

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE PROGRAM,
TOURISM, AND LIVING COMMUNITIES

by

Kathleen DesOrmeaux, B.A.

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Council of
Texas State University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
with a Major in History
December 2017

Committee Members:

Lynn Denton, Chair

Nancy Berlage

Ronald Johnson

COPYRIGHT

by

Kathleen DesOrmeaux

2017

FAIR USE AND AUTHOR'S PERMISSION STATEMENT

Fair Use

This work is protected by the Copyright Laws of the United States (Public Law 94-553, section 107). Consistent with fair use as defined in the Copyright Laws, brief quotations from this material are allowed with proper acknowledgement. Use of this material for financial gain without the author's express written permission is not allowed.

Duplication Permission

As the copyright holder of this work I, Kathleen DesOrmeaux, refuse permission to copy in excess of the "Fair Use" exemption without my written permission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my advisor and committee chair, Dr. Lynn Denton. Thank you for your patience, guidance, and mentorship throughout the thesis process and my graduate education. Your support and encouragement to conduct field research in Italy and England was instrumental to the writing of this thesis. Your flexibility, even working long distance at times, to coach me and encourage me to think creatively when analyzing the three case study sites is greatly appreciated.

I would like to thank Dr. Nancy Berlage and Dr. Ronald Johnson for agreeing to sit on my committee. Dr. Berlage: Thank you for your encouragement with this topic, the suggestions on how to further expand on this work in the future, and for the constructive comments to improve my prose. Dr. Johnson: Thank you for asking tough questions that broaden my thinking when approaching heritage and history. Our discussions about my thesis and our independent study helped me better understand the political context in which UNESCO formed and some of the reasons for shifts in foreign policy as the convention was crafted. Your coaching to me as a student and as an Instructional Assistant regarding the importance of historiographical writing and methodologies in how to more effectively approach analytical arguments assisted a great deal in structuring this work.

The field work and a portion of the primary source collection for this thesis would not have been possible without the assistance of Dr. Bridget Drinka, who approved my request to accompany the 2016 UTSA Fall Study Abroad History cohort to Italy and the

willingness of Dr. Kolleen Guy to supervise my research abroad while modifying her two courses to accommodate a graduate student.

I am forever grateful to my husband Glenn, my son D'Artagnan, and my parents Barb and Raul for their love, support, and encouragement throughout my studies. To Glenn and D'Artagnan in particular: Thank you for your understanding of me spending long hours researching, traveling, and writing to complete this thesis. I know there were some extended days of what D'Artagnan would call "Raven like behavior" with the amount of time I spent in the office.

Last, but not least I would like to thank my brilliant professors and colleagues at Texas State, UTSA, and in the heritage field along with my friends who assisted in a variety of ways throughout the thesis process. While I don't have room to name everyone, I would like to give the following individuals some special recognition: Dr. Fritz Hanselmann, Dr. Kenneth Margerison, Dr. Rhonda Gonzalez, Professor Susan Rosenberg, Heather Haley, Malak Carrillo, Rachael Lunsford, Katie Hedger, Mary Elise Grassmuck, Jennifer Ruch, Colleen Swain, Dorian Sanchez, Randi Gilmore, Kimi Diedrich, Alex Lundien, Jessica Scodro, and Mitchell Phelps. And a very special grazie mille to Marco Romagnoli, who encouraged me to just keep writing and helped me navigate the Italian heritage management and tourism sectors to find points of contact along with key data information needed to complete my thesis. *Ti sarò per sempre grato Marco!*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. TOURISM AND UNESCO	10
History of UNESCO and the World Heritage Convention	15
3. UNESCO PROCESSES, MONITORING, AND REPORTING	28
The Nomination and Inscription Process	28
Reporting and Reactive Monitoring	29
4. UNESCO HISTORIC CENTERS – PROTECTED LIVING ENTITIES	36
Potential Changes in Class-ism	38
Place, Memory, and Authenticity	41
UNESCO Recommendations to Mitigate Value Clashes.....	47
5. BATH: SHORT-TERM FRUSTRATION, LONG-TERM SUCCESS	51
Affordable Housing and Resident Oriented Development.....	57
Traffic Management and Vehicular Risks to the Historic Environment...	63
Intangible Heritage and Local Identity	66
World Heritage Branding and Awareness	71
Success From Compromise and Conservation	72
6. SAN GIMIGNANO: A TALE OF DISPLACEMENT	74
Displacement of Residents and Loss of Non-staged Local Identity.....	78
Cultural Values Clash Created by Tourism.....	84
Charming Town Transitions to Outdoor Museum	87
Intangible Heritage and Agriturismo	89

7. URBINO: PLANNING A RENISSANCE IN HERITAGE TOURISM	94
History	95
Tourism Trends	100
The Merging of Academia and Tourism	104
8. CONCLUSION	109
APPENDIX SECTION	114
REFERENCES	149

1. INTRODUCTION

In July 2012, I received a phone call notifying me that I won a trip of a lifetime to the London Olympic Games. A few short weeks later, my mother and I boarded a trans-Atlantic flight bound for England. Not only did we enjoy watching the Olympic fencing events, we also explored the famous historical sites of London, South End on Sea, and Windsor. At Tower Hill, I noticed several signs displaying a diamond on a stick with the words “World Heritage Site” written underneath. While touring Westminster Abbey, these signs appeared once again. I knew there must be something important about the emblem for multiple locations to display it. Lost in the thrill of winning a trip to the Olympics and immersing myself in England’s rich history, the title “World Heritage Site” quickly drifted into distant memory.

That unexpected windfall of a trip forever altered the course of my professional life. I resigned my leadership position in the financial services industry to study history. A few short months after resigning, I found myself sitting in an Italian university classroom discussing the globally recognized World Heritage designation and the awarding organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), during one of the first lectures of the semester. Little did I know our class discussions on history, heritage, that odd shaped flower looking emblem, and UNESCO would send me on a journey of historical study at the undergraduate and graduate levels culminating in this thesis. My interest in historically significant site-based travel led to researching the World Heritage Program, UNESCO, and various forms that cultural tourism takes.

While I recognized the World Heritage Designation posted at various sites in

England, I did not understand exactly what the “World Heritage Site” designation meant. I merely knew it related to a United Nations agency and was a sign of prestige. Many people I speak with about my thesis or encounter on my travels find themselves in the same place of not comprehending the significance of a site being able to display the World Heritage Designation. The curious individuals usually ask, “What is a World Heritage Site?” and “Why is it important?” A World Heritage Site is a location deemed to hold a place of heightened esteem amongst historical locales around the globe according to UNESCO’s selection criteria. Once a site has cleared an arduous application process, inspections by experts, and a review by the World Heritage Committee, it is awarded the revered designation of World Heritage Site and inscribed on an exclusive list of other globally significant places known as the World Heritage List. The World Heritage List of physical locations is only one aspect of heritage that falls under global protection and the heritage purview of UNESCO’s broader reaching World Heritage Program.¹

The UNESCO World Heritage Program and heritage tourism share a long-standing, inseparable relationship that distinctly shapes and influences community identity, sense of place, and socioeconomic development for inscribed urban historic centers. The governing document for the World Heritage List, the Convention Concerning the Protection of The World Culture and Natural Heritage, and UNESCO’s Operational Guidelines apply strict parameters designed to preserve and protect sites for future generations by curbing developmental threats and placing certain preservation requirements on any site inscribed on the World Heritage List. Violating these guidelines can lead to international pressure and removal of the World Heritage Designation. Even

¹ UNESCO’s World Heritage Program actually consists of multiple sub-themed heritage areas. This thesis focuses primarily on the themes of historic cities, sustainable tourism, and general protections for tangible and intangible heritage.

with the spirit of conservation and protection embodied in the World Heritage Convention governing the program, the document creators remained cognizant that the program may in fact be destructive to the sense of place at a qualifying site by changing the socioeconomic conditions within the city in a detrimental fashion. Yet, the convention drafters hoped to spur tourism for economic benefit. The nation or community in which a site is located could then use those funds to support preservation initiatives and improve the quality of life for those residing around World Heritage Sites. The World Heritage Designation is indeed a beacon to tour companies and travelers signaling that a specific location holds some outstanding and special attribute.

However, tourism is in many respects in direct conflict with the effort to preserve a location for posterity. Tourists consume the sense of place through visiting historical locations and purchasing local wares. As tourism numbers grow, greater infrastructure such as roads, hotels, and other services are needed to support that growth. Tourist perceptions of locations along with the designation can work to freeze a location in time. In worst-case scenarios, World Heritage Historic Centers become almost amusement park-like places that are deserted after the main business hours. Venice is very much a ghost town once the cruise ship passengers and day-trippers leave around dinner hour. In these troubled historic centers, goods sold in stores reflect tourist souvenir desires or imitations of products associated with a place instead of actual high quality local products. These worst-case scenarios dominate headlines and highlight the downsides to being a community that is attractive to tourists and inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Fortunately, there are listed historic centers that manage to balance the needs of residents, protect the physical heritage detailed in their UNESCO file along with the

intangible elements that are frequently sacrificed elsewhere, and provide for the wants of the tourist market. They remain active places of innovation, tradition, and offer an authentic experience of community. These more successfully managed sites can provide ideas and best practices to heritage managers struggling with high tourism volumes and the UNESCO preservation requirements. Newly inscribed sites and locations wanting to attract tourism can also learn from their floundering peers featured in the media limelight.

Due to the extremes seen within locations inscribed on the World Heritage List and the increasing role tourism plays in the global environment, the relationship between tourism and heritage preservation is a heavily debated topic within the academic and practitioner communities. By taking on this controversial topic for my thesis, I hoped to answer several key questions as I analyzed documents, attended conferences focused on preserving living and tangible heritage, researched heritage tourism, and conducted site inspections to better understand why some communities seemed to thrive as World Heritage Historic Center Sites and others in many respects imploded. The key questions I continually asked myself were: How did the UNESCO program come about, how does it function, and does it deliver on its purpose? What is the actual historic relationship between UNESCO, tourism, and preservation? Why do cities and nations submit themselves to the World Heritage Committee to become UNESCO World Heritage Sites? How do world heritage tourism and the UNESCO designation impact living communities labeled as historic centers? How have some small to mid-sized communities effectively balanced their designation status with the needs of residents while others struggle to do so? What lessons can be learned to improve heritage planning for future heritage site managers and to improve conditions for those sites struggling under the pressures of

increased tourism?

One thing stood out as I read text after text and article after article on UNESCO's World Heritage Program and world heritage tourism: historians and public historians rarely authored those works. Cultural anthropologists, sociologists, heritage studies professionals, urban planners, architects, and tourism managers with MBAs predominantly compose the literature addressing the role of tourism in the UNESCO World Heritage Program and the field overall. The historian is notably absent from the discussion. That absence seemed particularly strange to me. World Heritage and World Heritage tourism naturally lend themselves to historical study. For a site to be considered for inclusion on the World Heritage List, it must be a location that offers 'outstanding universal value' to the international community. In order to determine if a location meets the criteria of 'outstanding universal value,' thorough research must be conducted into the physical and nonphysical aspects of a site over time, the surrounding landscape, and the outlying community by an interdisciplinary team of experts. Though virtually absent in the literature surrounding world heritage tourism, historians can be found on research teams composing the written portion of a proposed location's World Heritage application.

This thesis seeks to add the missing voice of the public historian to the body of academic literature on world heritage tourism. It provides a historical lens to study the evolution of UNESCO's World Heritage Program. This work first outlines the historical foundation of the UNESCO World Heritage Program and global travel then further delves into the life cycle a city undergoes as a World Heritage Site and how that cyclical process in turn impacts heritage management strategies over time and the public understanding of the history of that particular place. My research draws upon the fields of

public history, political history, tourism studies, anthropology, sociology, and heritage studies. Additionally, it explores the affects of memory, identity, nostalgia, authenticity, and shared authority in place making.

This thesis proposes that the UNESCO World Heritage Program arose out of a need for both economic development and preservation of historically significant locations. It challenges previously drafted literature that argues conservation was the primary reason for the convention or downplays the importance of tourism and economics in the rise of protecting global cultural assets. Tourism played a major role in the development of UNESCO's heritage conventions and continues to do so in contradiction to the claims that the convention arose strictly from a desire to protect culturally important sites. The first chapter provides a history and overview of global tourism and expands upon the niche form of travel that experts call cultural or heritage tourism. Additionally, the chapter covers the simultaneous boom in travel and the development of UNESCO after World War II. It ends with an analysis of UNESCO documents and travel growth in the later decades of the twentieth century when a professional shift occurred from viewing tourism solely as a positive source of economic development to a destructive economic tool if not carefully managed. As heritage tourism and the UNESCO World Heritage Program entered the twenty-first century, UNESCO became alarmed at the effects of global travel and changed its tourism related focus to a theme of sustainable tourism instead of the earlier stance of utilizing open ended tourism for heritage preservation and economic development of communities housing World Heritage Sites.

In general, UNESCO designated historic centers present a much more complex

set of challenges to tourism and site management than a stand-alone site location. The second chapter highlights those differences and the causes of them. It introduces the various stakeholders that play an important part in the heritage management process. It also explores the interplay among placemaking, identity, authenticity, nostalgia and memory in the context of a living entity like a historical center. This chapter provides insight into how differences of perception, interpretation of place, and use of historic space can cause friction between residents and tourists.

A final component this thesis argues is the associated tourism driven by the World Heritage designation combined with the program requirements can alter local identity along with providing positive and negative aspects of economic development. The third, fourth, and fifth chapters of this thesis consist of three case studies of small to mid-sized World Heritage Historic Center communities in Italy and England. The case studies further identify successful components of heritage management and areas of opportunity within heritage management plans. They provide actual examples of the impacts directly linked to the UNESCO designation and world heritage tourism on communities. To craft the case studies, I analyzed heritage management plans, governing and inspection documents from the UNESCO Archives, and local tourism development policies. News articles, blog posts, informal discussions with residents and tour guides, and first hand observation served as evidentiary sources to obtain resident and visitor perspectives.

The three historic centers selected for case studies are Bath in England, San Gimignano and Urbino in Italy. I selected these three cities based on their size, equivalent designation as a historic center, and enough longevity on the inscription list to demonstrate how the designation influences marketed and managed-inscribed

communities. Sites within the United Kingdom and Italy are excellent locations for case studies in established tourism destinations. They have well-rounded heritage management plans and regulations in addition to long standing with the UNESCO organization. Italy is the country leader in inscribed sites on the World Heritage List. The fifty-one Italian sites to date have not been placed on the endangered or watch lists for development conflicts, designation violations, or other infractions warranting UNESCO scrutiny. At initial glance, Italy appears to be an UNESCO success story. In contrast, the United Kingdom with a total of thirty World Heritage Sites has multiple sites that regularly end up on the watch or endangered list throughout their relationship with the World Heritage Committee. Edinburgh, Bath, and Liverpool regularly tangle with UNESCO over development and tourism.²

As with all surface level perceptions, reality may paint a drastically different picture of what success looks like and how it is achieved. Tension between UNESCO, tourism, and local communities can serve as a catalyst to positive transformation over the long term. It can also bring about important changes in approaching preservation and the historical environment that falls under the purview of the UNESCO program. A lack of friction between UNESCO and communities paired with no change in World Heritage Status to Endangered Status may hide festering problems and poor management strategies as frequently as it can imply that proactive management and preservation strategies are in place. Moreover, it can hide stagnation or an out of touch, elitist approach to management strategies within the World Heritage Program. Historical study

² UNESCO World Heritage Centre, “United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,” UNESCO World Heritage Centre, accessed March 27, 2017, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/statesparties/gb/>; UNESCO World Heritage Centre, “Italy - UNESCO World Heritage Centre,” UNESCO, accessed March 27, 2017, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/statesparties/it>. As of the writing of this thesis, Liverpool is listed on the endangered list.

of the UNESCO World Heritage Program and individual sites offers a well-rounded and accurate picture of how effectively the UNESCO convention is functioning. It provides important information enabling heritage managers and cultural diplomats to adapt policies to better address the changing needs of inscribed locations while simultaneously fulfilling the Program goal of preserving heritage for all of mankind.

2. TOURISM AND UNESCO

Since Antiquity, humans traveled the known world for a variety of reasons. Romans traveled for leisure, conquest, and knowledge. Throughout the Middle Ages and Renaissance, the faithful embarked on religious pilgrimages, artists and musicians traveled from country to country to enhance their skillset under the patronage of wealthy sponsors, and the aristocracy traveled for both personal and political reasons. Traveling for knowledge and cultural experiences continued to grow from the seventeenth through the nineteenth century as elites, primarily young men, went on Grand Tours. Grand Tours were a form of travel intended to develop one's knowledge of the Classical and Renaissance Worlds in the Mediterranean region. Beginning in the late nineteenth century, modernity produced more efficient and cost effective means of transportation. The increased disposable income of the growing middle class and working class enabled others outside the elite ranks to see the world and enjoy all of its many wonders.³

Heightened consumer interest during the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries for visiting locations of what UNESCO later called "outstanding universal value" produced a new subfield of global travel known as world heritage tourism.⁴ World heritage tourism differs from other forms of tourism in that it maintains a fundamental belief that heritage sites belong to all of humanity, not solely the nation or locale where the artifact is located. World heritage stresses experiencing the history of mankind through a concept of "unity in diversity:" the principle of common narrative and ties

³ Philip Scranton and Janet Davidson, eds., *The Business of Tourism Place, Faith and History* (Philadelphia, Pa: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 5; Edward Chaney, *The Evolution of the Grand Tour: Anglo-Italian Cultural Relations Since the Renaissance* (Taylor & Francis, 2000), xi-xii; Tony Perrottet, *Pagan Holiday On the Trail of Ancient Roman Tourists* (New York, NY: Random House Paperbacks, 2003), 6.

⁴ UNESCO, "Convention Concerning The Protection of The World Cultural and Natural Heritage" (UNESCO, 1972), 1, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext/>.

between diverse peoples and sites collectively called humanity.⁵ The unity in diversity concept stemmed from UNESCO's mission to "facilitate peace in the minds of men" in the modern world.⁶ World Heritage tourism further diverges from other forms of tourism in that it is heavily influenced by political ideology. Travel itineraries of heritage tourists are formed around locations recognized by a politically developed vetting process and policies created by a supranational organization versus solely an interest to explore or see a specific location.

In the later half of the twentieth century, the inherent relationship between tourism and preservation led to the creation of the UNESCO 1972 World Heritage Convention. Tourism and UNESCO's World Heritage program are unequivocally linked and cannot be separated from one another. Initially a productive partner, tourism transitioned to a menace and a threat in the early twenty-first century for many popular and marketed urban historic centers. The pressures of tourism are unavoidable once the World Heritage Committee inscribes such a community on the World Heritage List. Examples of the tangible and intangible effects of inscription surfaced at multiple sites over the past fifteen years. Residents in many UNESCO historic centers voiced disgruntled opinions towards their esteemed heritage status. Further local resistance to the concept of universally owned heritage surfaced through local petitions objecting to submission as a potential World Heritage Site. In nations where locals have a voice in the nomination process, communities such as Cambridge declined national requests to submit

⁵ Michael A. Di Giovine, *The Heritage-Scape: UNESCO, World Heritage, and Tourism* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2008), 21.

⁶ Giovine, 21; UNESCO World Heritage Centre, "UNESCO World Heritage Centre - World Heritage," accessed April 10, 2016, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/about/>; Sue Millar, "Stakeholders and Community Participation," in *Managing World Heritage Sites* (The Netherlands: Elsevier Ltd, 2006), 39.

a package for UNESCO consideration.⁷

Advocates of the World Heritage Convention have argued that world heritage tourism is a secondary byproduct arising out of nations selecting sites for a supranational body to recognize as exemplary. Michael Di Giovine, a cultural anthropologist, contended that the World Heritage Convention was “predicated on the deliverable of identifying and preserving for perpetuity these monuments to universal culture.”⁸ He elaborated further by stating that any negative impacts such as “museumification” or disneyfication of historic center communities were “unintended consequences.”⁹ Stephen Boyd and Dallen Timothy opined that nations “do not nominate sites because of their tourism draw,” and only after inscription, do states “turn to tourism” as a funding mechanism for preservation.¹⁰

A 2003 study conducted by Rebanks Consulting Ltd further compounds the arguments of the convention’s primary goal being preservation by challenging any critique that the UNESCO designation brings about socioeconomic gain. The consulting group stated that in the 1970s and 1980s “no sites had a socio-economic motivation for designation.”¹¹ Their research found this changed in the 1990s to encompass “perhaps 5 –

⁷ Bart van der Aa, Peter Groote, and Paulus Huigen, “World Heritage as NIMBY? The Case of the Dutch Part of the Wadden Sea,” in *The Politics of World Heritage Negotiating Tourism and Conservation* (Tonawanada, NY: Channel View Publications, 2005), 19.

⁸ Giovine, *The Heritage-Scape*, 16.

⁹ Giovine, 12. Museumification is the process through which heritage managers or heritage management strategies turn a location into a museum like environment. Disneyfication is when tourism or heritage management strategies change the environment of a historical site or community to one that is fabricated and consumer oriented with the intent to entertain the visitor versus displaying a true representation of the heritage or history of a specific location.

¹⁰ Stephen Boyd and Dallen Timothy, “Marketing Issues and World Heritage Sites,” in *Managing World Heritage Sites* (Elsevier Ltd, 2006), 59.

¹¹ Rebanks Consulting Ltd and Trends Business Research Ltd, “World Heritage Status: Is There an Opportunity for Economic Gain?” (Reeds Printers, Penrith, 2003), 2, <http://icomos.fa.utl.pt/documentos/2009/WHSTheEconomicGainFinalReport.pdf>.

10% of sites.”¹² It concluded that there is a negligible socioeconomic impact for World Heritage Sites because most World Heritage Sites “are overwhelmingly about preservation of heritage” not economic gain; therefore, socioeconomic benefits are negligible when a location is awarded the designation.¹³ The authors of the study missed the social and political context of nominating a site within the 1970s and 1980s because they did not conduct a historical study of political, social, and cultural norms. Instead, they focused on motivations taken from statements of outstanding universal value and nomination files along with conducting interviews with current World Heritage Specialists at case studied sites. The nomination files of a World Heritage Site, especially early on, do not usually contain indications of the spectrum of motivations for becoming a listed site. These would most likely be found in press releases, internal documents of national and local bodies, and other media sources about the inscription of a nominated site. Nor would the staff in place at the time of the study be likely to provide representative insight into why policymaking teams nominated a site for inscription during the 1970s and 1980s.

The Rebanks study reviewed data from all 878 inscribed sites in 2003 and conducted fourteen case studies. This approach raises serious questions about its findings. First and foremost, the World Heritage List is made up of diverse sites. This study is drawing conclusions about socioeconomic benefits of the designation across a broad pool of subjects, which can naturally skew data oriented findings. A natural or endangered site does not experience socioeconomic growth or tourism the same way as an inscribed site within an urban environment or an inscribed historic center. Secondly, fourteen case

¹² Rebanks Consulting Ltd and Trends Business Research Ltd, 2.

¹³ Rebanks Consulting Ltd and Trends Business Research Ltd, 5.

studies do not represent a statistically valid sample size to draw conclusions with high levels of confidence from a population of 878 sites. The consulting firm acknowledged that the complexities and diversity of individual sites might influence socioeconomic impacts at the local level. They also recognized that localized studies of UNESCO sites that “effectively trade upon their heritage” might find that the designation provided some form of economic lift through more esteemed branding or attracting a greater number of tourists.¹⁴

Historical perspective disproves claims that tourism is an unforeseen consequence of the World Heritage List, any sort of secondary aftereffect, or not a relevant factor in site nominations prior to 1990. UNESCO documents contain evidence that the convention itself arose from more than an interest in preserving physical signs of heritage. National interests with increasing prestige and in capturing revenues from the growing tourism industry of the late twentieth century spurred the support for a global policy addressing conservation of tangible cultural sites. Funding ideas for an international center of excellence focused on preservation and studying heritage included tourist taxes and a tourist oriented incentive of a special card allowing free entrance to museums, galleries, and archeological sites. International tourism organizations served as experts and advocates throughout the development of the World Heritage Convention and Program. The ongoing periodic reporting and site inspections conducted to ensure nations and localities abide by UNESCO requirements further confirm that UNESCO always viewed tourism as a valued partner in preservation despite claims to the contrary. Moreover, communities see the designation as a way to facilitate socioeconomic change versus solely a preservation tool or source of pride.

¹⁴ Rebanks Consulting Ltd and Trends Business Research Ltd, 11.

History of UNESCO and the World Heritage Convention

In 1942, European Allied governments along with the United States formed an organization known as the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education (CAME). The goal of this organization was to develop a formal strategy to restore destroyed educational programs and institutions once World War II concluded. CAME asked the United Nations for assistance in completing that objective. After reviewing CAME's petition, the United Nations General Assembly agreed that education was a key component to ensuring peace in the post-war world. The United Nations convened a special session to address the restoration of educational systems in November 1945. Forty-four nations attended the session in London. The conference expanded the scope of restoring damaged educational systems to all nations that needed assistance with establishing or repairing educational institutions.¹⁵

The delegates established a new international body to ensure education access became a global priority for all United Nations member countries: UNESCO. Thirty-seven of the forty-four countries authored and signed the organizing constitution to form the new agency on November 16, 1945. A key argument for establishing UNESCO was a shared belief "that political and economic agreements are not sufficient to build lasting peace."¹⁶ Education, morality, and intellectual exchange needed to accompany economic and political treaties if the nations of the world hoped to live in peace. Over the following thirty years, UNESCO's organizational reach expanded into the fields of science, culture,

¹⁵ UNESCO, "History | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization," UNESCO, 2016, <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco/about-us/who-we-are/history/>.

¹⁶ UNESCO, "Introducing UNESCO," UNESCO, September 24, 2012, <http://www.unesco.org>.

economic development, and championing freedom of thought and expression.¹⁷

UNESCO and many scholars identify the 1960s project to relocate the temples of Abu Simbel in Egypt as the catalyst of UNESCO's Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. Contrary to the image of a sudden interest in the preservation of sites surrounding the Abu Simbel project, protecting physical cultural heritage had been an issue explored by UNESCO well before 1968. The organization ventured into the protection of monuments, art, and physical archeological sites in the late 1940s. The 1964 General Conference Program referenced Resolution 6.43, adopted in 1948, as the official beginning of UNESCO cultural protections. The resolution approved a large-scale effort to study "the measures for the preservation of monuments of historical or artistic value through the establishment of an international fund or by any other means."¹⁸

The 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflicts drafted by the General Assembly of the United Nations reinforced UNESCO's early global interest in protecting tangible heritage. Europe reeled from the loss of art, artifacts, religious icons, and the destruction of important sites throughout World War II. The development of legal protections, military protocols, and ramifications for the destruction of not only fine art, but also physical representations of heritage greatly concerned diplomats in the post-World War environment. Even countries that did not experience significant destruction shared European preservation concerns about the

¹⁷ UNESCO; UNESCO, "History | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization."

¹⁸ United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization "UNESCO General Conference Program Commission" (UNESCO, June 16, 1964), 1, Establishment of the Convention Item 15.3.4, accessed March 3, 2016, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/1526>. (Organization referred to as UNESCO going forward.)

lack of funds and expertise to carry out needed preservation projects. In December 1950, the threats to heritage other than warfare included “town planning,” “neglect,” natural disasters, “flooding of valleys” and other damage “from the construction of dams.”¹⁹

The UNESCO proposals and resolutions of the 1950s referenced increased tourism as one of three reasons for the establishment of an International Cultural Convention for Preservation, a supporting global fund, and a research center or oversight body. The other stated reasons included a shortage of expertise, few facilities to conduct preservation work, and most significantly, a lack of funding to carry out preservation projects at the nation-state level. The emphasis of these three components in early UNESCO documents challenges the arguments of academics like Di Giovine, Dallen, and Boyd that tourism was not a consideration or a prime motivator for preservation within the UNESCO heritage-sphere. Rather, it was a main component elevating national interest in preserving physical representations of culture. Leaders of nations around the world viewed international tourism as an economic priority, an emerging source of revenue, and a potential equalizer for developing nations seeking to compete with wealthier first world countries.²⁰

International tourism as we know it now took form in the 1950s. The World Tourism Organization reported an estimated 25.3 million tourists visited international

¹⁹ “Conventions,” accessed April 17, 2016, <http://www.unesco.org/eri/la/convention.asp?KO=13055&language=E>; UNESCO, “Note on the Desirability of Framing an International Convention Establishing an International Fund for the Preservation and Restoration of Monuments and Historic Sites,” (UNESCO, December 1950), 3, Establishment of the Convention Item 1519, UNESCO Website Archived Resources, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/1519>; “UNESCO General Conference Program Commission,” 1. UNESCO, “Note on the Desirability of Framing a Convention for an International Fund,” 3.

²⁰ Delgation of Mexico, “Project for An International Convention For the Holding Of Historic Momuments and Art Treasures (UNESCO General Conference)” (UNESCO, May 26, 1950), 5, 5c-22e, UNESCO Wesite Archived Resources, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/1517>; William Theobald, ed., *Global Tourism*, Third (New York, N.Y: Elsevier Inc, 2005), 5.

destinations throughout the decade.²¹ Commercial airline companies emerged with jet aircraft available for civilian travel after World War II, which enabled easier international travel. Film and radio stimulated public interest in visiting new places and experiencing other cultures, and the influx of leisure travelers steadily rose at exotic locations around the globe. The destinations sought by the wealthy or middle class were archeological sites, museums, and towns highlighted in films and broadcasts. These physical cultural artifacts and surrounding locations needed to be in a condition that aligned with foreign perceptions of the site to provide an authentic experience for visitors not just because they tell the story of mankind, but according to UNESCO delegates, important archeological sites and monuments represented “a testimony to a nation’s culture and history.”²² Nations without the means to stabilize or restore tangible heritage feared tourists would perceive them as uncivilized or uneducated. These perceptions compounded with already existing economic disadvantages from colonization or historical discrimination threatened a developing nations’ ability to capture a portion of the new international tourism market.²³

Mexico in particular pushed the need for an international oversight organization and a global fund to protect cultural objects. Mexico’s tourism industry significantly increased from the 1930s through the 1950s. The growth forced Mexico to invest substantially in infrastructure to ease travel within the country. The large allocation of

²¹ The World Tourism Organization was officially chartered by the United Nations General Assembly in 1975. Prior to this time, its parent organization, International Union of Travel Organizations, served as a consultant to the United Nations and international community on tourism and tourism related matters from 1947 through 1975. (Source for this information World Tourism Organization History website, Accessed April 26, 2016 <http://www2.unwto.org/content/history-0>)

²² Delegation of Mexico, “Project for An International Convention For the Holding Of Historic Monuments and Art Treasures (UNESCO General Conference)” (UNESCO, May 26, 1950), 2, 5c-22e, accessed March 3, 2016, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/1517>.

²³ Theobald, *Global Tourism*, 5.

money for transportation systems limited Mexico's financial ability to conduct restoration of archeological sites. Additionally, Mexico struggled to overcome age-old stereotypes of a backwards culture with substandard accommodations for international visitors. Mexico's leaders envisioned Mexico competing with Europe and other elite destinations. To do so, the country needed to ensure its natural and manmade wonders were maintained on par with other Westernized nations; thereby, eliminating any inference that the country's residents did not appreciate their cultural assets.²⁴

Mexico's desire to maintain and increase their portion of the international tourism market led to their proposal for an international heritage fund for restoration and research capitalized by a special tourism tax. To finance such a fund, the proposal called for individuals who traveled to an UNESCO member country to pay an entry tax. In exchange for this fee, tourists would "receive a card" allowing them to visit that country's "museums, monuments and picture galleries" without paying an admissions fee.²⁵ Under the proposal, a national government would keep a portion of the tourism tax for preservation and the remainder would go into UNESCO's international fund. The suggested fund would have eliminated some of the financial burdens for national governments caused by preservation projects.²⁶

European countries voted down the tax claiming it would not be popular with the general public. While the reason for the 'unpopularity' of such a tax was not explicitly

²⁴ Don M. Coerver, Suzanne B. Pasztor, and Robert Buffington, *Mexico: An Encyclopedia of Contemporary Culture and History* (ABC-CLIO, 2004), 505; Dennis Merrill, ed., "Containment and Good Neighbors:: Tourism and Empire in 1930s Mexico," in *Negotiating Paradise*, U.S. Tourism and Empire in Twentieth-Century Latin America (University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 69–78, http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.txstate.edu/stable/10.5149/9780807898635_merrill.6.

²⁵ Delegation of Mexico, "Project for An International Convention For the Holding Of Historic Monuments and Art Treasures (UNESCO General Conference)," May 26, 1950, 4, 5c-22e, accessed March 3, 2016, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/1517>.

²⁶ UNESCO, "Note on the Desirability of Framing a Convention for an International Fund," 4.

stated, the strongest voices against it consisted of European nations adversely impacted by a visa tax. European nations needed to grow tourism within the region and encourage intra-continental travel to revive devastated post-war economies. Other non-European countries also opposed the tax due to the difficulty and expense of collection. The International Touring Alliance (ITA) championed the formation of an international fund, but opposed the tourist tax because it created a barrier to tourism.²⁷ Alternatively, ITA proposed countries charge an overall visitor's daily fee based on the amount of time a tourist spent in a particular country. Ultimately, UNESCO vetoed the tax as a direct conflict with UNESCO values promoting "the exchange of persons and freedom of movement between states."²⁸

Australia, the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom did not support the creation of any sort of global fund for restoration or a convention for the protection of heritage. Their oppositional stance stemmed from the difficulty in administering a global preservation program and the expense associated with such an undertaking. The United States believed preservation aid, if given, should be restricted to only war related damages. All four countries objected to the fund, tax, and entry card on the grounds that managing monuments and museums related to internal national governmental affairs versus global affairs requiring UNESCO oversight. These four nations further argued that the entry card to museums and sites would cause individual institutions to forego revenue

²⁷ The International Touring Alliance is a nonprofit touring organization founded in Luxembourg City in 1898. In Europe, the organization is known as the Alliance Internationale de Tourisme. The ITA has served as a consultant for the United Nations Economic and Social Council since 1947. (Source for ITA: The Alliance Internationale de Tourisme International Representation website. Accessed April 26, 2016 <http://www.ait-touringalliance.com/international-representation> and Anolik Law Group website Accessed April 26, 2016, <http://travellaw.com/page/international-touring-alliance-alliance-internationale-de-tourisme-ait>)

²⁸ Ibid.; UNESCO, "Report on the Possibility and Advisability of Adopting an International Convention for the Instituting A Special Tourist Tax for the Preservation of Monuments and Museums," 2.

generated by entry fees.²⁹

The debate around universal support for the protection of heritage changed dramatically in 1959 after Sudan and the United Arab Republic sent a plea to UNESCO requesting help with saving important Egyptian, Nubian, Roman, Christian, and pre-historic sites resting on the land threatened by flooding from the Sadd El Aali High Dam and the Aswan Dam. Egypt and Sudan could not salvage the historical sites from rising waters due to limited financial resources. Fifty member nations of UNESCO raised approximately \$87 million to relocate the important structures and their associated artifacts along with recording site information for locations that experts would be unable to excavate once under water. Italy and the Netherlands produced engineering plans to move the large structures deemed too valuable to lose by UNESCO and academic bodies. The engineering teams relocated “twenty-three monuments” in total.³⁰ Included in these twenty-three were the well-known Amada, Beit El Wali, Dakka, Great Temple of Abu Simbel, and Kalabasha. Academic teams from around the globe worked alongside experts from multiple governments to meticulously document, move, and rebuild the impacted structures.

UNESCO publications about the initiative included language featuring how Egypt and Nubia represented the story of mankind based on those locations providing “the ancient history of civilization” that “long inspired historians of art, religion, and travelers

²⁹ UNESCO, “Supplementary Report on the Possibility and Advisability of Adopting an International Convention Instituting a Special Tourist Tax for the Preservation of Monuments and Museums” (UNSECO, June 22, 1951), 2, Establishment of the Convention, UNESCO Archives, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/1521>.

³⁰ Christiane Desroches-Noblecourt, “Floating Laboratories on the Nile,” *The UNESCO Courier*, no. The 14th Year (October 1961): 30–31.

the world over” to gain wide spread public support for the project.³¹ The UNESCO Courier articles garnered academic and political support by including a quote from Sir LP Kirwan, President of the British Institute of East Africa, that UNESCO’s efforts would undoubtedly “produce world history...also of Africa as whole...which is of increasing importance to African students and peoples as they emerge into independence.”³²

The four superpowers previously viewing heritage as an internal nation state concern embraced it as a global one. The change in position more than likely can be attributed to a greater acknowledgement of minority history occurring within their borders, decolonization, which occurred within the African continent at the same time as the Abu Simbel endeavor, and an age old attachment to Classical and Ancient civilizations by the general public and academic community within each country. Britain and the United States in particular had substantial academic investment in the region and throughout the project. Teams from Columbia, Cambridge, Oxford, Yale and the University of Pennsylvania, and London worked on pre-historic sites. The anthropologists leading these expeditions announced that they believed that they might find the missing link between “the primitive man of Africa and the ancient man of Europe” in Nubia.³³ Furthermore, the Oriental Institute of Chicago oversaw much of the Nubian work in exchange for lifetime ownership rights to artifacts and other materials discovered during the excavation.³⁴

³¹ UNESCO, “Abu Simbel Now or Never,” *The UNESCO Courier*, October 1961, 6, unesdoc, UNESCO Archives; Michel Lacoste, “How Philae Will Be Saved,” *The UNESCO Courier*, no. 14th Year (October 1961): 16.

³² Rex Keating, “Journey To the Land of Kush,” *The UNESCO Courier*, 14th Year (October 1961): 37; “Obituary: Sir Laurence Kirwan | Culture | The Independent,” accessed April 26, 2016, <http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/obituary-sir-laurence-kirwan-1091927.html>.

³³ UNESCO, “Abu Simbel Now or Never,” 15.

³⁴ UNESCO, 25–26; Ernst Breisach, *Historiography Ancient, Medieval, and Modern*, Third (Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 2007), 418.

Tourism heavily influenced UNESCO policy and the funding to save the treasures of Egypt and Sudan. Flooding was not a new threat to archeological sites located along the Nile. For centuries, the Nile periodically inundated the lands surrounding it. Philae flooded at least once annually after the construction of the Aswan Dam in 1902. Archeologists at the time did not possess the technology or resources to relocate the ruins in Philae so instead they reinforced the structures in hopes that the temples and houses would survive periods of partial inundation. During one of the flood cycles, a visitor to the famous temples noted the “walls had become so soft that a finger could be stuck into them.”³⁵ Worse yet, tourist boats sightseeing in the area damaged the supports of the Birth House of Horace and Temple of Isis. With full immersion, as would occur with the High Dam, the water and tour boats could destroy the structures. UNESCO consultants and academics working on site reported that tourists frequently came to the area on boats due to “international appeal for the safeguarding of Nubia’s monuments.”³⁶

Eight years after the close of the Abu Simbel project, an ICOMOS publication attributed that the archeological sites had to be saved for one reason and one reason alone: so “that as many people as possible should be enabled to visit them. They must function as a museum. And indeed it can be claimed that the Abu Simbel Temples now constitute one of the most magnificent open-air and indoor museums in the world.”³⁷ In 1978 (the year ICOMOS published the article), Abu Simbel was one of the “must” see destinations of the world.³⁸ UNESCO and Egypt launched research programs into how to generate visitation to the area to cover the on-going costs to maintain the newly relocated

³⁵ Lacoste, “How Philae Will Be Saved,” 19.

³⁶ Desroches-Noblecourt, “Floating Laboratories on the Nile,” 26.

³⁷ Lennart Berg, “The Salvage of the Abu Simbel Temples,” *Monumentum* 17 (1978): 54.

³⁸ Berg, 54.

wonders since the preservation project depleted all sums allocated to it. Visitor costs and related revenues from tourist stays in nearby areas were included in plans to assist with the costs to maintain the sites for future generations.³⁹

President Kennedy described the 1960s rescue of historical monuments as “an international effort, which has captured the imagination, and sympathy of the world over.”⁴⁰ The Abu Simbel and Nubia project did not introduce the need to save the history of humankind for current and future generations as many preservationist-authored texts assert. Instead, Abu Simbel validated that cultural preservation was a global responsibility and only through international cooperation between nations could UNESCO’s cultural mission truly be fulfilled.⁴¹

Delegates from nations involved with the project met with UNESCO officials and heritage specialists finally drafting the long anticipated Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage during the years of 1962 through 1972.⁴² 1968 was the first time commercial development, specifically factories and other businesses excluding tourism, appeared as a threat to heritage sites in UNESCO papers. UNESCO ambassadors and heritage experts recognized that tourism and protection depended on one another. The working committee for the convention revived the tourism tax and entry pass idea to fundraise for the international monument fund. Experts argued that the tax was justified as tourists benefited the most from UNESCO 1960s preservation efforts to protect Abu Simbel, Florence, and Venice. More importantly, the earlier fears

³⁹ Berg, 54.

⁴⁰ UNESCO, “Abu Simbel Now or Never,” 4.

⁴¹ UNESCO, 4; Berg, “The Salvage of the Abu Simbel Temples,” 54.

⁴² In 1970, the members of a working group addressing the protection of natural heritage merged with the team originally focused on the protection of monuments, groups of buildings, and sites as UNESCO believed that the best way to protect natural and cultural heritage was under a single convention versus multiple programs.

of stifling tourism no longer held valid grounds. International tourism thrived around the globe. The number of international tourists jumped from 25.3 million in 1950 to 69.3 million in the 1960s.⁴³

The expert committee drafting the convention stated that heritage “must be integrated into the social life” of a nation.⁴⁴ This included a focus on education and public outreach. Drafts of the convention’s education provision encouraged the publishing and posting of excavations and preservation work carried out in order to educate the public on the importance of preserving heritage. UNESCO encouraged member nations to host a World Day campaign to raise awareness about monuments and sites. Part of the World Day campaign’s purpose was to obtain gifts and donations from the public for the international fund. UNESCO was well aware that emphasizing the importance of tourism and academic research at heritage sites was necessary to maintain public interest in the program. Without successful tourism and educational outreach plans, the funding needed for preservation projects would not materialize.⁴⁵

The finalized convention set improved universal standards for the protection of physical sites, allowed for the creation of a supervisory body – the World Heritage Committee, and established a formal fund specifically to assist with expenses associated with preservation and protection projects carried out by member states. The document contained strict criteria for any nation who sought to participate in the cultural initiative. Any nation that submitted a site for consideration agreed to these criteria by signing the

⁴³ Theobald, *Global Tourism*, 6; UNESCO, “Meeting of Experts to Establish an International System For the Protection of Monuments, Groups of Buildings And Sites of Universal Interest Final Report” (UNESCO, November 10, 1969), 25, Establishment of the Convention Item 15.3.4, UNESCO Website Archived Resources, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/1532>.

⁴⁴ UNESCO, “Meeting of Experts to Establish an International System For the Protection of Monuments, Groups of Buildings And Sites of Universal Interest Final Report,” 28.

⁴⁵ UNESCO, 28.

convention. These requirements included: adopting national policies and regulations to protect heritage; establishing services necessary to preserve, protect, and manage state heritage; developing protocols and mechanisms “capable of counteracting the dangers that threaten its cultural or national heritage;” and taking all appropriate “measures for the identification, protection, conservation, presentation, and rehabilitation of this heritage.”⁴⁶

The World Heritage Committee is the supervisory body of the World Heritage Program. The World Heritage Committee formed in 1976 four years after the ratification of the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. Its first meeting occurred in 1978. Unlike the UNESCO staff, the Committee is primarily made up of ambassadors and politicians from countries that signed the Convention.⁴⁷ It is the World Heritage Committee that determines which sites meet the criteria for inscription. Additionally, the World Heritage Committee is the only entity that may remove sites from the World Heritage List. They also define the parameters for which proceeds from the World Heritage Fund may be released. The growth of projects arising out of the World Heritage Convention expanded significantly over twenty years leading to the establishment of the World Heritage Centre in 1992.⁴⁸ The Center oversees the operational aspects of the cultural organization along with managing the World Heritage Fund.

⁴⁶ UNESCO, *Convention Concerning The Protection of The World Cultural and Natural Heritage* (1972), Article 5, accessed January 31, 2016, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext/>.

⁴⁷ Lynn Meskell, “UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention at 40: Challenging the Economic and Political Order of International Heritage Conservation,” *Current Anthropology* 54, no. 4 (2013): 485, <https://doi.org/10.1086/671136>.

⁴⁸ Meskell, 485.

The World Heritage Centre and World Heritage Committee partner to manage the inscription process and monitor the condition of inscribed sites through inspections and two reporting requirements.

3. UNESCO PROCESSES, MONITORING, AND REPORTING

The Nomination and Inscription Process

Once a nation binds itself to the convention requirements, they may proceed with submitting applications for cultural resources to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. Inscription is the formal terminology for the awarding of the UNESCO designation. To begin the process, nations identify places fitting the definition of universal value and determine which formal criteria the site should be submitted under. Currently, there are ten set standards for outstanding universal value. A site must meet at least one of these markers. Next, a nomination file is prepared. This file includes a variety of documents outlining the site's history, detailing the site and the value it brings to the story of mankind, planning and management documents, photographs, and maps. This file is passed onto a group known as the Advisory Bodies of UNESCO.⁴⁹

The Advisory Bodies are where UNESCO's professional heritage staff can be found. The organizations making up this panel are the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), International Centre for the Study of Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), and the World Conservation Union (IUCN). These groups review the file and conduct onsite inspections to capture the condition of the site along with making recommendations to the submitting nation and the World Heritage Committee about what gaps exist in site management plans to ensure public safety and perpetuation of the resource for future generations. Once a cultural resource clears the Advisory Bodies, the file is passed onto the World Heritage Committee who either approves the site for inscription or rejects the site. If the site is selected by the

⁴⁹ UNESCO World Heritage Centre, "[Http://Whc.unesco.org/En/Nominations/](http://whc.unesco.org/En/Nominations/)," UNESCO, accessed December 11, 2015, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/nominations/>.

World Heritage Committee due to proving that it exhibits the criteria for a location of outstanding universal value, the site is added to the world heritage list and becomes subject to the convention and monitoring requirements.⁵⁰

Reporting and Reactive Monitoring

Routine monitoring of sites utilizes two distinct mechanisms and timetables: period reporting and state of conservation reporting. Periodic reporting is completed every six years. Periodic reports provide a regional snapshot into how effectively the World Heritage Program is functioning. All of the nations within a specific region craft reports detailing how the convention requirements are applied within their boundaries. The reports include information about regional World Heritage Site management and various conditions that are influencing regulation and preservation of inscribed locations. The World Heritage Committee leverages the regional reports to encourage “regional co-operation and the exchange of information...between States Parties.”⁵¹ A secondary goal of the regional reporting structure is to create qualified teams of regional subject matter experts. Once the World Heritage Committee completes their review of the reports, the committee findings are forwarded to the UNESCO General Assembly and any action items from the committee review are sent to state leadership for follow-up.⁵²

State of Conservation reports are completed at the individual state and site levels. The national reports are forwarded to the UNESCO World Heritage Committee and World Heritage Centre teams for review. These reports detail national, regional, and local regulations and protections in place at a particular site, the current conditions of a site,

⁵⁰ UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

⁵¹ UNESCO World Heritage Centre, “Periodic Reporting,” UNESCO World Heritage Centre, accessed April 14, 2017, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/periodicreporting/>.

⁵² UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

and expert opinion on proposed changes at the various oversight levels needed to ensure a particular site remains viable in the World Heritage Program. This type of reporting is done on an as needed basis to address “recurrent problems.”⁵³ The World Heritage Committee frequently uses these reports when reactive monitoring is triggered for an inscribed site.

Reactive monitoring is a process through which UNESCO and the World Heritage Committee evaluate activities or events that threaten to cause significant harm to the outstanding universal value of any inscribed site. Threatening activities vary from developmental construction projects to military action. All sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger are automatically placed in a reactive monitoring status. This process can be initiated from the top down when ICOMOS and UNESCO become alarmed about conditions at an inscribed location or from the bottom up when a nation or other outside entity requests UNESCO monitor a situation at a particular location. The top down initiation frequently arises from the failure of a participating state to take corrective action against a repeatedly documented deteriorating condition or threat. A location or nation state requesting an advisory committee from the World Heritage Center to come on site to assist in understanding a potential threat and to participate in offering solutions is an example of bottom up triggering.⁵⁴

Outside parties such as NGOs, journalists or individuals may also initiate the reactive monitoring process by reporting a potential threat to the World Heritage

⁵³ UNESCO World Heritage Centre, “Reporting and Monitoring,” UNESCO World Heritage Centre, accessed April 13, 2017, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/118/>.

⁵⁴ UNESCO World Heritage Centre, “State of Conservation (SOC),” UNESCO World Heritage Centre, accessed April 13, 2017, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc/>; UNESCO World Heritage Centre, “The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention” (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, October 26, 2016), 41, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/>.

Committee. The World Heritage Centre staff partner with the Advisory Bodies to evaluate the credibility of the report and take the appropriate action needed if the expert team verifies that the nature of the threat requires attention at the international level. If UNESCO intervention is needed in an outside source reported incident, all information is sent to the national representative for review with a request for further state level investigation and a formal national response to the Advisory Body inquiry. The Advisory Body will then escalate the response and their recommended handling of the issue to the World Heritage Committee for further action. Both periodic reports and state of conversation reports surfaced the need to address a variety of threats created by the boom in cultural tourism.⁵⁵

Throughout the late 1970s and all of the 1980s, international tourism rapidly grew along with traveler and tourism company awareness of the World Heritage List. By the midpoint of the decade, 327.2 million tourists ventured across the globe. This number was almost double the 1970s volume of 165.8 million tourists partaking in international tourism. Likewise, the World Heritage List grew from an initial twelve sites inscribed in 1978 to three hundred and nineteen by 1989. Modernity continued providing improved efficiencies in the workplace enabling more people leisure time and excess income to apply to pursuits like travel. A large change in people's mindsets towards travel propelled this growth and caught the attention of academic sociologists and anthropologists along with politicians and businessmen.⁵⁶

The social shifts that began in the 1970s of pursuing activities outside of the work place versus centering leisure time and daily activities around occupation morphed into a

⁵⁵ UNESCO World Heritage Centre, "Reporting and Monitoring."

⁵⁶ UNESCO World Heritage Centre, "UNESCO World Heritage Centre - World Heritage List," accessed April 26, 2016, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/&order=year>; Theobald, *Global Tourism*, 6.

“life-style” social class in modern society.⁵⁷ This life-style class differed from the elite and middle class with excess leisure time in prior periods. The new social group consisted of individuals from varying socio-economic backgrounds and a shared interest in social activities outside of the workplace including global travel.⁵⁸ Furthermore, the rise of paid vacation days in the US and Europe enabled this new life-style class to more freely travel than prior groups before them. Tourism companies recognized this social structure change. Tourism planners embraced the World Heritage List as a valuable tool central to marketing campaigns for the life-style elite along with the middle and working class seeking to escape from the nine to five of modern day work life.⁵⁹

Tourism continued to eclipse other industries throughout the 1990s and into the new millennia. The number of tourists again doubled from the 1980s to a staggering 652.2 million by 1999 making tourism an even greater political and economic priority for developed and undeveloped countries alike. It is also in the 1990s during this increase in growth that marketing analysts began to fragment the mass tourism market into smaller segments. Once this practice became mainstream, initial estimates showed that “thirty-five to seventy percent of international travelers were cultural tourists.”⁶⁰

Individual site inspections at the time of application for inscription, periodic reports, and state of conservation reports began to note tourism as a potential concern in

⁵⁷ Dean MacCannell, *The Tourist A New Theory of the Leisure Class*, 2013th ed. (Berkley CA: University of California Press, 1976), 6.

⁵⁸ Global travel in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was limited to only those who could afford such excursions. While traveling for pleasure became popular in the nineteenth century, most individuals only vacationed within the region or nation they lived in until after World War II.

⁵⁹ MacCannell, *The Tourist*, 6; Erkan Sezgin and Medet Yolal, “Golden Age of Mass Tourism: Its History and Development,” in *Visions for Global Tourism Industry - Creating and Sustaining Competitive Strategies* (Croatia: INTECH, 2012), 75, <https://www.intechopen.com/books/visions-for-global-tourism-industry-creating-and-sustaining-competitive-strategies/mass-tourism-its-history-and-development-in-the-golden-age>.

⁶⁰ Bob McKercher and Hillary Du Cros, *Cultural Tourism, 2nd Edition*, 2 edition (New York: Routledge, 2015), 1; Theobald, *Global Tourism*, 6.

the late 1980s. The frequency of ICOMOS reports recording tourism as a threat to a World Heritage Site's designation increased over the next ten years. UNESCO's and the World Heritage Committee's concern about the negative impacts of tourism on the sites shifted from precautionary to a state of alarm. Terminology in Periodic Reports and UNESCO strategic planning documents from the early 2000s forward referred to tourism as a 'danger.' As a result, UNESCO established the UNESCO World Heritage Tourism Program. This program delivered training and guidance on how heritage managers could limit the detrimental impacts of tourism while still collaborating with the tourism industry to derive economic benefits. The 2001 program remains in place today under an updated name of the World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism Program.⁶¹

Ironically in the same year, one of the most horrific terrorist attacks on the traveling public occurred in the United States: the hijacking of four commercial airliners headed to international or cross-country destinations on September 11, 2001. At the end of 2001, the World Tourism Organization total volume for tourism declined slightly by about four million to 692.7 million from the prior years total of 696.7 million. However, the global travel market rebounded setting a new all time travel record of 715.6 million arrivals in 2002. While the events of 9/11 significantly changed the way people traveled domestically and abroad, in the long term it did not slow the growth of global tourism.⁶²

With nothing stemming the rising tide of global travel volumes during the 1990s, tourism pressures pushed the need to protect intangible heritage to the forefront of global

⁶¹ Sophia Labadi, *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value: Value-Based Analyses of the World Heritage and Intangible Cultural Heritage Conventions* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2013), 99; UNESCO World Heritage Centre, "Report of the Twenty-Fifth Session of the World Heritage Committee (Helsinki, Finland, 11 - 16 December 2001)" (UNESCO, February 8, 2002), 145, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/1269>.

⁶² Theobald, *Global Tourism*, 6.

heritage policy.⁶³ This arose from heritage professional and general traveler complaints about a loss of authenticity and loss of tradition occurring in the communities surrounding World Heritage Sites and popular travel destinations. The heightened sensitivity of the traveling public to a loss of authenticity and tradition aligns with the increased demand for experiential travel.⁶⁴ Additionally, awareness of the importance of preserving the traditions and customs of indigenous people against “intolerance” and “the process of globalization” for the first time became a global priority within the heritage-scape.⁶⁵ UNESCO’s website shares that the “invaluable role of the intangible cultural heritage as a factor in bringing human beings closer together and ensuring exchange and understanding among them” is so critical that it warranted protection to ensure it lives on for future generations.⁶⁶ The 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage passed the World Heritage Committee and the UNESCO General Conference in October 2003.⁶⁷

Tourism growth combined with the diverse nature of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List further compounded management challenges in approaching sustainable tourism strategies. There was no one-size-fits-all best practice that could be readily implemented across the globe. A natural site cannot be managed the same as a living historical city. The next chapter introduces the unique characteristics of urban historic

⁶³ Intangible heritage for this thesis is defined as the social practices, spiritual rituals, cultural traditions, and the knowledge, skills, and techniques of craftsmanship, tradesmanship or unique production methodology to produce culturally-significant traditional products for a specific location or group of people.

⁶⁴ Experiential travel is traveling to a destination specifically to experience a different culture through their social and cultural practices in addition to visiting the location they inhabit in the hopes of gaining a greater understanding of that particular group.

⁶⁵ UNESCO, “Text of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage - Intangible Heritage - Culture Sector - UNESCO,” accessed September 11, 2017, <https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention>.

⁶⁶ UNESCO.

⁶⁷ UNESCO; McKercher and Du Cros, *Cultural Tourism, 2nd Edition*, 4,8.

centers that challenge heritage managers and policymakers to creatively approach tourism and preservation in a constantly evolving environment.

4. UNESCO HISTORIC CENTERS – PROTECTED LIVING ENTITIES

UNESCO's World Heritage List includes three types of physical sites: static historic sites such as the Coliseum in Rome, natural sites such as the Grand Canyon or the Florida Everglades, and historic centers of historically significant communities. This analysis will use the terms historic center, world heritage city, and historic community interchangeably. The alternating usage of terms aligns with UNESCO publications and terminology since 1996. When the term "world heritage city" appears within this text, it does not reference the specialized Organization of World Heritage Cities designation, but rather a community containing an UNESCO listed historic center within its boundaries.⁶⁸ Tourism and economic development activities in the late 1990s and early 2000s surfaced how inscribed cities faced challenges of a different nature than a natural landscape or a stand-alone site. Throughout these two decades, UNESCO evolved their original view of historic sites as lone, individual places to recognize the "total historic environment;" expanding the boundaries of a World Heritage Site into the surrounding landscape and communities.⁶⁹

Unlike static sites, historic centers are continually in a state of flux. The populations of cities expand and contract based on economic development, industry booms, and the migration of people from countryside to urban center over the course of time. Cities naturally go through a life cycle of beginning, maturing then declining, and at

⁶⁸ The World Heritage Cities Designation is awarded by a heritage and cultural organization separate from UNESCO that is known as the Organization of World Heritage Cities. This organization serves as an additional professional body for cities that are either an inscribed urban historic center or have a World Heritage Site within its boundaries to develop and share regional best practices focused on urban heritage management.

⁶⁹ Minja Yang and Jehanne Phares, "Safeguarding and Development of World Heritage Cities" (Partnership for World Heritage Cities, Urbino, Italy: UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2002), 10; Peter de Figueiredo, "English Heritage" (Partnerships for World Heritage Cities Culture as a Vector for Sustainable Urban Development, Urbino, Italy: UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2002), 46.

times, repeating the cycle again when something spurs new growth within the community. As cities grow their boundaries and physical structures begin to sprawl, placing pressure on protective buffer zones, vehicles and industry increase pollution that can harm protected structures, and rising rents may force working and middle classes from their center. When a city enters a declining stage, businesses relocate, individuals move to other areas in search of better economic opportunity, and infrastructure begins to crumble. Frequently, poverty and crime arises in the ranks of those remaining in the community if it is not abandoned altogether.⁷⁰

Aylin Orbasli describes the urban heritage environment as "an ecosystem...a compilation of past and present layers providing a framework for the contemporary mechanisms of urban economy and life."⁷¹ This ecosystem and the natural life cycle of cities create unique challenges for heritage managers. Heritage professionals working in an urban setting must look at cultural resources through a lens of contemporary values and usage. City planners, tourism managers, and heritage managers face a constant stream of pressures that produce challenges to the authenticity, integrity, and relevancy of a site. They must strategically address stakeholder groups who claim ownership of a historic center. They must also consider the values of the original community that earned a historic city its designation along with the values of present day users of that same space.⁷²

An UNESCO historic center draws heritage tourists seeking both an authentic experience within an urban environment and a desire to view firsthand whatever tangible

⁷⁰ Aylin Orbasli, *Tourists in Historic Towns Urban Conservation and Heritage Management* (London ; New York, NY: E & FN Spon, 2000), 9.

⁷¹ Orbasli, 9.

⁷² Jukka Jokilehto, "Authenticity, Integrity, and the World Heritage Center" (Partnerships for World Heritage Cities, Urbino, Italy: UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2002), 29–30.

heritage component earned that community its coveted inscription on the World Heritage List. The designation award declares an inscribed city to be a *must-see* location drawing trip planners and individual travelers to a particular destination over other nearby communities lacking UNESCO recognition. The volume of tourists drawn to a listed historic center can become problematic due to carrying capacity. Carrying capacity is “a combination of physical capacity and social tolerance.”⁷³ It is the threshold dictating the maximum amount of visitors a city can handle before resentment develops between resident and tourist, the physical aspects of the city begin to experience deterioration from foot and/or vehicle traffic, and various marketing and management policies create friction between those making policy and different stakeholders. In extreme cases, breaches of carrying capacity will deter future visitation from tourists while simultaneously destroying the quality of life for residents.⁷⁴

Potential Changes in Class-ism

There are many urban planners and architects that argue historic centers are often found in poorer and dilapidated communities that need preservation work and economic injection. While this is true in some places, it is not true in all historic centers. Additionally, many of the intangible characteristics of local culture that make a place attractive to tourists can be found within artisanal, working class, and poorer communities. Without the economic means to modernize, these communities preserve cuisine, traditions, crafts, music, and dance much more so than wealthy or upper-middle class neighborhoods. If normal community growth is paired with heritage tourism, outside entities, and drastic shifts in catering to tourist needs can force residents from

⁷³ Orbasli, *Tourists in Historic Towns Urban Conservation and Heritage Management*, 60.

⁷⁴ Orbasli, 60; Theobald, *Global Tourism*, 194–96; George Smith, Phyllis Messenger, and Hillary Soderland, *Heritage Values In Contemporary Society* (Walnut Creek, Calif: Left Coast Press, 2010), 267.

their neighborhoods and destroy local businesses instead of revitalizing a community. The same can happen to declining cities as investors purchase property for tourism purposes. These purchases drive up rents and create gentrification or a falsified sense of authenticity all in the interest of economic gain from visitation. This socioeconomic occurrence is referred to as touristic monoculture.⁷⁵

Gentrification is a controversial topic within the academic and public spheres. It can simply be defined as the process through which an increased cost of living stemming from revitalization projects, urban planning, and/or heritage management practices to improve an area results in an accelerated the rate of change in a particular neighborhood. Change due to gentrification significantly alters the identity, character, cultural landscape, intangible heritage, and potentially the tangible heritage of a community. Gentrification is frequently viewed in a negative light due to the common belief that it causes the displacement of people. Donovan Rypkema, an international expert on Economics and Preservation, contends “gentrification and displacement are not synonyms as neighborhoods naturally change. The problem arises when the natural rate of change is so fast that it becomes disruptive to a community.”⁷⁶

While Rypkema is correct that displacement and gentrification are not necessarily interchangeable, this phenomenon is rightfully associated with displacement. Far too frequently, lower income earners are forced to relocate due to communities failing to proactively address the known outcomes of preservation and development projects, which include rent increases in areas with stagnant wages and a need for new regulations

⁷⁵ Enrico Fontanari, “Partnerships for Urban Conservation Strategies” (Partnerships for World Heritage Cities, UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2002), 21.

⁷⁶ Donovan Rypkema, “Leveraging Living Heritage for Economic Prosperity” (San Antonio, Texas, September 8, 2017).

to manage how quickly an improved historic area gentrifies. Small local businesses that can no longer afford rent or sustain the income necessary to continue operating within a certain neighborhood also leave potentially altering the sense of place associated with that community. A 2015 UK study of the cost of living at a World Heritage Site in the United Kingdom came with a 27 percent premium over the cost of owning a home elsewhere. Moreover, revitalization projects are not always a natural progression or change for a particular location, but rather development initiatives facilitated by heritage managers and urban planners. Unfortunately, gentrification is frequently an unavoidable consequence of heritage conservation efforts and effective heritage marketing to attract visitors and investors to a World Heritage Site. It can also be the result of individuals being attracted to living in or placing a business in a historic community for prestige.⁷⁷

The negative outcomes of gentrification can be potentially mitigated against through the creative use of new tax revenues by community policymakers “to support programs” that assist impacted individuals such as rent subsidies, small business grants, and incentivized programs that encourage entrepreneurship in traditional trades and crafts.⁷⁸ Heritage managers working within a historic center can help demonstrate the need for such programs to other key stakeholders who may lack line of sight to the benefits intangible heritage and the sense of place provide to the economic well-being of communities. As with any designation awarded to a location, the UNESCO designation and convention requirements always bring with it an unavoidable economic impact, which depending on how it is managed can be a benefit or detriment to the community.

⁷⁷ Lindsay Pantry, “The Price of Culture: Living near Unesco Site Bumps up Property - Yorkshire Post,” *Yorkshire Post*, November 16, 2015, 231–32, <http://www.yorkshirepost.co.uk/news/the-price-of-culture-living-near-unesco-site-bumps-up-property-1-7573702>.

⁷⁸ Rypkema.

Place, Memory, and Authenticity

At the Partnerships for World Heritage Cities Conference in 2002, participants received a reminder that “heritage is not an affair of stone alone.”⁷⁹ It includes multiple unquantifiable elements adding to the attractiveness of a location to the outsider and resident. This attraction derives from what heritage experts describe as the “spirit of place:” the intermixing of “social, ritual or historic values” of a community or location.⁸⁰ These intangible concepts provide what visitors and marketers commonly refer to as character or charm. While past and present residents of historic cities create this sense of place for a particular location, tourists may interpret or experience a vastly different sense of place due to their own backgrounds or historical memory tied to a particular location.

Memory and identity play an important role in understanding historical communities. These two elements are the basis for any sort of individual and collective interpretation of historical space. One of the earliest scholars researching modern memory theory amongst social groups is Maurice Halbwachs. Halbwachs argued that our sense of self, place, and tradition derive from a larger group influence based on the communities we live within forming our perceptions and ideas into what is known as collective memory. Collective memory intertwines ideas and principles to group members over the expanse of time. While it can fade as group members die off or leave the community, collective memory does not have a clear-cut beginning or end. Pierre Nora, a modern French memory theorist, builds on this concept of collective memory arguing “memory crystallizes and secretes itself” at a specific key moment in time or

⁷⁹ UNESCO World Heritage Centre, “Partnerships for World Heritage Cities Culture as a Vector for Sustainable Urban Development” (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2002), 86.

⁸⁰ UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 92.

historical event forming what he terms “*lieux de memoire*” or sites of memory.⁸¹ These sites of memory are frequently the locations where collective memory and history intersect creating conflict amongst insider and outsider.⁸²

Cheryl Finley’s “Authenticating Dungeons, Whitewashing Castles: The Former Sites of the Slave Trade on the Ghanaian Coast” provides an excellent illustrative example of how memory and identity at a *lieu de memoire* becomes a place of tensions between the local resident and the visitor. One must keep in mind that this example centers on a very traumatic historical event in human history. However, it is an excellent case study to assist one in grasping the complexity of how memory and identity influence historical narrative and interpretation of UNESCO World Heritage Sites at the individual and collective levels. The Castles of Cape Coast and Elmina received their World Heritage designation in 1979. This is significant as 1979 was the second year the World Heritage List was in place. Moreover, the World Heritage Committee recognized the outstanding universal value the structures held within the history of the global community early on. In this case study, the reader is introduced to two groups: roots tourists who consist of individuals descended from the Africans trafficked in the slave trade and local Ghanaians whose ancestors remained within Ghana in various roles.⁸³

Roots tourists believe that “the slave trade...should be the focal point” of these

⁸¹ Nora, Pierre, “Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire,” *Representations* 26, no. Spring 1989: 7, accessed January 23, 2015, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/147.26.11.80>.

⁸² Jeffrey K. Olick, Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy, eds., *The Collective Memory Reader* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 139–44; Nora, Pierre, “Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire,” 7.

⁸³ Cheryl Finley, “Authenticating Dungeons, Whitewashing Castles: The Former Sites of the Slave Trade on the Ghanaian Coast,” in *Architecture and Tourism Perception, Performance and Place* (New York, NY: Berg, 2004), 111, 113.

structures along the Ghana coast.⁸⁴ They harbor strong feelings that the castles should remain places of mourning without the interference of modern preservation and conservation techniques. Additionally, roots tourists have a heightened awareness of power and racial dynamics in historical space. This is demonstrated by some of the roots tourism groups requesting whites not be allowed to accompany those of African descent on tours of the forts and by their utilizing racially oriented phrasing during mixed race tours.⁸⁵ Ghanaians found the racially divided tours and comments offensive.

In contrast to roots tourists, Ghanaians wish to feature the full “history and multiple uses of the sites” as there is more to the history and traditions of the structures and surrounding area than the slave trade.⁸⁶ In a desire to keep the two castles attractive to those that wish to visit them and available for future generations, the local site managers are taking steps to preserve the structures. These acts of maintenance and enhancements to make the castles more appealing to non-roots visitors include freshly painting walls and adding flower planters to the space. This local approach to site management creates further tension between tourists and locals as roots tourists see these actions as a form of downplaying or “whitewashing” the dark past of these sites.⁸⁷

International experts set a best practice at the Urbino Partnerships for World Heritage Cities Conference of prioritizing the local population’s definition of what their identity and historical memory are versus those of the incoming tourist. Local perception creates the foundation of “lived experiences” within a city.⁸⁸ It is the resident

⁸⁴ Finley, 111–12. Finley’s article indicates UNESCO designated the site in 1972; however, UNESCO records show it receiving the World Heritage Designation in 1979.

⁸⁵ Finley, 111, 118–19.

⁸⁶ Finley, 111.

⁸⁷ Finley, 111, 118–19.

⁸⁸ UNESCO World Heritage Centre, “Partnerships for World Heritage Cities Culture as a Vector for Sustainable Urban Development,” 89.

interpretation and use of historical space that rounds out the sense of place and authenticity on a daily basis. Based on the details provided in Finley's article, heritage tourism managers are trying to find a balance that works for both the insider and the outsider. Differing interpretations of memory in any location will always be a challenge for heritage managers and urban planners to tackle.

Like memory, authenticity is another complex concept that vastly influences the experience of place for individuals. Authenticity extends beyond the realms of tangible structures in the urban historic environment. Traditionally associated with conservation and preservation techniques for architecture, the concept of authenticity expanded into the sense of place, experience, and historical origins in the twentieth century. As UNESCO and the academic community embraced Eastern interpretations of authenticity, the definition further added the elements of "genuineness and reliability."⁸⁹ Tourists seek what they believe to be authentic experiences. Residents wish to preserve what they believe are authentic elements and traditions within their community.⁹⁰

Place, authenticity, and identity working together produce numen. Numen is a concept of "spiritual force or influence identified with a natural object, phenomena, or place."⁹¹ It allows an individual to experience walking in another person's shoes or provides them the ability to transcend above their present day life and to step back in time. The goal of a well-managed historic community is to enable this sort of experience and environment for both the resident and the tourist. However, the desire of heritage

⁸⁹ McKercher and Du Cros, *Cultural Tourism, 2nd Edition*, 75.

⁹⁰ Peter Howard, *Heritage: Management, Interpretation, Identity* (London ; New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2003), 224–27.

⁹¹ Catherine Cameron and John Gatewood, "Excursions into the Un-Remembered Past: What People Want from Visits to Historical Sites," *The Public Historian* 22, no. 3 (Summer 2000): 109, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3379582>.

managers to create numen and this special sense of transcendence can swing too far into the arena of spectacle. McKercher argues in favor of this approach to management on the grounds that tourists “are not seeking a deep learning experience” nor do they desire anything more than “entertainment” and “something interesting to do.”⁹² This position does not consider local resident values or the importance of authenticity in destination selection for the heritage traveler. If a heritage management team deploys an unbalanced marketing approach, a completely misleading and invented ‘historical’ experience designed for outsider tastes emerges. This staged environment frustrates local residents as it intentionally alters or falsifies their community narrative. Residents may begin to fear the potential loss of local intangible heritage that is not marketable because it does not align with the managed official narrative.⁹³

Tying consumption (consumerism) with heritage representation frequently creates conflicts in authenticity. Peter Howard cautions, “cultural heritage...cannot be recreated without losing some elements of authenticity.”⁹⁴ Unfortunately, heritage re-creation around World Heritage Sites and historic cities frequently translates into events, items, or trades that attract modern day audiences with excess cash to spend. Far too often, a top down approach deployed in historic communities results in cultural spectacles offering a commodified and staged historic experience instead of providing honest insight into the traditions and realities of life in the past. Eric Hobsbawm would label these spectacles invented tradition. He defined invented tradition as a practice or “set of practices...which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behavior by repetition, which automatically

⁹² McKercher and Du Cros, *Cultural Tourism, 2nd Edition*, 134.

⁹³ McKercher and Du Cros, 128–34.

⁹⁴ Howard, *Heritage*, 61.

implies continuity with the past.”⁹⁵ Hobsbawm further elaborated that the past, which invented traditions tie to is the “suitable past” according to those overseeing society.⁹⁶

The Lantern Festival of Hoi An is a powerful example of invented tradition and false authenticity arising out of UNESCO related world heritage tourism. According to Di Giovine’s research and case study of the city, this festival derived from Hoi An’s failure to pass an initial evaluation by an UNESCO Regional Advisor in 1996 as a viable World Heritage Site due to poor management. To add to the city’s charm and improve the city’s chances of being listed, the local office of the Vietnamese Ministry of Culture developed new conservation guidelines and revived the tradition of lantern lighting to re-create a day in eighteenth century Hoi An. This old time tradition was not a regular local practice after the nineteenth century until 1998. Authorities banned TV watching in the historic center along with the use of modern lighting. Regulation prevented any motorized vehicle traffic from entering the historic center during the festival. The festival initially failed to gain local support until the third occurrence. Residents viewed the festival as an inconvenience and disruptive to commerce. Smaller groups of international tourists that participated in the early Lantern Festivals enjoyed them and accordingly provided the city tourism planners with positive feedback. The Lantern Festival did not attract significant international attention until after the inscription of Hoi An on the World Heritage List a year later.⁹⁷

Once the Lantern Festival became popular within the heritage tourism market, the economic nature of the community completely shifted. Local merchants found a newly

⁹⁵ Eric Hobsbawm, “Introduction: Inventing Traditions,” in *The Invention of Tradition*, 20th ed. (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 1.

⁹⁶ Hobsbawm, “Introduction: Inventing Traditions,” 1.

⁹⁷ Giovine, *The Heritage-Scape*, 266, 270.

created demand for handcrafted silk lanterns and began building business plans to meet this demand as more people discovered their village. This shift in products falsely leads visitors to believe lantern making is an age-old industry. Prior to 1998, cao lau noodles, silk paintings and pottery made up the main commercialized goods produced in the Hoi An. The villagers of Hoi An know that the festival and goods sold forever altered the actual tangible and intangible heritage of the community. Uninformed visitors on the other hand derive a pleasurable experience, but the sense of place and authenticity they take away from visiting the city during the Lantern Festival is a completely staged and false one from the souvenirs they take home to the elimination of modernity. If tourists engaged with locals to learn the true, non-commercialized story of Hoi An, they might feel cheated out of the cultural experience they sought.⁹⁸

UNESCO Recommendations to Mitigate Value Clashes

UNESCO gradually took on more of a leadership role in assisting heritage and tourism professionals with developing methodologies to more effectively manage value clashes and increased visitation at World Heritage Sites. UNESCO sponsored and participated in multiple studies centered on tourism impacts and conferences discussing the challenges faced by urban centers in the 1990s and 2000s. They sought to gain multiple expert opinions on how to navigate these conflicts amongst others to ensure UNESCO World Heritage Sites remain viable and accessible for all who wish to visit them. Multiple experts continued to argue that heritage must play a role in a city's future as it had in its past. They concluded that the extent of that role and what features of a city's cultural identity transition forward with the evolving community is best determined at the local level. In contrast to private entities like developers seeking to make a profit or

⁹⁸ Giovine, 272.

nations wanting to gain political clout through increased World Heritage Site listings, most residents engage with heritage initiatives out of a “desire for a better quality of life” and a desire to preserve their culture.⁹⁹ Historic cities can only continue when there is mutual respect of cultural tourism development along with community engagement with a place’s “historical and cultural values.”¹⁰⁰ Additionally, world heritage cities need to be managed in a fashion that equally recognizes local and international ownership allowing access to both groups.¹⁰¹

Based on expert opinion and a desire to give policymakers at the local levels more voice in the World Heritage Management process, the 1990s brought a change in the UNESCO best practices for World Heritage Site Management. In 1996, UNESCO supported the growing movement of decentralizing management of World Heritage Sites from the national level to the local level. UNESCO’s heritage team anticipated this would lead to better addressing the needs of resident and tourist alike, empower local communities to more effectively identify what key components of identity and the past could best support future visions for their historic town. In turn UNESCO would obtain a greater level of support for the World Heritage Program within inscribed historic communities. Pilot programs were implemented in several inscribed historic centers as part of *The Programme for the Safeguarding and Development of World Heritage Cities*. These pilots sought to improve “the skills of local authorities in managing cultural assets as part of their socio-economic development strategy.”¹⁰² These pilots became official development programs and expanded their reach by being

⁹⁹ Orbasli, *Tourists in Historic Towns Urban Conservation and Heritage Management*, 110.

¹⁰⁰ Orbasli, 110.

¹⁰¹ Orbasli; Yang and Phares, “Safeguarding and Development of World Heritage Cities,” 13.

¹⁰² Yang and Phares, “Safeguarding and Development of World Heritage Cities,” 11.

implemented in additional locations in 2001 with the approval of the World Heritage Committee. Ultimately, these programs further evolved into a more robust World Heritage Cities Program (last revamped in 2005).¹⁰³

The best practices from the various historic cities conferences and the studies focused on the challenges of managing inscribed historic centers of the past decade culminated in the 2011 *Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape*. The *Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape* “supports communities in their quest for development and adaptation, while retaining the characteristics and values linked to their history and collective memory and to the environment.”¹⁰⁴ Best practices under this program remind managers and policymakers to view heritage in a sustainable and balanced fashion.

Good management strategies and complimentary preservation policies must be implemented to eliminate the points of contention highlighted throughout this chapter. Policies should serve the people living within the historic community first by seeking to improve their quality of life with tourism serving as a catalyst for that improvement. Heritage managers must remain aware of fear and resistance as a city transitions to and remains a viable World Heritage Site. Once a city is inscribed, heritage managers must collaborate with city development offices, state authorities, and national governments to assist in limiting the impacts of gentrification. They must manage to bring all stakeholders to the table to ensure the continuation of the rich, authentic traditions and

¹⁰³ UNESCO World Heritage Centre, “Partnerships for World Heritage Cities Culture as a Vector for Sustainable Urban Development,” 88,95; Yang and Phares, “Safeguarding and Development of World Heritage Cities,” 11.

¹⁰⁴ UNESCO World Heritage Centre, “Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape, Including a Glossary of Definitions,” UNESCO World Heritage Centre, November 10, 2011, http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=48857&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html.

unique aspects that earned a community the World Heritage Designation. After all, it is at the local level that all heritage policies succeed or fail.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁵ Theobald, *Global Tourism*, 198; UNESCO World Heritage Centre, “Partnerships for World Heritage Cities Culture as a Vector for Sustainable Urban Development,” 90.

5. BATH: SHORT-TERM FRUSTRATION, LONG-TERM SUCCESS

Exiting the Bath Spa train station with my two travel companions in July 2015, we immediately noticed the large and full parking lots around the edge of the historic center. However, we rarely saw another person as we made our way to the hotel. After dropping off our bags, we wandered into the historic center to find lunch and learn the lay of the land. It was a gray afternoon filled with drizzle and periodic downpours. Only a few brave souls explored the old quarter. Walking the nearly abandoned streets while surrounded by the yellow and white limestone Georgian architectural marvels easily allowed us to embrace that sense of lumen and our imaginations slipped back to eighteenth century Bath. Sunshine paired with mild temperatures the next day drastically changed that transcendence enabling space. The horde of people that filled the historic center by eight a.m. warned us we should have taken advantage of the weather the day prior to explore the ancient sites. As we climbed onto the van taking a small group of us to Stonehenge, multiple fifty-sixty seat sized tour buses rolled up to deliver large groups to the heart of the Georgian city.

When we returned from Stonehenge shortly before noon, the masses reminded me of ants scurrying along. The three of us slipped anonymously into the crowd making our way towards the most famous site in Bath, the Roman Baths. While the Roman *termini* amazed us, we could not move through the underground structure fast enough. Twisting from room to room became claustrophobic with the numbers of people squeezed into the narrow halls. Compounding the visual challenges of viewing artifacts and narrative alongside displays, large groups of summer school or camp children ran screaming between guests making it difficult to hear one another. By seven p.m., the historic center

and entertainment district just outside its boundaries once again became a ghost town for residents and those of us who were overnight visitors to quietly enjoy.

My second trip to Bath as a researcher instead of a tourist almost mirrored this cyclical phenomena with the exception of the Roman Baths. I returned to Bath during the off-season in October 2016. Summer and the December Christmas Markets are the busiest times of year to visit the city. Taking advantage of the lower tourism volumes, I returned to the Roman Baths early in the morning to view the UNESCO signage, tourist information, and the World Heritage Information Center before the masses arrived.

Mass visitation and migration to the Somerset region is not a new occurrence. For centuries, the hot springs attracted multiple peoples to the valley Bath calls home. Iron-Age Britons, Romans, Saxons, and eighteenth century gentry considered the location an important social, religious, and healing site. During the Middle Ages, a hospital was built near the springs as it was believed the waters could heal those with ailments. The 6,000-year-old tradition of spiritual healing using spring waters in local spas, healing centers, and various worship practices continues today.¹⁰⁶

Royalty and upper-class visitors from around Europe patronized the city in the eighteenth century as part of their European Grand Tours. In the late 1770s, three architects undertook modernizing the city into what visitors see today. Their architectural endeavors made Bath a bustling and exciting place to visit. These same three gentlemen added the famous parks and gardens to the medieval town. Sadly, World War II brought a significant amount of destruction to the distinctive Georgian homes. To prevent further

¹⁰⁶ Bath & North East Somerset Council, “City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan 2003-2009” (Bath & North East Somerset Council, April 7, 2016), 10–14, 22, <https://www.bathworldheritage.org.uk/management-plan>; Mayor of Bath’s Office, “Mayor of Bath,” The Mayor of Bath, 2017, <http://www.mayorofbath.co.uk/medieval-bath>.

loss of the famous architecture that gives Bath its unique visual appeal, the City Council with help from the national level instituted a push for building conservation throughout the 1950s and 1960s.¹⁰⁷

Bath's intangible heritage extends beyond its healing waters. Bath served as a regional trading center from the Middle Ages forward. The Somerset region is famous for agricultural production and mining. City and regional mines provided the stone used in Georgian construction. In the Middle Ages, Bath produced and dyed woolen cloth as part of England's cloth trade. The River Avon served as a power generator for these mills and facilitated trade up and down the river. In the sixteenth century, Bath first formally forayed into the tourism trade. The city constructed a bowling green and five tennis courts to attract wealthy upper-class visitors who sought to escape the problems of large city dwelling. Many artists, writers, and painters called the city home in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Jane Austin is one of the most well-known authors to reside within the city's boundaries.¹⁰⁸

UNESCO inscribed Bath on the World Heritage List in 1987. The inscription approval was contingent upon the adoption of the Draft City Plan, a heritage management plan drafted by Bath officials in 1984, but not instituted at the time. Bath's application encompassed a large swath of the city's history from the days of the Romans through the eighteenth century. The main tangible features that earned the city's designation are the Roman Baths and Georgian architecture in the historic center. Experts considered Bath to be an excellent example of eighteenth century urban design that blended landscape and buildings away from the medieval and Renaissance tradition of "inward looking streets"

¹⁰⁷ Bath & North East Somerset Council, "City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan 2003-2009," 6–13.

¹⁰⁸ Bath & North East Somerset Council, 10–14, 22; Mayor of Bath's Office, "Mayor of Bath."

to the repositioning of buildings and streets to “achieve picturesque views.”¹⁰⁹The recognition of the shift in city planning style and Bath’s social history were added to an updated universal value statement in 2013 after UNESCO drafted a separate heritage protection convention specifically recognizing intangible heritage.

Bath’s inscription never included any sort of boundary map, buffer zone information, or an analysis of the need for buffer zones. City documents from the 1990s (the Bath Manifesto of 1993 and the 1997 Bath Local Plan) indicated that the World Heritage Site boundaries consisted of all area within the defined territory of the municipality. This lack of well-defined boundaries ultimately led to disagreement between ICOMOS and the city about cultural viewsheds. Furthermore, understanding the exact area of a heritage site is important so community managers can effectively identify key stakeholders and monitor compliance with UNESCO and national expectations for preservation and visitor access.¹¹⁰

English Heritage, the leading body overseeing the conservation of historic properties throughout England, identified de-centralized management as a threat to Britain’s heritage sites in 2002. English Heritage argued that deregulation, privatization of formerly public entities like utilities companies, poor communication and partnerships between various entities in managing the historic environment, reduced budgets and increased traffic all increasingly threatened England’s fragile historic landscape. Additionally, the movement from rural areas into urban ones due to “the collapse in farming incomes” increased the potential of loss of countryside views and rural

¹⁰⁹ UNESCO World Heritage Centre, “State Of Conservation of World Heritage Properties in Europe Report - Bath Section II” (UNESCO, 2006), 1, Bath Documents #428, UNESCO Archives, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/428/documents/>.

¹¹⁰ Bath & North East Somerset Council, “City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan 2003-2009,” 36.

landscapes.¹¹¹ These exact issues appeared in Bath’s challenges with maintaining its World Heritage status and preserving the cultural landscape for future generations.¹¹²

From 1987 until 2003, Bath had neither a formal World Heritage Management Plan nor a specific governing body responsible for overseeing the compliance with ICOMOS recommended site management standards. During this window of time, Bath served as a textbook example of how a de-centralized approach to management exacerbated challenges and conflicts between resident and outsider needs. National, regional, and local regulations and a variety of organizations along with private citizens conducted preservation and maintenance work within the site boundaries. The lack of a centralized oversight body to manage preservation and visitor traffic led to friction between locals and tourists competing with one another to claim and utilize protected historic space. To rectify and eliminate some of these friction points, Bath worked with English Heritage and ICOMOS for two years to draft an in-depth management plan.

The team developing the plan noted that residents valued the historical significance of their city and recognized the importance of efforts to protect and preserve historical resources. This aligned with the English national outlook survey on heritage conducted in 2001 by the English Heritage organization. According to the project findings ninety-eight percent of the British population believed that heritage is an important tool in studying the past; however these same individuals felt “excluded” from the historical environment and “powerless to be involved.”¹¹³ This same sense of exclusion existed in Bath. The committee noted that little was done to “engage with the

¹¹¹ Figueiredo, “English Heritage,” 46.

¹¹² Figueiredo, 46.

¹¹³ Figueiredo, 46.

local community on world heritage matters.”¹¹⁴

Planning research confirmed that visitors traveled to Bath because of its historic environment and preserved architecture. The 2003 management plan indicated that the city’s World Heritage status further increased visitor interest in the locale. The project team stressed that world heritage focused tourism plans needed to be developed to attract longer stay visitors who would “explore more widely around the city...and spend more money locally.”¹¹⁵ They also stressed that tourism managers needed to remain cognizant that the city must not be turned into “solely a visitor attraction.”¹¹⁶ Neither the Steering Committee nor planning team wanted to museumify the city or displace residents and local businesses in the interest of tourism or preservation. Based on the desire to attract longer stay visitors, Bath and Somerset policymakers sought economic benefit from their designation negating the conclusions of the Rebanks study. City and regional planners hoped to facilitate job growth by improving access to the city along with increased conservation of Bath’s tangible and natural heritage.¹¹⁷

Bath heavily depends on tourism revenues for its economic well-being. Tourism equated to 195 million pounds of city and regional income at the time Bath implemented the 2003 Management Plan. Seventy-nine percent of the jobs in the city and surrounding areas consisted of tourism related fields such as service, recreation, and leisure. This is significant as seventy percent of Bath residents worked within the city boundaries in addition to living there. The burden on regional and local residents for funding conservation and preservation efforts increased as national funding shrank. Lastly, Issue

¹¹⁴ Bath & North East Somerset Council, “City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan 2003-2009,” 82, 106.

¹¹⁵ Bath & North East Somerset Council, 106.

¹¹⁶ Bath & North East Somerset Council, 82.

¹¹⁷ Bath & North East Somerset Council, 82.

61 of the project team’s findings notes, “there is a conflict between the interests of visitors and those of local residents, workers and shoppers.”¹¹⁸ The conflicts referenced included businesses and facilities that cater to local daily activities, vehicular access issues, and “affordable properties for residential and business purposes.”¹¹⁹

The 2003 plan set the precedent for a six-year strategic outlook to address these conflicts before they escalated into a point of crisis. Bath published the plan and related documents on a city website focused on the city’s World Heritage designation. Regular inspections and steering committee meetings took place to evaluate the city’s progress in achieving the stated goals of the strategic plan. Bath hired a World Heritage Coordinator to serve as a central point of contact and overseer of the World Heritage Management Program in Bath. Even in collaborating with ICOMOS to ensure they had a well-designed management plan and steering committee overseeing it, Bath almost lost their designation in 2008.¹²⁰

Affordable Housing and Resident Oriented Development

The conflict over affordable properties became the first major clash between resident and visitor that the city needed to defuse. Growth in Bath from 1950 through 2002 remained relatively minimal. In 1950, the population was recorded at 80,000 residents. By 2003, the city grew slightly to 84,000. However, this number jumped to 89,000 by 2010. Bath is expected to maintain a growth rate of 18 percent through 2026. Rents and property values around Bath increased creating a housing shortage. New structures needed to be built to accommodate the influx of people. The increased cost of living compounded with population growth within the UK city created a challenging

¹¹⁸ Bath & North East Somerset Council, 71.

¹¹⁹ Bath & North East Somerset Council, 71.

¹²⁰ UNESCO World Heritage Centre, “State of Conservation Bath Section II.”

environment for the local residents.¹²¹

Plans for a large number of residential dwellings (flats and houses), a shopping mall, a school, and parking for these facilities along the River Avon prompted a visit from ICOMOS. The proposed Bath Western Riverside Development sought not only to address the housing shortage, but also to revitalize the community. Additionally, the proposed Dyson Academy, an engineering innovation school program, became subject to UNESCO scrutiny. The Dyson Academy brought with it many beneficial employment and growth opportunities that extended beyond its initial construction phase.

Administrators, academic professors and instructors along with support staff would be needed to sustain the training program. However, the school's modern glass design scheme and height placed it in direct conflict with the UNESCO cultural view protection requirements. The United Kingdom received a stay order in July 2008 from UNESCO blocking all development plans until ICOMOS met with city planners and the developers to determine whether or not these facilities could be built without affecting the historic cultural landscape. This request directly placed preservation over the needs of the local community. The United Kingdom honored the request from the World Heritage Committee so they did not risk the designation further.¹²²

¹²¹ Bath & North East Somerset Council, "City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan 2010-2016" (Bath & North East Somerset Council), 11, accessed February 5, 2017, https://www.bathworldheritage.org.uk/sites/world_heritage_site/files/heritage/World%20Heritage%20Site%20Management%20Plan%202016-2022.pdf; Bath & North East Somerset Council, "City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan 2003-2009," 25.

¹²² Jonathan Glancey, "Will Bath Lose Its World Heritage Status, Wonders Jonathan Glancey | Culture | The Guardian," *The Guardian*, April 5, 2009, <https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2009/apr/06/bath-heritage-architecture>; ICOMOS and World Heritage Centre, "Seville Committee Paper: UNESCO Report and Decision," June 2009, <http://www.bath-preservation-trust.org.uk/campaigning/city-of-bath-world-heritage-site/unesco/>.

A “reactive monitoring mission” team visited Bath in November of 2008.¹²³

Individuals from the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS made up the field team. The World Heritage Committee tasked the team with reviewing not only development plans, but the overall condition of Bath based on its concerns that the city and region might not understand how the development projects impacted “the outstanding universal value, integrity and authenticity” of the world heritage property under their management.¹²⁴

While the monitoring team found no major failures in management, their report critiqued the steps taken to accommodate the needs of residents and at times, ICOMOS appeared to overstep their authority in telling the city how they may continue to modernize or rehabilitate properties within city limits.

ICOMOS’s investigation supported the city’s legitimate necessity for additional residences. ICOMOS recommended that the World Heritage Committee allow Phase One: residential development to provide locals with housing with a few stipulations. The team deemed the residential project as not having a “negative impact” on Bath’s status since the residential structures would improve the city’s aesthetics by eliminating a “derelict and un-aesthetic industrial site.”¹²⁵ The report directed the developer to reduce the residential structures’ height to a maximum of eight stories to prevent blocking the appealing historic views. Lastly, their report instructed Bath to rework the project design to place all of the locally needed infrastructure such as schools and a kindergarten in this portion of development.¹²⁶

¹²³ Bath & North East Somerset Council, “City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan 2010-2016,” 15.

¹²⁴ Bath & North East Somerset Council, 107.

¹²⁵ Bath & North East Somerset Council, 108.

¹²⁶ ICOMOS and World Heritage Centre, “Seville Committee Paper: UNESCO Report and Decision.”

ICOMOS requested that Phase Two and Three plans be updated to reflect a reduced number of “volume and height of structures.”¹²⁷ In addition to changing the Phase Two and Three plans, the report suggested an international architecture competition be staged and the winning submission be submitted to the World Heritage Center for approval before being green lighted. Bath pushed back against these recommendations by pointing out that national regulation about housing numbers and residential development prevented the Council or ICOMOS from mandating a reduction in “density.”¹²⁸ The international competition recommendation could not be implemented due to UK regulations around residential planning and commercial developments since the idea was not included in the approved Supplementary Planning Documentation for the development project.¹²⁹

The mission field team chided the Bath and Northeast Somerset Council’s decision to allow the Southgate Shopping Center to proceed with a “pastiche: architectural style.”¹³⁰ Pastiche architectural styling mimics that of another period. The Southgate Shopping Center exterior façades mirrored those of the Georgian architecture surrounding it. The United Kingdom regularly deploys façade style preservation and reconstruction methods throughout their historic communities to assist with maintaining a sense of place and authenticity while allowing needed modernization or rehabilitation to occur. Traditional building methodologies and tradesmen are not realistically affordable or always readily available in historic communities. The project proposal and artistic renderings complied with national, regional, and local construction and rehabilitation

¹²⁷ ICOMOS and World Heritage Centre.

¹²⁸ Bath & North East Somerset Council, “City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan 2010-2016,” 113.

¹²⁹ Bath & North East Somerset Council, 113.

¹³⁰ Bath & North East Somerset Council, 110.

regulations. The coloring and building design nicely blended into the historic construction around it preventing any sort of interruption of the built historic environment that would legitimately draw ICOMOS and the World Heritage Committee's ire. The "regret" the mission shared with the Bath management teams appeared to stem from a position of architectural elitism or design preference without consideration to national building guidelines or the design tastes of the local community.¹³¹

In contrast to the ICOMOS and UNESCO experts' thoughts on the design, the 200 million pound regeneration project revamped what the city and many local residents felt was an "un-aesthetically pleasing" shopping complex and bus station built three decades earlier.¹³² Approximately, 30,000 residents attended the opening of the retail center. Surveyed residents expressed that "the shopping mall is better than the 1960s one it replaced" and are "keen" on the retail offerings.¹³³ Even the Bath Historic Preservation Trust approved of the project as long as the developer utilized quality veneers and stone reflecting the local materials used in Georgian construction.

The only record of local opposition to the design was expressed by the Bath Heritage Watchdog Association, a local group of heritage enthusiasts interested in preservation of historic buildings within the community. Their critique, however, was more an expression of construction quality concerns and compliance to artist renderings than an issue with the overall project. Initially, the group did not appear to be upset by the development, but it drew the organization's wrath after the developer demolished a nearby historic building that their organization believed should be preserved. Ultimately,

¹³¹ Bath & North East Somerset Council, 110.

¹³² Bath & North East Somerset Council, 14.

¹³³ Jonathan Glancey, "Bath Saves Its World Heritage Status ... Just," *The Guardian*, November 10, 2009, sec. Art and design, <http://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2009/nov/10/bath-world-heritage-status>.

the completed shopping center received The Georgian Group Architecture Giles Worsley Award for a New Building in Georgian Context in April 2010.¹³⁴

ICOMOS negotiated with Bath to find middle ground between the designation requirements and city residents. The developer and city withdrew plans for Dyson Academy after ICOMOS and the World Heritage Committee expressed concern about its modern design disrupting historical views. Dyson funded the Royal College of Art's young engineering program instead and gave up on any plans to develop a program in Bath. New building height restrictions limited interrupting the views of the countryside in order to appease UNESCO allowing the city and UK to keep Bath a World Heritage Site. The ICOMOS report noted the need of city regulations to protect the natural landscape and gardens from future development as population growth threatened them. ICOMOS and Bath officials decided that Phase Two and Three of the project would be evaluated at a later time.¹³⁵

Bath City planners and the Bath & Northeast Somerset Regional Council needed to submit their full updated site management plan addressing not only development issues, but also their Tourism Management Plan, the Integrated Realm Plan, and an integrated Traffic Control Plan no later than February 1, 2010 to ICOMOS and the World Heritage Center for review before it would be allowed to be implemented. Bath complied with the request producing the 2010 - 2016 Management Plan responding to all findings and explaining why the city was unable to comply with the request for an international

¹³⁴ "Bath Heritage Watchdog - Southgate News," accessed August 6, 2017, <http://www.bathheritagewatchdog.org/churchill.htm>.

¹³⁵ ICOMOS and World Heritage Centre, "Seville Committee Paper: UNESCO Report and Decision," June 2009, accessed November 29, 2015. <http://www.bath-preservation-trust.org.uk/campaigning/city-of-bath-world-heritage-site/unesco/>; "Will Bath Lose Its World Heritage Status, Wonders Jonathan Glancey | Culture | The Guardian," accessed August 7, 2017, <https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2009/apr/06/bath-heritage-architecture>.

design contest.

Traffic Management and Vehicular Risks to the Historic Environment

Bath's vehicular troubles tying directly to tourism can be traced to increased tourism related bus traffic in the 1980s and 1990s. The carrying capacity of the historic center and Royal Crescent neighborhood began to be breached by the mid-90s. As tourism related traffic congested roads, especially during peak hours, tensions between local commuters and visitors reached a fevered peak in 1994. Upset residents of the Royal Crescent area, tired of the congestion and noise associated with open top buses, turned hoses on visitors riding the buses. Residents and the local Bath Preservation Society partnered together in an aggressive campaign to close the Royal Crescent and Historic center to bus traffic. It took another five years of resident and tourist conflict, traffic studies, and public hearings until the Council finally agreed to close the Royal Crescent to bus traffic in 1999. It is recorded that prior to a traffic ban, over 600 tour buses a day visited this historic area of the city alone.¹³⁶

In 2003, the city plan indicated they received 2.75 million day trip visitors and one million overnight visitors each year. As of the writing of this report, the annual day trip visitor number has increased by almost 4 million to 6.7 million daily visitors. Bath's tourism managers expect visitor counts to continue growing by 12 percent a year. The traffic increase in the city resulted from the volume of daily visitors wanting to see the World Heritage sites and to visit Bath's shopping district. Tour buses and cars are doing

¹³⁶ David Nischolson-Lord, "Tourist Overcrowding Spoils Enjoyment of Historic Venue: Chester Approaches Saturation Point as Tide of Visitors Grows. David Nicholson-Lord Reports | The Independent," *The Independent*, May 30, 1994, <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/tourist-overcrowding-spoils-enjoyment-of-historic-venue-chester-approaches-saturation-point-as-tide-1439620.html>; English Club TV Ltd., "The Construction of Bath's Royal Crescent," *English Club TV On-the-Go* (blog), February 28, 2017, <https://tv-english.club/articles-en/discover-great-britain-en/the-construction-of-bathvs-royal-crescent/>.

more than just clogging up roads for local residents. The 2014 UNESCO periodic report indicates that the volume of traffic presents pollution hazards related to vehicle emissions that harm human health and building stonework.¹³⁷

In an attempt to balance congestion and reduce emissions within the city center, city planners have embraced a comprehensive approach to reducing traffic as part of their 2009 – 2016 Management Plan updates. The city deployed initiatives to encourage more walking and bicycling around the historic center along with other areas. Most of the rehabilitation funding programs for the area prior to this point went to building preservation versus that of green spaces or parks, leaving a need for safe pedestrian walk ways and signage to be developed. A new fund and program needed to be established to address this gap. The Steering Committee and Council developed the Public Realm and Movement Strategy to tackle this issue.¹³⁸

Public transportation saw substantial improvements between 2008 and 2014. However, traffic planning is challenging for Bath due to the city's outstanding universal value encompassing the landscape around the city. Any changes to the landscape to address traffic concerns may threaten the city's World Heritage Status if those improvements cause a loss of protected cultural viewsheds. The city also cannot endeavor to re-route traffic via underground means due to the hot springs located underneath it.¹³⁹

¹³⁷ Bath & North East Somerset Council, "Tourism and the Visitor Economy | Bathnes," Bath & North East Somerset Council, 2015, <http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/services/your-council-and-democracy/local-research-and-statistics/wiki/tourism-and-visitor-economy>; ICOMOS, "2013 Periodic Reporting - Second Cycle Bath" (UNESCO, May 20, 2014), 4, UNESCO Archives, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/428/documents/>.

¹³⁸ Bath & North East Somerset Council, "City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan 2016-2022" (Bath & Northeast Somerset Council), 32, accessed February 5, 2017, https://www.bathworldheritage.org.uk/sites/world_heritage_site/files/heritage/World%20Heritage%20Site%20Management%20Plan%202016-2022.pdf.

¹³⁹ Bath & North East Somerset Council, "City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan 2010-2016," 55.

Today, the city finds itself struggling once again to combat the troubles caused by vehicular traffic directly linked to heritage tourism within the restrictions implemented under the World Heritage Program. With limited options available, city planners produced a resolution to expand their park and ride resources by building a new commuter parking lot in November 2015. The proposed locations for the lot landed Bath in the crosshairs of local interests groups, the National Trust, and UNESCO. Two different locations in the meadows of the Cotswald area greenbelt could ideally house the park and ride. The sites proximity to the city ensured that costs for commuters and tourists alike to reach the city center would not be prohibitive. The park and ride would relieve some of the pressure on local residents experienced trying to reach their homes or go about their daily activities. UNESCO dispatched ICOMOS to evaluate how the new parking lot impacted the city's designation status. The inspection team has not published their report or recommendation.¹⁴⁰

Multiple British news reports advised that the proposed lot locations substantially disrupted the historic landscape. The National Trust stated that the park and ride would cause “irreversible and significant damage” to one of Britain’s most popular World Heritage Sites.¹⁴¹ The Bath Historic Preservation Trust also echoed this sentiment. In July of 2017, Bath abandoned the park and ride plan. Instead, the city agreed to investigate the possible implementation of a new tram system from surrounding locations and already

¹⁴⁰ Steven Morris, “Bath Park-and-Ride Scheme Risks Unesco Status, Say Campaigners,” *The Guardian*, November 8, 2015, sec. UK news, <http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2015/nov/08/bath-park-and-ride-scheme-risks-unesco-status-say-campaigners>.

¹⁴¹ Morris; UNESCO, “Education for Sustainable Development | Education | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization,” UNESCO, accessed March 21, 2016, <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/education/themes/leading-the-international-agenda/education-for-sustainable-development/>.

existing park and ride lots to relieve congestion.¹⁴²

Intangible Heritage and Local Identity

Bath's tourism and heritage management strategies preserved many aspects of the community's position as a place of trade, healing, and learning. The city acknowledged the importance of its intangible heritage and unique sense of identity in providing visitors an authentic sense of place. In 2013, the city petitioned the World Heritage Committee to update their inscription criteria to include the important role of spirituality, historic regional trades, and the uniqueness of Bath's local identity to attract great thinkers and creative cultural leaders as key components contributing to the city's outstanding universal value. The updating of the statement of outstanding universal value draws attention to these frequently overlooked aspects of heritage within a World Heritage Site. Furthermore, it provides Bath's heritage managers powerful support to fund initiatives that continue local traditions and support for a local ordinance that protects these practices if they become threatened due to modernization.¹⁴³

Bath continues its long-standing tradition as a regional trade center just as it did in the Middle Ages. The city maintains a balanced mixture of local, regional, and national businesses. Within the historic center itself, one mainly finds local shops, historic hotels, and a combination of local and national eateries. The further out one goes from the Roman Baths, the more national retail franchises such as Marks and Spencer can be found. Most businesses within the historic center cater to tourist and visitor needs. On the edge of the historic district is the previously mentioned Southgate Shopping Center,

¹⁴² Steven Morris, "Council Ready to Ditch Bath Park-and-Ride Plan after Local Outrage | Culture | The Guardian," *The Guardian*, July 11, 2017, sec. UK News, <https://www.theguardian.com/culture/2017/jul/11/bath-park-ride-council-ditch-scheme-world-heritage-status>.

¹⁴³ ICOMOS, "2013 Periodic Reporting - Second Cycle Bath," 2.

which also provides a range of goods and services to both residents and tourists alike. The Steering Committee, Bath Council, Northeast Somerset Council, and Bath Preservation Trust partnered together to establish the Enhancement Fund to ensure continuity of construction craftsmen in the area. The fund assists with a variety of tasks ranging from costs to organize and train volunteers and support a variety of smaller improvement projects, which allow individuals to learn stonemasonry and ironwork skills. The City of Bath College participates in these projects to provide their masonry students with hands on experience. The Steering Committee submits bid petitions to the national Heritage Lottery Fund as an additional source of funding for projects that enhance the town's cultural views and further allow the application of traditional craft skills within the Somerset region.¹⁴⁴

The tradition of holistic healing through the famous hot springs under the city is fostered through projects encouraging the revival of spa style businesses and heritage initiatives that recognize the importance of the local hot springs to various civilizations over the centuries. The Visit Bath website's spa and well-being page incorporates the World Heritage logo and branding by declaring the city "A World Heritage Spa City." The spa and wellness businesses range in size from small, locally owned holistic centers such as the Neal Yard's Remedies to the multimillion-dollar Thermae Bath Spa complex. The employees within the healing centers support the heritage management strategy to relay the deep-rooted local history in healing as well as directly tie their organization into the city's World Heritage Designation. The spas and holistic healing centers are not only continuing centuries old traditions, they provide services that benefit both the local and

¹⁴⁴ Bath & North East Somerset Council, "City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan 2016-2022," 35.

out of town consumer. I asked a stylist within the Spa district about their customer base. She affirmed that the bulk of the customer base in this section of town is primarily made up of tourists, but their saloon and spa's clientele included locals and students from the University of Bath.

Bath is working with other European Spa Cities to develop a “trans-national world heritage nomination” which will encompass eleven European cities that historically have been viewed as places of healing or spiritual spa practices.¹⁴⁵ This is similar to the combined Frontiers of the Roman Empire, which incorporates World Heritage Sites in different countries such as Hadrian's Wall in England and Germany's Roman Limes into a single inscribed site also known as a serial site. This is an interesting approach to gaining a World Heritage Listing based on both tangible and intangible heritage. It also broadens the societal groups maintaining the historic memory of ancient healing from the local level to a continental base. Perhaps further global connections across all continents could be made to establish a new global ownership of water based spirituality and healing practices in the future.¹⁴⁶

Bath's Thermae Spa Complex is the current premier keeper of Bath's long standing tradition of water based healing and ritual. With the exception of the New Royal Bath contemporary structure, the buildings that make up the Thermae Bath Spa Complex originated in the eighteenth century. The complex encompasses the properties known as Hot Bath, Cross Bath, and Hetling Pump Room. According to archeological studies conducted on the Cross Bath building, the waters themselves served as a spiritual and wellness site from the Roman occupation of Britain through the Middle Ages when an

¹⁴⁵ Bath & North East Somerset Council, 35.

¹⁴⁶ Bath & North East Somerset Council, 35.

early bathhouse was constructed on the property, and into the mid-twentieth century. The World Wildlife Fund recognized Cross Bath as a sacred site. It is believed the springs served as a sacred site for the early inhabitants of the valley that Bath occupies. Cross Bath along with the other city baths and pools functioned until 1979. The city closed its spring fed pools due to a fatality caused by *Naegleria fowleri*, an amoeba which found the hot springs an inviting environment. Adding to the spa's woes was an additional case of Legionnaire's disease contracted within the Thermae Bath Spa complex. Due to improvements in filtering technology that limit the risk of acquiring Legionnaire's disease or amebic encephalitis, the blend of new and historic spring fed facility reopened for public use in 2006.¹⁴⁷

The increased focus on intangible heritage is a double-edged sword much like tourism can be. When viewed from a heritage perspective, the incentivization of historic trade and spa programs are excellent preservation tools that maintain Bath's historic collective memory and identity. The manner in which the city and region structured support for these programs and their integration into the overall heritage management master plan for the city do not raise criticisms of invented tradition or falsified authenticity from academics or tourists. Short-term, these businesses boost Bath's economy through increased revenues and employment opportunities. Private investment and funding of restoration and rehabilitation of protected structures relieves some of the financial burden from the pocketbooks of residents, the City, and the Somerset Region. But, viewed through a longer-term economic development lens, these programs may be

¹⁴⁷ Thermae Bath Spa, "The Spa Project Buildings | Thermae Bath Spa," Thermae Bath Spa, 2017, <https://www.thermaebathspa.com/news-info/about-the-spa/the-spa-project-buildings>; BBC News, "Timeline: Spa Saga Highs and Lows," BBC News, July 31, 2006, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/somerset/5230322.stm>.

placing the city's economic stability at risk.

One of the main criticisms of Bath's designation is that it limits the city's ability to attract innovative industries to diversify employment opportunities for residents. Tourism remains the main economic source of income for the city in 2016. Individuals at local, regional, and national levels express concern that the World Heritage requirements are forcing Bath to be overly dependent on the tourism and service sector. This critique was documented in a study completed by Dr. Aylin Orbasli on the impacts of tourism on Bath in 2010. Orbasli's study shared that the city believed that "the historic environment" was a "unique selling point... for businesses." Outside entities regularly challenged the city's perspective.¹⁴⁸

In a 2007 article entitled "Is Bath Britain's Most Backward City?" Sam Holiday, the editor for the Bath Chronicle, stated, "Developers who have worked all around the country say that they've never faced the level of criticism in Bath."¹⁴⁹ The restrictions of the World Heritage Program and the local desire to maintain Bath's historic appearance deter outside interest in Bath instead of inviting innovative industries and designers into the city. The new 2010-2016 Heritage Plan suggests that Bath and Somerset planners now recognize that history does not hold such a strong appeal to companies outside of the tourism and services industry. A new economic strategy for Bath and North East Somerset was implemented in 2014 to attract more skilled jobs through diversification of the local economy.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁸ Aylin Orbasli, "City of Bath World Heritage Site: Economic Development Appraisal" (Dr. Aylin Orbasli, August 5, 2017), 14, <http://www.aylinorbasli.com/Resources/Bath%20World%20Heritage.pdf>.

¹⁴⁹ Stephen Bayley, "Is Bath Britain's Most Backward City? | Art and Design | The Guardian," *The Guardian*, September 15, 2007, <https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2007/sep/16/architecture>.

¹⁵⁰ Bath & North East Somerset Council, "City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan 2010-2016," 11; Bath & North East Somerset Council, "Bath Economic Strategy Review 2013-2014" (Bath

World Heritage Branding and Awareness

Dr. Orbalsi's 2010 economic study and ICOMOS inspection reports prior to 2013 recorded a lack of recognition amongst visitors and townspeople of Bath's World Heritage Status. This was an area Bath's Steering Committee needed to address to better measure the potential benefits the designation brought to their city. By 2013, the UNESCO periodic report showed an uptick in resident and visitor recognition of the World Heritage Designation. The 2016-2022 World Heritage Management Plan confirmed this improvement through visitor surveys where "94 percent" of respondents knew the city was a World Heritage Site and "83 percent were interested in learning more" about world heritage.¹⁵¹ During my field visit in 2016, the World Heritage logo appeared seamlessly integrated into city signage, visitor resources, and conversations with various service industry employees. The emblem is displayed in multiple ways within the ticketing and waiting area of the Roman Baths in addition to along its exterior. An electronic information center, located just outside the Pump Room restaurant in the Roman Bath Complex, provides further details and insight into the UNESCO World Heritage Program and the aspects of what deemed Bath worthy of such special recognition. In my casual discussions with fellow visitors and residents, there was not a hint of friction between the narrative and interpretation of the city's history or utilization of historic space. One factor in that lack of friction may simply correlate with the timing of my visit as it was during a low period of touristic activity.¹⁵²

& Northeast Somerset Council, 2014), 2, 10,
http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/siteimages/Planning-and-Building-Control/Major-Projects/ba192_economic_strategy_05.pdf.

¹⁵¹ Bath & North East Somerset Council, "City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan 2016-2022," 33.

¹⁵² Orbalsi, "City of Bath World Heritage Site: Economic Development Appraisal," 9.

Success From Compromise and Conservation:

Bath is a World Heritage Historic Center success story. Even with the tumultuous moments between the city and the UNESCO World Heritage Committee, the two parties ultimately found neutral ground that allowed the needs of the community to be addressed while still maintaining the integrity of Bath's outstanding universal value. The journey to reach a point of relative equity between UNESCO, resident, and tourist needs took approximately twelve years from initial inscription. Bath formed productive partnerships at the local, regional, national, and international levels to better approach protecting their unique heritage.

From a conservation perspective, the convention requirements are functioning as intended to protect the tangible heritage, urban design, and cultural views of the small British city. Bath's Steering Committee listened to local residents, preservationists, and experts within the heritage-scape at all three levels of oversight and took action on their feedback. The city limited tourist related automobile traffic to improve the quality of life for residents and reduce the damage caused to historic buildings from automobile emissions. While willing to consider ICOMOS and the World Heritage Committee's expertise in approaching development in a fashion that both protected a World Heritage Site and addressed the needs of urban historic center residents, Bath pushed back where appropriate and compromised as needed to find a solution benefiting the community as much as possible while enabling the city to keep its designation. Additionally, the city updated its inscription to better protect its intangible heritage and historical role as a spa, healing, and regional commercial center. Heritage managers leveraged the international recognition to promote the traditional trades and practices within the community and to

attract longer stay cultural heritage tourists. To date, Bath's management strategies, carrying capacity, and proactivity limited the potential negative impacts of a monoculture economy primarily focused on tourism.

On the negative side, Bath struggles to bring innovative business sectors and new industry to the community with the restrictions of UNESCO's program. The inability to build structures of more modern design within the town boundaries due to rules about cultural viewsheds and disruption of the Georgian skyline may eventually cause the decline of the currently thriving town. The loss of economic injection from technology companies and programs such as those Dyson proposed may in the long term create substantial economic challenges for not only residents, but for the support of preservation projects if tourism declines or for some reason the university shuts its doors.

UNESCO's preservation requirements, tourist wants, and resident needs may become further out of balance as businesses are required to make changes to meet energy efficiency standards under the new G2 Climate Accord without disrupting historical views or changing the face of protected structures. Those costs of compliance may be significant for property owners and lead to a difficult decision between preserving the community's designation or abandoning it to ensure the existence of humanity in the face of climate change. Brexit and recent terrorist attacks in many of England's most popular tourist destinations may soon test the resilience of British inscribed historic centers to withstand the financial storm that comes with the erosion of an economic base primarily dependent on tourism.

6. SAN GIMIGNANO: A TALE OF DISPLACEMENT

In the preceding Bath case study, the main concern of a tourism-based economy is its deterioration causing economic harm to residents and the long-term preservation of an inscribed site. This chapter explores what happens if the pendulum swings too far in the opposite direction, when tourism injects large amounts of revenue into a community, visitor numbers accelerate rapidly, and local management is inadequate to address this sudden economic boom. San Gimignano is also a European medieval regional center of trade and site of pilgrimage. However, San Gimignano's path to inscription and popular tourist destination is vastly different from that of Bath. The challenges and prosperity brought to the community by tourism caused the worse case scenario every heritage manager tries their best to avoid: death by tourism. Tourism so drastically altered San Gimignano's local identity and so negatively impacted the residents of the town, residents loath when tourist seasons commences and brings the dreaded day-tripper into the boundaries of their walled city.

The Tuscan town is challenging to access and having limited time to reach San Gimignano, I decided to journey into the hill top city as the ever-dreaded day-tripper. I arrived with sixty other American, Australian, and Spanish tourists via tour bus. Traveling in this manner, allowed me to experience how tourists interacted with the small medieval town and how residents along with professional tour guides perceived outsiders. I braced for a cold reception, crowded streets, mass manufactured trinkets, and a museumified historic center based on my prior research. The criticism of lost community identity, that residents had been driven from the historic center they called home from the days of the Etruscans, and the behavior of visitors 'consuming' the architecture with

photography, but not supporting local businesses proved to be very accurate depictions of the woes San Gimignano struggles with on a daily basis. I noticed the lack of UNESCO signage throughout the historic center. This was in sharp contrast with what I observed in Bath and Urbino. It sent a loud and clear message, that while the city recognized its inscription online and in town tourism publications, the architecture of the city nor the designation are the main reasons the city wants visitors to stop in the walled historic center.

San Gimignano became a popular tourism stop in the 1970s and tourism numbers began to slowly grow throughout the 1980s. The increased tourism in the last decade of the twentieth century and the first of the twenty-first century destroyed the local character of the town for residents and tourists. Direct correlations of the negative effects of unsustainable tourism can be drawn from the time of its UNESCO inscription through today. The small medieval Tuscan city was and still is famous for its agricultural industry, cloth dying, saffron based cuisine, and Vernaccia white wine production. These items will be discussed more in-depth later in the case study.

San Gimignano's origins began in Antiquity. During the Middle Ages and into the early Renaissance, the town prospered as a free commune and an active trade center for saffron, wine, wool, and money lending.¹⁵³ Pilgrims traveling the Via Francigena assisted with the rise of the town as a trade hub by transporting goods and injecting income into the town's economy through taxes, purchases, and fees for overnight stops on their journey to Rome or returning northward from visiting the seat of the Catholic

¹⁵³ A free commune is a form of medieval government in Italy where the community is self-governed by a group of prominent community members known as the Consuls. In the later Middle Ages, a Podesta, a city governor from outside the commune, was added to the political structure in an attempt to prevent bloodshed between rival guilds and families. Tuscany frequently suffered from interregional feuding between familial factions loyal to the Pope and loyal to the Holy Roman Emperor.

Church. The Black Death swept through the city reducing the population of approximately 8,762 residents by 50 percent to 3,997 by 1350. The town's population remained around this number through the eighteenth century.¹⁵⁴

In the late nineteenth century, a European revival of interest in the Middle Ages made San Gimignano a popular stop on European Grand Tours. It is in this period that the city undertook its first preservation and restoration projects driven by outside interest in its unique history. In the 1920s and 1930s, Fascist programs and community initiatives completed multiple restoration projects within the city assisting in the preservation of its medieval character. The Tuscan community received its national designation as a "monument zone" in 1928.¹⁵⁵ After World War II, the town once again faced depopulation challenges as its youth sought employment in larger, nearby urban centers. Poor local farmers left the area due to meager crop yields and the inability to pay increased taxes during this same window of time. This migration trend slightly reversed in the 1970s as the town once again marketed itself as a tourism destination.¹⁵⁶

Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, academics, people employed in creative fields such as art or traditional crafts, and individuals interested in either wine production or organic farming moved into the city. People from Northern Italy or other countries started purchasing exceptionally affordable properties. Property values at the time were low due

¹⁵⁴ Comune di San Gimignano, "Comune di San Gimignano tourism-culture — English," municipality, Comune di San Gimignano tourism-culture, April 1, 2016, <http://www.comune.sangimignano.si.it/en/tourism-culture>; Guido Alfani and Francesco Ammannati, "Long-Term Trends in Economic Inequality: The Case of the Florentine State, C. 1300–1800," *The Economic History Review*, March 1, 2017, 6, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ehr.12471>.

¹⁵⁵ D. Medina Lasansky, "Urban Editing, Historic Preservation, and Political Rhetoric: The Fascist Redesign of San Gimignano," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 63, no. 3 (2004): 340, <https://doi.org/10.2307/4127974>.

¹⁵⁶ Comune di San Gimignano, "Comune San Gimignano"; Rebecca Goulding, Edmund Horan, and Lee Tozzi, "The Importance of Sustainable Tourism in Reversing the Trend in the Economic Downturn and Population of Rural Communities," *Pasos Revisita de Turismo Y Patrimonio Cultural* 12, no. N. 3 Special Issue (2014): 556; Lasansky, "Urban Editing, Historic Preservation, and Political Rhetoric," 326.

to the lower cost of living, a general lack of innovation, and the area's reluctance to embrace mechanized industry after World War II. The town relied on agriculture and tourism as its main income sources.¹⁵⁷

Italy submitted the Historic Center of San Gimignano for inscription during the 1989 World Heritage Conference. UNESCO inscribed San Gimignano in 1990. The city's unique medieval architecture and famous church frescos dating back to 998 C.E. provided the basis for its nomination. The features that distinguished San Gimignano from other Italian towns with medieval structures are its large number of *torri*. A *torre* is a tall tower once used by powerful, feuding families as residences. Additionally, the towers served as tax collection points for pilgrims and travelers on the Via Francigena. Other Italian cities, such as Bologna, have *torri*, but over the years, these cities lowered their remaining towers' height for various reasons. Along with the towers and church frescoes, San Gimignano provided an exemplary example of true urban design in Medieval Italy. The town developed around two piazzas with inward facing buildings and streets. There is no recognition of intangible culture within the statement of outstanding universal value for the site.¹⁵⁸

The World Heritage Committee approved the addition of San Gimignano contingent upon the Italian authorities addressing a few issues prior to the committee's next meeting. The first issue the committee noted was that the application did not include well-defined boundaries of the historic center nor the required buffer zone. Both of these

¹⁵⁷ Christine Phillips, *Sustainable Place* (Chichester; UK: Wiley-Academy, 2003), 100; Goulding, Horan, and Tozzi, "The Importance of Sustainable Tourism in Reversing the Trend in the Economic Downturn and Population of Rural Communities," 556.

¹⁵⁸ UNESCO World Heritage Centre, "State Of Conservation of World Heritage Properties in Europe - San Gimignano Section II" (UNESCO, 2006), 1, San Gimignano Documents #550, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/550/documents>; ICOMOS, "Advisory Board Evaluation -San Gimignano" (UNESCO, September 1, 1989), 1-2, San Gimignano Documents #550, UNESCO Archives, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/550/documents/>.

serve to protect the historic center and designated landscapes from encroachment related to development. In ICOMOS's inspection report and the summary drafted by the World Heritage Committee, both groups expressed a need for "Italian authorities to combat the effects of increased tourism," particularly in the summer.¹⁵⁹ The inspection report firmly cautioned that neither town development plans nor increased tourism should lead to additional infrastructure near the historic center, as any alteration would reduce the "beauty of the site" potentially negating its status.¹⁶⁰ San Gimignano managed to maintain compliance with this requirement as tourist numbers increased steadily from 1990 through today. Overnight tourism volumes in 1993 are recorded at 233,845 visitors and 381,116 in 1995. In 2003, a reported 1,515,000 people visited the town annually and only 137,717 stayed overnight. By 2015, San Gimignano city planners estimated that over 2.5 million day-trippers walked the city streets. This number increased to three million day trippers in 2016. Tourism volumes far exceed the carrying capacity for the small town.¹⁶¹

Displacement of Residents and Loss of Non-staged Local Identity

Tourism pressures and a tourism centric monoculture economy only worsened after the city's inscription in 1990. This trend continued throughout the decade as outsider interest in purchasing properties within the boundaries of San Gimignano increased. New property owners settling in the surrounding valley did not present a great threat to local identity as many were interested in learning and sustaining local farming

¹⁵⁹ ICOMOS, "Advisory Board Evaluation -San Gimignano," 66.

¹⁶⁰ ICOMOS, 66.

¹⁶¹ UNESCO World Heritage Centre, "State Of Conservation San Gimignano Section II," 1, 3-4; ICOMOS, "Advisory Board Evaluation -San Gimignano," 66; Redazione Rivista Siti Unesco Unesco Magazine Publishing, "San Gimignano: Rifunzionalizzare San Domenico," *Rivista Siti Unesco* (blog), March 9, 2016, <http://www.rivistasitiunesco.it/422-2/>.

and wine-making traditions. However, the individuals purchasing properties within the walled portions of town or close to the historic center altered the character and affordability of the *comune*. Many of these new landowners only lived within the city for short periods of time during the year creating an environment that fed property speculation and increased rents above the threshold that the small local population could afford. Christine Phillips noted in her 2003 economic and environmental study of San Gimignano that the total local population within the historic center consisted of “3500 inhabitants in 1985” which declined almost in half to only “1760 in 1996.”¹⁶² At the time Phillips completed her study, she noted that the town only had “four hotels,” a reputation for authentic local “luxury” products, and locals described their quality of life as good because it “had not succumbed to worldly pressures.”¹⁶³ She documented the residents’ belief that the town did not experience high tourism volumes from November to March. In a matter of a few short years, these descriptors drastically changed due to the added attention from the World Heritage designation, the requirements of the program to preserve the site, and the pressures of increased cultural tourism on the city.¹⁶⁴

UNESCO’s 2014 periodic report deemed the World Heritage designator and the related tourism growth as a very positive contribution to the quality of life for local residents. However, voices of dissent challenged that claim throughout the first decade and a half of the new millennium. A 2006 New York Time’s article captured the tension between tourism and locals. “This is a medieval city, not Disneyland,” advised the Mayor

¹⁶² Phillips, *Sustainable Place*, 97–98.

¹⁶³ Phillips, 52, 80, 97.

¹⁶⁴ Phillips, 98–99.

of San Gimignano.¹⁶⁵ He elaborated that he could not restrict tourism due to World Heritage Site status; however, he could not “pretend that nothing is wrong,” especially with his responsibility to protect the site.¹⁶⁶ The tension arose from what the mayor and Tuscan tourism officials describe as hit and run tourism. This is a form of tourism when buses drop off people to visit the city for an hour or two. During this short visit, tourists consume space and culture without providing the city any sort of positive benefit.

Hit and run tourism, a steady annual growth rate of five-ten percent in visitation, and the purchase of property by outside entities increased rents within the historic center to the point that providers of basic goods and services such as shoe repair found themselves forced out of the city center. A frustrated quote from resident Gabriele Bacciotini underscored the state of affairs for local residents of the World Heritage Site, “We are penalized because we spend as much as tourists do to live here. At least we live well in January when no one is here.”¹⁶⁷ By 2006, the historic center’s residential population declined by another two hundred bodies to 1,400.¹⁶⁸

The disruption of life to local residents only intensified after 2006 per a 2014 published article entitled “Urbicide in All Good Faith” by Marco D’Eramo. D’Eramo, an Italian anthropologist, grew up in San Gimignano. His article directly linked the World Heritage Program to the increased tourism just as the town’s mayor claimed in 2006. D’Eramo wrote that within the ancient walls, “not a butcher, not a greengrocer, nor

¹⁶⁵ Elisabetta Povoledo, “Tourism Traps an Italian Town with Its Own Success - Travel & Dining - International Herald Tribune - The New York Times,” *New York Times*, August 21, 2006, sec. Travel, http://www.nytimes.com/2006/08/21/travel/21iht-trgimi.2549491.html?_r=0.

¹⁶⁶ Povoledo.

¹⁶⁷ Povoledo, “Tourism Traps an Italian Town with Its Own Success”

¹⁶⁸ Povoledo, “Tourism Traps an Italian Town with Its Own Success - Travel & Dining - International Herald Tribune - The New York Times.”

genuine baker can be found;” instead, one finds only hotels, bars and souvenir shops.¹⁶⁹ All non-tourism oriented, local business disappeared from the historic center in a matter of just eight years. The city’s website confirms that the industries which provide the top two economic revenue streams for the city may be overlooked by a tourist as they are located in the surrounding outer valley.

My walk throughout the historic center, conversations, and direct observations confirmed D’Eramo’s description of local businesses replaced with those that only service tourists. Not a single grocery store, laundry center, or other routine business a resident may need to conduct daily activities existed. The majority of the businesses are small regional chains according to my discussions with shop owners and review of the multiple locations on the cards I collected. The exceptions to this are a handful of the cafes (bars in Italian), gelaterias, restaurants, and a few enotecas (wine shops offering local agricultural products). These businesses filled with tourists throughout the morning as opposed to residents who traditionally utilized them for a morning cup of coffee or pastry. This is a shift in the documented resident behavior of a decade earlier when locals visited the historic center for markets and socialized with friends in cafes and restaurants during the weekend.¹⁷⁰

The original expert body that wrote UNESCO’s convention in the 1960s warned that the preservation requirements might harm local identity and intangible culture. The panel anticipated that the working class, in particular shopkeepers and artisans, might be removed from a historic center due to increased rents arising from the rehabilitation of

¹⁶⁹ Povoledo; Marco D’Eramo, “Urbanicide in All Good Faith,” *domus*, accessed September 28, 2015, http://www.domusweb.it/en/op-ed/2014/08/20/urbanicide_in_allgoodfaith.html.

¹⁷⁰ D’Eramo, “Urbanicide in All Good Faith”; Comune di San Gimignano, “Comune San Gimignano”; Phillips, *Sustainable Place*, 81.

historic properties.¹⁷¹ The drafting committee suggested that national and local governments offer financial assistance to prevent these changes from occurring. What the committee did not anticipate was tourist demand for amenities and authentic cultural experiences causing more harm to communities than most rehabilitation or modern development projects.¹⁷²

From a resident's perspective, tourism created a struggle to find goods and services for routine daily activities. The average local resident and routine businesses disappeared from the historic center to relocate outside the city walls in favor of those entities that cater to the day-tripper or much smaller volume of extended stay tourist. Consequentially, San Gimignano's natives are alienated from what is rightfully their physical space and heritage by outsiders attracted to the city due to its affiliation with UNESCO. A December 2007 Stakeholders project conducted by the University of Florence further highlighted that the residents believed the tourism development plan deployed in the 1980s and 1990s was "not sustainable anymore."¹⁷³ The same study documented that shops and restaurants no longer offered local products, but instead served "non-local...sometimes low-quality products at excessive prices."¹⁷⁴ Worse yet, residents now described their quality of life as "quite difficult" due to the number of tourists and the increased cost of living.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷¹ UNESCO, "Meeting of Experts to Establish an International System For the Protection of Monuments, Groups of Buildings And Sites of Universal Interest Final Report," 33.

¹⁷² UNESCO, 33.

¹⁷³ Giulio Citroni, "Local Actions to Promote Sustainable Development: The Case of San Gimignano," accessed August 13, 2017, https://www.academia.edu/639324/Local_actions_to_promote_sustainable_development_the_case_of_San_Gimignano.

¹⁷⁴ Citroni.

¹⁷⁵ Comune di San Gimignano, "Comune San Gimignano"; D'Eramo, "Urbanicide in All Good Faith"; Povoledo, "Tourism Traps an Italian Town with Its Own Success - Travel & Dining - International Herald Tribune - The New York Times"; Citroni, "Local Actions to Promote Sustainable Development."

Visitors familiar with San Gimignano and that either travel extensively in Italy or reside in Italy echo resident sentiments that the town went from a popular living cultural center to an overcrowded tourist trap. Alasdair Romanes, an educator at a private prep school in England, composed a blog entitled “Death by Tourism” highlighting what he saw from an outsiders perspective pre and post UNESCO inscription. Romanes visited San Gimignano in 1979. He described the town as “charming,” “beautiful,” and awe-inspiring over two decades ago.¹⁷⁶ He returned to San Gimignano in September 2014 to find the city he missed to be a vastly changed place with five parking lots and crowded streets. He wrote that the “delightful shops of the Seventies had become a collection of nasty tat and so called ‘local’ goods and produce.”¹⁷⁷ He laments throughout the remainder of his blog about how the city no longer had any sense of soul or unique identity. Like D’Eramo, he argued that San Gimignano’s tourist oriented historic center “ceased to exist” and instead took on the empty shell of “the walking dead” with the town’s executioner being tourism.¹⁷⁸

A more recent blog post from 2017 on the popular Girl in Florence blog written by an American journalist living in Tuscany and working for Italy Magazine, confirms that the historic center in San Gimignano continues to be a place to avoid during peak season. The author describes the city as a victim of “fast tourism,” another way of saying hit and run tourism, where hordes of people race around the city for one to two hours “buying crappy souvenirs from unscrupulous sellers.”¹⁷⁹ She writes that she “avoided the

¹⁷⁶ Alsdair Romanes, “Romanes Rants: Death by Tourism,” Lambrook School, 2014, <http://www.lambrookschool.co.uk/Romanes-Rants-Death-by-Tourism>.

¹⁷⁷ Romanes.

¹⁷⁸ Romanes.

¹⁷⁹ Georgette Jupe, “Why Winter Is The Best Time To Visit San Gimignano,” *Girl in Florence* (blog), May 1, 2017, <http://girlinflorence.com/2017/01/05/winter-best-time-visit-san-gimignano/>.

town completely” during tourist season due to parking woes and an unpleasant environment resulting from the sheer volume of people crammed into the cobblestone alleyways and trouble finding parking.¹⁸⁰

Cultural Values Clash Created by Tourism

Tourist behavior, in addition to breaching of community carrying capacity, influences how residents of popular destinations receive outside visitors. Overwhelmed by large crowds and tourists who do not invest in the community, San Gimignano residents’ patience is strained with the visiting public. Add in tourist behaviors that Italians view as *brutta figura* (bad manners) and the natural, warm hospitality most Italians display vanishes. Tourists’ treatment of San Gimignano’s cultural traditions or lack of respect for the city itself forms a long running point of contention observed not only by towns people, but tour guides and other tourists. In most small towns I visited in Italy, I was regularly greeted with warm smiles and a friendly welcome when I entered a *bar* (coffee shop) or *negozio* (store). In San Gimignano, I was lucky to get eye contact or be acknowledged by any shop owner or café worker upon entering their establishment. It was only after I engaged them in Italian that a smile would appear or they would speak with me a bit about the town and their business. However, in one enoteca and a gelateria not even speaking in Italian won me any favor with the employee on duty.

Sadly, after eating my gelato and heading to the public restroom, I experienced the type of behavior that sours Italian outlook on tourists. Three Americans from Texas hopped the turnstile to the restrooms finding it ridiculous they had to pay to use the bathroom. When they saw me stop and pay to enter the stall they questioned me on why I did so when instead “I could just jump the stall.” I politely explained to them that the

¹⁸⁰ Jupe.

updated restroom was added just a few years ago to accommodate tourists like us. (The public bathrooms were approved as part of a restoration project of the old palazzo listed in the 2010 Heritage Management Plan.) The fee was in place as Italy's utilities are privatized and the townspeople bore the expense of paying for our right to use the bathroom if we did not pay the Euro fee. Only one of the three Texans decided to drop a coin into the slot after hearing my explanation.¹⁸¹

The 2006 Counselor for Commerce and Local Productivity explained day tripping and hit and run tourism "doesn't create wealth or guarantee the preservation of a beautiful or delicate city."¹⁸² The mayor in 2006 further re-enforced the Counselor's comments by declaring that "to stay for an hour" to take a selfie or only wander the town "is offensive."¹⁸³ Further compounding the values conflict is the outsider perception of tourism providing such great socioeconomic benefit to the entire town when in reality that is not the case. Residents repeatedly articulated via multiple mediums that any individual or business not supporting tourism was "pushed out of town."¹⁸⁴ Academic studies of the community confirmed that San Gimignano's tourism model only benefited an elite few versus the entire community. One study even referred to this elite group as adopting a "selfish and opportunistic attitude" that runs contrary to the behavior of the town's values in the past.¹⁸⁵

Taxes from tourism related income actually flow to the national level in Rome. Rome then allots funds back to the municipality for local management and use. Public

¹⁸¹ Comuni di San Gimignano, "Piano di Gestione del Sito UNESCO n.550 Centro Storico di San Gimignano," March 2010, 153, <http://allegatialbo.comune.sangimignano.si.it/unesco/pgest2010.pdf>.

¹⁸² Povoledo, "Tourism Traps an Italian Town with Its Own Success - Travel & Dining - International Herald Tribune - The New York Times."

¹⁸³ Povoledo.

¹⁸⁴ Citroni, "Local Actions to Promote Sustainable Development."

¹⁸⁵ Citroni.

works projects and initiatives must be approved and receive funding from the national or EU level. In 2015, the national government did shift this model of funding historic site preservation and public works to allow for private donations from businesses and crowd funding of projects in addition to creating Art Bonus Tax breaks incentivizing businesses to invest in art and cultural heritage related projects. While these initiatives assist the national level and local level with preservation and public works projects, the benefits of tourism revenues do not reach the broader population. It should be noted that most landowners who are the largest beneficiaries of tourism income are from outside of San Gimignano or are absentee most of the year so the incentive of mutual good to invest into community projects does not carry the same appeal as it does in situations where the landowner lives within that community on a daily basis. This lack of economic benefit to the entire town population only adds to the San Gimignano residents' conviction that their town is solely a commodity for an outside consumer.¹⁸⁶

Sensitive to the plight San Gimignano faces from tourism pressures and aware that day tours only rile local tempers further, our guide Alessandro provided all sixty of us on the tour insight into how important wine, gelato, and local agricultural products are to San Gimignano's identity. He only briefly touched on the UNESCO designation and tangible attributes of the city and instead highly encouraged everyone to stop at one of two award winning gelaterias, a coffee shop, or a local enoteca to purchase local products. I asked Alessandro what he observed when it came to tourism volume in San Gimignano and what he thought about tourism's impacts on the city. He explained he was torn as he makes a living as a tour guide and enjoys giving tours; however, he also

¹⁸⁶ Phillips, *Sustainable Place*, 98–99, 110; Rosie Scammell, "Saving Italy's Cultural Heritage by Modern Means | World News | The Guardian," *The Guardian*, March 19, 2015, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/mar/19/saving-italys-cultural-heritage-by-modern-means>.

saw the small towns of Tuscany change due to outsider expectations. He explained that San Gimignano's streets during the summer became so crowded people walked shoulder to shoulder. Even in the slower month of November, the parking lots filled up by the time our bus pulled out and the streets buzzed with people.

Charming Town Transitions to Outdoor Museum

In addition to the kitschy feel of a tourist trap with the elimination of local services and quality local goods, San Gimignano suffers from the phenomena of museumification. Museumification ensues when heritage officials or heritage related policy turns a location into a literal living museum.¹⁸⁷ The community or site becomes frozen within a particular period of time or theme with all things from architecture to food located in the defined boundaries considered authentic artifacts to be interpreted and curated. Museumification can occur intentionally or accidentally. D'Eramo repeatedly laments in his article that UNESCO preservation requirements, the designation's attractiveness to tourism marketers and tourists turned his hometown into a museum. In seventy interviews with local residents at the end of 2006 and early 2007, residents supported D'Eramo's 2014 observations by reporting to researchers that their home became an "open air museum" and repeatedly stated "they hoped it doesn't get worse."¹⁸⁸

The UNESCO historical narrative of San Gimignano presented to the outsider primarily focused on life during the Middle Ages. Therefore, the medieval period is the only temporal theme presented within the historic center. By doing this, tourism officials

¹⁸⁷ Giovine, *The Heritage-Scape*, 261.

¹⁸⁸ D'Eramo, "Urbanicide in All Good Faith"; Citroni, "Local Actions to Promote Sustainable Development."

generated a false sense of authenticity and disneyfied the city's history.¹⁸⁹ Moreover, the removal of the mundane and traditional local businesses from the historic center in favor of gift shops, hotels, bars, and eating establishments catering to tourist tastes misrepresented the occupations and culinary practices which made the city unique. This style of consumption oriented heritage management frequently results in tourist and marketer perceptions of sites functioning as an attraction versus a place of historical significance. This causes problematic sightseeing trends such as hit and run tourism.¹⁹⁰

In reality, San Gimignano's tale began well before the Middle Ages. The Etruscans inhabited the area until Rome colonized the region. In 63 BCE, two brothers "implicated in the Catiline conspiracies" built their homes in the Tuscan hillside and overtime the town of Silvia developed around them.¹⁹¹ A sixth century miraculous appearance of the deceased bishop of Modena, an early Christian saint, on the city walls saved the town from certain destruction by Totila, an Ostrogoth king, and provided religious myth adding to the city's importance in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages. In a pious display of gratitude, the town residents renamed their town San Gimignano. The narrow focus on the Middle Ages ignored something much more important than UNESCO recognized towers: the city origins and an esteemed sense of identity amongst other Tuscan communities in Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Furthermore, it failed to recognize the community struggles post World War II and its success in reviving its

¹⁸⁹ The definition of authenticity for this section is an accurate representation of a culture or place based on historical sources and well-established local traditions; not what the tourist perceives as authentic. The term disneyfied references creating a staged historical environment that serves to entertain visitors.

¹⁹⁰ McKercher and Du Cros, *Cultural Tourism, 2nd Edition*, 132; Giovine, *The Heritage-Scape*, 261.

¹⁹¹ "San Gimignano Art and Culture Town History San Gimignano Tourist Information Centre," accessed November 29, 2015, <http://www.sangimignano.com/en/art-and-culture/town-history.asp>.

agricultural heritage through wine production and farming.¹⁹²

Intangible Heritage and Agriturismo

Agriculture and wine are essential to Italian identity. Marcella Hazan, a famous Italian Chef, writes in the Introduction of her *Essentials of Classical Italian Cooking* that cuisine “spans remembered history, that has evolved during the whole course of transmitted skills and intuitions throughout the Italian peninsula.”¹⁹³ In the concluding chapter of the same work Hazan notes that “to make time to eat as the Italians still do is to share in their inexhaustible gift of making art out of life.”¹⁹⁴ One of the most potent memories visitors have of Italy is its distinctive food and beverages. People regularly tell stories of foods eaten and the popularity of Italian cuisine across the globe confirms an important link between food and Italian identity. In reality, there is no so such thing as Italian cuisine. Each region has its own distinctive dishes reflecting regional historical agricultural practices, trade routes, and cultural traditions dating back to Antiquity. As stated earlier in this chapter and on San Gimignano’s website, San Gimignano prefers to have tourists experience their city and heritage through more than an hour long stop admiring architecture. They want visitors to enjoy their traditions, learn about the connection between hinterland and community, and to leave with quality products as souvenirs that are also affordable commodities for residents.

To facilitate this authentic experience for the tourist and the continuation of tradition within the Tuscan community for residents, San Gimignano shifted its tourism

¹⁹² UNESCO World Heritage Centre, “Historic Centre of San Gimignano - UNESCO World Heritage Centre,” accessed April 8, 2016, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/550/>; Associazione Pro Loco San Gimignano, “San Gimignano Art and Culture Town History San Gimignano Tourist Information Centre,” 2017 1996; Comune di San Gimignano, “Comune San Gimignano.”

¹⁹³ Marcella Hazan, *Essentials of Classic Italian Cooking* (New York: Alfred A Knopp Inc, 2016), 5, <https://www.amazon.com/Essentials-Classic-Italian-Cooking-Marcella/dp/039458404X>.

¹⁹⁴ Hazan, 651.

strategy towards *agritourismo* (agricultural tourism) in the early 2000s. The refined strategy specifically focuses on a behind-the-scenes look at traditional local wine and food production. The switch to agricultural tourism continued to intensify over the past decade in hopes that through *agritourismo* the tourist can experience a true reflection of the town's identity. The community's hinterland has continuously produced products featured in these tours since the Etruscans inhabited the hillside. San Gimignano's agricultural products are not protected under the city's inscription on the World Heritage List. However, they are protected under the UNESCO Convention for Intangible World Heritage's inscription of the Mediterranean Diet.

The revised *agritourismo* strategy tries to relieve tourism pressures on the historic center by encouraging tourists to visit the wineries, farms, and factories in the surrounding valley. Resident support for this change in strategy was captured in the stakeholder conferences conducted as part of the SangimignanoAMO initiative. This was a regionally and locally supported project to encourage a higher level of resident participation in city economic development planning related to tourism. The 2010 Site Management Plan action items included developing a transportation plan to allow tourists to better interact with the surrounding town versus being forced to stay within the walled center. So far, residents and businesses that embraced the new integrated approach are benefiting from it and it appears to be relieving tensions for residents and tourists alike.¹⁹⁵

In 2003, La Rocca, a city museum dedicated to the production of its famous white wine Vernaccia di San Gimignano, opened its doors to educate travelers on one of the famous intangible heritage products made within the city boundaries. This white wine's

¹⁹⁵ Comuni di San Gimignano, "San Gimignano Heritage Management Plan," 153; Citroni, "Local Actions to Promote Sustainable Development."

production is documented as beginning in the Middle Ages. The wine was the first in Italy to obtain the distinguished Appellation of Origin designation in 1966. This special designation is used to protect Italian agricultural products and certify their authenticity. The wine received an upgraded designation of DOCG, (De-nominazione di Origini Controllata e Garantita) in 1993. Varying grades of Vernaccia are sold through the enotecas in the historical center. Tourists may partake in wine tastings either at La Rocca or at various wineries such as Tenuta Torciano.¹⁹⁶

Tenuta Torciano is a high-end winery that produces Vernaccia and other Tuscan wines such as Chianti. The winery is unique as it is one of the long surviving family owned local vineyards within the vicinity of San Gimignano. Fifteen generations of the Giachi family passed down the tradition of winemaking over a span of approximately three centuries to the current owners, Emanuele Giachi and his father Pierluigi Gaichi. The family is one that benefits from tourism so they embrace visitors. Furthermore, they encourage tourists not to simply attend a wine tasting, but to learn production methodology and the history behind the wines. Speaking with Emanuele Giachi, who hosted our tasting, the family is exceptionally proud of their winemaking heritage and of introducing traditional products of the region such as olive oil, truffle oil, and gourmet treats to accompany wine flights that are distinctly Tuscan. The Giachi's offer tourists the chance to stay at the winery, participate in Tuscan cooking classes, and take special tours of the property, city, and surrounding communities as part of an overnight agriturismo experience. One of the main reasons the Giachi family believes in incorporating robust

¹⁹⁶ Consorzio Della Denominazione San Gimignano, "Vernaccia Di San Gimignano - La Rocca - Wine Experience," San Gimignano Museo Vernaccia, 2017, <http://www.sangimignanomuseovernaccia.com/lang-eng.php>; Associazione Pro Loco San Gimignano, "San Gimignano Art and Culture Town History San Gimignano Tourist Information Centre," Associazione Pro Loco San Gimignano, 2017 1996, <http://www.sangimignano.com/en/art-and-culture/town-history.asp>.

experiences for visitors is not only to generate income for themselves, but also because they believe in order to appreciate the importance of winemaking in Tuscany, visitors must also embrace art and the history of the region. The winemaker purchased one of the protected medieval towers; the Useppi Palazzo now renamed Torre Chigi, and used private funds to restore it. The Torre Chigi serves as both a private residence and a museum allowing visitors to better understand how individuals lived within these structures.¹⁹⁷

Italy Magazine's Georgette states agriturismo experiences like Torciano or the Poggio Alloro organic farm, which carries on the longstanding tradition of saffron farming, changed her opinion of San Gimignano as an overcrowded tourist trap to a place of "beauty," history, and culinary delights that she enjoys after being able to view it through the eyes of a local during the winter off-season.¹⁹⁸ If the city tourism board can find a way to recreate this off-season experience during the months of higher visitor volumes, their 2010 strategy to encourage longer stays and tourist engagement with both the hinterland and the historic center will preserve the city for residents and tourists alike.¹⁹⁹ D'Eramo eloquently summed up the conundrum faced by citizens living in San Gimignano due to tourism and UNESCO restrictions, "It is an inhumane punishment to spend one's life in the guest-quarters of an endless museum."²⁰⁰ But with the new diversified tourism strategy, there is hope that city will once again find balance and the

¹⁹⁷ Tenuta Torciano, "Torciano Home," Tenuta Torciano San Gimignano, 2017, <http://www.torciano.com/en/>; Tenuta Torciano, "Torre Chigi - Historical Visit of the Tower with Winetasting and Lunch in the Winery," Tenuta Torciano San Gimignano, 2017, <http://www.torciano.com/en/visit/tours/torre-chigi-historical-visit-of-the-tower-with-winetasting-and-lunch-in-winery/>.

¹⁹⁸ Jupe, "Why Winter Is The Best Time To Visit San Gimignano."

¹⁹⁹ Jupe.

²⁰⁰ D'Eramo, "Urbanicide in All Good Faith"; Associazione Pro Loco San Gimignano, "San Gimignano Art and Culture Town History San Gimignano Tourist Information Centre," Associazione Pro Loco San Gimignano, 2017 1996, <http://www.sangimignano.com/en/art-and-culture/town-history.asp>.

residents may proudly revive the tradition of being a market town that is welcoming to visitor and resident.

7. URBINO: PLANNING A RENAISSANCE IN HERITAGE TOURISM

In striking contrast to San Gimignano's desire to reduce tourism to manageable levels, just a few hours east is another small Italian town in the Marche Region that hopes its UNESCO designation will serve as a signal to attract tourists. Urbino is the medieval and Renaissance town once praised as the "*citta ideale* (ideal city)" by scholars and European nobility around the Old World.²⁰¹ Urbino is a town that reminds one of a fairy tale castle and village featured in a Disney film. This community's pride in its UNESCO designation is evidenced in multiple ways. The UNESCO emblem is found throughout the historic center on wayfinding signage, plaques around important locations, on flags gracing university and hotel doorways along with on a variety of tourism related brochures and publications. Surprisingly, tourists do not overburden the postcard perfect city even during popular festival days. Development is well managed and occurs outside the historic center walls without causing any concern for disrupting cultural viewsheds. Unlike San Gimignano, the community residents regularly inhabit the historic center, utilize all the historic structures, and share the town with a fairly large international student body.

Tourism marketers and professors in the field of heritage management and history frequently refer to the Marche Region as Tuscany ten to twenty years ago. Urbino potentially provides a glimpse into what San Gimignano may have been like in the 1980s and early 1990s. Urbino offers a much richer history and inviting environment for a cultural heritage tourist than present day San Gimignano. While San Gimignano has a number of intriguing torre, Urbino has a one of a kind palace deemed the greatest and

²⁰¹ UNESCO World Heritage Centre, "Nomination File Historic Centre of Urbino - 828.pdf" (UNESCO, May 12, 1998), <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/828.pdf>.

“most beautiful” preserved example of a Renaissance palace in the world.²⁰² Like San Gimignano, the town attracts artisans, at one time being the leading patron court for artists, writers, and architects. The University of Urbino trains many of the art restoration and conservation professionals for Europe. The small Italian town atmosphere complete with breathtaking views and incredible sunsets easily provides all of the qualities needed to create lumen and a transcendent experience for any visitor. Without the crowds, one can easily be fooled into slipping backwards in time when standing on the medieval walls. All of these qualities makes one wonder why Urbino remains balanced during tourist season and desiring more tourism during the low season while San Gimignano groans beneath the weight of mass tourism.

History

Urbino began as an enclosed Roman fort. Historians and archeologists estimate the Romans first occupied the hilltops of the present day city in the second century B.C.E. The city expanded beyond the original Roman fort boundaries and by the eleventh century, the ruler of Urbino expanded the city walls to better protect his town. This expansion can be viewed today since the medieval walls stand with only minimal modification over the years. The city reinvented itself from an urban planning perspective in the fifteenth century under Duke Federico da Montefeltro. While the walls did not change in the fifteenth century, new construction within the city center reshaped its image. Montefeltro hired architects to build the Palazzo Ducale, a new palace that integrated pre-existing medieval structures and new Renaissance style construction. The ducal palace and neighboring cathedral became centerpieces in the revived urban

²⁰² Marinos Ioannides et al., eds., *Digital Heritage. Progress in Cultural Heritage: Documentation, Preservation ...* (Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, 2016), 674.

community. Other structures like the Church of San Domenico received new facades.²⁰³

Artists, architects, writers, and diplomats all visited Montefeltro's court throughout the Renaissance. Art, science, architecture, literature and mathematics found a nurturing home within the city. Among the notables who visited the court are statesman and writer Baldassare Castiglione; architects Luciano Laurana and Francesco di Giorgio Martini who authored the *Tratto di Architettura* and served as military theorist; and a variety of artists including Leon Battista Alberti, Raffaello, and his father. The standards of courtly behavior for the Renaissance grew out of Montefeltro's court with the publishing of Castiglione's book, *The Book of the Courtier*. Based on the various translations and references found in multiple archival studies on the reach of Castiglione's text, the book influenced manners as far away as Tudor England and Poland. The Duke's court established important political and military ties with the most powerful states in Europe and some "outside of Europe" such as Persia.²⁰⁴

After the death of Montefeltro and the rise of the Borgias to the papacy, Urbino transitioned to the oversight of Cesare Borgia. In 1508, the della Rovera family became the Dukes of Urbino. The oldest complete fencing manual for Italian Rapier was published by della Rovera's fencing master Capo Ferro and dedicated to Francesco's son Don Federigo. In the dedication, Ferro describes the Court of Urbino as "a great seat of

²⁰³ UNESCO World Heritage Centre, "Nomination File Historic Centre of Urbino - 828.pdf."

²⁰⁴ UNESCO World Heritage Centre, "Partnerships for World Heritage Cities Culture as a Vector for Sustainable Urban Development," 18; "Francesco Di Giorgio Martini (Italian, (Sienese), 1439 - 1501) (Getty Museum)," *The J. Paul Getty in Los Angeles*, accessed September 4, 2017, <http://www.getty.edu/art/collection/artists/773/francesco-di-giorgio-martini-italian-sienese-1439-1501/>; Peter Burke, "The Courtier Abroad: Or the Use In Italy," in *The Book of the Courtier*, ed. Daniel Javitch (New York, NY: WW Norton & Company, Inc, 2002), 391–92; Paulo Dal Poggetto, *Guide to the Galleria Nazionale delle Marche* (Roma: Gebart Srl, 2006), 5–9.

majesty in the world.”²⁰⁵ Francesco della Roveria held the duchy until December 10, 1624 when he signed over the city to the Papacy. Francesco’s son died before him and only a toddler-age granddaughter was left to potentially inherit the state. Francesco believed papal rule would best benefit the region as opposed to turning over his lands to a rival family via a betrothal agreement to a significantly underage heiress. The Bishop of Rimini, Berlingheri Gessi, formally accepted leadership of the former Duchy in January of 1625. This was the end of the city’s fame and wealth as it and the region economically stagnated from heavy taxation and commercial restrictions destroying agricultural trade under Papal governance. This did not change until the eighteenth century when Pope Clemente, who was born in Urbino, ordered various public works projects to begin to restore the city’s churches to their Renaissance glory. The nineteenth century brought about further preservation works and the addition of a theater along with the city’s Botanical Gardens.²⁰⁶

The city fortunately escaped destruction during World War II. Germany and the Allies reached an agreement that made the city off limits. Prior to the agreement, the city painted a large red cross on the palace in a successful gambit that a hospital in the region would not be bombed. Pasquale Rotondi, the Superintendent of Fine Art for the Marche Region, hid the many masterpieces from the palace, university and other important locations in the Rock of Sassocorvaro, a fortress built in the fifteenth century, earning it the nickname the Ark of Art. As the German’s fled the city, they severed Urbino’s railroad ties from the surrounding communities by destroying all railroad tracks that led

²⁰⁵ Ridolfo Capo Ferro, *Capo Ferro’s Gran Simalcro Italian Rapier Combat*, ed. Jared Kirby, trans. Ramon Martinez and Jeanette Acosta-Martinez (Italy: Frontline Books, 2012), 20.

²⁰⁶ James Dennistoun, *Memoirs of the Dukes of Urbino, Illustrating the Arms, Arts, and Literature of Italy, from 1440 to 1630* (Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1851), 209–10, 234; UNESCO World Heritage Centre, “Nomination File Historic Centre of Urbino - 828.pdf.”

into the town. New Italian laws and special extra-urban focused preservation programs established in post-World War II Italy helped protect and restore Urbino's distinctive structures. Similar to San Gimignano, people left Urbino after World War II for better jobs in nearby urban centers such as Pesaro, Rimini, and Bologna.²⁰⁷

The 1960s provided Urbino continued national protections and funds to revitalize and restore the historic city. The small local university established in 1507 transformed into a national large-scale university. Prior to the 1970s, the university awarded degrees in Education and Pharmacology. It was expected that the new university structure would double the town's population. The community's population in 1965 was estimated at 17,538 with 7800 living within city boundaries. Urbino invited architect Giancarlo Di Carlo to design and oversee a new master plan that expanded the university campus and to serve as a member of the team working on a revitalization plan for the community. The goal of the revitalization plan was to turn the city back into a "capitol of studies and culture."²⁰⁸ Giancarlo blended the historic center, newer areas outside the walls, and new university buildings into a complementary design that merged with the rolling historic landscape creating a unique synergy for students and residents alike. Ultimately, the revitalization plan of the 1960s failed as the population declined continuously in the 1970s and 1980s leveling off at about 15,917. This depopulation occurred as the number of students grew. Carlo and Urbino leadership anticipated the student growth, but did not

²⁰⁷ Provinvia di Pesaro e Urbino, "Sassocorvaro," [Turimo.pesarourbino.it](http://www.turismo.pesarourbino.it), 2017, <http://www.turismo.pesarourbino.it/en/elenco/comuni/sassocorvaro.html>; Dr. Kolleen Guy, "Introduction to Urbino and Marche" (Fall 2016 Orientation Day and Local Field Trips, Urbino, Italy, September 3, 2016); Monuments Men Foundation, "Rotondi, Pasquale | Monuments Men Foundation," Monuments Men Foundation for the Preservation of Art, 2017, <https://www.monumentsmenfoundation.org/the-heroes/first-hand-participants/rotondi-pasquale>.

²⁰⁸ Andrea Canziani et al., "Conserving Modernity: 20th Century Architectural Heritage: Case Studies and Historiography," 3, accessed August 25, 2017, http://www.polinternational.polimi.it/fileadmin/user_upload/documenti/Athens/2016/POLI23_Canziani.pdf

expect the permanent resident population to decline.²⁰⁹

Urbino was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1998. UNESCO found it worthy of inscription under criteria ii and iv. It met criterion ii due to its “short- cultural pre-eminence” where some of the “most outstanding humanist scholars and artists” designed an urban center that influenced Europe throughout the Renaissance.²¹⁰

UNESCO also declared the city should be inscribed under criterion iv due to it being “the pinnacle” of Renaissance urban architecture and art that blended the Middle Ages into the famed period of European Rebirth.²¹¹ Urbino’s population since inscription remains fairly stable according to the census with 15,114 residents in 1991 and 14,844 in December 2016. This number can vary during the school year as classes begin and end.²¹²

At the time of inscription, Urbino lacked a site specific World Heritage Management Plan. The management plan developed in 2012 and 2013 provides some insight into the inscription that differs from what is observed in Bath and San Gimignano’s documents. The opening of the 2012-2013 *Piano di Gestione*, it discloses that the city sought inscription for two reasons and approached the city’s nomination from a two-pronged approach. The first motivation for inscription was to support the Italian efforts to grow the membership of Italian cities on the World Heritage List. The second reason was to “be the promoter” and overseer of the city once inscribed.²¹³

Urbino’s World Heritage Management team clearly stated that they seek to leverage the

²⁰⁹ Viviana Martini, “The Conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes: An Approach” (University of Venice, 2013), 232, 243, 248, <http://www.ung.si/~library/doktorati/konzervatorstvo/6Martini1.pdf>; Peter Blundell Jones and Eamonn Canniffe, *Modern Architecture Through Case Studies 1945 to 1990* (Routledge, 2012), 165–66.

²¹⁰ UNESCO World Heritage Centre, “Nomination File Historic Centre of Urbino - 828.pdf.”

²¹¹ UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

²¹² Thomas Brinkoff, “Urbino (Pesaro E Urbino, Marche, Italy) - Population Statistics, Charts, Map, Location, Weather and Web Information,” City Population, June 13, 2017, <https://www.citypopulation.de/php/italy-marche.php?cityid=041067>.

²¹³ Ufficio del Comune di Urbino, “Piano Di Gestione Di Sito UNESCO - Urbino,” 2013, 24.

“potential of the site on the World Heritage List...from synergistic action that organizes and programs with a shared development plan not yet captured.”²¹⁴ The same section further elaborates on this developing plan to not only include better urban planning to preserve the city’s tangible and intangible culture, but also “the creation of an integrated territorial system of management.”²¹⁵ These statements are significant as this is the first instance in the three case studies that a community openly states that it sought inscription for conservation *and* socioeconomic benefits.²¹⁶

Tourism Trends

After centuries of economic stagnation, Urbino survived on the presence of the small university and tourism. In the 1960s, there was hope that expanding the university into a nationally recognized institution offering a wide range of degrees would spur economic growth and interest beyond the university in the *piccola citta*. Yet, fickle tourism did not rise as expected over the decades that followed as it did in other areas of Italy. The destruction of the train lines in the 1940s and the natural geography more than likely contribute to the failure in the revitalization plan. To reach Urbino, one can either drive or take a train to Pesaro followed by an hour bus ride from Pesaro into Urbino. This commute is not much different from that of one venturing to San Gimignano. If not driving to San Gimignano, one would need to take a train from Florence to Poggibonsi and then about an hour-long bus ride to San Gimignano.

The need to drive or for a bus to traverse winding roads to reach Urbino encourages visitors to venture to the city during warmer months to avoid issues with ice and snow. In contrast to San Gimignano’s steadily growing volume of tourist visitation in

²¹⁴ Ufficio del Comune di Urbino, 24.

²¹⁵ Ufficio del Comune di Urbino, 26.

²¹⁶ Ufficio del Comune di Urbino, 24–26.

the 1990s, Urbino's seasonal tourism in the 1990s is documented as "inconsistent" and "primarily made up of day trippers."²¹⁷ As seen in San Gimignano, day tripping tourism provided "no actual financial benefits for the town."²¹⁸ The inconsistent flow of visitors along with no realized financial benefits limited Urbino's ability to revitalize its economy and gain additional sources of funding for cultural preservation projects.

Urbino's geographic location can make it challenging to draw tourists from more than just a logistical perspective. There are no nearby major cities that draw mass tourism to the March region as there are in Tuscany nor has recent pop culture created an interest in the city or the region. Some of Tuscany's wide appeal relates to popular films like *Under the Tuscan Sun* and *Tea with Mussolini*. The 2009 *Assassin's Creed* Video Game series featuring a Florentine main character, Ezio Auditore, perked the interest of Millennials to visit the Tuscan communities in which the game is set along with Rome and Venice. The most well-known major international film shot within the Marche Region is the 1972 film *Alfredo, Alfredo* set in Ascoli Piceno featuring Dustin Hoffman and Stefania Sandrelli.

As Urbino transitioned into the 2000s, tourism numbers slowly began to rise. Urbino learned from the plight of San Gimignano and its peers in Tuscany based on the tourism portion of the management plan's specifically denouncing of "mordi e fuggi" (hit and run) style tourism.²¹⁹ The programs Urbino and their regional partners developed targeted more economically elite tourists looking to shop, eat, and enjoy small town life and Renaissance art and architecture over an extended stay.

The initial pilot of a joint regional and local tourism consortium called "Urbino

²¹⁷ Martini, "The Conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes: An Approach," 237.

²¹⁸ Martini, 237.

²¹⁹ Ufficio del Comune di Urbino, "Piano Di Gestione Di Sito UNESCO - Urbino," 90.

and Montefeltro” launched in 2002. The focus of the consortium is to promote tourism throughout the former territory of the Montefeltro Dukes. Urbino is its focal point, but the program encourages extended stays to learn about the history and intangible heritage of the region through agriturismo, local crafts, and Urbino’s connection with the surrounding small communities. The program brought together academics at the University of Urbino, entrepreneurs, tour guides, artisans, and agricultural producers to create a wide reaching experience for visitors to the Marche region. It evolved into a formal tourism consortium that conducts visitor related research and gathers information on visitors to better understand their interests in the region. Additionally, the “Urbino and Montefeltro” program encourages the growth of new industries that function within the field of cultural production to perpetuate long-standing regional trades and crafts. These include furniture making, the manufacturing and hand painting of ceramics, producing hand made pastas for distribution, winemaking, and ship building in nearby Pesaro and Fano. These products are key items visitors are interested in purchasing, but are also economic generators for residents and products that residents also consume. This program mirrors San Gimignano’s initiatives to spread tourism volumes between a key historic center and the surrounding hinterland through meaningful cultural connections.²²⁰

In 2011 tourism peaked in Urbino at 132,427 arrivals in local hotels and other overnight stay facilities.²²¹ The global recession began to impact Italy in 2012 and the damage to many of Urbino’s buildings caused by a severe snowstorm in January

²²⁰ Chamber of Commerce of Pesaro and Urbino, “Chamber of Commerce Pesaro and Urbino Italy Brochure” (Rotograf, 2016), https://www.ps.camcom.gov.it/promozione/files/Brochure_english_veget.pdf; Consorzio Urbino e il Montefeltro, “Il Consorzio | Urbino and the Montefeltro,” Urbino e il Montefeltro, 2014, <http://www.urbinoeilmontefeltro.it/en/il-consorzio/>; Ufficio del Comune di Urbino, “Piano Di Gestione Di Sito UNESCO - Urbino,” 26–27.

²²¹ Tourism numbers for the Marche region are tracked by hotel and other overnight stay facility arrivals only. No data for day-trippers in the city was found while researching tourism data for Urbino.

disrupted tourism to the city. Tourism reports from 2012 show a significant drop in tourist arrivals down to only 87, 835. By 2013, arrivals only slightly improved to 90, 393. This is concerning as the City's 2012 - 2013 World Heritage Management Plan lists tourism as a "key strategic resource on which the city must aim for its overall revival."²²²

In an effort to combat the negative trend in tourism, Urbino implemented multiple projects and programs to attract a longer stay tourist. They set up multiple initiatives to encourage entrepreneurship of local trades within the historic center to create a "natural shopping mall."²²³ The Urbino Office of Tourism reached out to its academic, tourism and business partners to develop special cultural experiences such as learning about book making, a centuries old tradition in Urbino, or cooking regional cuisines. The city launched an Urbino Tourist Card – a special card that allows a person to visit the museums and cultural institutions within a 30-day window, and improved accessibility through adding wifi and braille to all signs and facilities within the town. These efforts did not substantially increase tourism, but they did generate a slight increase and prevented the tourism trend from drifting lower. The most recent numbers published in 2015 showed tourism hovering around the same number of 93,579 hotel arrivals.²²⁴

2016 tourism numbers were not available at the time this thesis was composed. However, regional reports for Marche state that tourism dived 36 percent at the end of 2016 with the trend continuing into 2017 due to three months of seismic activity which scared tourists away in the last four months of 2016. One of the town's popular hotels within the walled historic center lost 25,000 euros in 48 hours after the August 2016

²²² Ufficio del Comune di Urbino, "Piano Di Gestione Di Sito UNESCO - Urbino," 89; Regione Marche, "Dati Turismo," Regione Marche Osservatorio Regionale Del Turismo, accessed August 28, 2017, <http://statistica.turismo.marche.it/DatiTurismo/tabid/100/language/it-IT/Default.aspx>.

²²³ Ufficio del Comune di Urbino, "Piano Di Gestione Di Sito UNESCO - Urbino," 96.

²²⁴ Regione Marche, "Dati Turismo."

earthquake. The same hotel reports a “fifty percent decrease in bookings” since that time.²²⁵ Many in Marche’s tourism and economic sectors blame the media’s focus on damaged areas for the decline in tourism when most of the region was not impacted by the series of fall earthquakes. Urbino, along with the communities of Marche, restructured their administrative oversight in the last quarter of 2016 to better pool shrinking financial resources for tourism marketing and site management. The new combined structure was implemented in fall 2016 with a heavy emphasis on promoting agriturismo and gastronomici (gastronomical) centered tourism in the region.²²⁶

The Merging of Academia and Tourism

Academic conferences and study abroad programs create a unique tourism market in Urbino called academic tourism. Academic tourism is defined as “any stays made by higher education institutions outside their usual environment for a period of less than one year” as part of completing a degree program or completing language related education at another institution of higher learning.²²⁷ Urbino expands the definition of academic tourism to include even short stays of “only a few days” associated with the university hosting academic conferences, seminars, and other short-term academic activities.²²⁸ This market segment is not one that is found in San Gimignano. Research into this category of tourism is relatively new. The newness relates to the increasing trend of university degree programs requiring or offering the opportunity to study abroad. A recent Oxford University study states that studying abroad for some segment of a higher education

²²⁵ Kristen Mirand, “Earthquakes Rattle Urbino Tourism,” *Urbino Project 2017* (blog), June 16, 2017, <http://2017.inurbino.net/earthquakesimpacttourism/>.

²²⁶ Mirand; Regione Marche, “Dati Turismo.”

²²⁷ Xose Rodriguez, Fidel Martinez-Roget, and Ewa Pawlowska, “Academic Tourism: A More Sustainable Tourism,” *Regional and Sectoral Economic Studies* 13–2 (2013): 89–98, <http://www.usc.es/economet/reviews/eers1327.pdf>.

²²⁸ Ufficio del Comune di Urbino, “Piano Di Gestione Di Sito UNESCO - Urbino,” 90.

program “quadrupled from 1.3 million in the 1990s to 5 million in 2014.”²²⁹ Academic tourism within Urbino easily falls into the realm of world heritage tourism as the offerings of the various study abroad programs and at academic events like conferences frequently center on cultural aspects of Urbino and Italy.

Urbino views academic related tourism as a double-edged sword just as it does any other form of tourism. Urbino’s policymakers labeled academic tourism a risk as when it is paired with providing for the needs of the Italian student population, it created a “student oriented monoculture” within the city.²³⁰ Students do not have the same income levels to support businesses and fund cultural initiatives as wealthier, adult extended stay visitors. Tourists and residents alike began competing with students for affordable housing in the 1990s and 2000s. The continuing growth of the student population and university staff increased rents forcing local born residents from the walled historic center as occurred in San Gimignano. Scholars such as Viviana Martini alleged that this removal of residents from the city center places the city’s identity at risk of becoming an “artificial world.”²³¹ Urbino City leadership shared Martini’s viewpoint and recognized the risk of museumification and falsified authenticity emerging from resident displacement. The 2012 World Heritage Management plan included strategies to bring residents back to the historic center via several tools such as co-habitation models that blended resident housing with student housing.²³²

From a positive perspective, academic tourism assisted in stabilizing the erratic cycle of seasonal tourism. Academic events and programs attract the intellectual tourist

²²⁹ University of Oxford, “International Trends in Higher Education 2016-2017” (University of Oxford, 2017), 14, http://www.ox.ac.uk/sites/files/oxford/trends%20in%20globalisation_WEB.pdf.

²³⁰ Ufficio del Comune di Urbino, “Piano Di Gestione Di Sito UNESCO - Urbino,” 32.

²³¹ Martini, “The Conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes: An Approach,” 242.

²³² Martini, 242.

that appreciates the cultural aspects of Urbino and Marche. Urbino considers the intellectual tourist to be a “quality” tourist unlike hit and run tourists.²³³ Academic tourists provide an intellectual resource that can be utilized to assist with cultural initiatives, improve preservation approaches, and innovatively address tourism and development related problems. The City of Urbino and the university hosted the 2002 Partnerships for World Heritage Cities Conference on Culture as a Vector For Sustainable Urban Development. This conference allowed Urbino heritage managers and professors teaching heritage management at the university to gain insight into how some of the top international experts in urban heritage approach the same challenges that they faced. Urbino established strategic relationships to help with preservation, cultural mapping, brand development, and marketing of the community. An example of the partnerships between Urbino and study abroad providers based at the University of Urbino is the ieiMedia Urbino Project. This program, started in 2009, creates video documentaries, magazines, and other media campaigns showcasing the community’s cultural aspects and the stories of residents. The ieiMedia partnership provides student resources and academic expertise from eight well-known universities including the US-based James Madison University, Ithaca College, and Rutgers University.²³⁴

From an economic perspective, academic tourists can provide financial benefits to Urbino even if they are not as substantial as those provided by more wealthy visitors. Students, academic conference attendees, and residents alike are attracted to the monthly market days, weekly Saturday agricultural and clothing markets, and the many festivals

²³³ Ufficio del Comune di Urbino, “Piano Di Gestione Di Sito UNESCO - Urbino,” 89–90.

²³⁴ ieiMedia, “The Urbino Project,” ieiMedia Telling the World’s Stories, accessed September 22, 2017, <http://ieiimedia.com/urbino/>; UNESCO World Heritage Centre, “Partnerships for World Heritage Cities Culture as a Vector for Sustainable Urban Development,” 6.

the city hosts throughout the year. The affordability of the products offered at these events enables students and residents living on limited budgets to maintain the good quality of life associated with Urbino. Purchases made at these markets and festivals sustain local trades such as pottery making, jewelry making, and furniture production. Additionally, they support smaller agricultural producers of honey, cascotta cheese, olive oil, and other agricultural products unique to the Marche region. Academic tourism attracts more than just students. It brings established academic professionals and the income earning family members of students, who can provide some of the financial lift the city is seeking, through overnight stays, visits to cultural institutions, and the purchase of meals and souvenirs from Urbino businesses. In the long term, academic tourism may facilitate sustainable tourism growth and provide a marketing advantage over other Italian World Heritage Sites without a university presence.²³⁵

In this case study, a different link to UNESCO's World Heritage Program and tourism is presented. Urbino provides an example of an inscribed community's need to attract tourism to preserve its tangible and intangible heritage. Without recognizing tourism's partnership with UNESCO's World Heritage Program and downplaying its potential economic importance within the heritage sphere, heritage managers and preservationists risk becoming one of the main facilitators in the deterioration of world heritage. Economic stagnation can quickly place intangible heritage at risk. Practitioners of traditional crafts and trades may be forced to seek employment in other fields to sustain a respectable quality of life for themselves and their families. The abandonment of traditional crafts or trades accelerates the natural cycle of obsolescence of important historical practices in a region potentially destroying key aspects of historical memory

²³⁵ Ufficio del Comune di Urbino, "Piano Di Gestione Di Sito UNESCO - Urbino," 32, 90.

that contribute to local identity. Alternatives to mass tourism such as academic tourism through partnerships with community institutions help stabilize local economies and assist in preserving heritage during periods of economic downturn or recession. If UNESCO inscribed historic centers do not maintain a healthy level of tourism, they are unable to generate the needed funds to preserve protected structures and ultimately, place their designation at risk.

8. CONCLUSION

UNESCO designated historic centers often find their development, identity, and distinctive character altered by tourism and the requirements of the World Heritage Program. At times these two outside influences better the quality of life in a community for residents while enhancing visitor experience, other times they are disruptive and destructive forces on urban environments. By detailing the history and development of the UNESCO World Heritage Program and delving into three case studies demonstrating how tourism and inscription interplay with one another, it is clear that tourism and the UNESCO World Heritage Program share a long-standing relationship. This interlinked affiliation can substantially shape a community in a fashion that can improve it, damage it, or in time achieve the coveted balance referred to as sustainability. Tourism played a significant role in the rise of the 1972 Convention for the Preservation of World Heritage from the earliest international discussions on the subject in the 1940s. Mexico and war damaged continental European nations called for an international policy on preservation despite the resistance of the United States and Great Britain, who disregarded the need for such a convention until flooding threatened to erase the famous Egyptian historic site of Abu Simbel forever. The Abu Simbel project unified the member nations in a shared belief that the protection of heritage extended beyond the realm of warfare and required all nations to collaborate under a supranational best practices document if future generations hoped to visit the material representations of humanity's journey.

The substantial growth of international tourism and a shift in attitude toward travel as something for everyone solidified the marriage of tourism and heritage. Over a span of forty years, tourism created new challenges for heritage managers. The concerns

about increased costs of living, congested streets, and the loss of identity vocalized by residents at urban World Heritage Sites caused all levels of oversight from local to UNESCO to more critically research tourism impacts on the urban environment. The challenges of balancing resident needs with visitor needs produced the new World Heritage Cities and Urban Historic Landscape Programs to share best practices in approaching development and preservation problems within cities and towns. Tourism expanded the definition of an inscribed location to include the surrounding landscape and intangible elements of heritage. New terminology developed to address these challenges within the field such as carrying capacity, authenticity, and museumification birthed an original concept of sustainable tourism within the global heritage management community. Increased travel volume and mass visitation forced heritage professionals and UNESCO to embrace the importance of intangible heritage and historic memory within the heritage-scape. Donovan Rypkema beautifully summarizes their role in shaping a location's sense of place in his lessons for leveraging living heritage for economic benefit by reminding heritage policymakers that "Meaning requires memory and memory is what makes a building or physical site important."²³⁶ Without memory and elements of intangible heritage, sites are no longer living locations where individuals can make meaningful connections.

Researching and visiting three UNESCO historic centers allowed for a better understanding of the complex dynamics between tourism, the UNESCO designation, and their impacts on living communities. Location specific research and site visits provided answers to many of the research questions posed in the introduction of this thesis. The

²³⁶ Rypkema, Donovan. "Leveraging Living Heritage for Economic Prosperity." San Antonio, Texas, September 8, 2017.

Bath case study addressed the questions of how does the designation function, does the World Heritage Convention deliver on its purpose, how does the interconnectedness of tourism and the designation impact living communities, and how do some communities effectively balance their World Heritage status with the needs of residents.

The UNESCO requirements are indeed maintaining the historical views and character of Bath via its landscape and architecture. Bath's management team stretched the protective elements of the World Heritage inscription to assist in drawing attention to and preserving the unique intangible practices of the city associated to spa culture. Resident concerns along with the tension between local developers and ICOMOS inspectors brought all Bath stakeholders to the table to explore options that would both allow Bath to sustain its unique historical character and resolve a housing shortage. This case study highlights the importance of compromise and a willingness of policymakers not only to listen to residential concerns, but to take action on those concerns to keep urban historic centers a viable and living site of outstanding universal value.

San Gimignano demonstrated what happens when effective management strategies are missing at the local level. Tourism grows at uncontrollable rates due to affiliations with the UNESCO World Heritage List and the weaknesses of economic system designs prevent the broader population from enjoying the benefits of heritage preservation and cultural tourism. Tourism can quickly create a falsified sense of place and destroy local intangible culture through low quality mass-produced products. After the town's carrying capacity was so severely breached, it lost the key elements of character, lumen, and transcendence that heritage enthusiasts seek. The UNESCO designation's focus on the medieval architectural elements of the community devalued its

broader history and assisted in museumification of the historic center. San Gimignano found itself quickly demoted from charming Tuscan town to tourist trap. Hit and run style tourism caused economic harm by consuming cultural and community resources without providing the needed revenues to maintain the architectural elements outlined in the town's statement of outstanding universal value and the intangible traditions that the community practiced. San Gimignano pioneered a best practice of implementing a dual transportation and tourism strategy that disperses tourist volumes between the inscribed historic center and surrounding landscape by making meaningful connections between the role of the walled town and the agricultural production which occurred in the outlying valley.

Urbino provided an alternate view of how communities apply to become a World Heritage Site out of a sense of national pride and a desire to attract tourists to their town versus a need for preservation. Their management plan provides evidence that communities frequently expect socioeconomic benefits to accompany the designation and further demonstrated that tourism is a strategic partner in facilitating the protection of World Heritage Sites. They took the lessons learned in places like Bath and San Gimignano to develop a management strategy that proactively addresses resident needs and mitigates negative impacts of tourism on inscribed historic centers. Even with regional marketing support, robust management plans, and creative high quality offerings for tourists, factors such as geography, limited transportation, and natural occurrences such as minor seismic activity may thwart visitation to even a World Heritage Site.

Bath and San Gimignano highlight the potential darker outcomes of the World Heritage Convention for local residents. The convention's drafting committee anticipated

some of these negative factors, but failed to accurately identify the root cause of them without foresight into the travel boom that began in the later 1970s. Urbino debunks the myth that communities list themselves solely for preservation purposes with no expectation of economic benefits or an increase in tourism. Despite the claims that no primary relationship exists between heritage tourism and UNESCO or the rise in literature discounting the role of tourism and associated socioeconomic benefits to sites in the UNESCO World Heritage Program, history proves these positions incorrect when viewed over the *long duree*. Tourism shaped the World Heritage Program from the very beginning and continues to do so in many ways today. Moreover, the UNESCO World Heritage Program requirements and tourism significantly influence the identity, narrative, sense of place, and the socioeconomic trajectory of inscribed urban historic centers.

APPENDIX SECTION

The ten criteria for Outstanding Universal Value established in 1972:

(i) to represent a masterpiece of human creative genius;

(ii) to exhibit an important interchange of human values, 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;

(iii) to bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared;

(iv) to be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history;

(v) to be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change;

(vi) to be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance. (The Committee considers that this criterion should preferably be used in conjunction with other criteria);

(vii) to contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance;

(viii) to be outstanding examples representing major stages of earth's history, including the record of life, significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features;

(ix) to be outstanding examples representing significant on-going ecological and biological processes in the evolution and development of terrestrial, fresh water, coastal and marine ecosystems and communities of plants and animals;

(x) to contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation

237

²³⁷ UNESCO World Heritage Centre, "UNESCO Operational Guidelines for World Heritage."



UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL
ORGANISATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE
PROTECTION OF THE WORLD
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Adopted by the General Conference at its
seventeenth session Paris, 16 November 1972



English Text

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

The General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization meeting in Paris from 17 October to 21 November 1972, at its seventeenth session,

Noting that the cultural heritage and the natural heritage are increasingly threatened with destruction not only by the traditional causes of decay, but also by changing social and economic conditions which aggravate the situation with even more formidable phenomena of damage or destruction,

Considering that deterioration or disappearance of any item of the cultural or natural heritage constitutes a harmful impoverishment of the heritage of all the nations of the world,

Considering that protection of this heritage at the national level often remains incomplete because of the scale of the resources which it requires and of the insufficient economic, scientific, and technological resources of the country where the property to be protected is situated,

Recalling that the Constitution of the Organization provides that it will maintain, increase, and diffuse knowledge by assuring the conservation and protection of the world's heritage, and recommending to the nations concerned the necessary international conventions,

Considering that the existing international conventions, recommendations and resolutions concerning cultural and natural property demonstrate the importance, for all the peoples of the world, of safeguarding this unique and irreplaceable property, to whatever people it may belong,

Considering that parts of the cultural or natural heritage are of outstanding interest and therefore need to be preserved as part of the world heritage of mankind as a whole,

Considering that, in view of the magnitude and gravity of the new dangers threatening them, it is incumbent on the international community as a whole to participate in the protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, by the granting of collective assistance which, although not taking the place of action by the State concerned, will serve as an efficient complement thereto,

Considering that it is essential for this purpose to adopt new provisions in the form of a convention establishing an effective system of collective protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, organized on a permanent basis and in accordance with modern scientific methods,

Having decided, at its sixteenth session, that this question should be made the subject of an international convention,

Adopts this sixteenth day of November 1972 this Convention.

I. DEFINITION OF THE CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Article 1

For the purpose of this Convention, the following shall be considered as "cultural heritage":

monuments: architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;

groups of buildings: groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;

sites: works of man or the combined works of nature and man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view.

Article 2

For the purposes of this Convention, the following shall be considered as "natural heritage":

natural features consisting of physical and biological formations or groups of such formations, which are of outstanding universal value from the aesthetic or scientific point of view;

geological and physiographical formations and precisely delineated areas which constitute the habitat of threatened species of animals and plants of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation;

natural sites or precisely delineated natural areas of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science, conservation or natural beauty.

Article 3

It is for each State Party to this Convention to identify and delineate the different properties situated on its territory mentioned in Articles 1 and 2 above.

II. NATIONAL PROTECTION AND INTERNATIONAL PROTECTION OF THE CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Article 4

Each State Party to this Convention recognizes that the duty of ensuring the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage referred to in Articles 1 and 2 and situated on its territory, belongs primarily to that State. It will do all it can to this end, to the utmost of its own resources and, where appropriate, with any international assistance and co-operation, in particular, financial, artistic, scientific and technical, which it may be able to obtain.

Article 5

To ensure that effective and active measures are taken for the protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage situated on its territory, each State Party to this Convention shall endeavor, in so far as possible, and as appropriate for each country:

- (a) to adopt a general policy which aims to give the cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community and to integrate the protection of that heritage into comprehensive planning programmes;
- (b) to set up within its territories, where such services do not exist, one or more services for the protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage with an appropriate staff and possessing the means to discharge their functions;
- (c) to develop scientific and technical studies and research and to work out such operating methods as will make the State capable of counteracting the dangers that threaten its cultural or natural heritage;
- (d) to take the appropriate legal, scientific, technical, administrative and financial measures necessary for the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of this heritage; and
- (e) to foster the establishment or development of national or regional centres for training in the protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage and to encourage scientific research in this field.

Article 6

1. Whilst fully respecting the sovereignty of the States on whose territory the cultural and natural heritage mentioned in Articles 1 and 2 is

situated, and without prejudice to property right provided by national legislation, the States Parties to this Convention recognize that such heritage constitutes a world heritage for whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to co-operate.

2. The States Parties undertake, in accordance with the provisions of this Convention, to give their help in the identification, protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage referred to in paragraphs 2 and 4 of Article 11 if the States on whose territory it is situated so request.
3. Each State Party to this Convention undertakes not to take any deliberate measures which might damage directly or indirectly the cultural and natural heritage referred to in Articles 1 and 2 situated on the territory of other States Parties to this Convention.

Article 7

For the purpose of this Convention, international protection of the world cultural and natural heritage shall be understood to mean the establishment of a system of international co-operation and assistance designed to support States Parties to the Convention in their efforts to conserve and identify that heritage.

III INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Article 8

1. An Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the Cultural and Natural Heritage of Outstanding Universal Value, called "the World Heritage Committee", is hereby established within the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. It shall be composed of 15 States Parties to the Convention, elected by States Parties to the Convention meeting in general assembly during the ordinary session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. The number of States members of the Committee shall be increased to 21 as from the date of the ordinary session of the General Conference following the entry into force of this Convention for at least 40 States.
2. Election of members of the Committee shall ensure an equitable representation of the different regions and cultures of the world.
3. A representative of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (Rome Centre), a representative of the International Council of Monuments and Sites

(ICOMOS) and a representative of the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), to whom may be added, at the request of States Parties to the Convention meeting in general assembly during the ordinary sessions of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, representatives of other intergovernmental or non-governmental organizations, with similar objectives, may attend the meetings of the Committee in an advisory capacity.

4. Election of members of the Committee shall ensure an equitable representation of the different regions and cultures of the world.
5. A representative of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (Rome Centre), a representative of the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and a representative of the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), to whom may be added, at the request of States Parties to the Convention meeting in general assembly during the ordinary sessions of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, representatives of other intergovernmental or non-governmental organizations, with similar objectives, may attend the meetings of the Committee in an advisory capacity.
6. Election of members of the Committee shall ensure an equitable representation of the different regions and cultures of the world.
7. A representative of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (Rome Centre), a representative of the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and a representative of the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), to whom may be added, at the request of States Parties to the Convention meeting in general assembly during the ordinary sessions of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, representatives of other intergovernmental or non-governmental organizations, with similar objectives, may attend the meetings of the Committee in an advisory capacity.

Article 9

1. The term of office of States members of the World Heritage Committee shall extend from the end of the ordinary session of the General Conference during which they are elected until the end of its third subsequent ordinary session.

2. The term of office of one-third of the members designated at the time of the first election shall, however, cease at the end of the first ordinary session of the General Conference following that at which they were elected; and the term of office of a further third of the members designated at the same time shall cease at the end of the second ordinary session of the General Conference following that at which they were elected. The names of these members shall be chosen by lot by the President of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization after the first election.
3. States members of the Committee shall choose as their representatives persons qualified in the field of the cultural or natural heritage.

Article 10

1. The World Heritage Committee shall adopt its Rules of Procedure.
2. The Committee may at any time invite public or private organizations or individuals to participate in its meetings for consultation on particular problems.
3. The Committee may create such consultative bodies as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions.

Article 11

1. Every State Party to this Convention shall, in so far as possible, submit to the World Heritage Committee an inventory of property forming part of the cultural and natural heritage, situated in its territory and suitable for inclusion in the list provided for in paragraph 2 of this Article. This inventory, which shall not be considered exhaustive, shall include documentation about the location of the property in question and its significance.
2. On the basis of the inventories submitted by States in accordance with paragraph 1, the Committee shall establish, keep up to date and publish, under the title of "World Heritage List," a list of properties forming part of the cultural heritage and natural heritage, as defined in Articles 1 and 2 of this Convention, which it considers as having outstanding universal value in terms of such criteria as it shall have established. An updated list shall be distributed at least every two years.
3. The inclusion of a property in the World Heritage List requires the consent of the State concerned. The inclusion of a property situated in a territory, sovereignty or jurisdiction over which is claimed by more than one State shall in no way prejudice the rights of the parties to the dispute.

4. The Committee shall establish, keep up to date and publish, whenever circumstances shall so require, under the title of "list of World Heritage in Danger", a list of the property appearing in the World Heritage List for the conservation of which major operations are necessary and for which assistance has been requested under this Convention. This list shall contain an estimate of the cost of such operations. The list may include only such property forming part of the cultural and natural heritage as is threatened by serious and specific dangers, such as the threat of disappearance caused by accelerated deterioration, large-scale public or private projects or rapid urban or tourist development projects; destruction caused by changes in the use or ownership of the land; major alterations due to unknown causes; abandonment for any reason whatsoever; the outbreak or the threat of an armed conflict; calamities and cataclysms; serious fires, earthquakes, landslides; volcanic eruptions; changes in water level, floods and tidal waves. The Committee may at any time, in case of urgent need, make a new entry in the List of World Heritage in Danger and publicize such entry immediately.
5. 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 4 of this article.
6. Before refusing a request for inclusion in one of the two lists mentioned in paragraphs 2 and 4 of this article, the Committee shall consult the State Party in whose territory the cultural or natural property in question is situated.
7. The Committee shall, with the agreement of the States concerned, coordinate and encourage the studies and research needed for the drawing up of the lists referred to in paragraphs 2 and 4 of this article.

Article 12

The fact that a property belonging to the cultural or natural heritage has not been included in either of the two lists mentioned in paragraphs 2 and 4 of Article 11 shall in no way be construed to mean that it does not have an outstanding universal value for purposes other than those resulting from inclusion in these lists.

Article 13

1. The World Heritage Committee shall receive and study requests for international assistance formulated by States Parties to this Convention with respect to property forming part of the cultural or natural heritage, situated in their territories, and included or potentially suitable for inclusion in the lists mentioned referred to in paragraphs 2 and 4 of

Article 11. The purpose of such requests may be to secure the protection, conservation, presentation or rehabilitation of such property.

2. Requests for international assistance under paragraph 1 of this article may also be concerned with identification of cultural or natural property defined in Articles 1 and 2, when preliminary investigations have shown that further inquiries would be justified.
3. The Committee shall decide on the action to be taken with regard to these requests, determine where appropriate, the nature and extent of its assistance, and authorize the conclusion, on its behalf, of the necessary arrangements with the government concerned.
4. The Committee shall determine an order of priorities for its operations. It shall in so doing bear in mind the respective importance for the world cultural and natural heritage of the property requiring protection, the need to give international assistance to the property most representative of a natural environment or of the genius and the history of the peoples of the world, the urgency of the work to be done, the resources available to the States on whose territory the threatened property is situated and in particular the extent to which they are able to safeguard such property by their own means.
5. The Committee shall draw up, keep up to date and publicize a list of property for which international assistance has been granted.
6. The Committee shall decide on the use of the resources of the Fund established under Article 15 of this Convention. It shall seek ways of increasing these resources and shall take all useful steps to this end.
7. The Committee shall co-operate with international and national governmental and non-governmental organizations having objectives similar to those of this Convention. For the implementation of its programmes and projects, the Committee may call on such organizations, particularly the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (the Rome Centre), the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), as well as on public and private bodies and individuals.
8. Decisions of the Committee shall be taken by a majority of two-thirds of its members present and voting. A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

Article 14

1. The World Heritage Committee shall be assisted by a Secretariat

appointed by the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

2. The Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, utilizing to the fullest extent possible the services of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property (the Rome Centre), the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) in their respective areas of competence and capability, shall prepare the Committee's documentation and the agenda of its meetings and shall have the responsibility for the implementation of its decisions.

IV FUND FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Article 15

1. A Fund for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage of Outstanding Universal Value, called "the World Heritage Fund", is hereby established.
2. The Fund shall constitute a trust fund, in conformity with the provisions of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
3. The resources of the Fund shall consist of:
 - (a) compulsory and voluntary contributions made by States Parties to this Convention,
 - (b) Contributions, gifts or bequests which may be made by:
 - (i) other States;
 - (ii) the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, other organizations of the United Nations system, particularly the United Nations Development Programme or other intergovernmental organizations;
 - (iii) public or private bodies or individuals;
 - (c) any interest due on the resources of the Fund;
 - (d) funds raised by collections and receipts from events organized for the benefit of the fund; and

(e) all other resources authorized by the Fund's regulations, as drawn up by the World Heritage Committee.

4. Contributions to the Fund and other forms of assistance made available to the Committee may be used only for such purposes as the Committee shall define. The Committee may accept contributions to be used only for a certain programme or project, provided that the Committee shall have decided on the implementation of such programme or project. No political conditions may be attached to contributions made to the Fund.

Article 16

1. Without prejudice to any supplementary voluntary contribution, the States Parties to this Convention undertake to pay regularly, every two years, to the World Heritage Fund, contributions, the amount of which, in the form of a uniform percentage applicable to all States, shall be determined by the General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention, meeting during the sessions of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. This decision of the General Assembly requires the majority of the States Parties present and voting, which have not made the declaration referred to in paragraph 2 of this Article. In no case shall the compulsory contribution of States Parties to the Convention exceed 1% of the contribution to the regular budget of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
2. However, each State referred to in Article 31 or in Article 32 of this Convention may declare, at the time of the deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession, that it shall not be bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article.
3. A State Party to the Convention which has made the declaration referred to in paragraph 2 of this Article may at any time withdraw the said declaration by notifying the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. However, the withdrawal of the declaration shall not take effect in regard to the compulsory contribution due by the State until the date of the subsequent General Assembly of States parties to the Convention.
4. In order that the Committee may be able to plan its operations effectively, the contributions of States Parties to this Convention which have made the declaration referred to in paragraph 2 of this Article, shall be paid on a regular basis, at least every two years, and should not be less than the contributions which they should have paid if they had been bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article.

5. Any State Party to the Convention which is in arrears with the payment of its compulsory or voluntary contribution for the current year and the calendar year immediately preceding it shall not be eligible as a Member of the World Heritage Committee, although this provision shall not apply to the first election.

The terms of office of any such State which is already a member of the Committee shall terminate at the time of the elections provided for in Article 8, paragraph 1 of this Convention.

Article 17

The States Parties to this Convention shall consider or encourage the establishment of national public and private foundations or associations whose purpose is to invite donations for the protection of the cultural and natural heritage as defined in Articles 1 and 2 of this Convention.

Article 18

The States Parties to this Convention shall give their assistance to international fund-raising campaigns organized for the World Heritage Fund under the auspices of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. They shall facilitate collections made by the bodies mentioned in paragraph 3 of Article 15 for this purpose.

V. CONDITIONS AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

Article 19

Any State Party to this Convention may request international assistance for property forming part of the cultural or natural heritage of outstanding universal value situated within its territory. It shall submit with its request such information and documentation provided for in Article 21 as it has in its possession and as will enable the Committee to come to a decision.

Article 20

Subject to the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 13, sub-paragraph (c) of Article 22 and Article 23, international assistance provided for by this Convention may be granted only to property forming part of the cultural and natural heritage which the World Heritage Committee has decided, or may decide, to enter in one of the lists

mentioned in paragraphs 2 and 4 of Article 11.

Article 21

1. The World Heritage Committee shall define the procedure by which requests to it for international assistance shall be considered and shall specify the content of the request, which should define the operation contemplated, the work that is necessary, the expected cost thereof, the degree of urgency and the reasons why the resources of the State requesting assistance do not allow it to meet all the expenses. Such requests must be supported by experts' reports whenever possible.
2. Requests based upon disasters or natural calamities should, by reasons of the urgent work which they may involve, be given immediate, priority consideration by the Committee, which should have a reserve fund at its disposal against such contingencies.
3. Before coming to a decision, the Committee shall carry out such studies and consultations as it deems necessary.

Article 22

Assistance granted by the World Heritage Fund may take the following forms:

- (a) studies concerning the artistic, scientific and technical problems raised by the protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of the cultural and natural heritage, as defined in paragraphs 2 and 4 of Article 11 of this Convention;
- (b) provisions of experts, technicians and skilled labour to ensure that the approved work is correctly carried out;
- (c) training of staff and specialists at all levels in the field of identification, protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of the cultural and natural heritage;
- (d) supply of equipment which the State concerned does not possess or is not in a position to acquire;
- (e) low-interest or interest-free loans which might be repayable on a long-term basis;
- (f) the granting, in exceptional cases and for special reasons, of non-repayable subsidies.

Article 23

The World Heritage Committee may also provide international assistance to national or regional centres for the training of staff and specialists at all levels in the field of identification, protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of the cultural and natural heritage.

Article 24

International assistance on a large scale shall be preceded by detailed scientific, economic and technical studies. These studies shall draw upon the most advanced techniques for the protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of the natural and cultural heritage and shall be consistent with the objectives of this Convention. The studies shall also seek means of making rational use of the resources available in the State concerned.

Article 25

As a general rule, only part of the cost of work necessary shall be borne by the international community. The contribution of the State benefiting from international assistance shall constitute a substantial share of the resources devoted to each programme or project, unless its resources do not permit this.

Article 26

The World Heritage Committee and the recipient State shall define in the agreement they conclude the conditions in which a programme or project for which international assistance under the terms of this Convention is provided, shall be carried out. It shall be the responsibility of the State receiving such international assistance to continue to protect, conserve and present the property so safeguarded, in observance of the conditions laid down by the agreement.

VI. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMES

Article 27

1. The States Parties to this Convention shall endeavor by all appropriate means, and in particular by educational and information programmes, to strengthen appreciation and respect by their peoples of the cultural and natural heritage defined in Articles 1 and 2 of the Convention.
2. They shall undertake to keep the public broadly informed of the dangers threatening this heritage and of the activities carried on in pursuance of this Convention.

Article 28

States Parties to this Convention which receive international assistance under the Convention shall take appropriate measures to make known the importance of the property for which assistance has been received and the role played by such assistance.

VII. REPORTS

Article 29

1. The States Parties to this Convention shall, in the reports which they submit to the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on dates and in a manner to be determined by it, give information on the legislative and administrative provisions which they have adopted and other action which they have taken for the application of this Convention, together with details of the experience acquired in this field.
2. These reports shall be brought to the attention of the World Heritage Committee.
3. The Committee shall submit a report on its activities at each of the ordinary sessions of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

VIII. FINAL CLAUSES

Article 30

This Convention is drawn up in Arabic, English, French, Russian and Spanish, the five texts being equally authoritative.

Article 31

1. This Convention shall be subject to ratification or acceptance by States members of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures.
2. The instruments of ratification or acceptance shall be deposited with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Article 32

1. This Convention shall be open to accession by all States not members of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization which are invited by the General Conference of the Organization to accede to it.
2. Accession shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of accession with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Article 33

This Convention shall enter into force three months after the date of the deposit of the twentieth instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession, but only with respect to those States which have deposited their respective instruments of ratification, acceptance or accession on or before that date. It shall enter into force with respect to any other State three months after the deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession.

Article 34

The following provisions shall apply to those States Parties to this Convention which have a federal or non-unitary constitutional system:

- (a) with regard to the provisions of this Convention, the implementation of which comes under the legal jurisdiction of the federal or central legislative power, the obligations of the federal or central government shall be the same as for those States parties which are not federal States;
- (b) with regard to the provisions of this Convention, the implementation of which comes under the legal jurisdiction of individual constituent States, countries, provinces or cantons that are not obliged by the constitutional system of the federation to take legislative measures, the federal government shall inform the competent authorities of such States, countries, provinces or cantons of the said provisions, with its recommendation for their adoption.

Article 35

1. Each State Party to this Convention may denounce the Convention.
2. The denunciation shall be notified by an instrument in writing, deposited with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

3. The denunciation shall take effect twelve months after the receipt of the instrument of denunciation. It shall not affect the financial obligations of the denouncing State until the date on which the withdrawal takes effect.

Article 36

The Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization shall inform the States members of the Organization, the States not members of the Organization which are referred to in Article 32, as well as the United Nations, of the deposit of all the instruments of ratification, acceptance, or accession provided for in Articles 31 and 32, and of the denunciations provided for in Article 35.

Article 37

1. This Convention may be revised by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Any such revision shall, however, bind only the States which shall become Parties to the revising convention.
2. If the General Conference should adopt a new convention revising this Convention in whole or in part, then, unless the new convention otherwise provides, this Convention shall cease to be open to ratification, acceptance or accession, as from the date on which the new revising convention enters into force.

Article 38

In conformity with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations, this Convention shall be registered with the Secretariat of the United Nations at the request of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Done in Paris, this twenty-third day of November 1972, in two authentic copies bearing the signature of the President of the seventeenth session of the General Conference and of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, which shall be deposited in the archives of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and certified true copies of which shall be delivered to all the States referred to in Articles 31 and 32 as well as to the United Nations.



**CONVENTION FOR THE SAFEGUARDING OF THE
INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE**

Paris, 17 October 2003

MISC/2003/CLT/CH/14

CONVENTION FOR THE SAFEGUARDING OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE

The General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization hereinafter referred to as UNESCO, meeting in Paris, from 29 September to 17 October 2003, at its 32nd session,

Referring to existing international human rights instruments, in particular to the Universal Declaration on Human Rights of 1948, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of 1966, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 1966,

Considering the importance of the intangible cultural heritage as a mainspring of cultural diversity and a guarantee of sustainable development, as underscored in the UNESCO Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore of 1989, in the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity of 2001, and in the Istanbul Declaration of 2002 adopted by the Third Round Table of Ministers of Culture,

Considering the deep-seated interdependence between the intangible cultural heritage and the tangible cultural and natural heritage,

Recognizing that the processes of globalization and social transformation, alongside the conditions they create for renewed dialogue among communities, also give rise, as does the phenomenon of intolerance, to grave threats of deterioration, disappearance and destruction of the intangible cultural heritage, in particular owing to a lack of resources for safeguarding such heritage,

Being aware of the universal will and the common concern to safeguard the intangible cultural heritage of humanity,

Recognizing that communities, in particular indigenous communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals, play an important role in the production, safeguarding, maintenance and re-creation of the intangible cultural heritage, thus helping to enrich cultural diversity and human creativity,

Noting the far-reaching impact of the activities of UNESCO in establishing normative instruments for the protection of the cultural heritage, in particular the Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage of 1972,

Noting further that no binding multilateral instrument as yet exists for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage,

Considering that existing international agreements, recommendations and resolutions concerning the cultural and natural heritage need to be effectively enriched and supplemented by means of new provisions relating to the intangible cultural heritage,

Considering the need to build greater awareness, especially among the younger generations, of the importance of the intangible cultural heritage and of its safeguarding,

Considering that the international community should contribute, together with the States Parties to this Convention, to the safeguarding of such heritage in a spirit of cooperation and mutual assistance,

Recalling UNESCO's programmes relating to the intangible cultural heritage, in particular the Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity,

Considering the invaluable role of the intangible cultural heritage as a factor in bringing human beings closer together and ensuring exchange and understanding among them,

Adopts this Convention on this seventeenth day of October 2003.

I. General provisions

Article 1 – Purposes of the Convention

The purposes of this Convention are:

- (a) to safeguard the intangible cultural heritage;
- (b) to ensure respect for the intangible cultural heritage of the communities, groups and individuals concerned;
- (c) to raise awareness at the local, national and international levels of the importance of the intangible cultural heritage, and of ensuring mutual appreciation thereof;
- (d) to provide for international cooperation and assistance.

Article 2 – Definitions

For the purposes of this Convention,

1. The "intangible cultural heritage" means the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. For the purposes of this Convention,

consideration will be given solely to such intangible cultural heritage as is compatible with existing international human rights instruments, as well as with the requirements of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and of sustainable development.

2. The “intangible cultural heritage”, as defined in paragraph 1 above, is manifested inter alia in the following domains:

- (a) oral traditions and expressions, including language as a vehicle of the intangible cultural heritage;
- (b) performing arts;
- (c) social practices, rituals and festive events;
- (d) knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe;
- (e) traditional craftsmanship.

3. “Safeguarding” means measures aimed at ensuring the viability of the intangible cultural heritage, including the identification, documentation, research, preservation, protection, promotion, enhancement, transmission, particularly through formal and non- formal education, as well as the revitalization of the various aspects of such heritage.

4. “States Parties” means States which are bound by this Convention and among which this Convention is in force.

5. This Convention applies mutatis mutandis to the territories referred to in Article 33 which become Parties to this Convention in accordance with the conditions set out in that Article. To that extent the expression “States Parties” also refers to such territories.

Article 3 – Relationship to other international instruments

Nothing in this Convention may be interpreted as:

- (a) altering the status or diminishing the level of protection under the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage of World Heritage properties with which an item of the intangible cultural heritage is directly associated; or
- (b) affecting the rights and obligations of States Parties deriving from any international instrument relating to intellectual property rights or to the use of biological and ecological resources to which they are parties.

II. Organs of the Convention

Article 4 – General Assembly of the States Parties

1. A General Assembly of the States Parties is hereby established, hereinafter referred to as “the General Assembly”. The General Assembly is the sovereign body of this Convention.
2. The General Assembly shall meet in ordinary session every two years. It may meet in extraordinary session if it so decides or at the request either of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage or of at least one-third of the States Parties.
3. The General Assembly shall adopt its own Rules of Procedure.

Article 5 – Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage

1. An Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, hereinafter referred to as “the Committee”, is hereby established within UNESCO. It shall be composed of representatives of 18 States Parties, elected by the States Parties meeting in General Assembly, once this Convention enters into force in accordance with Article 34.
2. The number of States Members of the Committee shall be increased to 24 once the number of the States Parties to the Convention reaches 50.

Article 6 – Election and terms of office of States Members of the Committee

1. The election of States Members of the Committee shall obey the principles of equitable geographical representation and rotation.
2. States Members of the Committee shall be elected for a term of four years by States Parties to the Convention meeting in General Assembly.
3. However, the term of office of half of the States Members of the Committee elected at the first election is limited to two years. These States shall be chosen by lot at the first election.
4. Every two years, the General Assembly shall renew half of the States Members of the Committee.
5. It shall also elect as many States Members of the Committee as required to fill vacancies.
6. A State Member of the Committee may not be elected for two consecutive terms.

7. States Members of the Committee shall choose as their representatives persons who are qualified in the various fields of the intangible cultural heritage.

Article 7 – Functions of the Committee

Without prejudice to other prerogatives granted to it by this Convention, the functions of the Committee shall be to:

- (a) promote the objectives of the Convention, and to encourage and monitor the implementation thereof;
- (b) provide guidance on best practices and make recommendations on measures for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage;
- (c) prepare and submit to the General Assembly for approval a draft plan for the use of the resources of the Fund, in accordance with Article 25;
- (d) seek means of increasing its resources, and to take the necessary measures to this end, in accordance with Article 25;
- (e) prepare and submit to the General Assembly for approval operational directives for the implementation of this Convention;
- (f) examine, in accordance with Article 29, the reports submitted by States Parties, and to summarize them for the General Assembly;
- (g) examine requests submitted by States Parties, and to decide thereon, in accordance with objective selection criteria to be established by the Committee and approved by the General Assembly for:
 - (i) inscription on the lists and proposals mentioned under Articles 16, 17 and 18;
 - (ii) the granting of international assistance in accordance with Article 22.

Article 8 – Working methods of the Committee

1. The Committee shall be answerable to the General Assembly. It shall report to it on all its activities and decisions.
2. The Committee shall adopt its own Rules of Procedure by a two-thirds majority of its Members.
3. The Committee may establish, on a temporary basis, whatever ad hoc

consultative bodies it deems necessary to carry out its task.

4. The Committee may invite to its meetings any public or private bodies, as well as private persons, with recognized competence in the various fields of the intangible cultural heritage, in order to consult them on specific matters.

Article 9 – Accreditation of advisory organizations

1. The Committee shall propose to the General Assembly the accreditation of non- governmental organizations with recognized competence in the field of the intangible cultural heritage to act in an advisory capacity to the Committee.

2. The Committee shall also propose to the General Assembly the criteria for and modalities of such accreditation.

Article 10 – The Secretariat

1. The Committee shall be assisted by the UNESCO Secretariat.

2. The Secretariat shall prepare the documentation of the General Assembly and of the Committee, as well as the draft agenda of their meetings, and shall ensure the implementation of their decisions.

III. Safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage at the national level

Article 11 – Role of States Parties

Each State Party shall:

- (a) take the necessary measures to ensure the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory;
- (b) among the safeguarding measures referred to in Article 2, paragraph 3, identify and define the various elements of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory, with the participation of communities, groups and relevant non-governmental organizations.

Article 12 – Inventories

1. To ensure identification with a view to safeguarding, each State Party shall draw up, in a manner geared to its own situation, one or more inventories of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory. These inventories shall be regularly updated.

2. When each State Party periodically submits its report to the Committee, in accordance with Article 29, it shall provide relevant information on such

inventories.

Article 13 – Other measures for safeguarding

To ensure the safeguarding, development and promotion of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory, each State Party shall endeavour to:

- (a) adopt a general policy aimed at promoting the function of the intangible cultural heritage in society, and at integrating the safeguarding of such heritage into planning programmes;
- (b) designate or establish one or more competent bodies for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory;
- (c) foster scientific, technical and artistic studies, as well as research methodologies, with a view to effective safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage, in particular the intangible cultural heritage in danger;
- (d) adopt appropriate legal, technical, administrative and financial measures aimed at:
 - (i) fostering the creation or strengthening of institutions for training in the management of the intangible cultural heritage and the transmission of such heritage through forums and spaces intended for the performance or expression thereof;
 - (ii) ensuring access to the intangible cultural heritage while respecting customary practices governing access to specific aspects of such heritage;
 - (iii) establishing documentation institutions for the intangible cultural heritage and facilitating access to them.

Article 14 – Education, awareness-raising and capacity-building

Each State Party shall endeavour, by all appropriate means, to:

- (a) ensure recognition of, respect for, and enhancement of the intangible cultural heritage in society, in particular through:
 - (i) educational, awareness-raising and information programmes, aimed at the general public, in particular young people;
 - (ii) specific educational and training programmes within the communities and groups concerned;

- (iii) capacity-building activities for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage, in particular management and scientific research; and
- (iv) non-formal means of transmitting knowledge;
- (b) keep the public informed of the dangers threatening such heritage, and of the activities carried out in pursuance of this Convention;
- (c) promote education for the protection of natural spaces and places of memory whose existence is necessary for expressing the intangible cultural heritage.

Article 15 – Participation of communities, groups and individuals

Within the framework of its safeguarding activities of the intangible cultural heritage, each State Party shall endeavour to ensure the widest possible participation of communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals that create, maintain and transmit such heritage, and to involve them actively in its management.

IV. Safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage at the international level

Article 16 – Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity

1. In order to ensure better visibility of the intangible cultural heritage and awareness of its significance, and to encourage dialogue which respects cultural diversity, the Committee, upon the proposal of the States Parties concerned, shall establish, keep up to date and publish a Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
2. The Committee shall draw up and submit to the General Assembly for approval the criteria for the establishment, updating and publication of this Representative List.

Article 17 – List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding

1. With a view to taking appropriate safeguarding measures, the Committee shall establish, keep up to date and publish a List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, and shall inscribe such heritage on the List at the request of the State Party concerned.
2. The Committee shall draw up and submit to the General Assembly for approval the criteria for the establishment, updating and publication of this List.

3. In cases of extreme urgency – the objective criteria of which shall be approved by the General Assembly upon the proposal of the Committee – the Committee may inscribe an item of the heritage concerned on the List mentioned in paragraph 1, in consultation with the State Party concerned.

Article 18 – Programmes, projects and activities for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage

1. On the basis of proposals submitted by States Parties, and in accordance with criteria to be defined by the Committee and approved by the General Assembly, the Committee shall periodically select and promote national, subregional and regional programmes, projects and

activities for the safeguarding of the heritage which it considers best reflect the principles and objectives of this Convention, taking into account the special needs of developing countries.

2. To this end, it shall receive, examine and approve requests for international assistance from States Parties for the preparation of such proposals.

3. The Committee shall accompany the implementation of such projects, programmes and activities by disseminating best practices using means to be determined by it.

v. International cooperation and assistance

Article 19 – Cooperation

1. For the purposes of this Convention, international cooperation includes, inter alia, the exchange of information and experience, joint initiatives, and the establishment of a mechanism of assistance to States Parties in their efforts to safeguard the intangible cultural heritage.

2. Without prejudice to the provisions of their national legislation and customary law and practices, the States Parties recognize that the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage is of general interest to humanity, and to that end undertake to cooperate at the bilateral, subregional, regional and international levels.

Article 20 – Purposes of international assistance

International assistance may be granted for the following purposes:

- (a) the safeguarding of the heritage inscribed on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding;
- (b) the preparation of inventories in the sense of Articles 11 and 12;

- (c) support for programmes, projects and activities carried out at the national, subregional and regional levels aimed at the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage;
- (d) any other purpose the Committee may deem necessary.

Article 21 – Forms of international assistance

The assistance granted by the Committee to a State Party shall be governed by the operational directives foreseen in Article 7 and by the agreement referred to in Article 24, and may take the following forms:

- (a) studies concerning various aspects of safeguarding;
- (b) the provision of experts and practitioners;
- (c) the training of all necessary staff;
- (d) the elaboration of standard-setting and other measures;
- (e) the creation and operation of infrastructures;
- (f) the supply of equipment and know-how;
- (g) other forms of financial and technical assistance, including, where appropriate, the granting of low-interest loans and donations.

Article 22 – Conditions governing international assistance

1. The Committee shall establish the procedure for examining requests for international assistance, and shall specify what information shall be included in the requests, such as the measures envisaged and the interventions required, together with an assessment of their cost.
2. In emergencies, requests for assistance shall be examined by the Committee as a matter of priority.
3. In order to reach a decision, the Committee shall undertake such studies and consultations as it deems necessary.

Article 23 – Requests for international assistance

1. Each State Party may submit to the Committee a request for international assistance for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory.
2. Such a request may also be jointly submitted by two or more States

Parties.

3. The request shall include the information stipulated in Article 22, paragraph 1, together with the necessary documentation.

Article 24 – Role of beneficiary States Parties

1. In conformity with the provisions of this Convention, the international assistance granted shall be regulated by means of an agreement between the beneficiary State Party and the Committee.

2. As a general rule, the beneficiary State Party shall, within the limits of its resources, share the cost of the safeguarding measures for which international assistance is provided.

3. The beneficiary State Party shall submit to the Committee a report on the use made of the assistance provided for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage.

VI. Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund

Article 25 – Nature and resources of the Fund

1. A “Fund for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage”, hereinafter referred to as “the Fund”, is hereby established.

2. The Fund shall consist of funds-in-trust established in accordance with the Financial Regulations of UNESCO.

3. The resources of the Fund shall consist of:

- (a) contributions made by States Parties;
- (b) funds appropriated for this purpose by the General Conference of UNESCO;
- (c) contributions, gifts or bequests which may be made by:
 - (i) other States;
 - (ii) organizations and programmes of the United Nations system, particularly the United Nations Development Programme, as well as other international organizations;
 - (iii) public or private bodies or individuals;
- (d) any interest due on the resources of the Fund;

- (e) funds raised through collections, and receipts from events organized for the benefit of the Fund;
 - (f) any other resources authorized by the Fund's regulations, to be drawn up by the Committee.
4. The use of resources by the Committee shall be decided on the basis of guidelines laid down by the General Assembly.
 5. The Committee may accept contributions and other forms of assistance for general and specific purposes relating to specific projects, provided that those projects have been approved by the Committee.
 6. No political, economic or other conditions which are incompatible with the objectives of this Convention may be attached to contributions made to the Fund.

Article 26 – Contributions of States Parties to the Fund

1. Without prejudice to any supplementary voluntary contribution, the States Parties to this Convention undertake to pay into the Fund, at least every two years, a contribution, the amount of which, in the form of a uniform percentage applicable to all States, shall be determined by the General Assembly. This decision of the General Assembly shall be taken by a majority of the States Parties present and voting which have not made the declaration referred to in paragraph 2 of this Article. In no case shall the contribution of the State Party exceed 1% of its contribution to the regular budget of UNESCO.
2. However, each State referred to in Article 32 or in Article 33 of this Convention may declare, at the time of the deposit of its instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, that it shall not be bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article.
3. A State Party to this Convention which has made the declaration referred to in paragraph 2 of this Article shall endeavour to withdraw the said declaration by notifying the Director-General of UNESCO. However, the withdrawal of the declaration shall not take effect in regard to the contribution due by the State until the date on which the subsequent session of the General Assembly opens.
4. In order to enable the Committee to plan its operations effectively, the contributions of States Parties to this Convention which have made the declaration referred to in paragraph 2 of this Article shall be paid on a regular basis, at least every two years, and should be as close as possible to the contributions they would have owed if they had been bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article.

5. Any State Party to this Convention which is in arrears with the payment of its compulsory or voluntary contribution for the current year and the calendar year immediately preceding it shall not be eligible as a Member of the Committee; this provision shall not apply to the first election. The term of office of any such State which is already a Member of the Committee shall come to an end at the time of the elections provided for in Article 6 of this Convention.

Article 27 – Voluntary supplementary contributions to the Fund

States Parties wishing to provide voluntary contributions in addition to those foreseen under Article 26 shall inform the Committee, as soon as possible, so as to enable it to plan its operations accordingly.

Article 28 – International fund-raising campaigns

The States Parties shall, insofar as is possible, lend their support to international fund-raising campaigns organized for the benefit of the Fund under the auspices of UNESCO.

VII. Reports

Article 29 – Reports by the States Parties

The States Parties shall submit to the Committee, observing the forms and periodicity to be defined by the Committee, reports on the legislative, regulatory and other measures taken for the implementation of this Convention.

Article 30 – Reports by the Committee

1. On the basis of its activities and the reports by States Parties referred to in Article 29, the Committee shall submit a report to the General Assembly at each of its sessions.
2. The report shall be brought to the attention of the General Conference of UNESCO.

VIII. Transitional clause

Article 31 – Relationship to the Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity

1. The Committee shall incorporate in the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity the items proclaimed “Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity” before the entry into force of this Convention.
2. The incorporation of these items in the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity shall in no way prejudice the criteria

for future inscriptions decided upon in accordance with Article 16, paragraph 2.

3. No further Proclamation will be made after the entry into force of this Convention.

IX. Final clauses

Article 32 – Ratification, acceptance or approval

1. This Convention shall be subject to ratification, acceptance or approval by States Members of UNESCO in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures.
2. The instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval shall be deposited with the Director-General of UNESCO.

Article 33 – Accession

1. This Convention shall be open to accession by all States not Members of UNESCO that are invited by the General Conference of UNESCO to accede to it.
2. This Convention shall also be open to accession by territories which enjoy full internal self-government recognized as such by the United Nations, but have not attained full independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), and which have competence over the matters governed by this Convention, including the competence to enter into treaties in respect of such matters.
3. The instrument of accession shall be deposited with the Director-General of UNESCO.

Article 34 – Entry into force

This Convention shall enter into force three months after the date of the deposit of the thirtieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, but only with respect to those States that have deposited their respective instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval, or accession on or before that date. It shall enter into force with respect to any other State Party three months after the deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.

Article 35 – Federal or non-unitary constitutional systems

The following provisions shall apply to States Parties which have a federal or non-unitary constitutional system:

- (a) with regard to the provisions of this Convention, the implementation of which comes under the legal jurisdiction of the federal or central

legislative power, the obligations of the federal or central government shall be the same as for those States Parties which are not federal States;

- (b) with regard to the provisions of this Convention, the implementation of which comes under the jurisdiction of individual constituent States, countries, provinces or cantons which are not obliged by the constitutional system of the federation to

take legislative measures, the federal government shall inform the competent authorities of such States, countries, provinces or cantons of the said provisions, with its recommendation for their adoption.

Article 36 – Denunciation

1. Each State Party may denounce this Convention.
2. The denunciation shall be notified by an instrument in writing, deposited with the Director-General of UNESCO.
3. The denunciation shall take effect twelve months after the receipt of the instrument of denunciation. It shall in no way affect the financial obligations of the denouncing State Party until the date on which the withdrawal takes effect.

Article 37 – Depositary functions

The Director-General of UNESCO, as the Depositary of this Convention, shall inform the States Members of the Organization, the States not Members of the Organization referred to in Article 33, as well as the United Nations, of the deposit of all the instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession provided for in Articles 32 and 33, and of the denunciations provided for in Article 36.

Article 38 – Amendments

1. A State Party may, by written communication addressed to the Director-General, propose amendments to this Convention. The Director-General shall circulate such communication to all States Parties. If, within six months from the date of the circulation of the communication, not less than one half of the States Parties reply favourably to the request, the Director-General shall present such proposal to the next session of the General Assembly for discussion and possible adoption.
2. Amendments shall be adopted by a two-thirds majority of States Parties present and voting.
3. Once adopted, amendments to this Convention shall be submitted for ratification, acceptance, approval or accession to the States Parties.
4. Amendments shall enter into force, but solely with respect to the States

Parties that have ratified, accepted, approved or acceded to them, three months after the deposit of the instruments referred to in paragraph 3 of this Article by two-thirds of the States Parties. Thereafter, for each State Party that ratifies, accepts, approves or accedes to an amendment, the said amendment shall enter into force three months after the date of deposit by that State Party of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.

5. The procedure set out in paragraphs 3 and 4 shall not apply to amendments to Article 5 concerning the number of States Members of the Committee. These amendments shall enter into force at the time they are adopted.

6. A State which becomes a Party to this Convention after the entry into force of amendments in conformity with paragraph 4 of this Article shall, failing an expression of different intention, be considered:

- (a) as a Party to this Convention as so amended; and
- (b) as a Party to the unamended Convention in relation to any State Party not bound by the amendments.

Article 39 – Authoritative texts

This Convention has been drawn up in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish, the six texts being equally authoritative.

Article 40 – Registration

In conformity with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations, this Convention shall be registered with the Secretariat of the United Nations at the request of the Director-General of UNESCO.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

- Bath & North East Somerset Council. "Bath Economic Strategy Review 2013-2014." Bath & Northeast Somerset Council, 2014. Accessed August 6, 2017. http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/siteimages/Planning-and-Building-Control/Major-Projects/ba192_economic_strategy_05.pdf.
- . "City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan 2003-2009." Bath & North East Somerset Council, Accessed April 7, 2016. <https://www.bathworldheritage.org.uk/management-plan>.
- . "City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan 2010-2016." Bath & North East Somerset Council. Accessed February 5, 2017. https://www.bathworldheritage.org.uk/sites/world_heritage_site/files/heritage/World%20Heritage%20Site%20Management%20Plan%202016-2022.pdf.
- . "City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan 2016-2022." Bath & Northeast Somerset Council. Accessed February 5, 2017. https://www.bathworldheritage.org.uk/sites/world_heritage_site/files/heritage/World%20Heritage%20Site%20Management%20Plan%202016-2022.pdf.
- . "Tourism and the Visitor Economy | Bathnes." Bath & North East Somerset Council, 2015. Accessed March 19, 2016. <http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/services/your-council-and-democracy/local-research-and-statistics/wiki/tourism-and-visitor-economy>.
- "Bath Heritage Watchdog - Southgate News." Accessed August 6, 2017. <http://www.bathheritagewatchdog.org/churchill.htm>.
- Bayley, Stephen. "Is Bath Britain's Most Backward City? | Art and Design | The Guardian." *The Guardian*, September 15, 2007. Accessed August 6, 2017. <https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2007/sep/16/architecture>.
- BBC News. "Timeline: Spa Saga Highs and Lows." BBC News, July 31, 2006. Accessed August 6, 2017. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/somerset/5230322.stm>.
- Brinkoff, Thomas. "Urbino (Pesaro E Urbino, Marche, Italy) - Population Statistics, Charts, Map, Location, Weather and Web Information." City Population, June 13, 2017. Accessed August 27, 2017. <https://www.citypopulation.de/php/italy-marche.php?cityid=041067>.
- Capo Ferro, Ridolfo. *Capo Ferro's Gran Simalcro Italian Rapier Combat*. Edited by Jared Kirby. Translated by Ramon Martinez and Jeanette Acosta-Martinez. Italy: Frontline Books, 2012.

- Chamber of Commerce of Pesaro and Urbino. "Chamber of Commerce Pesaro and Urbino Italy Brochure." Rotograf, 2016. Accessed August 25, 2017. https://www.ps.camcom.gov.it/promozione/files/Brochure_english_veget.pdf.
- Comune di San Gimignano. "Comune di San Gimignano tourism-culture — English." Municipality. Comune di San Gimignano tourism-culture, April 1, 2016. Accessed April 7, 2016. <http://www.comune.sangimignano.si.it/en/tourism-culture>.
- Comuni di San Gimignano. "Piano di Gestione del Sito UNESCO n.550 Centro Storico di San Gimignano," March 2010. Accessed August 13, 2017. <http://allegatialbo.comune.sangimignano.si.it/unesco/pgest2010.pdf>.
- Consorzio Della Denominazione San Gimignano. "Vernaccia Di San Gimignano - La Rocca - Wine Experience." San Gimignano Museo Vernaccia, 2017. Accessed August 20, 2017. <http://www.sangimignanomuseovernaccia.com/lang-eng.php>.
- Consorzio Urbino e il Montefeltro. "Il Consorzio | Urbino and the Montefeltro." Urbino e il Montefeltro, 2014. Accessed September 4, 2017. <http://www.urbinoeilmontefeltro.it/en/il-consorzio/>.
- Delgation of Mexico. "Project for An International Convention For the Holding Of Historic Monuments and Art Treasures (UNESCO General Conference)." UNESCO, May 26, 1950. 5c-22e. UNESCO Website Archived Resources. Accessed March 3, 2016. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/1517>.
- D'Eramo, Marco. "Urbanicide in All Good Faith." domus. Accessed September 28, 2015. http://www.domusweb.it/en/op-ed/2014/08/20/urbanicide_in_allgoodfaith.html.
- Desroches-Noblecourt, Christiane. "Floating Laboratories on the Nile." *The UNESCO Courier*, no. The 14th Year (October 1961): 26–31.
- English Club TV Ltd. "The Construction of Bath's Royal Crescent." *English Club TV On-the-Go* (blog), February 28, 2017. Accessed August 5, 2017. <https://tv-english.club/articles-en/discover-great-britain-en/the-construction-of-bathvs-royal-crescent/>.
- Glancey, Jonathan. "Bath Saves Its World Heritage Status ... Just." *The Guardian*, November 10, 2009, sec. Art and design. Accessed August 6, 2017. <http://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2009/nov/10/bath-world-heritage-status>.
- . "Will Bath Lose Its World Heritage Status, Wonders Jonathan Glancey | Culture | The Guardian." *The Guardian*, April 5, 2009. Accessed August 5, 2017. <https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2009/apr/06/bath-heritage-architecture>.

- ICOMOS. "2013 Periodic Reporting - Second Cycle Bath." UNESCO, May 20, 2014. UNESCO Archives. Accessed March 19, 2016. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/428/documents/>.
- . "Advisory Board Evaluation -San Gimignano." UNESCO, September 1, 1989. San Gimignano Documents #550. UNESCO Archives. Accessed April 1, 2016. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/550/documents/>.
- . "Seville Committee Paper: UNESCO Report and Decision," June 2009. Accessed November 29, 2015. <http://www.bath-preservation-trust.org.uk/campaigning/city-of-bath-world-heritage-site/unesco/>.
- Jupe, Georgette. "Why Winter Is The Best Time To Visit San Gimignano." *Girl in Florence* (blog), May 1, 2017. Accessed August 13, 2017. <http://girlinflorence.com/2017/01/05/winter-best-time-visit-san-gimignano/>.
- Keating, Rex. "Journey To the Land of Kush." *The UNESCO Courier*, no. 14th Year (October 1961): 32–37.
- Lacoste, Michel. "How Philae Will Be Saved." *The UNESCO Courier*, no. 14th Year (October 1961): 18–20.
- Mirand, Kristen. "Earthquakes Rattle Urbino Tourism." *Urbino Project 2017* (blog), June 16, 2017. Accessed August 27, 2017. <http://2017.inurbino.net/earthquakesimpacttourism/>.
- Morris, Steven. "Bath Park-and-Ride Scheme Risks Unesco Status, Say Campaigners." *The Guardian*, November 8, 2015, sec. UK news. Accessed November 29, 2015. <http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2015/nov/08/bath-park-and-ride-scheme-risks-unesco-status-say-campaigners>.
- . "Council Ready to Ditch Bath Park-and-Ride Plan after Local Outrage | Culture | The Guardian." *The Guardian*, July 11, 2017, sec. UK News. Accessed August 5, 2017. <https://www.theguardian.com/culture/2017/jul/11/bath-park-ride-council-ditch-scheme-world-heritage-status>.
- Nischolson-Lord, David. "Tourist Overcrowding Spoils Enjoyment of Historic Venue: Chester Approaches Saturation Point as Tide of Visitors Grows. David Nicholson-Lord Reports | The Independent." *The Independent*, May 30, 1994. Accessed August 5, 2017. <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/tourist-overcrowding-spoils-enjoyment-of-historic-venue-chester-approaches-saturation-point-as-tide-1439620.html>.

- Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire." *Representations* 26, no. Spring 1989: 7–23. Accessed January 23, 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/147.26.11.80>.
- Orbasli, Aylin. "City of Bath World Heritage Site: Economic Development Appraisal." Dr. Aylin Orbasli, August 5, 2017. <http://www.aylinorbasli.com/Resources/Bath%20World%20Heritage.pdf>.
- Pantry, Lindsay. "The Price of Culture: Living near Unesco Site Bumps up Property - Yorkshire Post." *Yorkshire Post*, November 16, 2015. Accessed May 30, 2017. <http://www.yorkshirepost.co.uk/news/the-price-of-culture-living-near-unesco-site-bumps-up-property-1-7573702>.
- Poggetto, Paulo Dal. *Guide to the Galleria Nazionale Delle Marche*. Roma: Gebart Srl, 2006.
- Povoledo, Elisabetta. "Tourism Traps an Italian Town with Its Own Success - Travel & Dining - International Herald Tribune - The New York Times." *New York Times*, August 21, 2006, sec. Travel. Accessed April 7, 2016. http://www.nytimes.com/2006/08/21/travel/21iht-trgimi.2549491.html?_r=0.
- Regione Marche. "Dati Turismo." Regione Marche Osservatorio Regionale Del Turismo. Accessed August 28, 2017. <http://statistica.turismo.marche.it/DatiTurismo/tabid/100/language/it-IT/Default.aspx>.
- Romanes, Aisdair. "Romanes Rants: Death by Tourism." Lambrook School, 2014. Accessed August 12, 2017. <http://www.lambrookschool.co.uk/Romanes-Rants-Death-by-Tourism>.
- Tenuta Torciano. "Torciano Home." Tenuta Torciano San Gimignano, 2017. Accessed January 20, 2017. <http://www.torciano.com/en/>.
- . "Torre Chigi - Historical Visit of the Tower with Winetasting and Lunch in the Winery." Tenuta Torciano San Gimignano, 2017. Accessed August 20, 2017. <http://www.torciano.com/en/visit/tours/torre-chigi-historical-visit-of-the-tower-with-winetasting-and-lunch-in-winery/>.
- Thermae Bath Spa. "The Spa Project Buildings | Thermae Bath Spa." Thermae Bath Spa, 2017. Accessed August 6, 2017. <https://www.thermaebathspa.com/news-info/about-the-spa/the-spa-project-buildings>.
- Ufficio del Comune di Urbino. "Piano Di Gestione Di Sito UNESCO - Urbino," 2013.
- UNESCO. "Abu Simbel Now or Never." *The UNESCO Courier*, October 1961. Unesdoc. UNESCO Archives.

- . “Convention Concerning The Protection of The World Cultural and Natural Heritage.” UNESCO, 1972. Accessed December 10, 2015. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext/>.
- . “Conventions.” UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Accessed April 17, 2016. <http://www.unesco.org/eri/la/convention.asp?KO=13055&language=E>.
- . “Education for Sustainable Development | Education | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.” UNESCO. Accessed March 21, 2016. <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/education/themes/leading-the-international-agenda/education-for-sustainable-development/>.
- . “History | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.” UNESCO, 2016. Accessed April 17, 2016. <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco/about-us/who-we-are/history/>.
- . “Introducing UNESCO.” UNESCO, September 24, 2012. Accessed March 19, 2016. <http://www.unesco.org>.
- . “Meeting of Experts to Establish an International System For the Protection of Monuments, Groups of Buildings And Sites of Universal Interest Final Report.” UNESCO, November 10, 1969. Establishment of the Convention Item 15.3.4. UNESCO Website Archived Resources. Accessed March 7, 2016. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/1532>.
- . “Note on the Desirability of Framing an International Convention Establishing an International Fund for the Preservation and Restoration of Monuments and Historic Sites.” UNESCO, December 1950. Establishment of the Convention Item 1519. UNESCO Website Archived Resources. Accessed March 1, 2016. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/1519>.
- . “Report on the Possibility and Advisability of Adopting an International Convention for the Instituting A Special Tourist Tax for the Preservation of Monuments and Museums.” UNESCO, May 10, 1951. Rise of the Convention. UNESCO Website Archived Resources. Accessed March 3, 2016. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/1520>.
- . “Supplementary Report on the Possibility and Advisability of Adopting an International Convention Instituting a Special Tourist Tax for the Preservation of Monuments and Museums.” UNSECO, June 22, 1951. Establishment of the Convention. UNESCO Archives. Accessed March 6, 2016. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/1521>.

- . “Text of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage - Intangible Heritage - Culture Sector - UNESCO.” Accessed September 11, 2017. <https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention>.
- . “UNESCO General Conference Program Commission.” UNESCO, June 16, 1964. Establishment of the Convention Item 15.3.4. UNESCO Website Archived Resources. Accessed March 3, 2016. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/1526>.
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre. “Historic Centre of San Gimignano - UNESCO World Heritage Centre.” Accessed April 8, 2016. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/550/>.
- . “Italy - UNESCO World Heritage Centre.” UNESCO. Accessed March 27, 2017. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/statesparties/it>.
- . “[Http://Whc.unesco.org/En/Nominations/](http://Whc.unesco.org/En/Nominations/).” UNESCO. Accessed December 11, 2015. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/nominations/>.
- . “Nomination File Historic Centre of Urbino - 828.pdf.” UNESCO, May 12, 1998. Accessed August 23, 2016. <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/828.pdf>.
- . “Partnerships for World Heritage Cities Culture as a Vector for Sustainable Urban Development.” UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2002.
- . “Periodic Reporting.” UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Accessed April 14, 2017. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/periodicreporting/>.
- . “Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape, Including a Glossary of Definitions.” UNESCO World Heritage Centre, November 10, 2011. Accessed April 14, 2017. http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=48857&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html.
- . “Report of the Twenty-Fifth Session of the World Heritage Committee (Helsinki, Finland, 11 - 16 December 2001).” UNESCO, February 8, 2002. Accessed April 21, 2017. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/documents/1269>.
- . “Reporting and Monitoring.” UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Accessed April 13, 2017. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/118/>.
- . “State Of Conservation of World Heritage Properties in Europe - San Gimignano Section II.” UNESCO, 2006. San Gimignano Documents #550. Accessed April 1, 2016. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/550/documents>.
- . “State Of Conservation of World Heritage Properties in Europe Report - Bath Section II.” UNESCO, 2006. Bath Documents #428. UNESCO Archives. Accessed January 31, 2016. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/428/documents/>.

- . “State of Conservation (SOC).” UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Accessed April 13, 2017. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc/>.
- . “The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.” UNESCO World Heritage Centre, July 8, 2015. Accessed April 16, 2016. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/>.
- . “UNESCO World Heritage Centre - World Heritage.” Accessed April 10, 2016. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/about/>.
- . “UNESCO World Heritage Centre - World Heritage List.” Accessed April 26, 2016. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/&order=year>.
- . “United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.” UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Accessed March 27, 2017. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/statesparties/gb/>.

Secondary Sources:

- Aa, Bart van der, Peter Groote, and Paulus Huigen. “World Heritage as NIMBY? The Case of the Dutch Part of the Wadden Sea.” In *The Politics of World Heritage Negotiating Tourism and Conservation*. Tonawanada, NY: Channel View Publications, 2005.
- Alfani, Guido, and Francesco Ammannati. “Long-Term Trends in Economic Inequality: The Case of the Florentine State, C. 1300–1800.” *The Economic History Review*, March 1, 2017, n/a-n/a. doi:10.1111/ehr.12471.
- Associazione Pro Loco San Gimignano. “San Gimignano Art and Culture Town History San Gimignano Tourist Information Centre.” *Associazione Pro Loco San Gimignano*, 2017 1996. Accessed April 29, 2016. <http://www.sangimignano.com/en/art-and-culture/town-history.asp>.
- Berg, Lennart. “The Salvage of the Abu Simbel Temples.” *Monumentum* 17 (1978): 25–54.
- Boyd, Stephen, and Dallen Timothy. “Marketing Issues and World Heritage Sites.” In *Managing World Heritage Sites*. Elsevier Ltd, 2006.
- Breisach, Ernst. *Historiography Ancient, Medieval, and Modern*. Third. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 2007.
- Burke, Peter. “The Courtier Abroad: Or the Use In Italy.” In *The Book of the Courtier*, edited by Daniel Javitch. New York, NY: WW Norton & Company, Inc, 2002.

- Cameron, Catherine, and John Gatewood. "Excursions into the Un-Remembered Past: What People Want from Visits to Historical Sites." *The Public Historian* 22, no. 3 (Summer 2000): 107–207. Accessed November 18, 2014. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3379582>.
- Canziani, Andrea, Andrea Luciani, Margherita Pedronio, Matteo Nerini Molteni, and Ileana Francesca Castelli. "Conserving Modernity: 20th Century Architectural Heritage: Case Studies and Historiography." Accessed August 25, 2017. http://www.polinternational.polimi.it/fileadmin/user_upload/documenti/Athens/2016/POLI23_Canziani.pdf
- Chaney, Edward. *The Evolution of the Grand Tour: Anglo-Italian Cultural Relations Since the Renaissance*. Taylor & Francis, 2000.
- Citroni, Giulio. "Local Actions to Promote Sustainable Development: The Case of San Gimignano." Accessed August 13, 2017. https://www.academia.edu/639324/Local_actions_to_promote_sustainable_development_the_case_of_San_Gimignano.
- Coerver, Don M., Suzanne B. Pasztor, and Robert Buffington. *Mexico: An Encyclopedia of Contemporary Culture and History*. ABC-CLIO, 2004.
- Dennistoun, James. *Memoirs of the Dukes of Urbino, Illustrating the Arms, Arts, and Literature of Italy, from 1440 to 1630*. Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1851.
- Figueiredo, Peter de. "English Heritage," 45–46. Urbino, Italy: UNESCO World Heritage Center, 2002.
- Finley, Cheryl. "Authenticating Dungeons, Whitewashing Castles: The Former Sites of the Slave Trade on the Ghanaian Coast." In *Architecture and Tourism Perception, Performance and Place*, 109–26. New York, NY: Berg, 2004.
- Fontanari, Enrico. "Partnerships for Urban Conservation Strategies," 21. UNESCO World Heritage Center, 2002.
- "Francesco Di Giorgio Martini (Italian, (Sieneese), 1439 - 1501) (Getty Museum)." *The J. Paul Getty in Los Angeles*. Accessed September 4, 2017. <http://www.getty.edu/art/collection/artists/773/francesco-di-giorgio-martini-italian-sieneese-1439-1501/>.
- Giovine, Michael A. Di. *The Heritage-Scape: UNESCO, World Heritage, and Tourism*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2008.

- Goulding, Rebecca, Edmund Horan, and Lee Tozzi. "The Importance of Sustainable Tourism in Reversing the Trend in the Economic Downturn and Population of Rural Communities." *Pasos Revisita de Turismo Y Patrmonio Cultural* 12, no. N. 3 Special Issue (2014): 549–63.
- Guy, Dr. Kolleen. "Introduction to Urbino and Marche." presented at the Fall 2016 Orientation Day and Local Field Trips, Urbino, Italy, September 3, 2016.
- Hazan, Marcella. *Essentials of Classic Italian Cooking*. New York: Alfred A Knopp Inc, 2016.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. "Introduction: Inventing Traditions." In *The Invention of Tradition*, 20th ed., 1–14. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Howard, Peter. *Heritage: Management, Interpretation, Identity*. London; New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2003.
- ieiMedia. "The Urbino Project." *ieiMedia Telling the World's Stories*. Accessed September 22, 2017. <http://ieimedia.com/urbino/>.
- Ioannides, Marinos, Fink Eleanor, Antonia Moropoulo, Hagedorn-Saupe, Antonella Fresa, Gunnar Liestol, Vlatka Rajcic, and Pierre Grussenmeyer, eds. *Digital Heritage. Progress in Cultural Heritage: Documentation, Preservation ...* Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, 2016.
- Jokilehto, Jukka. "Authenticity, Integrity, and the World Heritage Center," 29–30. Urbino, Italy: UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2002.
- Jones, Peter Blundell, and Eamonn Canniffe. *Modern Architecture Through Case Studies 1945 to 1990*. Routledge, 2012.
- Labadi, Sophia. *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value: Value-Based Analyses of the World Heritage and Intangible Cultural Heritage Conventions*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2013.
- Lasansky, D. Medina. "Urban Editing, Historic Preservation, and Political Rhetoric: The Fascist Redesign of San Gimignano." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 63, no. 3 (2004): 320–53. doi:10.2307/4127974.
- MacCannell, Dean. *The Tourist A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. 2013th ed. Berkley CA: University of California Press, 1976.
- Martini, Viviana. "The Conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes: An Approach." University of Venice, 2013. Accessed August 27, 2017. <http://www.ung.si/~library/doktorati/konzervatorstvo/6Martini1.pdf>.

- Mayor of Bath's Office. "Mayor of Bath." *The Mayor of Bath*, 2017.
<http://www.mayorofbath.co.uk/medieval-bath>.
- McKercher, Bob, and Hillary Du Cros. *Cultural Tourism, 2nd Edition*. 2 edition. New York: Routledge, 2015.
- Merrill, Dennis, ed. "Containment and Good Neighbors:: Tourism and Empire in 1930s Mexico." In *Negotiating Paradise*, 65–102. U.S. Tourism and Empire in Twentieth-Century Latin America. University of North Carolina Press, 2009. Accessed April 17, 2016.
http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.txstate.edu/stable/10.5149/9780807898635_merrill.6.
- Meskel, Lynn. "UNESCO's World Heritage Convention at 40: Challenging the Economic and Political Order of International Heritage Conservation." *Current Anthropology* 54, no. 4 (2013): 483–94. doi:10.1086/671136.
- Millar, Sue. "Stakeholders and Community Participation." In *Managing World Heritage Sites*. The Netherlands: Elsevier Ltd, 2006.
- Monuments Men Foundation. "Rotondi, Pasquale | Monuments Men Foundation." *Monuments Men Foundation for the Preservation of Art*, 2017. Accessed September 20, 2017. <https://www.monumentsmenfoundation.org/the-heroes/first-hand-participants/rotondi-pasquale>.
- Olick, Jeffrey K., Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy, eds. *The Collective Memory Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Orbasli, Aylin. *Tourists in Historic Towns Urban Conservation and Heritage Management*. London; New York, NY: E & FN Spon, 2000.
- Perrottet, Tony. *Pagan Holiday On the Trail of Ancient Roman Tourists*. New York, NY: Random House Paperbacks, 2003.
- Phillips, Christine. *Sustainable Place*. Chichester; UK: Wiley-Academy, 2003.
- Provincia di Pesaro e Urbino. "Sassocorvaro." *Turismo.pesarourbino.it*, 2017. Accessed August 27, 2017.
<http://www.turismo.pesarourbino.it/en/elenco/comuni/sassocorvaro.html>.
- Publishing, Redazione Rivista Siti Unesco Unesco Magazine. "San Gimignano: Rifunzionalizzare San Domenico." *Rivista Siti Unesco*, March 9, 2016. Accessed August 13, 2017. <http://www.rivistasitiunesco.it/422-2/>.

- Rebanks Consulting Ltd, and Trends Business Research Ltd. "World Heritage Status: Is There an Opportunity for Economic Gain?" Reeds Printers, Penrith, 2003. Accessed May 1, 2017. <http://icomos.fa.utl.pt/documentos/2009/WHSTheEconomicGainFinalReport.pdf>.
- Rodriguez, Xose, Fidel Martinez-Roget, and Ewa Pawlowska. "Academic Tourism: A More Sustainable Tourism." *Regional and Sectoral Economic Studies* 13–2 (2013): 89–98. Accessed September 21, 2017. <http://www.usc.es/economet/reviews/eers1327.pdf>.
- Rypkema, Donovan. "Leveraging Living Heritage for Economic Prosperity." San Antonio, Texas, September 8, 2017.
- Scammell, Rosie. "Saving Italy's Cultural Heritage by Modern Means | World News | The Guardian." *The Guardian*, March 19, 2015. Accessed August 19, 2017. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/mar/19/saving-italys-cultural-heritage-by-modern-means>.
- Scranton, Philip, and Janet Davidson, eds. *The Business of Tourism Place, Faith and History*. Philadelphia, Pa: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- Sezgin, Erkan, and Medet Yolal. "Golden Age of Mass Tourism: Its History and Development." In *Visions for Global Tourism Industry - Creating and Sustaining Competitive Strategies*, 73–90. Croatia: INTECH, 2012. Accessed October 29, 2017. <https://www.intechopen.com/books/visions-for-global-tourism-industry-creating-and-sustaining-competitive-strategies/mass-tourism-its-history-and-development-in-the-golden-age>.
- Smith, George, Phyllis Messenger, and Hillary Soderland. *Heritage Values In Contemporary Society*. Walnut Creek, Calif: Left Coast Press, 2010.
- Theobald, William, ed. *Global Tourism*. Third. New York, N.Y: Elsevier Inc, 2005.
- University of Oxford. "International Trends in Higher Education 2016-2017." University of Oxford, 2017. Accessed September 22, 2017. http://www.ox.ac.uk/sites/files/oxford/trends%20in%20globalisation_WEB.pdf.
- Wise, Michael. "Obituary: Sir Laurence Kirwan | Culture | The Independent." *The Independent*, May 6, 1999. Accessed April 25, 2016. <http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/obituary-sir-laurence-kirwan-1091927.html>.
- Yang, Minja, and Jehanne Phares. "Safeguarding and Development of World Heritage Cities," 10. Urbino, Italy: UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2002.