the magdalenian horses in the Cap-Blanc shelter (included in the nomination of the Valley of the Vézère) and running through to the portraits of U.S. presidents carved on the Rocky Mountains...Closer to Madara, geographically and historically, we find the bas-reliefs of Hattusa (Turkey - Hittite civilisation) and above all, those of the Achaemenid (VIth - Vth Centuries B.C.) and Sassanian (IIIrd to VIth Centuries A.D.), tombs at Naqsh-i-Rustam, near Persepolis (Iran). Indeed some archaeologists have described Persian influence at Madara.

The work is, nonetheless, unique for this part of the world (Europe, the Balkans, Bulgaria); its style, iconography and inscriptions are peculiar to it and seem to confirm the hypothesis that it represents a Bulgar Khan, sculpted in the 8th Century A.D.

In any case, the exceptional importance of this sculpture from the artistic and historical points of view is independent of the results of research into its origins.

This assessment should enable the Committee to reply to two general questions:

- (i) Who should provide evidence of the "outstanding" value of such a property in the context of the proposal and assessment procedures of the Convention? In Bulgaria there can be no doubt of it, since the work is absolutely unique within its boundaries. But should Bulgaria also have to demonstrate its uniqueness or rarity in a much wider geo-historical area? In our opinion, it should not be required to go beyond the "proto-bulgarian" field, regardless of any doubts as to the dating and origins of the work. The Committee should avoid judging matters of dating and historical origin where there is no general agreement on these.
- (ii) This raises a more general question as to the systematic internal organization of the historical and artistic fields of the World Heritage. (See below: Conclusions.)

C. MOVABLE AND IMMOVABLE PROPERTY

Note 3 - Italy - Milan: Last Supper by Leonardo de Vinci

The minutes of the 2nd Bureau meeting give the reasons for which it was deferred. The decision on this well-known property may set a precedent, the various aspects of which should be examined closely.

The "Last Supper" belongs without any doubt to category M. 2. Despite 18th and 20th Century restorations, it kept its quality and its prestige.

The problem is posed by its fate in the future. Its fragility is no reason for excluding it; on the contrary, a List of Heritage in Danger is to be drawn up. But the technique in which it is painted (Tempera) and the risks which it is subject to may induce the restorers to detach it, and transfer it to another support. Without going into the problems of the conservation of wall-paintings (determined both by the state of the support and the nature of the painted layers), it may be said that detachment is sometimes the last resort for conservation, but that even so there is a risk of further damage to the work. We must state that the Italian authorities have not yet decided on such a course of action although they have often had recourse to it elsewhere. As matters stand, their assurances on this score should be enough to justify accepting the nomination.

But a precedent is nonetheless created, not so much because of the state of the Last Supper, as of the large number of masterpieces of wall-painting - whose order of importance is even harder to establish than that of architectural works.

One must therefore ask oneself how many such works could reasonably be included. (We shall return to this question in the Conclusions).

We have already seen that where decisions have been deferred, this has not always been due to the inadequacy of the files submitted.

The properties we have mentioned (pp. 8-10) have one feature in common: it would be unreasonable to accept them as the heads of long series which would outnumber individual "monuments" whether isolated or gathered into an "ensemble" or group. The latter can be placed in an order of importance based on those visual criteria which already determine a specific approach and command world-wide agreement. But is it reasonable to put into a list of cultural properties hundreds of wall-paintings, without involving the monuments to which they belong?

D. SERIES OF PROPERTIES WITHIN A GIVEN AREA

Note 4 - Cave-Dwellings and Combinations of features (fr. "groupes d'éléments")

- France - Valley of the Vézère
- Italy - Valcamonica

This category poses a problem of interpretation of the closing words of the definition of "monuments" in the Convention: "cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value.--" (Fr. "grottes et groupes d'éléments, qui ont une valeur exceptionnelle.--")

The French word "éléments" is so vague as to be altogether meaningless, were it not associated with "cave dwellings" and followed by a comma, which suggests that the "éléments" in question are comparable with cave dwellings - which themselves follow after "elements or structures of an archaeological nature" and "inscriptions".

In English "combinations of features" is more specific, "feature" is a word used in the artistic field, as an extension of "facial features", meaning "characteristic, or significant, elements". One can, therefore, interpret the French text as meaning "significant features"; and, just as earlier in the phrase the word "element" is employed in the context of archaeology, we can deduce from the context that these "features", without necessarily being "features of cave dwellings", point to the "traces" or "symbols" of human presence. Failing this, one is at a loss to see why they are included among cultural heritage: "monuments". Furthermore, this reading is supported by the stipulation that they shall be of outstanding universal value "from the point of view of history, art or science" as well as by the inclusion of "natural monuments" elsewhere, under "natural heritage".

Notes 4 and 4 bis:

Notes 4 and 4 bis refer in the Table to:

- (i) groups of cave-dwellings, (4)
- (ii) groups of elements, (4) or
- (iii) groups of separate buildings, (4 bis)

which raise three problems:

- (i) a problem of definition of the property;
- (ii) a problem of delimitation of the area which includes them;
- (iii) a problem of consistency with the List of cultural properties taken altogether.

A comparison with the approach adopted as most suitable in the natural field is perhaps useful.

In placing a National Park on the List, we cannot claim that the parts of the Park are of equal importance. Only small areas may, for instance, be "natural reserves" of high biological importance. But the surrounding "buffer zone" of the National Park is nonetheless justified.

Thus, the notion of a group of (separate) elements justifies the nomination of an "inclusive" property containing "strong parts" (buildings, cave dwellings, features, inscriptions, forts, etc.). These "strong points" must be heavily concentrated and in an obvious relationship to each other. We have agreed that such properties can be admitted if:

- (i) each of the individual elements within them is clearly identified;
- (ii) the definition of the zone around them is also clearly specified.

And since any such property inevitably covers an appreciable area, we should be inclined to put it either in category ZA ("Areas, including archaeological sites"), G.1/2/3 ("Groups of separate buildings") or, occasionally, M.3 ("combinations of features"). Thus, we have decided to classify the Open-Air Museum of Nubia and Aswan as ZA, whereas Memphis is M.3 and the Kathmandu Valley G.1.

"The Kathmandu Valley" and "Nubia" raise the question of the size of such areas.

Why, in this case, not put the whole of the "Nile Valley", or the Ganges, Po or Loire valleys?

France, having nominated the "Cave Dwellings of the Valley of the Vézère", might well consider putting in the "Chateaux of the Loire" (just as Ghana is proposing the "forts and castles of the Volta"), rather than making separate proposals for Chambord, then Chenonceaux, Azay-le-Rideau, and so forth.

One might suggest the following answer to this crucial dilemma:

E. HOMOGENEITY AND DENSITY OF GROUPS WITHIN A SINGLE ZONE

Note 4 bis - Ghana - Forts and Castles of the Volta

Note 9 - Egypt - Nubia and Aswan Open-Air Museum

1. In any group of properties within a single zone, each individual property should be part of a homogeneous series: this seems to be the case for the "forts and castles of the Volta", whereas the series "chateaux of the Loire" is much more heterogeneous.
2. At the same time, the area should be one where such a series is the dominant, if not the only, sort of cultural property to be considered. This is the case for the "Valley of the Vézère"; it would not be for the "chateaux of the Loire" which are in an area containing historic towns, important churches, etc. In short, the entity "chateaux of the Loire" should not cover a geographical entity notable for the combination of great wealth and great heterogeneity. The World Heritage List should not be a simple atlas; it must at least imply some judgment as to the relative importance of cultural properties throughout the world. We have seen how difficult this is, but in view of the fact that it is inevitable and indeed desirable that the heritage should serve a public use in Unesco's own fields (education, science, culture and communication), it will be more and more essential as the List grows, and it would be a serious matter if initial inconsistency prevented it from being achieved.
3. If the homogeneity of the properties covered by any single nomination and the dominant, if not exclusive, position of these properties within the area in question are accepted, the convenient size of such an area should be fixed. For the reasons suggested above, a nomination for the Cathedrals of France, numbering 20, 50 or 100 monuments, would be unacceptable, but the "Open-Air Museum of Nubia and Aswan" (covering the monuments on the shores of the artificial lake created by the Aswan Dam) has received the Bureau's approval.

So far as its dimensions are concerned, this must be a borderline case. The Bureau would happily have accepted separate nominations for Abou-Simbel and Philae. By choosing another formula, Egypt has stressed a homogeneity which is due less to past history than to the event which brought about a display of international solidarity affecting not only Abou Simbel and Philae but several other temples, archaeological digs and Nubian ethnography.

This recent happening can be compared with certain effects of historical geography. The forts along the Ghanian coastline all served the same purpose. The distances which separate them do not destroy the unity of the area. But this area should, in principle, be defined without any breaks in its continuity.

To return to the case of Nubia, it is not without significance that this property has been placed, not among "groups" in our classification, but among "sites - areas including archaeological sites"(S-ZA); to the extent that homogeneity of the constituent parts, might, in such a large area, be thought insufficient to justify one single nomination - but its recent history and nature have given this area a unique character for the future - it might also be placed in S-HN (Sites: combined works of nature and of man).

A priori, it is hard to find any other example in the world where a single nomination could cover such a large area, whose unified character was only acquired thousands of years after the works which give it its importance.

F. INCLUSION OF OUTSTANDING MONUMENTS LOCATED IN TOWNS ALREADY LISTED AS SUCH.

Notes 5, 5 bis, 5 ter.

These notes refer to "historic towns" belonging to category G-3 of the classification.

Among the Committee's first decisions, Cracow can be taken as a prototype, whose characteristics are:

- (i) the old town is clearly bounded by the Town Wall;
- (ii) this boundary embraces the original central area, an ensemble with a concentration of architectural features noted either for their individual value (e.g., the famous Cathedral) or for their homogeneity as a group (the houses round the market square).

Other nominations cast in the same mould - when both the delimitation and contents are clearly brought out - have all been recommended without difficulty by the Bureau.

A difficulty does, however, arise over the Historic Centre of Rome, not of course for the principle, but for the presentation. There can be no town in the world which is comparable to this palimpsest of an ancient city and a living historic town. If the documentation was found wanting, this was doubtless in part because the case seemed too obvious, but also because the strict delimitation of such a "property" in terms of any classification is impossible. The limits depend upon the aspect of Rome which is stressed: elements which, though not part of the urbs, are closely linked to it through history and art, lie outside the "Historic Centre" which has been nominated.

Thus, it would appear that if the nomination is for the "Historic Centre" rather than "Ancient Rome", the Via Appia, for example, would have to be the subject of a separate nomination. On this score, might not the City of Rome legitimately give rise to multiple nominations, even of neighbouring properties?

One can see the extent to which each nomination affects the eventual prospect of a worldwide list, which is at least coherent, if not ideal.

An outstanding monument like the Cathedral of Chartres has been put up by itself, although it dominates a small town of undoubted artistic value. On the other hand, the Basilica of Vézelay is integrated into its setting in the relevant nomination.

There are reasons for this which it would be well to give. Chartres Cathedral is the first French proposal from a homogeneous series which must, at the least, include such prestigious monuments as the Cathedrals of Paris, Bourges, Amiens, Rheims, Rouen and Beauvais. At the European level, this list has already been started with the listing of the "Cathedral of Aix-la-Chapelle".

The classification of the "Historical Complex of Split and Palace of Diocletian" implies one solution to the problem of ambiguity: The "Palace" and the "Historical Complex" are in fact one and the same property, and the title only makes a distinction of age and function. This is an exceptional case, but it suggests a general solution to the question of classification, namely that the title itself should systematically bring out the multiple significance of a given property.

G. CRITERIA ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE - GENERAL REMARKS

Up to now, we have concentrated on the classification implicit in the Convention itself.

Article 11 (para. 5) of the Convention requires the Committee to "define the criteria on the basis of which property ... may be included in ... the lists". This the Committee did at its first session, by adopting a text which, while remaining within the definitions given by the Convention, defines and thus limits the notion of "outstanding universal value", which is so hard to justify objectively.

The criteria, proposed by ICOMOS, stress the following points:

- (i) unique artistic or aesthetic achievements;
- (ii) influence on subsequent developments;
- (iii) rarity;
- (iv) significant example of type of structure;
- (v) significant example of traditional architecture;
- (vi) historical associations.

The requirement of authenticity is specifically mentioned. Cf. para. 20 of Report of 1st Session "the property should meet the test of authenticity..." which makes this into a conditional criterion, while the others are mandatory ("...meet one or more of the following criteria ...").

Criteria (i) and (iii), as drafted, are variations on the theme of rarity; (ii), (iv) and (v) call for a comparative assessment which brings into play the resources of history and art history.

Any comparative assessment presupposes that there is a general consensus as to the way in which we read history - which is far from being the case. To take an uncontroversial example thirty years ago one would have used the theory of regional schools of Romanesque art to justify the choice of a certain number of churches in Europe to represent the Romanesque period. Nowadays, although in every Western European state there is a far stronger affirmation of "regional" cultural particularities, above all on linguistic grounds, than before, art historians are unwilling to grant that the typology of Romanesque art should be dictated by the notion of regional schools, as before.

As for rarity, it may of course have a more objective basis in the widest possible range of knowledge, not limited to any one country, but each cultural property is, essentially, different from all others, and one could in the end describe them all as "rare". Only to the extent that they contain innovations without precedent can their rarity be asserted, in a sense which is close to the notion of "influence". In truth, uniqueness (i) refers to the incomparable sight of a monument like the Taj Mahal or Mont Saint Michel, while rarity (iii) adds to this criterion the notion of a "precious" quality. However, these are (subjective) qualifications, not objective criteria, and should be applied only with the strictest caution, so as not to exceed the basic premise, which is to define "outstanding universal value".

H. CRITERION OF AUTHENTICITY

Note 6 - Poland - Historic Centre of Warsaw

The Committee having laid down that authenticity is a sine qua non at first sight the WHList should not include a town or part of a town which has been entirely destroyed and reconstructed, whatever the quality of the reconstruction.

If the classification, although close to that of the Historic Centre of Cracow (G. 3: Group of buildings: connected buildings, of architectural importance), is not applicable to Warsaw for lack of authenticity, the question is whether the latter could nevertheless be placed on the List because of the exceptional historical circumstances surrounding its resurrection.

We shall discuss this later.

Moreover, we have to stress that authenticity is relative and depends on the nature of the property involved.

A wooden temple in Kyoto which has been perfectly maintained, and whose timbers have been replaced regularly as and when they decayed - without any alteration of the architecture or of the look of the material over ten centuries - remains undeniably authentic.

The nature of a material, its finishing, its structural use, and its expressive use, the very nature of the civilization which built the building (whether or not it is the conductor of a genuine tradition) are all different factors according to which the idea of authenticity can be understood differently.

Recent analyses of Western European stained glass windows have shown that only a proportion of the glass is original, without casting any doubt on the authenticity of the windows. On the other hand, a heavily restored wall-painting has lost its authenticity; as for stone structures, great efforts are made nowadays to avoid having to replace stone surfaces, especially carved ones, by use of stone treatment products.

I. VULNERABILITY AND AUTHENTICITY: CONSERVATION, RESTORATION, RECONSTRUCTION

Vulnerability is taken into account by the Committee, not, of course, as a requirement, but as an incitement to list the property involved.

Vulnerability alone could not be a sufficient condition for listing. It is mentioned in the criteria so that the List should be an efficient tool using the resources of the Fund for the conservation of fragile property.

The purpose is to ensure that measures are taken to conserve and restore such properties - measures without which they would cease to exist. The idea of restoration, effected or desired, is thus inseparable from that of cultural property.

The situation can arise where a restoration disqualifies a property on grounds of authenticity, either:

- (i) if the restoration is bad; or
- (ii) if the restoration, however well done, consists of a reconstruction of a property which has in fact completely disappeared (e.g., Warsaw).

The Venice Charter published by ICOMOS to provide guidelines for necessary work on historic buildings prohibits reconstruction and recommends conservation of what exists without reduction or addition, even of an element whose form is known. "Restoration" is admitted only as a matter of exception.

It is in fact clear that vulnerability, which would be sacrificed by too restrictive an approach to conservation, is something against which the Committee must fight; and so long as restoration is based on precise, scientific standards, it is impossible to prohibit it altogether and keep all "restored" properties off the WHList.

Finally, the question arises, whether 19th Century restorations, which often took considerable liberties with the original fabric, have now been "legitimized" by the passage of time. We come back to the dilemma of Warsaw: can a haphazard 19th Century or a systematic 20th Century reconstruction be justified for inclusion on grounds, not of Art but of History?

We shall answer this question in our Conclusions.

J. HISTORIC PLACES - POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE HISTORICAL VALUES

We have referred to the extreme case of areas which may have no tangible cultural property on them but which have been the scene of an important historical event.

Such an event may be for the good of humanity, it may be uncertain in its effects (a battlefield), or it may live on in people's memory as a dreadful warning against any recurrence of the events which took place there.

Note 7 - Senegal - Gorée

The Island of Gorée, included by the Committee in its first listings, is a site of some artistic merit: a fine group of buildings in a pleasant natural site, Gorée is above all a reminder of the "Slave Trade", of centuries of suffering which have in some sense found their monument there; and the listing of Gorée is of topical significance precisely because Senegal intends to make this place, with such negative historical connotations, into a place of dialogue between civilisations.

Note 11 - Poland - Auschwitz

The monstrous chapter of deportation and extermination was a crime against humanity which has its own geography, and Auschwitz was the culminating point of horror. That is why Poland has nominated it, and although the huts which make it up are of no architectural interest (in contrast to Gorée), they do nevertheless form an ensemble which owes its coherence to the sinister function they fulfilled.

We should consider the implications of the nomination of Auschwitz for the WHList.

- (i) on the broader reading of the term "site" ("areas...which are of outstanding universal value from the historical... point of view"), Auschwitz should undeniably be placed on the List.
- (ii) Famous battlefields may also be put on it.
- (iii) Nevertheless, and in order to preserve its symbolic status as a monument to all the victims, Auschwitz should, it seems, remain in isolation. In other words, we recommend that it should stand alone among cultural properties as bearing witness to the depth of horror and of suffering, and the height of heroism, and that all other sites of the same nature be symbolised through it.

In any case, we would favour an extremely selective approach towards places like "famous battlefields", where there are no architectural features of note within the area in question. We must also consider the suitability of certain "places" without architectural merit, which were the scene of a positive historical event, such as a great scientific discovery, or a legendary or fabulous event.

Note 12 - U.S.A. - Edison National Historic Site

Note 13 - Cyprus - Paphos: Birthplace of Aphrodite

The nomination of the Edison Site gives the Committee an opportunity to examine the principle of including in the List sites associated with great scholars, artists, writers or statesmen - the "Great Men" of history.

Many great men - especially great conquerors - have left their mark on a series of different places.

We should, I think, avoid letting the List become a sort of competitive Honours Board for the famous men of different countries.

The letter of the Convention does not rule out such a possibility, but it is a question of basic expediency that the List, before it can be considered as exhaustive, must concentrate not so much on the endless places which have been the theatre of the passing glories of men (artists and others alike), as on the great works which they have created.

The same remark is applicable to legendary places: the nomination of Paphos is more strongly grounded in the archaeology and physical make-up of the site than in the legend which is associated with it.

CONCLUSIONS

We have tried by taking our examples from nominations already received to cover the whole range of possible nominations, and, if not to draw conclusions which would go beyond our charge, at least to suggest some guidelines for the work of the Bureau and the Committee.

We can recapitulate as follows:

1) The text of the Convention is sovereign. It steers us towards a classification or typology of nominations, and even if many properties fall into several categories, we can say that every nomination should refer to at least one precise category within it.

To help in sorting out the nominations, for the NGOs and for the Committee, States Party should be asked to state without ambiguity in which category they themselves place each nomination.

To enable this to be done strictly enough, the Committee should previously define, as we have attempted to do, the classification which can be inferred from the Convention (without reference to any other text than the Convention).

2) We have pointed to one or two ambiguities in the translation or, conceivably, in the drafting of this text. Reference can be made to the report and accompanying notes on the drafting meeting which brought together about 40 specialists for nearly a month in 1972.

So far as "sites" are concerned, one is inclined to adopt the widest interpretation, which does not exclude "areas" devoid of architecture which are of outstanding interest from the historical, artistic or scientific points of view. As for "combinations of features", we should oblige ourselves to assign a relatively precise meaning to these words, which they do not, literally, possess.

3) This argument may lead us to a rather broad classification: we should be all the more restrictive in limiting its applicability.

Analysis of the Convention does in some ways enable us to distinguish what is essential and what is marginal in the very notion of a universal cultural heritage.

This is where the criteria of outstanding universal value, adopted by the Committee at the suggestion of the NGOs, are relevant.

We have underlined the inevitable ambiguity of a notion like rarity. It would seem that it should be interpreted generally, bearing in mind the fundamental purposes of the WHList:

- a) to publish a list of properties of worldwide importance, and to give this list the widest publicity for the sake of the Heritage, and
- b) to create, through the existence of the Fund, a movement of international solidarity in support of these properties.

These objectives point towards an emphasis on concrete properties: "monuments", "groups of buildings", "sites", whose historical importance depends on tangible features of self-evident quality.

By all means, the concept of listing, so to speak, an "idea" which haunts a historic place is also consistent with the letter of the Convention, but in the case of "concrete" properties, rarity is compatible with diversity (whence the inevitably large number of monuments and historic towns on the List), while, on the contrary, sites representing the positive and negative sides of human history will only be invested with real force if we make the most remarkable into unique symbols, each one standing for the whole series of similar events.

On this principle, Auschwitz would be placed on the List, but would not be a precedent for a whole series of similar sites, whereas monuments or historic towns will inevitably form whole "families". We should also be reluctant to include whole series of famous battlefields or birth places, etc., of great men.

In our opinion, only when the List has achieved a degree of consistency, and can claim to be representative of "concrete" cultural property, will it be possible to reconsider this principle, which is, after all, more a matter of expediency than of statutory interpretation of the Convention.

4) The problem is, therefore, while respecting the sovereign authority of States over their own nomination policy and their own order of priorities, to set up a system whereby they shall be encouraged to give the Committee the opportunity of drawing up a list which will, at any given moment, include the most obviously important properties and whose internal consistency will emerge progressively.

Since the number of nominations and of nominating States is still quite small, that moment has not yet arrived, but it is the Committee's duty to steer States Party in this direction.

To get there, the form and the method of the ICOMOS review must be modified. These changes take us back to the need to clarify from the outset the overall typology of the Convention, in the nomination files themselves.

A convenient method for doing this may be outlined:

a) We feel that it would be useful to work out a clear typology or classification of the nominations pending, revising as necessary the proposals made in this Report, and specifying those properties which belong to more than one category.

b) Communicate this typology to States Party and ask ONGs to check that reference has been made to it in future nominations.

In the same way, each file would make express reference to the criteria (rarity, etc.) in order to qualify for consideration by the NGO and the Committee.

c) Wherever there is a multiple typological reference (i.e., a property belongs simultaneously to several categories), the State would be requested to express this ambivalence in the title of the property itself.

d) Thus, the Committee would be able to publish lists by category, and if the State desired it (or the nature of the property imposed it), the property in question could figure wholly in one category (e.g., historic town) and partially in another (e.g., the cathedral of the same town).

In this way a coherent publication policy for the World Heritage List could be built up.

e) The job of the experts commissioned by the NGO to review the file and give an opinion on its comparative merits would be made easier. The experts would be able to compare like with like.

f) In the case of a particularly wealthy area, inevitably involving complex issues, and which may seem to be divided up in an arbitrary fashion (e.g. Rome or Paris), the State nominating one part of this complex entity might be invited to make a provisional division enabling further nominations to be staggered over a period of time, in accordance with an order of urgency over which the State would retain full control.

Thus, the Committee could improve its own policy for coordinating the parallel series of which the Lists would be composed, benefiting from the States' labours, without trespassing on their prerogatives, in the context of genuine forward planning.

g) So long as there were only seven cultural properties on the List, and those due to the enthusiasm of this or that administration, one could only assess the intrinsic merits of each nomination. But this could only be an empirical prelude.

With more than 100 nominations, the public, to which the List will be addressed, cannot fail to wonder about:

- the relative importance of the properties
- their typology
- their autonomy or overlapping in geographical terms.

This is the moment to fix a method for judging what territorial divisions and typological juxtapositions are allowable.

If the opportunity is not taken today, we shall find we no longer have it when there are thousands of nominations.

h) This report, whose length is due to the analysis of an empirical situation, leaves room for discussion of certain fundamental choices and for rejection of certain options. Its purpose was to identify the dilemmas which face us today - today, while the weight of precedent is not too heavy to be overturned, forcing us into irremediable anomalies.

Naturally, this methodology must be coordinated with the adoption of new procedures for consulting the NGOs. We have been concerned above all with the first part of the process, as the State Party draws up its nominations, and with the last, as the property is placed by the Committee on the World Heritage List.

Michel PARENT