

INTRODUCTION

The *ICOMOS World Report 2008–2010 on Monuments and Sites in Danger (Heritage at Risk)* is the latest volume of what is already a whole series of *World Reports*, starting in the year 2000 and followed by the volumes *H@R 2001/2002*, *H@R 2002/2003*, *H@R 2004/2005*, and *H@R 2006/2007*. So far this series has also been complemented by three special editions: *H@R Special 2006 Underwater Cultural Heritage at Risk/Managing Natural and Human Impacts*, *H@R Special 2006 The Soviet Heritage and European Modernism*, and *H@R Special 2007 Natural Disasters and Cultural Heritage*. This publication series, also disseminated via internet, is an important tool for an organisation that since its foundation in 1965 feels bound to the great tradition of preserving monuments and sites: *ICOMOS shall be the international organization concerned with furthering the conservation, protection, rehabilitation and enhancement of monuments, groups of buildings and sites on the international level ...* (article 4 of the ICOMOS Statutes).

The continuation of the successful *Heritage at Risk* series can be regarded in connection with the President's new initiative to establish an ICOMOS Cultural Heritage Global Monitoring Network: *ICOMOS is launching the ICOMOS Cultural Heritage Global Monitoring Network, an important new initiative that relates to our core responsibility to know and understand the threats to the cultural heritage in all regions of the world. The ICOMOS Cultural Heritage Global Monitoring Network is the logical outgrowth of our Heritage@Risk programme whose concept and nurturing into a successful programme is part of the rich legacy of the past decade. The Monitoring Network also looks ahead to the future as a bold step towards establishing a fully-fledged heritage observatory that will eventually track the state of conservation of all cultural heritage throughout the world. The success of this programme will depend on the cooperation of as many National Committees as possible. To participate, each National Committee is asked to gather the information requested in the attached format annually for each World Heritage cultural or mixed site in their country and for cultural sites in its Tentative List and submit it in electronic form to globalmonitoring@icomos.org. As a test run for the first year, we would like to have as many reports as possible ...* (letter of 8 June 2010 by Gustavo Araoz to all ICOMOS National Committee Presidents, see also his foreword on p. 9 f.).

The new *ICOMOS World Report 2008–2010* also implements Resolution 26 of the last General Assembly of ICOMOS in Quebec:

Considering the publication since 2000 by ICOMOS of five World Reports on Monuments and Sites in Danger and three special editions on Underwater Cultural Heritage, Soviet Heritage and European Modernism, and Natural Disasters and Cultural Heritage, with numerous contributions from our National and International Committees as well as ICOMOS members and partners, constituting the Heritage at Risk Series,

Thankfully noting the support of UNESCO and the German Federal Government Commissioner for Cultural Affairs and the Media for this ICOMOS initiative,

Noting the impact of the Heritage at Risk Series and its dissemination in printed or web format, to raise a more global awareness of the state of heritage sites, structures and areas around the world

and on the effectiveness of their protection and conservation to face threats of increasing diversity and intensity,

Considering the decisions of the Executive Committee on the establishment of an ICOMOS "Observatory" (working title) on the protection and conservation of monuments, sites and other types of heritage places as part of the 2005–2008 Triennial Work Plan,

The 16th General Assembly of ICOMOS, meeting in Quebec, Canada, in October 2008 resolves to:

- Request the Heritage at Risk Series to be continued and that actions be taken to enhance its communication and impact so as to support protection and conservation of the cultural heritage world-wide, and to better serve ICOMOS and its Committees to define priorities and strategic goals,*
- Request National and International Committees to reinforce their contribution to the content, production, dissemination and discussion of the World Reports and Special Editions with their members and partners,*
- Request that the Heritage at Risk Series and ICOMOS "Observatory" project be coordinated through the international Secretariat to enhance their consistency and impact.*

In this spirit, the new *ICOMOS World Report 2008–2010* tries to fill a gap in ICOMOS' annual reporting. In many cases, the new report takes up topics from the previous five publications. The *Heritage at Risk* initiative is – quite in accordance with the preface of Mounir Bouchenaki, former Deputy General of UNESCO, for the *World Report 2004/05* – "significant in view of its capacity to expose the dangers facing heritage in various countries of the world and promote practical measures to avert or at least allay them." The types of threats and the patterns in human activity that endanger our heritage (compare *Heritage at Risk 2004/05*, Introduction, pp. 12–15) are very diverse. On the one hand, humankind's built heritage has always been threatened by the consequences of earthquakes, typhoons, hurricanes, floods and fires. Natural disasters have therefore been brought up time and again in *Heritage at Risk*: e. g. the earthquake in Bam on 26 December 2003 whose consequences our colleagues of ICOMOS Iran had to face; and the Tsunami disaster in December 2004 after which ICOMOS Sri Lanka showed exceptional commitment. After the many disasters of the previous years earthquakes and their impacts also remain a central topic in this *Heritage at Risk* edition, with reports from China (pp. 46–48), Italy (pp. 109 f.), Chile (pp. 43–45), Haiti (pp. 74–101), and New Zealand (pp. 127 f.). The lessons learnt from such disasters – risk preparedness, rescue actions, opportunities for reconstruction, etc – were already discussed with colleagues concerned at an international conference of ICOMOS on "Cultural Heritage and Natural Disasters" during the Leipzig conservation fair in October 2006 (see *Heritage at Risk 2007*, Special Edition: *Cultural Heritage and Natural Disasters/Risk Preparedness and the Limits of Prevention*). On the other hand, wars and ethnic confrontations are still leading to tremendous losses. And human-made disasters also include the dramatic climate change (see special focus on global climate change in *Heritage at Risk 2006/07*, pp. 191–227) and the consequences of the world-wide pollution of air, water and land, including the pollution-linked destruction of monuments of

metal and stone that in some cases have deteriorated faster in the last decades than in the previous centuries.

The current threats to our cultural heritage are in many ways incomparable to those of earlier times, now that we live in a world that has been undergoing faster and faster change since the last decades of the 20th century. This rapid development, taking place under the pressures of world population growth and progressive industrialisation, leads to ever-greater consumption of land – destroying not only archaeological evidence under the earth but entire historic cultural landscapes – and to faster and faster cycles of demolition and new construction with their concomitant burden on the environment. Examples for such development pressures are for instance the various dam projects, some of which were already mentioned in previous *Heritage at Risk* editions: in Turkey, where according to the latest news in spite of all protests Hasankeyf will be flooded by the Ilisu Dam and Allianoi by the Yortanlı Dam (see p. 180, compare also H@R 2006/07, pp. 156–159); in Brazil the dam project in Belo Monte on Rio Xingu (see p. 37 f.). Another example for such a development pressure is the project threatening the World Heritage site Upper Middle Rhine Valley (see pp. 62–64).

Faced with social and economic change, historic buildings that are no longer in use become endangered by deterioration or by destruction through neglect. In many countries, however, not only the financial resources are unavailable to guide such developments in the direction of cultural continuity, but sometimes the political will is also missing. This is demonstrated, for instance, if there is no state conservation organisation with appropriate experts, if there are no monument protection laws, or if the extant legal regulations are not put to use. The continuous loss of cultural heritage is pre-programmed if there is not a certain degree of public-sector protection in the interest of the general public. As well, without sufficient protection, many archaeological sites are plundered by illegal excavations, and the illicit traffic of archaeological objects and works of art represents a continuous loss of cultural goods that, from the conservation perspective, should be preserved in their original context. Finally, in the development of an increasingly globalised world dominated by the strongest economic forces, the tendency to make all aspects of life uniform represents an obvious risk factor for cultural heritage. With the new global “lifestyle”, attitudes to historic evidence of the past naturally also change. However, there is hope that in some places this very globalisation is causing a renewed consciousness of the significance of monuments and sites that embody regional and national identity. This trend can also be identified for artistic and craft traditions, out of which our cultural heritage has developed in the course of the centuries. Nevertheless, the mass products of industrial society that are distributed world-wide remain a tremendous threat, because they continue to displace the historic techniques of skilled craftsmen, and thus prevent the possibility of repair with authentic materials and techniques.

With its *Heritage at Risk* initiative, ICOMOS is concerned with monuments and sites in the broadest sense: not only classic categories of monuments, like churches (compare reports on churches in Romania, p. 145 ff. and Ukraine, p. 182 f.), but also different types of immovable and movable cultural properties, the diversity of archaeological sites (see report on risk factors for archaeological heritage, p. 193 f.), historic areas and ensembles, cultural landscapes and various types of historic evidence from prehistory up to the Modern Movement of the 20th century. Innumerable historic urban districts suffer from careless, often totally unplanned renewal processes (compare reports on Vienna, p. 27 ff., Kashgar, p. 48 ff., Budapest, p. 103 ff., St. Petersburg, p. 159 ff., and Istanbul, p. 175 ff.) and from uncontrolled urban sprawl in their environs. Construction

methods using clay, wood and stone are being lost, making room for concrete constructions used all over the world. We are also losing the built evidence of our industrial history; these structures erected with modern techniques and now themselves worthy of preservation pose difficult problems for conservationists when the original use is no longer possible. And even architectural masterpieces of the Modern Movement of the 20th century are threatened with demolition or disfigurement (compare reports on the Marine Nationale in Paris, p. 56, the Beethovenhalle in Bonn, p. 69, the Stockholm Library, p. 173 f., and the White City of Tel Aviv, p. 107 f.). After an initial report on 20th-century heritage in *Heritage at Risk 2002/03* (pp. 177–181), a *Heritage at Risk Special 2006* was published on highly endangered examples of Soviet avant-garde architecture (*The Soviet Heritage and European Modernism*, Berlin 2007). The report at hand on “20th Century Heritage at Risk” (see pp. 148 ff.) gives an account of the present state of conservation of buildings from this period in Russia.

On the whole, the UNESCO Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage remains one of the few successful efforts at world cultural politics directed at saving humankind’s cultural heritage, and ICOMOS is proud to be able to work with UNESCO as an advisory body. The monuments and sites, historic districts and cultural landscapes that are entered on UNESCO’s World Heritage List should in fact be numbered among the non-endangered monuments, but here, too, there are not so few cases of substantial danger: for example the scandalous state of conservation of such a famous site as Pompeii (see pp. 110–114). In connection with historic towns on the World Heritage List there has been a whole series of dangerous projects for high-rise buildings at inappropriate locations, for instance the project for a Gazprom tower in St. Petersburg (see p. 164 f.) or the threat to the visual integrity of baroque palaces in Vienna (see pp. 28–29). The objective of the World Heritage Convention is first of all the protection and conservation of monuments, groups of buildings (ensembles) and sites. ICOMOS is not only concerned with the World Cultural Heritage; instead in *furthering the conservation, protection, rehabilitation and enhancement of monuments, groups of buildings and sites* (ICOMOS Statutes, art. 4) it has an abundance of responsibilities together with its partners on national and international levels. Therefore, our *Heritage at Risk* Report, providing information on the endangered cultural heritage worldwide, is not only meant as an appeal to the public; instead, ICOMOS hopes that on the basis of this report and together with its National and International Committees it will be possible to implement an increasing number of pilot projects organised by its experts. But under the present financial and organisational conditions the opportunities to realise projects that should set standards for a professional treatment of special conservation problems in different regions still remain behind our expectations. A special case are the projects of ICOMOS Germany in Afghanistan (see pp. 16–18) implemented in the years 2002–2010 thanks to funds (c. one million euros) provided by the German Foreign Office and thanks to funds (400 000 USD in 2009–2010) provided by UNESCO within the framework of Phase III of the Japan-Fund-In-Trust project ‘Safeguarding the Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley’ (see the reports in *The Giant Buddhas of Bamiyan. Safeguarding the Remains*, Monuments and Sites, vol. XIX, Berlin 2009).

An essential task of ICOMOS within the framework of the World Heritage Convention of 1972 is our work as advisory body to the World Heritage Committee and to UNESCO on issues concerning the World Cultural Heritage. The mandate and function of the advisory bodies ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM result from articles

8(3), 13 (7) and 14 (2) of the World Heritage Convention in connection with paragraphs 30 and 31 of the Operational Guidelines. One of the responsibilities of the advisory bodies is *to monitor the state of conservation of World Heritage properties* (OG § 31). The role of ICOMOS is described in paragraph 35: *The specific role of ICOMOS in relation to the Convention includes: evaluation of properties nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List, monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage cultural properties, reviewing requests for International Assistance submitted by State Parties, and providing input and support for capacity-building activities* (OG § 35). Just as article 5 of the World Heritage Convention commits the state parties to take care of the protection and conservation not only of the individual World Heritage sites, but of the entire cultural and natural heritage within their territories (compare also the 1972 UNESCO Draft Recommendation Concerning the Protection at National Level of Cultural and Natural Heritage), every National Committee of ICOMOS also has – in accordance with article 4 of the ICOMOS Statutes – a special responsibility for the monuments and sites of its country, of course in cooperation with all institutions concerned with protection and conservation.

Under these circumstances, based on the different experiences in their countries, individual National Committees have developed special initiatives for the monitoring of the state of conservation of World Heritage sites in their countries, and in reports they have pointed at the imminent dangers. For this purpose, ICOMOS Germany has a monitoring group, chaired since 2005 by Dipl.-Ing. Giulio Marano (compare also H@R 2006/07, pp. 62–63), in which ICOMOS colleagues from neighbouring countries are also active: Luxembourg (Alex Langini), Switzerland (Bernhard Furrer), Austria (Wilfried Lipp), and Czech Republic (Josef Stulc). Besides the reporting on the state of conservation of the German World Heritage sites this group currently plays an important advisory role within the framework of the “Promotion of Investments into National UNESCO World Heritage Sites” for the 33 German World Heritage sites, initiated in 2009 by the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development, expanded in 2010. The group’s task is a kind of compatibility check for projects the ministry has been funding with 150 million euros since 2009 and additional 70 million euros since 2010. To these sums corresponding funds from the federal states and the individual municipalities must be added. This very successful investment programme is not a normal urban development promotion programme. Instead, in focussing on a series of measures in conservation/restoration it is in many respects exemplary. In total, about 200 projects are being funded, the details of which cannot be presented here. Probably, in the near future these measures will be discussed at an international conference and published afterwards.

Monitoring programmes based on the ideas of proactive or preventive monitoring are related to our work as advisory body on issues concerning the World Heritage Convention. With its continuous observation such preventive monitoring differs from the Periodic Reporting described in the Operational Guidelines (OG V, 199–210) and from Reactive Monitoring (OG IV.A, 169–176). The obligation of the State Parties to do Periodic Reporting results from article 29 of the WH Convention, together with the Operational Guidelines (OG § 190, 191, and 199–210). Independently of the Periodic Reporting the World Heritage Centre is to be informed as part of Reactive Monitoring about exceptional circumstances or work *which may have an effect on the state of conservation of the property*: According to the Operational Guidelines *Reactive Monitoring is the reporting by the Secretariat, other sectors of UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies to the Committee on the state of conserva-*

tion of specific World Heritage properties that are under threat (OG § 169). Reactive Monitoring can only be applied in particularly serious cases. However, with the state of conservation of every World Heritage site bigger or smaller problems and threats may occur which are either not sufficiently taken care of or not recognised early enough by the State Parties or by the authorities for protection and conservation of monuments and sites. All in all, these are an abundance of sometimes very acute threats to the historic fabric. And normally these problems are not mentioned in the process of Periodic Reporting, nor can they be solved in time within Reactive Monitoring. Especially at extensive sites authentic values defining World Heritage can be affected by an immense number of plans and projects. Therefore, in this wide area of conservation problems a continuous proactive observation should take place, i. e. preventive monitoring, which takes into consideration the more general conservation concerns and the special criteria. As far as the World Cultural Heritage is concerned, this task can only be tackled by the advisory body ICOMOS. The corresponding mandate can be deduced from the above-mentioned articles of the World Heritage Convention, together with the mandate to be found in the Operational Guidelines “to monitor the state of conservation of World Heritage properties” (OG § 31).

It is very much to be hoped that all National Committees of ICOMOS, in special cases supported by the International Scientific Committees, will attend to the task of Preventive Monitoring in the future. The National Committees can get at the necessary information on the state of conservation of World Heritage sites in their country and report on all current threats and problems. Such reports should be sent to the International Secretariat of ICOMOS so that our headquarters in Paris can decide how to inform the World Heritage Centre. Then in particularly serious cases the procedure mentioned above as Reactive Monitoring can be the result. In any case, involving the ICOMOS National Committees as early as possible with the task of Preventive Monitoring will make it possible in many cases to avoid threats and conflicts with other interests through appropriate counselling. And as several examples in the *Heritage at Risk Reports* show also public discussions initiated by ICOMOS can at least result in acceptable compromises.

Even if the publication at hand, together with the previous volumes of *Heritage at Risk*, may be able to give a certain overview of the dangers, problems and trends regarding the protection of monuments in the 21st century in the different regions of the world, we are quite aware of the gaps in our work and of the limits to what we can do. In the often desperate battle against the ongoing destruction of our cultural heritage ICOMOS and its National and International Committees will continue to try to preserve monuments and sites in their authenticity and integrity, – a policy of conservation for which different nations and regions may set different emphases in accordance with cultural diversity. Therefore, in the years to come the *Heritage at Risk* initiative will not only need an improved financial base. It will also be necessary to involve all ICOMOS committees through annual reports on the dangers and trends in conservation in their regions. For a continuation of this publication series, which so far has only been made possible thanks to the initiative of a few National Committees (for instance, several times in the past we were actively supported by Australia ICOMOS for the editorial work), we actually need a press and information office based at our International Secretariat. This office should consist of one or two colleagues in charge of compiling and editing news for the *Heritage at Risk* initiative, i. e. where necessary putting statements of ICOMOS International on current risks on the ICOMOS website as fast as possible and collecting information for the annual reports. In any

case, we urgently need financial and organisational perspectives for the *Heritage at Risk* initiative that, beyond preventive monitoring within the framework of the World Heritage Convention, can be included in the above-mentioned new initiative of President Gustavo Araoz for a Global Monitoring Network: ICOMOS with its 9 000 members as a sort of general “monument watch” observing the state of conservation worldwide.

For the first time, the new *Heritage at Risk 2008–2010* (also available at www.international.icomos.org/risk) has a comprehensive index of sites that enables the reader to look up all cases discussed in the H@R publications between 2000 and 2010. Like the previous volumes the new report includes not only contributions from national and international committees, but also several reports by individual experts and uses quotations from different expertises, statements, articles and press releases. Thanking all

colleagues who contributed to this publication and made their pictures available to us, it is also noted, in line with ICOMOS policy, that the texts and information provided for this publication reflect the independent view of each committee and the different authors. Our special thanks goes to the Hendrik Bäßler Verlag in Berlin. At the secretariat of ICOMOS Germany in Munich we would like to thank John Zieseemer, who was in charge of the editorial work and the English translations, and Ioana Cisek for her untiring help. Finally, we wish to extend our thanks to the German Federal Commissioner for Cultural Affairs and the Media who helped again to provide the necessary financial and organisational framework of this publication.

Christoph Machat

Michael Petzet