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Abstract

There has been an increase in the use of human rights to address and discuss issues of social justice in heritage policy, practice and research. In the context of the World Heritage nomination of Bagan in Myanmar, this move toward human rights-based approaches is caught up in ambiguity and complexity. This paper demonstrates the difficulty of classifying key development-related conundrums facing Bagan’s World Heritage nomination in human rights terms. Tourism has the potential to raise standards of living and revenue for conservation, but it can also be a key force behind the exploitation of local populations. Forced relocations and development restrictions may be necessary for effective World Heritage protection, but such measures can negatively impact land, economic and development rights. Moreover, the scope of a human rights approach to World Heritage protection is unclear. It is argued that although human rights can provide valuable insights, they are subject to serious limitations and should be used in conjunction with other approaches.

Introduction

In recent decades, there has been an increasing concern with the ethics and social implications of heritage conservation. Various social justice issues have been raised at World Heritage sites: from forced evictions and violence in the Valley of the Kings in Egypt (Mitchell 2001) to development restrictions that entrench poverty at Angkor in Cambodia (Winter 2007). What is relatively new is the use of human rights language to address these situations. In the last few years, human rights language has increasingly been used to make claims to ownership and control of the past as well as to draw attention to unjust side-effects of heritage conservation. This is evidenced by the work of the United Nations (UN) independent expert and Special Rapporteur on Cultural Rights (UN Human Rights Council 2011; 2016), statements to and by the UN Human Rights Council (e.g. UN Human Rights Council 2007), United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) conventions and declarations (UNESCO 2001; 2003a; 2003b; 2005), policies and projects of International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) (IUCN 2004; 2008; 2012) and International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) (ICOMOS 1998; ICOMOS Norway 2014; Sinding-Larsen & Larsen 2017), and scholarly literature (e.g. Baird 2014; Hodder 2010; Langfield, Logan & Nic Craith 2010; Logan 2014; Meskell 2010; Silverman & Ruggles 2007). In October 2015, the World Heritage Committee endorsed the Policy Document for the integration of a sustainable development perspective into the processes of the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 2015)\(^1\). This document presents a very significant step towards mainstreaming human rights in World Heritage policy and practice. It refers to human rights widely, and states that ‘the full cycle of World Heritage processes from nomination to management [should be] compatible with and supportive of human rights’ (ibid, p. 7).
This paper is based on my doctoral research, for which I investigated the implications, challenges and opportunities of the increasing convergence of World Heritage and human rights in the context of the historic and religious site Bagan in Myanmar. In 2014 and early 2015, I conducted interviews and informal conversations with people involved in or affected by the current preparation of Bagan’s World Heritage nomination and spent several months observing day-to-day life at this site. Looking at the conservation of this cultural heritage site through a human rights lens draws attention to two key areas of tension: living heritage and development, with which I refer to ‘an ensemble of institutions, policies, disciplinary formations and, most importantly, practices of intervention in the alleviation of poverty’ (Gregory et al 2009, p. 155). Both could compromise conservation efforts and thus may be restricted for the World Heritage nomination. However, human rights approaches raise difficult questions about the extent to which such restrictions are acceptable.

Importantly, I found that, despite its popularity, the international human rights framework does not provide clear answers on how to address such key challenges facing heritage conservation. Human rights in the context of the World Heritage nomination of Bagan are shrouded in ambiguity, face many contradictions, and are subject to continuously changing interpretations. Elsewhere, I have elaborated on what this means for living heritage and cultural rights in Bagan (Kraak 2018). This paper aims to illuminate the complexities and ambiguities of the dynamics of heritage conservation and human rights in Bagan by discussing two development-related conundrums facing Bagan’s World Heritage nomination that are difficult to classify in human rights terms. The first challenge is the increase in tourism. The question raised here is: which human rights issues are part of the ‘full cycle of World Heritage processes’ (UNESCO 2015, p. 7) and which issues fall outside of the realm of World Heritage? The second challenge concerns the extent to which forced relocations and development restrictions are appropriate for conservation purposes. Before discussing these challenges, I will provide the necessary background to Bagan and Myanmar.

**The World Heritage nomination of Bagan**

Myanmar is a particularly interesting place to investigate the dynamics between heritage conservation and human rights. For decades, the military rulers of Myanmar led an isolationist policy and defied universalistic ideas of heritage conservation and human rights. In the 1990s and 2000s, Myanmar had one of the worst human rights records in the world (Genser 2014; Pedersen 2008) and its approach to the conservation of the monuments of Bagan was controversial (Hudson 2008; Pichard 2013). From 2011, this changed. The military government dissolved itself and new semi-democratic government was formed, which introduced a series of significant political and economic reforms and started to engage more actively with the international community and its standards.

Myanmar remains one of the poorest countries in the world. In 2016, it was ranked number 150 out of 187 countries on the Human Development Index. According to statistics of the World Bank and the United Nations Development Program, over a quarter of the population lives in poverty. This number is twice as high in rural areas—such as Bagan—where seventy per cent of the population lives. Over a third of children under the age of five suffer from malnutrition. The state of and access to infrastructure, education and health care are insufficient and three quarters of the country lacks access to electricity. The labour force is largely unskilled and Myanmar still suffers from endemic corruption, an opaque revenue collecting system and struggles with sectarian violence and armed conflict in certain states. Nevertheless, the change of government has created hope for a better future—both inside and outside of Myanmar².

At this time of social, economic and political turbulence, Myanmar is re-engaging with the World Heritage system (in 1996, a World Heritage nomination of Bagan was submitted, but it was referred). In 2014, the Pyu Ancient Cities became Myanmar’s first site on the World Heritage List and preparation for the nomination of Bagan officially started, submission of which is aimed for 2018. Bagan is an outstanding site of national and spiritual significance and consists of around 3,000 Buddhist pagodas that are scattered on a plain of around 100 square
kilometres. Most of them were built between the 11th and the 13th centuries when this area was the centre of the Bagan Dynasty (Pichard 2013, p. 236). Today, some of the pagodas have been largely abandoned and are not much more than ruins, but others have remained active places of worship (see Figure 1).

World Heritage listing of Bagan will raise difficult questions concerning conservation, living heritage, development and the rights of the local population. The spiritual significance and active use of several pagodas creates tensions with international conservation standards. The monuments are located in a poor rural area characterised by unsealed roads and daily electricity cuts. This is likely to change dramatically in the coming years as the region continues to develop and a significant increase in tourism needs to be accommodated. Military dictatorships and a poor international reputation meant tourism numbers had remained low until the change of governments in 2011. In 2010, Myanmar received 792,000 international tourist arrivals, but by 2015 the tourism numbers had risen to 4.7 million (UNWTO 2016, p. 9). By 2020, 7.5 million visitors are expected (Ministry of Hotels and Tourism 2013). Rapid tourism development will lead to an increase in hotels, restaurants and other tourist infrastructure, meaning gateway cities such as Nyaung U and New Bagan will likely encroach on the archaeological remains. While money flows into the region, local aspirations will increase, but the extent to which this money trickles down to local communities remains to be seen.

Development, land and economic rights are at stake when a new regime of spatial governance restricts where and what people can build and where and how they can run their businesses. Religious and cultural rights are at stake when the conservation and protection of monuments excludes people from their cultural heritage and spiritual practices. Yet, as we will see, the ambiguity and contestation around human rights means that that this framework is unlikely to provide answers to some of the key challenges facing Bagan’s nomination.

Tourism and the question of scope

The UN considers poverty ‘an urgent human rights concern’ and in 1998 appointed a Special Rapporteur on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights. In 1986, the UN adopted the Declaration on the Right to Development, which declares that ‘every human person and all peoples are entitled to participate in, contribute to, and enjoy economic, social, cultural and political development, in which all human rights and fundamental freedoms can be fully realized’. If poverty is a human right violation and there is a right to development, there are serious human rights issues in Bagan to be resolved. It has been argued that heritage, turned into an economic

Figure 1: The pagodas of Bagan (by author).
resource by tourism, could potentially become a means to alleviate poverty, a resource for development as well as a generator of funds to support conservation, which is particularly pertinent in developing countries (e.g. Ebbe, Licciardi & Baemler 2011; Samuels 2010; Starr 2012; Throsby 2012; Timothy & Nyaupane 2009). From this perspective, tourism could potentially be an effective part of human rights-based approaches. However, this section will show that it is not only questionable to what extent tourism contributes to poverty alleviation and development in practice, tourism may also be a key force behind rights violations.

Neil Silberman argues that the narrative of cultural heritage as an economic resource ‘represents a particular vision of development in which the remains of the past and the products and services derived from it can be commodified while the culture of commodification remains unquestioned and unseen’ (2013, p. 219). He argues that the revenue raised through this redefinition is often not as high as expected and not equally distributed. He identifies several factors that contribute to this. One is the mismanagement of revenue by governments. In Bagan, only two percent of the entrance fee of US$20 or 25,000 kyats goes toward the upkeep of the site, which is a source of indignation among residents. In a country with rampant corruption and a lack of transparency (in 2016, Transparency International ranked Myanmar 136 out of 176 countries on its Corruption Perceptions Index), several of my informants have raised concerns about how the rest of this money is spent. A second factor is related to leakage: even when the revenue is significant, it does not automatically follow that it leaks down to local populations. International tourism firms, which organise guided tours through Myanmar or own hotel and restaurant chains, take up much of the tourist spending. But leakage can also be national or regional when ‘outsiders arrive from nearby towns, often with more capital than the early local entrants. New arrivals use their capital to build more substantial stalls, small shops, or restaurants of more permanent construction’ (Hampton 2005, p. 751). Moreover, Winter has shown—in the context of Angkor in Cambodia—that tourism cannot be ‘conceived in static and geographically bounded terms’ (2007, p. 23). Rather, tourist flows are tied up to social and physical infrastructure and facilities in the region. Destinations like Cambodia and Myanmar are ‘often only visited as a short “extension” to an itinerary built around one or two neighbouring countries’ (ibid., p. 85). As a result, tourism is influenced by decisions made in offices located in regional hubs like Bangkok.

Mismanagement, leakage and the influence of more experienced neighbouring countries all contribute to the lack of control local communities in emerging economies have over the ways in which the tourism industry develops. The horse cart drivers are an example of a category of locals in Bagan that struggles with the arrival of new actors and developments. For decades, the main way to see the temples was by horse cart. However, in the last few years, electric bicycles, buses and cars have become the preferred means of transport and horse cart drivers have to find different ways to make a living. The majority of the locals lack the skills, education and capital to compete with outside investors and business owners. Lacking such skills, several people find alternative ways to profit from tourism. This may involve commodifying themselves or their religious practices. For example, a group of women outside of Minnanthu village call out to independent tourists passing by on (electric) bicycles, offering them a tour through their village for a tip. At the back of Shwezigon pagoda, several women invite tourists to come and see the ‘lucky Buddha’. Tourists who come to this end of the pagoda are treated to a performance of worshipping. Subsequently, they are handed a plate of food to offer to the ‘lucky Buddha’ themselves and a donation is expected in return. If such informal economies would be restricted, many of these people have few alternative means of making a living.

In 2013, the Ministry of Hotels and Tourism addressed some of these concerns in its Tourism Master Plan. The aim of the plan is to ‘maximize tourism’s contribution to national employment and income generation, and ensure that the social and economic benefits of tourism are distributed equitably’ (Ministry of Hotels and Tourism 2013, p. i). The document has many good intentions but the degree to which it is possible to implement them remains to be seen. In order to address the risks and constraints of tourism development that were identified, purportedly, the Government of Myanmar will constantly improve ‘good governance through transparency, open access to information, public participation and consultation, controlling corruption and
upholding the rule of law’ (Ministry of Hotels and Tourism 2013, p. 20). However, it is exactly in these areas where Myanmar has a long way to go and which present some of the most serious impediments to a socially just tourism development.

The potential negative implications of tourism and their effect on social justice are also reflected in a report on the Tourism Sector-Wide Impact Assessment by Myanmar Centre for Responsible Business and its co-founders, the Danish Institute of Human Rights and the Institute of Human Rights and Business (2015). In addition to existing methodologies of social and environment impact assessment, the report applies a human rights lens. This comprehensive report covers the impacts of tourism in a wide range of areas: from the role of local communities to the issue of land grabbing, from child labour to fair working hours and wages. Although the report identifies a few good practices, in many of these areas Myanmar faces significant challenges. As one of the main tourist destinations in Myanmar, these challenges are particularly relevant in Bagan.

Freya Higgins-Desboilles and Kyle Powys White argue that ‘understanding the impact of tourism on human rights in communities receiving tourists is not possible without contextualization in the dynamics of an economy driven by neoliberal principles’ (2015, p. 111). In their view, violations of human rights are not unfortunate side-effects but a direct result of a neoliberal ideology. Robyn Bushell and Russell Staiff have similarly argued that, by separating tourism off as a distinct ontological entity without reference to anything else, such as neo-liberal economic systems, modernity, mobility and the flows of people (such as translocation into towns and cities from rural areas), tourism appears to be a problem that could or should be dealt with in isolation. Viewed in the wider context, tourism is seen rather as a vehicle and manifestation of these broader changes. (2012, p. 253)

Indeed, Bagan does not exist in isolation and some human rights issues derive from structural global inequities that cannot be resolved in a World Heritage nomination dossier. For example, in Bagan, many children work as vendors of souvenirs around the pagodas, even though child labour is often considered a human rights violation6. If a human rights-based approach to World Heritage conservation means ‘the full cycle of World Heritage processes from nomination to management is compatible with and supportive of human rights’ (UNESCO 2015, p. 7), does this mean child labour is unacceptable on the World Heritage property, or is this beyond the scope of the World Heritage process?

The potential of human rights violations associated with tourism cannot be ignored if a human rights-based approach to World Heritage conservation is adopted. Tourism and heritage conservation are tightly intertwined. After all, it is the ancient monuments that make many foreign tourists visit Bagan in the first place. Yet, the (potential) rights violations discussed in this section are related to poverty, inequality, and the influence of a neoliberal market system. These are deeply-rooted, complex and structural global problems. They go beyond Bagan, UNESCO’s World Heritage system, or even Myanmar. Although this is no reason to ignore or accept them, a human rights-based approach to World Heritage conservation in Bagan cannot be expected to rectify such issues. When Bagan’s World Heritage nomination is submitted to the World Heritage Committee in 2018, it is not realistic that poverty will have been eliminated and everyone enjoys ‘a standard of well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services’ (UN 1948, Article 25(1)).

This raises questions about the scope of human rights-based approaches to World Heritage conservation. Which rights violations need to be prevented or addressed in a World Heritage nomination dossier or in evaluations of Advisory Bodies, and which should be considered outside of the realm of World Heritage? Should UNESCO and the Myanmar government (or any other agent that can be considered a duty-bearer) merely refrain from violating human rights themselves, or do their obligations extend to the prevention of third parties from violating human rights? This question is even more complex considering that it can be hard to identify third party violators if the human rights issue is a global structural problem like poverty.
Yet, even with policies that are implemented specifically and explicitly for the World Heritage nomination, it can be difficult to determine whether their effects are human rights issues or not. This becomes clear when considering the impact of relocation measures and development restrictions.

**Relocations and restrictions**

Historically, Bagan consisted of temples intermingling with housing, work places and farms. Today, there are still several villages scattered around the monuments. They are built around and incorporate several old pagodas (see Figure 2). However, in 1990 the government ordered the population living in the central village known as Old Bagan—over 5,000 people—to move to New Bagan, four kilometres to the south. International experts and the government’s own tourism authorities did not recommend this move but had ‘proposed integration of the “Old Bagan” villagers, some of whom were traditional caretakers of religious buildings, into the heritage site’ (Hudson 2008, p. 557). Yet, the government deemed the eviction necessary to prevent the damaging consequences of treasure hunting. From the interviews I conducted, it became clear that while some people experienced this eviction as unjust and devastating, others were satisfied with the compensation and the larger plot of land they received.

![Figure 2: A village built around an old pagoda (by author).](image)

Although the relocation from Old Bagan to New Bagan took place 27 years ago, it remains a controversial topic, which is reflected by the fact that the eviction is the key incident my informants referred to when discussing human rights in the context of Bagan’s World Heritage nomination, for which further relocations are being considered. Apparently, many of my informants perceive forced relocations as a human right violation. Interestingly, evictions are not explicitly mentioned in international human rights instruments, although in Resolution 1993/77 the Commission on Human Rights states that ‘the practice of forced eviction constitutes a gross violation of human rights’ (UN OHCHR 1993, Article 1). Subsequent reports on evictions and their negative impact on human rights led to the adoption of General Comment 7 by the Committee on Social Economic and Cultural Rights in 1997, in which forced evictions in the context of the right to adequate housing (UN 1966, Article 7) are further discussed and largely condemned. In 2007, the Special Rapporteur on Adequate Housing as a Component of the Right to an Adequate Standard of Living presented the *Basic Principles and Guidelines on Development-Based Evictions and Displacement* to the UN Human Rights Council. In this document, forced evictions are defined as
acts and/or omissions involving the coerced or involuntary displacement of individuals, groups and communities from homes and/or lands and common property resources that were occupied or depended upon, thus eliminating or limiting the ability of an individual, group or community to reside or work in a particular dwelling, residence or location, without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protection. (UN Human Rights Council 2007a, p. 3)

This definition applies to the 1990 relocation of Old Bagan. However, the Special Rapporteur also outlines certain ‘exceptional circumstances’ under which forced evictions may be permitted:

Any eviction must be (a) authorized by law; (b) carried out in accordance with international human rights law; (c) undertaken solely for the purpose of promoting the general welfare; (d) reasonable and proportional; (e) regulated so as to ensure full and fair compensation and rehabilitation; and (f) carried out in accordance with the present guidelines. (UN Human Rights Council 2007a, p. 6)

In Bagan, past and potential future relocations are (a) in accordance with national law and (c) arguably undertaken to promote general welfare, specifically the conservation and protection of a cultural heritage site of Outstanding Universal Value for Humanity. The incident of 1990 may not have fulfilled the other criteria, but theoretically future relocations could, particularly considering the possibility to flexibly interpret terms like ‘general welfare’, ‘reasonable and proportional’, and ‘fair compensation’.

Whether there will be further relocations and under what conditions will partly depend on the details of the nomination. In order to be nominated under the World Heritage Convention, a property needs to have good protection and management systems in place. Such systems include the delineation of boundaries and buffer zones, appropriate legislative, regulatory and contractual measures, and a management plan. During my fieldwork, the location of boundaries and buffer zones remained an unresolved and contested issue. Even if no relocations will take place, residents in what will be the protective zone will inevitably become subject to certain regulations and development restrictions. These can range from limits on the height of buildings to the types of crops that can be grown and the types of events—such as pagoda festivals—that can be organised. Such regulations and restrictions may be necessary to protect the archaeological, architectural and spiritual heritage of Bagan. Uncontrolled development—whether on a small or a large scale—can adversely impact the archaeology of the region, the fabric of the monuments, the integrity of the landscape, as well as the spiritual values of the pagodas: access to the temples and means of worship can be affected. However, in an area where the majority of people live in poverty, such development restrictions need to be well considered in order not to violate local economic and development rights.

In terms of human rights and justice, relocation and restriction measures are not easily classified. My informants had mixed views about the merit of the 1990 relocation and international statements and guidelines regarding evictions present contradictory messages. Arguably, this ambiguity can be explained by the conflicting rights and interests underlying such relocations and restrictions. While they can be devastating for some people, they may enhance the lives of others.

**Complexity and ambiguity**

Social justice in the context of Bagan’s World Heritage nomination is a messy problem, as distinct from a difficult problem. Jake Chapman explains this distinction as follows:

A difficulty is characterised by the broad agreement on the nature of the problem and by some understanding of what a solution would look like, and it is *bounded* in terms of the time and resources required for its resolution. In contrast, messes are characterised by no clear agreement about exactly what the problem is and by uncertainty and ambiguity as to how improvements might be made, and they are *unbounded* in terms of the time and resources they could absorb, the scope of enquiry needed to understand and resolve them and the number of people that may need to be involved. (Chapman 2004, p. 26-27)
For such messy problems, there are no clear solutions. As Ien Ang points out, ‘in a complex world problem-solving can only be a partial, provisional and indefinite affair, with uncertain and indeterminate outcomes’ (2011, p. 780). Yet, recognising the complexity of a problem is required for the ‘development of sophisticated and sustainable responses … because simplistic solutions are unsustainable or counter-productive’ (ibid., p. 797).

This paper has aimed to illuminate some of the complexities of the dynamics between cultural heritage and human rights in Bagan. I have shown that several factors, which are interpreted and weighed differently by different actors, influence whether a forced eviction is considered a human right violation. People involved in and affected by Bagan’s World Heritage nomination are divided about the merit of the 1990 relocation from Old Bagan to New Bagan, as well as potential future relocations. This is understandable, since some people will benefit or suffer from such measures more than others. The question of eviction for a World Heritage nomination is caught up in conflicting rights. The eviction of, as well as development restrictions on, certain villages could be considered violative of land, economic and development rights of individuals negatively affected. As experiences at World Heritage sites such as Angkor show (Miura 2005), there is a real risk people become trapped in poverty, having few opportunities to enhance their livelihoods in the restricted conditions that would be imposed in order to protect the heritage. However, simultaneously such measures may serve to protect cultural and religious rights, of these individuals as well as those of others.

Similarly, the increase in tourism brings opportunities for economic development and possibly a means to overcome poverty, but also the risk of rights violations. However, tourism—and its positive and negative effects on human rights—is a manifestation of several global forces, including neoliberal market principles. As a result, tourism-related human rights violations that take place in the context of Bagan’s World Heritage nomination such as child labour, exploitation, and entrenched poverty, cannot be understood or solved in isolation. The question is which human rights violations fall within the realm of World Heritage conservation and should therefore be addressed in and after the nomination process and by whom. Is the aim of human rights-based approaches to World Heritage conservation that not a single human rights violation is acceptable, regardless of who the violator is, or should only human rights violations that are directly traceable to policies related to World Heritage conservation be prevented?

An optimistic assessment of the dynamics between heritage conservation and human rights in the context the World Heritage nomination of Bagan is that a human rights-based approach could be a tool that persuades heritage practitioners to take a step back and reflect on the wider consequences of the conservation of Bagan’s monuments. It can motivate historians, conservators, architects and archaeologists to look beyond the material of the site and the events of the past to the lives and livelihoods that are implicated in conservation today. A human rights lens may draw attention to religious practices and struggles to overcome poverty that a material-focused approach to heritage conservation overlooks. The adoption of human rights-language in the right policy or legal documents may enable local people who are negatively affected by the World Heritage nomination to articulate their grievances, seek recompense or prevent (further) harm.

Ambiguity leaves the human rights and cultural heritage discourses open to change. It enables reflection, dialogue and debate on whether the link between heritage and rights is appropriate. Politically, the ambiguity of heritage and rights can mean these notions are not too confrontational and more governments may be willing to engage with them. As Andrea Cornwall argues, ‘[p]olicies depend on a measure of ambiguity to secure the endorsement of diverse potential actors and audiences. Buzzwords aid this process, by providing concepts that can float free of concrete referents, to be filled with meaning by their users’ (2010, p. 5).

It can even be argued that when it comes to global justice, the human rights discourse is not ambiguous enough. David Kennedy has warned that the institutional and political hegemony of human rights ‘makes other valuable, often more valuable, emancipatory strategies less available’, since ‘[t]o the extent emancipatory projects must be expressed in the vocabulary of “rights” to be heard, good policies that are not framed that way go unattended’ (2002, p. 108).
However, according to a more pessimistic assessment, the ambiguity of human rights will result in the interpretation of rights in favour of those who are more powerful, while the World Heritage system is taking the moral high ground and legitimising its own existence (see Uvin 2010, p. 171). Moreover, local understandings of justice may become marginalised or discredited because of the hegemonic human rights discourse that only supports one way of formulating righteousness.

In my opinion, the reality lies somewhere in between these optimistic and pessimistic assessments and aspects of both assessments can take place simultaneously. By illustrating the complexity and ambiguity of Bagan’s World Heritage nomination, the point is to explain why I am not convinced that the use of human rights approaches will provide a clear pathway to increased social justice in World Heritage conservation contexts. However, neither do I not reject this framework as harmful or useless. I contend that analysing a problem through a human rights lens can provide valuable insights, yet these will always be partial and subject to certain limitations. Juxtaposing human rights with alternative frameworks and approaches – such as sustainability, conflict resolution, or equality – will be necessary to engage with the multiple aspects of complex problems, such as social justice at World Heritage sites.
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Endnotes

1 The World Heritage Convention refers to the 1972 UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage.


