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Introduction

“Placing culture at the heart of development policy constitutes an essential investment in the world's future and a pre-condition to successful globalization processes that take into account the principles of cultural diversity. It is UNESCO's mission to remind all States of this major issue.”

-UNESCO Statement on Culture and Development

Historically, the preservation of heritage has been for the remembrance of past events, people, connections to history, and maintenance of cultural ties. In European and North American preservation throughout the 19th and 20th century there was an exclusive focus on tangible patrimony such as monuments and buildings; historically, preserving heritage was considered a Western pursuit.1 Throughout the last half of the 20th century, these views have changed and through international policy heritage has come to be defined as a resource that must be sustained and made available to all. Within the past fifteen years, through the influence of these policies, there has been a shift specifically towards the preservation of intangible heritage, and the need and possibilities of it to fulfill all the definitions of an economic, cultural, social, and natural resource.

Since this shift towards the preservation of intangible heritage, which has been caused by the increasing awareness of the negative effects of globalization on groups such as indigenous peoples and women, the use of intangible heritage for nation states has become recognized as a powerful source of socioeconomic growth and development. This is especially true of knowledge and heritage practices in the domain of women. This

has influenced the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to put women as a group to the forefront of heritage-focused socioeconomic development policies. Also within this time frame, as cultural heritage has increased in importance as a tool of international policy and cultural patrimonies, so has socioeconomic development. Both are now recognized by the international policy community as essential tools of diplomatic efforts.

This thesis will examine UNESCO trend on policies and conventions that focus on and affect the creation of intangible heritage-based women’s socioeconomic development programs. Following this line of inquiry, the thesis will next examine in detail intangible heritage policies and conventions, and the execution and implementation of preservation policies and treaties. The research will then specifically detail and analyze development projects that were initiated by UNESCO as case studies of how heritage based development policies operate and succeed. The conclusion of this paper will propose how the combination of intangible heritage preservation and women’s development projects can be used to further international cultural diplomatic efforts and relations. This can be achieved by the creation of bilateral treaties between nations and through the application of these culturally focused women’s development programs, including post-conflict recovery opportunities.
Chapter 1: UNESCO, Intangible Heritage, and Women

I. UNESCO’s View on Women and Intangible Heritage

UNESCO is a specialized agency of the United Nations organization (UN). As part of the UN system, the mission of the organization is to maintain and create a more peaceful world as summarized in the slogan “building peace in the minds of men and women.” As the only culture, education, and scientific agency of the UN system, it is the definitive international policy maker for cultural heritage and preservation issues; therefore, it influences trends, initiatives, and projects in the cultural heritage field. As such a powerful entity, UNESCO directly affects views on heritage issues; this makes the current position of the organization on women and their role as powerful agents in the preservation of intangible heritage, extraordinary.

Because of its inclusion in the UN network, UNESCO is subject to the missions and goals to be achieved by all agencies in the system. For the past decade, women have been a priority group for policies, initiatives, and programs in the system. As a result, specialized agencies like the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), the United Nations International Emergency Children’s Fund (UNICEF), and UNESCO have been required to incorporate women’s concerns into their planning. For example, mandates such as the *Statement on Women’s Contribution to a Culture of Peace on the Fourth World Conference on Women* prompted the cultural branch of UNESCO to include women more extensively in its policies. One of the ways this was achieved was

---

2 Found on the UNESCO Website.

through the recognition of the role of women as the main producers and transmitters of intangible heritage.

Intangible heritage is defined by UNESCO as:

“The living traditions and expressions inherited from our ancestors and passed on to our descendants. They include the oral, performing arts, social practices, rituals, festive events, knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe, or the knowledge and skills to produce traditional crafts.”  

In the past 20 years, intangible heritage as a category of cultural resources has gained critical importance and attention due to the processes of globalization which threatens to extinguish many traditions and practices. While the effort to formalize the preservation of intangible patrimony began with the 1970 convention on World Heritage, only one UNESCO convention known as The Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Heritage specifically applies and provides a policy framework for preservation.

Adding to the 21st century preservation effort is UNESCO’s view that women are the main bearers and providers of intangible heritage in communities. For example as stated in the Synthesis Report: Activities in the Domain of Women and Intangible Heritage: International editorial meeting and future activities in the domain:

---


“expressions of living cultures are best sought in the everyday practices of those engaged in making a living, rearing the young, healing the sick, enjoying leisure or searching for existential meaning. The role of women as key reproducers of cultural identities is, therefore, not in question.”  

This statement on women is controversial since it is not agreed upon by all nations and scholars. Cultural heritage scholar David Lowenthal, for example, has argued that women have no place in heritage. “Heritage is traditionally a man’s world, inheritance largely a matter of fathers and sons.”8 Lowenthal continues “that women are part of heritage, not sharers in it, is still a common view.”9 Not only does UNESCO highlight the role of women as key reproducers of intangible culture, but it also insists that intangible heritage in fact exists mostly in the domain of women. UNESCO’s strong statement has strongly influenced all of its subsequent research and preservation programs.

II. UNESCO’s Defining the Roles of Women in Intangible Heritage

The roots of the current UNESCO initiatives and policy influences are clearly recognized in the UNESCO document *Activities in the Domain of Women and Intangible Heritage (2001)*. In the same year of its publication, the research presented in Tehran, the Islamic Republic of Iran, focused on the increasing awareness of the vital roles of women in the transmission of intangible heritage and the need to begin planning for programs and policies. In the synthesis report from the conference, experts were consulted to

---


examine the various problems and obstacles that affect heritage preservation and socioeconomic development of women in defined cultural areas. It contextually highlighted the problems that were present and provided some possible solutions for each area. The research in this document presented in summary and then in analysis below, is representative of the approach taken by UNESCO in its policies regarding women and intangible heritage.

**A. African Region**

Scholar Esi Sutherland-Addy stated that, historically, women in this region had great cultural agency as healers and mediums. Sutherland-Addy also expressed that African women’s knowledge is displayed through their daily activities, such as childrearing and daily chores. In addition, not all of women’s intangible heritage, like body modifying practices of female circumcision, in the view of international human rights law such as the *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women* (CEDAW)\(^\text{10}\), were considered positive. Finally, Sutherland-Addy analyzed how women’s power was diminished during the colonization of Africa in the 19\(^\text{th}\) and early 20\(^\text{th}\) centuries through the institution of foreign legal and political structures by multiple foreign entities, among them the Portuguese, Dutch, and English. The suggestions given for capacity building of preservation programs for intangible heritage in Africa include the following:

• Reassess representations of African women in historical documentation and preparation of research guidelines, such as best practices, in order to avoid misrepresentations of African women;

• Support activities which enable the written documentation of women’s cultural heritage and perspectives in forms including story-telling and academic writing;

• Support women’s active participation in global processes, such as information technology, to enable them to gain from the opportunities and benefits they present;

• Encourage governments and civil society to support the full participation of women in development agendas.\textsuperscript{11}

\textbf{B. Asia Region}

Dr. Maitryee Chaudri stated that the major issues of women’s intangible heritage and development were linked to livelihood. Chaudri posited that the conditions of poverty in East Asia were directly linked to the decline of women’s intangible heritage. Therefore traditional crafts, such as weaving, were not able to flourish when more economically lucrative jobs were needed to survive. Exacerbating this problem was the increased centralization of markets, which had taken women’s crafts from their original context and put them in danger of mass commoditization, such as the mechanical reproduction of baskets instead of using traditional practices, thus potentially leading to the crafts losing their significance. Chaudri’s recommendations are short and direct:

• Undertake micro-regional studies in order to better understand the complexity of phenomenon effecting women’s intangible cultural heritage, particularly in relation to global dynamics;

• Develop activities for the protection of women’s intangible cultural heritage which will contribute to their livelihood without undermining this heritage.\textsuperscript{12}

C. Latin America

Dr. Cardaci focused on the cultural mix that is present in Latin America resulting from a 15\textsuperscript{th} century Spanish and Portuguese colonial past. Because of the large geographic area to be covered, the report focused on four countries which best represents the diversity of cultures to be found in contemporary Latin America: Mexico, Brazil, Chile, and Peru. The report on the status of women’s intangible heritage ranged from issues concerning gender and the environment to healthcare as a gendered issue. In short, there was an overall lack of institutional support or appreciation of Latin American women’s intangible heritage. The various recommendations for this area include:

- Multi-disciplinary and gender based approaches to the study of women, intangible heritage and development which emphasize women’s cultural diversity;

- Support NGO’s [Non-Governmental Organizations] undertaking activities relating to women, intangible heritage and development, and the use of information technology to achieve their aims;

- Encourage collaboration between NGO’s, government institutions and research centres in activities concerning women, intangible heritage and development, in particular, with regard to preservation.

D. Central Asia

Marfua Tokhtakhodjaeva analyzed the history of the region. Tokhtakhodjeva stated that the area’s intangible culture was highly influenced by traditional nomadic and sedentary lifestyles. This expert also studied the effects of imposed Soviet state culture during the first half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, and its breakup of the localized traditional

---


practices. Tokhtakhodjeva then posited that the subsequent piecing of cultures back together by different countries, after the breakup of the USSR, also severely affected the intangible cultural practices, such as the public festivals of Nauruz and Sharq Taronalari, for this area. Central Asia was the only region for which the report was not exclusively focused on the issues of women, and thus the recommendations for solutions to women’s development and intangible heritage preservation were very general:

- The revision of legislation and taxation policies in the field of culture;
- Support the training of policy makers, the creation of new types of professional associations;
- Promote joint projects between government bodies and NGOs

E. Arab States

Annie Tohme-Tabet wrote the briefest of reports on the cultures of the Arab States region. The gender roles and intangible heritage of this region, comprised of such countries as Yemen, Bahrain, and Saudi Arabia, have a complicated and currently controversial relationship. For example, countries such as Saudi Arabia and Iran have exclusively binary sex systems as well as institutionalized gender roles for men and women. Yet this is not discussed in the report and is due to the region’s conservative political influences. Tohme-Tabet stated the main issues of concern for this area are the basic recognition of the importance of women’s heritage by the states, as well as the heterogeneity of the region regarding religion and ethnicity. The report then summarizes what was then the recent development of NGO’s for women’s services such as

---

organizations for reproductive health and political recognition. The recommendations were:

- Raise awareness of the diverse social and cultural contexts in which women live;
- Sensitize research centres and local level organizations such as NGO’s to the significance of women’s intangible heritage and its role in development encourage research, documentation and publications which will inform action and policy development in this domain.\(^{15}\)

**F. Pacific Region**

Dr Susanna Kelly and Dr Lissant Bolton focused on colonialism as the major threat to this region’s intangible heritage. They assert that, unlike other regions of the world affected by colonization, such as the African continent, the traditional cultural heritage in the Pacific region has been completely lost or replaced due to the effects of colonialism. Complicating this issue are the situations of rapid population growth, increased pace of social change, and high rates of unemployment. Kelly and Bolton’s recommendations for this area were:

- Incorporate audio-visual documentation activities as a significant and effective means to document and revive women’s intangible heritage;
- Centralize documentation to avoid duplication;
- Further strengthen consultations with local women into activities;
- Provide support for a radio programme in view of the effectiveness of this medium for geographically dispersed communities in the Pacific.\(^{16}\)

---

\(^{15}\) *Ibid.*

III. Analysis of Activities in the Domain of Women and Intangible Heritage (2001)

The synthesis report as described in summary above, and its recommendations for capacity building of preservation programs, is surprising. While there is a clear focus on intangible heritage, the process of preserving traditions is second to the effects of intangible heritage in the lives of the women. In every recommendation, the programs instead focus on how intangible heritage affects the social and economic development of women. For example, in the Arab States report, one recommendation was “Sensitize research centres and local level organizations such as NGO’s to the significance of women’s intangible heritage and its role in development.” Another is a focus in analysis on women’s intangible heritage that can be potentially perceived negatively, such as female genital modification in Sub-Saharan Africa, and may be in breach of international human rights standards and legislation.

While the capacity-building analysis and recommendations by the regional experts were well thought out and researched they are limited by the logistics of the size and scope of UNESCO’s mission. Throughout each expert analysis report, women are treated in each region as a homogenous group, this oversimplifies the cultures, issues, and solutions outlined in the report. For example, in the Sub-Saharan African report, Sutherland-Addy does not detail women’s issues according to region, generation, ethnic identity, or even nationality in a continent of 54 countries and some disputed territories. A failing of all the individual reports, with the exception of the Asia report, this blanket grouping of women means that specific cultural practices, origins, and threats were not discussed and weakened the argument for cultural preservation. As a result, the UNESCO synthesis report was over generalized and did not account for the reality of cultural
differences in sub regions throughout the world and does not account for the tensions surrounding this issue between UNESCO member nations.

The nature of intangible cultural heritage puts certain traditions into a domain that is gendered female in many cultures. Teaching morals and customs, family history, and language are still, in most traditional cultures of the world, women’s work. Yet, as Lowenthal states, “heritage has been for much of history mostly a male domain.” 17 In many cultures, men dominated the formal sphere such as professions outside the home, public offices, and business, while women the informal, where they would be keepers of the home and child bearers. For example, the government of countries, such as Saudi Arabia, expressed the opinion that religious and cultural traditions gave men and women different roles in life and are therefore not necessarily equal. 18 In most cultural perceptions, public and national heritage, which are mostly large monuments and buildings, the narratives are often male dominated, but in many forms this is false when speaking of intangible heritage. For example, within Euro-American history in the 18th to the early 20th century, women were largely ostracized from public space and relegated to the private and home sphere.

Today, there is still opposition to programs related to women and their connection to intangible heritage, and this issue is still a cause of strife among UNESCO stakeholders. 19 It stems from the tension around the perceived importance, or lack thereof,

---

by stakeholders of cultural heritage and the perceived roles of women, the effects of globalization, and the transmitters and the transmission process, reflected in statements made by such countries such as Saudi Arabia. This trend is exacerbated by the issue of ensuring stakeholders (i.e. private nongovernmental organizations) and member nations are preserving cultural practices that are not harmful to the population but are also intrinsically important to the culture. This paradox means that the practices that countries do want to receive preservation support must not contradict current human rights law. For example, a country that wishes to receive support for preservation of traditional farming practices must ensure that children are not unfairly used as labor or that cultural dress restricts the physical movement or development of women could be found in violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. 

As stated earlier gender mainstreaming or gender equality is a UNESCO priority. As part of what is known in the UN system as cross cutting themes; these themes are priority areas and an attempt to move forward the agendas of all the United Nations Organizations. These themes are called global priorities and are currently focused on Africa and women’s equality. Each UN agency, including UNESCO, must design programs which will achieve or affect the priority area and priority group. In a past biennium, the UNESCO 2010-2011 strategy plan specifically addressed the issue of women and intangible heritage and the connection of the two. It’s recommendations include:

---


• Women’s active and visible participation in cultural and creative industries increased;
• States Parties to the 1972 Convention encouraged to increase women’s active participation in World Heritage Committees and related management and conservation initiatives for World Heritage;
• Gender equality integrated into the development and implementation of capacity-building activities for museums;
• Opportunities increased for women to gain managerial experience in museums;
• Understanding among UNESCO stakeholders.22

Interestingly, the same section of the strategy plan also includes mention of the previous biennium plan, which reviews the various commitments, economic and social, that it has made in the area of cultural heritage. This includes an effort to:

continue its cooperation with women’s associations involved in dialogue, especially, interreligious dialogue for conflict-resolution and reconciliation in Africa, drawing on the results and recommendations of seminars and training courses for trainers (TOT) held during the previous biennium. Moreover, the development of culturally appropriate and gender-responsive policies and actions at the country level in HIV/AIDS prevention and care as well as in maternal health will be pursued, in particular in the framework of the "Delivering as One" approach at the country level.23


At the most basic level however, the biennium is a statement on the direction which programming should take. It also states how funding will be directed and used in the different program sections of UNESCO.

Though UNESCO’s policy focuses on culture is preservation, from UNESCO documents and writings it is clear their initiatives and programs have another direction. In analyzing the organization’s views on women and intangible heritage, preservation policy is not the priority, but that UNESCO plans clearly focus on the social and economic development of women as the most important factor to intangible heritage. If the UNESCO programming initiatives focus on socioeconomic development through cultural heritage, how is this nexus supported by the UNESCO cultural heritage policies and conventions? And if they are supported, how does cultural preservation fit in the realm of intangible heritage-based development programs for women?
Chapter 2: Intangible Heritage Conventions, Laws, and Policies

The mission statement of UNESCO expresses succinctly the goals of all UNESCO projects, programs, and initiatives. The mission statement, found on the UNESCO website states:

UNESCO works to create the conditions for dialogue among civilizations, cultures and peoples, based upon respect for commonly shared values. It is through this dialogue that the world can achieve global visions of sustainable development encompassing observance of human rights, mutual respect and the alleviation of poverty, all of which are at the heart of UNESCO’S mission and activities.\(^{24}\)

As an intergovernmental organization, UNESCO comprises of delegates from nations, that are officially recognized by UNESCO and the UN system, and which pay dues to be members or if not then observers. However, it is important to note that the national governments, which do participate in UNESCO, are not bound to this mission in their own nations. Nor do they have to follow every convention that UNESCO proposes. This makes the enforcement of the conventions at the national levels difficult and significantly impacts the way in which both conventions and UNESCO social and economic programs are implemented.

\(^{24}\) Found in the UNESCO website in the about us section.
I. The Workings of International Conventions and Their Legal Status

International law is made of treaties, decisions of international courts, such as the Court of Justice, the past practice of nations and the writing of international scholars. Conventions, such as the Hague Convention’s of 1899, 1907, and 1954 have been codified for all sovereign states and any violation of governments and their officials of the convention can be tried in the Court of International Justice. However, this legal process takes time and the trials must be successfully prosecuted in the courts to strengthen the case. Most UNESCO cultural heritage conventions do not have this universal legal basis.

The current UNESCO trend is to create declarations which then become a basis for research and framework for conventions. Once the drafting process is done, the state parties that decide to support the convention by approval or ratification then have a time of three months to a year to begin the proper processes to adhere to the new policy. The adoption process for a convention begins with research and meetings between state parties to discuss the goals and obligations of each participating government or organization. “Though a convention is proposed, it does not become law until 120 Nation States ratify the document.” The UNESCO conventions are multilateral treaties. Instead of an agreement entered into by two nation states, they involve multiple nation states agreeing to uphold the law.


Of all the UNESCO cultural heritage conventions, two have direct application to intangible heritage. The first is the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Heritage (2003) and the other is the Convention for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005). Both documents have not been ratified by all member states of the organizations, but are applicable in a large majority of countries. Countries such as the United Kingdom, Canada, and Spain, to name a few, were member nations that did not accept or ratified the convention of 2003, have accepted the convention of 2005. By definition, “Declarations are nonbinding statements of aspiration, and thus do not require national ratification. Conventions, however, are binding, but only on the member states that choose to ratify them.”

II. The Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Heritage

In 2003, UNESCO ratified the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Heritage. The convention states the importance of intangible heritage and makes it a priority for preservation efforts within UNESCO and the countries that were party to the conference. It also created the three intangible heritage lists. The lists include the Intangible Heritage Representative List, Practices in Danger, and a list of elements that are best safeguarded. In further analysis, many of the practices heralded on the lists are

---


from countries which are on the African continent, Latin America, the Caribbean, and
many parts of Asia, or, to put it more succinctly, countries and geographic areas that do
not fall within the Euro-North American zone.

The *Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Heritage* was adopted
officially on October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2003. The purposes of the convention were stated in article 1
as follows:

(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.\(^{30}\)

As of April 2013, 148 countries and nation states have ratified or approved the
2003 intangible heritage convention. The convention specifically defines safeguarding
practices as

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 nonformal education, as well as the revitalization of the

various aspects of such heritage.\(^{31}\)

---


UNESCO also established the Fund for the Safeguarding of Intangible Heritage into which state parties deposit monetary contributions. The organization also dissolved the list *Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity* and included all of the items from those previous lists into the new *Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity*.

“The Convention is the most recent in a long series of UNESCO policies concerning intangible cultural heritage (ICH), including the *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural, Natural Heritage* (1972), the *Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore* (1989), and the *Proclamation of the Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity* (1998).”32

Within the convention, specific powers and responsibilities are divided between international and state party responsibilities. At the international level, the responsibilities are policy creation, modification, funding direction, research, and the creation and operation of infrastructure. In addition, UNESCO manages the list for the Safeguarding of Intangible Heritage and the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. The state responsibilities include inventory, safeguarding, and capacity building.

In analyzing this convention with regards to women, an interesting pattern emerges with relation to women’s heritage traditions. Out of 257 elements, the name for

---

the traditions entered on the lists, on the *Representative List of the Cultural Heritage of Humanity* there are only 62 elements (or just about 24 percent) of the list that specifically relate women and intangible cultural heritage. In all of intangible heritage lists combined, of 298 elements only 72 are connected to women (or just about 24 percent). It becomes clear that many of the elements on the list which do involve women are often not solely women’s intangible heritage, but usually cross over to the domain of men.

Some examples of listing include, Kalbelia Folk Songs and Dances of Rajasthan, in which women perform serpentine movements, but the musical accompaniment is all men and the Secret society of the Kôrêdugaw, the rite of wisdom in Mali, which includes both men and women. As mentioned previously, this pattern of unrepresented women’s intangible heritage may be attributed to the fact that although mainstreaming women into full societal membership is UNESCO priority, both this focus on gender equality and intangible heritage was not popular with many stakeholders. This was true of both those who did, and did not, join the intangible heritage convention. In trying to keep the mission of the UN system, UNESCO’s cultural branch has increasingly moved from a pure concern on culture preservation to using the intangible heritage practices in an applied, proactive manner to further the socioeconomic development of women.

### III. The Convention on the Protection and Promotion of Cultural Diversity

A second convention relating to intangible cultural heritage is the *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of Cultural Diversity* (2005). Adopted on October 20, 2005 in Paris, France, unlike the *Convention on the Safeguarding of Intangible Heritage* (2003), this international instrument is meant specifically to address concerns about cultural homogenization due to increasing globalization processes. In many ways, the 2005
convention is stronger instrument than the 2003 convention. It addresses many of the perceived flaws and gaps of the *Convention on the Safeguarding of Intangible Heritage* (2003) Convention while setting a framework for further cooperation on all levels to protect cultural diversity and expressions.

While it does not specifically reference intangible heritage, the term “cultural expressions” is defined as “those expressions that result from the creativity of individuals, groups and societies, and that have cultural content.” This is a clear effort by UNESCO to define a term that can be applied to different types of heritages both tangible and intangible. In article 2, the guiding principle section of the convention, the statement specifically defines and reinforces the promotion of culture in development. This is significant recognition, as it mirrors the new UNESCO emphasis on the use of cultural heritage as a resource in cultural preservation and economic development. The recognition change in the use of intangible heritage as a resource is the recognition of its essentiality to all sections of human life. Specifically, Points 5 and 6 describe culture as key factors of sustainable socioeconomic development. The convention also states in the preamble that one of the reasons for its adoption is the connection between culture and social cohesion and its potential to enhance the status of women in their own societies. The importance of this convention cannot be overstated: it is the first international legal cultural policy instrument to reinforce this connection.

---

Where the convention is truly different from the 2003 is the inclusion of articles which require the state parties to include culture as a major portion of development. In article 13 the document states: “parties shall endeavour to integrate culture in their development policies at all levels for the creation of conditions conducive to sustainable development and, within this framework, foster aspects relating to the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions.”

This terminology reflects how the policies of UNESCO have moved to reinforce the importance of culture to both social and economic sectors. The document then not only focuses on development, but the concept of sustainable development. With such diverse goals, the convention mechanisms that were drafted are much more expansive than the 2003 convention.

Instead of list creation such as the Representative List of Humanity, the mechanisms which UNESCO promotes for cultural diversity are based on the economic success of the community. In Article 14, the terminology focuses on economic development with mandates, such as providing for distribution networks for cultural goods and international support of film and arts between developed and developing countries. The Convention for the Protection of Cultural Diversity makes a viable framework to preserve intangible heritages and designates women as bearers of intangible heritage and does not just recognize their importance.

---

VI. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights and The International Convention on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights

In addition to the conventions of 2003 and 2005, discussed above, are the Universal Declaration of Human Rights\(^{35}\) (1948) (UDHR) and the International Convention on Economic, Social, and Cultural rights\(^{36}\) (1966) (ICESC). While both are not specifically focused on cultural practices, or specific cultures, they do include cultural rights. When including cultural rights, these conventions have stated they must be upheld within human rights law. While making this mandate does mean the exclusion of certain intangible heritage practices, such as mortuary cannibalism and sexual based body modification and causes controversy within some member states, it also strengthens the legal basis for the conventions.

A legal instrument created and ratified in 1949, the UDHR outlines the basic human rights of all individuals. Although its focus is not solely cultural, it highlights the right to cultural enjoyment and expression. Article 27 of the UDHR states :“(1) Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.”\(^{37}\) The ICESC, in contrast, takes a more nuanced approach to cultural rights. Article 15 is, more detailed than the UDHR, and reads:
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“1. The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone:

(a) To take part in cultural life.

(b) To enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications.

(c) To benefit from the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.

2. The steps to be taken by the States Parties to the present Covenant to achieve the full realization of this right shall include those necessary for the conservation, the development and the diffusion of science and culture.

3. The States Parties to the present Covenant undertake to respect the freedom indispensable for scientific research and creative activity.

4. The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the benefits to be derived from the encouragement and development of international contacts and cooperation in the scientific and cultural fields.”

While it is argued that the effort to formalize the preservation of intangible cultural heritage has occurred since the 1970 World Heritage Convention, only since 1989, when UNESCO issued the Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore, was a concentrated action taken to draft policies regarding its preservation. Each convention lays a framework to preserve the complicated nature of this heritage. Unlike tangible heritage, for which specific conditions, training, and protection plans can be implemented across geographic borders and over time, intangible heritage is a direct, but not material part, and product of human activity. It requires the participation of the holder of knowledge to be present and actively disseminating


knowledge. This process is known as cultural transmission and presents major problems since a living, breathing, person cannot be protected in a glass box or given buttresses for scaffolding such as might be done for the preservation of small objects or a building.

V. National, Regional, and Local Implementation of Conventions

The process of instituting international policy and law at national, regional, and local levels has its challenges. The conventions call upon nations and local communities to develop action plans for safeguarding culture. Within both UNESCO conventions, safeguarding those traditions entails their research and documentation, education and transmission, appropriate legal protection, and forms of public recognition and support. While there have been many successfully-instituted cases on the intangible cultural heritage list, the young age of the 2003 and 2005 conventions has not allowed for much subsequent scholarship about the actual process and the effects on local communities. The exception to this situation is the Toshidon festival of Shimo-Koshikijima.

A. Case Study: Toshidon of Shimo-Koshikijima, Japan

In 2010, Toshidon, a Japanese New Year’s Eve festival, was elected for the UNESCO Representative List of Intangible Heritage. Documented by folklorist Michael Dylan Foster in his article on the effects of UNESCO designation, the process of how this very localized tradition became internationally recognized is complex. The tradition is
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practiced in Shimo-Koshikijima, a small island off the coast of the southwest coast of Japan. The island has about 1,700 households with a population of nearly 3,000 people. Toshidon, though the exact dates of the practice inception are unclear, has been performed on the island for centuries and bears resemblance to other New Year’s Eve traditions throughout Japan.

Formally named on the list as “Koshikijima no Toshidon”, the tradition is performed once a year as a form of discipline and positive reinforcement of children’s behavior. Throughout the year parents will often remind their children that the Toshidon are watching them. According to the legend, the Toshidon are demon-like in appearance and watch the actions of the children from a world in the sky known as tenjōkai. On New Year’s Eve, they descend from the sky to visit each child and scold them for the bad and praise them for the good. The children are asked to perform various tasks, such as singing, to prove their good behavior and then receive their reward of moichi, a sweet rice cake. The Toshidon then move on to the next house.41

The tradition is a communal event. The Toshidon are portrayed by local men from 18 to 39 years of age. They dress in long black robes with traditional wooden sandals and white gloves. Their faces are covered with huge masks that are decorated with painted faces and large protruding noses. A “Toshidon Application”, submitted by each parent, recounts the failures and accomplishments of their child that they wish to
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highlight. Each tradition varies from village to village and these differences are discussed by the villagers themselves.

Foster makes clear that the island officials felt left out of the process of UNESCO designation. The village officials did not petition for initiating the UNESCO designation, but rather, were informed by the national government that their tradition was going to be nominated. Although the tradition is already on the national patrimony list of Japan, this UNESCO designation did promote a different type of discussion among the islanders on limitations of how they could protect their heritage. When the designation did finally occur, island officials were, once again, not made aware of the fact, by the Japanese government, but through publicity of the nomination in nationally-printed newspapers.

Foster’s analysis highlights the concerns, successes, and consequences of designation of a localized tradition on a community. From an administrative view, the local community should have been notified and informed of each portion of the process:

The most noticeable effects of the UNESCO designation were: an academic lecture, the acceptance of a little more publicity than usual and formal documentation of the ritual on DVD. In addition, posters about Toshidon were placed in various public spaces, such as the town hall and neighborhood community centers; three banners celebrating the designation were also hung, two on the façade of the town hall and one at the ferry terminal.\(^4^2\)

Within the local discourse, the UNESCO intangible designation brought about concerns that the tradition would become stagnant and formalized, inhibiting the socio-cultural

flexibility which has allowed the tradition to survive. For the islanders, “to follow the procedures of Toshidon just because they have been documented, just because it is a tradition, is meaningless.”

The case study of Toshidon is exemplary of the process, benefits, and problems of becoming a tradition on a representative heritage list. While the community did embrace the designation, it is clear that the decision to nominate was not completely within their power. The community also is divided on to how best define the preservation of a tradition that is not only a living part of their culture, but constantly changing. With these designations there is usually hope that an increase in tourism and an economic boom will result in the country of designation, but the process of making this Japan case a viable tourist attraction is still elusive at best. While UNESCO designation is an honor, it does not guarantee the survival of the tradition; however, it does increase the worry and risk of the tradition’s survival. One such risk is “mummification,” where a culture or tradition is not allowed to change, usually to preserve it for tourism, and no longer reflects the current views of its practitioners. There is also the fear of stagnating new tradition creation. The observed effects of UNESCO designation is in direct contrast with the effects of the UNESCO programs that have been initiated on women’s intangible heritage and their use in economic and sustainable development.

---
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Chapter 3: Culture in Economic and Social Development

In 1989, the *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future*, introduced the concept of sustainable development. At its core “sustainable development” requires meeting the basic needs of all and extending to all the opportunity to satisfy their aspirations for a better life.”\(^{45}\) Although this concept originally applied to environmental resources, sustainable development in the UN system, has since become synonymous with all development programs. Additionally, in this time frame other types of resources for sustainable development been recognized, including culture. In 1999, the World Bank, The Government of Italy, and UNESCO held a conference in Florence, Italy on the importance of culture in sustainable development. Cultural preservation was recognized as a key factor to the economic and social development of emerging economies and societies.

During this conference the participants researched and discussed the needs, benefits, and solutions that culture provides in development programs. The conference acknowledged that the divorce of culture from development initiatives leads to high failure rate of the social and economic programs. B. P. Singh, former executive director of the World Bank, stated “The emergence of culture as an important variable along with market and military in determining the position of the country within the comity of the nations in determining the position of the country which has to be taken note of both by
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planners and doers of development.” Singh inferred that along with military prowess and a strong market, a vibrant culture is necessary to determine the power position of a country in relation to others and that this should be taken into consideration by development planners. The findings of this conference and the 2001 UNESCO synthesis report are stunning. They not only indicate how essential both cultural heritage and women are in a country’s socio-economic prowess, but how the UNESCO and member nation sustainable development programs need to account for the cultural view of those they are meant to assist.

As the main transmitters of intangible culture, women’s increased and secure socioeconomic position is essential to the preservation of many forms of intangible heritage in addition to securing the future of developing nations. While the UNESCO project on Women, Intangible Heritage, and Development did not specifically become a convention, it did signal and preempt the future changes in the UNESCO organization’s bienniums. In every biennium since Tehran 2001, women have been a priority group and funding has been given toward projects for their development that are based on specific intangible heritage components. These UNESCO intangible heritage programs are no longer solely focused on economic development, such as artist cooperatives, but on social welfare and peace building projects aimed as sustainable development. Following the conference and its proceedings here have been many successful projects which have been instituted in each UNESCO designated cultural region.

---

I. Case Studies

The following case studies were gleaned and researched from UNESCO archives. Using the defined cultural regions created by the experts in the 2001 synthesis report as a geographic guide, each case study program described below focused upon intangible heritage that was directly connected to women. In addition, each program was initiated by UNESCO or UNESCO had great influence in the creation of it. All the programs were sustainable and economically development-based and used the transmission of heritage to support the development of women in the specific area of study.

A. Yemen: Women’s Literacy

One of the many successful programs in the Arab region was a literacy program in Yemen created for women in rural areas and originally initiated by the World Bank in 2003 then continued funding by UNESCO. The success of this program was preceded by high failure rates of traditional literacy program methods. While an enormous effort was made by the instructors to help the students to gain literacy in the earliest programs, the students were not retaining what they had learned. After an investigation, it was discovered that the students were learning and reading material based on a model for an industrialized economic system. The program, which was specifically meant to help women’s economic development, needed to change to reflect the social, cultural, and economic reality of the students. Most rural Yemenis are sedentary farmers, therefore the new material needed to include agriculture, fishing, and herding, so that the women would not be continually discouraged by lack of understanding and leave the program.
The solution to the content problem was called “Literacy Through Poetry”. The focus of the course turned to oral and spoken poetry, which is a prominent component of Yemeni society. In this culture, it is common for people to express deep feelings, thoughts, and opinions through short poems and proverbs\(^47\). Women especially compose and recite pieces to pass the time while performing manual labor. In the literacy program, the women composed their own pieces of poetry and proverbs. Then they copied them to large sheets of paper to hang on the wall. The learning would occur when the women reciting the poems began to recognize the alphabet and words by connecting the print to sounds.

The restructured culturally-based program was an enormous success. 72% of the learners in the first phase, and 63% in the second phase, successfully learned to read and write, and nearly all of them expressed an interest in continuing their education.\(^48\) As with many of the development programs, there were ripple effects in the community. There was a marked increase in respect for the women by their own families and more interest in educating adult women in general. “The women learners began actively participating in national elections, composing poems about various issues, and some even developed new genres of poetry.”\(^49\) Just as the public singing of women’s poetry was under threat


from media and neoconservative attitudes, this new use of the intangible tradition also helped to protect it from disappearing.

**B. Ecuador: Culturally-Appropriate Birthing Health Practices**

The following UNESCO case study focused on the change of policy in prenatal and birth care of women in rural areas of Ecuador. In 2002, the Ministerio de Salud Publica chose Health Center Number 12 Raul Maldonado Mejia Hospital as the pilot area for their Culturally Appropriate Births program (CAB). The country of Ecuador exhibits great cultural and religious diversity and possesses a large population of indigenous peoples. In the area of Cayambe Canton, in the Pichincha province where the health center is located, there is a population of 79,847 with 69% identifying as part of the Kichwa Nation from the Kayampi village that are mostly poor and from rural areas that have limited [access to their] geographic areas.50

The Kichwa community, which was suffering from high childbirth complications and mortality rates, was chosen by the Ministerio in an effort to obtain proper medical attention for the community. Complicating plans for the program was that many in the community were mistrustful or uncomfortable with the modern facilities because of the center’s lack of cultural understanding. CAB “carries out the implementation of culturally appropriate childbirth with an important recognition, revaluation, and retrieval of knowledge and cultural practices of ancestral medicine, promoting training and

---

accreditation to the elders of ancient medicine recognized in the community. This created a safer space for the community to come take advantage of the facilities. The program hoped to meet the objectives of the National Plan for Accelerated Reduction of Maternal and Neonatal Mortality and the National Plan of Good Living which wanted to reduce the communities maternal and neonatal premature mortality rates by 35% and increase the rate of institutional birth by 70%.

CAB addressed the issues of the high mortality rate in the community by realizing that the women in the community did not feel that their culture or wishes were being respected; the program was therefore instituted to remedy this situation. The program was instituted in different formats and stages. Beginning in 2002, the hospital staff began training to institute a model that consisted of internships performed regionally, nationally, and internationally. The model also worked to reinforce and share knowledge of traditional medicine and healing practices between midwives and doctors. It gave knowledge to the traditional midwives in the geographic area of modern obstetrics, therefore it became possible for the medical teams to provide help earlier and referrals when needed. The final steps were to physically change the obstetrics room to meet and fulfill the cultural needs of the women and their families. By changing the furniture and providing cultural tapestries in the rooms, it became a more comfortable and familiar space.

The process of birth was also changed. To meet the heritage needs of the Kichwa, certain procedures that were once considered medically-standard became optional for the
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community to choose. For example, a woman could have the option of wearing a medical
gown or traditional Kichwa dress. The birth position was also changed from mandatory
laying on a stretcher to having the option to stand or sit. Lastly, the destination of the
placenta was now given to the woman. The results of program were successful and led to:

- 35 health professionals trained and applying knowledge on standards and
  protocols of
  maternal and neonatal care and Culturally Appropriate Births and neonatal care.
- 27 health professionals (midwives, nurses and nursing assistants) with knowledge
  of
  psycho prophylaxis of births.
- 42 midwives applying knowledge for capture and institutional prenatal care,
  referral of
  pregnant women for institutional delivery care and obstetric emergencies.
- 100% of pregnant women attending health centers and hospitals, identifying
  [prenatal] danger signs and implementing birth / family emergency plans.\(^{52}\)

In 2011 there were a total of 790 births. Out of the total 709 women that gave birth, 419
women chose a free-form birthing position during labor versus 290 who chose the
standard lying down. Additionally, 131 women received culturally-based and appropriate
psycho emotional support before, during and after labor.

\(^{52}\) Culturally Appropriate delivery care: A Right of Women and Newborns Area de Salud Number 12
Hospital Raul Maldonado Mejia Canton-Cayambe. Ministerio de Salud Publica and CARE.
C. Cambodia: Women Artisan’s Business Training

The third UNESCO case study which focuses on intangible heritage and women was a business training program in rural Cambodia. The program focused on empowering women through cultural enterprises. The program’s official name The Creative Industries Support Program, was an effort of The Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund project that is financed by the government of Spain. The idea was to take a traditional indigenous craft, such as basket weaving, and teach the producers and the knowledge holders’ business principles and marketing strategies. This helps ensure that the crafts of indigenous pottery, textile weaving, and bamboo rattan basketry remained profitable and thus more likely to be transmitted to the next generation.

The project consulted different agencies such as UNESCO, the International Labor Organization (ILO), Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO), and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). Each agency was consulted to address the different problems related to the Cambodian women’s situation. The program dates were from October 2008 to September 2011. It was an attempt to take a holistic approach to the problem.

Although tourism is one of the major industries in Cambodia, the economics “…has not brought prosperity to the 5 million Cambodians who live on less than half a dollar a day. This is especially true in Cambodia’s remote provinces where the majority of the population is from indigenous communities.”\(^5\) The target population for the program was rural, indigenous, women. As in these areas, most of the producers of craftwork are women. However, knowledge of business ownership and entrepreneurial

skills are rare. The project’s main goal was to increase this sort of business knowledge and give the women tools to economically thrive and profit from their work.

The group of women was further narrowed by handicraft tradition, willingness to learn, presence of local organizations, and special attention to local livelihood activities (such as avoiding disturbing harvesting periods). In total, 547 female producers were enabled through the program to grow their businesses. Generally, the women saw their revenue increase by 35% or 50 United States Dollars. The unintended social effects were women being able to stay home and sell their goods rather than participate in the migratory work to the large plantations. The program report also mentioned a decrease in domestic violence among the women since the power balance had begun to shift and opinions of women’s value and standing changed.

**D. Mozambique: Culturally-Based Women’s Sexual Reproductive Health Programs**

This UNESCO case sources from the *Millennium Development Goal Achievement Fund Project*. This joint project between six UN agencies including UNESCO and ten Mozambican government ministries was called the *Strengthening Cultural and Creative Industries and Inclusive Policies in Mozambique*. The project was extensive in the way that it included many aspects of Mozambique society, such as health and economic projects. The focus of this analysis is the sexual reproductive health program. In Mozambique the general population suffers from extremely high rates of HIV/AIDS infection and high infant and mother mortality. The program gathered traditional healers
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and modern health professionals to collaborate on speaking with young audiences about women’s sexual reproductive issues.

The SCCIIPZ program original dates were meant to run from 2008 to 2011. The program was financed by the government of Spain and was meant to have two components and 6 outcomes. The cost was 5 million US dollars. The program was then scaled back, due to a limited time frame, to include only two components and three outcomes. It was then extended to February 2012. Six agencies were involved in the implementation. The areas chosen for the programs were: Maputo City, Zavala District, Inhambane City, Mossuril District, Ilha de Moçambique District and Nampula City which included Maratane Refugee Camp, on the outskirts of Nampula.

While the final data for the impact on the population is not yet available, there was a marked change in the approach of the community leaders. Incorporated into three districts, the socio-cultural approach to Sexual Reproductive Health was a success but the creation of materials and programs which integrated both accurate modern medical information and local beliefs was processed late. An unexpected outcome of the program was the partnerships forged by the traditional healers and medical community.

D. Analysis of Case Studies

All of the case study programs as summarized above were considered by UNESCO to be successful. This was also the general consensus of the governments involved. However, each program did have issues concerning implementation. Additionally, two out of the four programs did have some initial disappointing outcomes. One culturally-defined area, the Pacific region, had no UNESCO intangible heritage initiatives; this includes artist cooperatives and socio-cultural inclusive policies. For
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example, on the *Intangible Representative List of Humanity*, Vanuatu has just one heritage practice, sand drawing, listed. This low intangible heritage representation is repeated throughout other Pacific Region countries. This may attributed to multiple reasons, one being power and representation as stake holders in the UNESCO system, and two, recent political instability in the Pacific region, as will be discussed in a case study at the end of this thesis.

**II. Millennium Development Goals**

The Millennium Development Goals (MDG’s) are an important influence in UNESCO’s current programming and policy initiatives, especially those involving intangible heritage, women and development. MDG’s have been the main mission for all of the UN bodies and organizations since the *Millennium Declaration of 2000*.\(^{56}\) There are eight goals and each was meant to be significantly impacted or eradicated by 2015. The eight goals are:

1. End poverty and hunger
2. Universal education
3. Gender equality
4. Child health
5. Maternal health
6. Combat HIV/AIDS
7. Environmental sustainability

The MDG’s impact the overall program implementation process because UNESCO has to align its thematic programs with these goals. The impact of the MDG’s is clear through the fact that three out of four of the case study programs are through the MDG Fund. “The MDG-Fund was established in 2007 through a landmark agreement signed between the Government of Spain and the UN system with the aim of accelerating progress on the MDGs.”57 To date, the government of Spain has donated 900 million USD for the programs. As is characteristic of UN programming the MDG has thematic focuses. One of the program areas is strictly for cultural development. What is significant about the MDG program is the focus on results and specific framework.

From all of the case studies noted above, it is clear that intangible heritage-based development programs for women work. They not only work, but they are arguably more effective at the preservation of traditions than simple UNESCO designation by first recognizing the importance of the tradition, and then making intangible heritage economically and socially applicable to the lives of the women it impacts. Each program, though some have yet to meet their goals, has performed extremely well and exceeded the expectations of the initiators. It is clear that, as UNESCO has stated, culture at the heart of development is truly essential to the success of the programs and projects.

III. The Challenges of Heritage Tourism and Women’s Development Programs

The use of cultural heritage as resource for use through tourism is complex in its nature as well as controversial. Tourism accounts for 5% of direct global GDP and is the

main source of income for many developing countries. Cultural tourism makes up an increasing amount of this revenue. Further, adding issues such as intangible culture and the discussion of the roles of women in economic and social development to that of heritage tourism increases the financial and human rights stakes of member nations.

In 2011, current Director General of UNESCO, Irina Bokova, included a new initiative *Culture a Bridge to Development*, in the new Biennium Programme and Budget for 2012-2013 (36 C/5). This initiative is meant to introduce creative and innovative solutions that will center culture as a means to economic, social, and human development. So far, those goals are being met with the development programs that have been initiated with the MDG Fund and UNESCO programs.

However, the promotion of heritage tourism through these programs increases the risk of cultural mummification and socioeconomic stagnation. As one example given by Chaudri and Chandra states, how can a woman care about the traditional growing customs of her people if abandoning this would ensure her children never go hungry? Yet within all the conventions, it is clearly stated that the traditions need to be living and therefore constantly changing and evolving. Still, the opportunity for the economic and social exploitation of women is inexcusably high. This is when using human rights frameworks and policies can protect women from becoming simply providers of a service.

---


and they can be more engaged with the processes of development and planning. Human rights can also be the leverage used to promote preservation, and thus development treaties, between countries to protect the intangible heritage of women.

**IV. Problems in International Preservation and Development Policies**

Preservation of cultures is a complex process. The policy and economic mechanisms must constantly adapt to meet the changing challenges of heritage preservation in the 21st century, such as increasing homogeneity and increasing rapidness of historical site destruction. With regard to intangible heritage this situation of adaptation is an even more complex and an evolving process. The current international convention in place for the protection of international heritage is the *Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Heritage (2003)*, which declares and recognizes that it is a priority to safeguard intangible heritage. However, only the *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of Cultural Diversity (2005)* UNESCO acknowledged the destructive effects of globalization, such as cultural homogeneity, loss of sustainable rural lifestyles, increasing socio-economic disparity, on national and localized cultures around the globe.

Yet, both conventions still do not specify or give guidelines on how the preservation of intangible heritage against the encroachment of globalization can be achieved. As with other conventions, the work of how to achieve this is left to the member states of UNESCO to enact in their own countries and also decide if such action is necessary. This lack of specific guidance on capacity is indicative of the intergovernmental process of UNESCO. While the creation of law and convention
through government process is necessary, it does create a lack of institution of conventions on the national level. The lack of direction is also necessary to curtail the power of UNESCO being able to force a foreign worldview on the member nations.

A related concern is that of imposing Euro-American beliefs and lifestyles on the women of other cultures. The view of some countries, mainly in the Middle East, is that cultural exchange encourages women to leave their traditional social and physical spheres, such as childrearing at home, as women have done in many European and North American countries. In addition, if cultural global homogenization were to continue at the pace it has for the past decade, this will greatly affect intangible heritage practices of women around the globe and even cause the extinction of some practices. This is especially true of traditional craftwork practices such as Krgyz traditional felt carpet making and watertight technology of Chinese traditional junks.

This was part of the great controversy surrounding the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Heritage (2003). Many of the European and the North American countries held reservations about ratifying the list. These countries did not agree on a reason or see a economic or social gain for establishing an intangible cultural heritage list. The European and North American member nations felt that the logistics of implementation and funding required were too challenging; these nations are often known as market nations for tangible and intangible cultural objects. Of more interest, many of the countries that have ratified 2003, such as Cambodia, The Seychelles, and Zimbabwe, fall into the category of cultural heritage source countries and often have an
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abundance of monumental and intangible cultural practices. Additionally, countries that did not participate in the ratification of the convention of 2003 were in regions that were conspicuously not analyzed in the 2001 conference on women in the domain of intangible heritage. This is clear of the highly politicized nature of culture heritage issues in general.

The next challenge is the conflict between member nations about the perception of traditional roles of women in society. In many Euro-North American societies, the status of women has changed drastically. For countries such as the United States and Canada, the historical role of women as being mostly within the home and private sphere is now viewed largely as outmoded and restrictive of the rights of women. This is not true for other countries, such as Iran and Saudi Arabia. There is a direct link between heritage and human rights laws, and when the UHRD was to be amended to include equal rights between the genders, countries such as Saudi Arabia objected deeply to the addition. 61

Predominantly in Arabic countries, the cultural and sometimes legal status and role of women was not equal to men. Gender equality and fluidity between gender duties was taboo and contradictory to their cultural worldview. This created a dilemma about recognizing and protecting women’s intangible heritage in these specific countries. The problem of how to advance the social and economic status of women in these cultures without imposing an outside worldview is still not solved. Although UNESCO is the legal entity for cultural heritage as an international legal entity is also beholden to international human rights law. While taking the position of supporting full gender role

equality is expected, it is enforcing a policy that promotes a measurable and unwanted social change in some cultures.
Chapter 4: Using Intangible Heritage Development Projects for Cultural Diplomacy

Currently, bilateral and multilateral preservation treaties between nations focus entirely on tangible heritage. Yet intangible heritage is becoming more central to the policies of UNESCO and other international bodies; due to the increasing importance of intangible culture, international conventions have attempted policies to ensure its survival. But further potential for international instruments to safeguard intangible heritage resources and use them to enhance quality of life in developing nations has barely been examined though it can better preserve this complex heritage.

I. Case Study-Tangible Preservation Treaties with the United States

From 1987, The United States has multiple preservation treaties with 16 different countries: Belize, Bolivia, Cambodia, Canada, China, Colombia, Cyprus, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iraq, Italy, Mali, Nicaragua and Peru. In these bilateral agreements the US has agreed to monitor, bar, and return illegally imported cultural property to the country of origin. For example, in a bilateral agreement with Bolivia, established in 2001, the US government has agreed to not accept Pre-Columbian art and statues, which were in high demand in the illegal art market, due to popularity of advertisements by companies such as Kahlua liquor, which included West Mexican shaft grave figurines. This is the standard model for all the agreements. The international
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policy basis for these agreements are enforced at US borders, at customs, where federal agents are trained to recognize, report, and begin the process of repatriating the objects.

This bilateral model is straightforward in implementation, though still somewhat problematic to enforce, even with specialized agencies like the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Art Crimes Unit. The bilateral treaties focus on the protection of tangible heritage that are moved illegally into the United States. The responsibility of these treaties mean that customs agents in US airports and boats facilities are required to search for, confiscate, and report illegal cultural objects from a country such as China or Italy, that are prohibited from entering the United States. The treaty does not make use of the FBI Art Crime team, possibly due to a small staff of 11. Other problems with the execution of this treaty include: lack of proper training of customs agents on recognizing objects; little funding for training; and inadequate storage space to prevent further damage and deterioration of the cultural objects.

It is clear that nation states like the US and Bolivia are cooperating in the ramifications of Article 12 of the Convention Protection and Promotion of Cultural Diversity and World Heritage 1970 and by doing so these countries are making the laws that prosecute destruction of cultural heritage stronger. However, countries such as the US still have not actively pursued the possibility of bilateral and even multilateral treaties on the preservation of intangible heritage. Although the US maintains a grant program, The Ambassadors Fund for Cultural Preservation, most of the funding, again, is granted to tangible heritage. The few case attempts at preserving intangible heritage are funds and
grants given for the documentation of a practice. As has been proven earlier in this thesis, this is an inadequate method, for insuring the survival of the practices.

II. The Case for Intangible Heritage Treaties

The discussion of intangible heritage preservation, the international laws, and the use of intangible heritage for socioeconomic development has evolved. While there are many opinions and problems involving the focus of intangible heritage development and women, the success of these programs for the communities they have been instituted in is not in question. The preservation of cultural practices as defined by the UNESCO conventions and the successful further development of socioeconomic status of women in these communities has also been repeatedly demonstrated. It is clear that this model of using intangible heritage as the living resource it is, and centering socioeconomic development projects around it, has both social and political benefits.

Using these findings as a baseline, culturally-based socioeconomic development programs, can be used to further the potential of not only preserving the intangible traditions in question and enhancing the socioeconomic status of women, but also, furthering diplomatic efforts between countries. This can be achieved by the programs being the basis for bilateral and multilateral intangible heritage treaties, agreements, and cooperation between nation states. In addition, these treaties can further peace building efforts like the final case study to be presented, that of the Autonomous Region of Bougainville, Papua New Guinea, by magnifying the internal efforts of post conflict countries and increasing interests of countries in regions that might have suffered from

overall international political and economic disinterest. Unlike the tangible cultural heritage treaties that exist between nation states, (i.e. US and China) that focus on object inventory and illegal trafficking of objects, the intangible heritage treaties at national levels will require a different management as discussed in the models below.

**III. Models for Intangible Heritage Preservation Treaties**

The following models proposed for bilateral and multilateral treaties between nation states can provide a framework for treaties and set a workable plan to enact the UNESCO international policies and conventions on national levels. As the UNESCO conventions insist, any proposed cultural heritage treaties must not contradict prior conventions and existing human rights laws. As stated, a concern of these proposed treaties is to ensure they are not used to ‘freeze’ cultural practices in the guise of preserving cultural diversity or defending against cultural globalization.65 Another incertitude is the possible abuse by one country toward another by the promotion of one country’s interests, worldview, and values over those of another country. However, when supported in the frame of international human rights laws, the treaties will serve the dual purposes of aiding development and promoting preservation, but also mutually benefit all nation states involved. Structuring these treaties and programs around human rights laws already gives a foundation for socioeconomic development agendas.

Due to its multiple treaties with various nations and the position of political power in international affairs, the US was chosen as the unchanging or constant nation state

---

example in the models. The United States is also a country that would benefit greatly from cultural diplomacy and preservation treaties regarding intangible heritages as it has recently increased the importance of its public diplomacy programs. The other example nation states in the proposed treaty models will vary, to further exemplify that these paradigms for intangible heritage preservation treaties can and should be replicated with different country actors. Below are two models that can be recreated with any nation state.

**Model 1. National Bilateral Intangible Heritage Treaty-2 Nations States**

The first model example for the intangible heritage treaty would be a bilateral established between two countries. As stated the constant nation state is the US and, for this model, Ecuador will be the variable nation. In this theoretical scenario, referring back to the earlier case study of the culturally appropriate birth (CAB) program, the government of Ecuador impressed by the success wants to replicate CAB in other provinces. However, money from an NGO such the World Health Organization is not available due to the World Bank’s thematic priorities. In addition Ecuador’s own national budget will not allow for new spending. This is where a bilateral agreement with the US government would be created.

The Ecuadorian government’s branch of foreign affairs with their Ministry of Culture in conjunction with the Ministry of Health, would then initiate the process of a bilateral treaty with the US government to fund CAB in other provinces. With most national governments, the department for dealing with affairs of cultural heritage is generally handled through cultural ministries. The closest department the federal US government has to a cultural ministry is the U.S. Parks Department, but all negotiations and
communication with international organizations and foreign governments are made through the Department of State. Therefore the US State Department would then be the main contact and the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs would oversee the funding release.

The intangible heritage treaty, instead of protecting an export, would help or entirely finance the program that is building socioeconomic development of women through an intangible heritage-based programming core. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs would then, in conjunction with the US government international development agency US AID, decide how much money and or resources would be needed for capacity building. A date for expiration of the funding would be set and be renewed as desired or needed by both parties. The obvious benefactor in this scenario is the government of Ecuador, but the US, as the country providing the financial help, is building positive and influential relations, and political clout for negotiations with Ecuador. There is also the added benefit of a better public image of the US with the population of Ecuador.

**Model 2. Bilateral Intangible Heritage Treaty -3 or More Nations**

In this intangible treaty model there would be three nation state actors. This slightly changes the process as previously described above in the first model. In this conceptual scenario, the constant again is the US and the variable country is Cambodia. Referring back again to the earlier case study of *The Creative Industries Support Program*, the Culture Ministry of Cambodia wants to expand this program to other areas in the country. The Ministry needs more funding to continue the program to train more
women artisans but UNESCO cannot, due to budget cuts, fund the program any further. In this example, the United Kingdom, along with the US, is also interested in funding the program.

An inquiry would take place between the State Department, the Cambodian Ministry of Culture, and the British Cabinet of Culture. They would conduct negotiations on terms of funding. At this point, the Cambodian ministry would have a bilateral treaty with both the United States and the United Kingdom. But in this agreement, the US and United Kingdom would not be in treaty with each other. Cambodia would then agree on the division of resources as most beneficial to each nation state. For example, the UK may provide monetary capitol, while the US would provide human capitol in the form of business teachers. Again, these bilateral treaties would take place over a set period of time and would be renewed as needed or required.

Treaties such as the ones outlined in the models are in fact promoted and encouraged by the *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of Cultural Diversity* (2005). In Article 12, named the *Promotion of International Cooperation* the convention states “parties shall endeavour to strengthen their bilateral, regional and international cooperation for the creation of conditions conducive to the promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions…” An example of this is seen in the funding of the Millennium Development Projects by the government of Spain.

---

IV. Further Possibilities: Connection to Post-Conflict Recovery Efforts

Case Study Papua New Guinea: Inclusive Development in Post-Conflict Bougainville

Bougainville is an autonomous region of Papua New Guinea. Made of two large islands Bougainville and Buka, plus many smaller atolls, it has a population of 200,000 and over and its culture represents over a dozen different language groups of mostly Melanesian descent. The Bougainvilleans, while having subgroup ethnicities, view themselves as a cohesive group apart from other Papua New Guineans. A province of Papua New Guinea since 1975, in 1988 the island suffered a devastating nine year civil war for independence. 20,000 individuals were killed during this time by both the separatists’ forces and the Papua New Guinea military and almost half the population was displaced to the mountains or refugee camps. A ceasefire finally occurred in 1997.

The violence of the independence conflict has left Bougainville society in disarray and the population psychologically war-scarred. Further, during the conflict, women suffered various forms of sexual violence, forced agricultural labor throughout the island labor, and torture at the hands of both separatists forces and Papua New Guinea’s military. Currently, there is a development project being led by the World Bank in the peace building process of Bougainville. Titled The Inclusive Development Project in Post Conflict Bougainville and running from November 2010 to March 2015, the main tenets of the project is to involve Bougainville women’s organizations of the region more implicitly in socioeconomic development through funding to the women’s organizations
projects. The loan money from the World Bank will be disseminated through decision by the Bougainville Government.\(^{67}\)

Funding the women’s socioeconomic projects is supporting and relying directly on the intangible traditions and bearers of the Bougainville culture. Traditionally women held significant societal decision power and the Melanesian culture of the island was matrilineal. Prior to the conflict, women played vital roles in community-level decision-making and were key agents of development.\(^{68}\) Traditional intangible practices included women determining kinship, officiating birthrights, planning tribal and religious feasts, and sometimes were in consultation with men arranging marriages. Women were also responsible for agricultural knowledge and were the main producers of food in the communities. However, women’s social position was damaged in the war. Since the peace process has begun, it has been realized that, without the participation of the women, the development of the island’s peace and infrastructure has suffered and this initiative is being instituted to correct it.

Too often, international interventions do not achieve the lasting peace that communities – both domestic and international – expect will ensue.\(^{69}\) Ultimately, the goal of culture in development is to allow for traditional cultural practices to survive and help the heritage practitioners thrive in a globalized and modern world. Many of the practices


\(^{68}\)Ibid

that were chosen as case studies for this thesis had direct tangible applications, such as the midwife knowledge and artistry handiwork. For some heritage practices, such as the composition of poetry, practical applications are not immediately clear but have measurable results when used in socioeconomic development programs.

While, the goal of the *Inclusive Development in Post Conflict Bougainville* was not cultural heritage preservation, it relies on the intangible traditions and the role of women in Melanesian society to succeed. By doing so the culture of the island is being rebuilt, strengthened and preserved. This makes it a successful example of how cultural heritage preservation and socioeconomic development can and should be used in post-conflict recovery processes. This model can and should be essential to UNESCO programming and initiatives.
Conclusion

A. Final Recommendations

It is a clear position by UNESCO that women as the main transmitters of intangible heritage. It is no longer a question, but a fact, that women do have an important role in heritage and are responsible for much of intangible heritages’ survival around the world. However, UNESCO must also try to change the language of equating gender and women. This assumes falsely that gender, which includes both men and women and the interrelationships between them, is not a social construct and is instead a fixed biological state such as sex. While the work of using culture in programs of socioeconomic development is commendable and necessary, it must move past the use of antiquated ideologies and language.

When UNESCO fully commits to the fact that gender roles do vary from culture to culture, sometimes even within the cultures, then projects on development and peace can better replicated and contextualized properly. Further, by focusing on the socioeconomic development of women and more strongly including their presence and contributions in the process, such as the World Bank is funding at in Bougainville, UNESCO programming will then allow women to have agency of their own cultural, social, and economic situations.

Further, strengthening connections between sustainable development, culture, and women as a priority group have their basis and support in international policy. But these

efforts can be further supported by international treaties between countries that specifically support and maintain the programs. It will then give important benefits that include further economic and social development as well as peace building interactions among countries. While achieving all of these things, an intangible preservation treaty will promote, grow, and sustain heritages that are under threat of disappearance and decline. This cannot be done, however, without further efforts being made to acknowledge non-western and local conceptions of heritage.

Still, a return to past national and UNESCO initiatives in which women were directly involved in preservation management is needed. There are resolutions to promote this from an institutional level, such as the 2011 UNESCO biennium’s supporting craft workers and providing museum and preservation training to women. In projects such as the Vanuatu’s women’s project, women are teaching other women their intangible heritage practices, thus ensuring the practices not only continue but it will also not be completely taken out of cultural context. UNESCO should then better promote the exhibition of women’s intangible heritage in stakeholder countries. Doing so will not only highlight the importance of these traditions, but it will also promote the priority of women’s and gender equality through a cultural heritage lens.

Finally, considering the size and scope of the task that UNESCO has tried to address by creating policies involving intangible heritage and women, there remains a significant amount of work to be done. The current conventions must be made stronger

---

by putting an emphasis specifically on women’s intangible heritage and not intangible heritage and women. By doing so, UNESCO will mitigate some of the wariness from countries in which men and women’s roles are still traditionally gendered, such as the Middle East and certain regions of Africa. This will also help stave off the cultural homogenizing effects of globalization while still allowing for socioeconomic progress and modernity. If the intangible heritage and development program treaty models are used, the countries involved will also share diplomatic ties and views on preservation priorities.

**B. Closing Thoughts**

“In 2002, Koichi Matsuura, Director-General of UNESCO, stated that “[i]ntangible cultural heritage is not just the memory of past cultures, but is also a laboratory for inventing the future (UNESCO 2002).” Matsurra referred to potential of intangible culture as a resource that can and will shape the future. By UNESCO recognizing women as the principle bearers and transmitters of intangible heritage, the future is being shaped with the best of the past. Supporting culturally-based socioeconomic development programs of women through preservation treaties is important to humanity as a whole.

While tangible heritage can, and often, binds a person or group to country, religion, and culture through a shared and common experience, intangible heritage is different. As the patrimony of everyday activities in life, intangible heritage is perhaps

---

the most basic and essential expression of culture and human identity. It is through the rituals, learned skills, and group festivals of intangible heritage that the experience of one’s culture is simultaneously intimate, communal, and intergenerational. It allows for the person to become and live their culture and not just simply view or touch.
Appendix

Figure 1. Map of the World with Highlighted Case Regions (In Purple)
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