

# Study on the Recognition and Interpretation of the World Heritage Criterion (ii) “an important interchange of human values”

Semina An | [ssam2na@gmail.com](mailto:ssam2na@gmail.com)

Institute of industrial archaeology and history of science and technology (IWTG)

TU Bergakademie Freiberg, Germany

## Abstract

Criterion (ii) of the 10 World Heritage Criteria describes heritage as the result of "interchange" between different cultures. The definition of criterion (ii) was modified from "influence" to "interchange" by the 1996 Operational Guidelines. It is understandable that the view of World Heritage on cultural heritage has also changed from "one direction" cultural impact to "cultural interaction". Half a century after the adoption of the World Heritage Convention, it is necessary to review whether this criterion is properly applied to cultural heritage.

But, for a considerable number of listed sites, there is a gap in the recognition and interpretation of the value of criterion (ii) and the site. This paper recognizes the basic notion of "exchange of human values", which has not been studied before and uses the evolutionary chronology of criterion (ii) to interpret the intent of the change. The interpretation identifies the problem and discusses future considerations for criterion (ii).

## Keywords

The World Heritage Convention, Criterion (ii), Influence, Interchange of Human Values, World Fortified Heritages.

## 1. Introduction

This year marks the half-century since the adoption of the World Heritage Convention in 1972, and it is time to review the traces of the past and prepare for the next 50 years. In particular, it is necessary to verify that the World Heritage criteria, which are a standard grid for describing the OUV of a property, have been properly stated on the site.<sup>1,2</sup>

The criteria of the property are specified by the State Party in the nomination dossier and evaluated by the World Heritage Advisory Bodies, ICOMOS or IUCN, and the World Heritage Committee adopts the final decision on the OUV of the property based on the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies. Understanding and defining the criteria for the listing is critical, as it not only has a significant impact on the nomination but is also directly related to the direction of the heritage conservation and management plan.

Another important reason for the study of the criteria is the fact that the definition of the criterion has been modified on the basis of the experience accumulated in the last 50 years, for example, in living beings. Thus, due

Version	Definition
ICOMOS report (1976)	<i>Properties of <b>outstanding importance for the influence they have exercised</b> over the development of world architecture or of human settlements (either over a period of time or within a geographical area)</i>
The 1st session of the Committee, working documents (1977)	<i>the property <b>should be of outstanding importance owing to its influence</b>, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on subsequent developments in architecture, <b>monumental sculpture, gardens and landscape design, related arts</b>, or human settlements; for example, the Pantheon in Rome, a group such as the Plaza of Puebla in Mexico, or a site such as the <b>château and gardens at Vaux-le-Vicomte</b></i>
Operational Guidelines, draft (1977)	<i>Have exerted <b>considerable influence</b>, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on subsequent developments in architecture, monumental sculpture, garden and landscape design, related arts, or human settlements</i>
Operational Guidelines (1978)	<i>Have exerted considerable influence, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, <b>on developments</b> in architecture, monumental sculpture, garden and landscape design, related arts, <b>town planning</b> or human settlements</i>
Operational Guidelines, adopted (1980~1992)	<i>Have exerted <b>great influence</b>, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture, monumental arts, or town planning and landscaping</i>
Operational Guidelines (1994)	<i>Have exerted great influence, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture, monumental arts, or town planning and landscape design</i>
Operational Guidelines (1996 ~)	<i>Exhibit an <b>important interchange of human values</b>, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town planning or landscape design</i>

Table 1. Chronology of Criterion (ii) (web reference: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/>, Accessed 01 June 2021)

to insufficient study and understanding of the revised criteria, errors have often been made in explaining the inherent value of heritage through the criteria.

Among the ten criteria, especially criterion (ii) has been changed its main notion radically. The present definition of criterion (ii) has been modified a total of five times in the operational guidelines. (See Table. 1)<sup>3</sup> The significant difference in the definition is that “influence” was changed to “interchange” in 1996 when it was last revised for criterion (ii). The “interchange of human values” in criterion(ii) is the only reciprocal value resulting from the interactions and multidimensional dialogue between countries, regions or cultural clusters. In other words, heritage that meets criterion (ii) must be considered in the transnational dimension, not only in the field but in integrating relations with other cultures and countries relating the interchange value in terms of sustainable development and resilience.

## 2. Evolution of criterion (ii)

### 2-1. ICOMOS report on World Heritage Criteria (1976)

What was the reason and trigger for changing the description of criterion (ii)? The starting point for the establishment of criterion (ii) is the “UNESCO informal consultation of intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations in the implementation of the Convention” in Morges in May 1976.<sup>4</sup> At this meeting, ICOMOS proposed the first draft of criteria (i) ~ (vi), and criterion (ii) was stressed “influence over the development”. The report also provides some examples of potential properties relating each criterion to understand the criteria. As indicated by ICOMOS' descriptions and examples, the significance of criterion (ii) must be a heritage that impact other cultures. (See Table. 1)

## 2-2. Changes to Operational Guidelines until 1994

Since the first adoption of criterion (ii), which reflected the ICOMOS proposal, the basic idea of the criterion as "influence" remained until the 1994 Operational Guidelines.<sup>5</sup> Criteria, as with the evolution of living organisms, have been revised several times by discussions among the Committee members, experts, and advisory bodies.

Compared to the ICOMOS report, the sentence structure of criterion (ii) in the Operational Guidelines (1977) was largely changed, and the objects of sites are refined in the guidelines and were added "monumental sculpture, garden and landscape design, related arts". According to the final report of the 1<sup>st</sup> session of the Committee, it was decided to delete examples that could affect the criterion to evaluate cultural properties as they could cause prejudice on the site.<sup>6</sup> Through this process, it can understand the attempts of the Committee to maintain equality and fairness in the evaluation of sites.

In the 1978 Operational Guidelines, the term "subsequent" was omitted and kept consistently concise in this sense. The term "town-planning" was added to the objects that can be assessed under criterion (ii).<sup>7</sup>

However, the definition of criteria remained difficult, as the wording of the Convention itself was occasionally imprecise. Therefore, the Bureau of the Committee asked Mr. M. Parent to confirm a detailed criteria study to define a property.<sup>8</sup> One of in his paper, he pointed out that criteria (ii), (iv) and (v) needed the comparative assessment,<sup>9</sup> and the results of his study were then reflected in a revised version of the 1980 Operational Guidelines.<sup>10</sup> The definition of criterion (ii) in the Guidelines was slightly modified. Compared to the 1979 definition, the wording "considerable influence" was changed to "great influence". The category of the property to be evaluated was modified to "architecture, monumental arts, or town-planning and landscaping". The phrase "monumental sculpture ... related arts" was merged into "monumental arts", broadening the meaning of the spectrum. The phrase "garden and landscape design" also merged into "landscaping" but was changed back to "landscape design" in the Guidelines (1994). The defined description was maintained until 1994.

## 2-3. World Heritage Expert Meeting on Global Strategy, Paris (1994)

The year 1994 can be recognized as a turning point about criterion (ii), as the framework for World Heritage was changed by the Expert Meeting on Global Strategy, the Nara Documents, and the Expert Meeting on Heritage Canals in Canada. The Committee launched the Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List. Its aim is to ensure that the List reflects the world's cultural and natural diversity of OUV.<sup>11</sup>

The work group of the Global Strategy recommended the revision of criteria for cultural heritage.<sup>12</sup> About Criterion (ii) had comment as "Re-examine this criterion so as to reflect better the interaction of cultures, instead of the present formulation, which suggests that cultural influences occur in one direction only". In the regards of this comment, "the Delegate of Thailand stressed the importance of the proposed modification to criterion (ii) which, in its present form, only takes into account cultural influences which occurred in one direction only, between the different continents. This re-examination should be carried out in-depth in order to avoid all notion of any cultural domination: efforts must be made to achieve diversity of the manifestations of different cultures in their interaction with their environment".<sup>13</sup> Right after his comment, the Delegate of China mentioned as "to

continue according to attention in the future to the diversity of cultures so as to achieve a fully representative List". At the 18th session of the Committee, the criterion was finally redefined as it is today, referring to the work group's recommendations for modification.<sup>14</sup>

### **3. Analysis of the final definition of criterion (ii): an important interchange of human values**

The definition of criterion (ii) in the Operational Guidelines in 1996 was reflected by the comprehensive results of the previous expert meetings and the Committee. To analysis the justification of the criterion, first, the Cambridge dictionary definition of "interchange" states that it is an exchange between different people, especially intangible things, ideas, and information. As the revision from "Influence" to "Interchange", the flow of culture is also multiple direction.

*Human values* generally refer to the values that are at the core of being human and are considered fundamental, inherent values of human beings, including truth, honesty, loyalty, love, peace, and so on. This term is usually used in the Constitution or professional ethics. However, the term used for criterion (ii) stands for "ideas" according to the presentation material produced by Ms. Susan Denyer at the international world heritage expert meeting on criterion (vi) in Warsaw, Poland in 2012. But the meaning of human values needs to identify more. Lastly, the objective category was expanded from only "architecture or human settlements" to "monumental art or landscape design", after the discussion of the historic canal in Canada (1994), the term "technology" is also added and recognized as a value of interchange. The spectrum of value was broader than before. Currently, the definition of criterion (ii), as amended in 1996, is retained as the latest version.

### **4. Problems the recognition and interpretation of criterion (ii)**

It has always been a challenge to determine the value of heritage at different sites. As a result, there are potential errors in the interpretation of the State Party's inscription criteria, and the value of the cultural heritage may not be properly recognized. In fact, some sites that were in transition to changing the definition of criterion (ii) provided confusing explanations about the meaning of the criterion.

For instance, Historic Fortified City of *Carcassonne* was inscribed on the list with criteria (ii) and (iv) in 1997. The description of this site's criterion (ii) "... It is of exceptional importance by virtue of the restoration work carried out in the second half of the 19th century by Viollet-le-Duc, which had a profound influence on subsequent developments in conservation principles and practice." Although the main notion of criterion (ii) at the time was an interchange value, it is still described as an influence. If its inherent value is not properly understood, this can also lead to mistakes in maintaining the value of the property in the future.

### **5. Conclusion and plan of this research**

The evolution of the criteria over the 50-year history of the Convention is the result of changing perceptions of World Heritage over that time. This year is the appropriate time that we look to the last half century for the future of World Heritage.

There is a saying that the process and the results are good only when the first button is well tightened. If the expression of the OUV of the property are inconsistent with the criteria, there will be a misalignment in the

overall process of the World Heritage Site between the application, the evaluation, the listing and the conservation management, which will seriously affect the sustainability and resilience of the World Heritage Sites.

Criterion (ii) has not been studied till now, so in many cases, the "interchange of human values" has been confused with the concept of "influence" before the amendment. This means that when we need to discuss sustainable development and resilience, an unstable cornerstone has been laid. At this point, we need to examine the criteria.<sup>15</sup>

The development of this study will analyze criterion (ii) based on case studies that have been inscribed as World Heritage. It may also be an interesting experiment to see if the criteria for inscription can be re-evaluated with the revised criterion (ii), "interchange of human values", among properties inscribed before the 1996 revision. The best examples of this possibility study are the *Galle* Fortress in Sri Lanka, inscribed with criterion (iv) in 1988, and the Imperial City of *Huế* in Vietnam, inscribed with criterion (iv) in 1993. In addition, ICOMOS annual reports on "World Heritage Evaluations" are used in this research, especially when the ICOMOS recommendation is "not to inscribe" or "deferred" and the file was subsequently withdrawn by the States Parties. The analysis of these cases, whose evaluations are not published on the World Heritage Centre website, helps for the depth study of criterion (ii) in the form of a multi-layered analysis.

This work is important not only for the study of World Heritage criterion (ii) but also to complete the identification of World Heritage and to ensure a truly representative World Heritage List and thus its credibility for the next 50 years. And also I would like to ask the question for next step: "do we need to complete criterion (ii) today to be consistent with its actual use?"

<sup>1</sup> Para. 5 of Article 11 in the World Heritage Convention states that ‘the Committee shall define the criteria on the basis of which a property belonging to the cultural or natural heritage may be included in either of the lists mentioned in paragraphs 2 and 3 of this article.’

<sup>2</sup> Decision CONF 001 VI.A(a).18 ([whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/2038/](http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/2038/), Accessed to 26 August 2022)

<sup>3</sup> UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE CENTER, *The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, 1977 ~2019*.

<sup>4</sup> The UNESCO informal consultation held with ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN, and UNESCO Secretariat on the implementation of the Convention. They discussed three aspects: Criteria for the inclusion of property in the World Heritage List; Format and content of documentation to be requested from States; and Criteria for the determination of an order of priorities for awarding international assistance.

ICOMOS, *Proposals made by the International Council on Monuments and Sites, in UNESCO, Informal consultation of intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations in the implementation of the Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage*, Morges, 19-20 May 1976. (CC-76/WS/25. annex III)

UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE CENTER, *Final report on the informal consultation of intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations on the implementation of the convention concerning the protection of world cultural and natural heritage, 1976*.

<sup>5</sup> JOKILEHTO JUKKA, *The World Heritage List. What is OUV? Defining the Outstanding Universal Value of Cultural World Heritage Properties*, Berlin, hendrik Bäßler, 2008.

<sup>6</sup> UNESCO, *final report*, In “Intergovernmental Committee for the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage”. Paris. 17 October 1977, Para. 29. (CC-77/CONF.001/9)

<sup>7</sup> The ‘Medina of Fez’ in Morocco was inscribed on the List in 1981 with criteria (ii) and (v). The heritage is described its criterion (ii) as being influenced by the city of eastern Mediterranean on town-planning development. It was the first inscription by recognizing the value of town-planning has been written in the criterion.

WHL, Medina of Fez (<https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/170>, Accessed 09 July 2021)

<sup>8</sup> UNESCO, *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. Third Session of the World Heritage Committee*. Paris. October 1979. Para. 3 (CC-79/CONF.003/11)

<sup>9</sup> MICHEL PARENT, *Comparative Study of Nomination and Criteria for World Cultural Heritage. Paris. September 1979*. (CC-79/CONF.003/11 ANNEX)

<sup>10</sup> UNESCO, *Operational Guidelines*. Paris. October 1980. WHC/2 Revised. Para. 19.

<sup>11</sup> Official definition of “Global Strategy” on the website of World Heritage Centre ([whc.unesco.org/en/globalstrategy](http://whc.unesco.org/en/globalstrategy), Accessed 09 July 2021)

<sup>12</sup> UNESCO, *Expert Meeting on the “Global Strategy” and thematic studies for a representative World Heritage List* (UNESCO Headquarters, 20-22 June 1994), In “the 18th session of Bureau of the World Heritage Committee”. UNESCO Headquarters, Paris. 28 June 1994. WHC-94/CONF.001/INF.4

<sup>13</sup> “XII. Global Strategy for a Representative World Heritage List.”

UNESCO: *Report of the Rapporteur*. In “18th session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee” (UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 4-9 July 1994). 19 August 1994. (WHC-94/CONF.001/10, 19)

<sup>14</sup> UNESCO, *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, World Heritage Committee, Eighteenth session*, Phuket, Thailand, 12-17 December 1994, Report (WHC-94/CONF.003/16, 31 January 1995)

<sup>15</sup> Criterion (vi) had been studied:

JUDITH HERMANN, *Tracing change in World Cultural Heritage: the recognition of intangible heritage*. Ph.D. Thesis, Faculté de l’aménagement, Université de Montréal, 2015. Available at : <https://papyrus.bib.umontreal.ca/xmlui/handle/1866/14112>

CHRISTINA CAMERON; JUDITH HERMANN, *Guidance and capacity building for the recognition of associative values using world heritage criterion (vi): Final Report*. World Heritage Centre Paris, 2018 (Document-327-20)